



LEARNMe: POSITION PAPER THREE

**Xarxa de Centres Mercator sobre la Diversitat Lingüística:  
Projecte LEARNMe 2013-2015**

**Mercator Network of Language Diversity Centres:  
LEARNMe Project 2013-2015**

**Universitat de Barcelona**

**Catalunya**

**8-9 d'abril / April 2015**

<b>THEMA:</b> El replantejament de la diversitat lingüística en la política lingüística, els mitjans i l'ensenyament	<b>THEME:</b> Revisiting, reanalysing and redefining research on linguistic diversity: policy, media and education
--	--

## Contents

1.	Introduction, production and structure of the Position Paper .....	4
1.1	Introduction .....	4
1.2	Production.....	7
1.3	Structure of this Position Paper .....	7
2.	The presentations and discussions.....	8
2.1	First session.....	8
	a) Vicent Climent-Ferrando: «Minoritized languages within the EU» .....	8
	b) Eva Pons: «The legal protection of Aranese Occitan in Catalonia» .....	11
	c) Conclusions .....	14
2.2	Second session .....	14
	a) Anna Rolewska: «Nationalist and regional parties as drivers of minority language policy and planning» .....	15
	b) Alessia Vacca, University of Sassari, Italy «Protection of Minority Languages in the Public Administration of Northern Ireland: Irish and Ulster Scots Linguistic Legislation, which and when?’».....	16
	c) Conclusions and discussion.....	18
2.3	Third session.....	19
	a) Vesna Crnić-Grotić: Legislation and minority languages – the role of the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages.....	19
	b) Giovanni Poggeschi: Recent developments with regards to minority languages in Italy.....	20
	c) Eneritz Zabaleta: Recent developments on the legal protection of minoritized languages in France.....	20
	d) Discussion.....	21
	e) Conclusions .....	21
2.4	Fourth session .....	22
	a) Rudi Janssens: The impact Brussels & Brussels linguistic regime on sociolinguistic Dynamics on Brussels and the Rand: recent developments.....	23
	b) Miquel Cabal, Universitat de Barcelona: «Crimea at a crossroads: perspectives for linguistic diversity in Crimea in the light of the last year’s events» .....	24
	c) Jarmo Lainio, Stockholm University: «The interplay between the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, national authorities and NGO’s – The case of teacher education for national minority languages in Sweden».....	25
	d) Conclusions .....	26
2.5	Fifth session.....	27

a)	Antoni-Ignasi Alomar, Universitat de les Illes Balears: «The transformation of public language policies in the Balearic Islands during the last four years».....	28
b)	Avel·lí Flors, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, UOC: «From soft promotion to defencelessness? Sociolinguistic effects of changing language policies in València».....	29
c)	Natxo Sorolla, Universitat de Barcelona / Universitat Rovira i Virgili: «Changing policies with regards to minority languages in Aragon and its sociological and sociolinguistic impact».....	30
d)	Conclusions .....	32
3.	Analysing the papers and discussions .....	33
3.1	List of theoretical concepts.....	33
3.2	An analysis of contents on the basis of the sub-themes.....	48
3.2.1	Sub-theme 1: Policy and Practice: <i>Top-down</i> and <i>Bottom-up</i> approaches and Sub-theme 3: Socio-political approaches and ideological objectives.....	49
3.2.2	Sub-theme 2: Terminological diversity and its consequences.....	56
3.2.3	Sub-theme 4: Methodological issues.....	59
3.2.4	Sub-theme 5: Sociolinguistic practices in media, education and policy.....	60
4.	Final reflections .....	61
	Appendix 1 Programme of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> LEARNMe Workshop .....	63
	Appendix 2 Preparatory document, invitation to participate.....	66

# 1. Introduction, production and structure of the Position Paper

## 1.1 Introduction

This document is the third Position Paper of the LEARNMe Project. The focus of this project is to explore and develop ideas and views referring to linguistic diversity as a dynamic and changing concept by means of a series of scientific meetings that gather specialists in the area in order to discuss a number of theoretical and methodological relevant issues. The LEARNMe project is based on an iterative methodology: formulating a Preparatory Document, a number of invited Papers to be presented at three Workshops and a reflective Position Paper produced after each of these workshops. The experiences and conclusions of the first Position Paper form a background to the second one, and these in turn form a background to the third one from Barcelona, all with slightly different foci. A Final Position Paper — the White Paper — will be based on the preceding three Position Papers and other documentation collected during the workshops and the project period. The White Paper will be presented at the Final Conference in Budapest during fall 2015.

This Position Paper<sup>1</sup> was developed building on the experiences of the three LEARNMe Workshops:

1. The first one, held at Aberystwyth University (Wales) on the 17th – 18th October 2013, which had a focus on media and research issues.
2. The second one, held in Stockholm (Sweden), on the 8th – 9th May 2014, which had a focus on education.
3. The third one, which is the major basis for this Position Paper, held in Barcelona (Catalonia) on the 8th – 9th April 2014, which had a focus on language legislation, language policies and their impact on the sociolinguistic dynamics.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> From now on, all Position Papers will be referred by means of two initials and their respective number. PP1 = First Position Paper, PP2 = Second Position Paper, PP3 = Third Position Paper.

<sup>2</sup> The contents and calendars of the three Workshops have followed the outlines made within the Mercator Network, although the third workshop, planned to be held in January 2015, had to be postponed three months due to the fact that the original Catalan partner in the Network (CIEMEN) had to be replaced by a new partner (CUSC-UB) by the end of the year 2014. For further

Each one of these workshops put the emphasis on a different aspect of linguistic diversity:

- The first workshop (WS1) was entitled “*Revisiting, reanalysing and redefining research on linguistic diversity: **media**, education and policy*”, stressing the media and its research sectors, sometimes however involving the other fields mentioned in the workshop outline.
- The second workshop (WS2) concentrated more on educational issues, and therefore was called: “*Revisiting, reanalysing and redefining research on linguistic diversity: **education**, policy and media*”, stressing both educational linguistics and language policy research findings, as well as practical experiences from these fields.
- The third workshop (WS3), which is the basis for this PP3, turned its eyes to the juridical and political dimension of language policies, as expressed by its title “*Revisiting, reanalysing and redefining research on linguistic diversity: **policy**, media and education*”, and paid a particular attention to the consequences of legislative measures on the position of lesser-used languages in all domains of life.

All three workshops focused primarily on Europe and had a slight regional overweight in the programme design and among the participants which in the WS3 meant a special representation of Western Mediterranean countries. Nevertheless, invitations and participants were not restricted to this area, and thus all three workshops were international by design, and all speakers were invited to adopt a global research perspective.

In the preparatory meetings for the previous workshops, a number of sub-themes had been identified and suggested to experts and presenters as foci for discussions and presentations. In both Aberystwyth and Stockholm the common themes were:

---

information on the project and its progression, see: <http://www.mercator-research.eu/research-projects/learnme-mercator-network/>.

- 1 **Policy and Practice:** Top-down and bottom-up approaches to research, policy and practice; International Level; Nation-state/Country/Regional and Local levels;
- 2 **Terminological Diversity and its consequences:** Terminology as an institutionalised field (e.g. language, dialect, vernacular, bi-/multilingualism, plurilingualism, translanguaging, second vs foreign language, multilingual competence, minority language, immigrant languages, lesser used language, state language, official language, etc.);
- 3 **Socio-political approaches and ideological objectives:** e.g. assimilationist, additive/multicultural/segregated linguistic and cultural independence etc.; identities;
- 4 **Methodological Issues:** e.g. *linguaging* and approaches to linguistic diversity; effects of non-essentialist and essentialist perspectives on language education; permeable and impermeable language frameworks;
- 5 **Sociolinguistic practices** in the fields of Education, Media (including social media) and Policy.

In addition to these five themes, a sixth one was introduced for the workshop in Stockholm:

- 6 **Examples of best practice** at any level of education for multilingual students.

According to the original plan of the LEARNMe Project, the WS3 was to be oriented towards the legal and political aspects of linguistic diversity, and this was the orientation adopted when defining its programme, which can be consulted in Appendix 1. In line with this orientation, presenters at the Barcelona Workshop were invited to make a special emphasis on two particular aspects:

1. **Recent developments** regarding the legal protection of minoritized languages.
2. **Impact of legislation** on sociolinguistic realities.

All the presentations and the discussions of the WS3 were video recorded and uploaded, and are now available for on-line consultation at <http://www.ub.edu/cusc/politling/projects/learnme/>.

## 1.2 Production

The first draft of this PP3 was originally written by the members of the Organizing Committee of the WS3, namely F. Xavier Vila, Eva Pons and Guillem Pujades (Universitat de Barcelona). This first draft was sent to the members of the Mercator Network, who have participated actively in the programme and have been given the opportunity to comment on this Position Paper.

This paper was produced using the following material:

- First and the Second Position Papers,
- Outlines for the project,
- Preparatory Document / Invitation to Participate (Appendix Two),
- Presentations, including PowerPoint presentations, papers and video recordings,
- Notes in the form of summaries from the two-day workshop by the CUSC UB team (F. Xavier Vila, Guillem Pujades and Eva Pons),
- Reports by the three experts invited to the workshop

## 1.3 Structure of this Position Paper

This PP3 synthesises the main contents of the presentations and the discussions that took place among the c. 30 participants during the WS3, as well as the contributions made by the Experts invited for the event, namely Jeroen Darquennes, from Université de Namur (Belgium), Tom Moring, from University of Helsinki (Finland), and Eithne O'Connell, from Dublin City University (Éire). The document includes:

1. A presentation of the document
2. A summary of the contents of all presentations and the discussions of the two-day workshop in Stockholm, based on the reports elaborated by the moderators of each session.

3. A conjoint analysis of the main issues discussed during the workshop, paying attention to their connection with the issues discussed in the previous workshops.
4. Some general reflections and preliminary conclusions.
5. A number of annexes.

## 2. The presentations and discussions

The Workshop was structured in a series of five sessions, each one including 2-3 presentations thematically connected, followed by a time devoted to discussion between the speakers and the public.<sup>3</sup>

### 2.1 First session

Chaired by Tom Moring

The session was based on two presentations which took two different scopes: on the one hand, Vicent Clement-Ferrando's «Minoritized languages within the EU» analysed the language policies and language discourses deployed by the EU authorities, and showed how these seem to be moving away from the protection of lesser used languages. On the other, Eva Pons's lecture on «The legal protection of Aranese Occitan in Catalonia» brought the lens down to how a very small community of just a few thousand speakers can be effectively protected in legal terms.

#### a) Vicent Climent-Ferrando: «Minoritized languages within the EU»

The speaker started out presenting the Network to Promote Linguistic Diversity (NPLD), a European wide network working in the field of language policy and planning for Constitutional, Regional and Small-State Languages (CRSS which was established in 2007.

He pointed out the need of a pan-European network to ensure that all languages, regardless of status or political weight are represented and respected at

---

<sup>3</sup> The following summaries, including the conclusions, are based on the minutes provided by the chairpersons of each sessions. They have only been homogenized for stylistic purposes.



EU level, therefore including the 24 official languages (of which some are kin-state languages in other states and thus count as regional or minority languages in those states), 5 more languages have semi-official status with the EU, allowing for example correspondence with the Union in these languages, and the 60-80 autochthonous lesser used / minority / regional languages, a category with a complex terminology (e.g., the use of *minority* depends on the relational aspect, i.e., minority to whom?) which, in the policies of the EU, are left aside.

The situation for the minoritized (regional- or minority) languages in Europe has not developed positively within the Union, in spite of several resolutions in favour of resolute action taken by the European Parliament. The speaker particularly pointed to the Ebner resolution in 2003, the Moares resolution in 2005, and the Alfonsi resolution in 2013. The Alfonsi resolution (see <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&reference=A7-2013-0239&language=EN#title1>) was accepted by a broad majority of the parliament, 92% voted for and those who voted against represented only one country, namely France.

In February 2015 the NPLD launched its *European Roadmap for Linguistic Diversity, towards a new approach on languages as part of the European Agenda 2020* (see <http://www.npld.eu/uploads/publications/313.pdf>). The roadmap, which is now up for consultation, will be discussed in a conference to be held in November, 18-20<sup>th</sup> 2015 in Brussels, consists of four parts:

1. The legal and policy status
2. The benefits of linguistic diversity
3. The importance of an inclusive approach in regard to the developments of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) in the field of languages
4. The need for support to Regional, Minority and Endangered Languages of Europe, and the recognition of and support to each language.

The speaker pointed to the status difference between the official languages and other languages, underlining that it must be recognized that all languages are connected with prosperity and progress. But this is not the case, and, for instance,

in the current situation, school contests of languages promoted by the EU are arranged only for the 24 official languages, with the message that other languages are not beneficial to study. Another example that was pointed out was the absence of regional or minority languages in EU jargon data-bases, or the restriction of EU's on-line platform [Language Learning Portal](#) to only 24 languages. NPLD has asked for an expansion of the amount of languages but has so far not received any response.

The speaker pointed out that in recent years there has been a change in EU priorities, and that this change is illustrated by the transformation in the rhetoric on languages of EU (figure 1). The left column includes the elements of the 'rhetoric of multilingualism' which has been gaining ground in the last time (*utility, competitiveness, employability, mobility, growth*), while those on the right show the concepts connected to the 'rhetoric of linguistic diversity' (namely, *identity, protection, extinction, loss, culture*) that are being replaced by the former in the EU rhetoric. This shows how 'multilingualism' is not taking into account regional or minority languages anymore, as language skills are now one-sidedly linked to employment and economy, and culture is less and less discussed in connection with languages.

Multilingualism	Linguistic diversity
<i>Utility</i>	<i>Identity</i>
<i>Competitiveness</i>	<i>Protection</i>
<i>Employability</i>	<i>Extinction</i>
<i>Mobility</i>	<i>Loss</i>
<i>Growth</i>	<i>Culture</i>

Figure 1 Rhetoric of multilingualism vs. rhetoric of linguistic diversity

Two main conclusions of the speaker were that the presence of minority languages in the development of ICT is crucial, and that a dialogue must be developed that can overcome the biased and unfavourable approach of the EU in regard to those autochthonous languages that are not today supported.

In the discussion, the importance of public funding for regional or minority languages through EU programmes was brought to the fore. The lack of funding for translation for these languages in particular, and the criteria within the current programmes for funding language-related projects in general were discussed. It was noted that the main-streaming of languages in the criteria for EU programmes and projects has led to a situation that in practice prevents applicants from smaller languages from receiving funding, as languages without official status in the competition with bigger languages are put in an unfair position (particularly in light of the discursive positionings mentioned by the speaker, see Figure 1). Problems related to main-streaming have been pointed to several times earlier, for example in the SMiLE report<sup>4</sup> commissioned by the EU. An equality aspect should be established that gives appropriate attention to the needs of regional or minority languages. NPLD is currently lobbying with the European Commission to get the aspect of “equity” into the programmes.

#### **b) Eva Pons: «The legal protection of Aranese Occitan in Catalonia»**

Dr. Pons explained the legal and political developments concerning Catalonia’s autochthonous minority language, Occitan Aranese, which has been receiving increasing protection since it was initially recognised in 1979 in Catalonia’s Statute of Autonomy. She paid special attention to the discrepancies in the language policies developed by the Catalan and Aranese authorities, on the one hand, and the Spanish central government on the other.

The protection of Aranese Occitan started with the recognition, in 1979, that the “parla aranesa” (‘Aranese parlance’) was the autochthonous linguistic variety of Valley of Aran. It should be borne in mind that, due to the strong linguistic repression both in France and in Spain, by those times most speakers of Aranese Occitan had very little metalinguistic knowledge and only a few were actually aware that their language was spoken much beyond their Valley. So during the first steps to normalize the language, ample use of the local glottonym was made to calm down potential parochial reticences. But all language planning initiatives undertaken in the following years —language codification, language

---

<sup>4</sup> Visit: [http://www.ecmi.de/fileadmin/downloads/Smile\\_report\\_2002\\_Final.pdf](http://www.ecmi.de/fileadmin/downloads/Smile_report_2002_Final.pdf)

teaching, promotion of official language use, etc.— assumed that Aranese was just part of Occitan, and that it was in the benefit of Aranese speakers that this fact become widely acknowledged in the Valley. This assumption was therefore reflected in the successive pieces of linguistic legislation passed by Catalonia's authorities: 7/1983 Law of Linguistic Normalization, 1/1998 Language Policy Law. So by 2006, when a second Statute of Autonomy for Catalonia was voted for, Aranese Occitan was enshrined as the Valley's *llengua pròpia* (i.e., 'own language'), and as an official language next to Catalan and Castilian. Even more, Occitan was also declared official in the whole of Catalonia, not only in the Valley of Aran.

Examples of the affirmative actions derived from recognition of the Aranese Occitan are for example the developments of education of Occitan and by means of Occitan, the fact that the toponymy in Aran is supposed to be exclusively in Aranese Occitan, or the fact that some legal texts are available in Aranese. In fact, since 2010 the Valley of Aran enjoys some degree of autonomy and its language is acknowledged in the first place as an official language by the 35/2010 law which, significantly, is named the "law of Occitan, Aranese in Aran". In 2014 an Aranese Academy of Occitan Language (*Acadèmia Aranesa dera lengua Occitana*) was established for the linguistic unity of Occitan language, and to develop a reference norm of Occitan. But the ample degree of protection which is recognised by Aranese and Catalanian authorities for Occitan has met with opposition from the Spanish Central Government, which has taken Catalonia's legislation to the Constitutional Court.

As far as the ECRML is concerned, the Spanish authorities included Aranese in it, but in the last report this language is not included among the different official languages in Catalonia, only in the Aran Valley. This is, according to the speaker, erroneous, and the Spanish state has represented this in a wrong way, because the ECRML ratification (2001) claims that "Spain declares that, for the purposes of the mentioned articles, are considered as regional or minority languages, the languages recognised as official languages in the Statutes of Autonomy of the Autonomous Communities of the Basque Country, Catalonia, Balearic Islands, Galicia, Valencia and Navarra".

In spite of this legislative development in favour of Aranese Occitan, the sociolinguistic position of the language is weak: due to increasing recent immigration, Aranese is today the first of 22% of the population of the Valley, compared to 37% that have Spanish as the first language and 15% that have Catalan. Concerning the knowledge of Aranese language, older people understand the language better, and use it more, but cannot write it due to the absence of language in official public life. People between 30 and 44 — with a larger percentage of non-native Aranese —, is the group that has lower percentages of understanding, speaking, reading and writing. Young people are the group with higher percentages of writing. The media situation of the language is also weak, with only some hours of Aranese on the TV in Catalonia, and no newspapers. In view of these data, and according to the speaker, the sociolinguistic situation of Aranese Occitan is a matter of serious concern.

In conclusion:

- The cultural and historical particularity of Aranese is recognized by Catalan legislation.
- The Occitan language has (through Aranese) been increasingly legally protected.
- The legal regime of the Occitan language reflects the tension between the Catalan legislation and the State legislative framework
- There is a need for practical measures to promote the effective use of Aranese.
- The sociolinguistic situation is a permanent limit for the development of legislation.

In the discussion, particular attention was given to the relational aspects of different Occitan speech communities and language varieties. On the one hand, there is an argument for standardization of Occitan language. On the other hand there are hindrances in practice due to historical differences and state borders.

It was also pointed out that the French approach is not supportive of Occitan, and this strengthens the negative perspectives of Occitan language that is already badly pressed by a decreasing number of speakers, the pressure of stronger *linguae francae*, and internal and external migration.

During the discussion, the speaker stressed the importance of full recognition of Occitan language, and pointed out that there is a domino effect in the relation between recognition and an Occitan identity of Aranese, a positive development would be dependent on strengthening all aspects of the Occitan language.

### **c) Conclusions**

Matters of particular principal importance rising out of these two presentations and the following discussions are:

- Matters relating to the negative effects of mainstreaming within the EU policies,
- Importance of equal status for minority languages,
- Avoidance of negative/negligent rhetoric in EU parlance in regard to minoritized languages,
- An appropriate approach to ICT developments,
- The importance to seriously consider the role and both negative and positive aspects of standardization of endangered languages and their varieties,
- The importance of cross-border cooperation where possible, to strengthen languages divided by national borders,
- Importance of State Party respect for positive regional measures that exceed national minimalist policies to promote and protect regional or minority languages.

## **2.2 Second session**

Chaired by Eithne O'Connell

The second morning session on Wednesday, 8 April 2015, which started after the coffee break and ran from 11.30 until 13:00, was devoted to papers about the situation of minority languages in the British Islands. Anna Rolewska from the University of Aberystwyth, Wales, UK spoke on the topic «Nationalist and regional parties as drivers of minority language policy and planning» and Alessia Vacca

from the University of Sassari, Italy examined «Protection of Minority Languages in the Public Administration of Northern Ireland: Irish and Ulster Scots Linguistic Legislation, which and when?». The session and subsequent discussion was chaired by Eithne O'Connell of Dublin City University Ireland.

**a) Anna Rolewska: «Nationalist and regional parties as drivers of minority language policy and planning»**

Anna Rolewska delivered a paper which took as its starting point the common assertion that electorally successful nationalist and regionalist political parties (NRPs) typically undergo a process of expansion that involves increased pragmatism and ideological moderation, especially when they are elected to participate in government. Rolewska set out to establish if this was necessarily true by examining closely a NRP in Wales, looking particularly at its policies on the Welsh language. Rolewska's research, based on her master's thesis completed in 2014, looked at the specific case of the National Party of Wales, Plaid Cymru. This organisation was first established in 1925 as a movement to protect and promote the Welsh language. By the 1980s, it had already moved from its more radical position on Welsh to embracing the idea of bilingualism. By 1999, it had expanded and grown to the point where it was able to enter the National Assembly for Wales as an opposition party. The paper focused in particular on two different phases of its activity: the first as an opposition party from 1999 until 2007, and the second, thereafter as a coalition partner in the One Wales government. In an effort to establish whether or not the party had become increasingly tame and pragmatic, particularly in relation to minority language issues, as it gained power and influence, Rolewska made particular reference to the incorporation of Welsh into the coalition agreement, the debate about a Welsh language daily newspaper and the introduction of new Welsh Language Measure in 2011.

Interestingly, Rolewska found that while the party did undergo a period of accommodation and pragmatism, this occurred largely in the early decades of the party and, later, while still in opposition. However, by the time it became a power sharing party in government, significant institutional changes had occurred which helped it to enact its policies. The 1998 National Assembly for Wales had been a

weak body which made no formal distinction between legislature and the executive and had confusing legislative processes and divisions of competences. But early in the new millennium, as a result of the reforming Government of Wales Act (2006), Plaid Cymru had an improved institutional context, in the form of the National Assembly for Wales and Welsh Assembly Government, in which to work. In the decades since the formation of the party, Wales had seen a gradual normalisation of Plaid Cymru's affirmative positions on the Welsh language and since the new Act made a clear distinction between legislature and executive, it was now possible for the Assembly to take affirmative action, which it did by passing the Welsh Language Measure in 2011. This significant legislation confirmed the official status of Welsh in Wales, provided for a Welsh Language Commissioner plus advisers, established a Welsh Language Tribunal and introduced Welsh language standards applicable to public and some other bodies. In short, the strengthening of the Assembly in Wales, which occurred between the period when Plaid Cymru was first in opposition and later came to power, meant that there was latterly more political and administrative scope for Plaid Cymru in government to make a significant contribution to the protection and promotion of the Welsh language, which it duly did. This affirmative action taken by Plaid Cymru shows that it is not inevitable that NRPs become less ideological and more pragmatic when in power. Rolewska's case study shows, rather, that they have their best chance of effecting positive (minority language and other kinds of) change if they come to power at a time when their ideology and policies have been carefully debated and can be progressed in a supportive legislative and executive institutional context.

**b) Alessia Vacca, University of Sassari, Italy «Protection of Minority Languages in the Public Administration of Northern Ireland: Irish and Ulster Scots Linguistic Legislation, which and when?»**

Alessia Vacca reported on research which she had conducted for her doctoral thesis at the University of Aberdeen, Scotland. In her paper, she emphasised the symbolic and practical benefits that can accrue to a minority language when used in public administration. The increased visibility arising from



use in the public sphere enhances the prestige of a minority language as well as offering additional practical opportunities for speakers to use the minority language in their everyday lives. This visibility and utility in turn create incentives for other citizens to learn and/or use the language. Vacca also pointed out, however, that plans to introduce and/or increase the use of a minority language in public administration can pose challenges in terms of corpus planning, i.e. the development of the necessary linguistic resources such as technical administrative terminology. Furthermore, staff with the necessary linguistic skills need to be trained and recruited and all of this has cost implications, which may be resented by those speaking the majority language.

Focusing on Northern Ireland, Vacca's paper explained how Irish, on the one hand, and Ulster Scots, on the other, have come to be seen as divisive by the two main sectors of Northern Ireland society: although the vast majority of inhabitants of Northern Ireland are native speakers of English, Catholic Nationalists tend to identify with the Irish language while Ulster Scots is increasingly linked to the Protestant Unionist population. In the 2011 census, 8.08% claimed some ability in Ulster Scots, while 10.65% claimed some ability in Irish. There is a discrepancy, however, between the census figures and the linguistic reality of the two languages. Irish, a Celtic language, enjoys considerable language planning support in the Republic of Ireland, where it is the first official language and is a compulsory school subject. Indeed, in 2007, it even became one of the official EU languages. As a result, it has already undergone considerable standardisation and codification. Ulster Scots, on the other hand, which is a Germanic language closely related to English, has very little official language planning support of any kind and it would therefore be much more difficult to implement its use in public administration.

Since 1998, when the Northern Ireland Act was passed, the Northern Ireland Assembly has had significant legislative powers at its disposal in relation to the protection of both Irish and Ulster Scots but these powers remain unused, largely due to the highly contested nature of language in Northern Ireland as well as the continuing stalemate between Nationalist and Unionist parties on most issues in the NI Assembly. The situation is further complicated by the fact that

Northern Ireland, though part of the UK, currently offers no legislative protection for minority languages. The ECRML Committee of Experts have made various recommendations to the UK government in recent years in relation to the Northern Ireland Assembly enacting legislation to support both Irish and Ulster Scots. However, this has not happened and the proposed Irish Language Act continues to be vehemently opposed by Unionist political parties, which exercise an effective veto on any legislation in favour of Irish.

### **c) Conclusions and discussion**

These two research papers were complementary in that they both dealt with the situation of minority languages (Welsh, Irish, Ulster Scots) in the context of devolution within the UK. The first paper related in particular to sections 3, 4 and 5 of the theoretical framework and addressed the recent legislative achievements in relation to the Welsh language of a NRP, Plaid Cymru, while a coalition party in the Welsh government. The second paper related in particular to sections 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the theoretical framework and looked at the absence of minority languages in public administration in Northern Ireland. It outlined the divisive political reasons for lack of progress in the Northern Ireland Assembly in relation to legislation for Irish and Ulster Scots. While Rolewska found that political affirmation of a minority language in the context of devolution is possible and needs to be understood as a dynamic process, most likely to succeed when matched by appropriate legislative and executive powers, Vacca's paper showed that unfortunately devolution does not necessarily always play out to the advantage of local minority languages, at least not in cases where there is a lack of support for the individual languages among large sections of the population, as a result of deep-rooted political differences, as is the case in Northern Ireland.

During the discussion, the issue of terminology was raised, especially in connection with the terms 'nationalism' and 'nationalist'. Vila pointed out that these terms were heavily loaded with non-academic connotations which, to make things worse, were not coincidental in different languages, which made them virtually useless for scientific analysis. Other participants shared the view that

using these terms was indeed rather conflictual, to the extent that it would probably be difficult to reach an agreement about their 'objective' meaning.

### 2.3 Third session

Chaired by Jeroen Darquennes

The third session provided an overview of language policy in three largest and linguistically more diverse Western Mediterranean countries, namely Spain, France and Italy. It included three papers: the first one «Legislation and minority languages – the role of the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages», by Vesna Crnić-Grotić, Chair of the Committee of Experts (CoE) of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML). The second one, «Recent developments with regards to minority languages in Italy», by Giovanni Poggeschi, from University of Salento; and the third one, «Recent developments on the legal protection of minoritized languages in France», by Eneritz Zabaleta, University of Pau et des Pays de l'Adour.

#### a) **Vesna Crnić-Grotić: Legislation and minority languages – the role of the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages**

In her paper, Vesna Crnić-Grotić, in her role as chair of the Committee of Experts (CoE) of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML), first of all explained the different parts of the Charter. She briefly commented on Part I, i.e., general provisions, provided information on Part II, devoted to objectives and principles, and above all concentrated on Part III, which contains measures to promote the use of regional and minority languages in public life. The 'menu-system' contained in Part III of the Charter is what turns it into unique language planning instrument (cf. Grin 2003a on language policy evaluation related to the Charter as well as Darquennes 2010 who provides an analysis of the Charter against the background of language policy and planning theory).

The speaker also focused on the history of the Charter in Spain as well as on the latest report on Spain<sup>5</sup>. She highlighted two cases: one in the field of education, where the message is passed by the CoE that one has to see to it that models of trilingual education do not jeopardize the role of the minority language in education and beyond, and one in the field of the media, where the Spanish Law and the Charter would need to be attuned.

**b) Giovanni Poggeschi: Recent developments with regards to minority languages in Italy**

Making use of informative maps, Giovanni Poggeschi provided an overview of language diversity in Italy as well as the mechanisms (laws) put in place (and/or under discussion) aiming at the protection of minority languages. He discussed the situation in Val d'Aoste and South-Tyrol as well as the situation of the Slovenes on the Italian-Slovene border in detail. An interesting point made by the presenter was that Italy, in case it would ratify the Charter, should perhaps profit from that occasion to not just use the Charter to strengthen the legal protection for the minorities. It should also consider the ratification of the Charter as a lever to provide rights (as a sort of 'language duties') for the majority languages, as well as rights for the many dialects and for the immigrant languages. In other words: it should strive for what one could refer to as a bundle of legal measures aiming at 'inclusive' language rights.

**c) Eneritz Zabaleta: Recent developments on the legal protection of minoritized languages in France**

Eneritz Zabaleta introduced the audience to the history of language minority protection in France with a focus on issues of minority language education where certain improvements have been made in recent years (cf. his PowerPoint presentation). He further discussed the process of the ratification of the Charter in detail. The French president promised to ratify the Charter in point 56 of his presidential programme. Ratification, however, requires certain changes

---

<sup>5</sup> cf. [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/minlang/Report/default\\_en.asp#Spain](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/minlang/Report/default_en.asp#Spain) for details, though not yet on the latest report of the CoE

in the Constitution. A proposal for a Revision of the Charter has been submitted in December 2013. Now there is quite some uncertainty concerning: (1) the road that will be taken to revise the constitution, and (2) the actual form of the revision.

#### **d) Discussion**

In the discussion, two ‘major’ topics were addressed:

1. A part of the discussion was devoted to the question if ‘trilingual education’ (cf. Vesna Crnić-Grotić’s talk) — which can include the minority language, the majority language and English (cf. Fryslân) but, e.g., also the minority language and two majority languages (cf. the Ladin valleys) — necessarily poses a danger to minority languages. In some cases, the fact that a third language is offered makes the program more attractive and is generally seen as an added value rather than as a danger, but this is not always necessarily the case, as demonstrated by the presentations of Alomar and Flors below. Of course, contextual factors (cf. Haugen’s principle of the ecology of language) play an important role, e.g.: the role and the weight of the three languages in education, the goals one wishes to achieve, the educational model used, pedagogical support and training given to teachers, etc. When the CoE evaluates a situation and tries to find out if a member state attains the goals selected in the menu of Part III of the charter, these factors are taken into account as well.

2. The challenging question of how to tackle the language rights of immigrant languages was also raised. Do we need the same or separate measures for both historical and new minority languages? How do we cope with the differences between ‘old’ and ‘new’ minority language communities? A real answer to this complicated question was not provided. The animated discussion centred more around the content of the notion ‘minority’.

#### **e) Conclusions**

The three papers provided a good view of the way in which the Charter works and the technical as well as more ‘ideological’ problems and challenges related to its ratification and implementation in different contexts.

The presentations and perhaps even more so, the discussions made it clear that minority language studies would profit a lot from a discussion of some of its most central concepts such as ‘minority’ and ‘minority language’ as well as the difference between ‘minority’ and ‘immigrant’ languages. What could help is a more truly inter-, trans- or multidisciplinary dialogue (or even an intradisciplinary dialogue?) in which all the partners familiarize themselves with the other discussants’ disciplinary points of view before engaging in a discussion of central notions. In order to do so, one could consider to juxtapose multiple viewpoints in an edited volume (cf. Giordan 1992 or – in a more popularized version – Le Monde’s Atlas des minorités), or to individually engage in a juxtaposition of different existing viewpoints in a single publication (cf. Grin 2003b or Rindler Schjerve 2006).<sup>6</sup>

## 2.4 Fourth session

Chaired by F. Xavier Vila

The fourth session was the most heterogenous of all, and brought together three different cases that allowed to analyse the interplay between legislation, language policies and sociolinguistic evolution: the session was started by Rudi Janssens (Vrije Universiteit Brussel) considerations about «The impact Brussels & Brussels linguistic regime on sociolinguistic Dynamics on Brussels and the Rand: recent developments». He was then followed by Miquel Cabal, from Universitat de

---

<sup>6</sup> Darquennes, Jeroen. 2010. Minorities, language politics and language planning in Europe. In Bernd Kortmann and Johan van der Auwera (eds.), *The languages and linguistics of Europe. A comprehensive guide*, 547-560. Berlin, de Gruyter.

Giordan, Henri (ed.). 1992. *Les minorités en Europe. Droits linguistiques et droits de l'homme*. Paris, Kimé.

Grin, François. 2003. *Language policy evaluation and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave macmillan.

Grin, François. 2003. Diversity as paradigm, analytical device and policy goal. In Will Kymlicka and Alan Patten (eds.), *Language rights and political theory*, 169-188. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Le Monde. 2012. *L'atlas des minorités*. Paris, LaVie/LeMonde.

Rindler Schjerve, Rosita. 2006. Regional minority language research in Europe – a call for a change in perspective. In Ulrich Ammon, Klaus J. Mattheier and Peter Nelde (eds.), *Perspektiven der Soziolinguistik (Sociolinguistica 20)*, 105-120. Tübingen, Niemeyer.

Barcelona, and his discussion of «Crimea at a crossroads: perspectives for linguistic diversity in Crimea in the light of the last year's events». The session was closed by Jarmo Lainio (Stockholm University), with «The interplay between the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, national authorities and NGO's - The case of teacher education for national minority languages in Sweden»

**a) Rudi Janssens: The impact Brussels & Brussels linguistic regime on sociolinguistic Dynamics on Brussels and the Rand: recent developments**

When it became independent, the Belgian State enshrined the principle of freedom of language use in its 1830 Constitution. But this freedom was just a theoretical principle, for the administration worked in French and, thereby, forced the citizens to adapt to and, eventually, to adopt this language. In face of a process of growing Frenchification, the Flemish Movement pushed first for thorough bilingualism all around the country, and eventually, in view of the failure of this project, it progressively demanded that linguistic equality was based on territorial delimitation of each language. The 60s language laws finally divided the country into two major monolingual territories, Flanders and Wallonia, and the bilingual region of Brussels. Speakers of the 'other' language in some municipalities along the border were recognized 'linguistic facilities' in education and their relations with the local authorities. As a consequence, four language regimes were established: Dutch official monolingualism in Flanders, French official monolingualism in Wallonia, municipalities with language facilities, and Brussels, with an officially bilingual administration and where language of instruction depends on the parents' choice.

Janssens focused his exposition on the linguistic situation in the Brussels Rand, i.e., the periphery of the capital where Dutch is the official language but some facilities are accorded to French speakers. Although placed in Flanders, this area has attracted a sizeable number of Francophones and foreign residents who settle down there and work in the capital. As a consequence, and according to the data from the last survey in the region, Dutch is the predominant home language of the Rand —47% Dutch; 10,4% Dutch & French; 19,7% French; 7,2% French and other; 14,9% other languages—, but, French is more widely known than Dutch (88,4% vs.

77,7% of the population), because francophones and foreign residents tend to show less interest in learning a second language than their Flemish conationals.

Janssens described how the different demolinguistic trends in the region intermingle to create a complex panorama. First, parents tend to pass their language over to next generation, and little language shift is apparent towards French. Second, Dutch is felt more as an instrument language and not in emotional terms. Third, the situation is characterized by a combination of language practices and language identifications, which include an open list of combinations where English, in theory a foreign language, has a significant presence in the repertoire of the population, and where the local lingua franca depends on the neighbourhood composition. Basic to this language mixing is the idea that language needs not be perfectly mastered to be used, a situation that, according to Janssens, is leading towards an increasing *languaging* between the three basic languages: French, Dutch and English.

As a result of this situation, the author claimed that young people in the Rand see multilingualism as a norm, feel less and less affiliated with language communities as basics of politics are changing, and most people prefer bilingual education.

**b) Miquel Cabal, Universitat de Barcelona: «Crimea at a crossroads: perspectives for linguistic diversity in Crimea in the light of the last year's events»**

Cabal's presentation reviewed the legal framework, the sociolinguistic situation and the presence of the languages in schools and media after Crimea was annexed by the Russian Federation in 2014.

Before the annexation, Crimea was overwhelmingly Russian-speaking, but Ukrainian and Tatar enjoyed a much better position than now, the first one as the state language, the second one as the language of the Tatar nation, deported to Siberia by Stalin after WW2 and returned little by little since the fall of the Soviet Empire. It should be noted that, in spite of existing linguistic tensions, Ukraine had ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages in 2005.

The annexation has implied dramatic changes for language other than Russian in the Republic. To start with, the Russian Federation signed the ECRML in



2001 but never ratified it. In theory, the Russian Constitution recognises the right to use the different native languages of the Federation, but it also establishes Russian as the state language. The republics of the Russian Federation may establish their own state languages according to the 1998 Law of Languages, that reinforces the Russian language as the language of the whole RF and makes the Cyrillic alphabet compulsory for all languages.

The 2014 constitution of Crimea establishes Russian, Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar as the languages of the Republic, and the law of languages, still in force, establishes the same state languages but mentions Tatar languages first. But in practical terms, since the annexation, and in spite of the official declarations of respect towards the three official languages, Russian is rapidly replacing Ukrainian as language of instruction in almost all schools, and almost all media are in Russian, because Crimean Tatar radio and televisions have been closed and all the Ukrainian channels are blocked. In this respect, demolinguistic data suggest that the number of Ukrainian speakers has dramatically dropped.

**c) Jarmo Lainio, Stockholm University: «The interplay between the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, national authorities and NGO's – The case of teacher education for national minority languages in Sweden»**

Lainio's presentation analysed the role played by the ECRML, national authorities and NGO's with regard to protecting national minority languages, and put the many problems encountered in minority language education in Sweden as a case in point.

There are about 250,000 Sweden Finnish speakers, and with other minorities like Jews, Roma, Sami, Tornedalians, and recently Elfdalians, there are at least 1,2 million Swedes that have Swedish as a second language, including global migrants. Sami was the first group accepted as an indigenous minority. The recognition of these languages has been evolving in the last decades. In 1994, Finnish was recognized as a domestic language. In 1998, a Committee recommended which languages should be included in the Swedish ratification of the ECRM, which finally took place in 2000 in order to give protection to the national minorities and to support the historical minority languages in order to keep them alive. In legal

terms, Sweden opted for the ECRML's lowest levels of protection as far as education is concerned. More recently, the Language Act (2009) put national minority languages and sign language on a par with Swedish, but protected migrant languages less well. There is also an Act on minorities and minority languages (2010), which covers the national minorities and their languages. The Language Act recognized the right to use, develop and learn for national minority languages, but not for migrant languages. Migrant languages are not considered in the Act on minorities and minority languages.

In spite of legislation, the actual protection given to national minority languages in Sweden is weak. The problems on the ground are numerous: the actual scheme of education for the five national minority languages lacks coherence, and changes in the administrative area for three national minority languages in Sweden – Finnish, Meänkieli and Sami – between 2011 to 2014 have not improved the situation in education. The problems are indeed numerous, and according to a report by the National Schools Inspectorate from 2011, the municipalities do not adequately fulfil their obligations towards the national minorities. Thus, in the field of language acquisition and teaching, there is no age-level continuity of mother tongue instruction, cooperation with the speakers of the five national minority languages is scarce, and demands of teaching staff are not covered by educational provisions. Status planning is not better: revitalisation has not been formally taken into account until 2014, and there is no coherent status planning for regional and minority languages, no structured policy for the education field, and neither language maintenance nor literacy support, neither support for the public/collective nor for individual/family transmission for the languages.

#### **d) Conclusions**

In the discussion, the mismatch between researchers and politicians was amply discussed. «I'm fed up of training politicians» expressed one of the participants graphically, transmitting the frustration produced by the fact that once confidence between both spheres had been created and transference of knowledge occurred, politicians tended to move to a different topic and be replaced by totally new ones which had to be informed again from the scratch.

Simultaneously, it was also admitted that this continual renovation implied an effort on the side of researchers and interest groups to improve their policies of communication. In this sense, Lainio pointed out that the representatives of lesser used languages had become clearly more professional in recent times, which facilitated their communication with decision makers. Internationalization in this respect had been a positive movement, because minority activists had realised that their desires and goals were shared by many other groups around the world and had had the opportunity to learn from each other's experiences.

Another issue of discussion was that of terminological discrepancies and their negative consequences for fluid communication. Jones expressed that unifying terminologies may not be (completely) feasible, but called also the attention to the need to cultivate the awareness of these divergences as a creative force. On her side, Bartha suggested that perhaps better empirical research could lead to solving some of the terminological problems.

## 2.5 Fifth session

Chaired by Vanessa Bretxa

The final session was focussed on language policies and their impact in three Catalan-speaking territories that are often overshadowed by the fact that their policies in favour of Catalan are by far less dynamic than those deployed in Catalonia. The session was started by Antoni-Ignasi Alomar (Universitat de les Illes Balears), with «The transformation of public language policies in the Balearic Islands during the last four years». He was followed by Avel·lí Flors (Universitat Oberta de Catalunya/Universitat de Barcelona) «From soft promotion to defencelessness? Sociolinguistic effects of changing language policies in València». The session was closed by Natxo Sorolla (Universitat de Barcelona / Universitat Rovira i Virgili) «Changing policies with regards to minority languages in Aragon and its sociological and sociolinguistic impact».

**a) Antoni-Ignasi Alomar, Universitat de les Illes Balears: «The transformation of public language policies in the Balearic Islands during the last four years»**

Antoni-Ignasi gave an overview of the public policies that have been applied in the Balearic Islands regarding the Catalan language in different areas such as legislation, public policies, model of language, education, media and recognition of the language in the public sphere, focusing especially on those deployed by the conservative Popular Party Government between 2011 and 2014.

During his presentation, Alomar first exposed how the process of re-establishing Catalan, the autochthonous language of the Balearic Islands, as a fully official language has been relatively consensual and non-conflictive until recent times. The speaker explained how the legal recognition of the language evolved from the first period of autonomy in the late 1970s after the dictatorship until the early 2010s, highlighting the Decree of Bilingualism (1979) and the Law of Language Normalisation (1986), and some decrees that facilitated a growing recognition of the Catalan language as a language of instruction and administration. In time, this legislation had led to deploy a school linguistic model where Catalan was the predominant language of education, that was socially accepted, suitable for pupils and optimal for the acquisition of both Catalan and Spanish languages.

But the 2011 elections to the Balearic parliament dramatically changed the scenario. The government that was formed after these elections suddenly started to undermine the position of Catalan as an official language in a variety of ways:

- Proficiency in Catalan ceased to be a requirement to work in public administration in the Balearics, while proficiency in Castilian remained a requirement (Law 9/2012),
- A new trade act approved abolishing the right to be served in Catalan (Act 11/2014),
- Subsidies for Catalan language newspapers were abolished,
- The Balearic Islands left the Institut Ramon Llull, the institution in charge of spreading the knowledge of Catalan
- The official agency for Language Policy and Education, as well as the Catalan Learning Service were suppressed.

- Balearic TV became bilingual,
- Majorcan (Catalan-medium) public TV was closed down,
- The reception of most TV channels from Catalonia was blocked by the authorities.

Alomar focused his attention especially on education. In 2013, the Balearic government passed the decree 15/2013 of “integrated treatment of languages” (known as TIL) for primary and secondary education. In this decree, the Government urged all schools to reduce the percentage of hours taught in Catalan to just one third, and required them to use Castilian and English as means of instruction for the other two thirds of the time. This measure was felt as a direct attack against the sole institution in the islands that was still guaranteeing that the thousands of children of immigrant descent could learn adequately the local language, and encountered a massive opposition from teachers, parents and society in general, including a teachers’ strike and the most massive demonstration which had ever taken place on the islands (September 2013). The decree was finally rejected by a judicial ruling in 2014, although the Government promised to try to impose its school model as soon as possible.

**b) Avel·lí Flors, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, UOC: «From soft promotion to defencelessness? Sociolinguistic effects of changing language policies in València»**

The linguistic regime in the Valencian Autonomous Community or Valencian Country is regulated by the LUEV – Law on the Use and Teaching of Valencian (1983). This law, mostly focused on schooling, is supposed to ensure Catalan-medium education for those who desire it, and promote the usage in Catalan in public administration. The LUEV requires that all children should end school being proficient in Catalan and Castilian, the two official languages in Valencia. The law foresees two school models: a Castilian-medium programme with a progressive incorporation of Catalan, and a Catalan-medium programme — either as a first language or in an early immersion programme.

But law and reality fall quite apart, and, while all students in the Catalan-medium programme end up being bilingual, those in Castilian-medium education

hardly ever learn Catalan and remain at best passively bilingual. Catalan-medium schools have a high demand, but the administration has tended to put severe limits to Catalan-medium programmes and, as a consequence, only 30% of the students can follow them. Recent legislative developments guarantee the status of Castilian as language of instruction and give priority to Castilian-medium education.

Flors studied a sample of students from secondary school in Castelló de la Plana to analyse the results of both models in the achievement of the programme goals, with quantitative and qualitative samples. The results showed a high linguistic confidence in Castilian in all models, but less confidence in Catalan, especially among students that followed Castilian-medium programmes. The qualitative analysis showed that, in time, confidence in Catalan and motivation to use it decreased among Castilian speaking students.

**c) Natxo Sorolla, Universitat de Barcelona / Universitat Rovira i Virgili:  
«Changing policies with regards to minority languages in Aragon and  
its sociological and sociolinguistic impact»**

Sorolla presented data obtained from the Franja, the territory in Eastern Aragon where Catalan is the historical language of the population. It should be taken into account that this territory only contains 5% of the Aragonese population, which makes them a small minority in a predominantly Castilian-speaking autonomous community. The 2011 population census showed that 4,2% of the Aragon population can speak Catalan, and 1,9% can speak Aragonese, while around 10% of the population has some kind of knowledge of one language or other. Neither language enjoys official status in Aragon or the regions where they are traditionally spoken, and none are taught within the official curriculum, although Catalan has been taught optionally for 1 or 2 hours per week in most schools in La Franja thanks to initiatives from the local governments and with the support of Catalonia's authorities. As a consequence, only 17% of people who speaks Catalan in the Franja, can write it. Language shift is rapid in Aragonese, but up to now there has been a relative stability in intergenerational transmission of the Catalan language.

The legal context in Aragon was first defined by the Statute of Autonomy (1982) which recognized the protection of the "different linguistic modalities",

without saying which modalities or languages were being protected. The text was modified in 1996, defining the protection of “languages and linguistic modalities”, leaving Catalan and Aragonese, both historical languages of Aragon, without explicit protection. In 2009, a first Aragonese Linguistic Law was passed by a leftist government which explicitly used the terms Catalan and Aragonese for these languages, and recognized some minor linguistic rights to their speakers.

But in 2011 a Conservative government came to power with a linguistic discourse against all languages other than Castilian and especially against Catalan, which was seen as a sort of fifth column of Catalonia. Thus, the official policies of Aragon autonomous authorities between 2011 and 2015 explicitly aimed at suppressing all references to Catalan and abolished virtually all rights Catalan and Aragonese speakers might have. Some of the measures seemed to favour Aragonese in comparison to Catalan, such as the elaboration of a language education curriculum for Aragonese, but not for the Catalan language. But most measures were equally damaging for both languages. The most devastating one was the replacement of the Languages Law by a new one, which among many things substituted the glottonym ‘Catalan’ with the neologism “Aragonese language belonging to the Eastern Area”, mockingly called LAPAO —for its acronym in Catalan and Castilian—, outlawed the official use of both languages, suppressed the academies of Catalan and Aragonese to create a unified academy of “Aragonese” (sic, for both languages), and even suppressed the literary prizes existing for each language, replacing them by a single prize for both languages without any monetary recognition.

In this context of extreme language suppression, it is not surprising that the data from the RESOL project presented by Sorolla were no optimistic. The study detected that a significant proportion of Catalan-speaking teenagers in the Franja develop Castilian-speaking roles (27,9%) and stop using Catalan in intragroup exchanges; most native bilinguals develop Castilian roles (70,4%); and the majority of teenagers that use Castilian with both parents never use Catalan (77,6%). These data show that in the context of the Franja, education plays an essential role in reversing or at least arresting language shift.

## d) Conclusions

These three research papers were complementary in that they dealt with the situation of Catalan in three different regions of Spain (Balearic Islands, Valencia and Aragon). The three papers gave examples of how public policies can weaken the status of Catalan —a language spoken by 10 million people— to erode its intergenerational transmission, whereas in other more favourable legal conditions this same language has nothing to fear in this respect (the case of Catalonia). The first paper (Alomar) provided detailed accounts of how the public cultural, communicative and educational infrastructures of Catalan have been all but dismantled in less than a legislature following changes in power, and under pretexts such as austerity, democratic will of majorities, and/or change of sovereignty.

Alomar, Flors and Sorolla provided examples of societies where politicians supported explicitly and proudly discourses and practices which denied explicitly the validity of academic knowledge in the area of language and society, and cultivated populist topics and prejudices under the alibi of following the common people's sense.

Finally, the three authors analysed the practical consequences derived from the legal capacity of deciding the name of a given language. In Aragon, Valencia and Balearic Islands, the conservative Partido Popular has campaigned to erase the term 'Catalan' from public life, replacing it with local denominations of the language or even with a rather bizarre formula (LAPAO acronym). Moreover, in the last years the same political party (Partido Popular) has been working in order to cut all sort of intercommunication —radio, television, paper literature, cinema, theatre, etc.— between Catalan speaking territories.

Note of the Editor: In May 2015, the conservative governments in these three territories suffered a very severe electoral defeat that, especially in the case of the Balearic Islands, was strongly connected with their language policies. All the winning candidates were publicly much more favourable to Catalan.



### 3. Analysing the papers and discussions

In this section we will try to identify at least some of the most basic points of consensus and dissent between the participants in WP3, and the relationship between these points and those of the previous two workshops. To do so, we will proceed in a two steps way: We will first analyse the most relevant key words used in the presentations in order to identify the basic areas of discussion and, afterwards, we will compare these areas with the issues dealt with in the previous two workshops by means of the list of key words provided by the PP2. In short, we will synthesise the content of the major discussions in the WS3, and put them in perspective of the different sub-themes that had been identified at the beginning of the LEARNMe project.

#### 3.1 List of theoretical concepts

The authors of the PP1 identified a number of theoretical concepts drawn on numerous disciplines that were used in the presentations and discussions of the first LEARNMe Workshop. This list of concepts was tentative and by no means exhaustive. These terms were collated in the First Position Paper so that they could be revisited in the next stages of the project and re-evaluated in the process of producing the White Paper.

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

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

The three lists are included in the following table. When comparing them, the readers should keep in mind that the terms presented in PP1 were less exhaustive and more explorative than those in PP2 and PP3, so straightforward comparisons are not possible, although they may provide a hint of similarities and

differences between the three workshops. Besides that, some terms may have been used during the presentation but not included in the slides and summaries, and therefore not included in the list.

**Table 1 List of terms used in at least one of the three Learnme workshops**

	ABT 2013	STK 2014	BCN 2015	
1		2		Specialised term
2		2		Specialised term
3		2		Specialised term
4		2		Specialised term
5		2	3	Specialised term
6		2		Specialised term
7			3	Specialised term
8		2		Specialised term
9			3	Specialised term
10			3	Specialised term
11		2		Specialised term
12			3	Specialised term
13			3	Glottonym
14			3	Glottonym
15		2	3	Glottonym
16		2		Glottonym
17	1			Specialised term
18			3	Glottonym
19		2		Specialised term
20	1			Specialised term
21			3	Glottonym
22		2		Specialised term
23		2		Glottonym
24		2		Glottonym
25			3	Specialised term
26			3	Specialised term
27		2		Specialised term
28		2		Specialised term
29		2	3	Specialised term
30			3	Specialised term
31			3	Specialised term
32		2		Specialised term
33		2		Specialised term
34		2		Specialised term
35		2		Specialised term

36	Bilingual teaching (transitional/ maintenance/polydirectional) (2)		2		Specialised term
37	Bilingual university (2)		2		Specialised term
38	Bilingualism (3)			3	Specialised term
39	Bottom-up approach (1)	1			Specialised term
40	Bulgarian (2)		2		Glottonym
41	Castilian (3)			3	Glottonym
42	Castilian homogenization (3)			3	Specialised term
43	Catalan / Valencian / Catalan-Valencian (2) (3)		2	3	Glottonym
44	Catalan-medium education (3)			3	Specialised term
45	Celtic language (3)			3	Glottonym
46	Census (language data) (2)		2		Glottonym
47	Chuvash language (3)			3	Glottonym
48	CLIL (Content- and language integrated learning) (2)		2		Specialised term
49	Code switching (1) (2)	1	2		Specialised term
50	Codification (1) (2)	1	2		Specialised term
51	Coercive power relations (2)		2		Specialised term
52	Collective Rights (1) (2)	1	2		Specialised term
53	Colonialism (2)		2		Specialised term
54	Committee of experts (3)			3	Specialised term
55	Commodification (1)	1			Specialised term
56	Communication pattern (3)			3	Specialised term
57	Communicative boundaries (2)		2		Specialised term
58	Community groups (3)			3	Specialised term
59	Community language (2)		2		Specialised term
60	Compensatory policies (2)		2		Specialised term
61	Competence			3	Specialised term
62	Complementary schools (2)		2		Specialised term
63	Comprehensive input (2)		2		Specialised term
64	Compulsary language learning			3	Specialised term
65	Conjunction model (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
66	Constitutional rights (2)		2		Specialised term
67	Contact languages (3)			3	Specialised term
68	Co-official language (3)			3	Specialised term
69	Cooperation (3)			3	Specialised term
70	Cornish (3)			3	Glottonym
71	Corpus (language) (2)		2		Specialised term
72	Corpus planning (3)			3	Specialised term
73	Covert (LPP) (2)		2		Specialised term
74	Crimean Tatar / Tatar (2) (3)		2	3	Glottonym
75	Critical authorship (2)		2		Specialised term
76	Critical literacy (2)		2		Specialised term
77	Croatian (2)		2		Glottonym
78	Cultivation (of language) (2)		2		Specialised term
79	Cultural affairs (3)			3	Specialised term

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

123	Ethnic diversity (2)		2	Specialised term	
124	Ethnic minority child (2)		2	Specialised term	
125	Ethnography (1)	1		Specialised term	
126	Ethnolinguistic diversity (2)		2	Specialised term	
127	Ethnolinguistic groups (2)		2	Specialised term	
128	Euskera / Basque / Basque language (3)		3	Glottonym	
129	Family transmission (3)		3	Specialised term	
130	Finnish (2)		2	Glottonym	
131	Fluency (language) (2)		2	Specialised term	
132	Foreign language (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
133	Foreign language immersion (2)		2	Specialised term	
134	Fragmentation (1)	1		Specialised term	
135	Framework Convention for Protection of National Minorities (3)			3	Specialised term
136	Freedom of choice (3)			3	Specialised term
137	French (2) (3)			3	Glottonym
138	Frenchification (3)			3	Specialised term
139	French-medium education (3)			3	Specialised term
140	Functional illiteracy (2)		2	Specialised term	
141	Functional multilingualism (2)		2	Specialised term	
142	Gagauz (2)		2	Glottonym	
143	Galician (3)			3	Glottonym
144	Generation (first and second) (2)		2	Specialised term	
145	Geolinguistic regions (1)	1		Specialised term	
146	German (2)		2	Glottonym	
147	Global migration (3)			3	Specialised term
148	Global private spaces (1)	1		Specialised term	
149	Globalization (2)		2	Specialised term	
150	Greek (2)		2	Glottonym	
151	Heteroglossia (1)	1		Specialised term	
152	High variety (3)			3	Specialised term
153	Higher education (2)		2	Specialised term	
154	Historical minority language			3	Specialised term
155	Holistic language practice (1)	1		Specialised term	
156	Holistic perspective (3)			3	Specialised term
157	Home language (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
158	Homogeneity (ethnic) (2)		2	Specialised term	
159	Human Rights (1) (2)	1	2	Specialised term	
160	Hungarian (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
161	Identity (2)		2	Specialised term	
162	Identity affirmation (2)		2	Specialised term	
163	Identity claim (2)		2	Specialised term	
164	Identity devaluation (2)		2	Specialised term	
165	Identity enhancement (2)		2	Specialised term	
166	Ideological narratives (2)		2	Specialised term	
167	Ideologies (1)	1		Specialised term	

168	Illiteracy (3)		3	Specialised term
169	Immersion (early/delayed/late) (2)	2		Specialised term
170	Immersion (one-way/two-way/dual) (2)	2		Specialised term
171	Immersion (total/partial) (2)	2		Specialised term
172	Immersion education (3)		3	Specialised term
173	Immersion language teaching (2)	2		Specialised term
174	Immigrant (student) (2)	2		Specialised term
175	Immigrant language (3)		3	Specialised term
176	Impermeable Linguistic Frameworks (1)	1		Specialised term
177	Implementation (of policies) (2) (3)	2	3	Specialised term
178	Inclusive pedagogies (2)	2		Specialised term
179	Independent schools (2)	2		Specialised term
180	Indigeneity (1) (2)	1	2	Specialised term
181	Indigenous group (3)		3	Specialised term
182	Indigenous journalism (2)	2		Specialised term
183	Indigenous media (2)	2		Specialised term
184	Indigenous rights (2)	2		Specialised term
185	Individual bilingualism (2)	2		Specialised term
186	Individual language (3)		3	Specialised term
187	Initial (language) (2)	2		Specialised term
188	Institutional monolingualism (2)	2		Specialised term
189	Institutional multilingualism (2)	2		Specialised term
190	Institutional practices (2)	2		Specialised term
191	Integration (3)		3	Specialised term
192	Integration (of pupils) (2)	2		Specialised term
193	Intercultural education (2)	2		Specialised term
194	Interculturality (3)		3	Specialised term
195	Intergenerational language transmission (3)		3	Specialised term
196	Intergroup relations (2) (3)	2	3	Specialised term
197	International conventions (2) (3)	2	3	Specialised term
198	Internationalisation (3)		3	Specialised term
199	Interpersonal relations (2)	2		Specialised term
200	Intra-group relations		3	Specialised term
201	Irish / Gaelic (1) (3)	1	3	Glottonym
202	Italian (3)		3	Glottonym
203	Judicial authorities		3	Specialised term
204	Karaim (2)	2		Glottonym
205	Knowledge (creation/mediation/production) (2)	2		Specialised term
206	Krymchak (2)	2		Glottonym
207	L1 (first language) (2)	2		Specialised term
208	L2 (second language) (2)	2		Specialised term
209	L3 (third language) (2)	2		Specialised term
210	<i>Laissez-faire</i> policy (2)	2		Specialised term
211	Language planning (3)		3	Specialised term
212	Language (2)	2		Specialised term

213	Language (social) construction (2)		2	Specialised term
214	Language academy (3)		3	Specialised term
215	Language acquisition (2) (3)		2 3	Specialised term
216	Language activism (2)		2	Specialised term
217	Language as practice (2)		2	Specialised term
218	Language assessment (2)		2	Specialised term
219	Language attitudes (3)		3	Specialised term
220	Language awareness (2)		2	Specialised term
221	Language backing (2)		2	Specialised term
222	Language border		3	Specialised term
223	Language census		3	Specialised term
224	Language choice		3	Specialised term
225	Language combination		3	Specialised term
226	Language community		3	Specialised term
227	Language community (2)		2	Specialised term
228	Language competence (1)	1		Specialised term
229	Language confidence (3)		3	Specialised term
230	Language conflict (3)		3	Specialised term
231	Language cultivation (3)		3	Specialised term
232	Language death (2)		2	Specialised term
233	Language deficits (3)		3	Specialised term
234	Language development (2)		2	Specialised term
235	Language diversity (3)		3	Specialised term
236	Language domains (2)		2	Specialised term
237	Language education (3)		3	Specialised term
238	Language education curriculum (3)		3	Specialised term
239	Language enhancement (2)		2	Specialised term
240	Language equality (1)	1		Specialised term
241	Language extension (2)		2	Specialised term
242	Language facilities (3)		3	Specialised term
243	Language group (3)		3	Specialised term
244	Language heritage (2)		2	Specialised term
245	Language immersion (2)		2	Specialised term
246	Language infrastructure (3)		3	Specialised term
247	Language innovation (2)		2	Specialised term
248	Language issues (3)		3	Specialised term
249	Language knowledge (3)		3	Specialised term
250	Language law (2)		2	Specialised term
251	Language learning (2) (3)		2 3	Specialised term
252	Language maintenance (2) (3)		2 3	Specialised term
253	Language management (2)		2	Specialised term
254	Language model (3)		3	Specialised term
255	Language of instruction (2) (3)		2 3	Specialised term
256	Language of instruction (3)		3	Specialised term
257	Language of significance (2)		2	Specialised term
258	Language pedagogies (2)		2	Specialised term

259	Language policies (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
260	Language practices (3)			3	Specialised term
261	Language preference (3)			3	Specialised term
262	Language proficiency (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
263	Language programmes (3)			3	Specialised term
264	Language promotion (3)			3	Specialised term
265	Language protection (3)			3	Specialised term
266	Language regime (3)			3	Specialised term
267	Language repertoires (2)		2		Specialised term
268	Language retention (2)		2		Specialised term
269	Language rights (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
270	Language secessionism (3)			3	Specialised term
271	Language shift (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
272	Language shift reversion (3)			3	Specialised term
273	Language teaching (3)			3	Specialised term
274	Language transmission (2)		2		Specialised term
275	Language use (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
276	Language variety (2)		2		Specialised term
277	Language vitality (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
278	Languages in contact (3)			3	Specialised term
279	Languaging (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
280	Legal context (3)			3	Specialised term
281	Legal framework (3)			3	Specialised term
282	Legal measures (3)			3	Specialised term
283	Legal status (3)			3	Specialised term
284	Legislation (3)			3	Specialised term
285	Legislative competencies (3)			3	Specialised term
286	Legislative framework (3)			3	Specialised term
287	Length of residence (2)		2		Specialised term
288	Leonese (3)			3	Glottonym
289	Lesser-user languages (1)	1			Specialised term
290	Levels of LPP (macro/meso/micro) (2)		2		Specialised term
291	Lingua franca (3)			3	Specialised term
292	Linguistic rights (3)			3	Specialised term
293	Linguistic community (3)			3	Specialised term
294	Linguistic conflict (3)			3	Specialised term
295	Linguistic diversity (3)			3	Specialised term
296	Linguistic diversity (3)			3	Specialised term
297	Linguistic emigration (3)			3	Specialised term
298	Linguistic identity (2)		2		Specialised term
299	Linguistic input (2)		2		Specialised term
300	Linguistic laboratory (3)			3	Specialised term
301	Linguistic law (3)			3	Specialised term
302	Linguistic modality (3)			3	Specialised term
303	Linguistic output (2)		2		Specialised term
304	Linguistic project of the center (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term



305	Linguistic protection (3)			3	Specialised term
306	Linguistic regime (3)			3	Specialised term
307	Linguistic repertoires (2)		2		Specialised term
308	Linguistic representation (1)	1			Specialised term
309	Linguistic self-confidence (3)			3	Specialised term
310	Linguistically heterogeneous (3)			3	Specialised term
311	Literacy (basic/emergent) (2)		2		Specialised term
312	Literacy engagement (2)		2		Specialised term
313	Literacy skills (2)		2		Specialised term
314	Literacy support (3)			3	Specialised term
315	Local textual practices (2)		2		Specialised term
316	Low variety (3)			3	Specialised term
317	LPP (language policy and planning) (2)		2		Specialised term
318	Macro-linguistics (1)	1			Specialised term
319	Macro-sociolinguistics (2)		2		Specialised term
320	Macro-structure (2)		2		Specialised term
321	Main language (2)		2		Specialised term
322	Mainstream class (2)		2		Specialised term
323	Mainstream curriculum (2)		2		Specialised term
324	Mainstream education (2)		2		Specialised term
325	Mainstream journalism (2)		2		Specialised term
326	Mainstream school (2)		2		Specialised term
327	Majority language (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
328	Majority speaker (2)		2		Specialised term
329	Mandatory (instruction) (2)		2		Specialised term
330	Manx (3)			3	Glottonym
331	Marginalization (2)		2		Specialised term
332	Marginalized communities (2)		2		Specialised term
333	Meaning-making (2)		2		Specialised term
334	Meänkieli (2)		2	3	Glottonym
335	Media(tiza)tion (2)		2		Specialised term
336	Medium Languages (1)	1			Specialised term
337	Methodological approaches (1)	1			Specialised term
338	Methodology of diversity (2)		2		Specialised term
339	Micro- and Macro Approaches (1)	1			Specialised term
340	Micro-interaction (2)		2		Specialised term
341	Micro-sociolinguistics (2)		2		Specialised term
342	Migrant (student) (2)		2		Specialised term
343	Migrant groups			3	Specialised term
344	Migrant settlement			3	Specialised term
345	Minimalist interpretation (LPP) (2)		2		Specialised term
346	Minorities (3)			3	Specialised term
347	Minoritization (1)	1			Specialised term
348	Minoritized language (1) (3)	1		3	Specialised term
349	Minority language (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Specialised term
350	Minority language community (3)			3	Specialised term

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

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

441	Prescriptive (grammar) (2)		2	Specialised term	
442	Prestige (2)		2	Specialised term	
443	Print access (2)		2	Specialised term	
444	Proficiency (linguistic) (2)		2	Specialised term	
445	Promoting (legislation/LPP) (2)		2	Specialised term	
446	Protected language (3)		3	Specialised term	
447	Protecting (legislation/LPP) (2)		2	Specialised term	
448	Protective language policy (3)		3	Specialised term	
449	Public administration (3)		3	Specialised term	
450	Public services (3)		3	Specialised term	
451	Public sphere / public life (3)		3	Specialised term	
452	Public sphericules (1)	1		Specialised term	
453	Public use (language) (2)		2	Specialised term	
454	Qualitative analysis (3)		3	Specialised term	
455	Quantitative analysis (3)		3	Specialised term	
456	Reading comprehension (2)		2	Specialised term	
457	Reading engagement (2)		2	Specialised term	
458	Recognition (3)		3	Specialised term	
459	Recognized language (3)		3	Specialised term	
460	Reconciliation processes (2)		2	Specialised term	
461	Reconstruction of language (2)		2	Specialised term	
462	Regional language (3)		3	Specialised term	
463	Regional minority languages (1) (2)	1	2	Specialised term	
464	Relevant language (3)		3	Specialised term	
465	Research evidence (2)		2	Specialised term	
466	Resemiotization (2)		2	Specialised term	
467	Revitalization (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
468	Right to develop (a language) (3)			3	Specialised term
469	Right to learn (a language) (3)			3	Specialised term
470	Right to use (a language) (3)			3	Specialised term
471	Roma (Gypsy) (2) (3)		2	3	Glottonym
472	Romani (2) (3)		2	3	Glottonym
473	Romanian/ Rumanian (2)		2		Glottonym
474	Russian (2)		2	3	Glottonym
475	Rusyn (2)		2		Glottonym
476	Ruthenian (2)		2		Glottonym
477	Sami (2)		2	3	Glottonym
478	Scaffolding (2)		2		Specialised term
479	School language (of instruction) (2)		2		Specialised term
480	Schooling (3)			3	Specialised term
481	Schooling trajectory (3)			3	Specialised term
482	Scots (3)			3	Glottonym
483	Scottish Gaelic (3)			3	Glottonym
484	Second language (3)			3	Specialised term
485	Second language immersion (2)		2		Specialised term
486	Self-confidence (3)			3	Specialised term

487	Self-representation (2)		2	Specialised term	
488	Serbian (2)		2	Glottonym	
489	SES (Socioeconomic status) (2)		2	Specialised term	
490	Slovak (2)		2	Glottonym	
491	Slovene (2)		2	Glottonym	
492	Social group (2)		2	Specialised term	
493	Social inclusion (2)		2	Specialised term	
494	Social integration (2)		2	Specialised term	
495	Social life (3)		3	Specialised term	
496	Social network (3)		3	Specialised term	
497	Social reference (3)		3	Specialised term	
498	Socialization (2)		2	Specialised term	
499	Societal discrimination (2)		2	Specialised term	
500	Societal multilingualism (2)		2	Specialised term	
501	Sociolinguistic change (2)		2	Specialised term	
502	Sociolinguistic dynamics (3)		3	Specialised term	
503	Sociolinguistic effects (3)		3	Specialised term	
504	Sociolinguistic impact (3)		3	Specialised term	
505	Sociolinguistic outline (3)		3	Specialised term	
506	Sociolinguistic practices (1)	1	2	Specialised term	
507	Sociolinguistic role (3)		3	Specialised term	
508	Space and time (2)		2	Specialised term	
509	Spanish (2)		2	Glottonym	
510	Spanish language (3)		3	Glottonym	
511	Spanish-medium education (3)		3	Specialised term	
512	Speaker (3)		3	Specialised term	
513	Specific legislation (3)		3	Specialised term	
514	Spoken language (2)		2	Specialised term	
515	Stable (bilingualism) (2)		2	Specialised term	
516	Standard (language) (2)		2	Specialised term	
517	Standard language (3)		3	Specialised term	
518	Standardization (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
519	State language (3)		3	Specialised term	
520	State language policy (3)		3	Specialised term	
521	State languages (1)	1		Specialised term	
522	State legislation (3)		3	Specialised term	
523	State level (3)		3	Specialised term	
524	Status (of language) (2)		2	Specialised term	
525	Status languaging (3)		3	Specialised term	
526	Structural problem (legislation/LPP) (2)		2	Specialised term	
527	Structured policy (3)		3	Specialised term	
528	Student assessment (2)		2	Specialised term	
529	Superdiversity (1)	1		Specialised term	
530	Sweden Finnish speakers (3)		3	Specialised term	
531	Swedish (3)		3	Glottonym	
532	Swedish Sign Language (2)		2	Glottonym	

533	Tamazight / Berber (3)			3	Glottonym
534	Target language (2)		2		Specialised term
535	Teacher education (3)			3	Specialised term
536	Teacher training (basic/further) (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
537	Teaching materials (3)			3	Specialised term
538	Telugu (2)		2		Glottonym
539	Territorial language (2)		2		Specialised term
540	Territoriality (1)	1			Specialised term
541	Territoriality (vs. personality) (3)			3	Specialised term
542	Theory of learning (2)		2		Specialised term
543	Theory of teaching (2)		2		Specialised term
544	Top-down approach (1)	1			Specialised term
545	Tornedalians (3)			3	Specialised term
546	Traditional language (3)			3	Specialised term
547	Traditional practice (3)			3	Specialised term
548	Traditional presence (3)			3	Specialised term
549	Transborder contacts (2)		2		Specialised term
550	Transculturalism (1)	1			Specialised term
551	Transfrontier exchange (3)			3	Specialised term
552	Transfrontier relations (3)			3	Specialised term
553	Translanguaging (1) (2)	1	2		Specialised term
554	Translation (1)	1			Specialised term
555	Transnational communities (1)	1			Specialised term
556	Transnational identity (2)		2		Specialised term
557	Transnationalism (1)	1		3	Specialised term
558	Trilingual education (2) (3)		2	3	Specialised term
559	Trilingualism (3)			3	Specialised term
560	Ukrainian (2) (3)		2	3	Glottonym
561	Ulster Scots (3)			3	Glottonym
562	Unbalanced bilingualism (3)			3	Specialised term
563	Unique (minority language) (2)		2		Specialised term
564	Valencian (catalan) (3)			3	Glottonym
565	Validation (of language and culture) (2)		2		Specialised term
566	Variety (of language) (2)		2		Specialised term
567	Vehicular (language) (2)		2		Specialised term
568	Voice (power-related) (2)		2		Specialised term
569	Walloon dialects (3)			3	Glottonym
570	Welcoming class (2)		2		Specialised term
571	Welsh (1) (2) (3)	1	2	3	Glottonym
572	Written illiteracy (3)			3	Specialised term
573	Yiddish (2)		2	3	Glottonym

The review of the core concepts most used in the WS3 makes it clear that, as expected, the issues dealt with were clearly oriented towards legislative and sociopolitical issues.

While a proper comparison of the concepts' distribution in each one of the three workshops will be made in the White Paper, a number of conclusions can already be obtained from a preliminary comparison:

1. A significant percentage of the terminology used —especially in PP2 and PP3, but not in PP1— is in fact made up of glottonyms, i.e., language names; the repetition of these language names is obviously contingent of the particular linguistic cases.
2. Even without language names, the number of terms which appeared in all three workshops is extremely low. Of course, a more exhaustive list from the PP1 would increase the number of coincidences, but the number of non-coincidences between the second and the third workshop remains high enough to predict that most terms in the list would not be shared by the three workshops.
3. The reason for non-coincidence can be traced back to disciplinary and epistemological diversity between different fields of research:
  - a. Most of the concepts used exclusively in the first workshop belonged to the theory of language standardisation, anthropological linguistics and political economic approaches;
  - b. Most of the concepts which appeared only in the second workshop belonged to the theory of educational sociolinguistics and bilingual education;
  - c. Most of the concepts used in the third workshop but not in the others were juridical and political in nature.
  - d. The differences between the second and the third workshops derive obviously from their area of specialization, which were respectively education, and policy and law. Contrary to this, the terminological differences between the first workshop and the other two do not lie on the area of specialization (i.e., media studies) but rather on epistemological reasons. It may also be relevant here not to oversee the circumstance that, in general terms, more participants in the first workshop were closer to

what Kachru (1992)<sup>7</sup> named as the English language inner circle. It may not be unreasonable to consider the hypothesis that the anthropological and political economic approaches are more popular among scholars of this circle than in other academic traditions.

In any case, the analysis of the similarities and the discrepancies in terminology will be resumed and explored in detail in the White Paper.

### **3.2 An analysis of contents on the basis of the sub-themes**

A comparative analysis of the summaries developed in the previous sections makes it clear that, as was the case in the previous workshops, not all presentations addressed all theoretical and methodological issues directly. Some issues were dealt with much more often than others and, given the orientation of this workshop, socio-political aspects were more widely discussed than other. In fact, the analysis of the contents showed clearly that the contributions and discussions at the WS3 only projected themselves irregularly onto the theoretical grid provided by the six sub-themes identified for the two previous workshops. As pointed out in the PP2:

«(...) it is obvious that the division into themes competes with alternative ways of structuring the presentations and their ways of connecting to a discourse on linguistic diversity. Similarly to the first workshop these characteristics of interdisciplinary work are repeated here, due to the vast research and practice fields relating to linguistic diversity. This is also typical of the cross-disciplinarity of the research profiles and expertise of the workshop participants. It furthermore reflects the dynamic nature of research in this area. As was stated in the first Position Paper and the Preparatory Document, it is also a characteristic feature of the iterative practices associated with the workshop methodology.» (PP2: page 7)

In general terms, it can be said that the three sub-themes that received more attention during the WS3 were the first and the third one, concerned with socio-political and ideological issues, as well as the second, centred around

---

<sup>7</sup> Kachru, Braj B. (1992) *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*. University of Illinois Press.



terminological diversity. For the sake of clarity, in the following section we will combine sub-themes 1 and 3.

### 3.2.1 Sub-theme 1: Policy and Practice: *Top-down* and *Bottom-up* approaches and Sub-theme 3: Socio-political approaches and ideological objectives

Given the goal of WS3, it was obvious that political and ideological objectives would play a significant role in it, and that was finally the case. The first glimpse at the summaries provided in the previous section allows to see that, following the instructions established by the organizers, the main issues tackled by the participants turned around the legal and political events affecting the development of a considerable number of minoritized and lesser-used languages in general from all over Europe, and their consequences in the everyday dynamics of these languages. Some of the presentations were broader in their scope, while others focused on very particular cases; some were legally oriented, others made emphasis on politological aspects, while others took a more sociological approach. The geographical scope was also considerable, since the cases dealt with stretched from Northern Ireland to the Crimea, and from Scandinavia to Southern Italy. And the status of the linguistic communities analysed was indeed remarkable, going from languages which enjoy official status in some regions but hardly no official recognition in other parts of the same nation state, to languages that are on the verge of extinction, including languages with all sorts of official recognition and degrees of protection.

Given this variety, a first, an inescapable conclusion of the workshop was that, even within the confines of Europe, ***the heterogeneity of sociolinguistic situations and juridico-political arrangements is indeed enormous***, and that heterogeneity may be found not only among different linguistic communities, but also within the same communities, often as a consequence of their division in different socio-political entities.<sup>8</sup> Of course, this heterogeneity is an incentive for

---

<sup>8</sup> The heterogeneity between groups here described does not preclude that heterogeneity within groups also exists, of course. Micro-sociolinguistic, ethnographic research within each of the collectivities here

classificatory efforts, and some of these were discussed in the workshop by, for instance, Climent-Ferrando and Poggeschi, but the fact is that there is still no universally agreed classification of minoritized and lesser used languages as a whole, if this is in fact a realistic possibility —and see next section for terminological issues further complicating this point.

In spite of this diversity, though, a second conclusion was unavoidable: ***the lives and fates of minoritized and lesser-used languages in Europe are intrinsically related to their legal and political status***. Even more: it is precisely because of their already weakened social positions that these languages are especially vulnerable to juridico-political changes. Alomar, Flors and Sorolla gave vivid examples of how public policies can weaken the status even of a medium-sized language such as Catalan to the extent of eroding its intergenerational transmission, whereas in other more favourable legal conditions this same language has nothing to fear in this respect. Cabal, Lainio, Poggeschi, Vacca and Zabaleta subscribed to the same argument with data from other contexts. In other words, the relevance of the legal instruments for the life and disappearance of lesser used language was empirically supported by virtually all the presentations.

And how are legal arrangements to be analysed? In stark contrast with other fora, where it is almost customary to evoke the erosion of power of the nation states in hands of globalization, participants routinely corroborated the determinant influence of sovereign states in the definition of language policies. ***Most if not all the presentations emphasised the crucial role of nation states as regulators of language policies*** not only in the areas centrally covered by the LEARNMe network, i.e., the media and education, but also in the rest of social spheres, from health and entertainment to socioeconomic life. In fact, some of the most extreme case studies discussed during the workshop provided detailed accounts of how the cultural, communicative and educational infrastructures of a number of minoritized languages had been all but dismantled in less than a legislature—as in the Balearic Islands—, and even in a period of weeks —as in the Crimea—, following changes in power, and under pretexts such as austerity, democratic will of majorities, and/or change of sovereignty. In other cases the

---

analysed would probably identify numerous forms of internal heterogeneity and cross-group similarities. This form of diversity, though, was not the aim of this workshop.

changes had a smaller scope but equally devastating consequences, given the previous fragile situation of the communities concerned, as shown by Lainio in connection with teachers of heritage languages in Scandinavia. On the whole, though, the crucial significance of nation states' legal and political decisions for language maintenance, recovery and normalization was visible in all cases.

Seen that nation states are fundamental in the legal arrangement which are vital for linguistic pluralism, how should they be organized? Even if, as in WS3, virtually all cases reviewed shared the basic principles of liberal democracy and political pluralism, ***a comparative view clearly showed also that the possible legal-political arrangements with respect to lesser used languages within a liberal-democratic state may be immensely different*** according to different lines, such as interventionism vs. non-interventionism, degree of explicit recognition of pluralism, role of the principles of historicity, territoriality and personality, etc. The intricacy of the relationship among policies, politics and management was also apparent, with innumerable examples of specific management measures that seemed to contravene even the most solid constitutional principles and political discourses that reformulated general principles in a way that was hurtful for non-hegemonic languages.

As a whole, though, participants tended to be ***at least sceptical about the effects of what could be defined as exclusively top-down approaches***. This point was probably better exemplified by the interminable conflicts involved with the recognition of lesser used languages in France and with the possible signature and ratification of ECRML reported by Zabaleta, for instance, which derived to a large extent from the combination between an extremely centralised political organisation and the refusal to acknowledge interlocutors between the State and the individuals. The case of Val d'Aran, where authorities relatively *on top* — the Catalan parliament — pushes the protection of a lesser-used language to the point of passing a law giving official prevalence to the local language even when this has become demographically minor in its own territory is more an exception than a rule. As a rule of thumb, decisions from those on top are not beneficial to the weaker languages — and the Aranese case, where the Spanish government has taken the law of Aranese Occitan to the Constitutional Court, may be a good reminder of it.

Reluctance against top-down approaches should not be confused with a naïve adoption of an only *bottom-up* approach. To say the truth, whereas plenty of speakers made their reluctance with regards to exclusive top-down policies explicit, as in the WS1 and W2, the fact is that none of the speakers devoted a significant amount of time to discussing the opposition between a *top-down* and a *bottom-up* approach. This conspicuous absence was probably attributable to a number of factors, but very principally to the fact that, as pointed out during the WS1 (1PP: 7), ***this conceptual opposition is in fact excessively reductionist***, and this for a number of reasons.

In first place, although the opposition may be useful to describe radical shifts in power balance such as that described in Crimea by Cabal, it is insufficient to describe even those situations with some degree of precision, for even in the Crimea, the number and types of real actors is not reduced to a single group on top and another one, rather homogeneous, at the bottom. On the contrary, even in polarized circumstances, it is often the case that both those on top and those in the bottom may often be plural and difficult to identify as single entities, as Zabaleta showed for France and Rolewska for Wales.

In second place, and adding to the push for more elaborate analytical tools, the dichotomy between only two levels may perhaps function in cases where the power inequality is extremely clear, such as that in the Franja depicted by Sorolla, but the opposition becomes ambiguous when, as it is usual in many contexts, different levels of power compete with each other. That was the case depicted by Pons in Val d'Aran, where the capacity act in language policy is divided among the Aranese, the Catalanian and the Spanish authorities. This last case showed also another interesting point: those 'on top' —or at least on one of the tops— may establish alliances with some of those 'at the bottom', making the opposition thus even more confusing.

Finally, presentations such as Vacca's, which described the situation of a highly polarized society with different governmental levels and a society strongly divided by sectarian cliffs, and Rolewska's, with its analysis of the interaction between political parties, their supporters and the institutions made it clear that language policy cannot be reduced to the activities of public institutions.

On the whole, then, and in line with WS1, WS3 made it clear that, whereas ***the opposition between top-down and bottom-up may be of help for schematic, preliminary analyses, any serious attempt to capture adequately the language policies dynamics of any given society requires more nuanced institutional and socio-political models and categories.*** Crucial to this development seems to be the idea that politics and public policies are much closer than one may believe.

This understanding of language policies as a complex, multiagency activity, did not undermine the general recognition of the crucial role of the nation state in defining the language policies, but just put it into an adequate, pluralist perspective. Other (public and private) institutions were by no means ignored during the presentations, but their significance was closely connected with their capacity to operate in the field of language policy. For instance, Janssens' analysis of the language policies in the Brussels Rand, i.e., the Flemish municipalities surrounding the Belgian capital shed light on how sub-state entities may be even more powerful, as far as language policy is concerned, than central authorities. The changing role of sub-state legislative powers was also explored by Pons and Rolewska among others, corroborating that these may exert crucial language policy functions provided they were legitimised to do so by a devolution, a federal arrangement or even a certain degree of autonomy.

Beside the nation state and the sub-state authorities, several presenters emphasised the possibilities of the European Union in the field of protecting linguistic diversity. Nevertheless, several of the speakers —especially that of the Climent-Ferrando— perceived that ***continental policies were showing disturbing symptoms of adopting a more market-oriented discourse and practice which was judged by some as less receptive to the claims of minority and minoritized language communities.*** In this respect, Climent-Ferrando suggested that the steady move away from the discourse of linguistic diversity towards a discourse based on multilingualism was in fact covering the loss of interest for marginalized languages in favour of big, international lingua-francas.

Indeed, the mistrust towards the EU was a reflection of another quite general point of coincidence: with a diversity of emphasis, several speakers expressed a ***general mistrust towards politicians and decision makers,*** in at least three senses. To start with, the difference of rhythms between science and

politics —a classic at least since Max Weber’s considerations about scientist and politicians— was resented, in the sense that the latter needed to be *educated* once and again about basics of linguistic diversity, as if every generation of (future-to-be) decision makers had to learn them from scratch. Secondly, several participants claimed that very often decision makers did not pay enough attention to the general interest, were moved by short-term, tactic and electoral goals. Finally, more specific blames were produced in connection with politicians and decision-makers. Several participants raised the issue that administrations and politicians tend not to rely on scientific advice when dealing with issues of societal multilingualism. It should be noted that this estrangement from politicians vis-à-vis specialised knowledge was relatively new —and therefore perhaps more resented— in some societies where the cooperation between both sectors had functioned better in the past, as Lainio and Janssens expressed. In other places where the distance between the scientific and the political spheres has been traditionally bigger, though, the estrangement among them was not resented as a novelty. Even worse, Alomar, Flors and Sorolla provided examples of societies where some politicians supported explicitly and proudly discourses and practices which denied explicitly the validity of academic knowledge in the area of language and society, and cultivated populist topics and prejudices under the alibi of following the common people’s sense. In a perhaps less dramatic tone, Lainio evoked the evolution towards a NIMBY [‘not-in-my-backyard’] culture as one of the foundations for politicians’ estrangement from scientific research.

It goes without saying that the lack of confidence in research by politicians was, especially in their most acute cases, sadly resented. But at the same time, some voices also attempted to go beyond disappointment, suggested that the academia was perhaps less efficient and effective in disseminating research results, and therefore tried to suggest ways to improve this estrangement. In this respect, some participants like Vila pointed out that academics should make an effort to communicate better the results of research and make them easily available both to decision makers and the general public. In this line of reasoning, Lainio welcomed the fact that the representatives of minority languages were becoming more professional and therefore more capable to look after their interests in the field of politics.

Another *traditional* issue of contention in fora such as the WS3 is the position of non-traditional minority languages vis-à-vis the other languages in presence in a given nation state. As is well-known, current European institutions and legislation tend to draw a clear distinction between national minority languages, traditional regional and minority languages, on the one hand, and those spoken as a result of recent immigration waves, on the other. This distinction is resented by some sectors as unfair and opposed, sometimes even vehemently, in their demands for recognition on equal terms as the former language groups. The issue is without doubt a delicate one, and has strong connections with some other complex topics such as immigration, policies of nationalisation, etc. Besides, the issue cannot be simply dealt with as a matter of more recognition for more groups, since the consequences of such a movement are not really clear – neither for the immigrated groups themselves nor for the other, traditional groups, that often resent this possibility as a way to get further minoritised. Some echoes of this discussion were actually felt in some presentations such as the one by Poggeschi or Lainio but, in fact, though, the actual focus of the WS3, centred on actual legislation and its impact, rather than on political philosophy, had as a consequence that a vast majority of speakers referred basically to traditional, autochthonous groups, because these are the ones that have been the object of some legislative acts in Europe.

Other subjects that had appeared in previous workshops did not attract much attention in Barcelona. Thus, the issue of the integration of language rights in mainstream human rights arose less debate in WS3 than in WS1, for instance, although a tentative classification of universal language rights was put forward by Poggeschi on the basis of the Italian experience that distinguishes between national languages, minority languages, and dialects and foreign languages. Similarly, the debate about the individual vs. collective nature of language rights, that had attracted a degree of interest in WS1, was not a matter of discussion in WS3.

### 3.2.2 Sub-theme 2: Terminological diversity and its consequences

«Terminological diversity is recognised to be highly prevalent in the field of linguistic diversity and the consequences featured in all discussions and presentations» (2PP 2015: 47)

This sentence, written in the *Second Position Paper*, was also pertinent to describe the WS3. Demands for terminological clarification abounded after each presentation, and debates about terminology were indeed common, especially during the discussion sessions.

Indeed, at least some of the participants addressed explicitly the fact that not only the terminology, but even whole discourses were evolving and changing hand in hand with the terms they used. Climent-Ferrando analysed how the EU discourse seems to be moving from a paradigm he defined as that of “linguistic diversity” based on a more holistic view which included also lesser used languages, and replacing it with a the discourse of “multilingualism”, based on more market-friendly and economicist approach. Lainio, on his side, denounced a similar evolution between a discourse centred on *equality* towards another one based on *equity* of treatment, which allows for more differences than the former.

The debates about terminology took ***three main different lines: challenges related to academic terms, interferences between academic and non-academic usages, and the question of glottonyms.***

In first place, some of the challenges derived from the heterogeneity of terminology revolved around the fact that some terms had originated in non-hegemonic academic traditions and were not easily transferred to English. Crnić-Grotić, for instance, put on the table the difficulties encountered by specialists when dealing with the terminology developed in the Spanish languages, such as *linguistic normalization or llengua pròpia*, a position that was nuanced by Jones, who pointed to the fact that terminological diversity may in fact be connected with different theoretical and epistemological approaches to reality that may enrich the researchers’ view about sociolinguistic reality. WS3 re-encountered the challenges posed by terms as *majority, minority, minoritised language*, etc., already detected in previous workshops.



A second source for terminological challenges had already been pointed out in previous workshops and was the fact that a significant percentage of terms used in the field of linguistic diversity are also used in non-academic fields, especially in politics and in management of social reality. The controversial use of *dialetto*, widespread in Italy, for instance, to refer to varieties with a strong linguistic personality, was pointed out as a problem because it automatically categorised these varieties as deserving lower levels of protection than *real* languages, as was evidenced by Poggeschi and several participants to his presentation. The polysemy of *integration*, pointed out among other by Lainio, was another case of terminological conflict. But without doubt, though, the most controversial term was *nationalism* — and, to a lesser extent, *regionalism* —: introduced by Rolewska to refer to political parties seeking the increase of power of sub-state entities, this usage of the term was put into question by Vila, O’Connell and several others, who signalled, for instance, the derogatory connotations the term has in some languages and political traditions, or the contradiction arising from the fact that a particular linguistic behaviour such as speaking a given language  $L_a$  in front of a speaker of a different language may be described as nationalist if  $L_a$  is not a state language, whereas the same behaviour could not be termed as nationalist in case the language was a state language.

Finally, another source of terminological reflection was that of language names or glottonyms. Different authors, such as Pons, Flors, Sorolla, etc., analysed the practical consequences derived from the legal capacity of deciding the name of a given language: in Catalonia, the government has supported the idea that the local minority speech is just a variety of a larger language, namely Occitan, to the extent that it has been campaigning the term ‘Aranese Occitan’ as the official name for the valley’s language. In Aragon, Valencia and Balearic Islands, on the contrary, the conservative Partido Popular has campaigned to erase the term ‘Catalan’ from public life, replacing it with local denominations of the language or even with a rather bizarre formula (“Language with belongs to the Eastern Aragonese Areas”, i.e., LAPAO according to its Catalan and Castilian acronym). In both cases, terminology has been just the symbolic tip of a more comprehensive project to break the language into pieces that has included, among other, the official dismantling of mass media exchange —namely radio and television—between

different Catalan speaking territories, or the boycott against the cultural production —literature, cinema, theatre, etc.— coming from neighbouring territories, to name but two.

The comparison of the terms used in WS3 and the other workshops in the previous section has already shown that, as expected, concepts related to the focus of each workshop were relatively more common in that event than in the others. As a consequence, for instance, educational terms were much more present in WS2, and legal and political terms were more abundant in WS3. Less expectable perhaps was the absence in WS3 of a subset of terms and concepts that abounded especially in WS1 and which find their roots in relatively recent works in anthropological sociolinguistics, first and foremost the notion of *translanguaging*, but also others such *superdiversity*.

This terminological dissonance requires some discussion. A first, on-the-spot interpretation might attribute the absence of these and similar terms to a lack of contact of the WS3 presentations with empirical reality on the ground, but the applied, empirical nature of all the presentations rapidly gives away with this prejudice. A second hypothesis might be that perhaps the presentations had focussed on academic issues that did not give a chance to these concepts to appear. Again, this interpretation would be wrong: in fact, the WS3 —for instance, Alomar, Climent-Ferrando, Flors, Poggeschi, Pons, Sorolla— did deal with issues such as language standardization, plurilectal continua, multiple identities, plurilingual practices, migrants and heritage languages, etc., that is, the opportunity to introduce the aforementioned concepts was obviously there. In other words, it was not lack of opportunity that prevented that the aforementioned terms were employed. So, to explain the conceptual dissonance, a more sophisticated explanation is required. While a more in-depth analysis of this issue will be elaborated in the White Paper, it should be probably be taken into account in first place that notions such as *translanguaging* or *superdiversity*, to mention but two, have been developed recently and have achieved popularity especially —although not exclusively— in more micro- and ethnographically oriented academic circles; nevertheless, these concepts have not permeated many other approaches to linguistic diversity, and in particular, they have clearly not made any inroads into

legal or political discourses, not to say in standard language. Dr. Darquennes did point explicitly in this direction when saying:

«[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.» (1PP 2014: 9)

On the whole, WS3 underlined the conclusions arrived at during the previous workshops, and synthesized in a number of question marks:

«is it possible to make a differentiation between the scientific discourse and research results/terminology and the political/legal/public discourses, so that the results of research still become clear and adaptable for the latter discourses? As consequent questions – if research results point in the same direction – can a defined content be retained when transferring the use of a concept from a scientific discourse to a societal and political one, and, can the extensive use of different concepts be reduced – and is this a practical solution?» (2PP 2015: 50)

In a similar, perhaps less optimistic vein, O’Connell pointed out that terminological problems may be simply unavoidable for they reflect actual discrepancies in the approach to the facts of study. In such a scenario, the awareness that common definitions cannot be taken for granted, i.e., the critical stance towards terms and concepts as they are used both within and without the academia, is probably a requirement that should be continuously maintained.

### **3.2.3 Sub-theme 4: Methodological issues**

Methodological issues did appear quite frequently in the presentations, but they did not generate a sustained debate or one similar to that produced in some previous workshops. As in other editions there were comments and demands for clarification about the procedures to obtain the data used in some presentation, especially in the more demolinguistic-oriented presentations.

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

A general claim during the WS was that there is a considerable distance between discourses and actual practices, and that this distance contributed considerably to the discredit of politicians already mentioned in a previous section. Focusing on the Valencian educational system, for instance, Flors clearly showed that the theoretical linguistic streams are far from well-defined, coherent structures, since, for example, Castilian monolingual teachers may be assigned to programmes in Catalan immersion. Vacca described the difficulties in implementing pluralistic policies in Northern Ireland, even if they were a significant element of an international peace treaty. Further to the north, Lainio criticized the widespread distance between benevolent discourses and described some of the difficulties on the ground for speakers of lesser used languages to get the support, e.g. L1 instruction, they are officially entitled to.

But politicians were not the only ones to be blamed here. Academic discourses also had their share, since they may also lie far away from actual reality, in a reproduction of the ivory tower topic that discredits researchers in the eyes of the general public. Thus, several presentations —Alomar, Cabal and Flors— showed that in the time of, at least in theory, unprecedented freedom for transnational communication and widespread democracy and respect for human rights, it suffices with the will of a government to reduce drastically, and even suppress absolutely any presence on TV and radio of a given language.

On the whole, the distance between the law and reality was shown as often acute, with real practices recurrently being much worse than legislation.

## 4. Final reflections

Conceived as a forum where researchers would find a place to exchange not only data and knowledge about new developments on the legal arena in the field of linguistic diversity in Europe, but also enjoy the freedom to express and discuss their views about a large array of relevant issues in this arena, it can be said that the WS3 amply accomplished its functions.

In general terms, the WS3 corroborated the need to develop more refined models of language policy analysis that go beyond manicheistic oppositions and simple terminological definitions. Social reality *is* complex, social actors are numerous, and since it is inevitable that they use language and discourse to advance their respective interests, analysts cannot content themselves with schematic accounts of reality. Complexity in the analysis and continual critical vigilance with respect to the terms and the narratives are an inescapable toll for social sciences. In this sense, the slide from a discourse of linguistic diversity with a strong penchant for equality, towards a new discourse of market-oriented multilingualism observed in the EU in general is paradigmatic of how analysis that have socio-political and methodological diversity in their background may contribute to understanding the challenges that lie ahead in the field.

Building the complex analytical models that are required is indeed no easy task. WS3 showed that the strong dynamism in research, combined with the multiplicity of academic approaches, leads to a proliferation of concepts and terminologies that may be difficult to reduce to a set of standardized terms. If we add to this the fact that societies — in plural— are often eager to absorb the terminological innovations and prone to recycle them for the object of social competition, the goal of standardization, at least in its most demanding sense, appears even more titanic, not to say Sisyphean, since it would require not just a technical, but rather profound ideological and epistemological change that does not seem to show up in the visible horizon of the science. Nevertheless, the fact that the final horizon of total harmonization may be in practice unachievable — and to a certain extent, perhaps even undesirable — should not deter the efforts in this sense. Indeed, strenuous efforts and continuous vigilance should be applied, in first place, to increase awareness among scholars themselves of the reality of terminological proliferation and the challenges it poses to scientific

communication; and, in second place, to exploit this diversity in a positive sense, as a tool to reconsider existent certainties and a lever to move apparently immobile truths wherever it is needed. Researchers cannot allow themselves the luxury of taking terminological homogeneity for granted. The discussions about terms such as *nationalism* or *integration* are good examples of the scope such a practice may have bot for academia and society at large.

In contrast with some discourses that announce the demise of the public sector and the dissolution of the nation state, the WS3 corroborated the relevance of both realities as determinant factors in orienting the evolution of linguistic diversity. In the age of Google and Ryanair, the fate of many languages is still very much dependent on what governments and parliaments say. Of course, for those used to living in centralised, powerful nation states where the central authorities used to enjoy the monopoly of political power, the actual scenario of decentralizations, devolutions, international and transnational institutions, lobbying, etc., may look bewildering, but the fact remains that, even if redistributions among institutions have taken place, political power is still fundamental for language management, and political power is still to a large extent a prerogative of nation states. Therefore it is of crucial importance to continue analysing legal and political practices vis-à-vis linguistic diversity, and to persevere in developing models to tackle it in a more professional, more productive, and, of course, a fair(er) way.

## Appendix 1 Programme of the 3<sup>rd</sup> LEARNMe Workshop

**Wednesday, 8th April**

**Recent developments regarding the legal protection of minoritized languages: a legal approach**

8.45 Welcome - documentation

9.15 Opening session

9.30 **Vicent Climent-Ferrando**, Network to Promote Linguistic Diversity, NPLD

*Minoritized languages within the UE*

10.00 **Eva Pons**, Universitat de Barcelona

*The legal protection of Aranese Occitan in Catalonia*

10.30 Discussion moderated by **Tom Moring**

11.00 **Coffee break**

11.30 **Anna Rolewska**, Aberystwyth University, Mercator Institute for Media, Languages and Culture

*Nationalist and regionalist parties as drivers of minority language policy and planning.*

12.00 **Alessia Vacca**, University of Sassari

*Minority languages in public administration in Northern Ireland*

12.30 Discussion moderated by **Eithne O'Connell**

13.00 Lunch

14.00 **Vesna Crnic-Grotic**, Committee of Experts of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages

*Legislation and minority languages – the role of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages in Spain*

14.30 **Giovanni Poggeschi**, Università del Salento

*Recent developments with regards to minority Language in Italy*

15.00 **Eneritz Zabaleta**, Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour

*Recent developments with regards to minority Language in France*

15.30 Discussion moderated by **Jeroen Darquennes**

## Activity

### REVISTA DE LLENGUA I DRET - JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE AND LAW

We will visit EAPC, Escola d'Administració Pública de Catalunya - School of Public Administration of Catalonia. The **Revista de Llengua i Dret, RLD, Journal of Language and Law**, published biannually, publishes academic papers about administrative and legal language, linguistic law and language policy and sociolinguistics. - trip to the EAPC - walking distance

16.30 **Joan Ramon Solé**. Presentation of RLD - EAPC

20.00 Dinner

**Thursday, 9th April**

**Impact of legislation on sociolinguistic reality**



9.30 **Rudi Janssens**, Vrije Universiteit Brussel

*The impact Brussels & Brussels linguistic regime on sociolinguistic Dynamics on Brussels and the Rand: recent developments*

10.00 **Miquel Cabal**, Universitat de Barcelona

*Crimea at a crossroads: perspectives for linguistic diversity in Crimea in the light of the last year's events*

10.30 **Jarmo Lainio**, Stockholm University

*The interplay between the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, national authorities and NGO's – The case of teacher education for national minority languages in Sweden*

11.00 Discussion moderated by **F. Xavier Vila**

11.30 Coffee break

12.00 **Antoni Ignasi Alomar**, Universitat de les Illes Balears

*The transformation of public language policies in the Balearic Islands during the last four years*

12.30 **Avel·lí Flors**, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, UOC

*From soft promotion to defencelessness? Sociolinguistic effects of changing language policies in València*

13.00 **Natxo Sorolla**, Universitat de Barcelona / Universitat Rovira i Virgili

*Changing policies with regards to minority languages in Aragon and its sociological and sociolinguistic impact*

13.30 Discussion moderated by **Vanessa Bretxa**

14.00 **Concluding remarks & Workshop closure**

14.30 Lunch

## **Appendix 2 Preparatory document, invitation to participate**

### **Mercator Network**

#### **LEARNMe Project: 3rd workshop on linguistic diversity and language policies**

**Revisiting, reanalysing and redefining legal aspects on linguistic diversity:**

**policy, media and education**

#### **Presentation of the Workshop**

The **revisiting, reanalysing and redefining linguistic diversity: policy, media and education** workshops are a series of scientific events organised by Mercator Network, on the LEARNMe Project, *Language and Education Addressed through Research and Networking by Mercator*, with the aim of bringing together researchers, practitioners and policy makers in the field of minority and minoritized languages. So far, two workshops have taken place in Aberystwyth (Wales) and Stockholm (Sweden) with a strong emphasis on media and education respectively.

Now, the CUSC-UB invites you to attend the third workshop of this series focusing on recent developments regarding the legal protection of minoritized languages under different European perspectives.

The aim of this workshop will be to bring together a group of specialists that will inform the attendants of a number of innovations in the legal and political arenas in connection with a

variety of European languages, and to explore the sociolinguistic consequences of these policies in a variety of settings.

The workshop will be divided into two parts. The first part, on 8th April, will focus on recent developments of the different legal frameworks, and presented more protection cases and cases under protection. The second part, on 9th April, will focus on the impact resulting of different legislation and Language regimes in a variety of multilingual Settings which are open to modification in their legal status.

### **Theoretical background and goals (for authors)**

In connection with the scientific committee, each author is invited to synthesise his presentation trying to keep in mind a number of questions. The authors will be dealing with slightly different issues: some of them will study the linguistic regime of particular languages, others of a group of languages inside the State, others the position of supranational organisations, and finally, proponents during the second day will make emphasis on the results of specific language policies on particular language groups. Therefore, the questions are not a rigid scheme but a compass to be applied to the different cases, approaches and focus of the participants. In all cases, though, proponents are strongly invited to make a contribution that facilitates comparative reflection that may help participants to discuss cross-nationally the results of each presentation in order to contribute to the refinement of general theoretical issues during the discussions that will take place after their interventions.

The presentations about linguistic rights need to be addressed taking into account:

- 1 Influence of the legal international framework --established or under construction--, applicable to languages other than the official language of the state which is about the presentation, including:**
  - a. Positive elements or promoters: ratification and application of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, other international treaties (protection of national minorities, human rights, European Union treaties, bilateral treaties) or other soft law.
  - b. Elements potentially constraining limits derived from European Union law (regime of official languages in the European Union, freedom of movement of people and goods) limits derived from human rights treaties, globalization effects

- 2 Internal factors of the legal system, established or under construction, applicable to languages other than the official language of the state which is about the presentation, including:**
  - a. Sociolinguistic type: number of speakers, sociolinguistic situation, continuity / fragmentation of the language community, the presence of international or global languages...
  - b. Political type: the influence of the party system, construction and maintenance of political consensus, the degree of political autonomy...
- 3 Legal type: constitutional limits, types of legal instruments, judgments of constitutional courts or ordinary interpretation of juridical concepts, influence the general characteristics of the regulatory system**
- 4 Distinction between the different areas of regulation within the language system, including:**
  - a. Administration and other public authorities; the public service
  - b. Education
  - c. Media
  - d. Socio-economic
- 5 New legal and political developments: possible highlighted innovative elements about legal instruments; experiences of cross-border cooperation; good practices in the application or outside the linguistic legislation; political and legal debates.**

Participants speaking about the impact of legislation are invited to pay a particular attention to the links between sociolinguistic reality and politico-legislative organisation, paying attention both to the present and to envisionable future.

**Oral presentations and written contributions**

Presentations to the workshop should be thought of as brief oral events, with the support of whatever electronic device is needed, and designed to provide the participants with the basic information that makes discussion possible and profitable for everybody. The organising committee has already approached an indexed international journal so that the eventual written contributions may be published as a monograph, provided that they approved by blind per review.

**Location**

The workshop will be held in CUSC UB Barcelona - 8th-9th April 2015

University of Barcelona, in the Building Josep Carner.

Facultat de Filologia, Universitat de Barcelona

C. Aribau, 2 – 08011 Barcelona

5th floor - Sala de professors, Professors Hall

**Scientific Committee**

F. Xavier Vila

Eva Pons

Vanessa Bretxa

Guillem Pujades