



ISET WORKING PAPER 15

APPROACHES TO MULTILINGUALISM IN EUROPE – SHARED VALUES AND CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

Hanna Komorowska

Warsaw School of Social Science and Humanities

Warsaw University

Email: hannakomo@data.pl

March 2010

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author, and do not represent the collective view of ISET.

Institute for the Study of European Transformations (ISET)

166-220 Holloway Road, London N7 8DB

Telephone: +44 (0)20 7133 2927

Email: iset@londonmet.ac.uk

www.londonmet.ac.uk/iset

ABSTRACT

The present paper will discuss the main trends in the language policy as demonstrated in recent documents of the Council of Europe and of the European Union, present main European tools and documents, as well as identify both the shared values and differences of ways 'old' and 'new' EU member states deal with linguistic diversity and the role of history and cultural heritage in shaping present-day attitudes. It will also analyse doubts and controversies arising over various issues related to multilingualism such as the need for a *lingua franca*, attitudes to English in this role, the value of protecting regional and ethnic languages vis-à-vis its cost, and the choice of strategies to face the challenges of multilingualism in the educational context. Areas where tensions arise and compromise is necessary will be identified and directions for the future language policy will be outlined on the example of the work of the EU High Level Group on Multilingualism and its recommendations for the promotion of multilingualism in Europe.

Key words: multilingualism, European policy, language policy,
second/foreign language teaching, *lingua franca*, language
protection

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The text is based on a guest talk given within the frame of the European Interdisciplinary Autumn 2009 Seminar Series 'Sustaining Diversities' organized by the Institute for the Study of European Transformations (ISET), London Metropolitan University. The author wishes to thank ISET for the invitation.

MULTILINGUALISM – LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY AND LANGUAGE EDUCATION

The question of languages had for centuries been absent from international politics. Languages spoken within the changing borders of empires – languages imposed, promoted or banned – had been considered part of the internal policy of each ruler or each government. It is only in the late 20th century that the question of linguistic diversity entered the realm of international debates, first as a basic human rights issue, later as one of the most important aspects of education which was growing to be seen as an important prerequisite of democracy and economic development.

Whether we like it or not, different languages do not enjoy the same status. There are numerous reasons for the varying status of languages, military power, economy, history, religion and ethnicity being the most powerful factors. What adds to the complexity of the situation is that the status of languages is a dynamic phenomenon, which is demonstrated by the emergence of independent languages such as Macedonian and Croatian along with the emergence of respective independent states, by the slow disappearance of languages such as Lusatian due to the lack of support of its own nation state, by the gradual loss of the status of Byelorussian due to cultural and political dependence on Russia, or by the revival or even creation of languages from a variety of local dialects, which is the case of Kashubian, codified and successfully promoted by the local elites in the last two decades (Rzetelska-Feleszko 2002).

Although in some countries more than one official language is spoken, the EU's official language regime, as Palomero (2007: 1) points out, 'hinges (with few exceptions) on the "one State / one language" criterion'. This approach, however no longer adequate, has strong historical roots, as particular member states were often seen to have treated the language as the backbone of the state and insisted on internal homogenisation. In some cases a larger number of languages spoken on the territory of the state were the reason for this and in others external factors were at work, e.g. when communities wanted to differentiate themselves from their opponents.

It is, however, impossible to keep languages within the borders of the state, so they are often spoken astride a political border. In some cases the language enjoys full and equivalent recognition by both states as is the case with French in France and Belgium or Dutch in The Netherlands and Belgium, but often the status of these languages can also be unbalanced across the border as illustrated by Danish in Germany, German in France or French in Italy (Palomero 2007: 2).

Languages spoken on territories which do not coincide with state borders are often referred to in the neighbouring country as minority languages. There are, however, communities using those languages in states which are not divided by a common border. The situation of those languages is quite different; languages with a 'kin state' are in fact not at all minority languages – it is the community which speaks them that finds itself in a minority situation in another member state as is the case with German or Ukrainian in Poland or Polish in the Czech Republic. Ethnic languages which do not have a state of their own, even if they are spoken in several states, like Catalan, do not enjoy the protection of a powerful state and, however actively maintained and used in the respective communities, need a specific degree of support in the European language policy.

Migrant and non-territorial languages are always in a more difficult situation, which cannot be ignored by educational decision-makers because of the fact that the number of migrant languages in Europe is constantly growing. The VALEUR project, coordinated by CILT and completed within the frames of the second medium-term programme of activities 2004-2007 launched by the European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz Project, identified 458 languages spoken in the schools of 22 European states (www.ecml.at/mtp2/valeur, December 2007).

The two most important European institutions, i.e. the Council of Europe and the European Union, are the first international bodies to acknowledge the problem and to engage in research and reflection on challenges and ways of overcoming difficulties through a coherent language policy as well as through education.

THE LANGUAGE POLICY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

The Council of Europe has a long record of activities related to languages.

In 1970 the Council commissioned the first notional-functional language syllabus which soon gave rise to a number of communicative syllabi such as *Breakthrough*, *Waystage the Threshold Level* and *Vantage and Mastery*. The Communicative Approach to second and foreign language teaching and learning was then promoted through the activities within Project no 4 and Project no 12 of the Council of Europe. The Council also supported teacher education in member countries with special aid given to Eastern Europe in the decade after the fall of communism.

Since 1998 the Council of Europe's language policy has been based on *Recommendation (98) 6* encouraging member states to:

- develop learners' skills in more than one language;
- increase the number of languages taught in the school systems;
- encourage flexibility in syllabus design;
- promote new technologies in language education;
- organize pedagogical exchanges to support language learning and
- ensure possibilities of life-long language learning.

At present the Council of Europe, through its Language Policy Division, focuses on political issues at individual, national and supranational levels. With this end two concepts have been introduced, namely of *plurilingualism* and *multilingualism*. In the terminology of the Council plurilingualism is related to the psycholinguistic aspect, i.e. to the individual use of more than one language, while multilingualism is related to the sociolinguistic aspect, i.e. to coexistence of several languages in a given region or state whose members are not necessarily plurilingual.

A variety of strategies have been recommended by the Council of Europe to promote both plurilingualism and multilingualism as demonstrated by the document entitled *From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe* authored by J.P. Beacco and M. Byram, first published in 2002 and revised in 2007 and by *Recommendation CM/Rec(2008)7 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the Use of the Council of Europe's*

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and the Promotion of Plurilingualism, adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 2 July 2008 in Strasbourg.

It is worth noting that activities of the Council of Europe were in harmony with those undertaken by the European Union as demonstrated in two reports prepared for the European Commission, i.e. *The Diversity of Language Teaching in the European Union* (Strubell et al. 2007) and the *Final Report of the High Level Group on Multilingualism* presented to the European Commission in 2007.

At the school level the Council promotes the so-called *whole language policy* based on the assumption that every teacher is a language teacher and for that reason a need arises for cooperation not only between mother tongue teachers and teachers of other languages, but also between language teachers and teachers of all the other subjects.

The main documents and tools of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg are the following:

- *European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages* (5.XI.1992) now signed by 19 countries;
- *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages – Learning, Teaching, Assessment* (2001); *Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe* (Beacco and Byram 2002, revised in 2005);
- *European Language Portfolio* first piloted in 2000–2001 (Schärer 2001) with more than 100 versions of national documents now validated by the Council of Europe and
- *European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages*. (Newby et al. 2007).

THE LANGUAGE POLICY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

The language policy of the European Union is mainly connected with the Lisbon strategy (2000), according to which Europe was expected to become a leading economy by 2010. Ways to achieve it were laid out in what is often called 'Berlin Declaration of 2001' in relation to quality assurance in higher education (*Language*

Studies in Higher Education: A Key Contribution to European Integration 2001) and in the recommendations of the European Council in Barcelona from the year 2002 where the formula of the mother tongue plus 2 languages to be taught in the educational systems of the EU member countries was accepted as stated in the report of the European Council from 15 and 16 March 2002 (European Council 2002a).

From the very beginning the role of teacher education has been emphasized very strongly and concrete activities and tools have been developed, such as the *European Profile of the Language Teacher* (Kelly and Grenfell 2004).

The issue of multilingualism was approached in 2005 in the *New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism* which encouraged EU member states

- to maintain the multilingual nature of the EU's institutions, based on its translation and interpretation services;
- to underline the major role that languages and multilingualism play in the European economy;
- to encourage all citizens to learn and speak more languages.

In spite of all those efforts some worrying trends have been noticed. Firstly, the average number of foreign languages being learnt in secondary education shows no sign of attaining the objectives set by the Barcelona European Council. Secondly, the range of languages taught is often extremely narrow. And thirdly, language skills are still unevenly spread – disparities can namely be seen between central and peripheral regions, between older and more recent member states and between age groups and social classes.

In order to counteract these worrying trends a number of activities have been undertaken. Only in the year 2007 a new portfolio for multilingualism was created, Leonard Orban was appointed Commissioner for Multilingualism, a Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue (GIID) led by Amin Maalouf was asked to advise the EU on intercultural issues and the High Level Group on Multilingualism (HLGM) was formed. In their report the GIID came up with the idea of a 'personal adoptive language' (*Report. Group of Intellectuals for the Intercultural Dialogue. A*

Rewarding Challenge 2008) and the HLGGM published a report listing recommendations for the promotion of language education (*Final Report, High Level Group on Multilingualism* 2007). Both gave an impetus for further analysis of the situation in the EU as can be seen in the document entitled *An Inventory of Community Actions in the Field of Multilingualism and Results of the Online Public Consultation 2008*, the document entitled *Promotion of Multilingualism in the 31 Countries of the Lifelong-Learning Programme. Final Report 2008* as well as in the *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Multilingualism: An Asset for Europe and a Shared Commitment* from September 2008.

SHARED VALUES IN THE LANGUAGE POLICY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE AND THE EUROPEAN UNION.

The main foci shared by the two main European institutions are related to

- implementing strategies which guarantee that citizens and institutions can gain access to decisions and information on the European policy in their own language;
- increasing effort to promote better understanding and communication between citizens guaranteeing their cultural identity and linguistic diversity.

In the field of education both institutions promote

- the teaching of two foreign languages in the school system;
- the early start for the first FL;
- lowering the starting age for the second FL;
- support for education in regional and ethnic minority languages and
- ensuring quality of language education.

Rationale for the above aims and policies at the social level is mainly connected with the contribution of language skills to economic growth. Education is seen as investment, especially considering the fact that economic losses due to the lack of language skills amount to 100 billion euro per year in the sector of small and medium enterprises, the so-called SMEs, as demonstrated by the *ELAN Study* commissioned by the *European Commission* in 2005 and completed a year later (*ELAN 2006*). Contribution of language skills to the peace process is also stressed as interaction and communication are believed to lead to a deeper knowledge of other communities and their cultures and in consequence to prevent stereotyping, promote tolerance and counteract xenophobia. Last but not least, contribution of language skills to general education is emphasized and especially their role in developing competences transferable to other, non-linguistic areas.

Rationale for the shared aims and policies at the individual level is related to research showing that language education supports attention, memory, concept formation, critical and divergent thinking as well as problem-solving, provides support for special educational needs (S.E.N.) students, promotes tolerance, helps develop sensitivity to

interaction, interpersonal skills and intercultural competence, strengthens cognitive control and facilitates the future learning of other languages, increases the chances of employability and professional career and is even demonstrated to delay mental dementia (Belz 2002, Bialystok, E., Craik, F., Grady, C., Chau, W., Ishii, R., Gunjii, A., Pantev, C. 2005, Bialystok 2006, Bialystok, E., F. Craik, M. Freedman 2007, Goetz 2003, Kharkhourin 2008, Kormi-Nouri et al. 2008).

The beneficial impact of multilingualism is visible especially when languages are acquired through various forms of immersion, bilingual education or CLIL, i.e. content and language integrated learning (Lazaruk 2007, Marsh and Hill 2009, Sierra 2008, Zydatiss 2009).

Research areas which are recommended as crucial for the present day and which characterize the development of the field in the 21st century are the following:

- transversal competences, e.g. reading comprehension, and transferable competences, e.g. learning strategies (Braun 2007);
- multicompetence (Cook 1992, 2002, Herdina and Jessner 2002, Kormi-Nouri et al. 2008);
- early bilingualism (Singleton and Lesniewska 2009, Muñoz 2006) / early start (Curtain 2003, Enever 2006, Nikolov (ed) 2009) and
- intercomprehension (Doyé 2005, Hufeisen and Marx 2009).

QUESTIONS, DOUBTS AND CONTROVERSIES IN THE FIELD OF LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND POLICY

Although there seems to be full agreement as to the value of language learning and the need for protection of regional and ethnic languages, some doubts and controversies seem to be unavoidable in relation to the complexity of the issue.

Questions are raised as to the role of English and whether it is a killer language or a voice-giving language, as to the status of languages, e.g. the so-called conference languages vs. the less widely used ones, and as to strategies for the promotion of regional and ethnic languages.

Do we need a *lingua franca* for Europe?

The main controversy revolves around the question whether a *lingua franca* for Europe is needed at all. The problem lies in the conflict between the pragmatic objective, which is to communicate and exchange ideas, and two other important aims, i.e. the intercultural objective to promote tolerance and the sociopolitical one to protect linguistic diversity. The pragmatic objective is relatively easy to achieve through agreeing on a *lingua franca*, but the other two aims can only be successfully pursued if no dominant language overshadows the linguistic diversity of the region.

This controversy is best summarized by the now-famous quote:

how could language educational policies avoid the Scylla of a market-driven tendency of linguistic homogenisation and the Charybdis of communicative isolation within multilingual diversity? (Breidbach 2002: 16).

History shows that people have always needed a common language for international contacts and various languages, such as Greek, Latin or French, have in different periods been used in this function. It is hard to imagine that such a basic need would fade away, especially in the globalised world of facilitated face-to-face encounters and dense, immediate on-line contacts. A need for a *lingua franca* is further confirmed by the unilateral interest in ethnic minority languages, used as home languages and even selected as languages of education within ethnic communities, but not learnt as foreign languages by those using the majority language.

What is interesting to note is how languages come to be accepted or rejected in their role of *linguae francae*. It is worth noting that Russian, although obligatory for all the school and university students in the countries of the former Soviet bloc, has never gained the status of a *lingua franca* outside the territory of the Soviet Union. To distance themselves from the regime and to oppose the political message of making Russian an obligatory school subject, the older generation of citizens would use French and German in international contacts in the region, while the younger generation would go for English (Komorowska 2005).

If we do need a *lingua franca*, must we decide on English?

The second controversy springs from the popularity of English. Many voices can be heard, especially in countries whose languages had been widely spoken in the past, which undermine the role of English, calling it 'a killer language', yet statistics seem to support its status as the international language.

Language learners and users deal with this controversy in a very straightforward way, that is by voting with their feet. They choose a language they consider most useful and take FL courses which seem to be the best investment in their future private and professional contacts. In spite of recommendations by the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe to broaden the language offer in schools and to encourage students to learn less widely used languages, learners decide to take up English as their main foreign language.

Statistics leave us with not much doubt. The Inner Circle which embraces those who speak English as their first language (L1) is estimated at around 320–380 million, the Outer Circle, including those who speak English as their second language (L2), at 150–300 million and the Expanding Circle, grouping those who learn English as a foreign language, at 100–1,000 million. 83–98% of research is published through the medium of English, and 80% of the content of the Internet is English (Graddol 2006). *Key Data on Teaching Languages at Schools in Europe* collected by EURYDICE reveal that at the primary level 60% of learners take English as a foreign language, only 4% take German, and 6% take French. At the secondary level the situation is even more favourable for English as 90% of learners take this language, while 20% take French, and the same percentage (20%) take German (*Key Data on Teaching Languages at Schools in Europe 2008*).

The above confirms not only the need for a *lingua franca*, but also the increasing role of English as a global language. Yet many people tend to think that even though a *lingua franca* is a concept to be supported for its pragmatic value, English, often called the *killer language*, should not be allowed to play this global role. Arguments are given in favour of the so called *trap scenario* (Alexander 1999), according to

which English belittles national languages and cultures, and leads to consumerism and macdonaldization.

This line of reasoning is counteracted by those who promote the concept of the *liberation scenario*, according to which English broadens educational and occupational chances of citizens and facilitates the political expression of countries which – like the countries of Central and Eastern Europe – would otherwise stand no chance of being heard on the European political scene. The remarks in section 5.1. above concerning the refusal to use Russian as a *lingua franca* in this part of Europe show how the political context paved the way for the quick and easy acceptance of English in this role – a situation distinctly different in the ‘new member countries’ from that in quite a few ‘older’ EU member states (Komorowska 2006a).

There seems, however, to be a third way, i.e. that of functional realism where conflicting aims and approaches could be harmonized by means of using the Barcelona formula of teaching the mother tongue plus 2 foreign languages. Home languages would then be preserved, cross-European communication could be achieved, as one of the two foreign languages could be English, and linguistic diversity could be promoted through the choice of the second foreign language (Seidlhofer 2002).

Should certain languages, and especially English, be mandatory in the school systems of Europe?

Using the Barcelona formula gives rise to yet another question, namely that related to whether any language, and especially English, should become an obligatory subject in the school system. There are countries which answer this question in the affirmative for reasons such as globalisation, market-economy and mobility. Their number today amounts to 13 of the EU member states. Some of them have languages spoken by large proportions of EU citizens, e.g. German is spoken as the first language by 24% of EU citizens (*Key Data on Teaching Languages at Schools in Europe 2008*).

An almost equal number of EU member countries prefer the free choice of languages in the educational system, even if the system requires the obligatory learning of a certain number of foreign languages in the curriculum. Reasons for leaving the choice of languages open to the learner vary quite considerably and range from unhappy traditions of imposed languages in the past (as in the example of German and Russian, imposed on Poland which was erased from the map as a result of partitions in the years 1772–1918, and Russian which under communism was made obligatory for all learners over the age of 11), through teacher shortages or the multilingual context of a given region to straightforward refusal to contribute to the promotion of e.g. English, a language which is often believed to be able to successfully promote itself.

As can be seen, the role of history, geography and cultural heritage is immense not only in deciding the differential status of languages, but also in taking decisions related to the linguistic policy in the educational system.

Which variety of the language to teach – e.g. learner’s English or user’s English?

The question concerning the variety of English to be taught is relatively new. Almost till the end of the 20th century the answer was obvious and the belief that we need to provide the learner with the best model of educated English was never doubted. This common attitude of curriculum constructors, syllabus designers and language teachers was based on the shared set of aims identified for all the courses of English as a second or foreign language, which were supposed

- to prepare learners for communication with native-speakers;
- to prepare learners for communication in English speaking countries;
- to prepare learners to communicate within the sociocultural norms of native-speakers and
- to help learners to develop near-native competence (Gnutzmann 2000, Seidlhofer 2002, Poelzl 2003, Jenkins 2005, Ringbom 2007).

The controversy, noticed, described and analysed in the last decade, springs from the fact that those aims are no longer valid. In this drastically changed situation

radical solutions are promoted, such as teaching what non-native users in functional communication actually say (Jenkins 2000 and 2005), equally often balanced by less revolutionary suggestions to emphasise the communicative value of messages, concentrate on fluency rather than on accuracy and develop intercultural competence rather than offer information on sociocultural aspects of life in the English-speaking countries (Komorowska 2006b).

Has enough been done to protect regional and ethnic languages?

A lot seems to have been done in order to help, protect and promote regional and ethnic languages: The Maastricht Treaty (1992) speaks of the 'languages of the Member States' rather than of the language of each country, the European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages (EBLUL) specifically deals with all the issues related to less widely used languages (LWULs) and the Mercator network offers assistance through its three documentation centres for education, law and media. Many other activities of this type are now being carried out and co-financed within projects on social inclusion and regional co-operation.

Yet more and more voices can be heard drawing attention to the fact that educational policies do not prove sufficient to protect regional and ethnic languages. What is more, new difficulties arise. The ruling of the Court of Justice in 1998 stopped those activities financed by the EU which had no previous basis and thus suspended the budget line for minority languages. Economic decisions related to the labelling (2000) and free movement (2006) of goods require the use of official languages of the EU and in consequence mean a step back from what was achieved in the Maastricht Treaty (Palomero 2007: 11–12).

For these reasons regional languages strive for the official status which would – as it is hoped – provide dignity and recognition to their speakers. This would, however, happen at a certain cost: using ethnic languages as working languages of the European Union would at the same time increase the role of relay languages and strengthen the role of English, which is feared by many. It is enough to say that a total of 506 interpreters would be needed to cater for all the existing pairs of

languages with only 46 needed for 3 relay languages, i.e. English, French and German. The controversy over the distinction into 'official languages of the EU' and 'languages of the EU' means, therefore, a conflict between striving for status and the risk of the 'the more languages, the more English' tendency (de Swaan 2001, de Swaan 2007).

Doubts also arise as to the type and level of engagement on the part of governments when it comes to policies related to multilingualism on their territories. Ethnic minorities in Poland may well illustrate the problem. Unequal engagement has for many years been noticed on the part of particular ethnic minorities in making use of linguistic benefits. A very strong engagement is demonstrated by the Lithuanians, speaking a minority language in Poland, and the Kashubians, speaking a regional language, while the Byelorussian minority seems to be relatively less interested in profiting from legal and financial possibilities to support its language and culture. Huge differences can also be seen in the field of education and schooling with e.g. the German minority being much more active in promoting education through its language than other minorities. The question arises whether the government ought to engage in activating other minorities.

Varying opinions are also voiced in relation to decisions concerning whether the government should encourage ethnic language education at secondary and tertiary levels of schooling. All the ethnic minorities in Poland show a tendency to favour the language education pyramid, i.e. they show a relatively strong interest in education through the medium of their own language at the primary level and gradually lose this interest throughout lower secondary education to move on to education through the language of the majority at the upper secondary level. Numbers speak for themselves – in Poland there are over 470 minority / regional / ethnic language primary schools with 70% of all the ethnic minorities teachers, but no more than 170 lower secondary schools with 25% of all the ethnic minority teachers and only 12 upper secondary schools with 5% of the teachers (Komorowska 2005).

There is no unanimous agreement as to whether the authorities should encourage language and culture oriented activities in less active communities or just respond to

needs already voiced by particular ethnic minorities, though the second option is in fact more often pursued.

LOOKING AHEAD

Directions for the future **language policy** suggest activities which would be related to empower minority and regional languages through supporting their use both in the EU and in member states and to promote successful activities and projects (Strubell 2007). It is also considered beneficial to recognize the value of bilingual communities as laboratories of good practice, which was stressed at the meeting of project coordinators at the ECML, Graz (24-25 November, 2009). What is also urgently needed are steps to create a European public space as, although numerous professional contacts are established and maintained, there seems to be insufficient support for the translation of literature. Moreover, according to many views the existing international media intensify americanisation in content and anglicisation in the language used (de Swaan 2007).

Directions for the **educational policy** are most clearly presented in the documents of the European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz, attached to the Council of Europe.

Recommendations and activities already being carried out include:

- empowering learners through developing learning to learn skills and learner autonomy;
- encouraging schools to provide a broader offer of languages;
- developing in-school, whole-school and out-of-school approaches to language teaching;
- promoting content and language integrated learning (CLIL);
- supporting the teaching of languages for specific / occupational purposes;
- ensuring the quality of language education e.g. through the modularisation of language courses and
- empowering teachers through raising the quality of language teacher education, strengthening professional networks and providing tools for assessment, self-assessment and reflection, such as the *European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages* now translated into 10 languages.

Directions for the language and education policy call for decisions related to the choice of ***motivational strategies*** (Komorowska 2007). Some of those suggested in the Report by the High Level Group on Multilingualism of the European Union include:

- setting realistic goals, capitalizing on positive experience, designing language courses on the solid fundament of needs analysis, and modularising and selecting full or partial competences needed;
- providing information on how to learn and Internet support, e.g. websites with published materials, educational portals and support material on-line;
- making languages visible, e.g. through providing links to sports and music, or presenting successful learners and
- making languages attractive through 'edutainment', documentaries on life and customs in a given country or supporting functional literacy in the media by means of subtitling or using digital TV (*Final Report. High Level Group on Multilingualism 2007*).

All the aims and objectives mentioned above can be successfully achieved if useful programmes and activities of the Council of Europe and of the European Union, such as *Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity 2003* or *A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism 2005*, are continued to be supported in the future. Those deserving special attention are:

- the EU 2007–2013 Life-Long Learning Programme (LLL) with 7000 million euro over 7 years;
- language support activities in programmes such as *Comenius*, *Erasmus*, *Leonardo da Vinci*, *Grundtvig*, *The European Language Label*, *eTwinning*, *ICT*, *Naric* and *Days of Languages*;
- activities promoting plurilingualism and multilingualism carried out by the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg and
- projects conducted within the frames of the programmes of the European Centre of Modern Languages in Graz.

REFERENCES

Alexander, R. J. 1999. 'Caught in a global English trap, or liberated by a *lingua franca*? Unravelling some aims, claims and dilemmas of the English language teaching profession'. In: Gnutzmann, C. (ed). 1999. *Teaching and Learning English as a Global Language: Native and Non-Native Perspectives*. Tuebingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.

A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism. 2005. Communication from the Commission to the Council the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Brussels.

An Inventory of Community Actions in the Field of Multilingualism and Results of the Online Public Consultation (2008). Commission Staff Working Document. Accompanying Document to the

Beacco, J.-C., M. Byram. 2002, revised 2007. *From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Belz, J. 2002. The myth of the deficient communicator. *Language Teaching Research*, 6, pp.59–82.

Bialystok, E. 2006. Effect of bilingualism and computer video game experience on the Simon task. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 60, pp. 68–79.

Bialystok, E., F. Craik, M. Freedman. 2007. Bilingualism as a protection against the onset of dementia. *Neuropsychologia*, 45, pp. 459–464.

Bialystok, E., F. Craik, C. Grady, W. Chau, R. Ishii, A. Gunjii, C. Pantev. 2005. Effect of bilingualism on cognitive control in the Simon task. Evidence from MEG. *Neuroimage*, 24, 1, pp. 40–49.

Braun, A. 2007. Immersion et compréhension en lecture. In: Puren, L. & S. Babault (eds) *L'éducation au-delà des frontières*. Paris: L'Harmattan, pp. 215–257.

Breidbach, S. 2002. *Plurilingualism, Democratic Citizenship in Europe and the Role of English*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Byram, M., B. Gribkova, H. Starkey. 2002. *Developing the Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Common European Framework for Languages. Learning – Teaching – Assessment. 2001. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Multilingualism: An Asset for Europe and a Shared Commitment. 2008. Brussels: The European Commission.

Cook, V. 1992. Evidence for multi-competence. *Language Learning*, 42, 4, pp. 557–591.

Cook, V. 2002. Background to the L2 user. In V. Cook (ed). *Portraits of the L2 User*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp 1–28.

Curtain, H., C. A. Dahlberg. 2003. *Languages and Children. A Perfect Match*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

De Swaan, A. 2001. *Words of the world. The Global language System*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

De Swaan. 2007. The language predicament of the EU since the enlargements. In *Sociolinguistica*, 21, pp. 1-21.

Doyé, P. 2005. *Intercomprehension. Guide for the Development of Language Policies in Europe: From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education*. Strasbourg: Language Policy Division, Council of Europe.

ELAN, 2006. *Effects on the European Economy of Shortages of Foreign Language Skills in Enterprise*. 2006.

http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lang/doc/elan_final_report_en.pdf

Enever, J. 2006. Implementing an early start: learning from others across Europe, www.britishcouncil.de/pdf/2006_conference.pdf, pp. 34–39.

European Charter for Regional and Minority Rights. 5.XI.1992. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

European Commission. 2002. *Education and Training in Europe: Diverse Systems, Shared Goals for 2010*. Brussels: European Commission.

European Council. 2002. Stockholm European Council. Presidency Conclusions. *Press Release 100/01/01*.

European Council. 2002a. Barcelona European Council. Presidency Conclusions. *Press Release 100/1/02*.

Final Report. High Level Group on Multilingualism. 2007. Brussels: The European Commission.

Gajo, L. & C. Serra. 2002. Bilingual teaching; Connecting language and concepts in mathematics. In: So, D. & G. Jones (eds). *Education and Society in Plurilingual Contexts*. Brussels: VUB Brussels University Press, pp. 75–95.

Gnutzmann, C. 2000. *Lingua Franca (Especially English): Functions, Role, Evolution – Teaching and Learning Issues – Striving for Plurilingualism*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Goetz, P. 2003. The effects of bilingualism on theory of mind development. *Bilingualism; Language and Cognition*, 6, 1, pp. 1–15.

Graddol, D. (ed). 2006. *The Future of English*. London: The British Council.

Herdina, P., U. Jessner. 2002. *A Dynamic Model of Multilingualism: Perspectives of Change in Psycholinguistics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hufeisen B., N. Marx. 2007. *EuroComGerm – Die Sieben Siebe: Germanische Sprachen lesen lernen*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.

Jenkins, J. 2000. *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. 2005. ELF at the gate: the position of English as a Lingua Franca. *Humanizing Language Teaching*, 7, 2, pp. 3–12.

Kelly, M., M. Grenfell. 2004. *European Profile of Language Teacher Education*. Southampton: University of Southampton.

Key Data on Teaching Languages at Schools in Europe. 2008 Edition. Eurydice. The information network on education in Europe. Brussels: The European Unit.

Kharkhurin, A. 2008. The effect of linguistic proficiency, age of second language acquisition and length of exposure to a new cultural environment on bilinguals' divergent thinking. *Bilingualism; Language and Cognition*, 11, 2, pp. 225–243.

Komorowska, H. 2005. Linguistic policy effects of the European Union enlargement. In: R. Festauer et al. (eds). 2005. *Mehrsprachigkeit und Kommunikation in der Diplomatie*. Wien: Diplomatische Akademie; Favorita Papers 04/2005, pp. 35–51.

Komorowska, H. 2006a. Teaching English as a *lingua franca*. In: J. Zybert (ed). 2006. *Issues in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 111–123.

Komorowska, H. 2006b. Intercultural competence in ELT syllabus and materials design. *Scripta Neophilologica Posnaniensia*, VIII, pp. 59–83.

Komorowska, H. 2007. Issues in the language policy of the European Union. Motivation as a key factor in promoting language learning. *Glottodidactica*, XXXIII, pp. 7–19.

Kormi-Nouri R., R.-S. Shojaeil, S. Moniri, A.-R. Gholami, A.-R. Moradi, S. Akbrai Zardhaneh, L.-G. Nilsson. 2008. The effect of childhood bilingualism on episodic and semantic memory task. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 49, pp. 93–109.

Language Studies in Higher Education: A Key Contribution to European Integration. 2001 Declaration of the Members of the Scientific Committee of the Berlin European Year of Languages Conference, Berlin.

Lazaruk, W. 2007. Linguistic, academic and cognitive benefits of French Immersion. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63, 5, pp. 605–628.

Marsh, D., R. Hill. 2009. *Study on the Contribution of Multilingualism to Creativity. Final Report.* Brussels: European Commission. www.europublic.com.

McKay, S. 2002. *Teaching English as an International Language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Moore, D. 2006. Plurilingualism and strategic competence in context. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 3, 2, pp. 125–138.

Muñoz, C. 2006. *Age and the Rate of Foreign Language Learning.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Newby, D., R. Allan, A. B. Fenner, H. Komorowska, B. Jones, K. Soghikyan. 2007. *European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages.* Graz: European Centre for Modern Languages; Council of Europe Publishing.

http://www.ecml.at/mtp2/FTE/html/FTE_E_news.htm.

Nikolov, M. (ed). 2009. *Early Learning of Modern Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Palomero, J. 2007. *The Specific Obstacles to the Promotion of 'Regional and Minority' Languages*. A report for the High Level Group on Multilingualism, 16 March 2007.

Poelzl, U. 2003. Signalling cultural identity: the use of L1/Ln in ELF. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 12, 2, pp. 3–23.

Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004–2006. 2003. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Brussels.

Promotion of Multilingualism in the 31 Countries of the Lifelong-Learning Programme. Final Report 2008. Brussels: The European Commission.

Recommendation no R (98) 6 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States concerning Modern Languages. 1998. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Recommendation CM/Rec (2008)7 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the Use of the Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and the Promotion of Plurilingualism. Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 2 July 2008. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Report. Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue. A Rewarding Challenge. 2008. Brussels: The European Commission.

Ringbom, H. 2007. *Cross-linguistic Similarity in Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Rzetelska-Feleszko, E. 2002. Language and Nationality. The Example of Kashubians and Macedonians. In: J. Sujecka (ed). 2002. *The National Idea as a Research Problem*. Warsaw: SOW, pp. 305–324.

Schärer, R. 2001. *European Language Portfolio. Final Report on the Pilot Project*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Seidlhofer, B. 2002. *A Concept of International English and Related Issues: From 'Real English' to 'Realistic English'*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Sierra, J. 2008. Assessment of bilingual education in the Basque Country. In: Cenoz, J. (ed). *Teaching through Basque. Achievements and Challenges*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 39–47.

Singleton, D., J. Lesniewska. 2009. Age and second language acquisition – research highways and byways. In: M. Pawlak (ed). 2009. *New Perspectives on Individual Differences in Language Learning and Teaching*. Poznan – Kalisz: Uniwersytet Adama Mickiewicza Press, pp.109–124.

Strubell, M., S.Vilaró, G. Williams, G.O.Williams. 2007. *The Diversity of Language Teaching in the European Union*. Report for the European Commission, DG EAC. Brussels: European Commission.

VALEUR Project Report. Valuing All Languages in Europe. Graz: ECML www.ecml.at/mtp2/valeur. December 2007.

Zydatiss, W. 2009. *Deutsch-Englische Zuege in Berlin (DEZIBEL) Eine Evaluation des bilingualen Sachfachunterrichts an Gymnasien*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.