Pádraig Ó Riagáin[1]

International norms and domestic language policies: The Republic of Ireland and the EU

Achoimre/Abstract

Nuair atá tionchar polasaithe teanga faoi chaibidil, caithfear idirdhealú a dhéanamh idir na polasaithe a théann i bhfeidhm go díreach ar chúrsaí teanga (m. sh. oideachas), agus polasaithe a théann i bhfeidhm go hindíreach (m.sh. polasaí réigiúnach, sóisialta). Tharla méadú suntasach i gcéatadán de na haoisghrúpaí scoile in Éirinn idir 1960 agus 2006 a fuair oideachas i dteangacha seachas a máthairtheanga agus ar bhain bunchaighdeán labhartha – ar a laghad – amach inti. Ach is léir gurb iad na polasaithe indíreacha ba chúis leis seo, go mórmhór na polasaithe sin a chuaigh i bhfeidhm ar an ráta rannpháirteachais san oideachas. Is beag ar fad an tionchar a bhí ag polasaithe teanga Aontacht na hEorpa ar an méadú seo, ach arís bhí tionchar áirithe ag na polasaithe indíreacha ar chursaí teanga.

1. Introduction

As a consequence of the dramatic changes that have taken place in Europe over the last decades of the twentieth century, there has been a significant shift in the perspectives from which linguistic diversity is viewed. The accelerated growth of economic activity – which many refer to as 'globalisation' – across national and regional political boundaries finds expression not only in the increased movement of goods and services, but also the migration of people. It is facilitated by a lowering of government impediments to such movements, and by technological progress in transportation and communications. The activities of states are thus designed to create the conditions necessary to promote economic competitiveness within the international economic order. These concerns impact on language policy by prioritising the demands of the market and the need for labour flexibility and mobility.

The priorities of state and multistate institutions, however, cannot be purely economic. They have also to be concerned with social inclusion and social solidarity because of the disorderly implications of social and economic restructuring. When substantial groups in a population are unable, to a full or limited extent, to participate in mainstream economic or social life because of the languages they speak (or do not speak), then the distribution of linguistic competences will clearly affect the social cohesion of the state (or of a multi-state region, like the EU). While social and political concerns may give added weight to the learning of official and foreign languages – to levels where children will not, at the very least, be disadvantaged later in their educational and adult careers – such concerns also stimulate demands in many regions for the teaching of minority languages.

Thus the movement towards a new, more radical, phase of European political integration is increasingly confronted by the tensions created by these trends in society which

[1] As Prof. Ó Riagáin is also one of the two delegates representing Foras na Gaeilge at EFNIL activities, it should be stated that he wrote this paper in a personal capacity and it does not necessarily represent the views of An Foras.

pose difficult challenges for educational policy makers at all levels about the languages to be taught, and the manner in which they are taught in the schools and other institutions of Europe. It is not surprising, therefore, that transnational organizations are seen as significant actors in the formation and implementation of language policy. The more visible manifestations are found in formal policy statements by the EU – and related action programmes – promoting language learning as an instrument of social and economic policy. Other European bodies, such as the Council of Europe and OSCE, are also relevant in this context. Legal instruments such as The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM) and The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages – both formulated and implemented by the Council of Europe – are clearly important. Given the differing functions and roles of these bodies, complete agreement on priorities cannot be expected. However, there is sufficient common ground to suggest that some broad policy norms are emerging against which member states are urged to assess their internal policies. Clearly, language policy has now to be considered and evaluated with a new post-national, polycentric politics.

A complete assessment of these issues is not possible in a single paper. In this paper, therefore, I only wish to consider some aspects of the current and proposed policies of the European Commission as they relate to national language policies. The discussion is framed by two considerations.

First, while the European policies in question must obviously include those that have explicitly language objectives, some attention must also be paid to those whose influence on language matters are less direct and transparent. While it appears to many, including the present author, that language policies on the European level are so weakly developed that they can be almost totally discounted in any analysis of the changing sociolinguistic face of Europe, it can also be argued that many European policies which relate to economic, social and political integration, and whose intent is not directly language oriented, hold the potential to greatly affect language patterns. Policies in these sectors are rarely assessed for their impact on language patterns, yet it is probable that, in total, their consequences for language maintenance objectives are extensive and of more importance than current or projected language policies per se (Ó Riagáin 1991). Although this point cannot be developed in any detail here, it remains a sobering consideration when language policies, per se, are being assessed.

Secondly, despite the important role played by European institutions, the state-centric world has not been replaced by a single European system, but coexists and competes with it. These are thus two policy-making domains: (a) a community of states, in which the rules of diplomacy and national power remain the key variables, and (b) a world of European politics, which is peopled by many different transnational organizations, corporations and NGOs. Thus, in the new post-national, polycentric politics of today, European agencies compete or cooperate with national governments (Rosenau 1990, 2003). In assessing the impact of language policies, national policies cannot be ignored, even when the focus is primarily on the European context.

This issue will be approached by way of a discussion of changing patterns of language acquisition in Ireland over the last half century or so. While an individual case-study is necessarily of limited relevance, the experience of Ireland does help to identify some of the policy issues at stake. This will be followed by an unavoidably short discussion which examines the current policy norms of the EU in the field of language policy. The final section then considers the Irish experience in the light of these norms, and draws some conclusions about the effectiveness of European Union policies in this policy domain.

2. Languages in Irish Schools between 1961 and 2006

In Ireland, as well as internationally, the twentieth century has seen a general decline in the teaching of classical languages and a simultaneous growth in the teaching of modern foreign languages (Cha 1991). In broad terms, the overall trend has been one of progressively greater investment in foreign language teaching.

The development of language teaching in Ireland reflects this worldwide pattern, but with some deviations. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Latin and Greek were core language subjects and there was little emphasis on modern foreign languages in education. With the establishment of secondary schools by Catholic religious orders in the nineteenth century, a trend to include foreign languages, particularly French, in the curriculum gathered pace. In addition to its position as the most popular modern language, the numbers studying French at the end of the nineteenth century were also higher than those for Latin and Greek.

However, the situation changed after 1922, when Ireland became an independent state. For the first time, Irish became a compulsory subject for public examinations. This change in the national curriculum was, of course, part of the changes that occurred following the achievement of national independence. Despite the marked regional bias in the distribution of Irish-speakers at the time towards western areas, the Irish state did not, as happened in several other countries (e.g. Belgium, Switzerland, Spain) legislate for a language policy organised on territorial lines. That is to say, it did not designate two language regions, one Irish-speaking and the other English-speaking, within which each language would be defined as the official standard and norm. While an Irish-speaking region was defined (*The Gaeltacht*) and special measures were formulated to deal with it, Irish language policy applied to the state as a whole and not just a region of it. Of course, outside the Irish-speaking areas, Irish speakers formed negligible proportions of an almost entirely English-speaking population, and the new state looked to the educational system for an increase in the numbers of Irish-speakers in society. However, the constitutional and legislative provisions made for Irish since the 1920s and 1930s do not suggest that anything other than the establishment of a bilingual state was ever envisaged. The first Constitution of Ireland in 1922, and all subsequent revisions, designated two official state languages – English and Irish (see Ó Riagáin 1997 for fuller details).

Until the 1960s, therefore, the relative and absolute position of modern foreign languages declined and, together with Irish, Latin became again the main ‘additional’ language in Irish schools. However, in line with trends across the world, the number of

students studying Latin declined after 1950. In more recent decades, the overall trend in relation to the study of modern foreign languages was one of growth, although there were marked differences in the take-up rates for different languages (Ruane 1990; Coolahan 1981).

The following three tables attempt to illustrate the relative scale and direction of these trends in statistical terms. Two age cohorts – 0-4 years and 15-19 years – have been selected to examine the linguistic repertoires of Irish youth cohorts at the point just before they enter the education system and just at the point when the cohort completes second-level education. The difference in the linguistic repertoires of the two cohorts can, therefore, be read as a measure of the impact of school experiences of the respective cohorts, and the differences between the 1960 and 2006 estimates of school effectiveness can, in turn, be taken as a measure of changes over the period.

It must be stressed that the statistics in the tables are broad estimates, built up from a number of separate sources. Basic demographic data was obtained from the Census of Population. This source provides figures for the numbers in the age cohorts and numbers of immigrants in each cohort. The census also provides a figure for the numbers claiming to be able to speak Irish. However, the census does not provide any data for other languages, and other sources were utilized at this point. The most important of these secondary sources were the annual reports of the Department of Education which contain data on the numbers passing state examinations in language subjects, and some recent, but limited, surveys of languages spoken by immigrant groups in Ireland.

Measuring language proficiency in national populations is a troublesome enough research problem, without adding the extra methodological dangers of combining different data sources in this fashion. However, one survey conducted in 1993 (Ó Riagáin/ Gorman 1999) used the same question module to measure proficiency in a variety of languages and the findings are broadly consistent with the estimates presented here. It is thus argued that while the present analysis is clearly of a preliminary nature, it is sufficiently robust to provide a reliable gross measure of changes in the linguistic repertoires of young Irish cohorts over the forty five year period in question.

The first column of figures in Table 1 contains estimates of the linguistic repertoires of the cohort consisting of those under five years. The languages spoken by this age-group may be taken as indicative of the first or home language, and it can be seen that the language spoken by the overwhelming majority in the home was English (97%), with about 4% speaking Irish, and even this small percentage includes some who speak both Irish and English. Other languages were spoken by less than 1% of the cohort or, in the case of some, such as Latin, not at all.

The second column of figures shows the effect of primary and post-primary schooling. The percentages had increased in every case. Despite its already dominant position, there was still a small increase in the percentages speaking English, as a result of children speaking Irish and other non-English languages becoming proficient in it. However, the main impacts of school programmes affected non-English languages. Two fifths (41%) of the cohort became proficient in Irish, and small but significant minorities

also became proficient in Latin (10%) and French (5%). Zero figures in the case of other languages do not necessarily imply that no children in the cohort learned these languages, but simply that the numbers were, in relative terms, less than 1%.

Language	0-4 year cohort	15-19 year cohort	Difference
	%	%	
English	97	99	+2
Irish	4	45	+41
Latin	0	10	+10
French	0	5	+5
German	0	0	0
Other EU & Non-EU	0	0	0

Table 1: Estimated linguistic repertoire of two Irish youth cohorts about 1961 (Source: Census of Population & State Examination Statistics)

The situation in 2006, forty-five years later, is significantly different. The percentages speaking English as their first or home language have actually declined slightly, compared to 1961. This is not due to any change in the percentages that speak Irish – in fact the evidence would suggest that more of this sub-group are now Irish/English bilinguals, rather than monolingual Irish-speakers (Census of Population 2006, Vol. 9, Table 37). However, there was a considerable increase in the number of immigrant families – especially from other EU countries – in the period between the censuses of 1996 and 2006. On the available evidence, it would appear that a large proportion of these children – about 5% of the cohort – are not be able to speak English (or Irish) when they begin school in Ireland (Department of Education 2007). Hence, the overall proportion of this cohort deemed to be proficient in English has declined.

The figures for the older cohort in 2006 are also different. Larger proportions have learned a second, or even a third language, in addition to their first language. About 60% now claim to be proficient in Irish, 40% in French and 12% in German. There was a small increase in the proportions able to speak English, and a small decrease in the proportion speaking 'Other EU and non-EU languages'. This last statistic, however, reflects the age-composition of recent immigrant flows rather than the effects of education.

Language	0-4 year cohort	15-19 year cohort	Difference
	%	%	
English	95	97	+2
Irish	4	65	+61
Latin	0	0	0
French	0	43	+43
German	0	12	+12
Other EU & Non-EU	5	3	-2

Table 2: Estimated linguistic repertoire of two Irish youth cohorts about 2006 (Source: Census of Population & State Examination Statistics)

In the final table, the linguistic repertoires for the two older cohorts in 1961 and 2006 are directly compared. The dominant position of English did not change very much, although there were slight fluctuations around its high rating, mostly caused by demographic shifts. However, by any standard, the increase in the proportions of children learning certain non-English languages is impressive. In absolute terms the biggest increases occurred with Irish, French and German, and the biggest decrease occurred in the case of Latin. While the largest proportion has learned to speak Irish, this proportion was already quite high in 1961. The highest relative changes in the period, therefore, occurred in the case of other languages, French in particular, but also German and Latin, although in the last case the percentages collapsed altogether. Although the numbers speaking languages other than Irish and English as their first language attract a lot of media attention, it can be seen that these groups still constitute only a small proportion of the national cohort – notwithstanding the fact that the uneven spatial distribution of immigrant groups can disproportionately alter the composition of local cohorts.

Language	c.1960	c.2006	Difference
	%	%	
English	99	97	-2
Irish	45	65	+20
Latin	10	0	-10
French	5	43	+38
German	0	12	+12
Other EU & Non-EU	0	3	+3

Table 3: Estimated changes in the linguistic repertoire of 15-19 year-old Irish youth cohort between about 1960 and 2006 (Source: Census of Population & State Examination Statistics)

As stated in the introduction, our interest in these figures in the present context concerns the effect of international norms on national policies. Ireland was a member state of the Council of Europe since 1949 and of the European Union since 1972. Before this question can be addressed, however, more detailed reference must be made to the language policies of these two bodies.

3. The European Union

In considering the language policy of the EU, I have relied on the detailed analysis conducted by my fellow countrywoman and former research associate, Niamh Nic Shuibhne (2002, 2007). While she is particularly interested in minority languages, her analysis is placed in the context of the EU's overall language policy, and it is upon her discussion of this wider perspective that I draw here.

Nic Shuibhne (2007: 123) argues convincingly that "there is not a clear Treaty mandate for the EC to act in respect of languages of any status beyond the most basic competence to regulate institutional administration". While every member state is presently

'represented' in the EC language scheme by a least one of its domestic official languages, and the EC generally respects the equality of these languages in terms of translation and interpretation services, there is no *constitutional* principle of linguistic equality. In fact the Court of Justice in 2001 made this much clear in its decision on the *Kik* case, which viewed as "appropriate and proportionate" the policy of the Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (OHIM) to restrict the number of working languages to five – English, French, German, Italian and Spanish. What has to be borne in mind here is the requirement in Community law generally to ground binding legislative measures in the Treaty. Therefore following the Court decision in 2001, "EC linguistic action in any domain cannot be rooted in a secure constitutional premise" (Nic Shuibhne 2007: 127). (It is significant, incidentally, that these same five languages have been given priority in the implementation of the upcoming language indicator survey.)

If language policy cannot be grounded in a specific treaty provision, then the EC has to present it as a logical consequence of other provisions. Nic Shuibhne (2002: Chapter 3) examines the links with EC Cultural policy in some detail, but the considerations that figure most prominently are freedom of movement for workers and goods. The first objective of the recently created post of Commissioner for Multilingualism is to enhance the contribution of multilingualism to "economic competitiveness, growth and better jobs" (http://europa.eu/languages/en/document/99/23). These considerations also underpin recent documents relating to EC language policy (see, for example, *A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism*, European Commission 2005). However, the outcome of these deliberations is to date rather confused and ambivalent as the following selection of statements of the objectives of language policy makes clear.

Objectives of EU Language Policy:

> teaching at least two **foreign** languages from a very early age. (Emphasis added. *Barcelona European Council 2002, Presidency Conclusions, pt. 1,43.1*)
>
> to enable all Europeans to communicate in two languages **in addition to their mother tongue**. (Emphasis added. *EC Web-site, accessed October 2007*)
>
> Mother tongue plus two **other** languages. (Emphasis added. *Promoting language learning and linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004-06*. European Commission 2004)
>
> to teach at least two **foreign** languages. (Emphasis added. *Promoting language learning and linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004-06.* European Commission 2004)
>
> at least two **foreign** languages to be taught. (Emphasis added. *A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism*, European Commission 2005).
>
> two languages **in addition to his or her mother tongue**. (Emphasis added. *A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism*, European Commission 2005)

The documents from which these extracts were taken were all published in the past five years. They are not randomly selected, nor are they selected from peripheral, quasi-official documents. Rather, they are selected from front-line policy pronouncements.

The constant repetition of what appears to be the same objective suggests that the EC is attempting to establish a norm against which the policies of individual states can be assessed. Viewed in that light, however, a number of questions arise. I will comment shortly on the ease with which the formula slides between 'foreign languages' and 'other languages in addition to the mother tongue'. Just now I wish to focus on the quantitative dimension. All of these statements require students to learn two additional languages. Why two? And what evidence is there that the acquisition of two additional languages will enhance Europe's economic competitiveness and growth? I have been unable to find any EU document which presents an analysis of these issues. It appears to me that the insistence on two languages was selected as a simple political strategy to avoid a direct confrontation with the 'English only' issue. As far as I can establish, research to date has not identified any strong relationship between international language patterns and socioeconomic variables (see Fishman 1989 for a fuller discussion of this issue).

This is not the only problem. A moment's reflection will show that there are other unresolved issues with these policy goals. While it is not disputed that in many instances these various policy formulations will not create any confusion, it is also true that there are many cases in the EU where children learn two languages in addition to their mother tongues, and yet do not learn two foreign languages. These are cases, like Ireland, where there are two official languages, or others where there is a regional language that is not a foreign language. In other words, these policy statements, which are used interchangeably in some key documents, suggest that either political agreement about these goals is less than complete or perhaps, although one hesitates to suggest this, that the EC officials' understanding of the language situation in all member-states is defective. Either way, it is a fundamental matter that requires further clarification.

There is, however, also a further consideration. As Nic Shuibhne (2007: 137) puts it, even if a solid foundation for EC language policy existed, "just what exactly should the Community strive to require and accomplish?". She continues "as a practical tool for determining capacity to act when both the member states and the EU have the competence to act, the *principle of subsidiarity* becomes relevant". This is defined in Article 5 of the Treaty and stipulates that the Community shall only take action "if and in so far as the objectives of the proposed action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member State and can, therefore, by reason of the scale or effects of the proposed action, be better achieved by the Community". Generally speaking the Community does not seek to interfere in the internal workings of national language policies. The following extracts from *Promoting language learning and linguistic Diversity: An Action Plan 2004-06* (2004: 11) make this much abundantly clear.

> It is the authorities in Member States who bear the primary responsibility for implementing the new push for language learning in the light of local circumstances and policies, within overall European objectives.
>
> The European Union's role in this field is not to replace action by Member States, but to support and supplement it.

Therefore, given the legal difficulties, the lack of clarity about goals, and the subsidiarity principle, it is not surprising to find that very few legally binding Directives have been adopted in the field of language policy. I could find only one example, dating from 1977. It is the *Council Directive of 25 July 1977 on the education of the children of migrant workers* (77/486/EEC). The key paragraphs are as follows, with emphasis added:

> **Article 1:** This Directive shall apply to children for whom school attendance is compulsory under the laws of the host State, who are dependants of any worker who is a national of another Member State, where such children are resident in the territory of the Member State in which that national carries on or has carried on an activity as an employed person.
>
> **Article 2:** Member States shall, in accordance with their national circumstances and legal systems, take appropriate measures to ensure that free tuition to facilitate initial reception is offered in their territory to the children referred to in Article 1, including, in particular, the teaching – adapted to the specific needs of such children – of **the official language or one of the official languages of the host State**. Member States shall take the measures necessary for the training and further training of the teachers who are to provide this tuition.
>
> **Article 3:** Member States shall, in accordance with their national circumstances and legal systems, and in cooperation with States of origin, **take appropriate measures to promote, in coordination with normal education, teaching of the mother tongue and culture of the country of origin for the children.**

In tone, and in substance, this Directive is actually a good deal more robust than recent approaches to language policy. Here positive requirements are imposed on member-states. However, it is disappointing to find in the most thorough examination of this Directive (Ackers/Stalford 2004: 264), that implementation was

> patchy and half-hearted […]. Member states have been more proactive in funding language tuition for its own nationals living in other member states rather than assisting non-nationals within their own territory. […] The Commission has clearly conceded that a didactic approach to regulating Member States' education policy in respect of such a diverse population is politically problematic and ultimately ineffective.

Although the authors were assessing only one particular Directive, of limited relevance in the overall context, this last sentence seems to me a fair, if sobering, assessment of EU language policy in general.

4. Conclusions

It is now time to relate these two short discussions – one about language policy in Ireland, the other about language policy in the EU – to each other.

Language policy is formulated, implemented and accomplishes its results within a complex interrelated set of economic, social and political processes which include, inter alia, the operation of other state policies. The modernisation of Irish society, a process which developed slowly prior to 1960, exerted a powerful influence in subsequent years. With the rapid growth of economic prosperity since 1960 came a widening of economic, political, demographic and cultural contacts and influences as Ireland became more comprehensively incorporated within the framework of international capitalism.

The new economic policy, which was elaborated in a series of economic development programmes between 1960 and the early 1970s, placed emphasis on export markets and foreign investment. Education was primarily seen as a form of investment within the context of economic growth. A range of new policies led to huge increases in second-level participation rates, and simultaneously the number and range of third-level institutions was widened.

As Tables 1 to 3 demonstrate, there have been substantial increases in the proportions of young Irish cohorts learning other languages in addition to their mother tongue. However, very little of this increase has been due to explicit EU or national language policies. Most of this increase can be explained by reference to the increasing rates of educational participation since the 1960s. This factor was of such a scale as to outweigh all pedagogic factors. In 1960, about 20% of an average youth cohort in Ireland completed second level education, by 2006 this proportion had rise to 80%. Understandably, other things remaining more or less equal, the output of graduates from the educational system with proficiency in languages was bound to increase in tandem.

The language policies of the EU can be almost totally discounted in any analysis of the factors causing changes in the sociolinguistic face of Ireland. It is clear that when set in this context, the European Union, given the shape and scope of its present policy, was not a significant influence on language policies and practices of Ireland. The small resources devoted to EU language policy, and some basic ambiguities in the formulation and legal basis of that policy, makes it difficult to identity any impact whatsoever on language acquisition policies in Ireland.

However, while the implicit consequences of EC economic policies for language maintenance programmes are difficult to establish because of the confounding of national and European policies, there is reason to believe that these have been important. Membership of the EU is generally seen as an important contributory factor to Ireland's recent economic success and, of course, the composition of recent immigration flows to Ireland are closely connected to the eastward expansion of the EU.

Thus, while public attitudes in Ireland are quite supportive of a policy to teach foreign languages in the schools, this support rests on a perception that a knowledge of foreign languages is economically beneficial. This vocational element can be seen operating in language subject selection at second and third-level. This suggests that language learning will be influenced more by changes in national and international labour markets than by education policy per se.

5. References

Ackers, L./Stalford, H. (2004): *A community for children? Children, citizenship and internal migration in the EU.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Cha, Y.-K. (1991): Effect of the global system on language instruction, 1850-1986. In: *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 64, No. 1, 19-32.

Commission of the European Communities (1977): *Council Directive of 25 July 1977 on the education of the children of migrant workers* (77/486/EEC).

Commission of the European Communities (2002): *Barcelona European Council 2002, presidency conclusions*.

Commission of the European Communities (2004): *Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity: An action plan 2004-06.*

Commission of the European Communities (2005): *A new framework strategy for multilingualism.*

Coolahan, J. (1981): *Irish education: its history and structure*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

Department of Education (2007): *Press office: personal communication 2007*.

Fishman J.A./Solano, F.R. (1989): Cross-polity linguistic homogeneity/heterogeneity and per-capita Gross National Product: An empirical exploration. In: *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 13, 2, 103-118.

Nic Shuibhne, N. (2002): *EC law and minority languages policy: Culture, citizenship and fundamental rights*. The Hague: Kluwer.

Nic Shuibhne, N. (2007): Minority languages, law and politics: Tracing EC action. In: Castiglione, D./Longman, C. (eds.): *The language question in Europe and diverse societies: Political, legal and social perspectives*. Oxford: Hart Publishing, 123-147.

Ó Riagáin, P. (1991): National and international dimensions of language policy when the minority language is a national language: The case of Irish in Ireland. In: Coulmas, F. (ed.): *A Language Policy for Europe.* Berlin: Mouton, 255-278.

Ó Riagáin, P. (1997): *Language Policy and Social Reproduction: Ireland 1893-1993*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ó Riagáin, P./Gorman, T. (1999): Proficiency of Irish adults in European languages. In: *Teangeolas***,** 38, 60-71.

Rosenau, J. (1990): *Turbulence in world politics: A theory of change and continuity*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Rosenau, J. (2003): *Distant proximities: Dynamics beyond globalisation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ruane, M. (1990): *Access to foreign languages in second-level schools*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.