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Abstract

The purpose of this article is to focus on the actions and players from the countries of emigration which support or do not support the maintenance of native languages of migrants in Europe. For this, links need to be discovered which exist between European languages and languages of origin. Firstly, all languages are not important. A social hierarchy exists which depends on the context of elocution. Multilingualism was gradually developed during the 20th century but all bilingualisms are not considered as a resource. Bilingualism related to immigration is often synonymous with handicap and deficit of integration which justifies a certain essentialisation of the language. However, language learning depends partly on its social value in the host country and the country of origin. This social recognition rests for example on the fact that it concerns an oral or written language; a religious language, an international language, etc. This article thus aims at understanding the European and national language policies set up to support the mobility of individuals and their entry into new territories.
The traditional model of integration preaches an ethnocentric universalism from which the behaviours of the migrants are perceived as “lacking” (Sayad, 1999). Admittedly, they do not renounce cultural memberships relating to their country of origin, but they no longer live in the margin of the society, locked up in an imagined culture. Although it is largely used at the scientific level, the concept of integration is often related to political ideologies which mask the complexity of social interactions. This vision of a cultural unity is above all a political ambition. This idea, according to which there would exist a dominating model in Europe and which would prevail over all others, is the result of a form of “cultural imperialism” (Hajjat, 2005). Linguistic imperialism (Philipson, 1992) in particular refers to the propagation of a language like English or French in the old colonised countries but also more recently in many European countries where this language (English mainly) became obligatory within the academic framework.

Our objective here is thus to question the upholding of languages of migrants in a context other than the country of departure. The “native or first languages” of people having known an international mobility will be distinguished from the languages known as “European”. The first relates to the dialects in which individuals were socialised before their migration while the seconds refers to official languages of the countries of destination.

In fact, the migrants fit in several social and cultural universes to which they refer, belong and project themselves. Their country of birth and their native languages constitutes their “reference group” (expression introduced by Hyman) i.e., this learning resulting from childhood, this primary socialisation, partly relate to how social reality is perceived. The host country represents the “participation group” (Bastide, 1970) and this maintenance of several cultural universes is not necessarily the source of conflict. The duality becomes more apparent when the individuals adapt to this cultural universe, but are excluded from it socially. The migrants therefore do not live between two cultures, but in two cultural universes. They manage their belonging taking into consideration the country of origin and arrival, according to their degree of participation in the various social spheres, and taking into account in particular the pressures and constraints which weigh on them. For this reason, the maintenance of one or more languages other than the language of the host country is not disapproval towards the host country just as passing on this cultural baggage to the next generation allows continuing the bond with the country of origin.

To focus on the acculturation of migrants in the home country and the place made for their native language, it is advisable to take into account the integration model supported. Three principal types prevail: assimilation, multiculturalism or communitarianism (issues relating to minorities and ethnic communities within societies). Although reality is largely multicultural in most big cities of Europe, this cultural diversity is often denied and it is frequently forgotten that integration is not reduced to an incorporation of migrants in a nation which would be fossilised, static and which would not benefit from these migratory currents. In that, integration is a process which is not unilateral but with a double direction. Speaking of an integrated society is not limited to measuring the inclusion of a group in the whole of the society by forcing this collective to merge into the mould. It is by adopting this way of thinking that many European institutions transformed the “right” to integration into an “obligation”, a “will” to be integrated.

Thus, by questioning linguistic abilities of migrants and how those are likely to influence their process of integration in the receiving society, we will not adopt a linear point of view. It is rather a question of understanding the comings and goings between native languages and European languages learned by people born outside the European Union. The main objective is to apprehend the players and actions resulting from the country of origin supporting or not supporting the integration of these

---

1 “As ECRI has repeatedly stated, integration is a two way process, based on mutual recognition, which bears no relation to assimilation”, part 15, Annual Report 2010. European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (Council of Europe) www.coe.int/ECRI.
migrants outside their country of birth. What is the place of the language of the immigration country in the country of origin? Which representations and which functions are allotted to this language in the country of birth and to the native language in the host country? In which contexts these languages are practiced? How these native languages can be socially more developed?

The main difficulty of our subject matter is related to the great diversity of possible configurations because of plurality of the countries of origin and the countries of arrival but also of the scope of the languages which it concerns. Thus, we do not claim to present all possible situations exhaustively but rather to present some typical situations.

1. Rare demo-linguistic data

National quantitative data mentioning the languages spoken by individuals are even rare sometimes, when they exist, censured because they are considered to be too politically sensitive. In Belgium for example, this data resulting from the census of population are prohibited since 1961 in order not to create tensions between linguistic communities. Besides this political dimension, it is difficult to describe the linguistic landscape of each country because measurement is sensitive. Indeed, it is advisable to be able to define contours of a language which is not easy. For example for Arabic, does one consider that Moroccan Arabic is the same as Algerian or Egyptian Arabic? Does one distinguish the native language spoken in family from that written and taught at the school? In countries where linguistic data exist (Switzerland, England, Austria, etc.) they relate either to the spoken languages in the house or on the written languages or even sometimes only the official languages which complicates the possible comparisons thereafter. In Austria, a question on usual, vernacular languages is posed in the census. But there still, the answers are difficult to exploit because it is not known if these languages of daily uses are those of the family or of the work place.

Data is thus seldom available, and when it is, it provides only a vague focus. In France for example, in 1999 a national survey was conducted parallel to the population census. It revealed nearly 400 different linguistic varieties in the metropolis (Héran, Filhon, Deprez; 2002.

In addition to this quantitative information, the results presented in this text result primarily from sociolinguistic work which is based on discussions with institutional players (teachers, institution heads, administrative staff), parents and children as well as on ethnographic observations (of classes for example) or yet on official texts of language policies. We also mobilised national and international reports sent to the Council of Europe in particular or to the European Parliament. We finally referred to some legal texts, circulars in particular, national and European.

Thus this text mainly concerns second hand information. However, even if this research relates to a wide context of a country, a case study resulting from a research by discussions which I carried out in France at the beginning of the years 2000 with Arabic-speaking and Berber speaking migrants will be presented in the last part. Within the framework of this project, about forty biographical discussions were made for the purpose of recalling migratory paths of parents and their children from Algeria, from Morocco and Tunisia. The migrants were studied as dynamic players who were neither carriers of a “culture of origin” or “transplanted” as in a new society; but rather individuals having lived varied experiences from their linguistic socialisation in Arabic or Berber, their learning or not of the French language at the school (according in particular to their sex, place of life, generation, etc).

2. World linguistic landscape: mono-lingualism vs multi-lingualism

There are 6,000 to 7,000 languages in the world which continuously evolve, change; some disappearing, and others taking life. These languages are unequally distributed since most of them are used by a very small portion of the population whereas some other languages are spoken by the very great majority of the individuals. It is the case of Mandarin, English, Spanish or Arabic and Hindi
which are international languages. This hegemony of some languages leads to a hierarchy structure between all linguistic varieties according to the number of speakers but not restricted to it. Other criteria also intervene and contribute to the value of each language, one of the criteria being for example the context, i.e., the place of enunciation. Thus let us note from the start that all languages are not socially equivalent.

In Europe and more particularly in Western Europe, mono-lingualism was preached since the 17th century with the idea that the use of a common language is the only means to arouse a national feeling, i.e., very often the nation works by a single language. As a whole, in almost all the countries of Europe, mono-lingualism of State reigns with only one language, national language supplants all others. It is in this geopolitical space that the monolingual ideal is developed the most and “tends to associate a same territory, only one politico-administrative organisation and a single language. The French State is the concretisation of this ideal of State-Nation” (Boyer, 2010: 71) of which one could recently observe the rapid setting up, with the case of ex-Yugoslavia.

For as much, mono-lingualism is far from being in a majority since several thousands languages exist in the world of which sometimes, as in Cameroon, hundreds of varieties on the same territory. In Europe, this diversity is less: it is estimated that this continent includes only 3% of the world variety. Nearly a third of the 6,000 spoken languages are respectively on the African continent and on the Asian continent and more than 15% of all the dialects are located in America and Oceania (Juaristi; Reagan and Tonkin, 2008).

Regional languages and the languages of immigration however are anchored since a long time in Europe and have resulted in setting up these last years the European Charter of the regional or minority languages which aims at an institutional recognition of these languages historically present on the various territories. Admittedly, the national feeling in most countries of Europe is conveyed by the legitimate language which is associated with it. The indivisibility of the nation is thus expressed by the use of a strongly socially developed single language. For as much, mono-lingualism of State does not mean that only a single language is spoken on the territory.

3. Pluri-lingualism, a socially marked practice

Social Hierarchy structure of languages

To understand the evolution of languages of immigration in Europe, to know whether their maintenance supports or does not support integration and identify the main players, it is advisable to clarify initially how the dialects position themselves one against the other.

First of all, the concepts of “language”, “dialect” and “patois” are terms defined by linguists and sociolinguists who always do not agree on the same lines concerning the common language. While one would tend to hierarchise the dialects while going from the “language” to the “dialect” and finally to the “patois”, it is important to specify that objectively, it is the other way around. The distinction between a standardized “official language” and other “dialects” and “patois” is not about value. For example, the imposition on the European territories of mono-lingualism of the State (Niel, 2007) involved a devaluing of the other “languages”, i.e. “dialects” and “patois” (Lodge, 1997). However, they are also “languages”, as an exclusive instrument of communication which they represent. They do not refer to a specific community of individuals which would refer to it exclusively; its choice is especially determined by the social use. It depends on the membership to a group, the situation of interaction or problems of dominance (Fishman, 1965).

“Languages” thus differ mainly according to their spatial occupation, their social status and policy. Each language is equipped with a value on the “linguistic market” and thus all languages other than the national language are not equivalent: “The construction of a linguistic market creates conditions of
an objective competition in and by which legitimate competence can function like linguistic capital producing, at the time of each social exchange, a distinctive advantage…” (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 84.)

This is why, within various geopolitical spaces, languages constitute strategic instruments making it possible to hierarchise the speakers with each other. Such an approach is revealing an essentialisation of the language which results in denying “constitutive heterogeneity” of the language and compartmentalising in a deterministic manner societies and cultures (Canut, Duchêne, 2011). In *Ce que parler veut dire (what one says actually means)*, Bourdieu thus showed how “communication reports [...] are reports of symbolic power where the power struggles between the speakers or their respective groups are updated” (1982, p. 14). In that, the knowledge of the national language on the territory constitutes a major asset in many spheres of public life. Learning this language and its practice in the family sphere imply for certain families a sense of investment for a social mobility.

**Legitimate language: a plus value for migrants?**

Principal works of economists (Grin, 1996; Grenier, 2000; Chiswick, 1992; Borjas, 1999) conducted in the United States and Canada from population censuses helped assessing the knowledge of languages as questions were asked on their competences. From these data, the socio-economic analyses conducted have established that language can be regarded as a human capital. In this sense, knowledge of a language reveals to be profitable on the job market. Borjas (1999), for example, explains that, it is an economic advantage for immigrants to have English competences because they can have access to employment within their group of membership, as also outside this group. Thus, bilingual immigrants would have better salaries than others. The author moreover deplores that in 1990, 37% of these immigrants settled in the United States and for about ten years have not had “very good” control over English. He moreover wonders about the weakness of linguistic English investment of certain immigrants taking into account the “profit” of this investment. Gilles Grenier (2000) partly confirms these results in his study conducted in Quebec and Ontario. He also notes that men speaking a language other than English or French in a family have lower incomes. Nevertheless, the spoken language in family by women does not seem to have incidence on their incomes.

These economic analyses throw light on the benefit offered by the control of language of the home country on the job market and in particular the possibility that it offers to widen opportunities of taking up a job and obtaining a higher income. Taking into account these works, one could conclude from it if the inactive ones transmit their native language more than the active ones (Filhon, 2009), it is because they sufficiently did not invest in the learning of national language and hence access is only possible for jobs offered by their source linguistic community.

However, the professionally occupied place and the linguistic practice do not unilaterally examine the second determining the first. The spoken language and professional activity are in interaction. One can consider that by learning the language from the host country, one will be more likely to take up a job, but also conversely, it is by taking up a job that one can learn how to speak or speak fluently the language of the host country. Conceiving the learning of a language as a simple personal “investment” is denying the crucial role of interactions and considering that this bilingualism is the single result of an individual will.

Whatever the dialect in question, a person conversing in two different linguistic forms not allowing inter-comprehension, will be declared bilingual. “Active” bilingualism is distinguished which consists in speaking two languages of “passive” bilingualism for which the practice of one of the two languages is not effective and is limited to understanding. In a general manner, the practice and/or the comprehension of at least two linguistic varieties are called multilingualism. For example, in Germany, for many Turkish migrant families, parents will speak spontaneously in Turkish or Kurdish with their children who understanding this language and will answer in German, the language in which they are socialised outside the family sphere. Thus, parents and children do not use the same speech but understand the
language of the other as they are accustomed to listening to it. This process of progressive comprehension then of activation of bilingualism is without any doubt a sign of integration.

In this sense, the work of Cummins (2000) reveals that it is advantageous to the child or to the migrant adult to improve learning their native language in order to facilitate in a second time, the learning of the language of the host country. He perceives in that additive bilingualism, in which learning a second language is done while developing and improving the first, subtractive bilingualism which induces a learning of the national language to the detriment of the native language. In a preceding research, Cummins (1994) had already shown that learners who are in a context of additive bilingualism succeed more than those who undergo an undermining of their language and their culture by the school or the society in general. The learning of a second language is also more or less difficult according to the first language. Thus, geographical distance between countries of departure and arrival as also the proximity of the graphic or grammatical systems of the two linguistic varieties will facilitate or not facilitate its acquisition:

“In terms of motivation, the Q-value of L1, i.e. the native language, and the geographical distance between the origin and receiving contexts are of particular importance; in the context of access to the second language, both previous contact to the L2 in the country of origin, including media contact and language instruction in L2, and, in view of transnational mobility, geographical distance, which hampers L1 access, play an important role. The linguistic distance between L1 and L2 and the cultural distance between the contexts affect the efficiency of language learning and also the costs of L2 acquisition.” (Esser, 2006, p. 36).

In continuity, there is no doubt that teaching a second language in the country of origin has positive consequences on the integration of migrants in the society of immigration. Lastly, in support of several investigations on different dates in Australia, the USA, Israel, Canada and Germany, Halmut Esser showed that in each of these countries the acquisition of an official language depended above all on the duration of settlement and the degree of education and not the age at migration or yet a territorial concentration on migrant populations.

Ultimately, bilingualism or multilingualism is in fact an asset in the process of integration in the society from an identity as well as economic point of view. However, countries do not necessarily perceive this capital as a social resource.

**Bilingualism, a social resource?**

Thus State mono-lingualism exists in the great majority of the European countries, as also more recently an enhanced value of certain multilingualism with increasingly early teaching of several foreign languages at the school and the professional need to speak some international languages like German, English or Spanish. Only 5 States in Europe have several official national languages: Belgium, Finland, Switzerland, Ireland and Luxembourg. In the last 3 countries, official multilingualism reveals a will to promote undervalued languages which are respectively Romansh, Gaelic and Luxemburgish, dialects which symbolise the national identity of each of these countries. Moreover, beyond the official multilingualism the daily uses remain monolingual because in Ireland English largely supplants Gaelic and in Finland Finnish from now on is spoken much more than Swedish (Baggioni, 1997). Even in Belgium and Switzerland there is a territorialised mono-lingualism which is often a source of conflicts between linguistic communities.

If some multilingual practices constitute a resource to be developed socially, the tradition of integration of several countries of Europe expressly invites migrants to give up their native languages for an exclusive use of the legitimate language. In these cases in fact, multilingualism of migrants is perceived as a threat to the national unit. Cultural assimilation then amounts to a linguistic assimilation i.e., by a renouncement of its native language.

Thus, seeking to study the acquisition of the German language by the migrants, Hartmut Esser (2006) draws up a direct link between “the mechanisms, social conditions and consequences of the
Acquisition and language retention are understood here as the outcome of the interaction of ‘immigrant’ activities or learning, on the one hand, and certain social conditions, on the other. Learning of a new language depends on four basic factors: motivation (e.g. the prospect of increased income), access (e.g., opportunities for contact or availability of courses), skills (e.g., general intelligence or particular ability to learn languages) and the costs associated with learning (e.g., time involved, pressure to assimilate).” (p.3)

Bilingualism related to immigration is thus necessarily not perceived as an asset. It is even sometimes regarded as an additional “source of difficulties” (Roselli, 1997), in particular for the most socially deprived populations. Social utility of languages of origin is not recognised right from the start in the home country. The proof is in the Benisti pre-report drafted in France in 2004 by the Prevention commission of the parliamentary Group of study on internal security in which it is written that multilingualism of foreign parents is pathogenic, a source of cognitive disorders. A bond is even established between this multilingualism and the delinquency of the children. A recent investigation thus showed that “the conception of the bi/multilingual pupil is positive only if, on the one hand the languages are taught/offered by the school (seldom if they are practiced outside, in the family for example) and if, on the other hand, the pupil has good academic performances” (Auger, 2009: 45). The maintenance of a source language would be in fact regarded as a brake to the learning of the language of the home country. However sociolinguists showed that bilingualism facilitated the acquisition of a new language and increased memory capacities.

There is no single form of bilingual education. For certain countries and certain regions, bilingualism is regarded as a transition supposing that native language of the migrants gradually has to disappear. For others, it is important to maintain this bilingualism either by doing so that there is no loss and that the family practice continues; or by seeking to improve this competence (Baker, 2011).

Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (2001) have shown in their project on the place of minority languages in Europe, that most European countries favour regional languages over immigration languages in particular at school. As a whole, two principal orientations are considered according to the territories: either a multicultural perspective which involves national policies preaching multilingualism whatever it is as a resource - not only economic - to be developed. Or conversely, an assimilationist’s perspective which supposes that the languages of immigration are a handicap because they potentially harm learning and the use of the European language and the acceptance of a new cultural identity nurtured partly by the language. These variations of linguistic policy are not found only between countries but also inside a same national territory as in Germany for example where positioning vary according to Länder.

In the countries of departure this ambiguity of multilingualism is also visible. Admittedly some languages constitute considerable plus-values for countries in terms of opening towards the outside and participation in the worldwide economy. They thus represent important resources for the intervening parties on the job market. But this development of multilingualism is still complex for young nations of Africa or Eastern Europe which remain nations who have yet to develop multilingualism and seek to date to affirm their national identity while promoting above all a single official language.

Ultimately, bilingualism and bi-literacy are seldom purposes in itself but much more the means deployed for: assimilation of migrants in the society; unifying a multilingual society; supporting the communication of a country to the outside; entering the job market and allowing social mobility; safeguarding religious and cultural identities of migrants; bringing closer linguistic and political communities; supporting the use of a colonial language; preserving the favoured position of a certain elite or on the contrary giving a legal status equivalent to two languages which in reality do not enjoy the same social recognition. And finally, to look further into the understanding and knowledge of a language and a culture (Ferguson, 1977).
4. Language policies

Progressive recognition of multilingualism by the Council of Europe

If multilingualism is developed more and more within Europe since the end of the 20th century, languages of immigration remain despite all barely recognised and many negative representations persist. “The challenge to recognise multilingualism resulting from immigration as a wealth in itself and not as an obstacle or at best as a temporary means of integration, exists fully within the societies where speakers of languages of origin are second class citizens - when they are likely to be it - and excluded more or less permanently from the places of power.” (Mc Andrew and Ciceri, 2003).

This progressive recognition of multilingualism was done in particular via the Council of Europe in two instances (Beacco and Cherkaoui Messin, 2010):

- At the beginning of the nineties when the Charter of regional and minority languages is proposed with the signature of each European State. Taking into account the diversity of national configurations, 98 articles feed this Convention which requires it in order to be ratified that 35 of them are accepted by the signatory country.

- Following this partial recognition of undervalued languages, the Division of language policies of the Council of Europe supported the use of the “multilingualism” term in particular through the Common European Framework of reference for languages set up in 2001. The ambition is here mainly to develop and diversify linguistic repository of each individual.

However, beyond this political will, the primary texts (before translation) submitted by the European Commission, the principal generator of texts of all institutions is a very eloquent indicator of the concrete evolution of the languages relation in Europe. Whereas in 1986, 58% of the texts were written in French, 26% in English, and 11% in German. In 1999, the rates are respectively 35%, 52% and 5% (Truchot, 2001). One can, without taking too many risks, suppose that this trend was still strong at the beginning of 21st century. Despite an aspiration to develop multilingual practices, English asserts itself gradually including within EU institutions.

Recent national language policies

Language policies set up in Europe since decades sought to support economic development and a cultural influence. In that, these policies which prevail are often largely set aside from social practices.

State mono-lingualism was imposed gradually by means of language policies which correspond to two levels of intervention in the management of languages (Boyer, 2010). A first level relates to the language itself and its standardisation for example whereas a second level relates to the languages involved, their respective statuses. They are then protection policies of certain languages, ousting other dialects or standards of use.

There exist overall three types of management of the Co-presence of languages (Boyer, 2008):

1. A liberal design which consists in accepting the domination of some languages over others with thus the idea of a competition between languages and the linguistic communities. From this point of view, non official intervention is appropriate.

2. A second approach consists in promoting the intervention but not only at the national level. This political management of languages aims at “linguistic ecology” on all levels i.e., the most local level up to the international level.

3. Lastly, a second interventionist approach favours the identity aspect and preaches linguistic nationalism (Hellier, 2002) particularly visible for the maintenance of the Catalan in Spain, Hebrew in Israel or French in Quebec.
This last type of management emerges in particular during the constitution of a State. In the case which interests us here, i.e. to grasp links with countries of origin of the migrants, they are frequently countries colonised in the past which sought when they became independent to dissociate from colonising countries by imposing another national language while adopting this model of monolingualism of European State and in such a brutal manner that could take place in Europe. This linguistic imposition was thus set up in Algeria, in Guinea, in India, etc. Some African countries as Angola have on the other hand chosen to maintain the language of the coloniser as official language, considering Portuguese as a “war trophy”. During the proclamation of independences of Angola as also of Mozambique or Cap Vert, the new governments decided pragmatically that Portuguese would be favoured as common language and language of teaching. Contrary to other forms of nationalism which took care to eradicate the language of the former colonists, these countries rather regarded this European language as a conquered language which became their own. In Algeria for example, vis-à-vis the linguistic dispossession and the imposition of French during colonization, the re-Arabisation of the country then corresponds to a wish to break up with this cultural imperialism and emerge a new national identity. The population also hoped that this policy of Arabisation would restore equal opportunity. To understand the relationship with the languages of migrants, it is necessary to bear in mind this ambiguity which is very present in many countries of emigration, namely a will to break up with its colonial languages which at the same time remain languages of social advancement, i.e. languages used in the bourgeois and prestigious schools.

In a large number of European countries, as I mentioned previously, recent language policies developed aiming at strengthening the learning of the official language. In parallel, this control over the legitimate language of the host country sometimes became a condition to enter on the territory or to obtain nationality. The relative novelty of these language policies are partly explained by the fact that for many years the governments bet on the return of migrants in their country of origin and attractive policies were thus set up in this direction (Weil, 2004). In the same way as explained by P. Weil, one fears both in France and in the countries of origin that the elimination of illiteracy of the populations increases their political conscience and thus their democratic claims.

Thus, for a few years several European countries have deplored very weak knowledge of the migrants of the national language. It is the case for example in Germany as Nicola Tietze (2005) affirms it. In the design of the State-Nation France and Germany have since always posed as opposite models. In France, official construction preceded the development of the nation. French language is indeed central in the assimilationist’s design which preaches the idea that it would be only guarantor of a right to equality. In Germany, on the other hand, language constitutes a criterion of collective identity. It is thus a vector determining a belonging to “Kulturnation”. For as much, today, in Germany as in France, the policy of integration of migrants attaches great significance to the learning of German and French. Contrary to the seventies and eighties when foreigners could not be changed into nationals, the new laws on immigration in Germany and the new code of nationality of 2000 associate nationality more with citizenship and consider more than before a territorial definition of nationality based mainly on the right of the land. Thus, language in Germany is no longer solely considered as a cultural marker, it is also a social marker and in that, German dialect would support equal opportunity.

In such a context, the division of language policies of the Council of Europe sought to measure national expectations with respect to the control over the legitimate language, while comparing in 2007 and the 2009 the evolution of linguistic national policies. The delegates of the European Committee for migrations (representatives of 44 Member States) have thus responded to a questionnaire relating to linguistic abilities expected in three situations: for the entry on the territory (A), to reside sustainably in the territory (B) and finally to obtain nationality (C). Moreover, in order to determine the language policies founded in the countries of the questions related to the courses

suggested, their contents, their duration, the tests, the penalties in the event of failure etc. Finally, 27 countries have responded in 2008 and 31 in 2010.

The first results of this investigation (Extramiana and Van Avermaet, 2010) reveal that expectations within the European countries as regards knowledge of languages vary according to the three situations suggested. One country in Europe out of four requires a control over the official language to enter on the territory in 2010 (more than seven out of 10 require it for the granting of permanent residence and finally more than 9 countries out of 10 make language a criterion for obtaining nationality (table 1).

The second significant result reveals that for each situation expectations of the countries were strengthened between the two dates which is also accompanied by a rise of linguistic trainings suggested. They were 62% in 2008 (6 countries out of 13 made these courses obligatory against 82% in 2010 (8 countries out of 19 required this training).

Table 1. Countries which impose or do not impose knowledge of the language of the host country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language knowledge compulsory in 23 states</th>
<th>Language knowledge not compulsory in 8 states (** = optional language classes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Germany A, B, C</td>
<td>1. Belgium/Wallonia**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Armenia C</td>
<td>2. Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Austria B, C</td>
<td>3. Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Estonia B, C</td>
<td>5. Ireland**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Finland A (Russian Ingrians), B</td>
<td>6. Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. France A, B, C</td>
<td>7. Serbia**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Greece B, C</td>
<td>8. Sweden**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Italy B, C??</td>
<td>11. Liechtenstein A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lithuania B, C</td>
<td>12. Luxembourg A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Czech Republic B, C</td>
<td>17. Slovak Republic C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. United Kingdom A, B, C</td>
<td>19. San Marino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Turkey C</td>
<td>23. Ukraine C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Extramiana and Van Avermaet, 2010, p.11.
Immigration proceeds from now on subject to certain conditions and this, especially in Western Europe. A significant variation exists between expectations of countries of Western Europe and those of Eastern Europe. More than four countries of Western Europe out of ten have a requirement of control over the language of the host country as of the entry of the migrants on the territory against almost any State in the East of Europe. They are also more than twice more numerous in the West likely to deliver a permanent residence permit depending on the linguistic abilities. On the other hand, the acquisition of nationality very largely requires control over the national language in the East as in the West.

It is in this context of hardening of the political discourses with regard to immigration and increasingly demanding policies of integration were set up these last years of language policies including in particular tests of competence in the language of the host country. Indeed, control over the national language constitutes a favoured indicator to measure the integration of immigrants as well as others as mixed marriage, number of children, age at marriage etc. This use of collective indices of integration poses questions. The first limit relates to the atomisation of a process of adjustment reduced to a plurality of criteria perceived as independent of each other. This “analytical deconstruction” makes it possible to reveal the plurality of situations but denies the articulation of these indicators between each other (De Rudder, 1994). Through the analysis of the various migratory profiles, the relative interdependence between the place of life, sociability or the spoken languages was clearly shown. The use of such indicators is thus in tautological cases and does not offer additional comprehension of the phenomenon.

5. Linguistic education

This recent evolution encourages many European countries to set up linguistic training whose duration varies strongly from one State to the other as well as its compulsory character, its content, its non paying access. Very often, these trainings strongly remain in link with a community project and thus relate to a special learner profile. Certain criteria related to the migrants are taken into account to direct these trainings but the latter remain limited and the trainings thus are not much diversified:

- Taking into account the academic luggage in certain countries like Germany or Denmark.
- Elimination or not of illiteracy of the populations (France, Luxembourg etc.)
- Lifetime on the territory (Netherlands)
- Speed of progression of the learners (the United Kingdom) which can also cause financial penalties.

However, these criteria especially result in determining the duration of the training and the teaching orientations are not much varied.

One of the key questions to reflect on is not only the place of the countries of origin in the maintenance of native languages but also in the training of European languages to know which institutions play a significant role and what are their potential actions.

Linguistic training of the migrant potentials in the country of origin

In the countries of origin, the main institution is the school. It is indeed the principal place of learning of European languages. The school is also a decisive body insofar as higher the level of studies, easier for migrants to learn the language of the host country even if they did not have the occasion to be educated academically in the host country. Moreover, the statutory value of language

---

3 ECRI recognises that speaking the host country’s language is essential for a successful integration process. However, procedures such as using linguistic tests prior to immigration, especially for family reunification, as an indirect tool of restricting immigration are, in ECRI’s view, counterproductive. Par. 14, ECRI’s Annual Report 2010.
is partly related to the social image of the speakers. As a result, the higher the number of graduate migrants while arriving in the country of emigration, the more their native language increases in the hierarchy of languages.

Currently, in certain countries of emigration, educational establishments do not have the sufficient backing yet to set up reforms aiming at improving the capacities of hosting and the training contents (Adami, 2007). Certain territories also lack financial means. In formerly colonized countries still sometimes the question of the language of teaching arises which is not necessarily the language spoken by the majority of pupils. If the share of graduate migrants does not cease to increase, the rates of illiteracy in certain countries of emigration remain relatively important which strongly complicates the learning of a second language. Indeed, it initially seems preferable to continue the learning of the first language, and pedagogy which concretely is seldom set up after migration.

For pupils profiting from an education until the secondary or higher level, the learning of a second language remains despite everything very partial. There exists in particular a strong rupture between linguistic expectations at the primary and secondary level on one hand, and on the higher level on the other hand. For example, in Morocco, the university language of communication is mainly French whereas students are not prepared for this use (except the minority resulting from the most favoured classes likely to speak French in the family sphere and to be enrolled in French schools). Admittedly pupils take French courses as of the 3rd year of Primary Education at a rate of approximately 8 hours per week. They will continue this education in the college then at high school with gradually fewer hours. But, despite this consequent French training, an important hiatus exists between university expectations and the benefits of secondary education (Belhaj and Lepez, 2009).

Educational reforms in progress in many countries have the disadvantage in Europe as elsewhere of not thinking of linguistic teaching in continuity. Moreover, one observes an ineffective hourly over-investment which asks for re-examining teaching practices. In particular, many sociolinguists now preach communicative and action approaches which suppose real life experience. This approach implies developing the language as instrument of communication, giving up thereby learning based on translation of texts or reading of traditional literary works. Several international devices were thus proposed since the end of 1990, allowing a remote access: it is the case for example of project Cultura (http://cultura.mit.edu) where it is possible to learn a foreign language via intercultural exchanges and multi-media supports.

In Europe, actions implemented mainly relate to linguistic training of migrant adults or migrant children or resulting from immigration.

Training of children in the country of arrival

In the migratory context, several players from countries of origin play a significant role. One initially finds Language Teaching and source culture (ELCO). This lesson is not dispensed in all countries of Europe (see figure 2.1). The majority of the host countries have recommendations or regulations in favour of teaching the language of origin of the children. But some countries including United Kingdom and Portugal estimate that these courses must be conducted by private initiatives and not by the State. On the contrary, in some rare countries like Latvia or Lithuania, immigrant pupils can continue their schooling in their first language. Thus, pupils coming from Poland, Estonia, Belorussia and especially Russia can be provided education in one of these languages. These language policies can imply the end of the Soviet empire and if entirely bilingual lessons are proposed in primary education, the final objective of the Latvian government is to gradually obtain a linguistic assimilation and an exclusive use of Latvian.

These parental language teachings were also established in the objective of a possible return to the country of origin and in order to maintain a contact with the members of the country of departure, not to forget one’s origins. Today, in Europe as in the countries of emigration the authorities are aware that the
settling of these populations is final. So depending on the countries, some especially will favour learning of the national language whereas others consider this native language as a potential resource. In the countries of departure, the return of migrants is not always wanted insofar as these families represent a significant income source abroad. What is essential for these original homelands is that these populations do not lose sight of the fact their origins and continue to go there and send funds to it.

Figure 2.1: Educational measures for teaching the language of origin of immigrant pupils,
general education (ISCED 1-3), 2007/08

Source: Eurydice.

**Additional notes**

**Germany:** The regulations concerning the provision of mother tongue tuition for immigrant pupils are passed at Länder level.

**Latvia:** Immigrant pupils can follow school programmes in minority languages that are offered for the national ethnic minority populations.

**United Kingdom (ENG/WLS):** Schools have always been able to offer languages spoken by their pupils within the modern foreign languages curriculum, if they so wish. From 2008/09, there are revisions to the curriculum intended to make it easier for them to do so.

**United Kingdom (SCT):** A number of schools are offering classes in Polish language and culture.

**Explanatory note**

Clarification of the levels of education covered by the national regulations and recommendations on the provision of mother tongue tuition for immigrant pupils can be found in Figure 2.1.
However, this assumption of responsibility by the consulates can lead to the perpetuation of discriminations particularly with respect to populations which are downplayed even discriminated before their departure such as for example the Kurdish migrants. Indeed, it is very largely the national language which is proposed and financed during bilateral agreements. Thus, the bond between language and country of origin is complex and not very obvious and the recognition of certain languages is still very problematic in the context of migration.

ELCO can be organised during school hours and thus replace other lessons; it can also be planned after class and in this case, depending on the countries, the courses proceed in the school buildings or
outside⁴. In the first case, the problem is that pupils do not benefit from the same lesson as their friends and parents fear the academic success of their children is at stake. One also notes a rupture of the group of pupils and consequently a certain labelling of the immigrant pupils or those resulting from immigration. These courses take place during early learning; activities often appreciated by pupils which makes ELCO not so desirable to follow. In the second case the problem relates to an addition of working time and concretely leads to a strong absentee rate. Moreover, according to a report on integration of immigrants in Europe thanks to schools and a multilingual teaching drafted in 2005 by Miguel Portas, the courses dispensed outside the school framework cause stigmatisation, which has already been depicted as a harmful effect in the first case.

Ultimately, it appears that the place granted to languages of immigration and to players from these countries of departure is not always correlated with the more or less proportion of migrants on the territory. Indeed, countries like Belgium, Germany, Luxembourg, France, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands which are old territories of immigration do not adopt the same strategies (Eurydice, 2009). The first 4 countries favoured bilateral agreements and today try to establish links between the teaching of these languages of origin and the foreign school languages. In the Netherlands, the languages of origin from now on are no longer taught so that foreign languages are exclusively dispensed to pupils. Lastly, the United Kingdom never proposed LCO teaching but currently thinks of foreign diversification of courses of foreign language. Obviously, in these immigration countries, the diversification of migratory flows complicates the implementation of these courses. Do the taught languages have to be only international languages? Languages which consolidate a significant migrant community?

In addition to this school learning, there are private initiatives taken by embassies, diplomatic missions or other players who cannot be considered here because they are too scattered and heterogeneous depending on the countries. In particular, associative schools are independent structures in relation to the countries of origin which develop the native language to a greater extent and allow an “immersive” teaching which supposes an intensive learning, sometimes almost-exclusive of the source language.

There are also Institutes which often mix linguistic teaching and teaching of religious values. The places of worship indeed offer in many countries the opportunity of learning the native language. For example, in France, the Ghazâli institute trains Imams and teaches Arabic (http://www.institut-al-ghazali.fr/). It largely relies on handbooks imported of the countries of origin and distributed by the consulates.

The example of teaching of Arabic in Europe

Works on immigration hardly focus on the country of origin of departure, often the analyses focuses on the country of arrival. However, a collective work published in 1998 worth mentioning states that the country of arrival is focused upon since it studies the place of the Arab language and its teaching to Moroccan migrants in five European countries (France, Belgium, Germany, Belgium and Spain). This work titled *Morocco in the heart of Europe* and conducted by the scientific department of Hermann Obdeijn and Jan Jaap de Ruiter shows convergences and divergences between the countries in the ELCO for students admitted to pursue courses as well as for Moroccan teachers trained in Morocco and selected by the Moroccan Ministry of State Education or in Europe via the Embassies and even for the Netherlands by the Municipalities.

In France, teaching of foreign languages and the use of foreign monitors are proposed as of the mid twenties. These courses are envisaged in elementary schools after class hours. However, these courses

---

⁴ In Belgium, different courses are not organised by the Belgian authorities as in France, whether they are varied or integrated, the ELCO teachings are coordinated by the educational system.
“concern particularly initiatives of embassies and consulates representing the countries of migration” (P. Masthoff, 1998)

In 1975, a circular specifies that these lessons are introduced without obligation in schools during – preferably - or after school for non consecutive 3 hours per week, and, thereafter they are dispensed in college and high school as optional lessons. In parallel, France signs bilateral agreements with Portugal, Italy, Tunisia, Spain, Morocco, ex-Yugoslavia, Turkey and in 1981 only with Algeria. Likewise, as from the seventies, when family grouping began, the Ministry of National Education instituted learning of French as foreign language for the immigrant and non French-speaking children. These new provisions in favour of learning of the native languages and French attest political awakening of non return of migrants to their country of birth.

For as much, in France the most taught foreign languages remain English, German and Spanish and this despite the important Arabic-speaking community. As from the nineties a strong decrease has been noted in the enrolment of students wishing to learn Arabic. Moreover, the increasingly early learning of school languages and in particular English tends to weaken the ELCO which are seen as competing in France by the Early Teaching of living languages (EPLV). Living languages are dispensed by French teachers and thus learning of English even regional languages is what matters.

In a report written in 1985 to the Minister for state education J. Berque then suggested that one should no longer speak of origin but speak about contribution and initiate all children who are provided education and not only migrants in the plurality of the civilisations of the world through Languages and Cultures.

Teachers who dispense LCO courses in France were trained in their country of origin and are selected by the authorities of this country even if then they are supervised under the administrations of the host country. These teachers on a temporary assignment did not receive specific teacher training to teach migrant children or those resulting from immigration and some difficulties were faced by them in finding their niche in the French education system. They are often isolated and not much integrated in the pedagogical teams.

Broadly this isolation undergone by ELCO teachers is found in all the interrogated countries. The setting up of these structures is on the other hand sometimes late as in the Netherlands where it is necessary to wait for the law on primary education of 1985 (Richters, 1998). Earlier these courses were organized only outside the school framework and were regarded as a “return teaching”. Thereafter, they were integrated in the school program but the schools were not obliged to set them up and if they set them up, they had to coordinate the program, the didactics, and the recruitment of teachers who are remunerated moreover by the Dutch authorities.

In several European countries, LCO lessons were planned to remedy school difficulties of immigrant children after being convinced of the reason for return. Gradually however, many countries will recognize the importance of empowering this teaching and make it possible for children to learn not only the official language of the country of departure but rather the native language. In the Netherlands, in addition to this teaching, one can also learn the language and culture of the country of origin thanks to the religious schools even if they are very few on the territory.

Several European countries have experienced a certain shift in expectations of the various players. Parents want their origins to be transmitted to their children especially religious values. On their part, the school and the pedagogical team often do not know much about the ELCO interveners and their culture. They consider above all this staff as a mediator between the school and the parents and thus wish that these people explain to families the operation of the school system which requires that these interveners know it well. Lastly, teachers of ELCO ardently wish to initiate pupils in their cultures of origin without integrating religious dimensions. They are strongly isolated from the entire pedagogical team in particular because they often work in several schools and have heavy administrative tasks.
Their low recognition or their low involvement is due to the fact that in most countries they do not receive the same remuneration as their colleagues.

These teachers must thus have a command over the national language of the host country and also know the history of this country, its school operation which requires that they already reside in the host country during their recruitment. Some countries as Belgium even wish to support the recruitment of graduate children of immigrants (Masthoff, 1998)

Training of adults in Europe

The language of the host country has unquestionably a strong statutory value and is often necessary for entering the job market. However, this bond established between the learning of the language and job access sets aside a part of the population and in particular mothers who do not have vocational plans and do not know that they can benefit from a linguistic training or are not motivated. Indeed, when the linguistic community is largely established in a district or a city, migrants can easily find intermediaries, associations likely to help them in their administrative approaches for example and thus not experience the need to learn the national language. In this case, the linguistic community, and the district constitute “protective enclaves” which can become “captive spaces over the years” (Simon, 1998). For other women on the other hand, who are more isolated, their weak network and their ignorance of the host country makes them unaware of associative structures and linguistic trainings. Thus, it is important to motivate these women in this learning and upstream do so that they can as of their arrival benefit from learning irrespective of their plans. An important motivation is the follow-up of schooling of their children. This involvement of parents in the academic success of their children happens through regular exchanges between teachers and families which can also initially require resorting to interpreters and translation of rules of procedure etc. Many but not all countries give this opportunity. Indeed, this encouragement to pursue duties, to weave more bonds with the educational establishment strongly encourages mothers in particular to begin or continue their learning of the language of the host country.

Obviously, people who were exposed to the language of the country of arrival before their migration will be more comfortable using this language in communication and will have more facilities to continue this learning (Leconte, 1997).

Migrations towards Europe being diverse, the needs of migrant adults are very heterogeneous. 3 principal profile-types are found:

1. Migrants who have arrived since many years in Europe who were not very educated in their country and thus have difficulty in writing even if they have a certain oral knowledge of language of the host country. They are in particular sometimes old women who come from old European colonies.

2. More recent migrants sometimes well educated and thus read and write, having perfect command over writing of their language of origin but not having any knowledge of the language of the host country. It is the case for example of young graduate men or women of higher education and coming from Asia.

3. Finally a third profile concerns people who can hardly read or write or not at all and who do not know the language of the immigration country.

To these a fourth profile is added which is coveted more and more by the host countries. They are strongly graduate migrants not needing any linguistic training. These candidates with international English or to a lesser extent French mobility thus became the standard in countries like Canada.

This diversity of profiles poses problem in the host countries in the type of training to be proposed and pedagogy to be adopted as we saw previously. Another difficulty relates to considering this diversity of languages. Indeed, learning requires from trainers some knowledge of the language of the
migrant which is not always possible. In that, the linguistic identity of the individual is often denied which undermines learning and does not motivate the migrant who is not recognized socially. In that, as of the seventies and eighties, Quebec supported the use of native languages in the courses of elimination of illiteracy proposed to migrants (Gsir, 2006).

To fill this void, some countries developed a portfolio of languages (http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/elp/default_fr.asp) as an additional tool of learning which aims at reinforcing intercultural competences, autonomy of learning and which relies on various experiences of each migrant.

6. Language: a history of family

To grasp more precisely the link in the languages of migrants, I conducted in Metropolitan France a research with families from North Africa (Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia). I could therefore understand their motivations to learn French but also their wishes or not to pass on their native language, Arabic or Berber to their children.

The maintenance of Arab and Berber languages to the next generation is explained first of all by French competences of the parents. Since they manage this language easily, it becomes difficult for them not to use it with their children. Moreover, when one of the two couple is not native of Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia and was not socialised in Arabic or Berber, the passing on by the single parent becomes more improbable and more than half of them state that they speak only in French with their sons and daughters.

In addition, if the passing over takes place starting from the person who passes on i.e. the parent, one cannot fully grasp this process without also taking into account the receiver, namely the child. Socialized only in French in all social universes that they frequent, the use of Arabic or Berber by their parents always does not enable them to activate this asset, in particular when it is transmitted in partnership with the French language. Majority of the children understand the parental language but do not speak it. This “passive” bilingualism can however evolve during their path accordingly for example through more or less regular returns to the country of their parents, close friends or yet of origins of their future spouse.

The use of Arab and Berber languages in the family sphere does not arise from a rational decision taken at a moment, given by the parents to pass on or not this asset. They are primarily as a matter of course practices which cannot be perceived as strategies. For as much, parents are often led to various moments of their journey (entry of children in school, return to the country, and discussion with colleagues…) having to justify their linguistic uses.

The motivations to transmit the parental language can be related to anticipations on the future of the children but they testify especially to an attachment to the past, a concern of continuing the family memory through in particular, maintenance of the parental language as also of other practical cultural and religious values. Arab language was sometimes mentioned as a resource which can be mobilised professionally by children, or more largely as an additional “wealth” which can be developed during voyages. In the same anticipatory intention, parents spoke Arab or Berber with their children because they had planned to quickly leave France, believing they were temporarily settled there. However, most of them in fact never set out again. Even when in 1977, political measures were taken “to support” the returns by a financial support or by vocational training, few native migrants of Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia were interested in it (Lebon, 1979). The transmission of Arab or Berber languages thus could be done for a possible return, but very often parents became aware gradually that the future of their children would be built in France.

Without necessarily considering a final return, seasonal travels allow the parents and the children to have a strong bond with the remainder of the family and constitute a motivation to transmit their
native language. Thus, among the important players who maintain the language of origin, the family is important. These regular returns during summer are the occasion, for children, to imbibe for a month or two, Arab or Berber language. If communications between parents and their children are the main source of initiation to the parental language, the extended presence in the country of origin of the parents is undoubtedly the second principal transmission channel, supporting the activation of the knowledge of languages. Indeed, when children find themselves in the presence of people who do not speak French, they have to manage communicating with them. The frequency of the returns is a significant factor to support this learning.

In the countries where they have settled, language is often used as substitute in the territory and to the loved ones left behind. The maintenance of this native language, as well as other cultural elements, is expressed by migrants as a certain “linguistic honesty” (Weinreich; 1970). But this honesty is not necessarily a nationalist act, it is above all a duty to remember, a wish not to forget the place from where they come. Obviously, this maintenance of the origins varies according to the country of emigration, the bonds preserved with it, the existing past between this country of birth and the host country etc.

**Conclusion**

The place of languages, their status and their social recognition within the countries of departure and that of arrival is related to each national history and is understood in comparison with room made for immigrants in each host country. It is important that schooling of young girls and boys continues in the countries of emigration because it is a deciding factor to support transnational mobility. It is also necessary that host countries develop knowledge of migrants, their course which participates largely in a sustainable enrolment of these populations in to the territory. Social recognition is without any doubt a crucial factor to integrate parents and children in the society.

*How to increase positive perception of languages of immigration?*

If one wishes to develop the languages of origin more, several suggestions can be offered. First of all, it is advisable not to limit learning of these languages only to migrants or children of migrants originating in these countries. The languages of immigration, whatever they are, must be proposed to all without distinction. Indeed, this would limit the hierarchy structure between various linguistic varieties, some being regarded as minority even useless compared to others like English mainly. To propose the learning of all languages of immigration is to fully take into account the intercultural aspect; to recognize their socio-professional benefit but also to accept the fact that they constitute all sources of personal enrichment. Today, insofar as in Europe these languages for the majority are only taught to children resulting from immigration, they remain largely perceived as useless (Sgir, 2006). For that, it matters that this linguistic diversity often present at the elementary school can continue at the secondary and higher level which is seldom the case in Europe where minority languages are sometimes developed at the start of schooling but quickly replaced by “major” international languages starting from the secondary level.

In certain countries like Canada, it seems that languages of immigration are devalued socially compared to most European countries. This difference is partly due to the fact that migrants are “selected” before their entry on the territory and thus socio-economic partitions between migrants and non migrants are weak. I do not intend here to preach customised immigration but rather to insist on the need for pursuing the process of making education available to everyone in the countries of origin for men and the women and for supporting in Europe the social mobility of these migrants by strengthening the access to continuing educations, evening course in companies, etc.
Which multilingual training?

Multilingualism learning would benefit in being developed in the countries of origin and as early as possible. Before and after migration, actions must develop to improve teacher training and quality of the school handbooks. Training of adults in migratory context would benefit to take into account the heterogeneity of profiles and projects. One of the solutions aiming at not de-legitimising the language of origin consists in learning a new language, which still requires certain additional competences from teachers.

Likewise, for the younger generations, it seems that the lesson directed towards the languages of origin is problematic. Rather than isolating certain populations by accentuating their differences, this learning of multilingualism must be possible for all irrespective of their origins. The countries of emigration could thus be requested to multiply exchanges between schoolboys/schoolgirls and between countries. These twinnings between linguistic cities or exchanges mainly remain currently internal in Europe for financial reasons. But beyond the linguistic voyages, one can also consider these exchanges via the new technical means of remote communication. These cooperative projects suggested by Miguel Siguan (2007) would at the same time make it possible to develop certain languages and cultures of immigration but also would reinforce in the countries of origin the knowledge of European languages and in particular their communicative dimension. They would also be the occasion to conceive international pedagogies avoiding certain shifts on this level between country of departure and country of arrival.
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