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1. Summary of the event

SS21 was held at the University of Murcia, located on the south-eastern coast of Spain. The general theme of the 2016 conference was Attitudes and Prestige.

The talk “Interaction between language policymakers and language practisers: Case studies from Latvia and Catalonia in an international comparative perspective” was given by prof. Sanita Lazdiņa (Latvia) and Montserrat Casacuberta (Spain).

2. Target audience and impact

The target audience was sociolinguists, researchers in the field of language planning and management, and students. After the conference, I got an offer to participate in the special issue for the international journal “Language Policy” developing an article about the topic presented in the conference.

3. Outcomes

During our session the main research questions that were discussed were: How are language practices at schools reflect official and non-official language policies. I have also learned for next research projects to think more about policies in both directions (bottom-up, top-down) or blended concentrating to the question: which of them are more effective, and: more effective to whom? I have created new contacts from the COST action IS1306 “New Speakers in a Multilingual Europe - Opportunities and Challenges”.
Sanita Lazdina at SS21 conference.

4. Slides
Interaction between language policy-makers and language practisers: case studies from Latvia and Catalonia in an international comparative perspective

Sanita Lazdiņa, Rezekne Academy of Technologies, Latvia

Montserrat Casacuberta, Équipe Recherche Interlangues: Mémoires, Identités, Territoires, Rennes (France)

Session: Language policy regimes, regimentation and governmentality in “new speaker” contexts

---

**Overview**

1. Main research questions
2. Rēzekne: location; sociolinguistic frame; languages of instruction at schools
3. Language policies at schools (top-down and bottom-up)
4. Language practices: examples from teacher training courses
5. Back to the main research questions
1. Main research questions

- How do language practices at schools reflect official and non-official language policies?

- Which policies are more effective (bottom-up, top-down or blended), and: more effective to whom?

- Do approaches in language teaching support the needs of New Speakers?
Ethnodemographic composition in Rēzekne

(In Latvia: Latvians: 62.1% Russians: 26.9%)

Language use

Languages used as every day languages in Rēzekne:
- Russian: 56.8% (in Latvia: 37.2)
- Latvian: 38% (in Latvia: 62.1)
- Latgalian: 40.5% (in Latvia: 8.8)

Language/s of instruction at schools
- 4 bilingual schools (bilingual Russian-Latvian models)
- 4 schools with Latvian as a lg of instruction
- 1 Rēzekne Polish Secondary School (lg of instruction – Latvian + few subjects in Polish)
3. Language policies at schools: General rules

- Official language and main language of education – Latvian (Official Language Law 1999)
- State supports national minority education programmes in seven languages – Russian, Polish, Hebrew, Belarusian, Ukrainian, Estonian, and Lithuanian.
- Primary minority schools have the option of choosing from five bilingual models, one of which allows schools to devise their own bilingual educational model.
- Secondary schools are entitled to determine which subjects are taught in Latvian, but the total should not be less than 60% of all subjects.
- In all schools of Latvia the first foreign language (English) is taught from Grade 1, second foreign language (usually German or Russian) from Grade 6.

3. Language policies at schools (bottom-up): Example 1

- CLIL – use a foreign or additional language for the teaching of curricular content (Smit, Dafouz, 2012).
- CLIL in Latvia was initiated by schools, now supervised by Latvian Language Agency
- In ~ 10 schools in Latvia
  - In the context of Latvia: Latvian, English, Russian
3. Language policies at schools (bottom-up): Example 2

- Voluntary school subject “Regional Studies” («Heimatkunde»), initiated by Rēzekne University Colleague and supported by Rēzekne municipality
- Introduced in schools of Rēzekne since 2013
- Translanguaging between Latvian, Latgalian, sometimes Polish (in Polish Secondary School)

3. Language policies at schools (bottom-up): Example 3

- Enhancing the use of less-used languages at schools during learning about new digital tools
- LangOER project initiated by European Comission (KA2 Languages, http://langoer.eun.org/), in Latvia led by Rēzekne University College
- Creating multilingual resources with open access (OER) (http://langoer.eun.org/oer-collection)
- Creating a Policy Brief «Open Educational Resources in your own language, in your way» http://www.icde.org/assets/AboutUs/Who_we_are/PolicyBrief-OpenEducationalResourcesinyourOwnLanguageinyourWay-20150107-final2.pdf
4. Language Practicers (Example 3)

**Teacher Training Courses in Rēzekne**

- **Place:** Rēzekne University College
- **Time:** March-May 2015

- **Educators:** (three researchers and one technical assistant)
- **Participants:** 49 teachers of different subjects (mostly: Latvian Language and Literature; Regional Studies; English) and 13 students of Rēzekne University College
- **Main result:** multilingual resources with open access (OER): [http://langoer.eun.org/oer-collection](http://langoer.eun.org/oer-collection)

**Data collecting methods**

- Observations and notes during training courses
- Questionnaires (open questions after the course)

**Main conclusions**

- For teachers it was most difficult to write in Latgalian, not to acquire digital skills
- They are not against translanguaging, using different languages for teaching purposes
- Teachers know about the concept of societal multilingualism in theory – but don’t apply it to the classroom or to creating multilingual teaching materials
- They are aware of regulations regarding the state language and diverse language practices in their families but not so aware of bilingual or multilingual patterns in their local public space (LL, also in virtual space)
5. Back to main research questions:

1) How do language practices at schools reflect official and non-official language policies?

- Language practices at schools depend on and reflect local actors (municipal authorities, schools, regional universities, etc.)
- The educational domain (curricular planning, languages of instruction) reflects the importance of the state language.
- At the same time educational institutions are much more flexible than other official domains to react to the ethnodemographic composition of the population.
- Language practices at schools reflect also debates among educators and researchers: how to move forward from monolingual towards multilingual habits in education (from One language-only language policy at schools into Translanguaging (Adamson & Fujimoto-Adamson, 2012)).
- Official language policies reveal bilingualism as a concept of two separate linguistic systems, while language practices at schools are more flexible and open to different versions of multilingualism.

5. Back to main research questions:

2) Which policies are more effective (bottom-up, top-down or blended), and: more effective to whom?

- Short-term: bottom-up policies are more effective
- Long-term: top-down support or blended policies allow for much better success and progress
- On-going efforts from main actors at schools (teachers, administration, pupils, parents) have to be supported (politically and financially) by the state
- Only holistic educational policy planning can be successful in the long run.
  - Access Policy (to learn some language);
  - Personnel Policy (to prepare teachers);
  - Methods and Materials Policy;
  - Evaluation Policy (Baldauf, 2005)
- More effective to whom?
  - The main audience in education are pupils and parents, efficiency should be evaluated from their perspectives
5. Back to main research questions:

3) Do approaches in language teaching support the needs of New Speakers?

- Bottom-up approaches reflect the needs of New Speakers
- CLIL creates authentic language-learning environment which is missing outside school > supportive in particular to New Speakers of English
- Regional Studies supports acquisition (New Speakers) and literacy development (New Readers and Writers) of Latgalian

Thank you!

sanita.lazdina@ru.lv