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There are two dominant approaches to study language endangerment. One is based on the study of language vitality and utility. The second is strongly associated with the work of Joshua Fishman. Both approaches have proved extremely useful over the past 50 years, but they are not without shortcomings. Language vitality runs into the problem that there is an endless range of factors that impact on vitality. As result, scholars have turned to ethnographic approaches to language endangerment. The tradition of Fishman metaphorically regards language endangerment as a “disease”. Hence scholars analyze the sociolinguistic situation in question in order to propose a “cure”, a practice similar to that of medical doctors. The problem with this approach is that speech communities are simply encouraged to find better ways how to deal with the present situation, instead of being instructed how to repair damaged and hostile language ecologies in the first place.

Both approaches (utility/ethnographic and Fishman) suffer from too much attention on emic aspects of language shift and from too little focus on etic aspects. I argue (1) that more attention needs to be placed on phenomena all cases of language shift share, (2) to adjust language shift theory on the basis of etic patterns, and (3) to expand methodologies for the study of language shift accordingly. Firstly, language shift always occurs in dominated communities. It is always triggered by changes in the economic organization of communities that result from inequality between communities in contact. Secondly, language shift is first and foremost a phenomenon of social inequality and the consequences of such inequality on communities. Language shift always negatively affects societal wellbeing of communities undergoing shift. Thirdly, attention needs to be placed on the societal wellbeing of communities. We need to study how wellbeing is positively or negatively affected by language shift, language maintenance and language revitalization.

In this paper, I use two cases in Japan to illustrate the advantages of a wellbeing approach to the study of language endangerment. The first case is that of the Ryukyuan languages. Modernist language regimes, like that of Japan, have only two ways of dealing with diversity, assimilation or exclusion. Deprived of other options, Ryukyans have experienced both. In other words, they have never been able to steer their own course and to pursue their own interests. Their wellbeing has suffered as consequence. The second case is that of the Ainu. The Ainu are an interesting case for our understanding of language shift, because we have detailed insights into Ainu language shift and into Ainu wellbeing. A number of surveys on their life conditions can be mapped on different speaker-types across modernity (Ainu monolinguals, Ainu-Japanese bilinguals, rusty speakers, passive bilinguals, monolingual Japanese speakers). The surveys on Ainu life conditions show that their wellbeing did not improve as a result of linguistic assimilation. Assimilation is not the solution to Ainu problems – it is a major source of their problems. Problems resulting from colonization and assimilation cannot be solved with yet more colonization and assimilation. Language policy needs not to be based on modernist
ideologies that simply link dominant languages with “progress”. Rather, the study of language policy must consider the effects of language policy on societal wellbeing. Policies must be formulated, evaluated and adjusted on this basis.

Many linguistic minorities are aware that they are trapped in the wrong time and the wrong type of society. The title of my talk, “how happy our ancestors must have been!”, is taken from the writing of a 19-year old Ainu woman, who died the same year (1922) she wrote these lines. Chiri Yukie continues that now “our eyes are filled with anxiety, burn with discontent, and are so dimmed that they cannot make out the way ahead. We are compelled to rely upon the compassion of others. We are a pitiful sight. A dying people…. that is our name. What a sad name we bear! In the past surely our happy ancestors never imagined for a moment that this, our homeland, would in the future be reduced to the kind of miserable state at hand.”
Urban varieties versus official languages: The challenges of implementing a national language-in-education policy in the township schools of South Africa.

Twenty-one years ago, the South African Constitution declared eleven official languages - English, Afrikaans (the former official languages) and nine African languages, spoken, in principle, by the majority of the African population in the country. The declaration serves two purposes. On the one hand, from the political standpoint, it is designed to promote formerly disadvantaged languages. On the other hand, it is consistent with the new democratic standards the country was setting up and reflects the plurilingual nature of South Africa.

In education, the declaration took a form of a language-in-education-policy through which the government strongly recommended the use of the home languages of the learners, the languages in which they are most proficient as languages of learning and teaching. For the learners, the use of home languages was meant to improve the academic performance of those for whom English and Afrikaans were not home languages.

However, the sociolinguistic background of the townships renders the implementation of this policy problematic and challenging. As it is, townships are not only inherently highly multilingual areas, but are also breeding grounds for the emergence of urban varieties. The urban varieties which have become home languages for the majority of township inhabitants. Against this backdrop, it is evident that the effective implementation of this language-in-education policy is seriously compromised by the pervasiveness of urban emerging languages. The township schools therefore offer a very complex framework for a homogeneous implementation of this policy. Indeed, the official languages, the legitimate languages of learning and teaching, compete for space with the emerging urban languages spoken in the townships.

If there is no change in the definition of the language-in-education policy, this competition may become a true barrier to the possible roles that the government is considering for official languages in the country.
Beñat Garaio, University of the Basque Country, Spain

"They will not demolish this! This is a breathing space for Basque!"
Micro language policy in Errekaleor, a squat neighbourhood in Gasteiz (Basque Country)

The revitalization of Basque has not been equal in all three regions of the Basque Country during the last 40 years and developments have been notably brighter in the case of the Basque Autonomous Community, where the language is co-official and has a solid civil support. Gasteiz (Vitoria in Spanish) is the capital of the Basque Autonomous Community and it is considered to be an interesting sociological laboratory, due to its multicultural composition and its constant ideological shifts.

Politically, the Basque Country has been traditionally ruled by the centre-right Basque nationalist party, but bottom-up alternatives to liberal policies have been common in the last four decades. One of those alternatives is the Errekaleor neighborhood, which was about to be demolished by the City Council in order to develop a larger urbanization plan. Nevertheless, some youngsters decided to occupy the neighborhood before that and have lived there for three years. In recent months the Gasteiz City Council has tried to expel the new neighbors, but the Basque society has stood up in order to “defend Errekaleor”. One of the reasons to protect the occupied neighborhood has been the linguistic one, as many claim that Errekaleor functions entirely in Basque, challenging the current top-down language regime which puts Basque in a symbolic position. This paper aims to 1) explore the ideologies of the neighbors in Errekaleor and 2) observe their language policies, in order to determine whether an alternative language policy is being shaped in such a special environment.
Kristine Horner, University of Sheffield, UK

‘Normalising’ the national language of Luxembourg?
The interface between grassroots movements and official language policy

Luxembourg is designated as a trilingual country, officially recognising three languages in the language law of 1984: Luxembourgish as the national language, and French and/or German as legal, judicial and administrative languages. Luxembourgish presents the somewhat paradoxical case of being a small and mostly spoken language with official recognition at national level. Language ideological debates in Luxembourg bring certain contradictions to light: though language-in-education policy continues to focus mostly on the teaching of standard (written) German and French and though Luxembourgish is not widely used for functions linked to standardised written languages, the 2008 citizenship law introduced formalised (oral) language testing in Luxembourgish (Horner and Weber 2010).

Framed by what Johnson (2016) refers to as the fourth stage of language policy scholarship, this paper takes a discursive approach to exploring the ways in which social actors engage in acts of resistance to language policy (cf. Horner 2015; Shohamy 2009). More specifically, it explores how recent grassroots movements have challenged certain aspects of language policy in Luxembourg, including the prioritisation of German and French for written administrative functions. As a prime example of this language activism, the focus here is on Petition 698, which was circulated in 2016 and received more signatures than any other petition in the history of Luxembourg. Its key premise was to make Luxembourgish the first administrative language of the country. The government subsequently has formulated a strategy paper to promote the Luxembourgish language. This case can be taken as an illustrative example of the need for researchers to engage with acts of resistance to language policy and consider interactions between various stakeholders as well as the ideologies that underpin rationale for language policy.
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Vanuatu, with over 130 vernacular languages, is the most linguistically dense country in the world (François et al. 2015:8). This abundance of languages poses a unique challenge to the implementation of recent language education policy. Our talk focuses on how interaction with stakeholders in the Government’s new education programme (VESP) has affected three different language communities (North Ambrym, Ske and Fanbyak). VESP’s focus on vernacular languages with larger speaker-populations has a detrimental effect on the smaller, more endangered varieties in the country’s fragile language ecology.

Interaction with national level stakeholders has been vital for a language’s inclusion in VESP. For North Ambrym, this is due to VESP’s recognition of a linguist actively working in the community and the existence of primary schools. For Ske, where no primary school means children are educated in the neighbouring Apma language, inclusion is due to recognition of an active linguist. Finally, Fanbyak speakers have been overlooked by VESP and are educated in the larger North Ambrym language, leading to educational underachievement.

Community interaction with different levels of stakeholder has also allowed for different interpretations of policy with respect to the content and topics of literacy materials produced for schools. Where linguists are involved, traditional ecological knowledge is foregrounded over more generic content.

Although recent language policy has now sanctioned the use of vernaculars as languages of education, we conclude that implementation will have mixed results: dialect variation and linguistic diversity could be reduced (Mühlhäuser 1990, 1995), whilst some languages may stand a better chance of being maintained (Crowley 2000).

Finally we comment on the drawbacks of excluding kindergartens from VESP and propose how, in areas where there are no primary schools, community-level voices might be heard at the national level to provide opportunities for their languages to be used in education.

References
Local cultural identity in Occitan

Language and identity are generally assumed to go hand in hand since language is an act of identity (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985). When dealing with linguistic minorities, a movement of shift to the language of the dominant group is observed, leading to language endangerment (Nettle & Romaine 2000) and also a fragmentation of linguistic identity (Marley, Hintze & Parker 1998).

The south of France constitutes an interesting case study in the process of linguistic minoritisation. While the lack of state support and the disparaging attitudes towards regional languages in France have been identified as two main reasons for the decline of linguistic diversity on the territory (Pooley 2000), more supportive policies have been launched in the recent past (Judge 2007). Occitan, which is spoken over a vast part of the southern part of France under different names (among which Provençal, Gascon or even patois) gathers some fascinating aspects of community endangerment but also survival.

The aim of this presentation is to examine in details the rationale in the learners’ desire to speak this local language. The analysis of interviews highlights the potential gate to the acquisition of this dying language: the rediscovery and recuperation of a culture. One particular top down type of policy will be investigated (i.e. the actions of the section of the Ministry of Culture in order to promote Occitan) as well as its reception by the local community. The notion of cultural identity will be discussed in light of Castan’s view on an “open identity”.

References
Multilingual policy and the role of language ideologies in monolingual Japan

This paper examines a policy of multilingualism implemented by a local government in Japan and how residents perceive the use of foreign languages in that city’s linguistic landscape.

It is widely believed that Japan is a linguistically homogenous nation, unlike other countries. However, the number of visitors and immigrants to Japan has been increasing since the 1980s, particularly in the city of Nagoya and its surrounding areas. To support resident foreign nationals with limited Japanese competence, the city has implemented a multilingual policy called the ‘Nagoya Multicultural Coexistence Promotion Plan’. This policy includes the use of five languages (Japanese, English, Chinese, Korean and Portuguese) on official signs, such as maps and direction boards in the city centre. Yet the languages promoted are not reflective of the number of speakers of foreign languages in the city, and the choice of languages is affected by the political economy of the region.

We found that few residents were aware of the official multilingual signs and a significant number of people have negative impressions of commercial signs written in some Asian languages. This relates to political conflicts among Asian countries and the feelings that Japanese people have towards the speakers of those languages and their countries.

In this paper, I discuss the correlations between language choice and political economy and consider the role of language ideologies in determining a language policy in a newly developing multilingual city.
Examining the political origins of local language policies

One way of conceiving of language policy is as a form of public policy that seeks to influence the nature of a society’s linguistic environment, and thus steer the patterns of language use amongst individuals. Indeed, given the need to communicate with citizens, it is a policy field with which every government must engage in some way or another. No government (state, regional or local) can detach itself completely from the linguistic sphere - decisions must be made regarding which language(s) should be used within public administration, the courts, the bureaucracy, public schools, public media, road signs, town names, etc. Yet, despite the political salience of language policy, political scientists have, traditionally, been reluctant to engage with the subject in any detail. This does not mean that language policy is a subject that has not been the focus of a substantial amount of scholarly research. However, this research has tended to take place within other disciplinary contexts and therefore has not been specifically geared to the task of analysing the political origins of language policies and explaining why particular language policy decisions are taken.

A significant step in this direction came with the recent publication of the edited volume *State Traditions and Language Regimes* (Cardinal and Sonntag, 2015). In this well-received volume, political science theories and methods are utilised in order to develop an explanatory framework, based on the twin concepts of ‘state traditions’ and ‘language regimes’, that can assist in understanding: ‘how and why are language policy choices made and how do they come about?’ (Sonntag and Cardinal, 2015: 3). The framework is presented as one that can enable a systematic examination of the historical, institutional and normative contexts that influence the formation of language policies.

The aim of this paper will be to engage critically with the STLR framework in light of the symposium’s core theme of ‘language policy at the local level’. The paper will be divided into two main parts. First, it will provide a detailed introduction of the main features of the STLR framework, as well as an overview of some of the key political science concepts and literatures that informed its development. Following that, the paper will go on to reflect on how the framework responds to the challenge of analysing the factors that condition language policy choices taken in relation to minority regional or local languages. A key question here will be whether a framework that places an emphasis on the concept of ‘state tradition’ provides a basis on which to capture the specific political circumstances that influence policy development in relation to non-state languages.
Luxembourgish primary schools have heterogeneous student populations and a high proportion of non-national students (50.4% in 2013/14), with many having a romance language background. The education system is marked by a multilingual, yet inflexible, language learning and teaching regime. German is not only used to teach basic literacy, but it is also the medium of instruction throughout primary school. With inflexible language education policies on the one hand, and a heterogeneous student body on the other hand, the question arises as to how primary school teachers in Luxembourg manage this situation on an everyday basis. This presentation is based on a sociolinguistic MA dissertation which collected data through qualitative interviews with fifteen Luxembourgish primary school teachers, and analysed their reported implementations and negotiations of language education policies.

This presentation will answer the following questions: How do Luxembourgish primary school teachers narrate their interpretations and negotiations of official language education policies? What role do language ideologies play in these narrations? More specifically, the focus will lie on teachers’ narrations of instances where language education policies were negotiated using translanguaging. Given the structures imposed by education policies, teachers’ reported deviations from the language of instruction during frontal teaching were minor. But when working with students individually, teachers experienced less pressure to adhere to the language of instruction, and engaged in more flexible language practices, drawing on resources from their linguistic repertoire. Distinguishing between “on-stage” and “off-stage” teacher roles facilitates the conceptualisation of this reported behaviour. While teachers voiced an overall skepticism towards translanguaging, such flexible language practices involving Luxembourgish and German were perceived in a positive light for serving scaffolding purposes in class. Teachers expressed more skepticism towards translanguaging using Luxembourgish and French.
Parents as policy-makers: Grassroots level LPP discourses of resistance in contemporary Galicia

National language policy that is implemented from the top is often considered as official legislation designed to influence people’s linguistic lives (Shohamy 2006). Governmental policy makers perceived as stakeholders of language management employ a range of policy strategies to legitimise control over community and individuals’ language ideologies. Language policies of the individual involves the inner dimensions of ideological conditioning and the external influence of state level policy; these two dimensions determine the language choice of a person in a bi(multi)lingual set up (Nandi 2016; Nandi and Devasundaram 2017). However, individual language choices are often difficult to detect because they are subtle, informal, and hidden from the public eye, and therefore, frequently overlooked by language policy makers. The primary focus of this study is to investigate the impact of state reinforced language policies in family domains and look into how individual as well as collective linguistic practices of Galician parents act as ‘visible’ and/or ‘invisible’ language planning measures influencing their children’s language learning. Drawing from multiple ethnographic research methods, including observations, in-depth fieldwork interviews, focus group discussions and family language audits with parents, this paper demonstrates that in Galicia’s language shift-induced shrinking Galician-speaker pool, pro-Galician parents can play an important role in the language revitalisation process. The aim is to ascertain whether these parents can restore inter-generational transmission and how their grassroots level interrogation of the dominant Castilian discourse takes form of bottom-up language policies of resistance.
In this paper I will examine how the post-2008 economic crisis opened a policy window for drastic neoliberal reforms in Irish language policy – a sector which had previously been largely insulated from such measures – and how these policies have affected key Irish-speaking (“Gaeltacht”) communities. Using semi-structured interviews, participant observation and macro-level policy analysis to “triangulate” my findings, I will initially give a brief overview of this ongoing PhD project, detailing how the closure of important community infrastructure under the guise of increasing State efficiency, as well as unemployment and emigration have impinged on the vitality of the Gaeltacht.

Drawing on Shohamy’s distinction between overt and covert language policies, I will then examine how state-led language revitalisation policies were restructured post-2008. I will discuss the differential treatment of Irish-language institutions – which have been hit much harder by austerity measures than comparable institutions which operate through English – and contend that this treatment is a product of the neoliberal opposition to “culturalist” endeavours such as language revitalisation. I will argue that the 20-year Strategy for Irish 2010-2030 and the Gaeltacht Act 2012 can too be seen as products of the neoliberal paradigm, before discussing some of the ways in which these policies have been contested by Gaeltacht communities. I will explore the current controversies surrounding the local language planning measures stipulated in the 2012 act and conclude by describing community efforts to overcome the cuts made to Irish language provision via recourse to unorthodox, non-state funding sources.

In referring to the literature on both language revitalisation and public policy studies, I hope to demonstrate what the Irish case can teach us about the ways in which neoliberal policy regimes impact minoritised language communities and contribute to language shift therein.
Robbie Penman, SOAS University of London, UK

The politics of language policy and planning by NGOs in Cusco

This presentation will explore how the language planning and policies (LPP) of small NGOs can empower - or fail to empower - endangered-language communities and speakers, focussing on Quechua. Evidence will be drawn from fieldwork carried out in Cusco, Peru, for the author’s M.A. dissertation at SOAS.

For NGOs, using Quechua in interactions with Quechua-speakers has great potential to politically empower Quechua speakers; it is potentially a win-win for both language revitalization and the “development” objectives championed by NGOs. In fact it is a Western bias to perceive these as different, even mutually exclusive aims, as I will explain in reference to Andean philosophies of well-being (sumaq kawsay). To justify the importance of pro-Quechua LPP in NGOs for political empowerment, I will draw from existing research in language policy, development studies, and ethnopolitics. To do so will highlight the relevance of this proposal to other contexts where NGOs work with rural populations speaking minority/endangered languages.

Given the degree to which indigenous philosophies of well-being figure in national-level politics in the Andes, political interests are a significant part of the puzzle regarding the use or non-use of Quechua in NGO work. To understand these interests it will be important to consider the second conference-theme: the relationship between Quechua-speakers, NGOs, and the Peruvian state as stakeholders in LPP.

To make these issues concrete, I will explore self-reported language policies and language practices among eight Cusco NGOs. These observations beg questions concerning the discrepancies between stated policies and actual language practices, which I will answer in reference to language beliefs, attitudes, and ideologies among NGO workers.

In light of this evidence, I will consider the extent to which current NGO LPP actually empowers or disempowers Quechua speakers in the political realm; and, lastly, suggest strategies to better incorporate Quechua into NGO work.
Julia Sallabank, SOAS University of London, UK

Language planning and language ideologies in Guernsey

The Bailiwick of Guernsey is a small, semi-autonomous archipelago in the English Channel. Although it is a British Crown dependency and part of the British Isles, it has its own parliament and does not belong to the United Kingdom or European Union. This unusual geopolitical situation means that the nation-state has little relevance. As Guernsey has had autonomy for 813 years, language is not seen as an essential feature of political independence. It is only recently that the indigenous former vernacular (known as Guernesiais) has been accorded any worth, at either grass-roots or government level: as its vitality declines (increasingly rapidly), its perceived value for individual and collective identification has grown. In a small island community, boundaries between ‘grass-roots’ and ‘top-down’ planning are blurred, and social and political interests and ideologies intersect.

Although public opinion overtly supports language maintenance, and increasing the vitality of the indigenous language is a stated aim of the government Guernsey Language Commission announced in 2012, effective measures to increase the number and fluency of speakers appear to be lacking: GLC-sponsored activities are ‘scattergun’ and arguably post-vernacular (Shandler 2008).

This paper will discuss examples of language-related activities and discourses, and examine the overt and covert ideologies that they embody. Issues concerning authenticity, prestige, authority and legitimacy emerge as salient, combined with an ideology of Guernesiais as a ‘language of the past’. As language becomes largely symbolic rather than communicative, ideologies surrounding language change and the quality of Guernesiais promoted become increasingly salient. We will discuss what effective policy for language revitalisation might mean in such a context.
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When approaching the study of language policies and politics, aprioristic assumptions that a minority group would wish the institutionalisation of its diversity and claim special rights might yield biased and false results. Conversely, a context-specific approach that considers exogenous discourses, local needs and how these interact can provide a more accurate account of the socio-cultural processes in act at the local level. In fact, as argued by a number of scholars (e.g. Duchêne & Heller 2007), goals at the core of activists’ agendas, as the officialization, standardisation and teaching of native minority languages, are not necessarily felt as a need or a priority for the speakers of those languages.

This contribution participates to the debate outlined above focusing on the case of the Berber-speaking community of Siwa Oasis, which constitutes an enclave in the largely Arabic-speaking Egyptian country. Despite formal overtures towards the diversity and richness of the Egyptian cultures ratified by the 2014 Constitution, Standard Arabic remains the only official language of Egypt and all other languages spoken in the country lack official recognition, they are neither standardised nor formally taught (Ennaji 2014, Part V).

After outlining the official treatment of Siwi (national level), the paper presents the community’s attitudes towards the official policy (local level) and acceptance/rejection of exogenous discourses that recently reached Siwa, such as Berber activists’ claims and international human rights narratives (transnational level). Our data, based on extensive fieldwork conducted between 2011 and 2015, shows that the speakers, as agents of unofficial language politics, mainly favour the local language, without claiming official support. However, data also uncovers the emergence of new kinds of awareness than might give rise to “cultural” claims and, more generally, a rising attempt to strike a balance between local, national and transnational interests.
Naija: An emerging language of Nigeria

Nigeria counts more than 160 million inhabitants who speak over 500 different languages (Lewis, Simons & Fennig 2013). This paper presents Naija, a creole also known as Nigerian Pidgin, spoken as a first language by 5 million people, and by 70 million people as a second language or many more as an inter-ethnic means of communication. Naija is increasingly spoken in over two-thirds of the country, and deeply rooted in the vast Lagos conurbation. It is learnt alongside and not instead of other Nigerian languages (Elugbe & Omamor 1991). Naija is now commonly used in informal conversations, and is noticeably popular among university students and educated speakers (Egbokhare 2004). It has made considerable progress in formal contexts such as information transmission by government agencies, in radio, politics, advertising, Christian religious practices, and although it is still excluded from the educational system, it is used unofficially in multilingual schools in southern Nigeria; further it is an identifying feature of the prosperous Nigerian film industry, Nollywood.

As noted by Osundare (2006), ‘Nigeria was promulgated into existence with little or no regard for its ethnic and religious peculiarities’, it still has no specific National Language Policy. English is Nigeria’s official language (with French and Arabic), it is dominant in the education system and in written usages. A number of national documents do feature elements about language: in the National Policy on Education, for example, it is stated that all children should be schooled in English, and encouraged to learn Hausa, Igbo or Yoruba as their second language. This paper will examine the vitality of Naija and how it continues to expand its functional constituency even though it receives no institutional support, its increasing role as a marker of national identity and solidarity (Akande 2008), and the widely debated question of why it still holds no official status in Nigeria’s language policy.

References


“We speak with words that do not exist”:
Linguistic ideologies, state policies and identity in Argentina

In the year 2016, Argentina celebrated two hundred years of political independence. The emancipatory process, however, found no reflection in State language policies: to the present day there is no legislation that defines which is or which are the official languages that identify the country. At the end of the 20th century, in the 1994 Constitution, the State legally recognized the existence of native languages. However, the language spoken by the majority of argentines, a plural network of varieties with substrates in languages from the Iberian Peninsula, native American languages and languages of immigration, lacks its own name. It is still designated - by the State and by the speakers - with categories that maintain cultural linguistic colonialism: we speak “Castilian” or “Spanish”, the language of Spain. The linguistic imperialism imposed 500 years ago, maintains here a fertile territory. From official web pages to educational practices, the referents continue to be the old and renewed colonial agencies: Royal Spanish Academy, American Academies of the Spanish Language, Cervantes Institute. Hence, for most argentines, a person who does not dominate or reproduce the prestigious linguistic model, either does not know how to speak (does not “exist” as speaker) or speaks "something" that does “not exist”.

Within this framework, I intend to analyze, in the first place, the tensions and contradictions between multilingualism and monolingualism in the Argentine State language policy, the epistemologies that underpin them and the discursive strategies that allow the coexistence of opposing ideologies. Secondly, I will address the effects of these tensions on the linguistic identity of speakers.

To do this, I will take as units of analysis: legislation, political and educational official documents from the last decade; interviews with speakers from different sectors and data obtained from my teaching experience at the university.
National objectives and local needs: Adjustments and resistances to language learning policy for adult migrants in two European cities.

Dominant narratives stress the importance for migrants to learn the language of the country they reside in and are concretised in a range of policies affecting their ability to access social rights and acquire administrative stability. In European countries, the past fifteen years have seen a strengthening of linguistic criteria for acquiring visas, permanent residence or citizenship, at the same time as the paradigm of “integration” has become more widely accepted at national levels. At the same time, the European Union (EU) has produced recommendations regarding language learning policies that national and local authorities should implement to facilitate socio-economic insertion and access to services and rights. To a greater or lesser extent, these overlap with distinct “national language” policies in EU member states. However, it is at local level that “integration policies” are truly negotiated and appropriated by those charged with putting them in place (Favell, 2001). In this paper, based on PhD research finished in 2016, we propose to examine language policies for adult migrants in one English and one French city, focusing particularly on national language classes. First, we will look at how objectives for these change between European, national and local levels. Then, using the tools of the sociology of public action, we will explore the mechanisms used to transfer national norms, categories and objectives to local actors and the leeway this gives them to adjust or resist national policies and construct new ones. Finally, we will consider how local stakeholders use their proximity with local populations to justify the adaption of national policies and to respond better to local needs.
Ann Wand, Oxford University, UK

Community reactions to language policy in South Tyrol, Italy

The German-speaking province of South Tyrol is situated just south of the Austrian border and has historically functioned as a sort of ‘conflict zone’ since the nineteenth century. When the region was annexed to northern Italy after the breakdown of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Mussolini attempted to the Italianize the province as early as the 1920s.

As northern Italy expanded its borders to include South Tyrol, a transition in language policy occurred as German-speakers found themselves confronted by the Fascist party. With Italian place names introduced to South Tyrol to eradicate the German language, violators received up to one to three months in prison if they used the words ‘Tyrolean’ or ‘South Tyrolean’.

In 1972 language policy shifted in favour of the German-speaking community after the provincial government established the Second Autonomy statute. Article 19 permitted all three provincial language groups (German-, Italian- and Ladin-speakers) to attend ‘separate but equal’ monolingual schools, avoiding bilingual education. The objective was to preserve the language and culture of the German-speaking minority.

However, overtime the Italian-speaking community has started to view German-speakers as having a linguistic advantage as they are entitled to 70 percent of the jobs available based on the autonomy statute. As a result, Italian parents have tried to find alternatives to encourage German education, with some parents giving their children German names and employing German nannies so that their children can pass as ‘German’ and enrol in German-speaking schools. Additionally, Italian teachers are trying to promote bilingualism through immersion teaching techniques and exchange initiatives to work around the autonomy statute.

In this paper I will explore through an anthropological lens how the Italian-speaking community negotiates and silently resists language policy measures in favour of the German-speaking community and how the role of German language ideology affects students’ abilities to learn the second language.
Local-level language management: *in vivo* and *in vitro* language policies in the tourist office of Marseille

As a “key site” of globalisation (Jaworski & Thurlow, 2010: 257), international tourism encounters constitute a complex situation of language contact. The highly heterogeneous nature of participants’ (socio)linguistic repertoires leads to ambiguity regarding language choice in these brief interactions. Thus, participants and/or tourist institutions must elaborate local-level language policies in order to manage linguistic diversity and its effects.

This paper aims to explore this phenomenon by combining ethnographic and interactional data from a fieldwork project undertaken in the Tourist Office (TO) of Marseille, France. Using these data, it will be shown how both *in vitro* and *in vivo* language policies (Calvet, 1993) are developed at the local level in order to manage language practices.

Firstly, the presentation will show how the management of the TO exercises control over which languages are seen, heard and used through the use of *in vitro* “micro-level” language policies – such as intervening in the linguistic landscape, choosing the languages used in official documentation or employing advisers with specific linguistic resources.

Secondly, it will be shown how, in encounters between tourist advisers and international tourists, participants select the main language of interaction through spontaneous negotiation, thereby elaborating fleeting, *in vivo* language policies for each encounter.

The paper will conclude by revealing how these local-level language policies lead to the promotion of a small number of “global” languages which can be easily linked to the practical, professional, economic and political interests of the advisers, the tourists and the TO. Thus, these data offer an opportunity to explore the interactions between the TO’s different language policy stakeholders and their interests, offering insight into language policy as a dynamic, ever-evolving socio-cultural process. Finally, discussion points will be proposed focussing on the influence of language ideologies on the above language policy processes as well as the inequality they engender.
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