Table of Contents

Report prepared by Nicola Bermingham

Keynote 1: Popinjays, Pragmatism and Policy: A New Speaker Triptych
Thursday, September 14 - Colin H Williams, Cambridge University, Cardiff University (Delivered by Kathryn Jones)

This keynote looked at issues that affect us and perplex us: how new speakers can be a new frame for thinking about things. The talk reflected on what the network has done but also looks forward. The image of the triptych was used to show how the network is illuminating what we're trying to understand about people and speakers in contemporary times. Williams stressed the importance of opening up to other people in order to avoid having a dialogue just amongst ourselves. He used the triptych to illustrate the three key players in communicating our research. From left to right these were as follows: policy makers and decision makers, new speakers, and academics and researchers. Williams argued that academics are like popinjays in that we speak about new speakers often in our work and we repeat other people's work. However, we need to action our ideas in a programmatic way so that our ideas filter into mainstream discourse and no longer seem partisan or marginal. He argued that repeating truisms that we find in our data isn't sufficient - thinking about policy isn't the same as analysing policy.

While we need to be politically savvy in what we do, we need to be aware of not rushing our research. We have to be in tune with the policy context in which we're working so that we're careful in how our messages are fed into policy. Williams posed the following questions in his keynote address: if we as researchers are engaging with non academic researchers, where would a novice find the key concepts we're using? How can other people easily access and understand what we're doing? We have to be able to demonstrate how well our ideas are working and how effective our approaches can be.

Questions and Comments

Q: Is there a tendency to over-exaggerate the relevance of new speakers to the vitality of smaller language groups, precisely because they are vulnerable and in more need of additional 'types' of speakers than are larger language communities?

C: In a policy context you can see policy makers focusing on education as the main driver as increasing the number of speakers of a minority language. However, while education is important it might not be the total focus.

Q: In our research we often ask people do they identify as a new speaker themselves - how important is self identification?

C: Ireland has 1.7 million people who identify as Irish speakers but have very low competence in the language

C: People have different priorities regarding where they're spending their energy and resources. Provision that we tend to think of are public sector resources (Education, Health) but important to think of private and voluntary sectors

C: Direct referencing of new speakers in policy documents is very limited but specific mention is rare but in many official policies there is indirect reference by talking about education and local community.

C: We're using the word new speakers but this has been going on for a long time. Caution against the tendency to exaggerate the pertinence of New Speakers in policy interpretation.

C: Is it possible to construct a convincing discourse about the universal needs of new speakers as a single category? For example access to health, needs within education, whatever they might be, we should be prioritising them.

Q: How relevant is the concept of new speakers to most situations? Does it travel across cultures and policies?

C: Educational implications: there's a presumption that minority languages such as Basque or Irish that they're accessed through the hegemonic language so new speakers don't necessarily have the skills to cope simultaneously with two new languages. In hegemonic language teaching contexts there's a huge amount of experience that takes account of linguistic backgrounds

C: Safe spaces, opportunities, usage - importance of having a safe space to speak a language - creating a physical space to facilitate people speaking their language - created with grassroots momentum and support.

Q: What are the social psychological costs for migrants not being able to adjust to the new language context?

Q: Looking at people's lived experiences as new speakers: are they linear or non-linear?

Q: What motivates people to take up or give up a language: time, expenditure, convenience. What are the priorities for individuals?

Q: Impact of the regulatory state: do we have examples of sites across our network where there are prohibitions on new speakers?

C: We need to be mindful when we think about our findings - are they going to be sufficiently robust to be incorporated in policy? Should our recommendations focus on new speakers specifically or should that be just an aspect of it?

C: Any policy or attempt to push an agenda for new speakers is challenging the current hegemony. It's about emphasising how, whatever area we're researching specifically, is potentially trying to make changes to a specific policy where the people who have the power are not necessarily sensitive to the needs to new speakers.

****

Panel 2: An investigation of the variables affecting heritage language development, competence and maintenance
Coordinator: Francesca La Morgia, TCD Dublin

Speaker 1: Xiao-Lan Curdt-Christiansen, University of Reading, UK

There has been an increase in transnational migration and therefore raising bilingual children is more widespread. Xiao's study focused on Chinese families in Singapore and the UK.
She argued that Family Language Policy (FLP) enhances our understanding of multilingual children and questioned why some children grow up in bilingual environment but become monolingual and why some grow up in monolingual homes and become bilinguals. FLP looks at external forces in play such as social economic forces affecting families and contributing to discontinuity of intergenerational transmission. She highlighted the need to think about how macro level policy can affect FLP while remaining aware that parents can also have power to change their children's language behaviour.

Information from the UK context:
One in six primary school pupils from transcultural and translational families
612,160 primarily school pupils labelled as EAL learners
England monolingual country
Learning home language is a private matter
Minority languages heard only in communities and private domains
Fear post-Brexit to speak minority languages in public

Information from the Singapore context:
Bilingual policy
Recognise English as language of instruction
Other languages (Mandarin Malay Tamil) taught in schools as subject
Learning MT in primary school is compulsory
Minority languages can be heard in public in the community

Aims of the study were to ask what types of FLP currently exist in the home domain in UK and Singapore. How do educational and political systems in these two different sociocultural contexts?

Differences between 2 groups of families:
In UK families speak more Chinese
In Singapore they speak half Chinese, half English, half other language (Reflects the linguistic multilingual ecology of Singapore)
UK children learn English in school and children try to speak Chinese at home with not a lot of code switching (sometimes second generation Chinese families)
In the UK learning home language private matter but in Singapore its supported by the public education system
UK public funding for minority language learning is non-existent

Implication of results of both studies is that English dominant ideology from both groups and that there is a hierarchical order of languages in both contexts.

Speaker(s) 2:
Sviatlana Karpava, University of Central Lancashire, Cyprus
Natalia Ringblom, University of Stockholm
Anastassia Zabrodskaja, University of Tallinn

The aim of the study was to see why some people grow up as bilinguals. The study put family in central position while also remembering the role of the children as their desire to learn a language is crucial and often overlooked.

The study compared Russian language transmission in four countries: Sweden, Finland, Cyprus and Estonia.

There were differences and similarities in the countries involved as Russian has different status in each of these countries.

Finland and Cyprus compared: biggest immigrant language and considered to have a high status
Cyprus: people eager to learn Russian and see it important to get a job
Sweden: people interested in Russian but not in the same way as in Cyprus
Finland and Sweden: there is legal right to mother tongue instruction
Cyprus: there are several private Russian speaking schools and it has a very high status

They highlighted the need to think about families that do one-parent one language. Parents think that it's either or - Immigrants want to learn new language of the country and think it's all or nothing approach to passing on Russian to their children.

The factors that affected immigrant language transmission included motivation (both integrative and intrinsic); attitudes; environment of the speaker and value of multilingualism within that environment.

The researchers distributed a questionnaire in four countries and conducted semi structured interviews and did ethnographic observations.

The findings were that parents want children to know Russian language and cultural heritage but on other hand they want mainstream integration and that's how Russian is lost. Researchers' aim is to let parents know that it's ok to not speak the minority language (Russian) perfectly.

Conclusion: even though parents aim to transmit the language this contrasts with their actual practices which impacts children's proficiency in Russian.

Speaker 3: Agnieszka Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, University of Warsaw
Transmitting Literacy in the Heritage Language

Recent academic literature supports the benefits of transmitting literacy in the Heritage Language (HL).

Aims of the study were to use FLP as a framework to see whether Russian migrants living in multilingual contexts transmit language skills and literacy skills to their children.

The countries studied were Cyprus, Ireland, Israel and Sweden.

An online and paper questionnaire was used to look at background, socioeconomic status, community language proficiency, wellbeing in the host society, language practices in the home and FLP. The subjects of the study were 345 females speaking Russian as L1 and born in the former USSR. There was a significant difference in self identification with target community and language. 182 mothers with at least one child aged 6-17 were chosen and questioned whether those children could read and write in Russian.

Findings:

91% of participants' children could speak and understand some Russian

52% of children could read and write in HL-Russian

As the education level of the women in the study was the same, the researchers asked how do we account for different results in each country?

They concluded that literacy transmission depends on the following variables:

1. Mother's age at migration
2. Her self identification with target language and culture
3. Active use of HL-Russian at home

They also found that:

1. Parents who were older when they immigrated transmit literacy better
2. If mothers identify with home culture they are more likely to pass on Russian
3. If parents speak their language at home children are more likely to speak Russian

The practical conclusions of the study were the following:

- Need to support FLP in HL (teachers, doctors, educators)
- Need to promote knowledge about he importance of HL literacy mong migrant mothers
- Need to promote extra curricular activities in HL

Speaker 4: Karolina Mieszkowska, University of Warsaw

The researchers in this study worked on Polish-English bilingual children in UK
The argument for the value of studying these speakers stems from the growing number of them and poor understanding of how bilingual children develop compared to monolingual children. Often, the language that bilingual children produce is seen as language impairment due to what are seen as 'mistakes' in their language. Polish parents in UK are often advised to stop using their home language so that children can integrated into majority community and not 'mess up' the language. Poland homogeneous in terms of language use and many Polish have started to emigrate since joining the EU in 2004.

Looking at Polish-English child migrants they explored issues around
- Their level of English compared to English monolinguals
- Whether their use of Polish was problematic in those children too (as they use it only in the home)
- If they return to Poland, they are 'hidden immigrants' as they have Polish last names but they struggle with the Polish school system - they have problems with regular subjects and sometimes don't write or read in Polish

The study looked at the home language of the children. It looked at children who have just started school and been there for just a few years, examining their vocabulary, syntax, and narration. They found that bilinguals when producing Polish sounds were doing it much worse that Polish monolingual children and had problems with their Polish as compared to their English. There were a lot of transfer errors in bilinguals from English into Polish as when producing sentences in Polish they would transfer from English (vowels, consonants).
Bilinguals also made more errors than Polish monolinguals (linguistic errors, pragmatic errors, overusing pronouns, etc.) When looking at children's ability to tell a story, there was no difference between two groups. The researchers found that if bilingual children can tell a story they can tell it in both languages and tell it as well as monolingual children.

What they saw is that in bilingual children, Polish is weaker and children have a lot of errors from English into Polish, as English starts to become their dominant language.
They argued that Polish runs the risk of becoming a 'kitchen' language because children use English with friends at school. The researchers also highlighted the importance of teaching to parents the value of the home language. Moreover, they concluded that monolingual norms should not be used when assessing bilingual children and language impairment should not be diagnosed due to difficulties in one language.

Speaker 5: Blathnaid ni Ghreachain, CEO of Gaelscoileanna

The final speaker reflected on the previous presentations and discussed the issues that emerged in the context of Ireland.

She argued that a questionnaire on home language transmission is needed in Ireland in order to ask questions about parents' role and expectations and their level of satisfaction about the amount of language instruction their child is getting.

In Ireland there is lack of awareness about parents' role. Society overall and organisations are not good enough about empowering parents to help themselves and help their children.
The one parents one language model is quite common in Ireland. It's important to think about the role of the child and their motivations as well as the role of the parent. We need to ask how education policy influence parental practices. FLP means something different to every family and every situation is unique; language choice and behaviours are a very personal choice.

In Ireland, transmission of Irish as a HL in Irish is very weak. In the Gaeltacht it's declining. However, on the upside, there are growing numbers of families outside these areas - they are new speakers who have come through Irish medium education and are driven by themselves and not by the state. Parents choosing to bring up their children through Irish have to show great courage and resourcefulness in a society that automatically marginalises them.
In Irish medium education, the linguistic profile of those families is that 3% are native HL speakers in the home, which is tiny minority. The need to protect this minority was stressed although the speaker highlighted potential for accusations of elitism as a counter argument.

In terms of family and how that crosses over into Irish medium education:
HL has to be the language of the home as English is language of socialisation in Ireland. Exposing children to Irish is a goal through socialisation with other Irish speaking families.
Childcare services in Irish don't exist outside the Gaeltacht (early years). There are also problems with teachers' competence in Irish as HL. Low expectations of parents is also a problem. There is a need to ask what demands should parents make of the system. Irish medium schools are very successful and have huge demand but there is no safe space for Irish and because of this, once children leave the classroom they speak English. There is also a lack of integrated structure for schools to help them focus on socialisation of children through Irish. Another point that was raised is that professional health services don't exist through the medium of Irish

Questions and Comments:

Question for Agnieska: Did you investigate what mothers understand by reading and writing?
It is highly problematic that you think we all understand reading and writing in the same way. Scholars would question the UNESCO definition - we as researchers shouldn't assume what writing and reading mean for people. Looking at African context where many languages are oral - this becomes very problematic and very Western oriented assessment. We must keep in mind that we're talking about societies that are highly literate. This doesn't apply to many speakers in this world who are multilingual but not literate.

Q: Mothers in Finland and Sweden and even Israel identify themselves with the host culture more than with their own culture. Cyprus and Russia are far away but Finland and Russia are closer so maybe more likely to identify with the host culture.

Q: Poland is always described as linguistically homogenous but have you thought about the differences depending on where in Poland and where in England the children are from? Is a linguistically homogenous Poland a myth?

C: There is one standard variety of Polish. If someone lives in the south or the north, apart from slight allophonic differences there will be no problems understanding. Poland is linguistically homogeneous because of communist times.

****

Keynote 2: Cécile Vigouroux - (Re)thinking Newspeakerism from a Sub-Saharan African Perspective

Migration is one of the most politicised topics in 20th & 21st centuries. Discourse that migration is a threat to national economies and that the rise of unemployment of native workers is because of migration is a common discourse in African countries too. Economists have focused on whether migrants represent a fiscal burden and draw on public services; this is because they work on contexts of welfare societies where this is an important aspect.

Lingering question: what role does the figure of the migrant play in sociolinguistics? We have endorsed the 20th political construction of the migrant as the *new proletarian* (Gerard Noiriel), especially the one coming from the Global South. This figure has enabled us to address issues of race and to tackle issues of social class dynamics. It has shaped our understanding of dynamics along the categories of thoughts imposed by the state, the first one being the dichotomy between migrants and locals.

Vigouroux's research wishes to focus on south to south migration and use Africa as a vantage point to show this phenomenon that might otherwise be overlooked. In Africa, 80% of African migrants move within Africa, sometimes urban to rural or to neighbouring countries. This challenges Western view of Africa as a place where migrants all aspire to move to global north a perception which politicians of the global north exploit. Few African countries have resources to invest in research so it is important to remain aware of the role funding agencies play in the production of knowledge.

South to South migrations force us to revisit some of our assumptions constructed mainly from dynamics pertaining to North to South populations by:
     1. Rethinking the colonial/postcolonial relationships between sending and receiving countries
     2. Challenging the racial approach to account for socio-political tensions between migrants and host populations

3. Revisiting the construction of migrants as challenging nation -states' ideologies of monolingualism and sociocultural cohesiveness like in Europe

Migration patterns in Africa don't differ so much from patterns elsewhere. However, scholarship on Africa can ask new reseach questions and contribute to new methodologies

The key note speech drew on a discussion of fieldwork conducted in Cape Town betwewn 1996 and 2016. Traditional migration patterns between African migrants and former European colonies impacted by Schengen agreement.

Vigouroux made the case for challenging our analytical categories:
When is someone categorised as a refugee? While these categories might be useful for policy making, they not useful for linguistics.

Migrant's patterns of interaction are often independent of their administrative status and access to employment is often based on the social capital a migrant possesses rather than their legal status.

Migrants' experience of language learning has been highly naturalistic. They don't tend to frame linguistic abilities in a new language as essential for participating in new social ecology. Vigouroux's interviews in her original ethnographic study were framed by her own experience of language learning, which were not the same as for multilingual people in African countries. Her findings show contrasts between migrants who operate a 'learn as you go' language principal of those that attend ESL classes. ESL classes attendees tended to be educated migrants who had been schooled and think that language is an asset for social mobility. In contrast, those who 'learned on the go' had a more pragmatic approach to learning English.

Vigouroux stressed the need to consider the literacy based perspective to migrants' language acquisition in our scholarship and instead take into account the serendipity of language acquisition which involves speakers' proactivity and creativity in transforming any social event or interactional activity into a language learning process.

In Cape Town is hard to assess whether migrants who learn English in ESL classes thrive more economically than those who learn as they go.

In academic literature on migration there are entrenched ideas of the link between migrants' learning the host language 'well' and competing on the local job market with those who do not. There is an assumption of the straightforward correlation between migrants' language competence and their social and economic insertion into the host country. Moreover, the sole responsibility of learning language for economic success placed on the migrant. Social agents are constructed as rational language users and learners; the languages they speak as non indexical; and the labour market in which they operate as race, gender, and ethnicity free, equally accessible to everybody, providing they have the 'right skills', including language.

There is a need to question to what extent there is a correlation between language competence and economic integration. These assessments are based on formalized economic integration, and based on formalized economic systems with highly regulated labour markets - does this reflect African migrants' experience in the overwhelmingly informal/vernacular economies?

The problem with treating language as human capital is that language acquisition and integration are portrayed as devoid of issues of class gender ethnicity race etc. If language can only be acquired naturalistically through mixing with its speakers, then the social capital of the migrant plays a key role in their ability to acquire the language this way. Language use in the context of migration can be conceived as a continuum of practices along the social and geographic migratory trajectories and not as a disconnected from previous language practices. There is a need to rethink the dichotomy between migrant and host discourse.

Questions and Comments:

Q: This is a framework that could go beyond this specific case. There is a tension between the need to explore the single speaker by doing a micro scale study but also the need to try to apply the framework in a different context that goes beyond the African context. The literacy framework doesn't work for many other contexts, especially in the case of regional minority languages. Have you thought about applying some of this framework to look at other contexts?

C: I haven't applied it but what I presented is a conversation I've been having with the literature that I've been reading on language and migration and on other European contexts, Latin American, etc. It's a conversation that I've been having with the book and asking why this literature doesn't answer my questions about Africa so it prompted to look at things from another angle.

Q: This work focuses on south-south migration. Have you encountered discourses and ideologies of the north in your research? Discourses about what the north is?

C: When you prepare yourself linguistically it's because you have the luxury of preparing yourself. People escaping genocide don't have the luxury of preparing themselves linguistically. In recent years, we have seen that many Africans speak 3,4,5 languages, and multilingualism is part of their lives. But, what I've noticed is an emerging discourse about their multilingualism. If you ask (the flawed question) "How many languages do you speak?", what I've noticed over the years is an inflation of the number due to discourse of multilingualism in the global north about how speaking many languages is valued

****

Panel 5: New Speakers and the European Charter of Regional and Minority Languages
Coordinator: Pia Lane, Professor, MultiLing, University of Oslo

Speaker 1: Aleksandra Oszmiańska-Pagett -Member of the Committee of Experts for the European Charter of National and Regional Minority Languages

Promoting language as practice vs. standard

This talk looked at the ECRML. The Charter's ideal scenario is to promote language use and acquisition both in and outside school. There are seven key areas which the Charter addresses. These are education, court, administration, media, culture, economic life and translational cooperation. Each EU state who wishes to sign the Charter choses from each of above 7 fields so that the end result is to achieve language acquisition in a 'natural' way across many domains.

There are difficulties in implementing this. Such difficulties stem from:

1. Choices made by states (oversized ratifications such as in Poland or undersized such as case of German in Denmark where choice of undertaking is very limited). The problem is that a state cannot back out of their choice. If they've committed to something they have to stick to it. However, they can add to what they've already committed to

2. Another problem is the difference between the written standard and the actual language varieties used, for example Belorussian in Poland

3. Lack of strategy on the part of the state to implement policies in above 7 areas

The Charter can impact on language acquisition as having the language mentioned in the Charter gives it status. It also places pressure on the state to plan for the language. This can motivate people to learn the language and can create new speakers.

Inclusion of a language in the Charter can often lead to its standardization. COMEX view is that standardization is welcome but it is not a prerequisite. It is not a prerequisite for the language to be standardized for it to be covered by the Charter. Especially with the development of the modern media, COMEX realises that 21st century technology shows that we don't need a standard. Often, standardisation doesn't act in the interests of the speaker, even though speakers themselves are fed myths about standardisation in school, society etc.

Questions and Comments:

Q: In relation to education - that's where the input of the charter could be seen for new speakers.

C: It's not only primary, secondary where language is taught, also adult and vocational and preschool. So, in theory, you could learn language from early years to adulthood. However, it is up to the ratifying state to chose how they want to implement policy and what budget they have for it. The strategy is there in the charter it's just not always ratified.

Q: Why do Governments differ so much in how they implement the charter? Do Government officials have no idea what they're signing?

C: Yes, sometimes states don't know the consequences of their choices. In the Polish context, COMEX say it's an overambitious choice but it was done with good will to give all 15 languages equal status.

Speaker 2: Anna-Kaisa Räisänen, Kven Institute/Kainun Institutti, Norway

Kven language and the charter in Norway: revitalisation efforts and new speakers and Sonja's story

Kven is endangered language in Norway. There are 2000 native speakers who can converse about daily life. There are 5000 people with receptive knowledge. There are also people who are learning Kven and becoming new speakers.

The Story of Sonja:
She was born just before WWII started in Norway. Her mother was Kven and her father was Sami. They were a family communicating in 2 languages at home. When she came to school her first day was traumatic because the school didn't speak her languages, but after a few years she became fluent in Norwegian, which became the dominant language in her life.
In 1960s the situation changed, she married and had two children and they used only Norweigan at home. Sami activism started in northern Norway in 1960s with people demanding rights to language, culture and land. This activated other minorities other than Sami and alerted them to their multilingualism. The Kven association was founded in 1987. Kven people followed the Sami movement but were influenced by other movements such as those in Sweden At that time Sonja and her husband decided to start using Sami at home. Sonja started to sing in a Sami choir and her children wanted to learn Sami. The Kven language was recognised as a language of its own in 2005. The Kven institute was founded 2006 and opened 2007. Kven studies started at the University of Tromso in 2006. The Kven language board was set up in 2007 and the Kven language council in 2008.

Sonja was perplexed about what to do with her Kven identity too so when it was recognised as a language she became enlightened and thought "my language is not just Finninsh language, it's something differed". As Kven is similar to Finnish, she could communicate in Finnish.

The EU Committee of experts recommended "a structured policy for the protection and promotion of Kven" and the Kven language nest was set up in 2014-2016. There is a sense that the language can be promoted without the Charter but it's good to have a service that's coming and checking what Norway is doing with the Charter.

Questions and Comments

Q: Can you give a brief explanation of what you mean by language nest?

C: It's a Kindergarten where you use the language you're teaching to children. In other language nests we didn't have funding to hire more teachers who could speak the language, but it's where you use only the minority language on a daily basis with children, it's a type of language immersion.

Q: Was it hard to get this project approved in Norway?
C: I never asked. In Norway you don't have any legislation that hinders you to do what I'm doing. They don't define what language you should speak to children in the legislation act, whereas in Sweden you have to have a certain percentage in Swedish

Q: How about the media? Do you have a magazine?
C: There is a discussion about this now because we have a newspaper published once a month but I have to correct information given to COMEX because in the report you say that it has 10 minutes daily of radio but that's not true it's only 12 minutes a week

****

Speaker 3: Michael Hornsby, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan, Poland

New speaker acquisition of minority languages and the Charter: Tensions and Challenges

Although not explicitly stated in the Charter, when a language is included in it there's a tendency towards standardization. New speakers can be between a rock and a hard place with regional minority languages in deciding which variety to speak. The Charter highlights the appropriate forms for teaching and studying minority languages. They say that they need to be standardized in order to allow non-speakers to access teaching in the language. There is not a requirement to standardize but when it does happen it's welcomed e.g. to help them fit in to education curricula.

Standardisation plays a role in the local processes of language legitimation. There are tensions over standardisation. For example:
- In where standard Greek has been language of education whereas local variety is different from standard Greek. This has implications for children speaking a different variety from the educational variety but also for new speakers of Greek in Cyprus who will be taught one type of Greek but come across a different type in communications
- There can be pressure on children as they can occupy an ambiguous place in revitalisation because they can bear the burden of standardisation

Tensions also exist outside the Charter as people who learn the standard variety of Breton often feel unhappy to sound like they're from 'nowhere' as it can lead to the local community rejecting their variety.

While there is no explicit requirement for minority languages to engage in standardisation, there is still a covert message that standardisation is still in the best interest of the minority language. Often the ideology is towards modernisation so that they can 'fit' into industrialised, secularised modern society, which can imply lexical engineering to homogenize regional minority languages and as a result to standardise

them at the same time. The problem with this is that this modernisation can, and often does, fail to take the covert ideologies of the minority language into account and as a result gives rise to tensions.

Questions and Comments

Q: A covert assumption is that standardisation is of interest. If we assume that standardisation comes with modernity (leaving religion out etc. speaking with voice from nowhere), this might have worked with languages like French, English or German 200 years ago, but no minority language speakers can do that in the majority language, so is the standardisation of minority languages the same thing as majority languages, can they follow the same principles, and what kind of citizens can be imagined through those processes?

C: Standardisation is sometimes taken on unthinkingly because it worked with majority languages. These are different circumstances and different times. In the 21st century circumstances are different. I don't think it's the same process at all, but we're calling it by the same term because that's how it's seen by some of the elite and the speakers themselves.

C: Standardisation is what people say it is - we need ideological clarification in many of these situations to know what people expect.

Speaker 4: Talwyn Baudu, University of Aberystwyth, Wales

Experiences of a "neo-native" speaker, language activism and the ECRML

Baudu discussed his experiences as a neo-native speaker of Breton and a language activist. He moved from Brittany to Aberystwyth but had no idea about sociolinguistics. He became interested in bilingual policy at the university in Aberystwyth. He found that he hadn't any experience of expressing emotions through Breton, even though his father spoke it to him at home. He also found that there is a gap between neo-native and neo-speakers of Breton in terms of language use. He became involved in Breton activism and found that the difficulty in using emotional language in minority languages is because there as a void in terms of creating a language that can be used socially.

Questions and Comments

Q: I found it extremely interesting. What you're saying is what we've been hearing in the French context for a while. E.g. "we're beyond the Charter at this stage". This makes me think about institutionalised French as being language of the state in 1539 but it took 200 years before that to get there. Perhaps this is a sign of how long it takes for these things to come through.

C: Yes, I also think if you go 200 years forward to the French revolution - the charter is too embedded in idea of what makes France indivisible - no point in going against ideology that has all the power of a centralised state.

This speaker discussed the ECRML and its objectives. He argued that we need to work together to protect the languages of those who most need it. We need to look at this instrument (the Charter) from a different perspective.

Molina has been working for council for more than 20 years. He stressed that we have to ask why the Charter is not working as it should be. How can we make sure that this instrument moves with society? In order to do so we have to understand how and when it was produced. The CoE is intergovernmental - states that are creating a system, they pay for the system and at the end they are criticised by the system. The Charter doesn't cover migrants and leaves out 80% of new speakers. We cannot afford to provide education in all migrant languages. We are shrinking languages completely because dialects are not included. There have been states that pushed too far and others have gone for the minimum. It is better to be in between so you can take slow steps forward and don't receive too much criticism. Nobody is policing the Charter but there is a need to ensure that the recommendations are implemented.

Another element that has to be taken into account is why is it that we have COMEX but we still have a intermediate control body before files are sent to COMEX. This body can change the recommendations but COMEX cannot master the outcome of the recommendations. More and more often the COMEX are starting to change recommendations in a way that they protect themselves.
Next year is the 20th anniversary of the Charter and we need to think about how we can move forward so that this instrument still has value. We have started with changing the formatting of the evaluation to show what needs need to be taken into account. We need to think about how the media has changed. Today, through the internet, you can have e learning platforms and facilitate language learning online. This is something you couldn't do 20 years ago. We need to work with people on a local level so that the voices of minority groups are heard. Normally, the bigger the group the more power they have. There is a need to engage with people on the ground to make case for providing these services and then make change at the national level.

We must ask what is the impact economically, for health care etc. if people can't be included in society. It more expensive to pay for these types of problems than to pay for language resources.

Questions and Comments

C: We have programs where we assist small cities with changing road signs to bilingual signing, interpretation of laws

Q: Regarding the point about migration and that new speakers are moving around - how is the Charter coping with that in its recommendations? Because you have minority language speakers that might not be within the boundaries of a state but might be within the confines of another state.

C: We need to think of different mechanisms and alternatives to accommodate new speakers

C: Think of the case of Germans in Denmark. There was a court case of someone speeding who was asked why wasn't interpretation provided and we recommended there should be. We do have issues that are brought to us by NGOs about these problems.

C: In the case of Kven, in the north they would have right to learn it but in Oslo they don't. The Charter was drawn without a focus on migration.

C: The CoE Charter isn't a magic wand, it provides a structure for things to happen

****

Panel 6: Language policy, learning, and citizenship
Coordinators: Steven Morris & Gwennan Higham

The questions that came up in this panel were linked to the key questions asked in Working Group 9 which were as follows:

- Rethinking traditional top-down hegemonic language policy
- How ethnographic based research can inform language policy
- What gaps do we see and how to impact and influence multi-level language policy

- To what extent do national citizenship regimes correspond to minority language settings? Moving away from national idea of citizenship. Looking at it not as visa status but rather ability to fully participate in a community.

Presentation 1
Steven Morris, Swansea University
Gwennan Higham, Swansea University
Kathryn Jones, IAITHl: The Welsh Centre for Language Planning

Language Policy in Wales:
There are tensions between what is symbolic policy and what is implemented in practice.

Welsh medium education mentions aspects of inequality such as race, gender etc. and making the education accessible to all.

The researchers in this panel combined three case studies:
- PhD on adult immigrants learning Welsh
- WG commissions study of BME pupils in bilingual and Welsh medium schools
- Adult speakers of Welsh research in 6 local authority areas

These studies have seen how successful adult education models have been in getting people to socialise with other speakers of Welsh. Moreover, they have created social spaces for the Welsh language in Welsh speaking communities.

Gwennan Higham's research found that adult learners don't all have the same language learning needs. There needs to be language policy that takes immigrants language and cultural background into account.

Kathryn Jones was struck by how, at policy level, there was lack of evidence to prove that there were children from different types of backgrounds. Children are coming to Wales aged 7, 8 or 9 and it is often a huge challenge to support these children. There are centres for children coming late to Welsh medium schools

Need to ask: when a grassroots policy gets taken over by the government - is it still the same thing?

Creating grassroots safe spaces but also need to create 'routes' out of safe spaces to new domains by linking education opportunities with employment opportunities.

Presentation 2
Gwennan Higham, Swansea University
Anna Augustyniak, Southampton University

Migrants as stakeholders in language regimes - Wales and the Basque country compared

Looking at language and belonging in nation states but also sub states such as Wales and the Basque Country.

The researchers posed questions such as:
- How is the role of language in integration defined and appropriated in sub-state policies in Wales and the Basque Country?
- How do migrants contest or comply with these policies?
- How does ethnography help us understand this?

They compared the findings of two PhD studies which looked at migrants in Wales and the Basque Country.

Their conclusions were as follows:
- The Basque Country and Wales have a desire to propose their own integration models distinct from state models of Spain and the UK
- Integration and language policies fall short of meeting migrants' expectations and needs
- Policies are contradictory and lacking in terms of mechanisms on how to carry out propositions
- Diverging power relations of the language regimes reveal access and attitudes to language are divergent
- Migrants contest homogenous assumptions and categorisations of languages and they become stakeholders in policy regimes

Heiko Marten, University of Latvia + Rezekne Academy of Technologies
Josep Soler

This study looked at new speakers in the Baltic States. Estonia is often described as a country at the crossroads. It has three local languages: Estonian, Russia and English. There has been a reversal of language shift policy after independence of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, there is an increasing number of transnational people in Estonia.

The researchers compared two studies. The first was conducted in Tartu University. It was an ethnographic study that looked at Estonian use in university. The second study was in the Talin International School in Estonia which is the main English school in Estonia. Both studies showed diverse attitudes towards Estonian and motivation for becoming new speakers. Speaker profiles ranged from resistance to adaptation; some do not become new speakers and other people do become new speakers, but it's not black and white, it's a spectrum. The 'resisters' have arrived to Estonia recently and may not see their future there and apply instrumental attitude and happy to 'get by' with English. The 'adapters' have personal reasons for becoming new speakers, integrative motivation, personal sphere - interested in becoming 'legitimate' new speakers by becoming accepted. There is a third group as well as resisters and adapters who show readiness at the start but were then demotivated and changed their attitudes. They were denied the opportunity to become legitimate new speakers of Estonian.

Presentation 4
Heini Gruffudd, Welsh language author and chairman of 'Dyfodoli'r Iaith', Welsh language pressure group

Activity and Pressure: some aspects in Wales

This stakeholder highlighted how local work can evolve into national policy. Welsh language centres were established by volunteers in the 1980s. They were local centres where people could speak Welsh, and offer a place where people can learn Welsh outside the schools. Nowadays there is Government policy to support centres that were supported socially in the 1980s. Development of Welsh medium education came about because of pressure from parents who established a national lobby. Gruffudd argued for the inclusion of Welsh as a necessary consideration in local housing plans.

Presentation 5
Petra Elser, Director of Banaiz Bagara, Basque language centre for migrants

Elser discussed her experiences as a new speaker of Basque. Her motivations to learn the language stemmed from family reasons. She discussed a Basque centre that she attended where she could practice her language skills and create connections with people that would hopefully last.

Elser also made mention of the Languageforwork.ecml.at project that she is involved with. It is a European learning network for professionals supporting work related second language development. They provide courses for teaching migrants language skills for the workplace and courses are free for participants. In the Basque context there is a focus on language classes for elderly care.

Presentation 6
Sanita Lazdiņa, Rezekne Academy of Technologies and Ministry of Education of the Republic of Latvia

New speakers in Latvia: Perspectives of Pupils and Educational Policy Planners

In Latvia many children are multilingual with many speaking Polish, Russian, Lithuanian. The presenter questioned the role of the state/ministry of education/school/teachers to help new speakers 'cross social boundaries'.

Looking at how multilingual children cross language borders by code switching all the time in informal settings. Children can be silent in lessons because they don't know the language of instruction but encouraging them to cross language boundaries and mix languages they might lead to them talking more (like they do in informal settings). We should be taking advantage of children's language biographies but, in school, children's languages are taught in separate boxes as schools follow very monoglossic ideologies. The new speaker label helps generate confidence amongst learners. The new speaker concept is less political than other concepts such as migrants, refugees, minorities etc. and is more concerned with social and integration issues

Comments and Questions

Q: To what extent are there similarities in matters concerning language policy, citizenship regimes and new speakers in Wales, the Basque Country and Latvia?

Q: What proficiency in what language counts as proof that someone has settled in a country?

C: Important to stress the idea of rethinking citizenship and linking it to language policy is interesting. Local initiatives are also very important - there is valuable work being done teaching minority language to workers.

C: There are limitations to grassroots initiatives because there is a need for top down support at some point. Having discussions with policy makers valuable.

****

Panel 3: Beyond medium education: the role of new speakers for supporting regional languages acquisition

Coordinator: Maria Garraffa

Regional language acquisition and medium education

This panel aimed to look at how the Gaelic language is perceived by secondary school pupils in Gaelic medium education. The researchers in this panel are working with pupils who will soon be leaving the school and looking for employment. They are interested in knowing students' perception of their Gaelic. The group want to better disseminate the findings of their project so that it might be more likely to influence education policy

Presentation1: Bernadette O'Rourke, Heriot-Watt University

Gaelic number of speakers at very low levels compared to other minority language contexts such as Galician or Catalan. Only 1.1% of Scottish population speak Gaelic. This project looks at Gaelic speakers in lowland areas who didn't acquire it in the home. Gaelic medium education has been in place since 1985. The native speaker model is still very strong amongst new speakers of Gaelic and new speakers want their language to be as 'rich' as the native speaker. There is still a strong connection between language and place and people trying to have 'one accent' so that they're identified with one place. Native speakers and new speakers struggle to interact sometimes.

The questions posed in this project include:
How can we support new speakers at different times in their educational trajectories?
How can we support transition out of Gaelic medium education?

Demand is very high for Gaelic medium education but problem is that not enough teachers to meet the demand and grow to the levels of people need.

****

Presentation 2: Mona Wilson, Chair of Education at Bòrd na Gàidhlig

This speaker discussed the challenges to producing teachers for the Gaelic schools.
In their research they looked at other contexts like Catalonia and Basque country to see how they had managed language immersion schooling. In Scotland the struggle is to get a critical mass but there are generally positive attitudes from society towards Gaelic. We need to think about how many teachers we need to meet growing demand. This involves recruiting participants to become Gaelic teachers and looking for 'new speakers' who want to become fluent. The Basque autonomous community was a good context to compare to but they found that 3 years was how long it took to form a fully fluent Basque teacher. The Gaelic project wanted to see if they could shorten that time to a yearlong immersion course to make them fluent. Trying to teach language and pedagogy at the same time was a challenge. Teachers found they got

great support on the course but not as much from local authorities. Teachers need to know what the next support after the course will be - a clear pathway for CLPL (continued life long professional learning).

Questions and Comments

Q: What is the number of applicants who were willing to go on the course?

C: 18 or 19 but has gone down over the years and it's about 10 or 12

Q: What is the selection process for that?

C: The local authority put out an advert that goes out to every school in the local authority and they put them forward to course and then they go back to their local authorities. We need to make sure we communicate better with local authorities. It is very hard to put in intensive support after teachers finish and not all teachers are as fluent as they aspire to be after they finish. There is a tension because they're already teachers so they have those skills so they want the course entirely in Gaelic to help their language skills.

Q: If everyone who wanted to apply could, would that fill the demand for teachers?

C: We're producing about 30 teachers a year - predominantly primary school -
but they have different language ability and the year course isn't going to be enough to get to the level of fluency needed to be a Gaelic teacher

C: In the Basque country the government put money into giving teachers who were already working time out to learn the language and estimated 3 years to do it although there is some dissatisfaction with the fluency that some of them reach

Presentation 3: Donalda McComb –Head Teacher Gaelic School Glasgow

The first GME unit opened in Glasgow in 1984 & one in Edinburgh that year too but the unit was attached to the mainstream primary school. Numbers gradually increased as parents have a key role in the development of GME.

Small beginnings to the situation but now the schools have 493 pupils in primary and 323 in secondary school - it's the second primary school in the city of Glasgow - 560 primary pupils in Glasgow and a secondary that these children will fit into. 80% of these students do not have Gaelic in the home but there's a strong commitment from them and the school has strong academic results. The aim is to have all subjects through the medium of Gaelic but that's not the case yet. Many parents make commitment to learn Gaelic themselves. The school advises parents to use language as much as possible outside school in order to normalise it. Parent councils are also involved in the school with fundraising activities etc. The schools themselves will produce teachers - past pupils will see a career in teaching with their Gaelic as a positive route as they want to give something back. The school is creating new speakers of the future and creating Glasgow Gaels. The children in the school are from all areas of Glasgow, from the most deprived to the most affluent. In the next few years the school won't be able to cope with demand so there is a need for growth. At the start of their studies the children have a tw year immersion where Gaelic is the only language of the classroom. The school wishes to support young people so that they can use their Gaelic once they leave the school and identify what the main jobs

will be in Scotland and identify areas where staffing would be needed (STEM). The school has a presence within the city and has raised the profile of Gaelic.

Questions and Comments

Q: Do you feel that some people just send their children to the school because it's a 'good' school and therefore do you fear not getting support from parents?
C: It is important to be aware of how the community fits in - what's a good catchment area - I don't think the school is that good (although good in terms of results) - it's in an area of Edinburgh where many parents are academics.

Reactions to the GME Video

Comment: only two men in the video - maybe it's coming across too strong that this is a women's environment (languages, women etc.) and this won't encourage STEM subjects

Comment: It's possible to connect STEM and Gaelic language and think beyond 'subjects' as categories and engage with community art etc.

Comment: The message needs to be simplified as there is too much information in the video

Presentation 4: Timea Kutasi, Heriot-Watt University and University of Edinburgh

Kutasi conducted a pilot study to see how being a new speaker of Gaelic impacts development of English

The findings of other projects on bilingualism and how it affects you are mixed -
Some say it helps you focus on new things and pick up other languages. There are very few studies on minority languages in psychology and there are mixed findings about more global languages saying that learning a minority language may hinder acquiring the majority language.

This study is unique because it looks at young adults who've been exposed to Gaelic over a period of 10 years in GME. They're unique in that they're not like adult learners who learned it in university. The study tested the linguistic, cognitive and social skills of 25 young adults, 10 home speakers and 15 new speakers.

Findings:
- Learning a minority language doesn't harm the majority community language
- When you've been exposed to the language extensively their English is still fine and they perform as well as English monolinguals
- Learning Gaelic gives them more plasticity and facility for language
- There is no cognitive difference between home speakers and new speakers
- Gaelic is not viewed negatively

- English is seen as more progressive
- The students are trying to modernise the language themselves
- Speaking Gaelic is seen as more cultured
- Students reported a desire and need to take the language outside the classroom

Presentation 5: Maria Garraffa, Psychology Department, Heriot-Watt University

New speakers as a life style choice: psychological and environmental aspects in young adult Gaelic speakers

Being a new speaker as a lifestyle choice. There needs to be a commitment from parents in GME. An increase in number of New Speakers is an effect of GME.
After 15 years GME students fully competent in Gaelic but need to decide what they want to do with it.

How do we develop the transition phase after GME?
- Don't wait for last minute chance to think about how this transition will take shape
- Unfolding the decisional process beyond choice of speaking a regional language after GME
- Social factors: new community coming from GME
- Psychological factors: awareness of benefits of language learning

Main points of the study:
- There distinction between new speaker and home speaker not evident to the students
- Their awareness is that they all learned the language in school
- Gaelic seen as a school subject
- They want to stress that they're not learners, they are speakers
- None of the HS (home speakers) felt their Gaelic was better than the NS (new speakers)
- The school created a sense of community amongst the speakers
- Young adult speakers consider Gaelic mainly as a means of communication, as English would be on a global scale, not as a means of identification
- Mixing English and Gaelic does not reflect corruption, but the only way to keep it alive
- They have created their own 'Glasgow Gaelic' accent
- Speakers from the Highlands tend to switch to English with young adults despite the young adults having started the conversation in Gaelic
- They see Gaelic as having potential outside school in the workplace

Moreover:
a. Gaelic is almost exclusively used at school in classes, even by home speakers
b. The distinction between HS and NS is slim
c. Young adults attending GME all perceive the Gaelic they are taught at school…
d. Gaelic needs to be modernised for communicative success
e. Language maintenance may now mainly rely on the preservation of the community created by GME

Questions and Comments

C: Because the situation is so extreme in Scotland in comparison with other minority language contexts, it really gives other opportunities to do things in a different way

C: it reminds me of the beginning of the Basque medium schools. First they were illegal and started in houses and then people physically built buildings when they were semi-legal and parental commitment was huge and there was an element of 'this is what we want, fighting for it'. The Gaelic situation reminds me of that as there is parental commitment to send children to these schools. I'm puzzled at the contradiction in students because there doesn't seem to be great attachment to the language itself. They are happy to be bilingual but no engagement with Gaelic and the revolutionary nature of it (which you would see in the Basque country). There is no identification with the language.

C: Growth in GME has happened because it has been promoted as something that has the benefit of bilingualism rather than just Gaelic so you have parents sending their children to the school just because they want the benefits of bilingualism