

# 7 Migrations, Multilingualism and Language Policies in Portugal and the United Kingdom

## A Polycentric Approach

*Clara Keating, Olga Solovova and  
Olga Barradas*

### INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

This chapter represents a collaborative attempt to develop a polycentric understanding of the different values that have come to be associated with Portuguese in two national contexts in Europe. We examine the use of Portuguese and the ways in which its value has been constructed in different contexts, and we describe the language policies that have been developed in the two national contexts, which are also our own local contexts of action and research. We start by drawing on ethnographic insights from three research projects: (1) a study of the lived experiences of Portuguese migrant women in London and of their multilingual literacy practices (this study was carried out by a Portuguese researcher in the United Kingdom; Keating, 2005, 2009); (2) linguistic ethnographic research among children of Eastern European origin in a city in Portugal, conducted by a researcher of Russian origin living in Portugal (Solovova, 2013); and (3) an educational ethnography conducted with second-generation Portuguese migrants in London, which focused on the role of complementary schools (this study was carried out by a Portuguese researcher and took account of education policies in the United Kingdom and Portugal; Barradas, 2004, 2007, 2010).

When juxtaposed, the insights from these different projects pointed to distinct linguistic hegemonies, cultural narratives and contrasting national projects, coexisting within the same European political arena. This prompted us to revisit our ethnographic and textual data and to view the different social spaces and speaker positions as being permeated by polycentricity (Blommaert et al., 2005a; Keating and Solovova, 2011). Polycentricity has been used by different authors to describe differentiated perceptions and regimes of multilingualism as acceptable sets of uses and resources instigated by different places (see, for example, Blommaert et al., 2005a, 2005b).<sup>2</sup> Our research into the values and practices associated with Portuguese in these different sociolinguistic spaces within the geopolitical area of Europe illustrates the diverse ways in which Portuguese is used and represented: as a national, official and institutional language, as opposed to the language(s) of migrant minorities; as a lingua franca; and as a language of diasporic

mobility and community activism. Our comparative work across different research sites has revealed wider language ideological processes at work across contexts, while at the same time being grounded in detailed ethnographic research in particular sites.

Our dialogue across these projects has highlighted three conceptual and methodological challenges: first, the need to describe the specific nature of the different regimes of multilingualism in the contexts in which our specific research projects were based; second, the need to account for overlapping configurations of space and time with respect to contexts of use—due to the distinct traditions of migration and mobility captured in our respective projects; and, third, the need to develop tools to analyse the workings of language policies and linguistic hegemonies at multiple scales (e.g. formal and informal; micro and macro; family, school or individual investments in language learning).

In this chapter, we focus on how the values associated with European Portuguese are being negotiated in two geopolitical contexts—Portugal and the United Kingdom—and across two distinct scales. At the scale of *public policies*, we follow textual trajectories over time related to two sets of official language policies introduced by the Portuguese government: (a) policies relating to speakers of European Portuguese living abroad and (b) policies relating to speakers of other languages living in Portugal. At the scale broadly defined here as ‘community’ (migrant collectives concerned with survival in their new place of residence), we trace, over time, the educational responses of two complementary schools to national language-in-education policies, showing how they navigate within the narrow scope of institutional action afforded to them by the policies. Pursuing these lines of investigation, we endeavour to show how Portuguese is being constructed as a prestigious ‘modern’ world language, subject to public assessment and accountability. This transition towards *modernization* is accompanied by *monolingualization*, by means of institutional discourses that draw boundaries between separate domains of language use rather than allowing space for flexible pedagogies inspired by the lived experience of multilingual interaction.

We start with local descriptions of our ethnographic work. Drawing on insights from mobility and migration studies in Portugal, and from sociolinguistic research related to scales (Collins, Slembrouck and Baynham, 2009), we then describe how we linked our work on distinct analytical scales: analysing policy texts and doing fieldwork in complementary school contexts. We also show how changes in public policies and subsequent changes in complementary school practices helped us identify new ways in which sociolinguistic spaces were being constructed. In these spaces, some sets of multilingual resources were nurtured whereas others were being discarded. We end by considering the benefits that accrue from engaging in multi-sited research into the processes involved in the construction of the values of Portuguese (Marcus, 1995). We show the importance of reflexivity in such research and of taking account of the voices of the different researchers

in such multi-sited teams. In addition, we propose some lines for future research, building on our own attempts at theory-building and on our own locally situated research practices.

## THE ETHNOGRAPHIES

### Portuguese in the United Kingdom

Keating's linguistic ethnography focused on the dynamic routes through informal multilingual literacies lived by Portuguese migrant women in their relocation from Portugal to London, and in London over a period of time. Her work explored the historicity of these women's overlapping subjectivities—as traditional migrants and, later, as European citizens—and the corresponding hybrid language and literacy investments they made in the changing cosmopolitan space of this city at the end of the twentieth century. A focus on the life cycles of these women, and on actual discursive activity in situated events, allowed Keating to develop an account of the 'person in the doing', tying this in with the concept of the 'person in history' (cf. Holland and Lave, 2001). In Keating's work, we see the changing discourses regarding multilingual practices and identities in migrant and transnational spaces.

For well over a decade, Barradas has been following educational provision for Portuguese-speaking pupils in complementary schools in London while also taking into account their parallel experiences in local state schools, including issues around access to success or exclusion with respect to the British educational system. She has done this work as a teacher and as a language researcher based at Goldsmiths College, University of London. She has traced the development of the educational policies of both the Portuguese and the British governments for the past decades. This made her work particularly relevant for the purposes of our chapter (Barradas, 2004, 2007, 2010).

### Slavic Languages in Portugal

Slavic languages were invisible in the Portuguese linguistic landscape until the 1990s, when patterns of migration and mobility changed across the European Union. Dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and of the USSR, as well as Portuguese membership in the Schengen agreement, contributed to major changes in migration from Eastern Europe to Portugal. In 2002 the numbers of migrants arriving in Portugal from Eastern European countries exceeded those recorded for migration from Cape Verde, the traditional source of labour migration (Ataíde and Dias, 2011; Baganha et al., 2004: 98). By 2009, 20% of the foreign population in Portugal was registered as having their origin in post-Soviet states. This resulted in unprecedented linguistic diversity in schools, where Russian and Ukrainian came to be considered as "languages of significant minorities in education" (Feytor-Pinto, 2008: 82–83).

There were calls for the development of new language policies (Mateus, 2011). Studies of Portuguese language policies distinguish between two periods: the 'African period' (1990–1999), which was characterized by the growing presence of speakers of African languages and Portuguese-based creoles in Portugal, and the 'Slavic period' (2000–4),<sup>3</sup> which was characterized by the new presence of Slavic languages in the country. This latter period saw the construction of language educational policies on "Português Língua Não Materna" (Portuguese as a Non-native Language) and the development of intensive legislation and regulation related to migration and access to citizenship.

Solovova's eight-year study focused on Eastern European immigrants in a city in central Portugal. It was an ethnography of a complementary school setting and the language policies that sustained it. In her study, Solovova traced the ways in which the complementary schools developed an institutional identity within an immigrant association. She also showed how the symbolic power of Russian was reinforced and how other languages like Ukrainian and Belarusian were relegated to the margins as participants in the complementary school project interacted with speakers of Portuguese at various scales (interpersonal, local, institutional etc.). The idea of focusing on the teaching of one language not only validated the implicit linguistic hegemonies in the Portuguese as a Non-native Language policy but also reinforced the status of Russian vis-à-vis other community languages. So, in the diaspora, as before in history, Russian became the rational solution to multilingual communication.

In addition, Solovova investigated the ways in which ideologies of language had shaped the language histories of the parents of children in the complementary school, along with the ways in which these ideologies were guiding the language and literacy socialization of their children. The immigrant parents' individual educational trajectories had left particular traces of language ideologies. For example, they associated normativity and purity with particular written and oral registers in different languages. They also construed multilingualism as having a repertoire of fixed, separate languages. Despite these idealized views of language, the actual language practices within their homes and within the Russian complementary school were fluid and complex and involved the use of multilingual communicative resources. These multilingual realities called for a flexible and dynamic view of language on the part of the researcher—one that would take into account the multilingual repertoires and resources of the research participants.

### **The Portuguese Language and Migrant Trajectories across Europe: Polycentricity in the Development of Local Regimes of Language**

We began by focusing on Portugal's intermediate position in the world system, as a portal for migratory fluxes, importing and exporting labour (Baganha, 2001; Santos, 1995). This draws our attention to the use of Portuguese in

plural institutional positions, with ideologies and values related to Portuguese sometimes operating in contradictory ways, in the same sociolinguistic spaces. Even though we recognized that in each research project we had undertaken the intersection of histories and geopolitical networks would be of a distinct nature and that we could instead have adopted a focus on English, creoles, other lusophone varieties in London or a Slavic language in Portugal, we chose to focus on Portuguese.

The Portuguese language has been a language of migration and diaspora since the early modern period. In the twenty-first century, it continues to be a communication resource for people in many niches of social life throughout the world. It has been part of European discourse about multilingualism, as an official nation-state language. In addition, it acts as an international working language in global and regional organizations (e.g. the United Nations) in Europe, Africa and Latin America, and it is linked to national and transnational projects of a cultural, political and economic nature. At the same time, Portuguese is considered to be a minor, subordinate language, associated with the displacement of its speakers, who lead lives of resistance and survival alongside people speaking more prestigious languages. Portuguese has even been labelled as a “less widely used and less widely taught language” (Commission of the European Communities, *Lingua Programme*, 1993: 280) alongside Hungarian, Bulgarian, Polish and Latvian in European discourses about language learning. It can also be found acting in the rhizomatic lines of flight from dominant positions, collaborating in the construction of alternative or counter-hegemonic cosmopolitanisms (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987; Santos, 1994, 1995; Capinha and Galano, 1996), or producing and reproducing alternative prestige among diasporic groups associated with exile or migration.

A diasporic perspective on Portuguese cannot be dissociated from its postcolonial condition since, as a world language, Portuguese has been bound up with multiple historical processes associated with different colonial temporalities which have had deep traumatic effects on the postcolonial condition of all actors involved (Ribeiro et al., 2010).<sup>4</sup> We should thus be able to identify historicities in microscopic moments of language use. The values associated with Portuguese are negotiated in strategic situated acts by speakers with multilingual repertoires which have been shaped in different ways, at different times and in different spaces, hence our use of the term *polycentricity*.<sup>5</sup> As indicated above, this is a term that we draw from the work on the sociolinguistics of migration and globalization. It enables us to align to the situated processes involved in the production and management of speech and writing material while taking into account the fact that these processes are permeated by constraints associated with various orders and multiple centres (Blommaert, 2010; Keating and Solovova, 2011). It allows us to see local uses of multilingual resources as being embedded in long-term configurations of power and to understand why local multilingual practices are narrated in distinct ways

by the participants involved. Although we focus in this chapter on texts such as policy documents rather than on interactions, we articulate our understandings with a critical and discursive focus on language as *linguaging*, i.e. as the performative construction, reinforcement and reinvention of semiotic resources *as if* language (Garcia, 2005, 2009; Wei, 2011), since it foregrounds the linguistic hegemonies at play in the multiscalar processes of construction of linguistic value.

## COMPLEMENTARY SCHOOL CONTEXTS AND OFFICIAL TEXTS

Drawing on our own empirical work, we now move on to describe the way in which the value of Portuguese was negotiated in local complementary schools and in public policy texts. As we noted above, the trajectories and the strategies of action adopted by complementary schools—a Russian-language complementary school in Portugal and Portuguese complementary schools in London—have been observed and documented over time by Solovova and Barradas, respectively. All three of us have been involved in tracking the trajectories of different discourses about Portuguese in legal texts and official documents over several decades.

### Complementary Schools

Complementary schools are organized by communities with linguistic, cultural or religious affinities with the aim of maintaining linguistic and cultural identities in the face of language erosion or loss (Lytra and Martin, 2010). They assume an identity and heritage that is distant from that cultivated within state-sponsored education. If and when they acknowledge multilingualism, they may adopt flexible pedagogies which contrast with formal state-provided education. Formal education is normally seen as insufficient or unsatisfactory, by both the children and the adult speakers of the minority languages. They thus operate on the interface between different language policies—including those adhered to at home (on the scale of the family). Explicit policies developed on this scale have the potential to create spaces for the development of aspects of multilingual repertoires and identities which are overlooked by the state schools, academic communities or educational policies of the dominant societies (e.g. creative and artistic aspects).

A focus on complementary schools also helps us to analyse the processes involved in interventions of nation-states outside national borders. It also enables us to throw light on the way in which the quest for legitimacy for some languages is played out in particular multilingual contexts, depending on how the languages are perceived as forms of symbolic capital and depending on the degree of support and investment by 'home' nation-states for 'mother tongue provision' within and outside of national territories.

Public recognition of complementary schools in Europe is related to the perceived prestige and status of their community languages in the mainstream (that is, whether they are considered as 'European', as modern languages within national educational systems or as heritage, second or foreign languages). This public recognition is also related to institutional policies in the countries of origin. In addition, processes of legitimation depend on historically situated disciplinary and academic traditions. A final factor to take into consideration is the time span for the reproduction of the language as a minority language, and the corresponding struggles and practices, of short-term or long-term duration, of people from minority communities.

### Official Texts

Official policy documents have a considerable impact on the scope of action for complementary schools. Textual analysis of such documents has allowed us to open a window on changing discourses about multilingualism in Portugal and has enabled us to identify discursive shifts over time. At the time of writing, official Portuguese documents show an alignment with European Union discourses (e.g. about 'integration').

The first set of texts, aimed at Portuguese nationals, regulates the provision of Portuguese language and culture education abroad. We compared two versions of the same Law-Decree, one in 2006, the other in 2009. The second version of this text generates substantial changes in the management of this provision by moving it from the Ministry of Education to the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. We provide further contextualization for these two texts by taking into account other policies affecting complementary schools in London over time and considering the actual consequences in the field.

The second set of texts relates to immigrants and speakers of other languages in Portugal. They reveal the discourses about *linguistic integration* emanating from the European Union, some of which was produced by the High Level Group on Multilingualism (European Commission, 2006). They specify the kind of integration support that should be provided to migrants (including language provision) and the degree of recognition that should be given to 'migrant languages' as legitimate resources.

The Portugal's Plan for Immigrant Integration emerged from a number of inter-ministerial agreements and set out measures for working towards social, cultural and economic migrant integration over two three-year periods (2007–2009, 2010–2012). We analyse below the first edition of the plan since the Portuguese government took the view that its aims had already been practically accomplished. The second text we analyse below was produced by the Ministry of Education in Portugal and contained the guidelines that regulated the provision of Portuguese as a non-native language (DGIDC, 2005) in the national curriculum.

## **TEXTS, CONTEXTS, DISCURSIVE REPRESENTATIONS: THE ANALYSIS**

As far as language and literacy policies are concerned, critical approaches to discourse are relevant in the sense that they focus on the various layers of contexts for the production and interpretation of texts. In our case, they helped us understand how wider discourses were shaping policies about what counted as literacy and languages in the three sites. This also helped us to recognize the power of these linguistic hegemonies at a macro scale and to see how this power was sustained over time. In addition, they helped us to identify how these policy discourses interacted with and counteracted other kinds of hegemonic representations of language, literacy and multilingualism (Johnson, 2009; Keating et al., 2013). Taking account of the historical trajectories of the official texts, our analysis focused on metaphors about language, literacy, multilingualism, representations of social actors, presuppositions and other inferences, as well as the effects of re-textualization in documents produced at different times (Blommaert, 2005). Our method was thus a linguistic ethnography informed by a critical approach to discourse analysis. Following recent methodological proposals by Johnson (2009), we were concerned about taking account of the different scales at which policy processes operated. As Johnson puts it, “one must consider the (1) agents, (2) goals, (3) processes, and (4) discourses which engender and perpetuate the policy, and (5) the dynamic social and historical contexts in which the policy exists, keeping in mind that these categories are neither static nor mutually exclusive” (151). In the sections that follow, we link our analyses of texts with reference to ethnographic narratives we each developed in different contexts. We then focus on the discursive and textual mechanisms involved in the representation of actors and spaces considered legitimate for the use of Portuguese and other languages. In a final section, we identify the common themes that emerged out of our analyses of the official documents and out of the ethnographic narratives, illustrating how they helped us identify the possibilities for future action.

### **Texts and Contexts: Portuguese Language Schools and Classes for Residents Abroad**

The 2006 Law-Decree recognizes the provision of Portuguese language education abroad as a constitutional right of Portuguese citizens and their descendants, as well as an intrinsic component of the Portuguese governmental mission and national project. This document is one of many others that regulate the support provided to the so-called Portuguese communities abroad. In 2006 and in 2009 (Law-Decree 165/2006 and 165-C/2009), the responsibility for the provision of Portuguese and the promotion of Portuguese language and culture (hitherto shared between different government departments and organizations) became the sole responsibility of Instituto



Camões (under the umbrella of the Foreign Office), with implications for its language partners.

When a number of language policies were implemented in the 2009 legislation, the official text did not distinguish between Portuguese communities located in Europe and elsewhere. The support offered to community schools, migrant associations and complementary schools was affirmed within a discourse that defined Portuguese as a modern, foreign and international language. It was also grounded in discourses of public administration around auditing, i.e. quality measurements, efficiency and responsibility by partners.

In addition, the 2009 version changed the aim of Portuguese teaching abroad from an educational mission for the communities in the diaspora towards cosmopolitan rationalities in the new globalized political economy and in the new global market. From this time onwards, the Portuguese language became one of the state's most significant commodities for export. National language policy now aims at the integration of Portuguese into the education systems of countries with sizeable communities of people of Portuguese origin. The assessment of linguistic competences is based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR)<sup>6</sup> and on the quantification of teacher appraisal.

Local contexts are inevitably affected by these changes. Barradas (2010) illustrates this by considering Portuguese classes in the United Kingdom, which started in the 1960s. At the time, they were organized and paid for by the local communities and migrant associations. The historical background to the exodus from Portugal at the time was that of a dictatorial regime, poverty, unemployment, political persecution and colonial wars in Africa. In the 1970s, with the Greater London Council, these classes started to take place in school premises, after school hours, but the teachers were still paid for by the Portuguese communities. Only after the April 25th Revolution, in 1976, did the Portuguese government take upon itself the responsibility for recruiting and paying the teachers. What had begun as a grassroots initiative became an enterprise subsidized by the Portuguese government, which recognized teachers as legitimate professionals and the classes as part of the children's educational pathway, albeit outside the formal education system and outside mainstream hours.

The number of students taking exams in Portuguese as a Modern Language within the British education system has risen steadily. A number of schools now offer Portuguese as a curriculum option, and protocols have been established with Jersey's educational authorities (Channel Islands), where a significant proportion of the school population is of Portuguese migrant origin. These policy moves acknowledge the need to articulate the languages used at home and in mainstream education. The growing visibility of Portuguese as a modern European language and as a community language works in tandem with the promotion of partnerships between mainstream and complementary schools (Barradas, 2010).

Institutional provision for Portuguese in London is thus the product of intervention by both the Portuguese and British authorities. This has inevitably culminated in strict regulation in the financing of local complementary schools, in the provision of classes and in curriculum content. The greater involvement by governmental authorities (local and national) has had two outcomes. First, it has created symbolic capital for Portuguese as an official European language. Second, it has affected pedagogy in local complementary schools: they may be forced to abandon alternative curricula and informal pedagogical practices that take into account children's multilingual repertoires and language pathways. The demands of current multinational frameworks (e.g. the CEFR) are such that teaching has become more oriented to student assessment, and this limits opportunities for informal pedagogic practices.

The impact of these decisions on the local contexts has been considerable. These policy changes have affected complementary school life. They have also had an effect on Portuguese education professionals and those who promote complementary schools. Together with new British education policies, these regulations will serve to impose another layer of institutionalization on teaching and learning in complementary schools, on the in-class use of language and on the acknowledgement of different ways of knowing associated with multiple repertoires, identities and multilingual resources.

In her most recent research, Solovova (2013) has identified similar changes in complementary schools organized by Russian-speaking immigrants in Portugal. From the locally established parent-run initiatives, schools are being transformed into highly regulated settings supported by the Russian state in terms of financial and material resources. Across the diaspora, the Russian language is promoted as a modern world language, which in Portugal means positioning it alongside Portuguese, the national official language.

### **Texts and Discourses: Portuguese as a Non-Mother Tongue (PLNM) and Linguistic 'Integration' in Portuguese**

We provide here a textual analysis of the representations of language issues in policy texts, with a legal and mandatory status, regarding speakers of languages other than Portuguese in Portugal. We focus in particular on issues related to the linguistic 'integration' of adults and children of migrant origin (Plan for Immigrant Integration [PII], 2007–2010 [Council of Ministers, 2007], and DGIDC, 2005). These policies emerged from the principles produced by supranational European agencies, such as the European Commission.

The 2007 PII appears to recognize 'mother tongue' provision needs for migrant children, yet it assigns this space of action to migrant associations while drawing on broader discourses about culture. However, in the same text, we see a contrasting discourse in which these mother tongues are seen

as sources of interference in the learning and acquisition of Portuguese as a second or foreign language:

Establish an inter-institutional dialogue with immigrant associations and other partners, in order to improve the specific conditions of support for the teaching/learning of students' different mother tongues

Identify, in collaboration with those organizations, groups/pools of experts in the different languages, to facilitate the process of recognition of interference in the processes of teaching/learning in Portuguese

Promote and encourage actions that give visibility and public expression to cultural manifestations developed by migrant communities

Promote co-productions and other forms of collaboration between creative and other cultural agents, especially in what concerns the areas of performative and visual arts.

(excerpts from Conselho de Ministros, 2007; our translation)

In the 2010 version of the plan (PII), the argument for mastering Portuguese as the crucial factor for social integration is further developed and reinforced with reference to the implementation of policy-led projects in state-funded schools, such as "*Ler + em vários sotaques*" (Reading more, in various accents). These projects acknowledge the existence of distinct language varieties and highlight diversity and cultural integration, but this is conceptualized as being only by means of use of Portuguese: "[. . .] promoting the knowledge of Portuguese as a factor of integration" as well as "promoting reading skills [. . .] by means of the program 'Reading more, in various accents' to be developed by schools" (Conselho de Ministros, 2010; cf. Measures 7 and 12 in Immigrant's Integration Plan 2010–2013: 4099).

Concern about acquisition of competences in Portuguese as a factor in integration is particularly evident in the following excerpt from the educational guidelines for *Portuguese as a Non-Native Language in the National Curriculum*, produced by the Ministry of Education in 2005:

School is the privileged space for the development of the social, cultural and professional integration of newly arrived children and youth. Their academic success is intrinsically linked to the command of Portuguese, the essential factor of this integration. Ensuring effective integration is a duty of the State and the School.

Reference is also made in this document to

measures that allow for the effective integration of students into the national educational system, by ensuring sufficient command of Portuguese as a vehicle for all school knowledge. This is the language in

which students will advance in their studies, but it is also the language that will guide them in a new space that cannot be conquered without its consolidation.

(DGIDC, 2005)

In the first fragment, the epistemic modality of certainty, accomplished by the use of the simple present, leaves no space for questioning the truth of the statements that (1) school is the privileged space for integration and (2) integration is intrinsically linked to full mastery of the language. This is corroborated by the use of *intrinsically* and *essential* (as in “essential factor”), and *effective* (as in “effective integration of students”). The last paragraph contains an explicit statement that Portuguese is the only language of instruction and curricula. A model of linguistic immersion is thus invoked, one that does not involve changes in the national curriculum and one that deals with linguistic diversity by introducing complementary support in Portuguese during after-school hours. Throughout the documents, the noun phrase *the language* (singular and definite) refers to Portuguese, and elsewhere in the document it is placed in opposition to *languages* (plural and indefinite), which refers to the languages of immigrants.

In the discourse underpinning the second PII document, family languages spoken by immigrant children are seen as sources of errors in the use of Portuguese. ‘Native’ speakers of Portuguese are thus assigned more symbolic power. PLNM deficit discourse is revealed in the use of medical and orthopaedic terms such as *diagnosis* and *correction*. Vocabulary choices such as *credit units* echo educational discourses which privilege the development of ‘competences’ as academic achievement. There are also correlations between pre-identified social and linguistic variables in the discussion of the development of language profiles. In addition, the document as a whole is framed within public administration and audit culture discourses on quality measurement, efficiency and responsibility.

Textual analysis helps us identify discursive processes that contribute to the representation of what count as legitimate spaces, processes and actors for linguistic integration in Portugal and points out the assimilationist nature of the discourse being produced (Blackledge, 2005). In sum, the PII represents linguistic integration as follows: (1) it delineates separate spaces for mother tongue support for migrants; (2) it ensures a certain type of visibility for cultural and linguistic diversity; and (3) it makes provision for Portuguese as a non-native language. The scope for participation by migrants in this new politics of linguistic integration is confined to teaching family languages in community spaces and collaborating, as ‘informants’ and ‘native’ speakers of ‘other languages’, in the identification of potential areas of interference for speakers of different languages in the learning of Portuguese. Interest in multilingualism and language diversity, as well as knowledge-building with regard to these matters, assumes relevance within

a Portuguese-only framework. Inevitably, this reinforces the hegemonic authority of the 'native' speaker of Portuguese.

In official discourses in Portugal such as this, little consideration is made of linguistic diversity. A linguistic-integration and Portuguese-only approach to linguistic policies has been adopted, while acknowledging the existence of societal multilingualism and the need for intercultural dialogue. Policies regarding 'language' in immigrant communities are separated from policies regarding 'culture'. These policies are reinforced by a discourse about separate monolingual linguistic hegemonies and are framed by theories of language acquisition, learning and development that highlight decontextualized grammatical knowledge and overlook socialization in multilingual practice.

Recent research on language learning and development in minority contexts and complementary schools contradicts these views. This research has drawn attention to the diverse and fluid ways in which minority languages and dominant languages are intertwined in conversational interaction at home, in complementary schools and in bilingual education programs. These diverse and fluid practices are referred to as 'translanguaging' (García, 2009). Other research has also drawn attention to the funds of knowledge that minority children bring from home to school (Moll et al. 1992) and has pointed to the value of exploring reciprocal ways of knowing. Making the case for translanguaging as a flexible form of bilingual pedagogy, researchers engaged in this work situate the speaker and the speaker's language trajectories at the centre of learning and consider language boundaries to be flexible spaces for negotiation (García, 2009; Blackledge and Creese, 2010).

Given the global discursive construction of Portuguese as a world language and the use of Portuguese as a linguistic resource in different multilingual contexts, as well as the increasing number of language-related policies implemented by the Portuguese government in the lusophone world, the traditional definitions of Portuguese as a 'mother tongue', a 'second language' and a 'non-native language' are in need of critical reconceptualization (cf. Block, 2003 for a thorough review of such approaches).

### **Representing and Using Portuguese: Polycentricity across Sociolinguistic Spaces and Scales**

The multi-sited research that we have described above has thrown into sharp relief the different values and ideologies associated with Portuguese at different points in time, in different social and political spaces and on different scales. We started with the grassroots movement in London, which led to the establishment of complementary schools and classes in Portuguese 'as a community language'—classes which were organized for children within the Portuguese diaspora. We then showed how discourses about Portuguese began to change once the Portuguese government began to subsidize and administer this form of educational provision, along with the curriculum and

pedagogy adopted in the classes. The complementary schools were appropriated and embedded within wider institutional processes, both Portuguese and British. By 2006 there had been a clear discursive shift towards the representation of Portuguese as a prestigious modern world language and towards a new emphasis on promoting Portuguese as a commodity outside Portugal.

We then moved on to Portugal and we examined the Portuguese government policy response to European Union discourses on diversity and to calls for explicit policy-making on the integration of groups of migrant origin. Here we saw linguistic integration being construed as acknowledging cultural diversity while placing the Portuguese language at the heart of the school curriculum. We also saw this discourse being strengthened in 2010 with the publication of the second version of the PII. Mastery of Portuguese had by then come to be viewed as an 'essential' factor in social integration. Moreover, we saw that this discourse about the centrality of Portuguese in education was accompanied by a deficit discourse about languages other than Portuguese, which came to be seen as 'sources of interference' in the learning of Portuguese.

The two sets of policy discourses—about the teaching of Portuguese to the children of residents abroad and about the teaching of Portuguese as a non-native language—are clearly differentiated, with the former espousing European-style discourses about multilingualism (as parallel monolingualisms related to the languages of nation-states) and the latter privileging monolingualism in Portuguese. However, we also identified overlaps in the discourses about the teaching of Portuguese in both contexts. In these two contexts, Portuguese is represented as a target language' and as a system of knowledge. Moreover, there is an orientation—in both contexts—to particular models of assessment, notably the CEFR and its application to Portuguese in the QuaREPE,<sup>7</sup> the reference table for the teaching of Portuguese to 'foreigners'.

The notion of polycentricity is useful here in capturing these discursive differences and overlaps. There are clearly different regimes of linguistic authority in Portugal and elsewhere in Europe where Portuguese is taught to the children of residents abroad. London is but one example. There are significant communities with ties to Portugal in other countries in Europe, such as France, Luxembourg and Switzerland. There are also contradictory elements in the adoption of these different policy positions by the Portuguese government: while not permitting use of languages other than Portuguese within the national system of education in Portugal, the Instituto Camões promotes recognition of the Portuguese language in national education systems outside Portugal (e.g. in bilingual education programs or modern foreign language teaching).

From our dialogue about the findings of our ethnographic work in different research sites, we have also become keenly aware of the diverse multilingual practices of adults and children in these sites. These practices

include the multilingual literacy practices of the women in Keating's (2005, 2009) study, the multilingual pedagogies observed and described by Barradas (2007, 2010) and the multilingual socialization practices of the families associated with the Russian school in Portugal, at the heart of Solovova's study (2013). These fluid and creative multilingual practices, in which Portuguese is mixed and blended with other languages, are completely overlooked in the different language policy discourses described above. The individual language learners we encountered in our research in different educational spaces in Portugal and the United Kingdom had diverse biographies, migration trajectories and experiences. Today, many classes in complementary schools and state schools have become contact zones for speakers of different languages and speakers of different varieties of Portuguese, from Africa, Asia, Europe (including the Azores, Madeira and Portugal) and North and South America.

Given the current positioning of Portugal in the world system and the fallout from the recent financial crisis, and given the growing outward migration of young highly educated Portuguese from Portugal, language policies which privilege monolingualism, or idealized parallel monolingualisms, are clearly in need of critical analysis.

## CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In this chapter, we have endeavoured to illustrate the advantages that accrue from multi-sited research of an ethnographic and longitudinal nature which takes different scales into account. It allows us to focus, over time, on the dynamics of policy-making processes relating to a particular language, such as Portuguese, and on the ways in which these dynamics play out in different social, political and historical contexts. Ethnography enables us to gain insights into the ways in which teachers, students and/or parents, in particular educational spaces, navigate policy constraints and/or policy changes in the daily cycles of life in multilingual communities. It gives us a perspective on the specific local ways in which they produce their own version of official language policies.

One key aspect of ethnography is that it allows extended engagement with research participants. This makes it possible to engage in dialogue and joint knowledge-building with research participants and to gain an understanding of their emic perspectives on policy processes. This kind of dialogue, between researcher and researched, also opens up possibilities for exploring directions for change (e.g. in pedagogic practices, curricula and/or teacher education and support).

In this chapter we have also endeavoured to show how close analysis of policy texts, combined with ethnography, enables us to capture the different discourses that shape the production of policy texts, in contemporary

contexts of increasing linguistic and cultural diversity. This combination of close textual analysis and ethnography can provide us with a window on the situated ways in which policy texts and globalized discourses about language-in-education are interpreted and actually appropriated, or contested, locally. Comparison across local contexts and across scales—in our case, comparison of policy texts, discourses and practices relating to Portuguese—makes it possible to draw out resonances and identify key contrasts in the ways in which these processes unfold. It thus allows us to assume a research position that is based on complexity and that struggles against the waste of experiences of research participants, of researchers and of the cultural and historical contexts involved in our studies (Santos, 2004).

## NOTES

1. We acknowledge the financial support of FCT (Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia [Foundation for Science and Technology]) and POPH (Programa Operacional Potencial Humano [Human Potential Operational Programme])-Fundo Social Europeu in Portugal and Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation in the research projects developed by Olga Solovova and Clara Keating.
2. This concept assumes a focus on regimes of language use and should not be confused with the sociocognitive definition of pluricentric languages, recently developed for the lusophone context of East-Timor by Batoreo and Casadinho (2009), which assumes languages as autonomous and self-confined systems and has been applied to Portuguese by Baxter (1992).
3. The 'Slavic period' in Feytor-Pinto's work ends in 2004 as his research spans this period. Solovova (2013) suggests that this period should be extended to 2009—the year in which the Eastern European migration decreased significantly.
4. In Ribeiro et al.'s words: "When we talk today about Portuguese in its European, Brazilian, African dimensions, as well as the existing diasporas in contexts of migration and mobility, we need to reflect upon the collection of pasts with their own specific origins and temporalities, the ones that have generated the external plurality of Portuguese colonialism and its great internal diversity" (Ribeiro et al., 2010: 3).
5. This sociolinguistic term echoes work in the social sciences around the concept of diatopic hermeneutics—one that we use in our academic work in Portuguese. Diatopic hermeneutics refers to the interpretive exercise of acknowledging the co-habitation of multiple historical-cultural configurations of knowledge (cf. Santos, 2004; Keating, Solovova and Barradas, 2013).
6. The CEFR is a framework that describes language ability on a scale of six levels. It was created by the Council of Europe with the purpose of providing a transparent, coherent and comprehensive basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses and curriculum guidelines, the design of teaching and learning materials, and the assessment of foreign language proficiency (Council of Europe, 2011).
7. The Quadro de Referência para o Ensino de Português no Estrangeiro (Qua-REPE; Framework of Reference for the Teaching of Portuguese Abroad; Grosso et al., 2011) follows the model proposed by the CEFR for the teaching and assessment of language and adapts it to the teaching of Portuguese outside Portugal.



## REFERENCES

- Ataíde, J.; Dias, P. (eds.). (2011). *Relatório de imigração, fronteiras e asilo* [Report on immigration, borders and asylum]. Lisbon: Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras. [http://sefstat.sef.pt/Docs/Rifa\\_2011.pdf](http://sefstat.sef.pt/Docs/Rifa_2011.pdf) (accessed 8 January 2013).
- Baganha, M.I. (2001). A cada sul seu norte: dinâmicas migratórias em Portugal [A north to every south: migratory dynamics in Portugal], *in*: Santos, B.S. (ed.) *Globalização: fatalidade ou utopia?* [Globalization: fatality or utopia?]. Porto: Afrontamento.
- Baganha, M.I.; Marques, J.C.; Góis, P. (2004). Novas migrações, novos desafios: a imigração do leste Europeu [New migrations, new challenges: immigration from Eastern Europe]. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 69: 95–115.
- Barradas, O. (2004). 'A disappearing act': Portuguese students—social inclusion and academic attainment, *in*: Abreu, G., Cline, T., Lambert, H. (eds.) *The education of Portuguese children in Britain: insights from research and practice in England and overseas*. Lisbon: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2007). Learning Portuguese: a tale of two worlds, *in*: Conteh, J.; Martin, P.; Robertson, L.H. (eds.) *Multilingual learning: stories in schools and communities in Britain*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2010). Linking community and mainstream schools: opportunities and challenges for Portuguese language and culture classes, *in*: Lytra, V.; Martin, P. (eds.) *Sites of multilingualism: complementary schools in Britain today*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Batoreo, H.; Casadinho, M. (2009). O Português—uma língua pluricêntrica: o caso de Timor-Leste [Portuguese—a pluricentric language: the case of East-Timor]. *Revista Portuguesa de Humanidades, Estudos Linguísticos*, 13 (1): 63–79.
- Baxter, A. (1992). Portuguese as a pluricentric language, *in*: Clyne, M. (ed.) *Different norms in different languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blackledge, A. (2005). *Discourse and power in a multilingual world*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Blackledge, A.; Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism*. London: Continuum.
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: a critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J.; Collins, J.; Slembrouck, S. (2005a). Polycentricity and interactional regimes in 'global neighborhoods'. *Ethnography*, 6 (2): 205–235.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2005b). Spaces of multilingualism. *Language and Communication*, 25 (3): 197–216.
- Capinha, G.; Galano, A.M. (eds.). (1996). *De língua-mar. Criações e confrontos em Português*. [Of the language-sea: creations and confrontations in Portuguese]. Rio de Janeiro: National Art Foundation.
- Collins, J.; Slembrouck, S.; Baynham, M. (eds.). (2009). *Globalization and language in contact*. London: Continuum.
- Commission of the European Communities, Lingua Programme. (1993). Less widely used less taught languages. Activity Report COM (94) 280.
- Conselho de Ministros. (2007). Plano para a integração dos imigrantes [Plan for immigrant integration]. *Diário da República* [Journal of the Republic], 1ª série, nº 85, 3 May.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2010). Plano para a Integração dos Imigrantes [Plan for immigrant integration]. [http://www.acidi.gov.pt/\\_cfn/4d346c9b80687/live/Consulte+a+vers%C3%A3o+do+Plano+2010-2013+em+portugu%C3%AAs](http://www.acidi.gov.pt/_cfn/4d346c9b80687/live/Consulte+a+vers%C3%A3o+do+Plano+2010-2013+em+portugu%C3%AAs) (accessed 8 January 2013).

- Council of Europe. (2011). *Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Cadre1\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Cadre1_en.asp) (accessed 9 June 2014).
- Council of Ministers. (2007). Plan for integration of immigrants [PII] 2007–2010. Council of Ministers Resolution 63-A/2007. *Diário da República*, 1ª série, nº 85, 3 May.
- Deleuze, G.; Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. B. Massumi (trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- DGIDC (Direção Geral de Inovação e de Desenvolvimento Curricular [General Office for Innovation and Curricular Development]). (2005). *Português Língua Não Materna no Currículo Nacional. Documento Orientador* [Portuguese as a non-native language in the national curriculum: guidelines]. Lisbon: Ministry of Education.
- European Commission. (2006). High Level Group on Multilingualism. Final report. Brussels: European Commission. <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/06/1221> (accessed 8 January 2013).
- Feytor-Pinto, P. (2008). *Política da língua na democracia portuguesa (1974–2004)* [Language policy in the Portuguese democracy]. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Lisbon: Universidade Aberta.
- García, O. (2005). Minority language education, in: Brown, K. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: a global perspective*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Grosso, M. J.; Soares, A.; Sousa, F.; Pascoal, J. (2011). *Quadro de Referência para o Ensino Português no Estrangeiro (QuaREPE)* [Reference framework for teaching Portuguese abroad]. Lisbon: Ministério da Educação [Ministry of Education]. <http://www.dgicd.min-edu.pt/index.php?s=directorio&pid=67> (accessed 9 June 2014).
- Holland, D.; Lave, J. (2001). *History in person: enduring struggles, contentious practice, intimate identities*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Johnson, D.C. (2009). Ethnography of language policy. *Language Policy*, 8: 139–159.
- Keating, M.C. (2005). The person in the doing: negotiating the experience of self, in: Barton, D.; Tusting, K. (eds.) *Beyond communities of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2009). Changing participation in changing practice: uses of language and literacy among Portuguese based migrant contexts, in: Baynham, M; Collins, J.; Slembrouck, S. (eds.) *Globalization and language contact: spatiotemporal scales, migration flows, and communicative practices*. London: Continuum.
- Keating, M.C.; Solovova, O. (2011). Multilingual dynamics among Portuguese-based migrant contexts in Europe. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43: 1251–1263.
- Keating, M.C.; Solovova, O.; Barradas, O.M. (2013). Políticas de língua, multilinguismos e migrações: para uma reflexão policêntrica sobre os valores do português no espaço europeu [Language policies, multilingualism and migration: for a polycentric view about values of Portuguese in Europe], in: Moita-Lopes, L.P. (ed.) *Português no século XXI : cenário geopolítico e sociolinguístico* [Portuguese in the 21st century: geopolitical e sociolinguistic scenario]. São Paulo: Parábola.
- Law-Decree 165/2006, de 11 de Agosto [11 August 2006]. [http://legislacao.min-edu.pt/np4/np3content/?newsId=1188&fileName=decreto\\_lei\\_165\\_2006.pdf](http://legislacao.min-edu.pt/np4/np3content/?newsId=1188&fileName=decreto_lei_165_2006.pdf) (accessed 3 July 2012).
- Law-Decree 165-C/2009, de 28 de Julho [28 July 2009]. <http://www.instituto-camoes.pt/.../decretos-leis-dp1?.../165-c-2009.../165> (accessed 3 July 2012).
- Lytra, V.; Martin, P. (2010). Introduction, in: Lytra, V.; Martin, P. (eds.) *Sites of multilingualism: complementary schools in Britain today*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

- Marcus, G. E. (1995). Ethnography in/of the world system: the emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24: 95–117.
- Mateus, M. H. M. (2011). Diversidade linguística na escola portuguesa [Linguistic diversity at the Portuguese school]. *Revista Lusófona de Educação*, 18: 13–24.
- Moll, L.; Amanti, C.; Neff, D.; Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice* 31 (2): 132–141.
- Ribeiro, M. C.; Keating, M. C.; Santos, H.; Solovova, O. (2010). Português na palma da mão: formação de professores. Língua Portuguesa no estrangeiro, pré-Escolar e 1º ciclo [Portuguese in the palm of your hand: in-service teacher-training, Portuguese language abroad, preschool and primary school]. Unpublished report presented at Instituto Camões, January. Coimbra: Center for Social Studies, University of Coimbra.
- Santos, B. S. (1994). Pela mão de Alice: o social e o político na pós-modernidade [Guided by Alice: the social and the political in post-modernity]. Porto: Afrontamento.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1995). *Toward a new common sense: law, science and politics in the paradigmatic transition*. New York: Routledge.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2004). A critique of lazy reason: against the waste of experience, in: Wallerstein, I. (ed.) *The modern world-system in the longue durée*. London: Paradigm.
- Solovova, O. (2013). *(In)-Between a rock and a hard place: notes for an ecology of language policies from a complementary school for Eastern European immigrant children in Portugal*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Coimbra: University of Coimbra.
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43: 1222–1235.