

# **Mobility and Inclusion in Multilingual Europe (MIME)**

A preview of research  
results

**WP1 – POLITICS**

Brussels – 27 April 2017  
Fondation Universitaire



The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement No. 613334 (Project MIME).



# Introduction

- WP1: POLITICS – Language, Society and Power (UVA-ES, Sciences Po, MTA-TK)
- Are existing governance arrangements, like Multi-Level Governance (MLG), and subsidiarity in the EU for traditional territorial minorities relevant for managing new forms of linguistic diversity due to non-territorial, mobile minorities such as Third-country Nationals (TCN), Internally Mobile European Citizens (IMEC), expats, Mixed Language Families (LF-MiX), etc.?
- Can existing government arrangements for European minority languages be adapted to facilitate mobility for members of other language groups?
- Can this, in association with accompanying measures, also facilitate inclusion?



# Conceptual / theoretical treatment

- In present European practice, migrant languages in national contexts have hardly received any recognition. On the other hand, traditional territorial minorities in such contexts have received recognition in European frameworks, like the Council of Europe's Framework Convention for National Minorities (FCNM), and the European Charter for Regional Minority Languages (ECRML) in terms of the territoriality and/or personality principle.
- These principles can be combined with the existing MLG arrangements in the EU that is inherent in the MIME approach distinguishing different levels of governance, i.e. macro-, meso-, and micro-levels.
- A subset of the language rights covered by the personality principle in traditional minority language recognition could be used to extend a system of language rights towards immigrant communities.



# Data and factual information 1

Case studies executed by WP1 that reflect on these issues:

- Comparison with cases of migrant language management outside the EU. States with multi-level governance, like Canada, display interprovincial migration (Sciences Po, desk research).
- Serbia's Vojvodina accommodating five traditional minority languages: Serbian, Hungarian, Croatian, Slovak, and Ruthenian. Study of the role of international legal standards, like the UN system (ICCPR, ICECSR, 1992 UN Declaration 1992), and the Council of Europe's FCNM, and ECRML in this Central and Eastern European region (MTA-TK, desk research and field work).
- Study of the status of migrant languages in West-European EU member states, like Turkish and Polish in the Netherlands, and Sweden (UVA-ES, desk research and field work).



# Data and factual information 2

- The Case of Vojvodina.
- A significant gap can be observed between the *image* (reflected in international norms) and the *practice* of multilingualism
- As the **case of Vojvodina** illustrates there are three main challenges to the implementation of language rights norms:
  - asymmetrical power relations: incoherent distribution of competences between government tiers (national, regional and local); government's full discretion in recognizing minorities and defining territorial requirements;
  - forced migration, homogenization policies, “ethnic unmixing” (esp. relevant in CEE) – changing language use landscape;
  - effects of kin-state activities and extra-territorial citizenship policies (e.g. labour migration).
  - **Preliminary conclusion:** A weak form of the personality principle applied in local and regional institutions, like primary education, facilitates traditional minority language rights.



# Data and factual information 3

In the case of Canada:

- The richest provinces attract internal migrants due to oil prices (2011 census; see data in bold in diagram below).
- It is difficult to make the personality rights of internal migrants in the domain of language policy effective (e.g. the linguistic assimilation of Francophones into English in an English-speaking province like Alberta is high).

*\* Interprovincial Migration (Mobility 5 Years Ago); source: Statistics Canada, 2011 National Household Survey, Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 99-013-X2011027. Date modified: 2017-02-14*



Provinces	Interprovincial In-Migrants	Interprovincial Out-Migrants	Interprovincial balance
Alberta	215 850	189 425	<b>26 425</b>
British- Columbia	166 455	130 105	<b>36 350</b>
Manitoba	36 855	48 020	- 11 165
New-Brunswick	36 135	36 375	- 240
Newfoundland and Labrador	28 755	23 565	<b>5190</b>
Nova Scotia	50 965	54 350	- 3 385
Ontario	177 600	225 010	- 48 010
Prince-Edward Island	9 165	8 645	520
Quebec	63 100	84 340	- 21 240
Saskatchewan	58 995	43 080	<b>15 915</b>
North-West Territories	5 195	6 840	- 1 645
Nunavut	2 355	2 275	80
Yukon	4 240	3 645	595



# Data and factual information 4

- The Cases of Poles and Turks in the Netherlands and Sweden.
- History of Dutch language policy : transitioning from ‘Pragmatic multiculturalism/multilingualism’ to ‘assimilation’
  - 1960’s-1970’s: mother tongue education for migrants to facilitate return migration
  - 1980’s: mother tongue education to facilitate Dutch language acquisition
    - Introduction of OALT/OETC (mother tongue education programmes).
  - 1990’s-2000’s
    - Stronger, near exclusive emphasis on Dutch language acquisition.
- Trends appearing from interviews with Poles in the Netherlands:
  - little emotional and cultural connection to Polish.
  - Primary aim: learning Dutch and English.
  - Mixed view on language transmission to their children.





# Data and factual information 5

## Trends appearing from interviews with Turks in Sweden:

- Strong connection to Turkish; in favour of bilingualism: were encouraged by teachers to raise children bilingually; still: Swedish by far considered more important for their children.

## Transnational identity and connections

- Both Poles in the Netherlands and Turks in Sweden have strong transnational ties with friends/relatives. Use their mother tongue daily using social media, skype, etc.

## Effective language policy

- Both groups: citizenship, including language courses are not effective; Swedish Turks: Midly satisfied with existence of mother tongue education; mostly unsatisfied with its effectiveness.

## Main conclusions fieldwork (so far)

- (i) Perspective on multilingualism seems to an extent class-based: “Erst das Fressen und dann die Kultur”; (ii) transnational connections make linguistic assimilation impossible, unless the individual actively wishes to be assimilated; (iii) Swedish Turks satisfied with the principle of mother tongue education. Teacher promotion **matters!** (iv) Language policy’s effectiveness in education (both citizenship courses and mother tongue education) in both Netherlands and Sweden are disputed.



# Conclusion 1

- MLG might facilitate linguistic rights of migrant languages, i.e. a subset of the personality principle cases for minority languages in states with MLG. This ties in with the integrative concept of MIME and the different levels of governance distinguished in the MIME framework. This can be introduced in primary education for language acquisition of host and heritage languages. However, the Canadian case shows that assimilation is high among internal migrants (who are comparable to IMECs) and the language policy in the Netherlands stimulates, contrary to the language policy in Sweden linguistic assimilation. Poles in the Netherlands contrary to Turks in Sweden have a weak connection with their heritage language.
- Improvement of state sponsored citizenship courses, including language acquisition programs to boost knowledge of host languages and to facilitate societal inclusion among migrants.



## Conclusion 2

- Higher level of awareness of multilingualism among migrants and policy makers of host states: stress value of multilingualism as a positive asset and as an effective tool for promoting societal inclusion, e.g. in formal education primary level, citizenship and lifelong learning courses. Both the host and heritage languages should be a part of the curriculum. This is fully in agreement with MIME's integrative concept.
- For children of IMECs there is already directive 25 July 1977 (77/486/EEC), on promoting and facilitating the education of the children of IMEC workers also in their mother-tongue, e.g. Polish for the children of Polish workers in the Netherlands and Sweden. This directive should be applied stricter in the EU member states.





Thank you for your attention



The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement No. 613334 (Project MIME).

