

Horizonty

4th Linee Training Institute in Multilingualism Research, Prague, June 21 – 25, 2010.

Sara Merlino

Université Lyon 2 & Laboratoire ICAR, DYLAN Project

Sara.Merlino@univ-lyon2.fr

The fourth yearly Training Institute of the LINEE project, which addresses linguistic diversity in Europe, took place in June 2010 in Prague, in the captivating atmosphere of the historical Faculty of Arts of the Charles University. First held in 2007 at the Catholic University of Brussels, Belgium, then in 2008 at the Free University of Bolzano, the Training Institute (TI) was hosted by the Charles University for the second time (on the previous Prague TI, see Sherman – Engelhardt, 2010). Here the TI is set to become a traditional annual event consistent with the LINEE project's mentality and objectives. The LINEE (Languages in a Network of European Excellence) project is a Network of Excellence in the European Commission's 6th Framework Program. Its general aim is to study languages in society and multilingualism in an interdisciplinary way. All research activities in LINEE are structured by four thematic areas (Language, Identity and Culture; Language Policy and Planning; Multilingualism and Education; Language and Economy) and by three levels of research scope (regional, national and European). Research institutions from 9 European Countries cooperate in the project: accordingly, several actions are organised in order to promote cooperation between academics in the participating countries (for more details on LINEE see <http://www.linee.info/>). TI, specifically aimed at doctoral students, represents one of these actions: notably, it contributes to the development of a network of research between young academics just starting their career.

In total, there were 13 participants: 2 from the LINEE project, 3 from the related DYLAN project, 2 from Charles University, 1 from Warsaw University, 1 from Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan and 4 from the University of Szeged. The strong participation from students from outside the project was coherent with LINEE's general aim to look at the future of the created research network, and to pursue the broadening of contacts and collaborations, especially in Central Europe.

On Tuesday, June 22, after a few welcoming words from Jiří Nekvapil, the main organizer, and Michal Stehlík, dean of the Faculty of Arts of Charles University, the TI's first presentation was given by Iwar Werlen, a professor at the University of Bern and the coordinator of the entire LINEE network. In his talk, entitled "*The LINEE Project*", Werlen mainly introduced the features, structure and original aims of the LINEE project and, discussing initial and subsequent emerging research questions, offered more general elements of reflection for research on language diversity.

Following a break, the first part of the poster session was held, during which all the participants introduced their work and research field. The topics discussed included:

- the management of linguistic diversity, including the dynamics of multilingual interactions in multinational companies (Ouarda Bougerra, Mirjam Jaeger, Sara Merlino)
- attitudes towards “minority” languages in educational settings in specific contexts such as the Serbian one (Eszter Gábrity, Paulina László)
- the role played by cognate linguistic resources in the process of third language acquisition in educational settings (Timea Molnár)
- issues of educational policies for the teaching of a second language in the kindergartens (Kinga Szeliga)
- politics and strategy of identity in multicultural cities (Éva Misits)
- language and identity in the Catalan region (Katarzyna Linda)
- issues of language revitalization in the Mexican area (Vendula Hingarová)
- the role of prosody in Czech TV talk shows (Martin Havlík)
- the role of prosody in teaching English as an international language (Judit Nagy)
- issues of “gender” in the censoring of Croatian tourism promotional materials (Anita Skelin Horvat)

The poster session was followed by the first in the series of lectures and seminars by four selected resource persons, experts in various aspects of multilingualism. The first speaker was Joseph Lo Bianco, professor of Language and Literacy Education at The University of Melbourne, who in his career has conducted large research in the domain of language policy, literacy planning, bilingualism and multicultural education. His talk, entitled “*Public Texts, Argumentative Debate, Performative Behaviour: Towards a Wider Framework of Language Policy and Planning*”, particularly expanded on some ideas regarding the LINEE thematic area of Language Policy and Planning. Lo Bianco proposed a new conceptualisation of language policy, taking the distance from both the rationalist approaches which dominate the field at present and the descriptive tradition derived from applied linguistics and sociolinguistics. Though drawing on these traditions, he actually avoided remaining at a pure descriptive level of policy texts and their formal declarations of intent, trying instead to capture the performative and discursive dimensions of language planning. According to Lo Bianco, “we can view policy as an ensemble of activities, some of which are textual (laws, reports, authorisations) other of which are discursive (speeches, radio, debates), while still others involve the public performance of behaviours that powerful individuals or institutions hold up as models to be followed” (Lo Bianco, 2008, p. 157). Language policy can thus be understood in relation to three dimensions, represented by text, discourse and performances. As explicitly stated at the beginning of his talk, Lo Bianco’s approach is specifically concerned with issues of “interests, power and politics”. The examples of United States and China were particularly effective in pointing to the relationship between language policies and different “practical” needs, as well as to the consequences of these same politics. As an instance, in United States a call for learning languages other than English, “improving the foreign languages and cultural capabilities of the Nation” (see the White Paper signed by the American Secretary of Defense in 2005, cited in Lo Bianco, 2008), was made as a consequence of the last decade historical events (since the attacks of September 11th) and of the recognition of the strategic role played by language in international diplomacy and military operations. China’s language education policy was instead reported to reflect on how certain symbolic dichotomies (such as English

Horizonty

for practical application, or utility vs. Chinese for moral principles, or essence) can have an impact on identity and produce real “dilemmas of identity” (see the recently published volume on the subject by Lo Bianco – Orton – Yihong, 2009).

The second day opened with the second half of the poster session, followed by the lecture of Melissa G. Moyer, who gave a talk on “*Sociolinguistic perspective on language and multilingualism in institutions*”. Moyer’s research interests over the past fifteen years have mainly focused on bilingualism and multilingualism related to Spanish and English. Adopting a critical sociolinguistic perspective, Moyer is currently concerned with language and migration in connection with social institutions (social welfare, justice, health, administration, education) of the nation-State and with the way institutional ideologies shape policies and practices of multilingualism. This research, developed within the framework of a national research project on multilingualism in public, private and NGO organizations, is methodologically based on a multi-sited ethnographic fieldwork, which allowed to collect different types of materials (interviews, field notes, audio recordings of interactions, official documents, pictures and so on) in three different institutional settings installed in the Barcelona metropolitan area: a private call shop or locutorio, a public health clinic and a local chapter of an international non-governmental organisation. During her presentation, Moyer insisted on the importance of a multi-sites ethnography, which would allow not only for the collection of different types of data, but also for a comparison of different contexts of “language use” and “language policy and ideology”; further she insisted on the necessity to overcome the traditional micro-macro divide in sociolinguistic research in order to combine a micro analysis of interactional data with a macro “overview” on wider social processes.

Moyer’s work is an illustration of the recent developments in sociolinguistic research, “where the globalizing context of modern societies has brought scientists to reorient studies of language, community and identity in the nation-state away from autonomous structures towards processes and practices, in order to capture the ways in which linguistic variation is central to new forms of social organization” (Heller, 2008). It is in this theoretical perspective and in the climate of the globalized new economy (where language centrality seems to grow more and more) that the notion of *the commodification of language* has developed. Moyer’s talk reviewed this as other questions and notions about language in current social processes (and particularly in institutional contexts), considering for example not only the “exchange value” of language as a commodity, but also *language as a resource* for access and exchange of information. At the same time, Moyer took into account phenomena of *regimentation of language* that seem to take place in specific institutional work contexts such as the call-centers: here, the rapid diffusion and intensification of linguistic control strategies, as the outcome of technological change and of the increasing influence of management approaches, has placed linguistic behaviour as well as other kinds of job behaviour under close scrutiny and surveillance. *Language as an ideological practice* was considered as “the result of normalized, naturalized patterns of thought and behaviour” (Bourdieu, 1990; cited by Moyer, forth.) and exemplified with some interviews collected in NGO organisations; these interviews contained, for example, some “discourses about” the categorisation of the type of job (and thus professional future) a speaker can or cannot achieve depending on the language he speaks; they showed, according

to Moyer, how it is possible not only to relate the multiculture of communicative action to political economic considerations of power and social inequality, but also to confront macrosocial constraints on language behaviour and to connect discourse with lived experiences.

A traditional component of the LINEE TI is the excursion, representing a link between the cultural, linguistic and political issues of research on multilingualism which are at the core of the LINEE project, and the local institutions and organisations situated in the region which hosts the TI. The previous TI held in Prague in June 2009 organized the excursion to the Vietnamese-owned-and-operated SAPA market, located in Libuš on the outskirts of Prague; this was consistent with the fact that the most contemporarily relevant issues for multilingualism in the Czech Republic is that of recent migration. This year, the TI featured another important community which is present in the Czech Republic, that is the Roma community. This was the subject not only of the meeting organised on Wednesday afternoon, but also of a presentation that was given by local scholars on Thursday 24 (see below).

The excursion took the participants to the Prague town hall and consisted of a meeting with some representatives of Roma who play an active role in the Czech media to spread and promote the Romani culture and language. There were four Roma activists and journalists, who presented their associations, journals, radio and TV programs on Roma culture. The first to speak was Karel Holomek, a Romani activist and chairman of the *Society of Roma in Moravia* (www.srnm.cz), an association established in 1991, whose activities include social work in excluded Romani localities in several regions of Moravia and educational activities aimed at Romani children. Holomek is also editor-in-chief of the Romani magazine *Romano Hantos*, a weekly newspaper which offers reports, interview and other articles about matters concerning the Roma, all in Czech. He was followed by Jarmila Balážová and Lukáš Houdek, both active in the *Romea* organization (www.romea.cz), whose activities are primarily aimed at the publishing of information on Roma, their current situation and culture via print as well as electronic media. The projects implemented by *Romea* include also the support of Romani youth education and the support and presentation of Romani culture and human rights activities. Since 2003 the association publishes a monthly magazine, *Romano vod'I*, and, since 2010, a children's magazine, *Romano vod'ori*. Finally, journalist Iveta Durdoňová offered a few words on the radio programme she moderates weekly on Czech Radio, the *O Roma vakeren*, which in addition to current news from Romani life, offers interviews, contributions by telephone, commentaries and observations dealing with the problems of the Roma. As was discussed after the individual presentations and as a consequence of the questions asked by the TI's participants, through the printed and broadcast media, Roma activists try to fulfil the right of national minorities to distribute and receive information – also – in their own language. As a matter of fact, the linguistic policy of the newspapers and broadcasted programmes include not only Czech, but also Romani, English, sometimes even Vietnamese (when for example some newspapers add a special language course on their final page). When during the discussion someone asked what it meant for Roma people to be part of the European Community, the journalists' reaction had quite negative tones: the hope for Roma people is still that the European Commission will exert in the future some pressure on the national state to fight against discrimination of Roma people in the countries they live.

Horizonty

Unfortunately, this is far from being the case, as some Italian or very recent French migration policies of exclusion show.

The late morning session of June 24 involved the lecture of Dick Vigers, from the University of Southampton and member of the LINEE project within which he has conducted research in the thematic area “Language Policy and Planning” at the national level, in Wales and Spain. Together with member of the Prague, Szeged and Zagreb teams, he has analysed the perceptions of the use of minority languages in signage in public spaces; the research took place in Wales, Croatian Istria, south-eastern Hungary and also in the Těšín Silesian region in the Czech-Polish borderland. In his lecture, entitled “*Identity and integration in multilingual contexts: past and present perspectives*”, Vigers first reviewed issues of mobility and plurilingual language practices from a historical perspective; he highlighted the implications that migration phenomena have for language practices and the development of multilingual repertoires and diversity, evoking the Ottoman Empire as a symbol of migratory fluxes and plurilingual “landscapes” (showing for example some documents dating from the period and written in different languages). He then focused on a particular example of migration in the 19th century, the one which characterised the Ubykh community (that migrated en masse from Caucasus and settled in western Turkey) and on its consequences for language, integration and identity; the members of the diaspora, integrated “too well” into the Turkish society, progressively abandoned the use of Ubykh language (a language which has attracted linguists’ interest also for its structural peculiarities – such as a large number of distinct consonants and only two vowels): the language completely disappeared with the death of Tevfik Esenç in 1992, its last speaker. The Ubykh example testifies for how communities and individuals live with the consequences of migration for generations; and particularly, how neither being a multilingual community nor living in a multilingual society secures the future of multilingual practices. The last part of Vigers’ lecture focused on contemporary migratory flows to the United Kingdom and their impact on language and integration policies. Referring to a research conducted within the LINEE project in Wales, Vigers showed how the Welsh language competence for migrants, especially those from Eastern Europe, has gained prominence as an issue in north Wales: this is coherent with recent policies promoted by the European Commission, which in 2008, explicitly states how “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” (COM, 2008, p. 6; cited by Vigers). Migrants in Wales are effectively encouraged to learn both English and Welsh, in the scope of a “positive” plurilingualism which, occasionally, encounters the opposition of migrants themselves (who report on some limits to this “promoted” multilingualism).

This was followed by two presentations by local scholars. The first was given by Ondřej Klípa, the secretary of the Government Council for National Minorities (an advisory and initiative body of the Czech Government), who gave a talk on “*Language and national minorities in the Czech Republic*”. In his talk, Klípa spoke about the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (introduced in 1998) and about the “practical” problems that sometimes arise by the concrete implementation of this charter. He reported the case of the Polish minority in the Těšín area in Silesia, where the Polish minority forms a rather compact group. Here the

introduction of bilingual inscriptions, as a way to implement the Charter, received a strong negative reaction by some resistance groups who destroyed the signs. According to Klípa, in the specific case, the “visibility” of national minorities in terms of “linguistic landscape” made visible some hidden problems, as the “symbolic” value of the signs excluded their “purely” bilingual function and made relevant questions of “domination” (which, as somebody in the audience suggested, cannot be disjointed by past experiences and the history of the communities involved). Klípa also raised the problem of “who” specified the crucial parts of the Charter for the Czech Republic, namely people who are not necessarily in contact with the national minorities.

The second presentation was given by Helena Sadílková and Pavel Kubaník, who gave a talk on “*Romani in the Czech Republic*”. Sadílková and Kubaník are the principal members of a team that has conducted a large-scale sociolinguistic research project funded by the Czech Ministry of Education, into the use of the Romani language in the Czech Republic since 2007. In their talk, Sadílková and Kubaník first gave an interesting outline of the historical origins of Roma and Romani language and culture. They then presented the results of the research they conducted in 2007–2009; using a quantitative approach, they first investigated the use of Romani in school among young children, which made it possible to select localities for a qualitative research on Romani language acquisition and competence and on the role played by Romani language in identity construction.

The institute’s final day was devoted to the lecture and seminar by Alexandre Duchêne, Professor of Sociology of Language and Multilingualism at the Suisse University of Freiburg and director of the Institute of Multilingualism (Freiburg University, Switzerland), who gave a talk on “*Multilingualism in the new economy: Linguistic resources as added value but for whom?*”. As suggested by the title of his talk, Duchêne started with a common assumption in research on language planning and language economy: multilingualism is a source of richness and linguistic competences constitute a good investment not only for the individual or the state, but generally for economy. This interrelation between linguistic resources and economic productivity was not negated, but rather, questioned under a different perspective by Duchêne, who posed the question: “who is profiting of these productivity and resources?” At the beginning of his talk, Duchêne, referring to the work of a group of French researchers who in the late 1980s investigated the role of language in traditional industrial workplaces (the “Réseau Language et Travail”) and the interrelationship between labour structure and language practices, outlined an interesting comparison between the way language was conceived in the manufacturing industry of the 19th century (as a disturbing element, as “counter-productive”) and the essential and crucial role it plays in the new economy: here communicative skills have become a selling point and multilingualism can be not only a practical necessity but also a marketing strategy.

Duchêne took what he himself defined as a social, interactional and critical linguistic perspective, considering not only language as part of the social order, but also practices and instruments of power. Using methodologically different types of data (ethnographic description, documents, audio recording of interactions), he proposed an overview of the linguistic dynam-

Horizonty

ics of a specific ethnographic site, a Swiss airport (a context where language contact seems to be pervasive and which seems to embody the mobility of people and products' "circulation"). This was the subject of research financed by the Swiss National Research Foundation which questioned the way companies (in this specific case, a company that handles passengers and luggage in the airport) deal with issues of multilingualism. Describing different levels at which the company intervenes through language policies and decisions (for example establishing specific linguistic criteria to hire people according to the job they will perform in the airport), Duchêne focused on a specific practice observed in the company: the writing of a list with all the languages spoken by all the employees in order to have always at their disposal "spontaneous" or "lay" interpreters of different and less common languages. According to Duchêne, "this list constitutes the key tool for managing unpredictable multilingual needs". The enterprise thus capitalises on the linguistic skills of its low-skilled manual workers, who on the other hand do not receive any economic recognition for the «work» they occasionally do, but just a sort of «symbolic» recognition, becoming «visible» for a couple of minutes. This shows how "multilingualism as a source of profit does not imply that the beneficiaries of this added value are the ones who produce it, i.e. the workers" (Duchêne – Heller, forth., p. 22) and, more interesting, there is some evidence, that the company is even planning this exploiting of linguistic resources, when making it relevant during recruiting. Pointing to the fact that multilingualism, indeed, can be a benefit mainly for the enterprises of the new economy, Duchêne thus emphasized that it is necessary to be careful when using an economic perspective to promote multilingualism.

Even if, officially, this was the last Training Institute organised and financed by the LINEE project, the Prague team seems well disposed to introduce the TI as a regular activity at the Faculty of Arts of Charles University, which appears to be an example of good practice initiated within the project and intended to be pursued in the next years.

References:

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES (2008): *Multilingualism: An Asset For Europe And A Shared Commitment*, COM (2008) 566 Final, Brussels.

DUCHÊNE, Alexandre – HELLER Monica (forth.): Multilingualism and the new economy. In: Marilyn Martin-Jones – Adrian Blackledge – Angela Creese (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. London – New York: Routledge.

HELLER, Monica (2008): Language and the nation-state: Challenges to sociolinguistic theory and practice. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12, pp. 504–524.

LO BIANCO, Joseph (2008): Tense Times and Language Planning. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 9, pp. 155–178.

LO BIANCO, Joseph – ORTON, Jane – YIHONG, Gao (eds.) (2009): *China and English: Globalisation and the Dilemmas of Identity*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

© 2010/ 2

MOYER, Melissa G. (forth.): The management of multilingualism in public, private and non-governmental institutions. *Sociolinguistic Studies*.

SHERMAN, Tamah – ENGELHARDT, Oliver (2010): LINEE Training Institute in Prague. *Slovo a slovesnost*, 71, pp. 154–158 (also available at: <<http://linee.info/linee/events/training-institutes.html>>).