Tilburg University

Trends in policies and practices for multilingualism in Europe

Extra, Guus

Published in:
Plurilinguismo

Publication date:
2015

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):
Extra, G. (2015). Trends in policies and practices for multilingualism in Europe: Aims and design of the Language Rich Europe Project and key outcomes for Italy. In C. Bruno, S. Casini, & F. Gallina (Eds.), *Plurilinguismo: Sintassi* (pp. 21-49). (Società di Linguistica Italiana; Vol. 59). Bulzoni.

SOCIETÀ DI LINGUISTICA ITALIANA

SLI 59

PLURILINGUISMO
SINTASSI

ESTRATTO

BULZONI
ROMA 2015

GUUS EXTRA
Tilburg University

Trends in policies and practices for multilingualism in Europe: Aims and design of the Language Rich Europe Project and key outcomes for Italy

1. ABSTRACT

Sections 3 and 4 offer background information on European actors (the European Union, based in Brussels, and the Council of Europe, based in Strasbourg) in promoting multilingualism and plurilingualism, and on the so-called *trilingual formula* ("mother tongue" plus two). Sections 5 and 6 focus on the language varieties and language domains explored in the project. The addressed language varieties include national languages, foreign languages, regional or minority languages, and immigrant languages. The addressed language domains include languages in official documents and data bases, languages in pre-primary, primary, secondary, and further and higher education; in addition, three language domains beyond education are addressed: languages in audiovisual media and press, languages in public services and public spaces, and languages in business. Section 7 goes into data collection and the proposed three-cities approach per country or region. The research methodology employed in the project is addressed in Section 8. Key outcomes for Italy are presented in Section 9.

2. INTRODUCTION

This text is derived from a recent publication on the *Language Rich Europe (LRE)* project[1], co-financed by the European Commission under its *Lifelong Learning Programme*, and initiated by the British Council, the UK's international organisation for educational opportunities and cultural relations (Extra, Yağmur, 2012). The project is managed by the British Council, and supervised by a Steering Group made up of representatives of European Union National Institutes for Culture and partner organisations.

---

[1] This project has been funded by the British Council with support from the European Commission and its outcomes have been published by Cambridge University Press. This publication reflects the views only of the authors and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Babylon, Centre for Studies of the Multicultural Society at Tilburg University, has led on the research element of the project, developing draft indicators based on *European Union (EU)* and *Council of Europe (CoE)* resolutions, conventions and recommendations to examine language policies and practices in 25 countries and regions, constructing and administering the research questionnaire among our partner network, processing and analysing the data, and writing up the cross-national outcomes of data collection. Our research partners in each country/region have complemented the data collected with their own analysis of the findings, supported by examples of good practice and promising initiatives. The overall objectives of the LRE project are:

— to facilitate the exchange of good practice in promoting intercultural dialogue and social inclusion through language teaching and learning;

— to promote European co-operation in developing language policies and practices across several education sectors and broader society;

— to raise awareness of the EU and CoE recommendations for promoting language learning and linguistic diversity across Europe.

The purpose of the draft indicators developed through the project is to act as a tool to support countries and regions in evaluating themselves against EU and CoE documents on multilingualism and plurilingualism. Through this process, we aim to raise awareness at both the public and the political macro-level among European, national and regional language policy makers, and motivate key stakeholders across a variety of sectors, languages and countries/regions to take action. Suggestions for further indicators are welcome, as is an active response to our findings. We hope that the outcomes will trigger relevant follow-up case studies and in-depth research into micro-level policies and practices on multilingualism and plurilingualism.

There are obvious limitations to what can be achieved in a survey study like this. These limitations will be addressed in Section 8 in terms of validity issues. However, we believe that the results we present go beyond the current state of our knowledge with regard to language policies and practices in Europe from at least four different perspectives:

— the high number of participating countries and regions: 25;

— the spectrum of chosen language varieties in the constellation of languages in Europe; we look at foreign, regional or minority, immigrant and national languages, the latter with a special focus on support for newcomers;

— the range of chosen language domains within and beyond education to include business, public services and spaces in cities, and the media;

— the publication and dissemination of the outcomes of this study in 20 languages including Turkish and Arabic as major immigrant languages in Europe.

3. EUROPEAN ACTORS IN PROMOTING MULTILINGUALISM AND PLURILINGUALISM

Linguistic diversity is a key property of Europe's identity, and both the EU Institutions based in Brussels and the Council of Europe based in Strasbourg have been active in promoting language learning and multilingualism/plurilingualism. The major language policy agencies in these two institutions are the *Unit for Multilingualism Policy* within the Directorate-General of Education and Culture in the European Commission and the *Language Policy Unit* of the Directorate of Education in the Council of Europe. The work done by these agencies underpins the important resolutions, charters and conventions produced by the respective bodies. Baetens Beardsmore (2008) gives an insightful overview of both EU and CoE language promotion activities in the past.

A search for multilingualism publications on http://europa.eu/ yields key EU documents in a range of languages organised under five headings: EU policy documents, information brochures, reports, studies, and surveys. On the CoE site, http://www.coe.int/lang, publications are offered in the domains of policy development, instruments and standards, languages of school education, migrants, conference reports and selected studies. The CoE makes a distinction between plurilingualism as a speaker's competence (ability to use more than one language) and multilingualism as the presence of various languages in a given geographical area. The EU uses multilingualism for both (sometimes specifying "multilingualism of the individual"). Throughout the report both concepts multilingualism/ plurilingualism are quoted.

3.1 *The European Union (EU)*

Within the EU, language policy is the responsibility of individual Member States. EU institutions play a supporting role in this field, based on the "principle of subsidiarity". Their role is to promote co-operation between the Member States and to promote the European dimension in national language policies. Within the three constituent bodies of the EU, that is the *Council of the European Union* (heads of state and government), the *European Commission (EC)*, and the *European Parliament*, multilingualism has been a key area of focus for a number of years.

EU language policies aim to protect linguistic diversity and promote knowledge of languages, for reasons of cultural identity and social integration, but also because multilingual citizens are better placed to take advantage of the educational, professional and economic opportunities created by an integrated Europe. Multilingualism policy is guided by the objective set by the Council of the EU in Barcelona in 2002 to improve the mastery of basic skills, in particular by teaching at least two additional languages from a very early age. This in turn had built on the seminal 1995 *White Paper on teaching and learning*, which advocated that everyone should learn two European languages. "European" was removed in later documents.

In 2003, the EC committed itself to undertake 45 new actions to encourage national, regional and local authorities to work towards a «major step change in promoting language learning and linguistic diversity». The EC's first ever Communication on multilingualism, *A new framework strategy for multilingualism*, was adopted in 2005 and complemented its action plan *Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity*. The importance of multilingualism to the EC was underlined by the appointment of a special European Commissioner, Leonard Orban, to manage the portfolio for the very first time in 2007, although in the 2009 Barroso reshuffle it became part of the remit of the Commissioner for Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth. Under Commissioner Orban, the EC produced their 2008 Communication, *Multilingualism: an asset for Europe and a shared commitment*, which established language policy as a transversal topic which contributed to all other EU policies. The Communication set out what needed to be done to turn linguistic diversity into an asset for solidarity and prosperity. The two central objectives for multilingualism policy were:

- to raise awareness of the value and opportunities of the EU's linguistic diversity and encourage the removal of barriers to intercultural dialogue;

- to give all citizens real opportunities to learn to communicate in two languages in addition to their mother tongue.

Member States were invited to offer a wider range of languages more effectively within the education system from an early age up to adult education and to value and further develop language skills acquired outside the formal education system. Moreover, the EC stated its determination to make strategic use of relevant EU programmes and initiatives to bring multilingualism "closer to the citizen".

The Commission Staff Working Document (2008), accompanying the above-mentioned EC Communication, presents a good overview of existing EU activities supporting multilingualism. The EC Communication (2008) was welcomed and

endorsed by resolutions from both the Council of the EU (2008) and the European Parliament (2009), with the emphasis on lifelong learning, competitiveness, mobility and employability. In 2011 the EC reported back on progress since 2008 and provided a full inventory of EU actions in the field. It also looked forward to the *Strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training* (ET, 2020) in which language learning is identified as a priority, with communication in foreign languages one of eight key competences to improve the quality and efficiency of education and training. Also included as core skills are communication in the mother tongue, mediation and intercultural understanding (EC, 2011).

Key statistics on language learning and teaching in the EU are collected in the context of Eurydice and Eurobarometer surveys. Of major importance for the primary and secondary education domains of our LRE questionnaire are the reports *Key data on teaching languages at school in Europe* (Eurydice, 2008, updated version of 2005 report) and *Integrating immigrant children into schools in Europe* (Eurydice, 2009), as well as two Eurobarometer reports on language skills of European citizens and their attitudes towards languages (Eurobarometers, 2001 and 2006). The above-mentioned report to the EC by Strubell et al (2007) also contains key data on student enrolments in language classes in primary, lower and upper secondary education in EU countries; moreover, the report offers an analysis of cross-national results and trends, and concludes with a range of recommendations.

Specific numbers of language learners and school learning exams, as well as types of language competences may be addressed in a follow-up version of the LRE questionnaire. We will explore the opportunities for synergies between data collection for the current LRE project and for the *European Language Monitor* (ELM) and the *European Survey on Language Competences* (ESLC), respectively (see the websites of the two projects for work in progress). The focus of the ELM project is on official state languages versus English at university level. The initial focus of the ESLC project is on students' competence in English, French, German, Italian and Spanish as their first and second foreign language in their final year of lower secondary education or their second year of upper secondary education, depending on the given educational context. The first ESLC report has recently been made available by the EC (2012a) and contains data of almost 54,000 students enrolled in 14 participating countries. Curriculum-independent tests were designed, standardised and applied for reading, listening and writing skills in each of the five languages referred to and linked to the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) levels. The ESLC results show an overall low level of competences in both first and second foreign languages tested. In

addition, the outcomes vary greatly across countries, chosen languages, and measured language skills.

3.2 The Council of Europe (CoE)

Founded on 5 May 1949, the CoE is an intergovernmental organisation with 47 Member States, including the 27 European Union States. Two CoE conventions are directly concerned with European standards to promote and safeguard linguistic diversity and language rights: the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* and the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities*. The *Charter* is a cultural instrument designed to protect and promote regional or minority languages as a threatened aspect of Europe's cultural heritage. It provides for specific measures to support the use of this category of languages in education and the media, and to permit their use in judicial and administrative settings, economic and social life and cultural activities. The *Framework Convention* specifies the conditions necessary for persons belonging to national minorities to maintain and develop their culture, and to preserve the essential elements of their identity, namely their religion, language, traditions and cultural heritage. States which have ratified these conventions are monitored with regard to their fulfilment of the commitments they have undertaken.

CoE recommendations are authoritative statements to national authorities on guiding principles and related implementation measures, but are not legally binding. The following are among the most relevant for the purposes of our project:

– Recommendation R (98) 6 of the Committee of Ministers on Modern Languages (1998) emphasising intercultural communication and plurilingualism as key policy goals and proposing concrete measures for each educational sector and for initial and in-service teacher education. The appendix to this recommendation specifies comprehensively, for each educational sector, ways in which plurilingualism may be established as an overarching aim in a coherent concept of language education in all the Member States of the CoE.

– Recommendation 1383 (1998) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe on Linguistic Diversification stating that «Europe's linguistic diversity is a precious cultural asset that must be preserved and protected» and that «there should therefore be more variety in modern language teaching in the CoE Member States; this should result in the acquisition not only of English but also of other European and world languages by all European citizens, in parallel

with the mastery of their own national and, where appropriate, regional 'language'».

– Recommendation 1539 (2001) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe on the European Year of Languages calling upon the Member States to «maintain and develop further the CoEs language policy initiatives for promoting plurilingualism, cultural diversity and understanding among peoples and nations» and to «encourage all Europeans to acquire a certain ability to communicate in several languages, for example by promoting diversified novel approaches adapted to individual needs ...».

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

– Recommendation 1740 (2006) of the Parliamentary Assembly on the place of the mother tongue in school education encouraging young Europeans to learn their mother tongue (or main language) when this is not an official language of their country, while pointing out that they have the duty to learn an official language of the country of which they are citizens.

– Recommendation R (2008) 7 of the Committee of Ministers on the use of the CEFR and the promotion of plurilingualism outlining general principles and measures to be implemented by authorities responsible for language education at national, regional and local level as well as specific measures aimed at policy making, curriculum and textbook development, teacher training, and assessment.

What might be described as "technical" instruments in the field of language education are generally reference tools, always non-normative, which policy deciders and practitioners may consult and adapt as appropriate to their specific educational context and needs. These instruments include the widely used *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*, the *European Language Portfolio*, and a variety of other practical tools developed through the pro-

grammes of the Language Policy Unit in Strasbourg and the European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz.

The *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (2001) was designed to promote plurilingual education and to be adapted to the specific contexts of use. The CEFR offers a common basis for developing and comparing second/foreign language curricula, textbooks, courses and examinations in a dynamic plurilingual lifelong learning perspective. Developed through a process of scientific research and wide consultation, the CEFR provides a practical tool for setting clear goals to be attained at successive stages of learning and for evaluating outcomes in an internationally comparable manner. It provides a basis for the mutual recognition of language qualifications, thus facilitating educational and occupational mobility. It is increasingly used in the reform of national curricula and by international consortia for relating of language certificates, in Europe and beyond, and is available in over 35 language versions.

The *European Language Portfolio* (2001) is a personal document in which those who are learning or have learned any language – whether at school or outside school – can record and reflect on their language learning and cultural experiences. It is the property of the learner. In the Portfolio, all competence is valued, regardless of the level or whether it is gained inside or outside formal education. It is linked to the CEFR.

The CoE's work on language education is co-ordinated by the *Language Policy Unit (LPU)* in Strasbourg and the *European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML)* in Graz. The LPU has been a pioneer of international co-operation in language education since 1957, acting as a catalyst for innovation, and providing a pan-European forum in which to address the policy priorities of all Member States. The results of the LPU's programmes have led to a number of recommendations and resolutions of the Committee of Ministers and of the Parliamentary Assembly of the CoE, which provide political support for its policy instruments and initiatives. Following on from this, the LPU organised the European Year of Languages 2001 with the European Commission; the aims of which continue to be promoted in the annual European Day of Languages.

The programmes of the LPU are complemented by those of the *European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML)* – an Enlarged Partial Agreement of the Council of Europe set up in 1994 in Graz (Austria). Thirty-one states subscribe to the Partial Agreement currently. The ECML's mission is to promote innovative approaches and disseminate good practice in language learning and teaching. The Centre runs four-year programmes of projects organised in co-operation with European experts in the field of language education.

In designing the LRE questionnaire for our survey, we drew on key EU and

CoE resolutions, conventions, recommendations and communications that have contributed to the development of policies and practices for multi/plurilingualism.

4. THE TRILINGUAL FORMULA AND PLURILINGUALISM

Promoting multilingualism in terms of trilingualism has not only been advocated by the EU. UNESCO adopted the term "multilingual education" in 1999 (General Conference Resolution 12) in reference to the use of at least three languages in education, that is the mother tongue, a regional or national language, and an international language. As early as the 1950s, the Indian government had put forward the outline of a multilingual educational policy, which included instruction in the mother language, in the regional (or State) language, in Hindi as the language of general communication and in one of the classical languages – Sanskrit, Pali, Arabic or Persian. Revised in 1961, the proposal was named the *three language formula (TLF)*, which included instruction in the regional language, in Hindi in non-Hindi-speaking areas or in another Indian language in Hindi-speaking areas, and in English or another European language.

The EC (1995a), in a so-called *Whitebook*, opted for trilingualism as a policy goal for all European citizens. Apart from the mother tongue, each citizen should learn at least two "community languages". This policy goal was followed up by the Council of the EU Resolution (2002) in Barcelona. At this stage the concept of "mother tongue" was being used to refer to the official languages of Member States and overlooked the fact that for many inhabitants of Europe "mother tongue" and "official state language" do not coincide (Extra, Gorter, 2008, p. 44). At the same time, the concept of "community languages" was used to refer to the official languages of two other EU Member States. In later EC documents, reference was made to one foreign language with high international prestige (English was deliberately not referred to) and one so-called "neighbouring language". This latter concept referred to neighbouring countries, rather than to the language of one's real-life next-door neighbours. More recently the EC's thinking has developed in this area and Paragraph 4.1 of the 2008 Communication is entitled *Valuing all languages*:

In the current context of increased mobility and migration, mastering the national language(s) is fundamental to integrating successfully and playing an active role in society. Non-native speakers should therefore include the host-country language in their 'one-plus-two' combination.

There are also untapped linguistic resources in our society: different mother tongues and other languages spoken at home and in local and neighbouring

environments should be valued more highly. For instance, children with different mother tongues – whether from the EU or a third country – present schools with the challenge of teaching the language of instruction as a second language, but they can also motivate their classmates to learn different languages and open up to other cultures. With a view to allowing closer links between communities, the Commission's advisory group on multilingualism and intercultural dialogue (Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue) (2008) developed the concept of a 'personal adoptive language', which should usefully benefit from further reflection.

While not explicitly specifying the number of languages to be learned, the CoE has played a pioneering role in promoting language learning and the development of plurilingualism in individuals from an early age, and has consistently underlined the need to value all languages.

It has also added an interesting perspective in putting forward the idea of variable and partial competencies.

Building on the Resolution of 1969 on an intensified modern language teaching programme for Europe, and Recommendation 814 (1977), the CoE's 1982 Recommendation, R/M (82) 18, called for Members States to ensure that as far as possible, all sections of their populations had access to effective means of acquiring a knowledge of the languages of other Member States (or of other communities within their own country) and to encourage the teaching of at least one European language other than the national language, or the vehicular language of the area concerned, to pupils from the age of ten or the point at which they enter secondary education. The Recommendation also called for states to make facilities available for learning "as wide a range of languages as possible". The CoE also took into consideration in this recommendation the needs of migrant workers, calling for adequate facilities for them:

to acquire sufficient knowledge of the language of the host community for them to play an active part in the working, political and social life of that community, and in particular to enable the children of migrants to acquire a proper education and to prepare them for the transition from full-time education to work to develop their mother tongues both as educational and cultural instruments and in order to maintain and improve their links with their culture of origin.

In the key follow-up recommendation of the Committee of Ministers, CM/R (98) 6, the CoE called for Europeans to achieve a degree of communicative ability

in a number of languages and asked Member States to achieve this by diversifying the languages on offer and setting objectives appropriate to each language, including modular courses and those which aim to develop partial competences.

A more recent CoE recommendation is CM/Rec (2008) 7E to Member States on the use of the CoE's *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* and the promotion of plurilingualism.

A detailed overview and analysis of EU policies on multilingualism is provided by Cullen et al. (2008), who say that there is still significant reluctance or resistance with respect to additional language learning – apart from learning English. This view is supported by 2009 Eurostat data which shows a marked increase in the learning of English, but not other languages. Only one in five Europeans, say Cullen et al., can be described as an active additional language learner and language skills are unevenly distributed geographically and culturally. Most of the activities aimed at promoting multilingualism take place in the formal education sector, more particularly in the domain of secondary education. Cullen et al. (2008, pp. iii–iv) arrive at the following main conclusions with respect to the political and policy context of promoting multilingualism in the EU:

— Multilingualism and linguistic diversity are sometimes conflicting policy agendas. Language learning policy has tended to be influenced by "harder" priorities like economic competitiveness and labour market mobility, and linguistic diversity policies by "softer" issues like inclusion and human rights. Multilingualism policy has been more highly prioritised than linguistic diversity policy in terms of concrete actions.

— The action of the European Parliament reflects a consistent and persistent effort to maintain minority language protection and linguistic diversity support. Since the late 1970s, the European Parliament has issued a series of communications and resolutions that call for the Commission to take action in order to promote the use of minority languages and to review all Community legislation or practices which discriminate against minority languages. However, a major problem is that none of these initiatives are binding for the Member States.

4.1 *Attitudes of EU citizens to multilingualism/plurilingualism*

One of the periodical European Barometers of the EC, Special Barometer 243 (2006), offers a cross-section of public opinion on issues related to multilingualism. Support for some of the principles underpinning the Commission's multilingualism

policy is analysed, along with respondents' perceptions of the situation in their respective countries or regions and their support for multilingual policies at the national level. The respondents were presented with five statements that illustrate some of the key principles behind the policies targeted at promoting multilingualism in Europe. All statements receive the support of the majority of Europeans but to a varying degree, as Table 1 makes clear.

Statements	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Do not know
1. Everyone in the EU should be able to speak one additional language	84%	12%	4%
2. All languages spoken within the EU should be treated equally	72%	21%	7%
3. Everyone in the EU should be able to speak a common language	70%	25%	5%
4. The European institutions should adopt one single language to communicate with European citizens	55%	40%	5%
5. Everyone in the EU should be able to speak two additional languages	50%	44%	6%

Table 1. Attitudes towards multilingualism in Europe (Source: Special Eurobarometer Report 243: 53, European Commission 2006)

The results of the survey show that while the vast majority of EU citizens think that one additional language is manageable, only 50% think that two is a realistic goal. There is strong feeling that languages should be treated equally, but an equally strong feeling that we should all be able to speak a common language. Opinions are divided about whether the EU institutions should adopt one language for communication with citizens.

The recently published follow-up Special Eurobarometer 386, carried out on behalf of the EC (2012b), shows almost similar outcomes on each of the five statements referred to in Table 1 in terms of proportions (%) of those who (totally) agree – (totally) disagree – do not know: (1) 84–13–3, (2) 81–25–4, (3) 69–27–4, (4) 53–42–5, and (5) 72–25–3. The strongest change over time occurs for more agreement with statements (2) and (5). In particular the increased agreement with statement (5) refers to a stronger support of the EC's trilingual formula. Apart from the key attitudinal data referred to, Special Eurobarometer 386 offers a whole range of recent survey data on multilingualism in the EU today, on the use of languages, and on attitudes to languages.

The LRE project offers interesting information about the extent to which the Barcelona principles are being followed in education systems in the countries/regions surveyed, and also provides findings about the way that all languages – national, foreign, immigrant, and regional or minority – are being valued both inside school and out.

5. LANGUAGE VARIETIES EXPLORED IN THE PROJECT

In the LRE project our ambition is to reflect the richness of languages present in European society and the extent to which all of these languages are included in policies and practices for multilingualism and plurilingualism. Our challenge was to distinguish the language types and categorise them appropriately.

In its 2008 Communication, the EC refers to the many "national, regional, minority and migrant" languages spoken in Europe «adding a facet to our common background» and also "foreign languages", used to refer principally to both European and non-European languages with a worldwide coverage. The value of learning the national language well in order to function successfully in society and benefit fully from education is widely recognised. The learning of foreign languages has also been common in Europe. The language types which have been less emphasised are regional/minority and immigrant languages, but their value across European Member States has been acknowledged and supported by both the CoE and the EU, which have emphasised that both types of languages need to be supported as they are important means of intra-group communication and are part of the personal, cultural and social identity of many EU citizens.

In CMR (98) 6, the CoE (1998) had already asked for Member States to ensure that the provisions of the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* and the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* be taken into account as indicating desirable parameters for policy on regional or minority languages or cultures. It had also called for parity of esteem between all languages and for countries to «continue to promote bilingualism in immigrant areas or neighbourhoods and support immigrants in learning the language of the area in which they reside».

The *High Level Group on Multilingualism* Final Report (2007) also mentions that it is necessary to use the potential of immigrants as a source of language knowledge and as a good opportunity for companies to profit from these immigrants' cultural and linguistic abilities in order to gain access to markets in the immigrants' countries of origin:

All too often, migrants are only seen as a problem – migrant children under

performing at school or adult migrants with only a minimal command of the language of the host country. What is often overlooked is the fact that migrants constitute a valuable resource. By giving value to migrant languages in our midst, we may well enhance migrants' motivation to learn the language of the host country; and — indeed — other languages, and enable them to become competent mediators between different cultures.

Very often, young second- and third-generation migrants possess well-developed aural/oral skills in their heritage or community languages, but cannot read and write them. Many of them are highly motivated to become literate in these languages. Schools, higher and adult education institutions should make it their business to provide special learning opportunities for these target groups. This would be sound investment, as these people could help to establish economic contacts in their countries of origin, and could be brought to play an active role in intercultural dialogue and integration programmes for newly arrived immigrants.

Against this background, the constellation of languages (Extra, Gorter, 2008, pp. 3–60) to be addressed in our LRE questionnaire includes *national, foreign, regional/minority* and *immigrant* languages. We are fully aware of the different connotations across European countries in referring to the people (and their languages) with a more or less long-standing history of residence that stems from abroad (Extra, Gorter, 2008, p. 10 for the nomenclature of the field). In the context of the LRE project, we will therefore explore and use the above language types with the following definitions:

— *National languages:* Official languages of a nation-state.

— *Foreign languages:* Languages that are not learnt or used at home but learnt and taught at school or used as languages of wider communication in non-educational sectors.

— *Regional or minority languages:* Languages that are traditionally used within a given territory of a state by nationals of that state who form a group numerically smaller than the rest of the state's population.

— *Immigrant languages:* Languages spoken by immigrants and their descendants in the country of residence, originating from an infinite range of (former) source countries.

For similar perspectives, we refer to McPake, Tinsley (2007). In this context, we want to express our awareness of the deliberate inclusion of immigrant lan-

guages as part of the European repertoire of languages, while at the same time in this first round of data collection on multilingual policies and practices for as yet little reference is made to sign languages. Within Western societies where there is significant migration, or within language minorities inside a single-nation-state, there are deaf people who are in effect minorities within minorities. Given the oralist hegemony, most of these deaf people have been cut off not only from mainstream culture, but also from their own "native" cultures, a form of double oppression (Schermer, 2011). There is an important difference between deaf communities and other language minorities. It is only to a limited extent that sign languages are passed on from one generation to the next. The main reason for this is that more than 95% of deaf people have hearing parents for whom a sign language is not a native language. Most people who are deaf have learned their sign language from deaf peers, from deaf adults outside of the family and/or from parents who have acquired a sign language as a second language.

The European Parliament unanimously approved a resolution on sign languages on June 17, 1988. The resolution asked all Member States for recognition of their national sign languages as official languages of people who are deaf. So far this resolution has had limited effect. In 2003, sign languages were recognised by the Council of Europe as minority languages in the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. In our first round of data collection, we include reference to sign language(s) in the *Languages in official documents and databases* and *Languages in audiovisual media and press* domains of the LRE questionnaire.

The distinction presented above between "regional/minority" and "immigrant" languages is widely used and understood across continental Europe, whereas the attractive bottom-up-supported reference to "community" languages, common in the UK, is used to refer to national, regional and/or immigrant languages. Moreover, the concept of "community" languages often refers to the national languages of European Union countries in EU documents and in this sense is almost "occupied territory", at least in the EU jargon (Extra, Gorter, 2008, pp. 7–11 for the nomenclature of the field). A final argument in favour of using the term "immigrant" languages is its widespread use on the website of *Ethnologue, Languages of the World*, a most valuable and widely used standard source of cross-national information on this topic.

In the context of the present project, we will consider regional/minority languages as "officially recognised" if such recognition derives from the nation-state under consideration. In addition to this, such recognition may also derive from the Council of Europe's *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. The Charter came into operation in March 1998. It functions as a European benchmark for the comparison of legal measures and facilities of Member States in this policy domain (Nic Craith, 2003), and is aimed at the protection and the promotion of the

historical regional or minority languages of Europe». The concepts of "regional" and "minority" languages are not specified in the *Charter* («States decide on the definition») and immigrant languages are explicitly excluded from it. States are free in their choice of which regional/minority languages to include. Also, the degree of protection is not prescribed; thus, a state can choose loose or tight policies. The result is a wide variety of provisions across EU Member States (Grin, 2003).

We are aware that there are a number of complicating factors that make clear-cut distinctions between the proposed language types virtually impossible. First of all, within and across EU Member States, many regional/minority and immigrant languages have larger numbers of speakers than many official state languages. Moreover, both regional/minority and immigrant languages in one EU country may be official state languages in another country, for example German in Denmark or Russian in Ukraine. It should also be kept in mind that many, if not most, immigrant languages in European nation-states originate from countries outside Europe. It is the context of migration and minorisation in particular that makes our proposed distinction between regional/minority and immigrant languages ambiguous. However, we cannot think of a more transparent alternative. In our opinion, if nothing else, the proposed distinction will at least lead to awareness-raising and may ultimately lead to an inclusive approach in the European conceptualisation of minority languages.

6. LANGUAGE DOMAINS ADDRESSED IN THE SURVEY

Eight language domains are covered by the LRE survey. As the first domain, we include a meta-domain which looks at the availability of official na-tional/regional documents and databases on language diversity. Given the key role of language learning in education, four domains focus on the main stages of publicly funded education from pre-school to university. In addition, three lan-guage domains outside and beyond education are addressed, in order to capture levels of multilingual services in society and business. All in all, the eight do-mains of the questionnaire are covered by a total of 260 questions, distributed across these domains as outlined in Table 2. The questions on language domains 2–8 are based on the European documents referred to in Section 3.

Domain 1 explores the availability of nationwide or regionwide official docu-ments and databases on language diversity in each of the participating coun-tries/regions. The availability of such documents and databases may contribute sig-nificantly to the awareness of multilingualism in a given country/region and can inform language education policy. The division of this domain into official docu-ments and databases is closely related to the common distinction in studies on lan-guage planning between *status planning* and *corpus planning*. In our study, the

section on documents refers to efforts undertaken *to regulate* the use and function of different languages in a given society, and the section on databases refers to ef-forts undertaken *to map* the distribution and vitality of the spectrum of languages in a given society.

N	Language domains	N questions
1.	Languages in official documents and databases	15
2.	Languages in pre-primary education	34
3.	Languages in primary education	58
4.	Languages in secondary education	60
5.	Languages in further and higher education	30
6.	Languages in audiovisual media and press	14
7.	Languages in public services and public spaces	31
8.	Languages in business	18
	Total of questions	260

Table 2: Distribution of questions across language domains

Domains 2–4 of the survey focus on education for non-adult learners provided by the state. Definitions of each of these domains are provided in the Glossary to Extra, Yağmur (2012), including the common distinction between lower and upper secondary education which may refer to age-related differences and/or differences related to type of schooling. In each of these domains, the organisation of language teaching is addressed in addition to the qualifications and training of teachers, for each of the four language varieties. The key distinction between organisation versus teachers is widely used in the European context (see, for example, Eurydice, 2008). The responses in these sections are based on publicly available data as well as from official sources.

Given the significant diversification in post-secondary education at the national and cross-national level, domain 5 focuses on basic (vocational) versus high (uni-versity) education. As a result, this domain yields highly binary and complementary data on post-secondary education. Domains 6–8 cover three crucial domains out-side and beyond education. Responses in domains 5–8 are based on collected and reported data in the urban contexts of three cities per country or region (see Section 5 for details). Domain 5 explores language provision in a small sample of further (vocational) and higher (university) education institutions. Domain 6 focuses on languages in the audiovisual media and the press. Domain 7 concentrates on lan-

guages in public services and public spaces in terms of institutionalised language strategies, oral communication facilities and written communication facilities. The focus of domain 8, languages in business, is on company language strategies, internal communication strategies and external communication strategies. In each country/region a sample of 24 companies was aimed at.

7. DATA COLLECTION AND THE THREE-CITIES APPROACH

As stated above, responses in language domains 1–4 of the LRE survey are based on *official/secondary* data and reflect policies and common practices at the national or regional level. Domains 5–8, on the other hand, are based on the outcomes of *primary* data collection and data analysis. The collection of this primary data took place in three cities in each country or region prompted by the following considerations:

– multilingualism is most prevalent in urban settings as long-term residents and newcomers tend to congregate there in search of work;

– cities reinforce national dynamics in responding to language diversity;

– large further and higher education institutions are present in cities (domain 5);

– the international press, cinemas and television stations are concentrated in cities (domain 6);

– as a result, city administrators and urban planners need to create local policies on multilingualism (domain 7);

– the headquarters of many businesses are located in cities (domain 8).

The selection of cities was identical for countries 1–14 in Table 3. Here the focus was on the two cities with the largest population size plus one city where the regional/minority language with the highest status, vitality and/or number of speakers in the country is spoken. Countries 15–18 presented a challenge as they do not fit the above model.

Country 15, Bosnia and Herzegovina, has three national languages: Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian. The cities chosen for primary data collection were Sarajevo, where Bosnian is mainly used, Banja-Luka, where Serbian is mainly used, and Mostar, where Bosnian and Croatian are mainly used.

Country 16, Switzerland, comprises 26 cantons and has four official languages: German, French, Italian and Romansch. LRE research in all domains took place in three sample cantons: one German-speaking (Zurich), one French-speaking

(Geneva), and one Italian-speaking (Ticino). The data for domains 2–4 has been aggregated for the tables presented in this publication, but for domains 5–8 are presented at city level.

Country 17, Spain, comprises 17 autonomous communities and two autonomous cities. LRE research has been conducted for domains 2–4 in three autonomous communities – Madrid, Sevilla, Valencia – and two "historic nationalities" – Basque Country and Catalonia. Three profiles have been created: a combined profile for Madrid, Sevilla and Valencia and two separate profiles for Basque Country and Catalonia. Basque Country has two official languages: Basque and Spanish. Catalonia has three official languages: Catalan, Spanish and Aragonese.

Country 18, the UK, comprises four countries that have separate governments and education systems. For the education domains (2–4) data has been collected on policies and common practice in each country/region. For domains 5–8, the cities in Wales and Scotland were chosen on the basis of population size. In England, after London, the city of Sheffield was chosen for practical reasons. It has not yet been possible to research a further city, but it is hoped that this data will be available soon. In Northern Ireland it has so far only been possible to include Belfast in the survey.

The selection of the three cities and the proposed regional/minority languages to focus on were decided upon in advance in co-operation with all participating national or regional teams on the basis of municipal statistics for the first two cities and regional/minority language/group statistics for the third city. Table 3 gives an overview of the cities surveyed per country (minus Germany).

N	Type A Countries	Largest city	Second/Third largest city	Additional city	Dominant regional/minority language in additional city
1.	Austria	Vienna	Graz	Klagenfurt	Slovene
2.	Bulgaria	Sofia	Plovdiv	Shumen	Turkish
3.	Denmark	Copenhagen	Aarhus	Aabenraa	German
4.	Estonia	Tallinn	Tartu	Narva	Russian
5.	France	Paris	Marseille	Corte	Corsican
6.	Greece	Athens	Thessaloniki	Xanthi	Turkish
7.	Hungary	Budapest	Debrecen	Pécs	German
8.	Italy	Rome	Milan	Trieste	Slovene
9.	Lithuania	Vilnius	Kaunas	Klaipeda	Russian

	Largest city	City in region 2	City in region 3	Official language(s)
Type B Countries				
10. Netherlands	Amsterdam	Rotterdam	Leeuwarden*	Frisian
11. Poland	Warsaw	Kraków	Gdańsk	Kashubian
12. Portugal	Lisbon	Oporto	Miranda do Douro*	Mirandese
13. Romania	Bucharest	Iași	Cluj	Hungarian
14. Ukraine	Kyiv	Kharkiv	Lviv	Russian
15. Bosnia and Herzegovina	Sarajevo	Banja-Luka	Mostar	Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian
16. Switzerland	Zurich	Geneva	Lugano	German/French/Italian
17. Spain: Madrid, Valencia, Sevilla	Madrid	Valencia	Sevilla	Spanish
Catalonia	Barcelona	Tarragona	L'Hospitalet	Catalan
Basque Country	Bilbao	San Sebastian	Vitoria-Gasteiz	Basque
18. UK England	London	Sheffield	—	English
Wales	Cardiff	Swansea	Newport	Welsh/English
Scotland	Glasgow	Edinburgh	Aberdeen	Gaelic/Scots/English
N. Ireland	Belfast	—	—	Irish/U. Scots/Engl.

Table 3: Three-cities approach for all participating countries/regions
* Absence of university leading to absence of university-based data

National or regional profiles are based on primary data collection for the 23+22+22=67 cities referred to in Table 3. As can be derived from Table 3, most dominant regional/minority languages in the chosen additional cities have the status of national language in adjacent countries. The focus of primary data collection for language domains 5–8 in each of the 24 participating countries/regions is summarised as follows:

— For language domain 5, the focus is on language provision in different types of adult education provided by the state. Two complementary sectors are addressed: language provision in vocational education for (young) adults aged 16 plus, and language provision in academic/university education.

— For language domain 6, the focus is on language provision in

audiovisual media, including public radio and television broadcasting, the largest cinemas, and in the press at the largest train stations and city kiosks in the cities surveyed.

— For language domain 7, the focus is on language provision in public services and public spaces at city level, more particularly on institutionalised language strategies, oral communication facilities and written information facilities at city (council) level in the cities surveyed.

— For language domain 8, the focus is on four different business sectors — supermarkets, construction businesses, hotels and banks. Researchers were asked to collect samples distributed as evenly as possible across multinational/international, national, and regional or local businesses. In practice, this ambition turned out to be difficult to realise across all countries/regions.

In Table 4, a summarising overview of language domains and targets for primary data collection per city is provided.

Language domain	Targets per city (3x)
5. Languages in further and higher education	— Largest institution for vocational education and training (VET) with language provision — Largest public and general university
6. Languages in the media	— Language provision in radio and television programmes, at the cinema, as described in the best-selling newspaper in the largest city — Language provision in press at the largest train station and city kiosk — Use of subtitles or dubbing for films in languages other than the national language — Provision of sign language
7. Languages in public services and spaces	— Institutionalised language strategies, oral communication facilities and written information facilities at the central city level
8. Languages in business	— Small-/medium-sized and large multi-/international, national and regional/local supermarkets, building construction businesses, hotels and banks

Table 4: Domains and targets for primary data collection per city

8. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

8.1 Different types of research

Various research methodologies can be chosen to investigate language policies and practices in a given society. In line with their research interests, researchers can take a micro-sociolinguistic or a macro-sociolinguistic perspective to document relevant policies and practices (Fishman, Garcia, 2010). If the research is limited to case studies with few informants, researchers mostly opt for ethnographic observation and discourse-analytic approaches. Linguistic ethnography (Heller, 2007) is one common methodology to investigate how and in which language people interact with each other. Linguistic ethnographers try to understand how people make use of their available linguistic resources in interacting with other individuals.

However, ethnographic methods cannot always be optimal in the investigation of language policies and practices at the societal level. The main focus of the LRE project is on societal multilingualism and in particular on institutional policies and practices promoting (or limiting) multilingualism. The methodology adopted for the LRE project was therefore to gather survey data on *common* language policies and practices in a variety of language domains in given national or regional contexts across Europe.

The questionnaire for the survey was compiled by studying the main EU and CoE documents on language policies and practices described above and pulling out the key recommendations. However, given the fact that language policies and practices across Europe are a very complex phenomenon, it is not possible to identify all the relevant variables, operationalise them and turn them into measurable constructs.

8.2 Questionnaire construction

In terms of questionnaire construction, the following prerequisites for constructing questions were followed:

- each question should yield rateable data;
- rateable data should be weighted, leading to differentiation of reported policies and practices;
- yes/no-questions where one of the answers would predictably lead to 100% scores should be avoided;
- the questions should be robust enough for repeated measurement over time.

Most commonly, each question had three response options and researchers had to select the option which was the closest to reality in terms of common policy or

practice in their country/region. Each choice was given a score. The highest score for each question corresponds to the policy or practice which is most closely aligned with EU/CoE recommendations. Our indicators will make it possible for users to situate their own policies in relation to those in other countries or regions and consequently to share information in a transparent way and to identify good practice. It is hoped that the indicators also contribute to context-specific new policy initiatives. It should be noted that the indicators are not meant as an instrument for carrying out in-depth analyses of multilingual policies or practices at the micro-level. The outcomes of our research, however, may trigger highly relevant follow-up case studies that will yield complementary perspectives and data, derived from the indicators' macro-level perspectives.

8.3 Complementary approaches

Not all of the domains covered in LRE lend themselves to the same research methodology, and so a complementary approach was adopted for language domains 1–8 (see Table 2). The part of the LRE questionnaire where official national or regional policies and documents exist is based on *official/secondary* data (language domains 1–4). This data was collected by our research partners, and where possible was cross-checked with the national ministries concerned. Where this data is absent (further and higher education, media, public services and spaces, business), the results are based on *self-collected/primary* data (language domains 5–8).

The primary data is not meant to be representative of any country/region, nor large enough for making generalisations, but is meant as a starting point for providing initial indicators of policies and practices on multilingualism and plurilingualism in domains which have been explored less in EC documents and covered less in research. Given the combined methodology adopted, it was decided neither to present overall scores per language domain, nor to provide one accumulative overall score or index per country/region.

Although, as stated above, the self-collected/primary database cannot be used for making generalisations, it certainly constitutes a valuable cross-national database for further research. We believe that the combination of secondary data analysis for language domains 1–4 and primary data collection/analysis for language domains 5–8 are innovative and pioneering elements in the project.

8.4 Process

The following procedure summarises the steps we took to design and pilot the LRE questionnaire, and to collect and process the data:

– In 2010, initial questions and scoring proposals for all multiple answer options were developed in co-operation between Tilburg University, the British Council and the Migration Policy Group in Brussels. The business domain was developed by CILT in London, using the ELAN survey (2006) as the starting point, and then further refined by the French research team. Advice for the public services and spaces domain was given by the Metropolitan Police languages team and other London public service providers.

– The draft version of the LRE questionnaire was pre-tested in three pilot studies in Poland, Spain and the region of Catalonia in early 2011. The pilot studies were aimed at testing the content and construct validity of the LRE questionnaire by taking into account variation in language policies and practices both between and within countries.

– On the basis of the pilot outcomes, the LRE questionnaire, a Field Manual for researchers, and the scoring procedures were further adapted and then scrutinised by the LRE Steering Group and external experts. The final LRE questionnaire was sent out in autumn 2011 to all national and regional teams for data collection.

– Different versions of the questionnaire were created for Bosnia and Herzegovina, Spain, Switzerland and the UK (see Table 3).

– Researchers were sent a detailed Field Manual explaining the background to the project, and how data collection was to be conducted. In addition, there was a two-day face-to-face meeting to discuss the methodology, and email exchanges and phone calls took place with each research team.

– Once the national and regional teams had provided all answers to all questions, all the data obtained was peer-reviewed independently to ensure a double-checked and consistent interpretation.

– Subsequently, all peer-reviewed data was processed, analysed and reviewed by the LRE team at Tilburg University.

– Through the process, it became clear that some questions had been interpreted differently by different researchers, while others had not been fully understood. The process of clarifying these, standardising responses, and agreeing final interpretations was completed in early 2012. It was decided that some questions would not be scored due to

unfeasibility of gathering the data. Data for questions on book collections in languages other than the national language in public libraries and bookshops proved impossible to collect in some countries. Questions on the languages required for undergraduate and postgraduate studies proved ambiguous, and have not been scored.

– The results for each country/region were sent back to all researchers and a further opportunity for feedback was given. The results were presented initially at the whole domain level, but subsequently it has been decided to present them at the more detailed question level in order to capture countries/regions policies and practices in more detail.

8.5 Outcomes

The national and regional profiles presented in Extra, Yağmur (2012) are the outcomes of the process described above, as are the cross-national and cross-sectional perspectives presented. For each country/region, the description is based on a qualitative and quantitative profile in terms of text and tables which relate back directly to the questions asked in the LRE questionnaire, accompanied by commentaries in which researchers in each country/region explain the results, put them into context, pick out the key findings and highlight interesting new initiatives and good practice. Our ambition has been to provide a contextualised balance and interplay between the two types of information.

Inevitably it is not possible to include all possible variables in such a piece of research. Nonetheless, we feel that while there may be some gaps, we have covered a lot of ground and captured many issues at the macro-level of language policies and practices. It should be noted that within the chosen domains of education, the focus of the LRE survey is on language provision, not on language demands in terms of actual student participation, nor on language proficiency in terms of actual language achievement. The latter two ambitions were beyond the scope of this first round of data collection.

9. KEY OUTCOMES FOR ITALY

The outcomes for Italy are commented upon by Barni (2012) in the national LRE report on this country. Here we present the major data for each of the language domains surveyed (see Table 2).

The national language (recognized in 1861 by the Unification of Italy), a range of R/M languages (recognized only in 1999), and foreign languages are dealt with in language legislation and/or language policy documents, in contrast to immigrant

languages. The European Charter for R/M Languages has been signed by government but has not been ratified by parliament in Italy. The following 12 R/M languages are recognized, protected and/or promoted in official country documents or legislation: Albanian, Catalan, Croatian, Franco-Provençal, French, Friulian, German, Greek, Ladin, Occitan, Sardinian, and Slovene. Official provision in education is commonly available in regions where these languages are spoken. Italy and France have a top ranking position amongst the surveyed Western European countries in the provision of R/M languages in education. However, different from France, there is hardly any provision of immigrant languages in (pre-)primary or secondary education.

Official nationwide data collection mechanisms on language diversity in Italy exist only in terms of periodically updated survey data, not in terms of regular census data, in contrast to many other countries. In these data mechanisms, national and R/M language varieties are addressed, based on a home language question. Immigrant languages are not addressed. Over time, however, a decrease has been observed in R/M languages and an increase in immigrant languages spoken in Italy.

In education, Italy's multilingual profile is weaker than that of many other LRE countries surveyed, both in terms of organization and teaching. Beyond education, a similar picture emerges.

In pre-primary education, the focus is on the learning and teaching of Italian (only gradually recognized as a second language for an increasing number of children). R/M languages are commonly offered in those areas where they are spoken. No provision is offered in either foreign or immigrant languages. In primary education, a similar picture emerges; in addition, however, English is offered nationwide as (the major and only) foreign language in primary schools.

In secondary education, schools show relatively better results. Although English dominates again the scene of foreign languages on offer, other languages (mainly French, German and Spanish) are offered as compulsory second foreign language in lower secondary education. English is the only compulsory foreign language, however, in higher secondary education. R/M languages are commonly offered in those areas where they are spoken. Recognition and support of immigrant languages is again absent.

Languages in further and higher education have been surveyed in three sample cities in Italy: Rome, Milan and Trieste (see also Table 3). The overall offer of vocational adult education and training in these cities remains more or less limited to European languages, in particular to Italian as a second language for immigrants (although participation numbers as yet have been proportionally low) and to English. In the three universities surveyed, languages other than Italian on offer are

mainly limited to Faculties of Arts.

Languages in audiovisual media and press show the following key characteristics. There is a wide-spread practice of dubbing instead of subtitling non-national movies and TV programmes (a similar phenomenon has been observed in about half of the surveyed countries), which does not help in making contact with other languages. English is available only occasionally in TV programmes and Slovene has a certain presence in Trieste. Better results are obtained for newspapers in the three surveyed cities: the languages available reflect both the presence of tourists and immigrant communities; the focus, however, is on European languages like English, German, French and Spanish.

Apart from the status of Slovene in Trieste, none of the three cities surveyed have significant oral or written institutionalized strategies for the promotion of multilingualism. The languages of immigrant communities are gradually on the increase in public services and spaces, although even in this domain the focus is on European languages for tourists, as mentioned in the former domain.

And finally, also in the domain of languages in business, Italy has obtained rather low results, even for English, compared to many other countries in the LRE survey. The majority of the 24 companies surveyed provide their branding and marketing, work place documents, intranet and website only in Italian. As a result, there is as yet little awareness of the advantages of multilingualism for Italian companies in a globalizing economy.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo, *Language promotion by European supra-national institutions* in Garcia Ofelia (a cura di) *Bilingual education: Multilingual and multicultural children and youths in 21st century schools*, New York, Blackwell, 2008.

Barni Monica, *National profile of Italy* in Extra Guus, Yağmur Kutlay, (a cura di), *Language Rich Europe. Trends in policies and practices for multilingualism in Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. 146-153.

CILT, *ELAN: Effects on the European economy of shortages of foreign language skills in enterprise*, London, CILT The National Centre for Languages, 2006.

Commission Staff Working Document, *Inventory of community actions in the field of multilingualism. Accompanying document to the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council et al.*, Brussels, European Communities, 2008.

Committee of Ministers, *Recommendation to Member States concerning modern languages*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1998.

Committee of Ministers, *Recommendations to Member States on the use of the Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and the promotion of plurilingualism*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 2008.

Council of Europe, *A Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Council of the European Union, *Resolution on linguistic diversity and language learning,* Brussels, European Commission, 2002.

Council of the European Union, *Council Resolution on a European strategy for multilingualism,* Brussels, European Communities, 2008.

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

Cullen, J., Cullen C., V. Maes, Paviotti G., *Multilingualism: Between policy objectives and implementation,* Brussels, European Parliament, 2008.

European Commission, Whitebook. *Teaching and learning: Towards a cognitive society,* Brussels, European Commission, 1995a.

European Commission, *White paper on education and training – Teaching and learning – Towards the learning society. Com (95) 590 final, 29 November 1995,* Brussels, European Commission, 1995b.

European Commission, *Europeans and languages. Special Eurobarometer Report 54,* Brussels, European Commission, 2001.

European Commission, *A new framework strategy for multilingualism,* Brussels, European Commission, 2005.

European Commission, *Europeans and their languages. Special Eurobarometer Report 243,* Brussels, European Commission, 2006.

European Commission, *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions. Multilingualism: An asset for Europe and a shared commitment,* Brussels, European Communities, 2008.

European Commission, *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions. A new impetus for European cooperation in vocational education and training to support the Europe 2020 strategy,* Brussels, European Communities. 2010.

European Commission, *Report on the implementation of Council Resolution of 21 November 2008 on a European strategy for multilingualism,* Brussels, European Commission, 2011.

European Commission, *First European survey on language competences. Final Report and Executive Summary,* Brussels, European Commission, 2012a.

European Commission, *Europeans and their languages. Special Eurobarometer Report 386,* Brussels, European Commission, 2012b.

European Parliament, *EP Resolution on multilingualism: An asset for Europe and a shared commitment,* Brussels, European Parliament, 2009.

Eurydice, *Integrating immigrant children into schools in Europe,* Brussels, Eurydice/European Commission, 2009.

Eurydice/EuroStat, *Key data on teaching languages at school in Europe,* Brussels/Luxembourg, Eurydice/EuroStat, 2008.

Eurydice/EuroStat, *Key data on education in Europe,* Brussels, Eurydice/Eurostat, 2009.

Extra Guus, Gorter Durk (a cura di), *Multilingual Europe: Facts and policies,* Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 2008.

Extra Guus, Yağmur Kutlay (a cura di), *Language Rich Europe. Trends in policies and practices for multilingualism in Europe,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Fishman Joshua, Garcia Ofelia (a cura di), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity. Disciplinary and regional perspectives,* Oxford/New York, Oxford University Press, 2010.

Grin François, *Language policy evaluation and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages,* Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue, *A rewarding challenge. How the multiplicity of languages could strengthen Europe,* Brussels, European Communities, 2008.

Heller Monica, *Bilingualism as ideology and practice,* in Heller Monica (a cura di) *Bilingualism: A social approach,* Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2007, pp. 1-24.

High Level Group on Multilingualism (HLGM), *Final report,* Brussels, European Communities, 2007.

McPake Joanna, Tinsley Teresa (co-ords.) *Valuing all languages in Europe,* Graz, ECML, 2007.

Nic Craith Máiréad, *Facilitating or generating linguistic diversity. The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages,* in Hogan-Brun Gabrielle, Wolff Stefan (a cura di), *Minority languages in Europe. Frameworks, status, prospects,* Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp. 56-72.

Parliamentary Assembly, *Recommendation on linguistic diversification,* Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 1998.

Parliamentary Assembly, *Recommendation on the European Year of Languages,* Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 2001.

Parliamentary Assembly, *Recommendation on the place of the mother tongue in school education,* Strasbourg, Council of Europe, 2006.

Schermer Trude, *Language politics,* in Woll Bencie, Steinbach Markus, Pfau Roland (a cura di) *Handbook of sign linguistics,* 2011.

Strubell Miquel, Vilaró Sergi, Williams Glyn, Williams Gruffudd Owain, *The diversity of language teaching in the European Union. Final report to the European Commission, Directorate General for Education and Culture,* Brussels, European Commission, 2007.