Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW)

European minority languages: endangered or revived?

Gorter, D.

2007

citation for published version (APA)
Gorter, D. (2007). *European minority languages: endangered or revived?*. 1-8.

European Minority Languages: Endangered or Revived?

Durk Gorter

Ikerbasque-University of the Basque Country
Tolosa Hiribidea 70
20018 Donostia/San Sebastian
Basque Country – Spain
[d.gorter@ikerbasque.org]

Abstract

A diagnosis is offered of language learning factors that contribute to the revival of European minority languages. In this paper four frameworks will be discussed. [1] The theory of Reversing Language Shift (Fishman 1991, 2001). The "family-home-neighborhood-community-nexus" is the central stage for language learning in the GIDS-scale of degrees of 'disruption' of minority language communities. [2] The Euromosaic study (Nelde, Strubell and Williams 1996), is a comparative study of minority language groups in the European Union. It offers a theoretical framework which gives a central place to reproduction and production of language groups through language learning as first and as second language. An important outcome is the ranking of language groups. [3] The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages of the Council of Europe (1998). The Charter provides a formal division into social fields which are relevant for the promotion of learning of minority languages. [4] The Unesco Ad hoc expert group on language endangerment (2003) has proposed a set of nine factors to assess the vitality of a particular threatened language, where continued language learning is of crucial importance. These four approaches will be compared on the dimension of language learning.

Introduction

Language learning becomes a different issue seen from the perspective of the speakers of a minority language or a socially dominant language. In the case of a majority language community, language learning at home and at school is commonly taken for granted: at home parents usually speak this language with their children, and at school this language is commonly the only subject and the only medium of instruction. In the case of a minority language community, however, there is frequently a mismatch between the language of the home and that of the school. This specific position has consequences for language learning. The Mercator European Research Centre in Ljouwert/ Leeuwarden gathers and mobilises expertise in the field of language learning at home, at school, and through cultural participation in favour of linguistic diversity of Europe.

In 1992 Michael Krauss published his by now famous article about the fast rate of extinction of the languages in the world, in which he warned that "the coming century will see either the death or the doom of 90% of mankind's languages" (Krauss 1992: 7). Since then the alarm bells over endangered languages have sounded louder all the time and there has been a "flood of publications on the topic of language death" (Ferguson 2006: 72). The greatest number of endangered languages is spoken in a broad area on either side of the Equator - in Africa, India, Southeast Asia, and South America. The European continent contributes a mere 3.5% to an estimated total number of 6.912 languages in the world (count by the Ethnologue: Gordon 2005). Still Europeans often perceive their continent to have an exceptional high number of languages, because countries have different state languages and because the European Union uses 23 official languages. They compare Europe to North America or Australia which they may wrongfully perceive as monolingual English speaking continents. Actually in North America (USA and Canada) there are 247 living indigenous languages and in Australia 231, excluding the numerous immigrant languages. In Europe we find a similar number of 239 living languages that are indigenous (counts according to the Ethnologue). Only a few of those languages have the full protection of a state behind them. The 47 member states of the Council of Europe have 40 different languages as their official state language(s); the other 200 languages are usually minority languages for which the survival in the long run is not guaranteed. In this contribution European minority languages will be the centre of attention.

A perspective in which language learning and language endangerment are combined leads to a focus on so-called 'unique minority languages', such as Basque, Frisian or Welsh. Minority language groups with a kin state, e.g. German in Belgium or in Denmark may be at risk in the region where they are spoken, but these cross-border languages are not threatened languages as such; the same reasoning applies *mutatis mutandis* to most migrant languages. In earlier times cultural, economic and geographic separation were factors that contributed to the continued existence of smaller languages. Modern means of transportation and communication make such relative isolation much less of an issue. The speakers of minority languages are no longer the stereotypical poorly educated older peasants living on farms in a peripheral countryside with hardly any

contact with the outside world. Today they hold university degrees, live in urban areas, go on holidays abroad, etc. The popular TV-shows and news images they watch, the movies they go to, the commercials they see, and the brand names they know are the same as for speakers of dominant languages. This is also the case when they live in the regions of Europe where minority languages are part and parcel of everyday life. At the same time a dominant state language is omnipresent and has a stronger presence in many social domains. Moreover, English has a certain presence and is learned from an increasingly early age. Today speakers of European minority languages are multilingual almost by definition.

Language communities have to find new and different ways to teach their language to the next generation. In the 19th and early 20th centuries language promotion consisted in having a bible translation, a grammar book, a dictionary and sometimes the teaching of the language as a subject. Those were basic tools for protection and for language learning, as well as symbols of some social prestige. These elements have been replaced by a claim for language rights, schooling *through* the language and in the 21st century it is seen to be of great important to have a TV channel, presence in YouTube, an own Wikipedia, T8-function in mobile phones, songs for MP3-players and localized popular (youth) culture. However, hardly any minority language group is able to provide the full range of those means of modern media and culture and is thus in a weaker position for (informal) language learning.

At the European political level there is a growing agreement about the value of protection and promotion of minority languages. During the last decades a flourishing of activities on behalf of minority languages took place, in part as a grassroots reaction to processes of homogenization and modernization (Glaser 2007). A number of minority groups have obtained provisions for language learning, which could hardly be expected in 1970. In particular, the steps taken for Basque, Catalan and Galician in Spain, or Welsh and Gaelic in United Kingdom can be called remarkable. Their policies culminate in measures in high-prestige domains such as public administration, higher education and the media. The result of all these efforts is that the patterns of long-term language decline have at least slowed down and are seemingly reversed. It is clear that a strong, full-fledged policy for a minority language can be successful. However, it offers no lasting guarantee that the speakers will actually continue to learn and use their language and transmit it to the next generation.

Studies that analyze the situation of minority languages have lead to the creation of typologies, models and scales, which may indicate degrees of risk or vitality of these languages. A well-known example is the model of Ethnolinguistic Vitality by Giles et al (1977). But also others such as Allardt (1979), Churchill (1986), Crystal (2000), and Edwards (1991, 2007) have proposed typologies or drafted lists of key variables. These proposals have diagnosed language learning inside the family and the community as well as in educational contexts as important factors that contribute to the survival and revival of European minority languages. In this paper four other analytic frameworks will be considered and compared mainly on the dimension of language learning. These are: [1] the theory of Reversing Language Shift as developed by Fishman (1991, 2001), [2] the Euromosaic study (Nelde, Strubell and Williams 1996), which is a comparative inventory study of minority language groups in the European Union, [3] the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages of the Council of Europe (1998) and [4] the Unesco Ad hoc expert group on language endangerment (2003).

These four conceptual frameworks and their application to the learning of European minority languages will be discussed. Their similarities and differences will be considered and some conclusions will be drawn.

Reversing Language Shift: GIDS

Fishman's 1991 book on '*Reversing Language Shift*' (RLS) is a significant contribution to the debate on endangered languages. The subtitle of the book - '*Theoretical and Empirical Assistance to Threatened Languages*' - makes clear that his RLS-perspective wants to combine a more distanced academic study with a perspective of intervention and the choice of the most appropriate means of protecting minority languages. RLS is thus not only descriptive but also prescriptive (Fishman 2001: 450).

The cornerstone of the theory is the "Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale" (GIDS) (Fishman 1991: 335). The GIDS is similar to Richter's scale of earthquakes to indicate the degree in which a language is 'at risk'. At the same time the GIDS is intended to be a diagnostic tool which offers a set of priorities for a language community. Fishman intended the stages of the GIDS to be "nothing but a logical set of priorities or targets to guide RLS-efforts toward a derived goal" (Fishman 2001: 465).

Stage 8: Reconstructing the language and adult acquisition of the language. This reconstruction has been done for e.g. Cornish and Manx.

Stage 7: Cultural interaction in the language primarily involves the older generation of the community. Saterfrisian in Germany can serve as an example, where grandparents go to the playgroup to talk with the young children to teach them the fundamentals of Saterfrisian, a language their parents did not learn at all.

Stage 6: The intergenerational and demographically concentrated family-home-neighborhood-community: the basis of mother-tongue transmission. As Fishman (1991: 399) warns "If this stage is not satisfied, all else can amount to little more than biding time".

Stage 5: Schools for literacy acquisition, for the old and for the young, and not in lieu of compulsory education. Many minority languages start promotional activities with adult classes and out of school lessons for children.

Stage 4b: Public schools for minority children, offering some instruction via the minority language, but substantially under control of the dominant language group, as is the case for West-Frisian.

Stage 4a: Schools in lieu of compulsory education and substantially under curricular and staffing control of the minority, e.g. the Diwan schools in Brittany.

Stage 3: The local/regional work sphere, both among minority and among majority speakers.

Stage 2: Local/regional mass media and governmental services, e.g. as were obtained for Welsh or Basque.

Stage 1: Education, work sphere, mass media and government operations at higher and nationwide levels. An example would be Catalan.

Table 1: Stages of Reversing Language Shift (adapted from Fishman 1991: 395, 2001: 466)

Fishman's eight-point scale is an effort to assess the appropriateness of different forms of support for minority languages. In particular, he draws attention to the most important element of language maintenance: intergenerational mother tongue transmission. Only stage 1 ensures that reversing language shift has by and large succeeded in recreating a natural, self-priming mechanism for the reproduction of the language community. It is the linkage of stages, i.e. language functions, which matter (Fishman 2001: 451). Stages 8 to 5 are on the 'weak side' and constitute the "minimum program" of RLS (Fishman 1991:400) for which speakers of the minority language do not need the cooperation and approval of those in power. In contrast the stages 4 to 1 are on the 'strong side', they are related to the 'high power' stages (Fishman 2001: 473) which are less willingly relinquished by the dominant groups. Language learning in the home and the community are of fundamental importance; language learning in school is also crucial and Fishman emphasizes the importance of language acquisition, learning and education in more than one stage. But complete reliance on schools as an agent of language revitalization is, according to the underlying logic of the scale, an almost certain recipe for failure.

In the SMiLE-study (Grin and Moring 2002: 179) an attempt has been made to group all 'unique languages' of the European Union (of the then 15 member states) according to the GIDS. The approach is to locate each of the 36 'unique' language groups in the most typical stage. The result is the following table.

(1=STRONGEST, 8=WEAKEST)

Stage 1	Catalan in Catalonia, Luxembourgish, Welsh, Basque in the BAC
Stage 2	Catalan in Mallorca, Catalan in Valencia, Galician
Stage 3	Frisian, Sámi in Sweden, Sámi in Finland, Basque in Navarre, Irish, Occitan in Spain, Gaelic, Corsican
Stage 4	Friulian, Sorbian, Basque in France, Ladin, Asturian, Catalan in France
Stage 5	Irish in Northern Ireland, Franco-Provençal in Italy, Mirandese, Breton, Catalan in Aragon
Stage 6	North Frisian, Occitan in France, Sardinian, Occitan in Italy, Catalan in Italy, Pomak in Greece, Berber in Spain
Stage 7	Saterfrisian
Stage 8	Aroumanian, Cornish

Table 2: "Unique" Minority Languages, Grouped by GIDS Stages

This overview characterizes these unique languages generally. Using the earthquake metaphor one could say that language communities such as Aroumanian

and Cornish have been disrupted most severely and Catalan, with Basque and Welsh have attained less shaky grounds. One of the major problems for these languages is that people do learn the language, but then proficiency does not always lead to usage in daily practice.

Euromosaic study

A call for tender by the European Commission in 1992 resulted in the Euromosaic study. It comprises an inventory of the minority languages in the 12 member states belonging to the European Community at the time. Case study reports were drafted for 48 language groups. Those reports were published in abbreviated versions on the web (www.uoc.es/euromosaic) and a general report was published in 1996 (Nelde, Strubell, Williams 1996). A follow up on the language groups in the three new member states (Austria, Finland and Sweden) was done in 1998, again published on the web, as well as an extension after the entry of 10 new member states in 2004.

The Euromosaic study seeks to develop a comparative analytic perspective. The emphasis is on the 'reproduction' and 'production' (and non-reproduction) of language groups as the two main dependent variables. That is to say, the language groups are 'reproduced' by language learning between parents and their children. Thus, languages as transmitted between generations. In addition 'production' refers to "learning of a language by those whose parents did not speak that language" (Nelde, Strubell and Williams 1996: 5-6). It refers to second language acquisition, mainly in a school context.

These concepts of reproduction and production are related to three primary agencies of socialization: the family, education and the community. A secondary agency of language and cultural socialization is the media. These four agencies are responsible for the learning (or not) of a minority language. As far as language learning inside the family is concerned, the degree of language group endogamy is crucial. If members of language groups intermarry a lot, the chances for continuity in handing the language to the next generation are smaller. Migration also influences the importance of the community as agency of minority language production or reproduction (Nelde, Strubell and Willams 1996: 7).

In many cases education leads to non-reproduction because only the majority language is taught. The school can have a positive influence on production (language learning), but education is usually under control of the authorities, who may not be inclined to give the minority language a prominent place. The line of reasoning is similar to Fishman.

The Euromosaic report also analyzes the relationship of the language groups to the economic system. It leads to the variable of 'language prestige', which is defined as "the value of a language for social mobility". Finally, two other variables are discussed: institutionalisation is "the extent to which language use within specific contexts conforms with the expected patterns of behavior such that it is taken for granted" and legitimation refers to direct legislation and to language policies.

Euromosaic develops a scaling instrument that makes a comparative approach possible. The main variables of the theoretical model are used to develop such scales. The scales do give a good indication of the relative strength of the different groups. On the basis of the total scores all language groups are classified into five clusters, which is presented in the following overview table. Although Euromosaic also includes cross-border minority language groups, here only the unique minority language groups are included.

Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Cluster 5
Catalan (Cat, E)	Catalan (Val, E)	Frisian (NL)	Irish (UK)	North-Frisian (G)
Luxembourgish	Basque (Nav, E)	Corsican (F)	Mirandese (P)	Occitan (F)
Welsh (UK)	Irish (Irl)	Friulian (I)	Breton (F)	Sardinian (I)
Basque (AC, E)	Occitan (E)	Sorbian (G)	Catalan (I)	Saterfrisian (G)
Catalan (Bal, E)	Gaelic (UK)	Basque (F)	Occitan (I)	
Galician (E)	Ladin (I)	Catalan (F)		
	Asturian (E)	Catalan (Ara, E)		

NB Luxembourgish and Irish have been underlined; as unique minority languages they have a special status as official state languages (only language groups from the first study are included).

Table 3: Euromosaic Study, Clustering of Unique Minority Language Groups in the EU

In the table there are 29 language groups in 5 different clusters. Cluster 1 contains the six 'strongest' minority language communities in the European Union and cluster 5 has the four 'weakest' groups, according to the indicator variables. The outcome is generally in agreement with the 'scores'

on the GIDS of these languages. The SMiLE study showed a high correlation between GIDS and Euromosaic scores (Grin and Moring 2002: 218). One could also conclude that language learning is the weakest in cluster 5 and strongest in cluster 1.

European Charter

Through the work of the Council of Europe two important international legal instruments came into force in 1998: the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* and the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities.* These treaties are important in protecting and promoting the language diversity of Europe, and thus for language learning.

The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages is unique because it only deals with languages. It does not speak of minorities, and it does not attempt to confer rights on language groups or linguistic communities (Woerhling 2006). The Charter is a legally binding treaty for the ratifying states. The Charter was designed in such a way as to be able to accommodate for the wide variety of the different languages in all 47 member states of the Council of Europe. This variety is reflected in the way the 23 different states have ratified so far. The Charter is designed to protect and promote regional or minority languages as a threatened aspect of Europe's cultural heritage. The aim is to ensure, where this is considered as reasonable, the possibility of use of regional or minority languages in different fields of society. The Charter mentions eight fundamental principles valid for all minority languages. These include the respect for the geographical area of each language, the need for resolute action, the encouragement of the use of these languages in speech and writing, in public and private life. These principles provide a necessary basic framework. The general principles are translated into more detailed and specific rules. There are seven paragraphs (1) education, (2) judicial authorities, (3) administrative authorities and public services, (4) media, (5) cultural activities and facilities, (6) economic and social life and (7) transfrontier exchanges. These cover major social fields. Language learning as such is not mentioned by the Charter. The home or the family is not among the fields of policy measures. Education is seen of greatest importance and thus it is recognized that the learning of minority languages must be strongly encouraged. A ratifying state must apply a minimum of 35 from a total of near 100 different measures. Some measures are presented as a sliding-scale going from minimal to more extensive provisions or rights. For instance, education is dealt with at all levels, going from pre-school education through university and higher level education, including adult courses, teacher training as well as the teaching of history and culture in relation to minority languages. For each level of education, the state can choose among the measures. The choice is "according to the situation of each language". Similar options are found in other paragraphs. It can be described as an *à la carte* menu, where some dishes are obligatory and where you must choose something from each course. The structure reflects the different and varying realities which the languages and their speakers are facing.

UNESCO Vitality Factors

UNESCO has asked an international group of linguists to develop a framework for determining the vitality of a language in order to assist in policy development, identification of needs and appropriate safeguarding measures. This Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages (2003) elaborated a landmark report. It establishes nine factors**:** (1) Intergenerational Language Transmission, (2) Absolute Number of Speakers, (3) Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population, (4) Shifts in Domains of Language Use, (5) Response to New Domains and Media, (6) Materials for Language Education and Literacy, (7) Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies Including Official Status and Use, (8) Community Members' Attitudes Towards Their Own Language and (9) Amount and Quality of Documentation. For each factor different degrees are distinguished, e.g. for intergenerational transmission five degrees of endangerment are listed. From (5) 'safe' where the language is spoken by all generations, through (3) where "the language is no longer learned as the mother tongue by children in the home" to (0) where "there is no one who can speak or remember the language". No single factor is considered to be sufficient to assess the state of a community's language. However, taken together, these nine factors can determine the viability of a language, its function in society and the type of measures required for its maintenance or revitalization. The factors for intergenerational language transmission and materials for language education and literacy are most directly related to language learning, but of course other factors such as the proportion of speakers also have a bearing on the opportunities to (informally) learn a language because there will be more comprehensible input. The Expert Group is in favour of "the learning of several languages from the youngest age". It further notes that multilingualism as such does not lead necessarily to language loss because it is a fact of life in most areas of the world.

The methodology of the UNESCO vitality factors has been applied in Australia by the Australian Institute of

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (2005). The report found that only 145 of Australia's more than 250 known indigenous languages continue actually to be spoken. Only 18 indigenous languages are described as "strong" according to such a crucial factor as intergenerational transmission. A similar study has not yet been carried out in Europe, to my knowledge. It might give very similar results as Australia because the UNESCO atlas by Wurm (2001) gives already an alarming message. Appendix 1 of the Expert Group report contains an assessment from three languages in Venezuela. On the basis of that example the following table contains an assessment of three European indigenous minority languages.

Factors	Languages		
	Basque	West-Frisian	North-Frisian
Intergenerational Language Transmission	4	4	3
Absolute Number of Speakers	632.000	450.000	6.000
Proportion of Speakers within the Total Population	2	3	2
Shifts in Domains of Language Use	4	3	1
Response to New Domains and Media	4	2	1
Materials for Language Education and Literacy	5	3	2
Governmental & Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies including Official Status & Use	4	3	3
Community Members' Attitudes toward Their Own Language	4	3	2
Amount and Quality of Documentation	5	4	3

Nb this table has been copied and then adapted from the original document of Ad Hoc Group where it was applied to three languages in Venezuela.

Table 4: UNESCO Vitality Assessment of Three European Minority Languages

This table tells us that the weakest factor for the Basque language in the Basque Autonomous Community is the proportion in the population (actually around 30%). Basque reaches the highest score on (only) two of the nine factors. West-Frisian in contrast may have a more favorable proportion of speakers (around 50%), but is weaker on all other factors. North-Frisian is severely endangered according to this diagnosis. It is also clear however that the instrument is only an approximation. Basque and West-Frisian may receive the same score (4= 'unsafe') on intergenerational transmission, but the situation for both languages is completely different.

Towards one framework?

The GIDS, Euromosaic, Charter, and UNESCO frameworks are brought together here in one table to compare them on their suitability for the study of European minority languages with special reference to language learning. The frameworks are combined in the next table.

Summary	Fishman GIDS (1991), 8 stages	Euromosaic (1996) 7 variables	European Charter (1998), 7 paragraphs	Unesco Vitality (2003), 9 factors
1	Stage 6: intergenerational transmission in family-home-neighborhood-community	1) Family 2) Community		Factor 1: Intergenerational language transmission
2	Stages 5 and 4a+b: schools and courses	3) Education	Art 8: Education	Factor 6: Materials for language education and literacy
3	Stage 2: regional mass media and governmental services	5) Culture 7) Institutio-nalization	Art 11: Media Art 12: Cultural activities and facilities	Factor 4: Shifts in domains of language use Factor 5: Response to new domains and media
4	Stage 3: work sphere	4) Language	Art 13: Economic	

		prestige	and social life	
5	Stage 1: education, work, media and government at higher levels	6) Legitimization	Art 9: Judicial authorities; Art 10: Administrative authorities and public services	Factor 7: Governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies including official status and use
6	Stage 7: cultural interaction (primarily older generation) Stage 8: Reassembling language and adult learning		Art 14: Transfrontier exchanges	Factor 2: Absolute number of speakers Factor 3: Proportion of speakers within the total population Factor 8: Community Members' Attitudes toward Their Own Language Factor 9: Amount and Quality of Documentation

Table 5: Comparison of the GIDS, Euromosaic, Charter and Unesco Vitality

From the comparison of the GIDS-scale, the Euromosaic study, the European Charter and UNESCO Vitality factors the following differences and similarities become clear. The GIDS and Euromosaic are more research oriented approaches, although they include a clear policy orientation. The Charter and the UNESCO have a more directly applied purpose. The European context of minority languages is the scope specifically of the Charter and Euromosaic, similar to the focus of this article, whereas the GIDS and the Unesco Vitality factors have a global reach. The four frameworks clearly agree on some factors but they only partially overlap. Each also all has some features that are unique to them and thus they are also complimentary.

The comparative table shows that GIDS, Euromosaic and UNESCO frameworks all three emphasize the importance of intergenerational learning of the language through the family and the community. That factor is absent from the Charter. Education as a factor is present in all four models and in the Charter it is the most important category. Education is the institution of society where most part of formal language learning takes place. It is also clear, however, that in many cases of a minority or endangered language the majority language is the dominant language in the educational system. Therefor the children will become proficient in the majority language and may thus learn to prefer that language over the minority language for many usage functions. In such cases the schools may in the end contribute more to the endangerment than to the revival of a minority language. In cases where the minority language is in a strong position in the schools and formal learning of the minority language is secured, the burden of language learning may fall almost completely on the shoulders of the educational system. However, it is also known that the schools alone cannot safeguard the language.

The four frameworks point to the importance of other social factors as well, although there is less agreement on which factors they are precisely or how to conceptualize them.

The media or cultural aspect is present in all four (level nr 3 in the table), but the role of the media is conceived of differently. For Euromosaic almost the whole cultural variable is conceived of in media terms, the other three have separate categories for media and other cultural activities. For the GIDS there is even a substantial distance between the more basic cultural activities in a community and related to a language when it is almost exclusively used by an older generation and the more advanced, technologically demanding aspects of mass media. A distinction can be made - as does the Charter - between media in the sense of radio, TV and the press on the one hand, and the cultural products, mainly related to language, such as literature, theater, etc. on the other. How and how much language learning takes place through the input of the media is difficult to establish because as a separate factor it is hard to isolate. However, the role of the latest technological inventions as they were mentioned in the introduction has not been assessed by these frameworks. It will even be more complicated to evaluate the impact of You-Tube or the availability of MP3-downloads on learning the language.

The socio-economic dimension is present in three approaches, except the UNESCO. The variables are operationalized quite differently. For the Euromosaic study the economic restructuring of Europe is one of the major influences on the reproduction (learning as first language) and production (learning as second language) of minority language groups. Moreover, 'language prestige' is one of the independent variables. Fishman in his GIDS has operationalized the economic dimension mainly as related to usage of language at work and for the Charter the importance lies in taking away legal obstacles for the use of minority languages in economic activities. The legal aspect is present in the Charter, in the Euromosaic model and in the UNESCO priorities, but less explicit in the Fishman's GIDS. He recognizes the importance of language legislation, but warns for the symbolic effects of such legislation. The use of the minority language by the government itself as a variable is again recognized again by all four approaches.

One of main general problems for language learning is identified as a 'forward shift' from proficiency to actual use. The level of language competence seems to 'determine' to a large extend later use. Still, second language learners in practice use the minority language much less than first language learners.

These frameworks are very useful for comparative purposes. Each has its strengths, but further work remains to be done and there is also considerable value in knowing more about individual cases. The consequences of learning a language at home, learning it in a school context or the informal learning that goes on in all kinds of other social contexts have to be investigated further in order to learn more about for the continued existence of minority languages.

References

Allardt, E. (1979). *Implications of the Ethnic Revival in Modern, Industrialized Society (A Comparative Study of the Linguistic Minorities in Western Europe)*. Helsinki.

Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (2005). *The National Indigenous Languages Survey Report*. On-line at: www.dcita.gov.au/indig/maintenance_indigenous _languages/publications.

Churchill, S. (1986). *The education of linguistic and cultural minorities in the OECD countries.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Crystal, D. (2000). *Language death.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, J. (1991). Socio-educational issues concerning indigenous minority languages: terminology, geography and status. In J. Sikma & D. Gorter (eds.), *European Lesser Used Languages in Primary Education*, 207–226. Leeuwarden: Mercator Education/ Fryske Akademy.

Edwards, J. (2007). Societal multilingualism: reality, recognition and response. In P. Auer &Li Wei (eds.), *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication*, 447–467. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

European charter for regional or minority Languages (1998). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Ferguson, G. (2006). *Language Planning in Education*. Edinburgh: Endinburgh University Press.

Fishman, J.A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift. Theoretical and Empirical Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.

Fishman, J.A. (ed.) (2001). *Can threatened languages be saved?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R.D. & Taylor, D. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (ed.) *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press. 307-348.

Glaser, K. (2007). *Minority Languages and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gordon, Raymond G., Jr. (ed.), (2005). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Fifteenth edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: www.ethnologue.com

Grin, F. & Moring, T. (2002). Final report: support for minority languages in Europe. Brussels: European Commission. On-line at: http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/lan g/languages/langmin/files/support.pdf.

Krauss, M. (1992). The world's languages in crisis, *Language* 68: 4-10.

Nelde, P., Strubell, M & Williams, G. (1996). Euromosaic: *The production and reproduction of the minority language groups of the EU*. Luxembourg: Publications offices.

Woehrling, J.-M. (2006). *The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. A critical Commentary.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Wurm, S. A. (2001). *Atlas of the world's languages in danger of disappearing.* Paris-Canberra: UNESCO Publishing / Pacific Linguistics.