

Mapping Linguistic Diversity in Multicultural Contexts



Contributions to the Sociology of Language

94

Editor

Joshua A. Fishman

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Mapping Linguistic Diversity in Multicultural Contexts

edited by

Monica Barni

Guus Extra

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin.

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines
of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Mapping linguistic diversity in multicultural contexts / edited by
Monica Barni, Guus Extra.

p. cm. — (Contributions to the sociology of language ; 94)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-11-019591-0 (hardcover : alk. paper)

ISBN 978-3-11-019621-4 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Linguistic minorities. 2. Pluralism (Social sciences) I. Barni,
Monica. II. Extra, Guus.

P119.315.M37 2008

306.44—dc22

2008017060

ISBN 978-3-11-019591-0

ISSN 1861-0676

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet
at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© Copyright 2008 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin
All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this
book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including
photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission
in writing from the publisher.

Typesetting: PTP-Berlin GmbH, Berlin.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

The *European Science Foundation* in Strasbourg and the *Università per Stranieri di Siena* co-funded an international exploratory workshop on the theme of this book in September 2006 in Siena/Italy. The workshop was hosted by the University for Foreigners of Siena: a crossroads of Italians and foreigners, of (persons with) different languages, cultures and identities. A University that finds itself inside the City of Siena in which the first chair of Italian language was founded in 1588, something that had never existed before in a university on the Italian peninsula. It was essentially a chair designated for German students who chose to carry out their university studies in Tuscany. Connecting the two facts comes naturally. Although they are centuries apart in time, they are linked in witnessing the Italian language fulfilling its international destiny – through contact – at the moment it is taken as a subject of study.

Today, Italy, traditionally a country characterized by emigration, has become one of the European countries with the highest numbers of immigrants. The 3,7 million immigrants merge in the areas in which Italian is spoken – traditionally structured around the extremes of the Italian language and its varieties, and its ‘dense forest of dialects’ and the minority languages of historical settlement – a consistent factor of plurilingualism, including more than 130 languages of immigrants that are already rooted in several local communities. This neoplurilingualism not only includes the languages of immigrants but the languages of minority groups as well, which by now are well-established among local communities: languages used systematically within groups, but also capable of displaying themselves to the entire collectivity, with the effect of profoundly modifying the semiotic and linguistic landscape of both our larger and smaller urban centres.

Tuscany is the fourth largest Italian region with the fourth highest number of immigrants in Italy. The province of Siena has seen major changes in its own demographic, social and linguistic structures as well. The vineyards of Brunello di Montalcino in the Chianti area are at this point in time cultivated by a growing number of immigrant workers from the Balkans and the Indian Subcontinent. Medieval buildings are being restored and modern structures are being built by Albanian, Romanian and North African workers. Elderly people are increasingly being nursed by young people from abroad. Strolling through Siena one could always hear the sounds of many languages: the languages of tourists and students in the City that has a distinct vocation as the centre of

international university studies. Nowadays, walking around Siena, one could add the sounds and alphabets of new citizens. Signs, posters or spontaneous writings can be found in Chinese and Arabic, in Russian and Turkish. In schools throughout the province, the presence of children from immigrant or mixed families already represents a major challenge for school leaders and teachers.

Siena nowadays appears more and more like a laboratory, a city that typifies the general condition of the country, of Europe and of the entire globe. In such a laboratory, experiments are taking place involving advanced modalities in the elaboration of models adequate for describing and interpreting the new plurilingual reality of the globalized world, the new plurilingual identity of children who fill the schools of the City and the surrounding small towns, the new plurilingual profiles which accompany our daily lives. The Sienese workshop could not have emerged in any other Italian city: Siena is home to a University for Foreigners, and therefore the centre of choice, representative in the study and formative administration of plurilingualism; home to an Excellence Centre of research whose main purpose is to develop a Permanent Language Observatory for the diffusion of Italian among foreigners and immigrants in Italy.

We have gathered beautiful memories of the Sienese workshop, memories of an intense exchange of reflections of welcoming which only Tuscany and Siena can give. This is Siena, a model of *glocalization*, a City that has written on one of its gates: *Cor magis tibi Sena pandit*, that is, “Siena opens her heart to you once more”. Once more from her gates Siena opens her heart to those who come from abroad and offers the history of her civil values to others. The others are, for Siena, today’s immigrants. In September 2006, the participants were the most pleasant guests – new friends at the Sienese workshop. I would like to express my sincere thanks to all of our guests, to the *European Science Foundation*, and to the University’s research staff and technical-administrative personnel, in remembrance of a high-profile scientific event of profound humanity.

Massimo Vedovelli
President of the University for Foreigners of Siena

Acknowledgements

This Volume is the follow-up to an international exploratory workshop on our topic of concern at the *Università per Stranieri di Siena* (Italy), held in September 2006 under the auspices of the *European Science Foundation* in Strasbourg. We want to thank the ESF and the University of Siena for their generous support in making this workshop and follow-up publication possible. We also want to express our thanks to Karin Berkhout at *Babylon, Centre for Studies of the Multicultural Society*, at Tilburg University (the Netherlands) for her dedicated support in the editing of this Volume, and to Simone Casini for the revision of the subject index.

Monica Barni and Guus Extra

Contents

Preface	v
Acknowledgements	vii

Section I. Introduction

Mapping linguistic diversity in multicultural contexts: Cross-national and cross-linguistic perspectives <i>Guus Extra and Monica Barni</i>	3
European migration statistics: Definitions, data and challenges <i>Michel Poulain</i>	43

Section II. Mapping regional languages in Europe

The Welsh language in the United Kingdom: Beyond cartography <i>Colin Williams</i>	69
The status of Basque in the Basque country <i>Jasone Cenoz</i>	93
Language surveys on Frisian in the Netherlands <i>Durk Gorter</i>	115

Section III. Mapping immigrant languages in Europe

Mapping immigrant minority languages in multicultural cities <i>Guus Extra and Kutlay Yağmur</i>	139
Immigrant languages and languages of France <i>Dominique Caubet</i>	163
Mapping immigrant languages in Switzerland <i>Georges Lüdi</i>	195
Mapping immigrant languages in Italy <i>Monica Barni</i>	217

Section IV. Mapping linguistic diversity abroad

Mapping linguistic diversity in an emigration and immigration context: Case studies on Turkey and Austria <i>Katharina Brzić and Kutlay Yağmur</i>	245
The <i>Linguistic Atlas of South Africa</i> : Mapping diversity in space and time <i>Izak J. van der Merwe and Johannes H. van der Merwe</i>	265
Community languages in Australia <i>Sandra Kipp</i>	293
The linguistic landscape of Tokyo <i>Peter Backhaus</i>	311
Contributing authors	335
Author index	337
Subject index	342

Section I
Introduction

Mapping linguistic diversity in multicultural contexts: Cross-national and cross-linguistic perspectives

Guus Extra and Monica Barni

1. Aims and rationale of this book

The focus of this book is on mapping linguistic diversity in multicultural contexts. Both well-known and established approaches will be explored, coined as *demolinguistics* (De Vries 1990) and *geolinguistics* (Van der Merwe 1989). The term *demolinguistics* originated among Quebec demographers, probably during the 1970s (Lachapelle and Henripin 1980). Over the last three decades, the field has become an international crossing for demographers and linguists; the same holds for *geolinguistics* as the crossing for geographers and linguists. In addition, more recent approaches will be explored in terms of *linguistic landscaping* (Gorter 2006). Whereas *geolinguistic* and *demolinguistic* studies focus commonly on the spatial and temporal distribution and vitality of languages in the private domain of the home, *linguistic landscaping* has as its focus the public domain in the most literal sense, i.e., in terms of the visibility and distribution of languages on the streets. In this sense, the outcomes of *linguistic landscaping* research should be read with care: they do not intend to present a faithful mapping of the linguistic make-up of the population in a given place (see Barni, and Backhaus, this volume).

For each of these approaches, we will offer cross-national and cross-linguistic evidence on so-called “non-national” languages. Dependent on particular contexts or perspectives, such languages are often referred to as minority languages or dominated languages. Numerical classifications do not necessarily coincide with social classifications. According to the 2001 census outcomes in South Africa, (isi)Zulu is the most widely spoken home language and English functions commonly as *lingua franca* with all its power and prestige (see Van der Merwe and Van der Merwe, this volume). Whereas English is a minority language in the homes of South Africans, it is the dominant language in society.

In Western Europe, Turkish belongs to the major immigrant languages, and it is spoken in the homes of far more people than, e.g., any of the official state languages of the three Baltic States. (see Brizić and Yağmur, this volume).

In this book, cross-national and cross-linguistic perspectives will actually be offered on two major domains in which language transmission occurs, i.e., the domestic domain and the public domain. Prototypical of these two domains are the home and the school, respectively. At home, language transmission occurs between parents and children, at school this occurs between teachers and pupils. Viewed from the perspectives of majority language speakers *versus* minority language speakers, language transmission becomes a very different issue. In the case of majority language speakers, language transmission at home and at school is commonly taken for granted: At home, parents speak this language usually with their children and at school, this language is usually the only or major subject and medium of instruction. In the case of minority language speakers, there is usually a mismatch between the language of the home and the language of the school. Whether parents in such a context continue to transmit their language to their children is strongly dependent on the degree to which these parents, or the minority group to which they belong, conceive of this language as a core value of cultural identity.

Both demo/geolinguistic research and linguistic landscaping can be characterised as empirical approaches with a strong fascination for large data sampling and for the visual representation of the resulting outcomes in tabulated figures and language maps. In many regards, this book will show evidence of this fascination. This is not to say that the value of qualitative small-scale data, common in ethnographic research, should be under-estimated (see, e.g., Brizić and Yağmur, and Kipp, this volume). In particular in the domain of multilingualism in a multicultural context, there is a need for multidisciplinary and complementarity of data collection methods. Table 1 gives an outline of complementary approaches or paradigms in ethnographic *versus* demo/geolinguistic research. Validity issues arise in each of these two approaches: in ethnographic research in terms of representativeness of the data and in terms of making generalisations, in demo/geolinguistic research in terms of a (mis)match between observed and reported data (see also section 7). To quote Hammersley (1992):

We are not faced then, with a stark choice between words and numbers, or even between precise and imprecise data; but rather with a range from more to less precise data. Furthermore, our decisions about what level of precision is appropriate in relation to any particular claim should depend on the nature of what we are trying to describe, on the likely accuracy of our descriptions, on our purposes, and on the resources available to us; not on ideological commitment to one methodological paradigm or another.

Table 1. Complementary approaches or paradigms in ethnographic *versus* demo/geolinguistic research

Research paradigms	Ethnographic research	Demo/geolinguistic research
Research methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Inductive / Heuristic – (Participating) observation – “Qualitative” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Deductive – Distance between researcher and informants – “Quantitative”
Usual data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Observed data in multiple contexts – Open-ended and in-depth interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Reported data in single contexts – Selective set of questions in pre-designed questionnaires
Informants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – (Multiple) case studies – Single/few informants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Large-scale studies – Many informants

A prominent concept in *geolinguistic* research is the spatial confinement of language groups to a particular geographical area. One should be aware that some language groups show a stronger degree of spatial confinement than other language groups. The former holds in particular for regional (minority) languages, the latter for immigrant (minority) languages. Taken from a dynamic perspective, regional languages may become (im)migrant languages within or across the borders of nation-states. Take the case of (isi)Xhosa as spoken in South Africa: it has its regional base (“centre of gravity”) in the Eastern Cape but has started to move in the post-Apartheid era also to the Western Cape. As a result, Xhosa is gaining a strong appearance next to Afrikaans and English in Cape Town (see Van der Merwe and Van der Merwe, this volume). A similar awareness should hold for the concept of “language groups” itself. Although there are many reasons, including methodological reasons, for its popularity, one should be aware that this concept is problematic in any multicultural context. The language repertoire of people in such a context consists often of more than one language. In the European public and political discourse, this has led to the popularity of the reference to plurilingual people in multilingual societies (see also Lüdi, this volume). Taken from this perspective, plurilingualism refers to an ability of individuals to communicate in more than one language, whereas multilingualism refers to a key marker of societies at large.

In this book, we want to compare the European state of knowledge on mapping linguistic diversity with initiatives taken in other parts of the world. Over

the last century, Europe has shifted from a continent of emigration to a continent of immigration. Demolinguistics is in particular a well-known and established field of research in non-European English-dominant immigration countries with a long history of population research in which census data have been collected and longitudinally compared, including census data on (home) language use. Apart from census data, other types of data, such as administrative population data and (*ad hoc*) survey data, may provide rich information sources on (home) language use (see Poulain, this volume).

Multicultural self-definitions have been created by former European immigrants in such non-European English-dominant immigration countries as Australia, Canada, the USA and South Africa (cf. also the concept of “rainbow nation”). A similar multicultural self-definition holds also for Europe at large: its identity is commonly described in terms of “celebrating cultural and linguistic diversity”. A paradoxical phenomenon in the European public and political discourse is the absence of this celebration in the case of non-European immigrant groups and their languages. For Europeans, much can be learnt from the experiences abroad in dealing with multilingualism and multiculturalism, both in terms of public and political discourse and in terms of data provision and data analysis. The final objective of this book is to provide the European research community and policy makers with a variety of conceptual and methodological considerations and challenges for mapping linguistic diversity in multicultural contexts.

2. The European constellation of languages

Europe’s identity is determined to a great extent by cultural and linguistic diversity (Haarmann 1995). Table 2 serves to illustrate this diversity in terms of 30 current and candidate European Union (henceforward EU) nation-states with their estimated populations (ranked in decreasing order of millions) and official state languages.

As Table 2 makes clear, there are large differences in population size amongst EU nation-states. German, French, English, Italian, Spanish, and Polish belong to the six most widely spoken national languages in the present EU, whereas Turkish would come second to German in an enlarged EU. Table 1 also shows the close connection between nation-state references and official state language references. In 27 out of 30 cases, distinct languages are the clearest feature distinguishing one nation-state from its neighbours (Barbour 2000), the major exceptions (and for different reasons) being Belgium, Austria, and Cyprus. The same holds for Switzerland, a non-EU country where more than one language are official state languages (see also Lüdi, this volume). This match between

Table 2. Overview of 30 EU (candidate) nation-states with estimated populations and official state languages (EU figures for 2007)

Nr.	Nation-states	Population (in millions)	Official state language(s)
1	Germany	82.5	German
2	France	60.9	French
3	United Kingdom	60.4	English
4	Italy	58.8	Italian
5	Spain	43.8	Spanish
6	Poland	38.1	Polish
7	Romania	21.6	Romanian
8	The Netherlands	16.3	Dutch (Nederlands)
9	Greece	11.1	Greek
10	Portugal	10.6	Portuguese
11	Belgium	10.5	Dutch, French, German
12	Czech Republic	10.3	Czech
13	Hungary	10.1	Hungarian (Magyar)
14	Sweden	9.0	Swedish
15	Austria	8.3	German
16	Bulgaria	7.7	Bulgarian
17	Denmark	5.4	Danish
18	Slovakia	5.4	Slovak
19	Finland	5.3	Finnish
20	Ireland	4.2	Irish, English
21	Lithuania	3.4	Lithuanian
22	Latvia	2.3	Latvian
23	Slovenia	2.0	Slovenian
24	Estonia	1.3	Estonian
25	Cyprus	0.8	Greek, Turkish
26	Luxemburg	0.5	Luxemburgisch, French, German
27	Malta	0.4	Maltese, English
28	Turkey	72.5	Turkish
29	Croatia	4.4	Croatian
30	Macedonia	2.0	Macedonian

nation-state references and official state language references obscures the very existence of different types of minority languages that are actually spoken across

European nation-states. Many of these languages are indigenous minority languages with a regional base, many other languages stem from abroad without such a base. We will refer to these “other” languages of Europe as regional minority (henceforward RM) languages and immigrant minority (henceforward IM) languages, respectively (Extra and Gorter 2001).

A number of issues need to be kept in mind, however. Within and across EU nation-states, some RM and IM languages have larger numbers of speakers than some of the official state languages presented in Table 2. Moreover, RM or IM languages in one EU nation-state may be official state languages in another nation-state. Examples of the former result from language border crossing in adjacent nation-states, such as Finnish in Sweden or Swedish in Finland. Examples of the latter result from trans-national processes of migration and minorisation, in particular from Southern to Northern Europe, such as Portuguese, Spanish, Italian or Greek. In particular the context of migration and minorisation makes our proposed distinction between RM and IM languages ambiguous. We see, however, no better alternative. It should also be kept in mind that many, if not most, IM languages in particular European nation-states originate from countries outside Europe. In our opinion, the proposed distinction leads at least to awareness raising and may ultimately lead to an inclusive approach in the European conceptualisation of “minority” languages.

3. Phenomenological considerations

Contrary to many popular views, the concepts of “nation” and “nation-state” in the modern sense are relatively recent phenomena. Barbour (2000) discusses the distinction between these two concepts in terms of a population and a legally defined entity, respectively. Nations have frequently developed from ethnic groups, but nations and ethnic groups do not necessarily coincide. Ethnic groups are often subsets of nations or function as collective entities across the borders of nation-states. The construction and/or consolidation of nation-states across Europe has enforced the belief that an official state language should correspond to each nation-state, and that this language should be regarded as a core value of national identity. The equation of language and national identity, however, is based on a denial of the co-existence of majority and minority languages within the borders of any nation-state and has its roots in the German Romanticism at the end of the 18th and the early 19th century (see Fishman 1973: 39–85, 1989: 105–175, 270–287; Edwards 1985: 23–27; Joseph 2004: 92–131 for historical overviews). The equation of German and Germany was a reaction to the rationalism of the Enlightenment and was also based on anti-French sentiments. The concept of nationalism emerged at the end of the 18th century;

the concept of nationality only a century later. Romantic philosophers like Johan Gottfried Herder and Wilhelm von Humboldt laid the foundation for the emergence of a linguistic nationalism in Germany on the basis of which the German language and nation were conceived of as superior to the French ones. The French, however, were no less reluctant to express their conviction that the reverse was true. Although every nation-state is characterised by heterogeneity, including linguistic heterogeneity, nationalistic movements have always invoked this classical European discourse in their equation of language and nation (cf. revitalised references in Germany to such concepts as *Sprachnation*, *Urfolk* and *Leitkultur*). For recent studies on language, identity and nationalism in Europe we refer to Barbour and Carmichael (2000) and Gubbins and Holt (2002), and for a comparative study of attitudes towards language and national identity in France and Sweden to Oakes (2001).

The USA has not remained immune to this type of nationalism either. The English-only movement, *US English*, was founded in 1983 out of a fear of the growing number of Hispanics on American soil (Fishman 1988; May 2001: 202–224). This organisation resisted bilingual Spanish-English education from the beginning because such an approach would lead to “identity confusion”. Similarly, attempts have been made to give the assignment of English as the official language of the USA a constitutional basis. This was done on the presupposition that the recognition of other languages (in particular Spanish) would undermine the foundations of the nation-state. This nationalism has its roots in a white, protestant, English-speaking elite (Edwards 1994: 177–178).

The relationship between language and identity is not a static but a dynamic phenomenon. During the last decades of the 20th century, this relationship underwent strong trans-national changes. Within the European context, these changes occurred in three different arenas (Oakes 2001):

- in the national arenas of the EU nation-states: the traditional identity of these nation-states has been challenged by major demographic changes (in particular in urban areas) as a consequence of migration and minorisation;
- in the European arena: the concept of a European identity has emerged as a consequence of increasing cooperation and integration at the European level;
- in the global arena: our world has become smaller and more interactive as a consequence of the increasing availability of information and communication technology.

Major changes in each of these three arenas have led to the development of concepts such as a trans-national citizenship and trans-national multiple identities. Inhabitants of Europe no longer identify exclusively with singular nation-states,

but give increasing evidence of multiple affiliations. At the EU level, the notion of a European identity was formally expressed for the first time in the *Declaration on European Identity* of December 1973 in Copenhagen. Numerous institutions and documents have propagated and promoted this idea ever since. The most concrete and tangible expressions of this idea to date have been the introduction of a European currency in 2002 and the proposals for a European constitution in 2004. In discussing the concept of a European identity, Oakes (2001: 127–131) emphasizes that the recognition of the concept of multiple trans-national identities is a prerequisite rather than an obstacle for the acceptance of a European identity. The recognition of multiple trans-national identities not only occurs among the traditional inhabitants of European nation-states, but also among newcomers and IM groups in Europe. At the same time we see a strengthening of regional identities in many regions in Europe, in particular those where a RM language is in use.

Multiple trans-national identities and affiliations will require new competences of European citizens in the 21st century. These include the ability to deal with increasing cultural diversity and heterogeneity (Van Londen and De Ruijter 1999). Plurilingualism can be considered a core competence for such ability. In this context, processes of both convergence and divergence play a role. In the European and global arena, English has increasingly assumed the role of *lingua franca* for international communication (Oakes 2001: 131–136, 149–154). The rise of English has occurred at the cost of all other official state languages of Europe, including French. At the same time, a growing number of newcomers to the national arenas of the EU nation-states express the need of competence in the languages of their countries of origin and destination.

Europe has a rich diversity of languages. This fact is usually illustrated by reference to the official state languages of the EU. However, many more languages are spoken by the inhabitants of Europe. Examples of such languages are Welsh and Basque, or Arabic and Turkish. These languages are usually referred to as “minority languages”, even when in Europe as a whole there is no one majority language because all languages are spoken by a numerical minority. The languages referred to are representatives of RM and IM languages, respectively. RM and IM languages have much in common, much more than is usually thought. On their sociolinguistic, educational and political agendas, we find issues such as their actual spread, their domestic and public vitality, the processes and determinants of language maintenance *versus* language shift towards majority languages, the relationship between language, ethnicity, and identity, and the status of minority languages in schools, in particular in the compulsory stages of primary and secondary education. The origin of most RM languages as *minority* languages lies in the 19th century, when, during the processes of

state-formation in Europe, they found themselves excluded from the state level, in particular from general education. RM languages did not become official languages of the nation-states that were then established. Centralising tendencies and the ideology of *one language – one state* have threatened the continued existence of RM languages. The greatest threat to RM languages, however, is lack of inter-generational transmission. When parents stop speaking the ancestral language with their children, it becomes almost impossible to reverse the ensuing language shift. Education can also be a major factor in the maintenance and promotion of a minority language. For most RM languages, some kind of educational provisions have been established in an attempt at reversing ongoing language shift. Only in the last few decades have some of these RM languages become relatively well protected in legal terms, as well as by affirmative educational policies and programmes, both at the level of various nation-states and at the level of the EU at large.

There have always been speakers of IM languages in Europe, but these languages have only recently emerged as community languages spoken on a wide scale in urban Europe, due to intensified processes of migration and minorisation. Turkish and Arabic are good examples of so-called “non-European” languages that are spoken and learned by millions of inhabitants of the EU nation-states. Although IM languages are often conceived of and transmitted as core values by IM language groups, they are much less protected than RM languages by affirmative action and legal measures, for example, in education. In fact, the learning and certainly the teaching of IM languages are often seen by mainstream language speakers and by policy makers as obstacles to integration. At the European level, guidelines and directives regarding IM languages are scant and outdated. Despite the possibilities and challenges of comparing the status of RM and IM languages across European nation-states, amazingly few connections have been made in sociolinguistic, educational and political domains (Extra and Gorter 2001).

As yet, we lack a common referential framework for the languages under discussion. Publications which focus on both types of minority languages are rare: examples are the dual volumes on RM and IM languages by Alladina and Edwards (1991), and the integrated volumes by Gogolin et al. (1991), Fase et al. (1992, 1995), Ammon et al. (1995), Ammerlaan et al. (2001), and Extra and Gorter (2001). As all of these RM and IM languages are spoken by different language communities and not at state-wide level, it may seem logical to refer to them as community languages, thus contrasting them with the official languages of nation-states. However, the designation “community languages” leads to confusion at the surface level because this concept is already in use to refer to the official languages of the EU. In that sense the designation “community

Table 3. Nomenclature of the field (Extra and Yağmur 2004: 19)

Reference to the people
National/historical/regional/indigenous minorities versus non-national/non-historical/non-territorial/non indigenous minorities
Non-national residents
Foreigners, <i>étrangers</i> , <i>Ausländer</i>
(Im)migrants
Newcomers, new Xmen (e.g., new Dutchmen)
Co-citizens (instead of citizens)
Ethnic/cultural/ethnocultural minorities
Linguistic minorities
Allochthones (e.g., in the Netherlands), allophones (e.g., in Canada)
Non-English-speaking (NES) residents (in particular in the USA)
<i>Anderstaligen</i> (Dutch: those who speak other languages)
Coloured/black people, visible minorities (the latter in particular in Canada)

Reference to their languages
Community languages (in Europe versus Australia)
Ancestral/heritage languages (common concept in Canada)
National/historical/regional/indigenous minority languages versus non-territorial/non-regional/non-indigenous/non-European minority languages
Autochthonous versus allochthonous minority languages
Lesser used/less widely used/less widely taught languages (in the EBLUL context)
Stateless/diaspora languages (in particular used for Romani)
Languages other than English (LOTE: common concept in Australia)

Reference to the teaching of these languages
Instruction in one's own language (and culture)
Mother tongue teaching (MTT)
Home language instruction (HLI)
Community language teaching (CLT)
Regional minority language instruction versus immigrant minority language instruction
<i>Enseignement des Langues et Cultures d'Origine</i> (ELCO: in French/Spanish primary schools)
<i>Enseignement des Langues Vivantes</i> (ELV: in French/Spanish secondary schools)
<i>muttersprachlicher Unterricht</i> (MSU: in German primary schools)
<i>muttersprachlicher Ergänzungsunterricht</i> (in German primary/secondary schools)
<i>herkunftssprachlicher Unterricht</i> (in German primary/secondary schools)

languages” is occupied territory. From an inventory of the different terms in use, we learn that there are no standardised designations for these languages across nation-states. Table 3 gives a non-exhaustive overview of the nomenclature of our field of concern in terms of reference to the people, their languages, and the teaching of these languages. The concept of “lesser used languages” has been adopted at the EU level; the *European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages* (EBLUL), established in Brussels and Dublin, speaks and acts on behalf of “the autochthonous regional and minority languages of the EU”. Table 3 shows that the terminology varies not only across different nation-states, but also across different types of education.

4. Regional minority languages across EU nation-states

We will present basic information on different RM language groups in the EU. In some nation-states, there are fairly accurate figures because a language question has been included in the census several times; in other cases, we only have rough estimates by insiders to the language group (usually language activists who want to boost the figures) or by outsiders (e.g., state officials who quite often want to downplay the number of speakers). Figure 1 serves to illustrate our overview visually and is derived from the Mercator Education website (see also Extra and Gorter 2007).

Figures for numbers of speakers are almost always problematic. In only a few cases they are based upon recent census or survey outcomes. Many other figures are, due to the lack of other data, derived from informed estimates by experts (these are sometimes referred to as “disputed numbers”). Also, some languages would perhaps not be included according to certain criteria; others might be split up further. Figures on RM languages in (mainly Western) Europe can be found in Breatnach (1998), Euromosaic (1996), *Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana* (1986), Siguan (1990) and Tjeerdsma (1998), as well as in the *Ethnologue* (2001). Derived from Extra and Gorter (2007), we will use a simple typology and distinguish between five categories of RM languages within the EU:

- unique RM languages, spoken in only one nation-state (e.g., Welsh in the United Kingdom, Frisian in the Netherlands or Breton in France; see Williams, Gorter and Caubet in this volume, respectively);
- RM languages spoken in more than one nation-state (e.g., Basque in Spain and France; see Cenoz, this volume);
- languages which are a RM language in one nation-state but the official mainstream language in a neighbouring state (e.g., Albanian and Croatian in Italy; see Barni, this volume);



Figure 1. Overview of RM languages across EU nation-states (Mercator Education, Fryske Akademy, Leeuwarden)

- historical non-territorial minority languages, which exist in smaller or larger numbers in almost all EU nation-states; the most prominent ones are Romani and Yiddish (see Extra and Yağmur, this volume);

- two languages with a special status, being official state languages of the EU but no official working languages of the EU; these are Luxembourgish, spoken in Luxembourg and France, and Irish, spoken in Ireland and Northern Ireland (UK) (see Table 2).

There are many publications on the status and use of RM languages, both in Europe and abroad (e.g., Gorter et al. 1990). Baetens Beardsmore (1993) focuses on RM languages in Western Europe, whereas Synak and Wicherkiewicz (1997), Bratt-Paulston and Peckham (1998), and Hogan-Brun and Wolff (2003) deal with RM languages in Central and Eastern Europe. In a number of European countries a periodical census includes one or a few questions on language and ethnicity, but in other countries no such questions are asked. An additional tool for obtaining data are sociolinguistic surveys. There are some RM language communities where such surveys are carried out with regular intervals. The Euromosaic (1996) project has provided a general overview of 48 language communities in the EU. In about half of those cases also data were collected through small-scale sociolinguistic surveys. The *European Language Survey Network* has developed a core module of 28 questions meant as a standard for questionnaires in any RM language community in Europe in order to obtain a basic overview of the language situation (ELSN 1996; Gorter 1997).

In Ireland and Wales, there is a tradition of both a regular census with language questions and regular sociolinguistic surveys (see Williams on Welsh, this volume). Spain has also a tradition of census with questions on the official languages of the Autonomous Communities in the Basque Country, Catalunya and Galicia (see Cenoz on Basque, this volume). In all contexts referred to, the focus is on regional languages, not on immigrant languages. The Netherlands has not had a census since 1971 and never had a language question; however, regular sociolinguistic surveys have been carried out on Frisian in the province of Friesland (see Gorter, this volume). In the United Kingdom, the next decennial census will be in 2011 and the Office for National Statistics carried out a household questionnaire in 2007 to test the planned procedures (www.statistics.gov.uk/censustest). Questions 12–15 refer to “national identity”, ethnicity, religion and language skills, respectively. With respect to the latter, a distinction is made between English, Welsh, Other language (to be specified in an open box), and British/Other Sign Language; in the first three cases, a further distinction is made between *no ability/understand/speak/read/write*. The format and nature of the 2011 UK census are still under negotiation. At the time of writing, no decision had been made on the number and type of language questions, neither on English nor on languages other than English.

5. The European discourse on “foreigners” and “integration”

In the European public discourse on IM groups, two major characteristics emerge: IM groups are often referred to as “foreigners” (*étrangers*, *Ausländer*) and as being in need of “integration”. First of all, it is common practice to refer to IM groups in terms of *non-national* residents and to their languages in terms of *non-territorial*, *non-regional*, *non-indigenous* or *non-European* languages. The call for integration is in sharp contrast with the language of exclusion. This conceptual exclusion rather than inclusion in the European public discourse derives from a restrictive interpretation of the notions of citizenship and nationality. From a historical point of view, such notions are commonly shaped by a constitutional *ius sanguinis* (law of the blood) in terms of which nationality is based on descent, in contrast to *ius soli* (law of the soil) in terms of which nationality derives from the country of birth. When European emigrants left their continent in the past and colonised countries abroad, they legitimised their claim to citizenship by spelling out *ius soli* in the constitutions of these countries of settlement. Good examples of this strategy can be found in English-dominant immigration countries like the USA, Canada, Australia and South Africa. In establishing the constitutions of these (sub)continents, no consultation took place with native inhabitants, such as Indians, Inuit, Aborigines and Zulus, respectively. At home, however, Europeans predominantly upheld *ius sanguinis* in their constitutions and/or perceptions of nationality and citizenship, in spite of the growing numbers of newcomers who strive for an equal status as citizens.

In this context, an interesting difference emerges between the American and European public discourse on ethnicity and nationality/citizenship. In the United States, word order constraints occur in such a way that ethnicity functions as modifier or adjective, and nationality/citizenship as head or noun (cf. references like *Latin/Afro/Anglo/Asian/Chinese/Dutch American*). In Europe, IM groups are often referred to by their source country instead of the target country of which they hold the nationality, resulting in such references as *Turks* instead of *Turkish Dutchmen*, or *Moroccans* instead of *Moroccan Frenchmen*. A remarkable phenomenon in the Israeli public discourse is the common way of referring to *Israeli Jews/Arabs* instead of *Jewish/Arab Israelis*: the former type of reference is focused upon difference in ethnicity, the latter upon similarity in citizenship.

A second major characteristic of the European public discourse on IM groups is the focus on *integration*. This notion is both popular and vague, and it may actually refer to a whole spectrum of underlying concepts that vary over space and time. Miles and Thränhardt (1995), Bauböck et al. (1996), and Kruyt and Niessen (1997) are good examples of comparative case studies on the notion

of integration in a variety of EU countries that have been faced with increasing immigration since the early 1970s. The extremes of the spectrum range from assimilation to multiculturalism. The concept of assimilation is based on the premise that cultural differences between IM groups and established majority groups should and will disappear over time in a society which is proclaimed to be culturally homogeneous. On the other side of the spectrum, the concept of multiculturalism is based on the premise that such differences are an asset to a pluralist society, which actually promotes cultural diversity in terms of new resources and opportunities. Whereas the concept of assimilation focuses on unilateral tasks for *newcomers*, the concept of multiculturalism focuses on multilateral tasks for *all* inhabitants in changing societies (Taylor 1993; Cohn-Bendit and Schmid 1992). In practice, established majority groups often make strong demands on IM groups for integration in terms of assimilation and are commonly very reluctant to promote or even accept the notion of cultural diversity as a determining characteristic of an increasingly multicultural environment.

It is interesting to compare the underlying assumptions of “integration” in the European public discourse on IM groups at the national level with assumptions made at the level of trans-national cooperation and legislation. In the latter context, European politicians are eager to stress the importance of a proper balance between the loss and maintenance of “national” norms and values. A prime concern in the public debate on such norms and values is cultural and linguistic diversity, mainly in terms of the national languages of the EU. These languages are often referred to as core values of cultural identity. It is a paradoxical phenomenon that in the same public discourse IM languages and cultures are commonly conceived as sources of problems and deficits and as obstacles to integration, whereas national languages and cultures in an expanding EU are regarded as sources of enrichment and as prerequisites for integration.

The public discourse on integration of IM groups in terms of assimilation *versus* multiculturalism can also be noticed in the domain of education. Due to a growing influx of IM pupils, schools are faced with the challenge of adapting their curricula to this trend. The pattern of modification may be inspired by a strong and unilateral emphasis on learning (in) the language of the majority of society, given its significance for success in school and on the labour market, or by the awareness that the response to emerging multicultural school populations cannot be reduced to monolingual education programming (Gogolin 1994). In the former case, the focus will be on learning (in) the national language as a second language only, in the latter case on offering more than one language in the school curriculum.

6. Criteria for the identification of multicultural populations

Comparative information on population figures in EU member-states can be obtained from the Statistical Office of the EU in Luxemburg (*Eurostat*). For a variety of reasons, however, reliable and comparable demographic information on IM groups in EU countries is difficult to obtain. Seemingly simple questions like *How many Turkish residents live in Germany compared to France?* cannot easily be answered (see Poulain, this volume). For some groups or countries, no updated information is available or no such data have ever been collected. Moreover, official statistics only reflect IM groups with legal resident status. Another source of disparity is the different data collection systems being used, ranging from nation-wide census data to administrative registers or to more or less representative surveys. Most importantly, however, the most widely used criteria for IM status – nationality and/or country of birth – have become less valid over time because of an increasing trend toward naturalisation and births within the countries of residence. In addition, most residents from former colonies already have the nationality of their country of immigration. In the context of our reference to nation-states, we will refer to nationality rather than citizenship. Even if the two concepts are commonly used as synonyms nowadays, we should be aware of their historical and contextual difference in denotation. Nationals belong to a nation-state but they may not have all the rights linked with citizenship (e.g., voting rights); in this sense, citizenship is a more inclusive concept than nationality.

For a discussion of the role of censuses in identifying population groups in a variety of multicultural nation-states, we refer to Kertzer and Arel (2002). Alterman (1969) offers a fascinating account of the history of counting people from the earliest known records on Babylonian clay tables in 3800 BC to the USA census in 1970. Besides the methods of counting, Alterman discusses at length who has been counted, and how, who not, and why. The issue of mapping identities through nationwide periodical censuses by state institutions is commonly coupled with a vigorous debate between proponents and opponents about the following “ethnic dilemma”: how can you combat discrimination if you do not measure diversity? (Kertzer and Arel 2002: 23–25). Both proponents and opponents of measuring diversity can be found (cf. Blum 2002 on this debate in France):

- proponents argue in terms of the social or scientific need for population data bases on diversity as prerequisites for affirmative action by government in such domains as labour, housing, health care, education or media policies;

- opponents argue in terms of the social or scientific risks of public or political misuse of such data bases for stereotyping, stigmatisation, discrimination or even removal of the “unwanted other”.

Kertzner and Arel (2002: 2) show that the census does much more than simply reflect social reality; rather it plays a key role in the construction of that reality and in the creation of collective identities. At the same time, it should be acknowledged that the census is a crucial area for the politics of representation. Census data can make people aware of under-representation. Language rights are often a key demand for minority groups on the basis of (home) language databases.

Decennial censuses became a common practice in Europe and the New World colonised by Europeans in the first part of the 19th century. The USA became the first newly established nation-state with a decennial census since 1790. The first countries to include a language question in their census, however, were Belgium in 1846 and Switzerland in the 1850s, both being European countries with more than one official state language (see Table 2). At present, in many EU countries, only population data on nationality and/or birth country (of person and/or parents) are available. To illustrate this, Table 4 gives comparative statistics of population groups in the Netherlands, based on the birth-country (BC) criterion (of person and/or mother and/or father – PMF) *versus* the nationality criterion, as derived from the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics (2000).

Table 4 shows strong criterion effects of birth country *versus* nationality. All IM groups are in fact strongly under-represented in nationality-based statistics. However, the combined birth-country criterion of person/ mother/father does not solve the identification problem either. The use of this criterion leads to non-identification in at least the following cases:

- an increasing group of third and further generations (cf. Indonesian/Moluccan and Chinese communities in the Netherlands);
- different ethnocultural groups from the same country of origin (cf. Turks and Kurds from Turkey or Berbers and Arabs from Morocco);
- the same ethnocultural group from different countries of origin (cf. Chinese from China and from other Asian countries);
- ethnocultural groups without territorial status (cf. Roma people).

From the data presented in Table 4, it becomes clear that collecting reliable information about the actual number and spread of IM population groups in EU countries is no easy enterprise. Krüger-Potratz et al. (1998) discuss the problem of criteria from a historical perspective in the context of the German *Weimarer*

Table 4. Population of the Netherlands based on the combined birth-country criterion (BC–PMF) versus the nationality criterion on January 1, 1999 (Antilleans are Dutch nationals; CBS 2000)

Groups	BC–PMF	Nationality	Absolute difference
Dutch	13,061,000	15,097,000	2,036,000
Turks	300,000	102,000	198,000
Moroccans	252,000	128,600	123,400
Surinamese	297,000	10,500	286,500
Antilleans	99,000	–	99,000
Italians	33,000	17,600	15,400
(former) Yugoslavs	63,000	22,300	40,700
Spaniards	30,000	16,800	13,200
Somalians	27,000	8,900	18,100
Chinese	28,000	7,500	20,500
Indonesians	407,000	8,400	398,600
Other groups	1,163,000	339,800	823,200
Total	15,760,000	15,760,000	–

Republik. In 1982, the *Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs* recognised the above-mentioned identification problems for inhabitants of Australia and proposed including questions on birth country (of person and parents), ethnic origin (based on self-categorisation in terms of which ethnic group a person considers him/herself to belong to) and home language use in their censuses. As yet, different experiences have been gained in EU countries with periodical censuses, and, if such censuses have been held, with questions on ethnicity or (home) language use. Given the decreasing significance of nationality and birth-country criteria, collecting reliable information about population groups in increasingly multicultural European nation-states has become one of the most challenging tasks facing demographers. In Table 5, the four criteria mentioned are discussed in terms of their major (dis)advantage.

First of all, Table 5 reveals that there is no simple solution to the identification problem. Moreover, inspection of the criteria utilised for statistics on multicultural population groups is as important as the actual figures themselves. Taken from a European perspective, there is a top-down development over time in the utility and utilisation of different types of criteria, inevitably going from nationality and birth-country criteria in present statistics to self-categorisation and home language in the future. The latter two criteria are generally conceived as complementary criteria. Self-categorisation and home language references

Table 5. Criteria for the definition and identification of population groups in a multicultural society (P/F/M = person/father/mother) (Extra and Yağmur 2004: 31)

Criterion	Advantages	Disadvantages
Nationality (NAT) (P/F/M)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – objective – relatively easy to establish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – (inter-generational) erosion through naturalisation or dual NAT – NAT not always indicative of ethnicity/identity – some (e.g., ex-colonial) groups have NAT of immigration country
Birth country (BC) (P/F/M)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – objective – relatively easy to establish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – inter-generational erosion through births in immigration country – BC not always indicative of ethnicity/identity – invariable/deterministic: does not take account of dynamics in society (in contrast of all other criteria)
Self-categorisation (SC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – affective (hearts and minds) – emancipatory: SC takes account of a person's own conception of ethnicity/identity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – subjective by definition: also determined by the language/ethnicity of the interviewer and by the mono/multi-cultural spirit of times – multiple SC possible – historically charged, especially by World War II experiences
Home language (HL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – HL is most significant criterion of ethnicity in communication processes – HL data are prerequisite for government policy in areas such as public information or education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – complex criterion: who speaks what language to whom and when? – language is not always a core value of ethnicity/identity – useless in one-person households, because of absence of interlocutors

need not coincide, as languages may be conceived to variable degrees as core values of ethnocultural identity in contexts of migration and minorisation.

7. The importance of language for identifying population groups

Complementary or alternative criteria for identifying population groups in a multicultural society have been suggested and used in countries with a longer immigration history, and, for this reason, with a longstanding history of collecting census data on multicultural population groups (Kertzer and Arel 2002). This holds in particular for non-European English-dominant immigration countries like Australia, Canada, South Africa, and the USA. To identify the multicultural composition of their populations, these four countries employ a variety of questions in their periodical censuses. In Table 6, an overview of the kernel array of questions is provided; for each country the given census is taken as the norm.

Both the type and number of questions are different for each of these countries. Canada has a prime position with the highest number of questions. Only three questions have been asked in all countries whereas two questions have been asked in only one country. Four different questions have been asked about language. The operationalisation of questions also shows interesting differences, both between and within countries over time (see Clyne 1991 for a discussion of methodological problems in comparing the answers to differently phrased ques-

Table 6. Overview of kernel census questions in four multicultural contexts (Extra and Yağmur 2004: 67)

Kernel questions in the census	Australia	Canada	South Africa	USA	Coverage
	2001	2001	2001	2000	
1 Nationality of respondent	+	+	+	+	4
2 Birth country of respondent	+	+	+	+	4
3 Birth country of parents	+	+	–	–	2
4 Ethnicity	–	+	–	+	2
5 Ancestry	+	+	–	+	3
6 Race	–	+	+	+	3
7 Mother tongue	–	+	–	–	1
8 Language used at home	+	+	+	+	4
9 Language used at work	–	+	–	–	1
10 Proficiency in English	+	+	–	+	3
11 Religion	+	+	+	–	3
Total of dimensions	7	11	5	7	30

tions in Australian censuses from a longitudinal perspective; see also Williams, this volume).

Questions about ethnicity, ancestry and/or race have proven to be problematic in all of the countries under consideration (see also Spencer 2006; Ansell and Solomos 2008). In some countries, ancestry and ethnicity have been conceived of as equivalent, cf. USA census question 10 in 2000: *What is this person's ancestry or ethnic origin?* Or, take Canadian census question 17 in 2001: *To which ethnic or cultural group(s) did this person's ancestors belong?* Australian census question 18 in 2001 only involved ancestry and not ethnicity, cf. *What is the person's ancestry?* with the following comments for respondents: *Consider and mark the ancestries with which you most closely identify. Count your ancestry as far as three generations, including grandparents and great-grandparents.* As far as ethnicity and ancestry have been distinguished in census questions, the former concept related most commonly to current self-categorisation of the respondent and the latter to former generations. The diverse ways in which respondents themselves may interpret both concepts, however, remains a problem that cannot be solved easily.

According to Table 6, South Africa remains as the only country where a racial question is asked instead of a question on ethnicity and/or ancestry. The paradox in South Africa is that questions on ethnicity are often considered to be racist, whereas the racial question (in terms of *Black/White/Coloured/Indian*) from the earlier Apartheid era has survived. Although the validity of questions about ethnicity, ancestry and/or race is problematic, at least one question from this cluster is needed to compare its outcomes with those of questions on language. The reason for this has been mentioned in Table 5: language is not always a core value of ethnicity/identity and multiculturalism may become under-estimated if reduced to multilingualism. For this reason, one or more questions derived from cluster 4–6 in Table 6 are necessary complements of one or more questions derived from cluster 7–10.

Whereas, according to Table 6, “ethnicity” has been mentioned in recent censuses of only two countries, four language-related questions have been asked in one to four countries. Only in Canada has the concept of “mother tongue” been included (census question 7). It has been defined for respondents as *the language first learnt at home in childhood and still understood*, whereas questions 8 and 9 were related to the language *most often* used at home/work. Table 6 shows the added value of language-related census questions for the definition and identification of multicultural populations, in particular the added value of the question on home language use compared to questions on the more opaque concepts of mother tongue and ethnicity. Although the language-related census questions in the four countries under consideration differ in their precise

formulation and commentary, the outcomes of these questions are generally conceived as cornerstones for educational policies with respect to the teaching of English as a first or second language and the teaching of languages other than English.

Table 6 also shows the importance of comparing different groups with equal criteria. Unfortunately, this is often not the case in public or political discourse. Examples of such unequal treatment are references to *Poles vs. Jews*, *Israelis vs. Arabs*, *Serbs and Croats vs. Muslims*, *Dutchmen vs. Turks* (for Dutch nationals with Turkish ethnicity), *Dutchmen vs. Muslims*, or *Islam vs. the West* (where does the West end when is the world a globe?). Equal treatment presupposes reference to equal dimensions in terms of Table 6.

From this overview, it can be concluded that large-scale home language surveys are both feasible and meaningful, and that the interpretation of the resulting database is made easier by transparent and multiple questions on home language use. These conclusions become even more pertinent in the context of gathering data on multicultural *school* populations. European experiences in this domain have been gathered in particular in Great Britain and Sweden. In both countries, extensive municipal home language statistics have been collected through local educational authorities by asking school children and/or parents questions about their oral and written skills in languages other than the mainstream language, and about their need for education in these languages.

An important similarity in the questions about home language use in these surveys is that the outcomes are based on reported rather than observed facts. Answers to questions on home language use may be coloured by the language of the questions themselves (which may or may not be the primary language of the respondent), by the ethnicity of the interviewer (which may or may not be the same as the ethnicity of the respondent), by the (perceived) goals of the sampling (which may or may not be defined by central state or local authorities), and by the spirit of the times (which may or may not be in favour of multiculturalism). These problems become even more evident in a school-related context in which pupils are respondents. Apart from the problems mentioned, the answers may be coloured by peer-group pressure and they may lead to interpretation problems in attempts to identify and classify languages on the basis of the answers given. For a discussion of these and other possible effects, we refer to Nicholas (1988) and Alladina (1993). The problems referred to are inherent characteristics of large-scale data gathering through questionnaires about language-related behaviour and can only be compensated by small-scale data gathering through observing actual language behaviour. Such small-scale ethnographic research is not an alternative to large-scale language surveys, but a necessary complement, as outlined in section 1. For a discussion of (cor)relations between the reported and

measured bilingualism of IM children in the Netherlands, we refer to Broeder and Extra (1998).

Throughout the EU, it is common practice to present data on RM groups on the basis of (home) language and/or ethnicity, and to present data on IM groups on the basis of nationality and/or country of birth. However, *convergence* between these criteria for the two groups appears over time, due to the increasing period of migration and minorisation of IM groups in EU countries. Due to their prolonged/permanent stay, there is strong erosion in the utility of nationality or birth-country statistics. Given the decreasing significance of nationality and birth-country criteria in the European context, the combined criteria of self-categorisation (ethnicity) and home language use are potentially promising alternatives for obtaining basic information on the increasingly multicultural composition of European nation-states. The added value of home language statistics is that they offer valuable insights into the distribution and vitality of home languages across different population groups and thus raise the awareness of multilingualism. Empirically collected data on home language use also play a crucial role in education. Such data will not only raise the awareness of multilingualism in multicultural schools; they are in fact indispensable tools for educational policies on the teaching of both the national majority language as a first or second language and the teaching of minority languages (see Extra and Yağmur, this volume).

8. Linguistic landscaping

A recent approach to mapping and measuring linguistic diversity in a given area is the so-called *linguistic landscape* approach. Although the concept of linguistic landscape can have several meanings (Gorter 2006), we refer here to the much-quoted definition given by Landry and Bourhis (1997) who introduced the concept in a paper on ethnolinguistic vitality in Quebec. Linguistic landscape concerns the way in which “the language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region or urban agglomeration” (Landry and Bourhis 1997: 25). If we follow this definition, the study of linguistic landscape becomes a new dimension in mapping and measuring linguistic diversity.

As Gorter (2006) observes, the presence of languages around us is often neglected: we do not pay much attention to the linguistic landscape that surrounds us. But the conformation of the linguistic landscape can be assumed to be a contributing factor in describing the language use characteristics of a given territory. In the same seminal paper, Landry and Bourhis (1997: 29) state that

“the linguistic landscape may act as the most observable and immediate index of the relative power and status of the linguistic communities inhabiting a given territory”. This statement underlines the informative and symbolic functions that the linguistic make-up and its conformation in multicultural, and thus multilingual, areas can have. The way in which the linguistic landscape is structured has an informative function because it signals the presence of specific linguistic communities within a given territory, represents their sociolinguistic composition, indicates the languages that may be used there, and provides information regarding the power and status attained by the languages involved. Furthermore, the presence and visibility of a language fulfils a symbolic function: it indicates a positive attitude on the part of ethnolinguistic groups towards their identity of origin. In this sense, the linguistic landscape can also be linked to the concept of “ethnolinguistic vitality” (Giles et al. 1977). The use of a language for social communication can be a sign of its level of vitality, and therefore represents one of the factors contributing to its maintenance (Barker and Giles 2002).

The term *linguistic landscape* came into use only recently. Although linguistic landscaping is a fairly new branch within sociolinguistic and applied linguistic studies, it enjoys a growing interest. Indicative of this growing interest is the fact that in recent conferences, such as those organised by the *European Second Language Association* (San Sebastian, Spain, 2002), the *International Association of Applied Linguistics* (Madison, USA, 2005), and at the *16th Sociolinguistic Symposium* (Limerick, Ireland, 2006), there were sessions organised specifically on the subject. A whole issue of the *International Journal of Multilingualism*, edited by Gorter (2006), deals with research on linguistic landscaping in different societies.

The places analysed to date, including some pioneering work before this field of research was really founded by Landry and Bourhis, have mainly been urban areas with a high density of plurilingualism (see Backhaus 2006 for detailed references). Investigations have concentrated primarily on those cities where the presence and contact of several languages has led to political and social conflict, such as Brussels (Tulp 1978; Wenzel 1996); Montreal (Monnier 1989; *Conseil de la Langue Française* 2000); Jerusalem (Rosenbaum et al. 1977; Spolsky and Cooper 1991), San Sebastian and Leeuwarden (Cenoz and Gorter 2006). Since the publication of Landry and Bourhis’s work, new studies have looked at cities that had already been analysed (such as Jerusalem: Ben-Rafael et al. 2004, 2006, in a comparative approach), but also in other urban areas, such as Lira Town in Uganda (Reh 2004), Hong Kong, Vienna, Beijing, Washington and Paris (Scollon and Scollon 2003); Tokyo (Backhaus 2006, 2007); Bangkok (Huebner 2006).