Tilburg University

Mapping immigrant minority languages in multicultural cities

Extra, G.; Yagmur, K.

Published in:
Mapping Linguistic Diversity in Multicultural Contexts

Publication date:
2008

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Extra, G., & Yagmur, K. (2008). Mapping immigrant minority languages in multicultural cities. In M. Barni, & G. Extra (Eds.), *Mapping Linguistic Diversity in Multicultural Contexts* (pp. 139-162). Mouton de Gruyter.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Mapping immigrant minority languages in multicultural cities¹

Guus Extra and Kutlay Yağmur

1. Rationale and goals of the study

Given the overwhelming focus on mainstream second language acquisition by immigrant minority (henceforward IM) groups, there is much less evidence of the status and use of IM languages across European nation-states. In contrast to regional minority (henceforward RM) languages, IM languages have no established status in terms of period and area of residence. Obviously, typological differences between IM languages across EU nation-states do exist, e.g., in terms of the status of IM languages as EU languages or non-EU languages, or as languages of former colonies. Taken from the latter perspective, e.g., Indian languages are prominent in the United Kingdom, Arabic languages in France, Congolese languages in Belgium, and Surinamese languages in the Netherlands.

Tosi (1984) offers an early case study on Italian as an IM language in England. Most studies of IM languages in Europe have focused on a spectrum of IM languages at the level of one particular multilingual city (Kroon 1990; Baker and Eversley 2000), one particular nation-state (LMP 1985, Alladina and Edwards 1991; Extra and Verhoeven 1993a; Extra and De Ruiter 2001; Caubet, Chaker and Sibille 2002; Extra et al. 2002), or one particular IM language at the nation-state or European level (Tilmatine 1997 and Obdeijn and De Ruiter 1998 on Arabic in Europe, or Jørgensen 2003 on Turkish in Europe). A number of studies have taken both a cross-national and a cross-linguistic perspective on the status and use of IM languages in Europe (e.g., Husén and Oppen 1983; Jaspaert and Kroon 1991; Extra and Verhoeven 1993b, 1998; Extra and Gorter 2001). Churchill (1986) has offered an early cross-national perspective on the education of IM children in the OECD countries, whereas Reid and Reich (1992) have carried out a cross-national evaluative study of 15 pilot projects on the education of IM children supported by the European Commission.

Here, we present the rationale, methodology, and kernel outcomes of the *Multilingual Cities Project* (henceforward MCP), a co-ordinated multiple survey study in six major multicultural cities in different EU nation-states. The project was carried out under the auspices of the *European Cultural Foundation*, established in Amsterdam, and it was coordinated by a research team at *Babylon, Centre for Studies of the Multicultural Society*, at Tilburg University in the Netherlands, in cooperation with universities and educational authorities in all participating cities. The aims of the MCP were to gather, analyse, and compare multiple data on the status of IM languages at home and at school, taken from cross-national and cross-linguistics perspectives. In the participating cities, ranging from Northern to Southern Europe, Germanic or Romance languages have a dominant status in public life. Figure 1 gives an outline of the project.

¹ This is an adated and extended version of an earlier text in *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 175/176 (2005): 17–40.

Figure 1. Outline of the Multilingual Cities Project (MCP)

The criteria for selecting a city to participate in this multinational study were that it should be prototypical for a multicultural environment with a great variety of IM groups, and that it should offer a university-based research facility that would be able to handle the local data gathering and local data analysis, and the final reporting of the local results. Given the increasing role of municipalities as educational authorities in all partner cities, the project was carried out in close cooperation between researchers at local universities and local educational authorities. In each partner city, this cooperation proved to be of essential value. In sum, the rationale for collecting, analysing and comparing multiple home language data on multicultural school populations derives from three different perspectives:

- taken from a *demographic* perspective, home language data play a crucial role in the definition and identification of multicultural school populations;
- taken from a *sociolinguistic* perspective, home language data offer valuable insights into both the distribution and vitality of home languages across different population groups, and thus raise the public awareness of multilingualism;
- taken from an *educational* perspective, home language data are indispensable tools for educational planning and policies;
- taken from an *economic* perspective, home language data offer latent resources that can be built upon and developed in terms of economic chances.

Local reports about the participating cities have been made available for *Göteborg* (Nygren-Junkin and Extra 2003), *Hamburg* (Fürstenau, Gogolin and Yağmur 2003), *The Hague* (Extra, Aarts, Van der Avoird, Broeder and Yağmur 2001), *Brussels* (Verlot, Delrue, Extra and Yağmur 2003), *Lyon* (Akinci, De Ruiter and Sanagustin 2004), and *Madrid* (Broeder and Mijares 2003). For the final cross-national report we refer to Extra and Yağmur (2004).

2. Method of research

Design of the questionnaire

Except in Scandinavian countries, there is no European tradition of collecting home language statistics on multicultural (school) population groups. In fact, collecting home language data in some countries is even in conflict with present language legislation. This holds in particular for Belgium, where traditional language borders have been allocated and legalised in terms of Dutch and/or French.

Our method of carrying out home language surveys amongst primary school children in each of the six participating cities has profited from experiences in non-European English-dominant

immigration countries with nationwide population surveys in which commonly single questions on home language use were asked. In contrast to such questionnaires, our survey was based on multiple rather than single questions on home language use and on cross-nationally equivalent questions. In doing this, we aimed at describing and comparing multiple language profiles of major IM communities in each of the cities under consideration.

The questionnaire for data collection was designed after ample study and evaluation of language-related questions in nationwide or large-scale population research in a variety of countries with a longer history of migration and minorisation processes. The design of the questionnaire also derived from extensive empirical experiences gained in carrying out municipal home language surveys amongst pupils in both primary and secondary schools in the Netherlands (Broeder and Extra 1995; 1998 and Extra et al. 2001; 2002).

A number of conditions for the design of the questionnaire needed to be met. The first prerequisite was that the questionnaire should be appropriate for all children and should include a built-in screening question for distinguishing between children in whose homes only the mainstream language is used and children in whose homes one or more other languages next to or instead of this language are used. In the latter case, a home language profile has to be specified.

The second prerequisite of the questionnaire was that it should be both short and powerful. It should be short in order to minimise the time needed by teachers and children to answer it during school hours, and it should be powerful in that it should have an appropriate and transparent set of questions which should be answered by all children individually, if needed – in particular with younger children – in cooperation with the teacher, after an explanation of the goals and design of the questionnaire in class. The survey consisted of 20 questions which were made available to schools in a double-sided printed format.

The third prerequisite of the questionnaire was that the answers given by the children should be controlled, scanned, interpreted, and verified as automatically as possible, given the large size of the resulting database. In order to fulfil this demand, both hardware and software conditions had to be met.

Table 1 gives an outline of the questionnaire. An English version is made available in the Appendix.

Table 1. Outline of the MCP questionnaire

Questions	Focus
1–3	Personal information (name, age, gender)
4–8	School information (city, district, name, type, grade)
9–11	Birth country of the pupil, father and mother
12	Selective screening question (Are any other languages than X ever used in your home? If yes, complete all the questions; if no, continue with questions 18–20)
13–17	Language repertoire, language proficiency, language choice, language dominance, and language preference
18–20	Languages learnt at/outside school and demanded from school

In compliance with privacy legislation in different nation-states, the resulting database contains language data at the levels of districts, schools, and grades only; no data have been processed that can be traced back to individuals. The answers to questions 9–12 make it

possible to compare the status of birth country data and home language data as demographic criteria. The countries and languages explicitly mentioned in questions 9–12 were determined on the basis of the most recent municipal statistics about IM children at primary schools. Thus, the list of prespecified languages for, e.g., Hamburg was quite different from the one used in Madrid. The selective screening question 12 (see also Appendix) was aimed at a maximal scope from three different perspectives, i.e., by the passive construction *are used* instead of *do you use*, by the modal adverb *ever*, and by asking for *use* instead of one of the four language skills. The language profile, specified by questions 13–17, consists of the following dimensions:

- language repertoire: the number and type of (co-)occurring home languages next to or instead of the mainstream language;
- language proficiency: the extent to which the pupil can understand/speak/read/write the home language;
- language choice: the extent to which the home language is commonly spoken with the mother, father, younger and older brothers/sisters, and best friends;
- language dominance: the extent to which the home language is spoken best;
- language preference: the extent to which the home language is preferably spoken.

Taken together, the four dimensions of language proficiency, choice, dominance, and preference result in a language vitality index (see Section 4). On the basis of questions 18–20, a school language profile can be specified. This profile provides information about the available language education in and outside school, as well as the expressed interest in learning other languages. The agreed-upon questionnaire was translated into equivalent versions in Dutch, French, German, Spanish, and Swedish. These versions were tested in at least one primary school in each partner city. On the basis of the suggestions of local educational authorities and researchers, the phrasing and wording of the questionnaires were further adapted. All six cities had the same questions, but one additional question on “nationality” was added to the German questionnaire. This question was not included in any of the other cities.

Data collection

The local questionnaires were printed in multiple copies. Due to the requirements of automatic processing, it was essential that printed rather than photocopied questionnaires were used. Uniformity, both in terms of content and form, was a prerequisite for data processing. Local educational authorities sent out letters of permission to schools and/or parents so that their children could participate in the survey. In each city, the printed questionnaires were distributed to school directors. Both for classroom teachers and for data collection assistants, a manual in the local language was prepared to facilitate interaction with the pupils.

The completed questionnaires were delivered by the schools to the researchers at the participating universities. After checks of the total set of questionnaires per school had been made, all delivered questionnaires were sent to Tilburg University in the Netherlands for data processing.

Data processing

Data processing was centrally done in Tilburg by *Babylon* researchers. Given the large size of the database, an automatic processing technique based on specially developed software (*Teleform*) and available hardware was developed and utilised. By means of these tools about 5000 forms could be scanned per day. Because some questionnaire items were filled-out in handwriting, additional verification of these items had to be done using character recognition software; in this way, around 4000 forms could be processed per day. After scanning and verification had been completed, the database for each city was analysed by using the SPSS

program. Table 2 gives an overview of the resulting database, derived from the reports of primary school children in an age range of 4–12 years (only in The Hague were data also collected at secondary schools). The total cross-national sample consists of more than 160,000 pupils.

Table 2. Overview of the MCP database

(^a Dutch-medium schools only; ^b Réseau d'Education Prioritaire only)

City	Total of schools	Total of schools in the survey	Total of pupils in schools	Total of pupils in the survey	Age range of pupils
Brussels	117 ^a	110 ^a	11,500	10,300	6–12
Göteborg	170	122	36,100	21,300	6–12
Hamburg	231 public 17 catholic	218 public 14 catholic	54,900	46,000	6–11
Lyon	173 ^b	42 ^b	60,000	11,650	6–11
Madrid	708 public 411 catholic	133 public 21 catholic	202,000 99,000	30,000	5–12
The Hague	142 primary 30 secondary	109 primary 26 secondary	41,170 19,000	27,900 13,700	4–12 12–17

In order to carry out systematic analyses on the data set, a SPSS syntax file which was developed step-by-step was used in the preparation stage. In the analysis stage, another SPSS syntax file was used in order to achieve uniformity of the findings. The last stage of data processing was transmitting the outcomes of the analyses in a readable format. Given the fact that the research results should be presented in the same format in all six participating cities in the project, a cross-nationally uniform format was set up. In presenting the results, *Excel Worksheets* and *Microsoft Graphics* within *Word for Windows* were used. Both the worksheets and the templates for figures within *Microsoft Graphics* were predefined. In this way, a uniform format for all the tables and figures could be achieved, which then needed to be interpreted.

3. Distribution of languages

The local language surveys amongst primary school children have delivered a wealth of yet unknown cross-national evidence on the distribution and vitality of IM languages at home. Apart from selecting one or more of the prespecified languages in each of the local surveys, pupils could also opt for self-references to other home languages by filling-out in hand-writing the boxes provided for this objective (see Appendix).

The resulting database consists of a huge variety of self-references (types) and their frequencies of mentioning (tokens). In most cases, the pupils referred to entities that could be (re)traced as existing languages. In this context, the regularly updated database of *The Ethnologue* (www.sil.org/ethnologue; Grimes 1996) on languages of the world proved to be very helpful. In cases of doubt or lacking information, other resources were used, such as Comrie et al. (2003), Campbell (2000), Dalby (1999/2000), Giacalone Ramat and Ramat (1998), and Crystal (1997). Apart from self-references to known and unknown languages, the pupils also made references to countries that could not reasonably be traced back to languages or to other/unknown categories. In general, however, the resolution level of the language

question in the survey was very high, and relatively few references could not be traced back to languages. Table 3 gives a cross-national overview of the data under consideration.

Table 3. References made by pupils in terms of types and tokens (x = not specified)

Municipality	Reference to languages		Reference to countries		Other/unknown references	
	Types	Tokens	Types	Tokens	Types	Tokens
Göteborg	75	7,598	8	40	10	20
Hamburg	90	16,639	12	229	10	92
The Hague	88	23,435	13	788	17	24
Brussels	54	12,737	9	186	7	11
Lyon	66	6,106	17	130	–	–
Madrid	56	2,619	x	x	x	x

Based on the overview of types and tokens of (re)traced home languages, the distribution of these home languages was specified in a ranked order of decreasing frequency. A common phenomenon in all participating cities was that few languages (types) were referred to often (tokens), and that many languages (types) were referred to rarely (tokens). Therefore, the most frequently mentioned home languages represent a very high proportion of the total number of occurrences/tokens in all cities.

Apart from Madrid, late-comer amongst our focal cities in respect of immigration, the proportion of primary school children in whose homes other languages were used next to or instead of the mainstream language ranged between one third and more than a half. The total number of languages other than Swedish/German/Dutch (The Hague/Brussels)/French/ Spanish ranged per city between 50 and 90. The figures were 36% of the total student population in Göteborg, 35% in Hamburg, 49% in The Hague, 82% in Brussels, 54% in Lyon, and 10% in Madrid.

The outcomes of the local surveys were aggregated in one cross-national database. On the basis of the number of references made to home languages, the top 20 of the most frequently mentioned languages in each city were identified. Forty-nine languages were in the group of the top 20 list in the six cities. Out of these 49 languages, 19 languages were represented in 3–6 cities and 30 languages in only 1–2 cities. There were also unique references in the top 20 per city; most of these languages were either languages of neighbouring countries, languages of former colonies, or RM languages. For purposes of cross-national and cross-linguistic analyses, 20 of the most frequently mentioned languages in these cities were chosen.

Two criteria were used to select these 20 languages from the list of 49 languages. Each language should be represented by at least three cities, and each city should be represented in the cross-national database by at least 30 pupils in the age range of 6–11 years. Our focus on this age range was motivated by comparability considerations: This range was represented in the local databases of all participating cities (see Table 2). Romani/Sinte was included in the cross-national analyses because of its special status in our list of 20 languages as a language without territorial status. Two languages had an exceptional status: English “invaded” the local databases as a language of international prestige, and Romani/Sinte was solidly represented in Hamburg and Göteborg only. The concept of language group was based on the pupils’ answers to the question whether and, if so, which other languages were used at home instead of or next to the mainstream language (see Appendix, question 13). On the basis of their answer patterns, pupils may belong to more than one language group. Table 4 gives an overview of the resulting database.

Table 4. Overview of the numbers of pupils (6–11 years) per reported language and city

Reported languages	Gö	Ha	tH	Br	Ly	Ma	Coverage
English	1,039	1,077	950	676	426	359	6
Arabic	768	464	1,391	1,608	2,789	662	6
Portuguese	88	360	88	77	259	202	6
Italian	51	192	92	361	255	43	6
Turkish	385	4,948	2,535	606	468	1	5
Spanish	328	431	288	389	353	–	5
German	148	–	156	119	91	45	5
French	118	17	185	7,327	–	157	5
Chinese	184	7	180	22	37	160	4
Kurdish	468	197	273	11	36	4	4
Albanian	186	410	5	107	62	3	4
Polish	163	1,729	16	33	3	100	4
Russian	70	1,652	14	32	11	37	4
Berber	4	–	1,334	214	145	37	4
Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian	795	460	46	29	26	6	3
Vietnamese	55	153	14	14	91	–	3
Somali	315	–	135	–	49	–	3
Urdu/Pakistani	27	238	294	32	1	3	3
Armenian	8	82	5	47	41	1	3
Romani/Sinte	51	219	6	8	3	1	2

As shown in Table 4, eight languages were represented in 5–6 cities, while eleven languages were represented in 3–4 cities. With respect to French, Brussels offers a special case, given the public and private status of both French and Dutch in this city (Verlot et al. 2003). There is a remarkable municipal distribution of two pairs of languages which are often in competition in their source countries, i.e., Turkish and Kurdish in Turkey, and Arabic and Berber in Northern African countries (in particular, Morocco). Only in Göteborg was Kurdish more strongly represented than Turkish, and only in The Hague were Berber and Arabic represented in balance. In our database, Kurdish hardly emerged in Brussels and Madrid. The same holds for Berber in Göteborg and Hamburg.

4. Specification of language profiles, demonstrated for the Turkish language group

For all language groups mentioned in Table 4, a cross-linguistic and pseudolongitudinal comparison was made of the four reported dimensions of language proficiency, language choice, language dominance, and language preference. For this analysis, the four reported dimensions were operationalised as follows:

- language proficiency: the extent to which the home language under consideration is *understood*;
- language choice: the extent to which this language is commonly spoken at home *with the mother*;
- language dominance: the extent to which the home language is spoken *best*;
- language preference: the extent to which the home language is *preferably* spoken.

The operationalisation of the first and second dimension (language proficiency and language choice) was aimed at a maximal scope for tracing language vitality. Language understanding is generally the least demanding of the four language skills involved, and the mother acts generally as the major gatekeeper for intergenerational language transmission (Clyne 2003).

The final aim was the construction of a language vitality index (henceforward LVI), based on the outcomes of the four dimensions presented above. Since Giles et al. (1977) introduced the concept of ethnolinguistic vitality, the focus has been on its determinants rather than on its operationalisation. Determinants have been proposed in terms of lists of factors, clustered in status factors, demographic factors, and institutional support factors, e.g. by Giles et al. (1977), or in additional factors such as cultural (dis)similarity, e.g., by Appel and Muysken (1987: 32–38). The proposed lists of factors suffer from various shortcomings that cannot be solved easily:

- the lists of factors are neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive;
- different factors contribute in different ways to (lack of) vitality and may even neutralise each other;
- some of these factors are personal characteristics (e.g., age, gender, or educational level), whereas other factors are group characteristics (e.g., group size or group spread);
- moreover, a distinction has been proposed and found between the objective status of these factors and their subjective perception by minority and/or majority groups (Bourhis et al. 1981, Van der Avoird 2001).

In our research project, we took a different approach by focusing on the operationalisation of language vitality rather than on its determinants. The operationalisation of language vitality was derived from the construction of language profiles, based on self-reports. In the analyses, the four above-mentioned language dimensions were compared as proportional scores, i.e., the mean proportion of pupils per language group that indicated a positive response to the relevant questions. The LVI is, in turn, the mean value of these four proportional scores. This LVI is by definition a value-driven index, in the sense that the *chosen* dimensions with the *chosen* operationalisations are *equally* weighted.

In this context, it should be mentioned that, from a conceptual point of view, the chosen dimensions are more closely related than in many other large-scale attempts to operationalise multiple human properties in terms of an index. An interesting case in point is the widely used *Human Development Index* (HDI), proposed by the United Nations in its annual UNDP reports. The HDI measures the overall achievements in a particular country in three basic dimensions of human development, i.e., life expectancy, educational achievement, and income per capita. For each of these dimensions, an index based on multiple values has been created. The ultimate HDI is based on the average of the three indices mentioned. In this case also, the chosen dimensions with the chosen operationalisations are equally weighted (for details see UNDP 2002).

For all 20 language groups, language profiles were specified based on tabulated and graphic information. Tabulated information was provided on the number of pupils and the language vitality (index) per age group and per generation. For all language groups, three age groups and three generations were distinguished. The age groups consisted of children aged 6/7, 8/9, and 10/11 years old. The three generations were operationalised as follows:

- G1: pupil + father + mother born abroad;
- G2: pupil born in country of residence, father *and/or* mother born abroad;
- G3: pupil + father + mother born in country of residence.

On the basis of this categorisation, intergenerational shift can be estimated. In addition, graphic information was provided on the pseudolongitudinal outcomes per age group on the four dimensions of language proficiency, language choice, language dominance, and language preference. In all cases, the total population of age groups was always larger than the total population of generations. This discrepancy is the result of a predictably larger number of missing values (i.e., non-responses) for generation than for age. In the former case, references have to be made to the countries of birth of the pupil, the father, and the mother; in the latter case, reference has to be made only to the age of the pupil. Language vitality indices for age and generation were calculated only if at least 5 children were represented in a particular group. Given the possible non-responses of children to any of the questions represented in figures and tables, all figures and tables were presented and interpreted in proportional values. In Table 5, we demonstrate the provided cross-national and pseudolongitudinal information on the Turkish language group (see Table 4 for the absence of Madrid).

Table 5. Turkish language group: cross-national numbers of pupils and LVI per age group and per generation

Cities	Age groups							
	Population			Total	Vitality			Mean
	6/7	8/9	10/11		6/7	8/9	10/11	
Göteborg	124	115	146	385	69	67	66	67
Hamburg	1,384	2,381	1,183	4,948	66	62	65	64
The Hague	833	853	849	2,535	75	68	65	69
Brussels	225	213	168	606	73	75	71	73
Lyon	146	176	146	468	65	63	68	65
Total / Mean	2,712	3,738	2,492	8,942	70	67	67	68

Cities	Generations							
	Population			Total	Vitality			Mean
	G1	G2	G3		G1	G2	G3	
Göteborg	51	308	10	369	67	68	43	59
Hamburg	627	3,676	205	4,508	69	64	49	61
The Hague	539	1,842	46	2,427	73	68	62	68
Brussels	75	417	42	534	74	74	70	73
Lyon	78	308	24	410	70	64	65	66
Total / Mean	1,370	6,551	327	8,248	71	68	58	65

Pseudolongitudinal profile of the Turkish language group

Figure 2a. Language proficiency in Turkish

Figure 2b. Language choice for Turkish

Figure 2c. Language dominance of Turkish and/or mainstream language

Figure 2d. Language preference for Turkish and/or mainstream language

Language proficiency (Fig. 2a). For all age groups, reported understanding (96–97%) and speaking skills (94%) in Turkish are higher than reported reading (38–80%) and writing skills (33–73%), but the differences narrow as children get older.

Language choice (Fig. 2b). At home, 77–82% of the children reported commonly speaking Turkish with their mothers, 70–76% with their fathers, 38–43% with their younger siblings, 27–36% with their older siblings, and 30–36% with their best friends.

Language dominance (Fig. 2c). The reported dominance of Turkish decreases as children get older (44%, 33%, and 31%, respectively). The reported dominance of the mainstream language increases across age groups (45%, 54%, and 53%, respectively). A slight increase in balanced bilingualism was reported across age groups (6–11%).

Language preference (Fig. 2d). Similar to dominance, the reported preference for Turkish decreases as children get older (43%, 35%, and 30%, respectively). In a complementary pattern, an increasing preference for the mainstream language was reported across age groups (44%, 50%, and 50%, respectively). No preference was reported by an increasing 7–12% of all children.

Language vitality across age groups and generations (Table 5). The Turkish language group is the largest group in the overall research population (except for Madrid). Turkish is spoken in the homes of 8,942 children across the age groups in 5 cities. A great majority of the Turkish-speaking pupils was traced in Hamburg and The Hague, followed by Brussels, Lyon, and Göteborg. In terms of intergenerational differences, first-generation children born abroad reported the highest language vitality (71%), followed by second- and third-generation children (68–58%). In Brussels, there is almost no difference between the 3 generations. Turkish has the highest vitality in Brussels (73%) for all age groups, and the average vitality of Turkish for all cities in the given age groups is 68%.

Languages other than Turkish. Next to Turkish, a number of other languages were reported as home languages. French (381), Kurdish (375), English (133), Arabic (96), German (29), Albanian (17), and Spanish (17) were the major languages reported.

5. Cross-linguistic perspectives on language vitality

In this section, we present a cumulative language vitality index (LVI) for all 20 language groups on the basis of the obtained proportional scores for language proficiency (understanding), language choice (with mother), language dominance, and language preference. As mentioned before, the LVI is based on the mean value of the obtained scores for each of the four language dimensions referred to. Table 6 gives a cross-linguistic and pseudolongitudinal overview of the LVI per language group and age group. LVI calculations have only been made if at least 5 children were represented in a particular age group and generation.

Table 6. Language vitality per language group and age group (in %, LVI in cumulative %)

Language group	Total pupils	6/7 years	8/9 years	10/11 years	Average
Romani/Sinte	270	76	71	64	70
Urdu/Pakistani	564	65	70	69	68
Turkish	8,942	70	67	67	68
Armenian	170	64	59	65	63
Russian	1,791	66	58	57	60
Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian	1,285	60	58	59	59
Albanian	765	63	56	58	59
Vietnamese	299	57	60	58	58
Chinese	561	56	58	60	58
Arabic	7,682	59	58	58	58
Polish	1,925	57	59	53	56
Somali	499	58	54	53	55
Portuguese	1,074	54	54	54	54
Berber	1,730	51	54	51	52
Kurdish	974	54	47	51	51
Spanish	1,789	47	49	47	48
French	7,787	47	40	44	44
Italian	994	39	40	39	39
English	4,527	37	33	39	36
German	559	35	31	32	33

Considering its non-territorial status, it is not surprising that Romani/Sinte emerged with the highest language vitality. English and German ended up in bottom positions given the fact that they often had a higher status at school than at home. When the average scores of the youngest and oldest age groups were compared, 11 language groups showed the highest scores for the former and 5 language groups for the latter. The largest interval between the scores emerged for Romani/Sinte. Strong maintenance of language vitality across the youngest and oldest age groups, with intervals of -1/0/+1 only, emerged for 8 out of the 20 language groups.

A different cross-linguistic and pseudolongitudinal perspective is provided in Table 7, in terms of generations.

Table 7. Inter-generational distribution (in %) and inter-generational language vitality (LVI in cumulative %) per language group

Language group	Total pupils	Inter-generational distribution			Inter-generational language vitality		
		G1	G2	G3	G1	G2	G3
Albanian	675	39	56	5	72	51	34
Arabic	7,002	21	73	6	64	57	35
Armenian	153	49	42	9	69	55	–
Berber	1,656	20	78	2	59	50	45
Chinese	523	22	74	4	72	59	–
English	4,045	16	42	41	43	41	28
French	7,090	7	45	48	55	43	30
German	506	18	45	38	43	35	22
Italian	916	12	60	28	49	43	29
Kurdish	900	50	49	2	61	43	33
Polish	1,837	14	82	4	73	59	31
Portuguese	1,004	27	66	8	63	52	33
Romani/Sinte	231	35	41	23	76	66	65
Russian	1,616	81	16	3	64	–	–
Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian	1,191	38	58	4	71	50	–
Somali	464	38	58	5	70	50	–
Spanish	1,570	18	61	21	63	47	30
Turkish	8,248	17	79	4	71	68	58
Urdu/Pakistani	534	25	72	3	70	67	–
Vietnamese	270	12	85	3	60	57	–

Table 7 reveals significant differences between language groups in the distribution of pupils across different generations. In most language groups, second-generation pupils were most-represented and third-generation pupils least. Remarkable exceptions to this rule were Armenian and in particular Russian, with mainly first-generation pupils. Third-generation pupils were relatively well represented (>20%) for English, French, German, Italian, Romani/Sinte, and Spanish. In conformity with expectations, Table 7 shows a stronger decrease of language vitality across generations than Table 6 shows across age groups. All language groups show more or less decreasing language vitality across generations. The strongest inter-generational shift between G1 and G3 emerged for Polish (42%), Albanian (38%), Spanish (33%), and Portuguese (30%), whereas the strongest inter-generational maintenance of language vitality occurred for Romani/ Sinte and Turkish.

The top position for language vitality of Romani/Sinte across age groups in Table 6, and its relatively strong maintenance across generations in Table 7, were also observed in earlier and similar research in the Netherlands (Broeder and Extra 1998: 70). The high vitality of Romani/Sinte was also confirmed by other studies on this language community (Acton and Mundy 1999; Kyuchukov 2002). One reason why language vitality is a core value for the Roma across Europe is the absence of source country references as alternative markers of identity – in contrast to almost all other language groups presented in Tables 6 and 7.

6. Conclusions

The findings of the *Multilingual Cities Project* have delivered a wealth of hidden evidence on the distribution and vitality of IM languages at home across European cities and nation-states. Apart from Madrid, late-comer amongst our focal cities in respect of immigration, the proportion of primary school children in whose homes other languages were used next to or instead of the mainstream language ranged per city between one third and more than a half. The total number of traced “other” languages ranged per city between 50 and 90; the common pattern was that a limited set of languages were often referred to by the children and that many languages were referred to only a few times.

The findings show that making use of more than one language is a way of life for an increasing number of children across Europe. Mainstream and non-mainstream languages should not be conceived in terms of competition. Rather, the data show that these languages are used as alternatives, depending on such factors as type of context and interlocutor. The data also reveal that the use of other languages at home does not occur at the cost of competence in the mainstream language. Many children who addressed their parents in another language reported to be dominant in the mainstream language.

Among the major 20 non-national languages in the participating cities, 10 languages are of European origin and 10 languages stem from abroad. These findings clearly show that the traditional concept of language diversity in Europe should be reconsidered and extended. The outcomes of the local language surveys also demonstrate the high status of English among primary school pupils across Europe. Its intrusion in the children's homes is apparent from the position of English in the top 5 of languages referred to by the children in all of the cities (Table 4). This outcome cannot be explained as an effect of migration and minorisation only. The children's reference to English also derives from the status of English as the international language of power and prestige. English has invaded the repertoire of all of the national languages under consideration. Moreover, children have access to English through a variety of media, and English is commonly taught in particular grades at primary schools.

In addition, children in all participating cities expressed a desire to learn a variety of languages that are not taught at school. The results of the local language surveys also show that children who took part in instruction in particular non-mainstream languages at school reported higher levels of literacy in these languages than children who did not take part in such instruction. Both the reported reading proficiency and the reported writing proficiency profited strongly from language instruction. The differences between participants and non-participants in language instruction were significant for both forms of literacy skills and for all the 20 language groups. In this domain in particular, the added value of language instruction for language maintenance and development is clear. Owing to the monolingual *habitus* (Gogolin 1994) of primary schooling across Europe, there is an increasing mismatch between language practices at home and at school. The findings on multilingualism at home and those on language needs and language instruction reported by the children should be taken into account by both national and local educational authorities in any type of language policy.

Appendix

English version of the language survey questionnaire

Anchorage points

Software and processing of the filled-out questionnaires are discussed in Extra & Yağmur (2004: 116–118). The bottom-line texts on the first and second page of the questionnaire function as anchorage points for data base recognition before the process of data scanning can start.

Questions 9/10/11

- C 1 = country of residence (*in casu* Sweden, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, France or Spain);
- C 2–20 = alphabetical list of countries most frequently represented in a particular city (*in casu* Göteborg, Hamburg, The Hague, Brussels, Lyon or Madrid, respectively), derived from local municipal statistics.

Questions 12/13

- xxx = mainstream language of country of residence (*in casu* Swedish, German, Dutch, French or Spanish, respectively).

Questions 13-20

- L 1 = mainstream language of country of residence;
- L 2–20 = alphabetical list of languages most frequently represented in a particular city, derived from assumptions on countries 2–20.

Multilingual Cities Project

(English version of the language survey questionnaire)

Do not use a pencil!

Do not use a pencil!

[illegible]

2. What is your age?

04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13

3. Sex: ☐ boy ☐ girl

3. Sex: ☐ boy ☐ girl

7. School type:

☐ regular education

☐ special education

○

8. Class/grade:

01

02

30

400

500

0700

○ ○

○

7

Please answer the questions below by colouring the circles. Countries not mentioned can be filled out in the boxes above the last three columns.

9. In which country were you born?

10. In which country was your father born?

11. In which country was your mother born?

Continue with question 12 on the next page!

12. Are any other languages than xxx ever used in your home?

☐ Yes
If yes, continue with all questions

☐ No
If no, continue with question 18 to 20

	L 1	L 2	L 3	L 4	L 5	L 6	L 7	L 8	L 9	L 10	L 11	L 12	L 13	L 14	L 15	L 16	L 17	L 18	L 19	L 20
13. Which other languages are used in your home <i>Instead of or next to xxx?</i>	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Which of these home languages can you																				
- understand?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
- speak?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
- read?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
- write?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Which language do you usually speak at home	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
- with your mother?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
- with your father?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
- with your younger brothers or sisters?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
- with your older brothers or sisters?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
- with your best friends?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Which language do you speak best?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Which language do you like to speak most?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Which language(s) do you learn at school?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Which language(s) do you not learn at school but would you like to learn at school?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. In which language(s) do you take classes outside of school?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Thank you for your cooperation!

References

- Acton, T. & G. Mundy (eds.) 1999 *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.
- Akinci, M-A., J.J. de Ruiter and F. Sanagustin 2004 *Le Plurilinguisme à Lyon. Le Statut des Langues à la Maison et à l'École*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Alladina, S. and V. Edwards (eds.) 1991 *Multilingualism in the British Isles* (Vol. 1: The older mother tongues and Europe; Vol. 2: Africa, the Middle East and Asia). London: Longman.
- Alladina, S. 1993 South Asian languages in Britain. In: G. Extra and L. Verhoeven (eds.), *Immigrant Languages in Europe*, 55–65. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Appel, R. and P. Muysken 1987 *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Baker, P. and J. Eversley (eds.) 2000 *Multilingual Capital. The Languages of London's Schoolchildren and their Relevance to Economic, Social and Educational Policies*. London: Battlebridge Publications.
- Bourhis, R., H. Giles and D. Rosenthal 1981 Notes on the construction of a 'Subjective Vitality Questionnaire' for ethnolinguistic groups. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 2: 145–155.
- Broeder, P. and G. Extra 1995 *Minderheidsgroepen en Minderheidstalen*. Den Haag: VNG Uitgeverij.
- Broeder, P. and G. Extra 1998 *Language, Ethnicity and Education. Case Studies on Immigrant Minority Groups and Immigrant Minority Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Broeder, P. and L. Mijares 2003 *Plurilingüismo en Madrid. Las Lenguas de los Alumnos de Origin Inmigrante en Primaria*. Madrid: Centro de Investigación y Documentación Educativa.
- Campbell, G. 2000 *Compendium of the World's Languages* (Volume 1 & 2). London: Routledge.
- Caubet, D., S. Chaker and J. Sibille (eds.) 2002 *Codification des Langues de France*. Paris: l'Harmattan.
- Churchill, S. 1986 *The Education of Linguistic and Cultural Minorities in the OECD Countries*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Clyne, M. 2003 *Dynamics of Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Comrie, B., S. Matthews and M. Polinsky 2003 *The Atlas of Languages*. Revised Edition. London: Eurospan Group.
- Crystal, D. 1997 *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalby, D. 1999/2000 *The Linguasphere Register of the World's Languages and Speech Communities* (Volume 1 & 2). Wales-Hebron: Linguasphere Press.

- Extra, G., R. Aarts, T. van der Avoird, P. Broeder and K. Yağmur 2001 *Meertaligheid in Den Haag. De Status van Allochtone Talen Thuis en op School*. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation.
- Extra, G., R. Aarts, T. van der Avoird, P. Broeder and K. Yağmur 2002 *De Andere Talen van Nederland*. Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- Extra, G. and D. Gorter (eds.) 2001 *The Other Languages of Europe. Demographic, Sociolinguistic and Educational Perspectives*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Extra, G. and J.J. de Ruiter (eds.) 2001 *Babylon aan de Noordzee. Nieuwe Talen in Nederland*. Amsterdam: Bulaaq.
- Extra, G. and L. Verhoeven (eds.) 1993a *Community Languages in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- Extra, G. and L. Verhoeven (eds.) 1993b *Immigrant Languages in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Extra, G. and L. Verhoeven (eds.) 1998 *Bilingualism and Migration*. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Extra, G. and K. Yağmur (eds.) 2004 *Urban Multilingualism in Europe: Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fürstenau, S., I. Gogolin and K. Yağmur (Hrsg.) 2003 *Mehrsprachigkeit in Hamburg. Ergebnisse einer Sprachenerhebung an den Grundschulen in Hamburg*. Münster/New York: Waxmann.
- Giacalone Ramat, A. and P. Ramat 1998 *The Indo-European Languages*. London: Routledge.
- Giles, H., R. Bourhis and D. Taylor 1977 Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In: H. Giles (ed.), *Language, Ethnicity, and Intergroup Relations*, 307–348. London: Academic Press.
- Gogolin, I. 1994 *Der Monolinguale Habitus der Multilingualen Schule*. Milnster: Waxmann.
- Grimes, B. (ed.) 1996 *Ethnologue. Languages of the world* (13th Edition). Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics (www.sil.org/ethnologue).
- Husén, T. and S. Oppen (eds.) 1983 *Multicultural and Multilingual Education in Immigrant Countries*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Jaspaert, K. and S. Kroon (eds.) 1991 *Ethnic Minority Languages and Education*. Amsterdam/Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- Jørgensen, J. (ed.) 2003 *Turkish Speakers in North Western Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kroon, S. 1990 *Opportunities and Constraints of Community Language Teaching*. Münster/New York: Waxmann.
- Kyuchukov, H. (ed.) 2002 *New Aspects of Roma Children Education*. Sofia: Ictus.

- Linguistic Minorities Project 1985 *The Other Languages of England*. London: Routledge and Kegan.
- Nygren-Junkin, L. and G. Extra 2003 *Multilingualism in Göteborg. The Status of Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and at School*. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation.
- Obdeijn, H. and J.J. de Ruiter (eds.) 1998 *Le Maroc au Coeur de l'Europe. L'Enseignement de la Langue et Culture d'Origine (ELCO) aux Éléves marocains dans cinq Pays Europeens*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press, Syntax Datura.
- Reid, E. and H. Reich 1992 *Breaking the Boundaries. Migrant Workers' Children in the EC*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Tilmatine, M. (ed.) 1997 *Enseignement des Langues d'Origine et Immigration Nord-Africaine en Europe: Langue Maternelle ou Langue d'Etat?* Paris: Inalco/Cedrea-Crb.
- Tosi, A. (1984). *Immigration and bilingual education. A case study of movement of population, language change and education within the EEC*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- UNDP 2002 www.hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2002/en/pdf/backone.pdf and [_backtwo.pdf](#).
- Van der Avoird, T. 2001 *Determining language vitality. The language use of Hindu communities in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom*. Dissertation, Tilburg University.
- Verlot, M., K. Delrue, G. Extra and K. Yağmur 2003 *Meertaligheid in Brussel. De Status van Allochtone Talen Thuis en op School*. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation.