



Erasmus+



Logistics
Language
Open
Training

7. BETWEEN LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY AND THE DOMINANCE OF ENGLISH – LANGUAGES IN EUROPE FROM THE POLITICAL, CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Dobrochna Hildebrandt-Wypych*, Celina Czech-Włodarczyk**

* Department of Comparative Education, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland,
Email: dhild@amu.edu.pl

** Department of Comparative Education, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań,
Poland, Email: cczech@amu.edu.pl

Abstract The paper presents and critical analyses the political, cultural and educational dimensions of the European language policy. Its primary aim is to discuss the tension between the necessity of sustaining linguistic diversity in Europe and the accompanying rise in importance of English as a global language of economy, politics, education and science. There is a visible contrast between the global tendency to cultural homogenization, with the accompanying dominance of English, and the European policy of supporting cultural diversity and multilingualism. On the one hand, the discourse on linguistic identity in Europe is focused on national and supra-national protection of minority languages. On the other though, English is supported as well, mostly for pragmatic and utilitarian reasons. Therefore, a certain balance is to be maintained between both trends. Especially from the perspective of the development of students' linguistic skills in the age of global economy and science

including the educational trend to intensify the use of ICT, advanced technologies and innovative methods of teaching foreign language teaching in European education systems.

Keywords: *language education, language policy, languages in Europe, CLIL, internationalization of education, English as a foreign language*

1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter contributes theoretically, by presenting a framework and perspective for interrogating and critically inquiring into the relationship between linguistic diversity and dominance of English. It also contributes to the language policy of EU and discussions in educational research and practice by highlighting the importance of foregrounding key tensions inherent to each field and by identifying the potential negative consequences of leaving these tensions implicit.

The second section draws on language policy in EU and includes the policies and recommendation in place in European countries which influence foreign language teaching. The section presents the ways the selected institutions of EU promote linguistic diversity through multilingualism and the measures they implement to protect regional languages in Europe.

The third section discusses the spread of English as a global language in the information society and its linkage to the neoliberal world economic order. The expansion of English as a business, academic and institutional language has an important educational consequence: the use of English in schools in Europe steadily increases, making English the modern *lingua franca*: a supranational language required for higher education, science and employment.

The fourth section presents diverse language policies and policy measures of selected EU Member States and their national or regional ways of preserving and respecting linguistic diversity. Five different policy models are discussed and exemplified: from the monolingual policy with pressure on linguistic assimilation at schools, to bilingual or multilingual policies, providing for educational need of minority language communities.

The fifth section presents selected methods in contemporary glottodidactic and teacher education especially CLIL and gamification. In the field of education there is a trend to use more ICT, advanced technologies and innovative methods of teaching foreign languages in order to improve and develop students' learning skills needed in 21st century.

Last are conclusions a synthesis of the findings from all sections.

2. THE LANGUAGE POLICY OF EU

Language policy is the responsibility of each member state and EU has not developed a common language policy so far. EU language policy is based on the respect for linguistic diversity in all Member States and on the creation of the inter-cultural dialogue in the EU. In order to put mutual respect into practice, the EU promotes teaching and learning of foreign languages and the mobility of every citizen through dedicated programmes for education and vocational training¹.

European Union institutions play a supporting role in this field, based on the principle of subsidiarity. Their role is to promote a European dimension in the member states' language policies. The institutions and bodies of EU which are promoting especially linguistic diversity and language learning are:

1. European Parliament (especially Committee on culture and education²),
2. Council of the European Union (especially Education, youth, culture and sport³),
3. European Commission (especially Education and Training⁴),
4. Committee of the Regions (especially Commission for Social Policy, Education, Employment, Research and Culture -SEDEC⁵),
5. One of the EU's agencies (Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European UNION -CDT⁶).

Today language policy in Europe is acquiring increasing importance because we live in an age of intensive political and cultural change and we have to face such issues as: ensuring the continued vitality of national languages, rights for minority languages, diversification in foreign language learning, as well as the Bologna process – the formation of a European Higher Education Area (Phillipson, 2008).

The important principle of language equality in relations between citizens in EU is clearly stated on the official EU website: „The European Union's aspiration to be united in diversity underpins the whole European project. The harmonious coexistence of many languages in Europe embodies this. Languages can build bridges between people, giving us access to other countries and cultures, and enabling us to understand each other better”⁷. Moreover on the same website there is a statement that linguistic diversity is one of the milestones of EU, referred

¹http://www.europarl.europa.eu/atyourservice/en/displayFtu.html?ftuId=FTU_3.6.6.html

²<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/CULT/home.html>

³<http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/council-eu/configurations/eycs/>

⁴<http://ec.europa.eu/education/>

⁵<http://cor.europa.eu/en/activities/commissions/Pages/corcommissions.aspx?comm=SEDEC>

⁶[C](http://cdt.europa.eu/)

⁶<https://cdt.europa.eu/>

⁷http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/multilingualism_en

to in community law: Article 22 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights („The Union respects cultural, religious and linguistic diversity”), and in Article 3 of the Treaty on European Union („It shall respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity, and shall ensure that Europe’s cultural heritage is safeguarded and enhanced”)⁸.

In the European Union there are twenty four official languages and more than sixty national and regional languages. There are fewer official languages than member states, as some share common languages. German, Greek, English, French, Dutch and Swedish are official state languages in more than one country. Furthermore, not all national languages have been accorded the status of official EU languages. These include Luxembourgish, an official language of Luxembourg, and Turkish, an official language of Cyprus (the reason why there are 26 official state languages but only 24 official and working languages of EU). Three from twenty four official languages possess the higher status of „procedural” languages: English, French and German.

According to the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, regional or minority languages are languages that differ from the official language(s) of the state. These languages are traditionally used within a given territory of a state by nationals who form a group numerically smaller than the rest of the state's population. Therefore, by definition, they are in opposition to official languages. Although it is true that, in general, minority languages are at a disadvantage in terms of diffusion and support compared to official languages, it is preferable to refer to them as smaller languages (i.e. languages with fewer speakers) or, more directly, under-resourced languages (Language equality in the digital age. Towards a Human Language Project, European Parliamentary Research Service, 2017, p. 11).

Multilingualism represents one of the greatest assets of cultural diversity in Europe and, at the same time, one of the most substantial challenges for the creation of a truly integrated EU. The EU's multilingualism policy has two goals: striving to protect Europe's rich linguistic diversity and promoting language learning⁹. Legislation in force on multilingualism are: Resolution on language learning and teaching in EU countries from 31 March 1995¹⁰ and Resolution on early teaching of EU languages from 16 December 1997¹¹.

In many EU’s publications we can read that: „A successful multilingualism policy can strengthen the life chances of citizens: it may increase their employability, facilitate access to services and rights, and contribute to solidarity through enhanced inter-cultural dialogue and social cohesion”¹². Moreover

⁸ https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/multilingualism/linguistic-diversity_en

⁹ https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/multilingualism/linguistic-diversity_en

¹⁰ [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:31995Y0812\(01\)](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:31995Y0812(01))

¹¹ [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:31998Y0103\(01\)](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:31998Y0103(01))

¹² https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/multilingualism/linguistic-diversity_en

as Bandov stated: „promotion of multilingualism not only adds to linguistic diversity and protection of communication and symbolic protection function of a language but it can also have a crucial influence upon the evasion of potential escalation of conflicts and has a positive impact upon obstructing negative sociological processes, such as intolerance, xenophobia and racism” (Bandov, 2013, p. 75). Language policy plays a key role in education and “multilingual education could be viewed as a democratic tool safeguarding active citizen participation in an intergovernmental forum such as the EU” (Christiansen, 2006, p. 21).

3. GLOBALIZATION AND THE ROLE OF ENGLISH AS A *LIGUA FRANCA*

From the socio-political point of view, language diversity in Europe is challenged from two perspectives. The first is the inclination of any technologically driven, socially stratified and centrally administered social system to impose a certain level of homogeneity, including economic, political and linguistic uniformity. The second explanation of a dominance of one language over another is associated with “western” or “modern” tendency to reduce the (linguistic) diversity in the name of “progress through increased efficiency” (Annamalai, 2004, p. 5). As indicated accurately by Xabier Arzoz (2008, p. 4) in this context: “The process of European integration shows expansionist standardizing tendencies in the field of communications, economics, social protection and justice. (...) The efficiency discourse in one we frequently hear in the context of EU multilingualism”. The homogenising rationale of the EU market integration stays in conflict with the legitimate articulation of linguistic diversity.

The spread of English as an international (global) language in the 20th century happened primarily for economic and technological reasons. There emerged a new type of communication in the global information society: the national-English bilingualism'. According to Haarmann, this specific form of bilingualism is impersonal, functional and elitist, giving its beneficiaries access to economic growth, political decision-making and consumption of knowledge. Similarly to Latin centuries ago, English possesses its functional-specific and elitist universality (Haarmann, 2003, p. 156). However, one of the essential differences between Latin and English lies in the unprecedented connection of the latter to one economic and political system (represented by one cultural and political entity): industrial and post-industrial capitalism of Anglo-Saxon world and the neoliberal world economic order. English as a supranational language of global hegemony was named by Phillipson as a *lingua economica* (2003, p. 149).

The use of English in compulsory schools in Europe has steadily increased between 2005 and 2015. As indicated in the 2017 Eurydice report “Key Data on Teaching Languages at Schools in Europe”, the proportion of primary education students rose significantly during the last decade. Moreover, English is the first mandatory foreign language during compulsory schooling in most of the European education systems, e.g. 97% of students in lower secondary education in Europe learn English. At the upper secondary level this figure drops to 85,2%, “mostly due to a lower proportion of vocational education students learning foreign languages (Eurydice, 2017, p. 72).

The role of English as a business, academic and institutional language has been expanding in Europe. English has become a requirement for higher education and later employment. English has also emerged as a universal language of science, esp. natural science, technology and engineering. The changing nature of English in Europe needs to be associated with internationalization and economic globalization. The dissemination of language entails the promotion of certain values, norms and patterns of behaviour. Robert Phillipson in his text, “English as a threat or opportunity in European higher education” warns against unreflective promotion of English as an extra-territorial language of academic (and economic) success, especially in multilingual and linguistically diverse Europe. He writes in favour of a multilingual academic and business culture when he point out: “Seeing a language as purely instrumental, or seeing language teaching as ideologically neutral, as an apolitical, purely technocratic mission, entails closing one's eyes and mind to how social structure operates nationally and internationally, and is in conflict with principles of social justice and a balanced sustainable language ecology” (Phillipson, 2015, p. 23). Unfortunately, the promotion and protection of minority languages and multilingualism in European member states is often downplayed by the stronger discourse of the protection of dominant, national language against the total impact of English in such areas as higher education, research, media and economy. As a result, there is a dramatic shift in the linguistic rights discourse. As formulated by Ekberg (2018) in relation to Sweden and its linguistic policy, in the Swedish versus English discourse, minority languages are essentially invisible.

4. RESPECTING LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY – LANGUAGE POLICIES OF THE SELECTED EU MEMBER STATES

After the 2013 accession the number of official EU languages had risen to twenty four, with five other languages (Basque, Catalan, Galician, Scottish Gaelic and Welsh), possessing semi-official status in all or part of their respective member states. The European linguistic diversity is much wider: the EU embodies twenty-eight member states, where over 60 autochthonous, regional or minority

languages are spoken. However, when compared with linguistic diversity worldwide, European linguistic diversity is relatively limited: of the 6909 languages spoken around the world, only around 230 are spoken in Europe¹³.

According to Patxi Juaristi, Timothy Reagan and Humphrey Tonkin, there are five linguistic policy models adopted in the European Union. First, there are member states, such as Bulgaria, France, Lithuania, Greece and Poland, which have a single official language and which refer to the idea of a “linguistic nation”, in which a common language plays a role of a constitutive element of each modern nation-state. Member states following this language policy model generally favour monolingual school systems and does not actively support minority language communities in their access to educational services (e.g. teaching/learning minority languages at public schools, translation services, etc.). In terms of a school integration policy towards minority children the stress is put entirely on linguistic assimilation, e.g. in the Lithuanian policy of “deliberate assimilation of speakers of Russian” (Juaristi, Reagan, Tonkin, 2008, p. 64).

Secondly, there are EU member states (e.g. Germany, Sweden, Portugal and Slovenia) with a single official language, which officially recognize and support other languages in some parts of the country. For example, there are five languages recognized as “national minority languages” in Sweden: Finnish, Tornedalian Finnish, Yiddish, Romany and Sami (defined as an indigenous language). According to the 2010 Minority Act, there are certain obligations of authorities towards speakers of these regional languages, e.g. use of the minority language in oral and written communication with the authorities, in preschool education or elderly care (Ekberg, 2018). On the other hand though, the increased migration puts a conflicting pressure on the Swedish social and educational policies. Although the aim of its language policy is to protect both Swedish and minority languages, the present focus is on fast acquisition of Swedish. Official recognition of some minority languages does not alter the dominant practice: monolingual instruction to promote social and school integration (Ekberg, 2018). This observation can be generalized on other states as well: in spite of limited state support, such languages as Frisian in Germany¹⁴, Mirandese in Portugal or Romany in Romania, may have considerable difficulty in surviving (Juaristi, Reagan, Tonkin, 2008, p. 65).

The third group of countries are the EU member states (e.g. Spain and the Netherlands) that recognise co-official languages in some parts of their countries. Apart from Castilian Spanish (the only official language of the Spanish state), the 1978 Constitution made space for co-official languages, granting them

¹³<https://www.linguisticsociety.org/content/how-many-languages-are-there-world>

¹⁴In spite of formal legal protection and the official status as a minority language, Frisian in Germany does not enjoy the status equivalent to German as the official language of the territory. As pointed out by P. Juaristi, T. Reagan and H. Tonkin, “having official status does not mean that the future of a language is secure: such recognition must be accompanied by decisive action in its favour” (2008, p. 66).

the official status in their self-governing regions. Spain's linguistic patchwork, including Basque Catalan, Valencian, Balearic, Galician and Aranese, concerns not only the promotion of the regional languages, but also the creation of autonomous linguistic and socio-cultural communities. The co-officiality of Spanish and regional languages profoundly influences educational policy aims, introducing two the main goals of linguistic minorities: the right to public bilingual education and the public support of multilingualism. For example, Galician is a mandatory subject at the primary and secondary education level. Moreover, teaching in Galician in compulsory public education institutions is obligatory for at least two non-language subjects and there is a general expectation that students can use the language of their choice in the classroom. However, the question of choice might be less important than the question of access, especially when “actual classroom practice often depended on individual teachers' linguistic preferences or abilities” (Weber, 2014, p. 176).

The fourth language policy, based on the idea of the language federation, functions only in one EU member state: Belgium. Political and cultural division of Belgium into three communities is based on three official languages – Dutch, French and German. In spite of a differentiated sociolinguistic situation of each language¹⁵ they are all treated equally in the federal state. The political recognition of three different language communities and the rules of linguistic and cultural parity result in the existence of three separate education policies and structures. The Belgian “linguistic conflict” has been successfully resolved through social segmentation and political accommodation. Kenneth Douglas McRae refers to the crucial historical explanation of the resolution when he writes: “The cross-cutting of the language frontier and various early political boundaries created strong traditions of cultural coexistence in *Brabant*, *Flanders* and *Limburg*. Finally, early traditions of communal autonomy and pluralism left a heritage of vigorous local government that mitigated the impact of excessive centralization (p. 327).

The fifth group of countries, represented by Cyprus, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg and Malta, are bilingual or multilingual states, with two or more constitutionally recognized official languages. These are countries with the equal status given to two or more domestic languages within public authorities of a single state. Their policies aim at the introduction of linguistic liberalism, based on community-regulated, separate education systems, with diverse languages of instruction and language curricula, but with a strong (at least rhetorically) commitment to principles of multicultural education and multilingualism. However, language policies are an extremely complex issue. For example, there were serious ideological discussions in Cyprus during the 1980s, when some politicians argued in favour of three official languages: Greek, Turkish and English

¹⁵The dominating Dutch-speaking community covers 60% of the country; second most spoken language is French with 40% of the population; the German-speaking community comprises only less than 1% of population.

as *lingua franca* – language of academic discourse and a means of enabling Turkish Cypriot students to enter the University of Cyprus. Opponents of such a solution expressed their fear “that English, which was constructed as unquestionably dominant on the island, would supplant Greek, which was, in their view, already 'endangered' in Cyprus” (Hadjioannou, Tsiplakou, 2013, p. 56). Eventually, the official language status was assigned to Greek and Turkish and the created bilingualism (equal status accorded to both languages) aimed at protection of the rights of both minority and majority language communities, creating a state of 'parallel monolingualism' (Heller, 1999). In Finland, despite the differentiated sociolinguistic position of Finnish and Swedish¹⁶, public administration provides for the cultural and societal (educational) needs of Finnish- and Swedish-speaking population on equal terms. Finnish bilingual policy aims at “maintaining the two languages in Finland and allowing monolingual life styles on the individual level” (Palviainen, Boyd, 2013, p. 230).

5. SELECTED METHODS IN CONTEMPORARY GLOTTODIDACTIC AND TEACHER EDUCATION (CLIL AND GAMIFICATION)

The EU takes a lot of actions toward improving the efficiency of languages teaching in schools. One of them was conducted between 2011 and 2013 by the thematic working group on languages in education and training focused on possible ways of improving language learning outcomes. It conducted a comparative analysis, subsequently drawing up a report on innovative, scientifically proven methods of speeding up language learning¹⁷.

One of the method tested was CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) a teaching method which provides additional teaching in foreign languages without increasing the overall instruction time, or taking away lessons from other curriculum subjects. The glossary produced by University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations (2009) offers the definition of CLIL: is an approach in which a foreign language is used as a tool in the learning of a nonlanguage subject in which both language and the subject have a joint role (p. 1)¹⁸. In CLIL, successful content learning is particularly dependent on language: enhanced language learning is dependent on content learning. Research-based knowledge of the interdependence of language (L1, L2, L3) and cognitive development facilitates

¹⁶Currently there are about 90% of Finish-speaking and 5.4% of Swedish-speaking inhabitants in Finland. The data is gathered according to a linguistic affiliation assigned to each individual by her or his parents after birth (Palviainen, Boyd, p. 230).

¹⁷http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/expert-groups-2011-2013_en

¹⁸https://www.unifg.it/sites/default/files/allegatiparagrafo/20-01_2014/clil_glossary_cambridge.pdf

both content and language learning (Marsh, Mehisto, Wolff, Frigols Martín, 2014, p.18).

In the article V. Pavon Vazquez and F. Rubio recalling many results methods emphasizing that CLIL advocates the assimilation of the academic content of non-linguistic subjects through the medium of a foreign language and, through this, help to encourage an advance in knowledge and use of that foreign language by the students. It involves a style of teaching that does not focus specifically on the progression of the foreign language but sees it as an opportunity to encourage its use and, in this way, promote its development (Pavon Vazquez, Rubio, 2010, p. 47).

In the literature on glottodidactic we can read that CLIL is currently gaining considerable momentum and it is being integrated into curricula all across Europe and also that CLIL has been a tremendous success-story and its influence on practice is currently expanding quickly across Europe and beyond (Meyer, 2013, p. 295). Nevertheless the Eurydice Report “Key Data on Teaching Languages at Schools in Europe. 2017 Edition” concludes that: “Although almost all countries have some schools providing this kind of teaching, only a few have introduced this approach in all schools at some stage. These include Austria and Liechtenstein in the first grades of primary education, Cyprus in at least one grade of primary education, Luxembourg and Malta at primary and secondary levels. In Italy CLIL is provided in the last grade of upper secondary education”¹⁹. Development of this method poses significant challenges, notably in relation to teacher education and qualifications.

Nowadays modern pedagogical paradigms and trends in education, reinforced by the use of ICT, create prerequisites for use of new approaches and techniques in order to implement active learning specially in the sector of languages teaching. Gamification in training is one of these trends (Kiryakova, Angelova, Yordanova, 2014).

There are numerous definitions of gamification. Above there are only three examples from literature:

1. “Using game-based mechanics, aesthetics and game thinking to engage people, motivate action, promote learning, and solve problems” Kapp (2012);
2. “The use of game elements and game-design techniques in non-game contexts” Werbach, Hunter (2012);
3. “The process of game-thinking and game mechanics to engage users and solve problems” Zichermann, Cunningham (2011).

As the Kiryakova, Agelova and Yordanova write various definitions overlap and can be summarized as follows: gamification is an integration of game elements and game thinking in activities that are not games. Gamification is based on some distinctive features of games which play a key role in this method:

¹⁹http://eurydice.org.pl/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/KDL_2017_internet.pdf

- users are all participants – employees or clients (for companies), students (for educational institutions);
- challenges/tasks that users perform and progress towards defined objectives;
- points that are accumulated as a result of executing tasks;
- levels which users pass depending on the points;
- badges which serve as rewards for completing actions;
- ranking of users according to their achievements (2014, P. 2).

Gamification has the potential to support learning and there numerous positives effects of using this method in teaching practice for example: enjoyment, flow, motivation, engagement, increase in voluntary participation, increase in participation rate, more qualified learning products, more successful students, higher achievements etc.²⁰ Researcher underline that during the leaning process when all of the basic psychological needs are supported then “(...) a gamification intervention should be more motivating to learners ad thus more likely to yield the desired outcomes” (Landers, Bauer, Callan, Armstrong, 2014, p. 183).

In European Union there are already examples of inclusion of gamification within government discussion forums, easily accessed through smart devices, which help to establish and maintain two- way communication with citizens in EU countries (Lang, 2015, p. 203).

Gamification could be one of trend that could be adopted by the foreign language teachers because it’s an effective approach to make positive change in students’ behaviour and attitude towards learning, to improve their motivation and engagement²¹. The results of the change have bilateral nature- they can affect students’ results and understanding of the educational content and create conditions for an effective learning process (Kiryakova, Angelova, Yordanova, 2014).

The biggest challenge concerning development of this method in teaching languages, similar to CLIL, is teacher qualifications, especially in using ICT and designing. As Knapp wrote the application of this method in learning process depends on development teachers skills and we have to remember that: “learning and development professionals are uniquely qualified to lead the gamification effort within organizations. the elements of interactive design that are buried in good instructional design strategies need to be surfaced and applied to the creation of online and face-to-face learning events to create compelling interactive

²⁰There are numerous examples of positives effects of gamification in education field in book „Gamification in education: breakthroughs in research and practice”, Information Resources Management Association (ed.), IGI Global, 2018, USA.

²¹More about using this method in teaching languages can be found in book: „Teaching languages with technology. Communicative approaches to interactive whiteboard use. A resource book for teacher development”, E.G. Schmid, S. Whyte (eds.), 2014, Bloomsbury Publishing.

experiences while leveraging the best from game-based experiences” (Kapp, 2012, p. 14).

6. CONCLUSION

There are generally two possible directions of language survival: the strategy of closing and of opening the nation. The first one is a promotion of monolingualism, as a result of protectionist policies against external 'threats', such as the pressure of migration, globalization or Europeanization aims at cultural survival within one 'national language'.

Opening of the nation is focused primarily on economic survival in the age of internationalization and globalization. It aims at the promotion of tolerance, the enhancement of inter-cultural communication and the appreciation of minorities. However, apart from formally promoting minority languages, there is a stronger tendency to create a neutral image of English as a non-ideological linguistic tool. The importance of English as a *lingua franca* of the international business and finance, as well as global language of scientific cooperation and academic research, is projected as an advantage. The priority given to communicative efficiency in the age of globalization is based on one rather obvious observation: the purpose of English as a *lingua franca* lies in communication and not identification. The question is, what are the consequences of casting the identity-related aspects aside and focusing only on effective communication. The study of attitudes to national scientific terminology in the Nordic countries shows for example, that the cost may be the lack (or gradual disappearance) of national language terminology (Hultgren, 2015).

Linguistic diversity is the key element of cultural heritage of Europe and EU institutions take a lot of effort to protect regional and minority languages. Non-respect for regional or minority communities' linguistic rights is qualified as a form of racial discrimination and a breach of human rights. Over the decades the European institutions have undertaken education-related initiatives at all levels of teaching to promote the use of regional and minority languages and the empowerment of the learners and teachers of regional and minority languages by providing them with teaching materials, social actions in cyberspace, as well as the advanced research on adequacy of terminology. The EU recognises the need for regional and minority languages to be taught to non-native speakers and has supported their media dissemination. Moreover, the European Parliament has recently supported the promotion of regional and minority languages and called for the protection of endangered languages (Pasikowska- Schnass, 2016, p. 6).

The main aim of the EU language policy is to raise awareness of the importance of linguistic skills of young people and link them with creativity and innovation within learning process. EU strategy in the field of language teaching

focuses mainly on innovative methods, resources and teaching materials, including online courses and measures for language testing. Other initiatives listed by the European Council include promotion, marketing, publicity and information campaigns, as well as conferences, studies and the development of statistical indicators in the field of language learning and linguistic diversity.

There is a visible contrast between the global tendency to cultural homogenization, with the accompanying dominance of English, and the regional (European) policy of supporting cultural diversity and multilingualism. On the one hand, the discourse on linguistic identity in Europe is focused on national and supra-national protection of minority languages. On the other though, English is (and will be) supported as well, mostly for pragmatic and utilitarian reasons. Therefore, a certain balance is to be maintained between both trends. Especially due to the fact that the language planning is vital for the preservation of not only minority, but also national language(s). Without the rules for promoting multilingualism, the symbolic cultural space is left solely to the laws of “the linguistic market” and “the survival of the fittest”: the emergence of one omnipotent linguistic (and thus political and educational) monoculture.

REFERENCES

- Annamalai E., (2004), Public Perception of Language Diversity, available at: http://www.barcelona2004.org/www.barcelona2004.org/esp/banco_del_conocimiento/docs/PO_35_EN_ANNAMALAI.pdf (accessed 30.04. 2018)
- Bandov G., (2013), Language policy of European Union- realization of the multilingual policy of EU, [in:] *Međunarodne studije*, Vol.13, No. 1, pp. 65-83.
- Christainsen P.V., (2006), “Language policy in the European Union: European/ English/ Elite/ Equal/ Esperanto Union?”, [in:] *Language Problems and Language Planning*, Vol. 30, No 1, pp. 21-44, <http://nsl.esperanto-jongeren.nl/pdf/EuropeanUnion.pdf> (accessed 02.05.2018).
- Ekberg L., (2018), Finish, Meänkieli, Yiddish, Romany and Sami in Sweden, [in:] C.A. Seals, S. Shah (Eds.), *Heritage Language Policies Around the World*, Routledge, New York.
- Haarmann H., (2003), *Weltsprachen, Universalsprachen und kultureller Realismus*, [in:] R. Ahrens, *Europäische Sprachenpolitik – European Language Policy*, Universitätsverlag Winter, Heidelberg, pp. 139-159.
- Hadjioannou X., Tsiplakou S., Kappler M., *Language Policy and Language Planning in Cyprus*, [in:] R.B. Kaplan, R.B. Baldauf, Jr., N.M. Kamwangamalu (Eds.), *Language Planning in Europe. Cyprus, Iceland and Luxemburg*, Routledge, New York, pp. 33-99.
- Hultgren A.K., (2015), “English as an international language of science and its effect on Nordic terminology: the view of scientists”, [in:] A. Linn, N. Bermel, G. Ferguson (Eds.), *Attitudes towards English in Europe. English in Europe. Volume 1*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 139-165.

- Juaristi P., Reagan T., Tonkin H., (2008), Language Diversity in the European Union, [in:] X. Arzoz (Ed.), *Respecting Linguistic Diversity in the European Union*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 47-71.
- Kapp, K. M. (2012), "The gamification of learning and instruction: game-based methods and strategies for training and education", John Wiley & Sons.
- Kiryakova G., Angelova N., Yordanova L.,(2014), "Gamification in education", https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320234774_GAMIFICATION_IN_EDUCATION, (accessed 02.05.2018).
- Lang G., (2015), "Maintaining online engagement in e-learning through games based learning and gamification techniques", [in:] V.L. Uskov, R. J. Howlett, L. C. Jain (Eds.), *Smart education and smart e-learning*", Springer, pp.193-207.
- Landers R. N., Bauer K. N., Callan R.G., Armstrong M. B., (2014), "Psychological theory and the gamification of learning" [in:] T. Reiners, L. C. Wood (Eds.), "Gamification in education and business", Springer, pp. 165-186.
- Marsh D., Mehisto P., Wolff D., Frigols Martín M. J., (2014), „European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education”, Council of Europe, Brussels, https://www.unifg.it/sites/default/files/allegatiparagrafo/20-01-2014/european_framework_for_clil_teacher_education.pdf (accessed 01.05.2018).
- Meyer O., (2013), „Introducing the CLIL-Pyramid: Key Strategies and Principles for Quality CLIL Planning and Teaching”, [in:] M. Eisenmann, T. Summer (Eds.), *Basic Issues in EFL Teaching*, Edition: 2nd, Universitätsverlag Winter GmbH Heidelberg, pp. 295-313.
- McRae K.D., (1986), *Conflict and Compromise in Multilingual Societies*. Belgium, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, Waterloo – Canada.
- Palviainen A., Boyd S., (2013), *Unity in Discourse, Diversity in Practice: The One Person One Language Policy in Bilingual Families*, [in:] M.Schwartz, A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful Family Language Policy. Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction*, Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 223-248.
- Pasikowska- Schnass M., (2016), *Regional and minority languages in the EU*, European Parliamentary Research Service, <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/EPRS/EPRS-Briefing-589794-Regional-minority-languages-EU-FINAL.pdf> (accessed 02.05.2018).
- Pavon Vazquez V., Rubio F., (2010), "Teachers' Concerns and Uncertainties about the Introduction of CLIL Programmes", [in:] *Porta Linguarium*, No.14, pp.45-58.
- Phillipson R., (2003), *English-Only Europe? Challenging Language Policy*, Routledge, London.
- Phillipson R., (2008), „Language Policy and Education in the European Union”, [in:] N.H. Hornberger (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Springer, Boston, MA, pp.429-452.
- Phillipson R., (2015), "English as a threat or opportunity in European higher education", [in:] S. Dimova, A.K. Hultgren, Ch. Jensen (Eds.), *English – Medium Instruction in European Higher Education*, English in Europe. Volume 3, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin
- Weber J.-J., (2014), *Flexible Multilingual Education. Putting Children's Needs First*, Multilingual Matters, Bristol – Buffalo – Toronto, pp. 160-178.
- Werbach, K., Hunter, D., (2012), „For the win: How game thinking can revolutionize your business”, Wharton Digital Press, Pennsylvania.

Zichermann, G., Cunningham, C. (2011), „Gamification by design: Implementing game mechanics in web and mobile apps”, O’Reilly Media, Inc, Canada.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Dobrochna HILDEBRANDT-WYPYCH (PhD), is an Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Educational Studies of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland. Her principal research interests are in comparative education and sociology of education, with a particular focus on political determinants of education in European societies. She is the author of a monograph, *Unification of Germany and Compulsory Education in the New Federal States* (Poznań, 2006). Her current key area of interest in political socialization of youth and citizenship education in European education systems. She is the co-author and co-editor of *Young People and Life Success: A Comparative Education Study on Young People in Poland, Germany, the Czech Republic and the Netherlands* (Kraków, 2010) and the co-author and co-editor of *Education systems of the European countries* (Kraków, 2012).

Celina CZECH-WŁODARCZYK works as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Comparative Education, at the Faculty of Education of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. She teaches: comparative education; education policy of EU; equity and social justice in education; globalization, economy and education; special pedagogy; behavioural and developmental disorders. Her research interests are: educational policies of EU countries; methods of reforming school subject curriculums; innovative practices of teaching in culturally different environments; citizenship education; multiculturalism and educational ideologies. She is the author of “Neoliberalizm a edukacja obywatelska. Studium porównawcze na przykładzie publicznych szkół średnich w Polsce i Kanadzie” (Neoliberalism and citizenship education. Comparative research of public secondary schools in Poland and Ontario/ Canada), Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, Poznań 2012, ss. 218 and co-author of “Systemy edukacji w krajach europejskich” (Educational system of the European countries), Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls, Kraków 2012, ss. 500. Her papers appear in numerous journals including: *Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, *Forum Oświatowe*, *Studia Edukacyjne*, *Terazniejszość- Człowiek- Edukacja*.