Glenn S. Levine
David Mallows *Editors*

Language Learning of Adult Migrants in Europe

Theoretical, Empirical, and Pedagogical Issues

Educational Linguistics

Volume 53

Educational Linguistics is dedicated to innovative studies of language use and language learning. The series is based on the idea that there is a need for studies that break barriers. Accordingly, it provides a space for research that crosses traditional disciplinary, theoretical, and/or methodological boundaries in ways that advance knowledge about language (in) education. The series focuses on critical and contextualized work that offers alternatives to current approaches as well as practical, substantive ways forward. Contributions explore the dynamic and multi-layered nature of theory-practice relationships, creative applications of linguistic and symbolic resources, individual and societal considerations, and diverse social spaces related to language learning.

The series publishes in-depth studies of educational innovation in contexts throughout the world: issues of linguistic equity and diversity; educational language policy; revalorization of indigenous languages; socially responsible (additional) language teaching; language assessment; first- and additional language literacy; language teacher education; language development and socialization in non-traditional settings; the integration of language across academic subjects; language and technology; and other relevant topics.

The *Educational Linguistics* series invites authors to contact the general editor with suggestions and/or proposals for new monographs or edited volumes. For more information, please contact the Editor: Natalie Rieborn, Van Godewijckstraat 30, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

All proposals and manuscripts submitted to the Series will undergo at least two rounds of external peer review.

This series is indexed in Scopus and the Norwegian Register for Scientific Journals, Series and Publishers (NSD).

More information about this series at https://link.springer.com/bookseries/5894

Glenn S. Levine • David Mallows
Editors

Language Learning of Adult Migrants in Europe

Theoretical, Empirical, and Pedagogical Issues

Springer

Editors
Glenn S. Levine 🆔
Department of European Languages
and Studies
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, CA, USA

David Mallows 🆔
Institute of Education
University College London
London, UK

Acknowledgments

Contents

Chapter 1
Introduction: Language Learning of Adult Migrants in Europe

Glenn S. Levine and **David Mallows**

Abstract In this introductory chapter, we first delineate issues and factors relevant in the study of migrants, and in particular refugees, learning new languages in those regions that distinguish this group from other groups of language learners. We highlight the tension between language and integration, and the often-disparate aims between national systems of adult migrant language education, language teachers in classrooms, and learners themselves. Next, we present the overall goals of the volume: to contribute to the conceptual framing of adult migrant language education, to offer empirical evidence of the impact and effectiveness of both national systems of language and integration as well as less formal settings of language learning, and to offer insights into some of the particularities of Europe as the site of adult migrant language education. We then offer an explication and brief critical treatment of the key concepts and terminology used in the volume, particularly when we refer to migrants and refugees, integration, and literacy, which, if used unreflexively, risk both methodological imprecision and blatant unfairness to the people at the centre of the studies offered in these pages. From there we offer a brief taxonomy of the different sorts of language learning settings that are prevalent in Europe and the focal settings of our contributors. We close with a brief introduction to those contributions.

Keywords Adult migrant language education · Asylum-seekers · Europe · Integration · Migrants · Refugees

G. S. Levine (✉)
Department of European Languages and Studies, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, CA, USA
e-mail: glevine@uci.edu

D. Mallows
Institute of Education, University College London, London, UK
e-mail: d.mallows@ucl.ac.uk

1   Introduction: The Essential Unity of Theory, Research, and Practice

Learning a new language in adulthood is a difficult, time-consuming, and potentially transformative experience, as anyone who has done so can attest. Teaching it is also no small challenge, especially to identify the pedagogical approaches and practices to suit particular individuals or groups of learners. In Europe, and by and large in north-western Europe, those instructional settings have long been marked by a remarkable diversity of language learners in terms of countries of origin, language background, ethnicity, age, gender, and other personal and demographic factors, as well as motivations for learning new languages (McGinnity & Gijsberts, 2015; Van Mol & De Valk, 2016, Unterreiner & Weinar, 2017).

Recent years, however, have seen a dramatic increase in the number of migrants learning the languages of their new homes, especially those forced to migrate by war and other situations of duress (European Parliament, 2017). This is not an entirely new situation, as in recent decades Europe has dealt with increased numbers of migrants fleeing hardship and violence in countries such as Iraq, Iran, Kosovo, Somalia, Eritrea, or Ukraine. However, educational systems and processes developed before the Syrian War quickly proved inadequate, soon overwhelmed by the demands placed on them beginning in 2015.

In response, educational institutions, countless volunteer groups and organizations, as well as motivated individuals in communities throughout Europe, set about adapting to the situation, with the goal of giving the newcomers access to the languages of their new home as quickly and efficiently as possible. Part of the motivation for these efforts throughout the continent align unambiguously with global neoliberal trends. Integration of migrants into the workforce through skills development is a central element in the policy response to migration in most European countries, with responsibility placed on the individual to gain the linguistic and other skills necessary to make an economic contribution. However, within the policies and stated missions of many national ministries tasked with helping new arrivals to integrate and within trans-national policy positions (Council of Europe, 2017; Rocca et al., 2020) there are also more idealistic, democratic, and compassionate aims for language learning, oriented toward the social inclusion of migrants and the embracing of diversity within society. Skills development and social inclusion are often given equal prominence in policy rhetoric when describing the aims of particular programmes of adult migrant language education. However, in practice, the focus is most often on the need to produce workers rather than citizens.

As applied linguists and language educators, we watched the efforts to help the newcomers integrate—or not, as the case may be—with fascination and excitement. And so, our own project, which began as a conference panel at the 2017 meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics, felt somewhat opportunistic. Yet this opportunism was born of our sense that issues of adult migrant language education were finally receiving the scholarly attention they deserve, with the ultimate aims of fostering inclusion, genuinely embracing diversity through educational

activity, and at the heart of it, contributing to providing migrants the best possible affordances for learning based on sound theoretical and empirical scholarship. Leo van Lier (1996, pp. 2–3) noted the essential unity of theory, research, and practice in the process of doing curriculum: "theorizing, researching, and practicing," he wrote, "are … inseparable ingredients in the professional conduct of the language educator." What scholarship of the sort presented here can offer is the first two elements—theory and research—toward enriching the third, teaching practice, which should then also inform further work in both theory and research.

Against this idealistic backdrop, then, the goals of this collection of papers is threefold. First, we aim to contribute to the *conceptual framing* of adult migrant language education, particularly in Europe but we hope in other regions as well. Second, we believe the contributions to this volume offer *useful empirical evidence of the impact and effectiveness* of both national systems of language and integration as well as other, less formal settings of language learning and use among migrants. And third, we would like this volume to serve as a *practical resource for language professionals*—those teaching students, administrators, and policymakers—for reflection and decision-making. Though there are surely broad similarities in situations of language learning by migrants worldwide, alongside these aims this collection should offer insights into some of the particularities of Europe as a site of migrant language education.

In these opening paragraphs we have used the term 'adult migrant language education' several times already, and our focus in this volume is narrowly on 'migrant language learning.' While this population is marked by particular characteristics that allow us to identify such learners as 'adult migrant language learners,' it is reasonable to ask whether adult migrant language education has become a viable subfield of applied linguistics. Other specific learner populations have led to the emergence of areas of inquiry that, if not 'sub-fields' per se, certainly stand as robust strands of scholarly work. The scholarship on heritage learners in the United States is one such example, dwarfed by another such strand, the study of English to speakers of other languages (ESOL). Obviously, our investigation of adult migrant language learning intersects and overlaps with the latter in English-speaking contexts such as the UK, yet on the face of it has as much of a claim to demarcated status within applied linguistics as these others. We should add that the study of adult migrants learning the language of their new home is not exclusive to applied linguistics, for scholars in sociology, anthropology, education, and other areas of the human sciences have likewise contributed to understanding aspects of the migrant language learning experience (e.g., Catarci et al., 2019; Husain, 2020; Kirkwood et al., 2016; Kirkwood et al., 2013; Reyes & Carrasco, 2018; Taylor & Sidhu, 2012; Warriner, 2007).

In terms of scholarly activity, discipline-specific concern with language learning among this population has come into sharp relief and certainly intensified in recent years. Numerous conference panels and presentations, edited volumes, special issues of journals, and individual journal contributions have explored aspects of the migrant language learning experience (e.g., Beacco et al., 2017; Burns & Roberts, 2010; Canagarajah, 2017; Mallows, 2014; Middeke et al., 2017; Naidoo et al., 2018;

Korntheuer et al., 2018; Shapiro et al., 2018; Simpson & Whiteside, 2015a, b). As with the contributions to this volume, most are based either on surveys or ethnographic research methods, and report on local, regional, or national projects or initiatives (e.g., Bajaj et al., 2017; Cantone, 2020; Holmes et al., 2017; Scheible & Rother, 2017). To date, just a few of those studies have explored specific aspects of L2 acquisition in which the issue of migrant language learning is a central concern (e.g., Lenz & Barras, 2017; Young-Scholten & Naeb, 2020). While many studies have examined migrant language learning in Europe, to date few book-length projects have focused just on Europe, as we do here.

While our call for papers went out broadly to colleagues throughout the continent, the ones our reviewers vetted and we selected deal with migrant language learning situations in several of the countries of northwest Europe. In focus here are England, Finland, France, Germany, Scotland, and Sweden. While they differ in the sorts of formalized or subsidized support provided to migrants, these countries have long-established systems of adult migrant language education, at least compared with the countries of southern Europe, which don't tend to have such systems. As such, they form a group that hopefully provides interesting insights into our three goals. At the same time, with our focus on Europe we would emphasize that we are not aiming to either fetishize or exoticize Europe; we are aware that all regions of the world receive migrants in one way or another, and that newcomers learn the languages of their new homes (Shapiro et al., 2018). But we would point out that in a few key respects, Europe is somewhat different from other parts of the world.

First, the European Union is characterized by the free movement of people across national borders. The institutions of the European Union advocate the adoption by member states of policies aimed at the promotion of multilingualism, and the development of language learning among the population (Council of Europe, 2014). Indeed, multilingualism plays an important role in the political identity of the 'European project.' The European Union's motto 'united in diversity' highlights this relationship between linguistic diversity and language learning. However, in practice that diversity is often not fully realized. Indeed, linguistic diversity in western Europe is by some measures lower than in any other region of the world (Lewis et al., 2016). While multilingualism features highly in EU policy rhetoric, in reality policies are framed within what Simpson and Cooke (2018) term a 'monolingualist discourse' and are heavily skewed toward the national languages of the continent rather than its many autochthonous regional or minority languages. In this context, the large-scale migration experienced in parts of northern Europe has increased the diversity of languages used in those countries, but it has not led to greater visibility of these in national policies.

Second, Europe is by and large characterized by social democratic systems, which means that there is an expectation that government will provide services to those in need, that vulnerable populations will be identified and supported. In the case of adult migrants, as well as welfare, this includes the provision of courses to support adult migrants' learning of the host country language.

Third, not to put too fine a point on it, compared with other regions of the world, Europe is aging at an alarming and possibly catastrophic rate, and as such needs an influx of new people. Thus, migrants represent not just cultural, ethnic and linguistic change, but hope for Europe's future in generational and demographic terms, and language learning of this new population rightly holds an important place in the process (Kassam et al., 2015; Romei, 2020).

And finally, there is Europe's long and fraught colonial past, which means that at least since the mid-twentieth century, newcomers from former colonial holdings throughout the world, along with the many languages they use, have been part of the fabric of life and culture throughout the continent. And yet, as noted above, their languages and the multilingual lives they live are seldom formally recognized or considered in educational contexts.

Adult migrant language education in Europe has also often had an uncomfortable relationship with national integration policies. Policymakers in EU countries often frame such programmes and initiatives as central to efforts to build community cohesion and to improve social inclusion. Yet migrant language learning programmes most often serve to perpetuate a Herderian 'one nation one language,' ideology (Simpson & Whiteside, 2015a, b). Migrants' learning and use of the host language is often presented as an issue of community cohesion, and even security, with migrants portrayed as 'other' separated from society by their linguistic practices (Khan, 2017). In this context monolingualism is seen as the norm, and speaking the host language a pre-condition for citizenship. This ignores or at the very least obscures the multilingual realities of the lives of migrants in these countries. The notion of superdiversity (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Vertovec, 2007) is used to describe societies which have experienced mass migration, often driven by forces of globalisation, with a resulting shift in the extent of their linguistic and cultural diversity. In superdiverse societies, these changes are deemed of a type and scale not previously experienced. The papers in this volume certainly present a picture of great diversity of linguistic and cultural practices and the notion of superdiversity is addressed directly in several of the contributions (e.g., Cox; Melo-Pfeifer & Thölkes; Norlund Shaswar).

These tensions between the multilingual realities of citizens and the monolingual policies of governments, between the turbulence of the modern world and the certainty of the nation state and its linguistic and cultural identity, mark the EU, and in particular, the countries of the northwest of Europe as a rich site for exploring language learning by adult migrants. The studies included here offer the reader close-up, intimate views of migrant language learning contexts in different parts of that region, alongside some big-picture analyses of, specifically, the German adult integration course system. Together they provide what we regard as immanently useful insights into the relationship between language learning and migration, as well as lessons for those involved in the crucial project of helping migrants to learn new languages and new ways of being in their adopted homes.

2   What's in a Name? Referring to the People and Processes in Adult Migrant Language Education

The chapters in this book address a range of issues related to language learning by adult migrants. With the exception of the chapter by Wienberg and colleagues, they focus on aspects of the *experience* of language learning rather than on specific aspects of L2 acquisition, and most deal specifically with the language learning experience of refugees. Thus we should address straightaway what we mean when we talk about both of these groups—migrants and refugees. The naming of any group of people is never merely an 'academic' practice or even the product of intended political correctness, as Taylor (2019, p. 128) points out, rather "a negotiation which takes place continuously, and sometimes aggressively, in everyday life." And yet, we must use such labels in order to do things like provide services such as improved educational opportunities for specific groups.

'Migrants' is the term used most broadly to describe people who have left their homes and settled in a new one, usually for economic reasons or merely to pursue a better life (Kelsey, 2019), and it is the term used most broadly in this volume. Migrants may return to their country of birth should they wish to, something that distinguishes them from refugees (Loescher et al., 2008). In Europe, we also often refer to those with a 'migrant background,' particularly those who have resided in their new country for a longer period of time, or who were in fact born in what was their parents' new country.

While one could never claim that the term migrant has not been politicized, and in the discourses of politicians and policymakers it is seldom used neutrally, in applied linguistics and education 'migrant' is a label used to distinguish this population of learners from others, ostensibly for their ultimate benefit, such as the provision of language education opportunities. Yet even here it is crucial to acknowledge that the label 'migrant' is seldom expressed as part of the migrant's own identity, except perhaps as they may perceive others labelling them as 'migrants.'

The label 'refugee' is, of course, more complex, and never politically neutral, though on the face of it, the definition of the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHCR) is straightforward:

> A refugee is someone who has been forced to flee his or her country because of persecution, war or violence. A refugee has a well-founded fear of persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, political opinion or membership in a particular social group. Most likely, they cannot return home or are afraid to do so. War and ethnic, tribal and religious violence are leading causes of refugees fleeing their countries. (UNHCR, n.d.).

While this understanding of what a refugee is may be unambiguous, the discourses around the term are far from it, nor are they innocuous. And so, in scholarship about this population of language learners, there are at least two aspects of those discourses we should keep in mind. First, we should observe the ways that refugees are commonly referred to in the media and by political leaders, often in terms of a 'flood' or 'wave' (Gabrielatos & Baker, 2008). For example, in 2015, British Prime

Minister David Cameron was criticized for referring to "a swarm of people coming across the Mediterranean, seeking a better life, wanting to come to Britain" (Kelsey, 2019). And of course, we need not dignify or waste ink on the many ways that former US President Trump referred to those fleeing violence and other hardships who sought refuge in the United States, rejecting compassion and instead casting them as a threat to public health and national security.

Second, we should be mindful of uncritically labelling language learners 'refugees.' Some may have fled war or persecution in their countries of origin and achieved legal refugee status. Many are not refugees, having arrived in their new home as economic migrants. In 2004, the EU welcomed ten new member states – the majority from Central and Eastern Europe. While only the UK, Sweden and Ireland initially opened their labour markets to these new EU citizens, over the subsequent ten years others followed, leading to a large increase in migrants from the less developed economies of the EU, seeking opportunities for work, and a better life. How and why each individual arrived in their new country, and what they aspire to achieve there will have an impact on their identity in relation to their country (or countries) of origin, as well as to their relationship to their new country.

Additionally, in one respect, the perpetuation of the label refugee forecloses any sort of equal power relationship—or at least a less unequal one—between those newcomers and the 'hosts' who have shown them hospitality and support (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000; Phipps, 2014, 2019). The imperative to provide the best possible language learning experience to all newcomers, though, means that empirical investigation of differences between refugees and other sorts of migrants is warranted. In this volume Melo-Pfeifer & Thölkes take up that up that challenge directly, but each author has remained mindful of these potentially insidious dimensions of the label refugee, with most opting for the broader term migrant.

Within the countries of the European Union, there is freedom of movement and of labour. Thus, millions of Europeans leave home in search of employment opportunities in other EU member states. The accession in 2004 of ten new member states led to large numbers of adults seeking work in the economies of, for example, the UK, where labour was in short supply, and where Polish is now the second-most widely spoken language. These internal migrants have often faced discrimination in the workplace and in wider society. They have also frequently been demonised in the press as economic migrants, threatening local jobs and culture. EU migrants, making use of their right to freedom of movement across the borders of EU countries are often placed together in public rhetoric with another group of migrants that feature in the papers in this volume, namely 'asylum seekers.' An asylum seeker is a migrant from a country outside the EU who has left their own country, perhaps fleeing war, oppression, or economic hardship. Asylum seekers seek sanctuary, the same protections afforded to refugees. But while their applications are assessed they remain in a state of limbo, with their future unassured. While reading the papers in this volume, we should be aware that while not every asylum seeker will see their application accepted and be recognised as a refugee, every refugee was, and is, initially an asylum seeker.

Along with retaining a critical awareness of the ways we refer to the people at the centre of this collection of papers, we also are mindful of our use of the term 'integration,' which is ostensibly the aim of adult language education for migrants throughout Europe, but particularly in the countries of northwest Europe studied by our contributors. The European Commission's 2016 Action Plan on the Integration of Third Country Nationals noted that "third-country nationals across the EU continue to fare worse than EU citizens in terms of employment, education, and social inclusion outcomes" and thus "[e]nsuring that all those who are rightfully and legitimately in the EU, regardless of the length of their stay, can participate and contribute is key to the future well-being, prosperity and cohesion of European societies" (European Commission, 2016, p. 2). Additionally, in the face of rising discrimination, prejudice, racism, and xenophobia, the authors of the plan note, "there are legal, moral and economic imperatives to upholding the EU's fundamental rights, values and freedoms and continuing to work for a more cohesive society overall" (ibid.). In a word, the successful integration of migrants is considered to be "a matter of common interest to all Member States" (ibid.).

We note that for the European Commission, at least, integration is about ensuring the well-being, prosperity, and cohesion of the EU. As part of this, the Action Plan likewise echoes the commonly-heard refrain regarding language education of migrants, that learning the language of the destination country "is crucial for third-country nationals to succeed their integration process" (sic) and that "language integration programmes should be provided at the earliest stage possible after arrival, adapted to each person's linguistic competences needs and combining language learning with learning of other skills and competences or work experiences" (p. 7). Yet as Plassmann (2017) notes, at least since the economic crisis of 2008 and more intensively since the increase in migration to Germany (and Europe) beginning in 2015, the focus of discussions of integration has been narrowly on the ability to work. The discourse has shifted from being primarily about integration into society to integration into the working world. Thus, it's not merely that "'language leads to integration' rather 'language leads to work, which leads to integration'" (Plassmann, 2017, p. 327). Yet as most of the chapters in this volume reveal, this framing of integration in terms of the contribution of migrants to the economy, is insufficient to capture its complexities, and risks marginalising or excluding from the process segments of the migrant population, particularly women, and specifically, mothers who are also the primary caregivers in their households (see also Ennser-Kananen & Pettitt, 2017). Additonally, too simplistic a framing of integration risks obscuring that for a great number of migrants, even those who arrive with high levels of previous education, learning the language is not the magic key to integration that they themselves may have imagined it to be. Simpson (2019; see also Simpson & Whiteside, 2015a, b) suggests this is in large part due to the one-directional and also monolingual discourses surrounding integration. This drive for social cohesion through homogeneity implies that it is the responsibility of the individual to integrate through use of the dominant language, rather than being a common effort between hosts and newcomers.

Ultimately, as Plassman (2017) observes, one problem is that 'integration' is never directly observable, rather only indirectly discernible. The explorations and analyses in these contributions will hopefully help our readers discern some of the nuances of that transformative process. For example, the papers by Graham-Brown, Cox, Hernández, Melo-Pfeifer and Thölkes, and Piccoli all show the reader dimensions of those migrants' lived experiences of language and language learning as part of integration, with an intimate view here into unresolved or unresolvable tensions between the demands of everyday life—raising children, finding housing, getting around town on one's own, dealing with bureaucracy—and more profound dimensions of integration, such as acceptance as legitimate, participating members of society in their new homes.

Another area of inquiry in several of the papers in this volume, whether in the foreground—as it is in the contributions of Norlund Shaswar, and Tissot and colleagues—or the background, is 'literacy,' and so we should clarify how it is used, for it is also at the core in many areas of language education policy, curriculum, pedagogy, and teacher education, whether explicit or not. In applied linguistics and education scholarship, the term literacy is used in different ways. The dominant contemporary UK English-language understanding of literacy (in both everyday and educational usage) is reading and writing (EU High Level Group of Experts on Literacy, 2012), although some argue that literacy should include spoken communication (see, for example, the English Adult Literacy Core Curriculum, DfES, 2001). In this sense, one aspect of language is literacy, and oracy is another.

In contexts of great technological, cultural and linguistic diversity, such as those described in the chapters of this volume, a description of literacy as simply reading and writing fails to account for the rich multimodal forms of communication that we engage in. The term multiliteracies was introduced by the New London group in the 1990s (New London Group, 1996) in order to emphasise that our literacy practices are not restricted to printed or written forms of language but instead involve creating and communicating meaning using multiple modes of representation: visual, oral, corporal, musical, as well as alphabetical (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000).

Yet, however intertwined various understandings of literacy are, we can also recognise that literacy as reading and writing is a distinct aspect of language use, different from speaking and listening, not least because it is so much more recent in human history, and not 'genetically encoded' in the same way as speaking and listening (Nation, 2006). This means that people usually need to be taught to read and write, while it is generally accepted that given 'normal' cognitive function and social environment, children develop oral language without the need for teaching. This is not, of course, to underestimate the highly linked nature of literacy and oracy, both in terms of how written and spoken language are used together in daily practices and in terms of the importance of oral language use for literacy development.

Thus, in settings of language learning by migrants, whether formal and institutional or informal or even incidental, literacy takes on dimensions that should be considered, and which are addressed by several of the contributors to our volume.

Wienberg and colleagues treat literacy concretely through an analysis of so-called literacy courses in Germany, here focused on the straightforward ability to read and write, including using what is for many migrants an entirely new alphabet. Norlund Shaswar considers literacy as practice, focusing specifically on digital literacy practices as a means of potentially tapping into the learners' full linguistic repertoires in the instructed setting.

There are three points about literacy in the context of adult migrant language education that we encourage the reader to keep in mind while reading these chapters. First, assessments of literacy in the migrants' new home tend to be high stakes, connected to receiving a range of services and benefits, yet migrants tend to perform poorly on such assessments. A study by the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIACC; Grotlüschen et al., 2016) shows that even when migrants have adopted the language of their new country as the language they use at home, they are more likely to have poor literacy skills in the test language than those who were educated in the test language from childhood. Oral fluency in migrants may therefore mask underlying literacy issues, which highlights the need for enhanced support for both first and second-generation migrants. In their chapter in this volume, Wienberg and colleagues suggest that this is particularly important for migrants who are not literate, or whose first language does not use the Roman alphabet.

Second, evidence on the use of literacy suggests that use and proficiency are linked. Most adults, whether migrants or not, are not required to make much use of their literacy, leading to skills decline and a mismatch between educational credentials (gained often in school age) and adults' abilities to engage with written texts. Use it or lose it. So for migrants adapting to a new linguistic and cultural environment, this dilemma is even more pronounced. Thus, an important pedagogical principle would be to engage the adult educational setting as a space for the use and development of literacy. Most of the studies in this volume imply or flesh out this principle, such as Norlund Shaswar's consideration of the roles of digital literacies in everyday life to language teaching.

And third, literacy is highly valued in modern societies, and so of great importance to migrants. We see systematic connections between information-processing skills, which includes literacy, numeracy, and other proficiencies, and a broad range of social and economic indicators of individual and societal wellbeing. Orienting language teaching in all settings toward helping migrants develop literacy thus need not be seen only in utilitarian terms, particularly if we take a multiliteracies approach, recognising the multilingual and multimodal ways in which learners experience literacy. Thus, rather than the transmission of a narrow set of skills, literacy teaching and learning with adult migrants supports their acquisition, and employment, of social and symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1989, 1991), reflecting the extent to which use of information-processing skills is woven into the very social and economic fabric of the societies.

3 Volume Overview

As detailed earlier, the papers in *Language Learning of Adult Migrants in Europe: Theoretical, Empirical, and Pedagogical Issues* have been selected with three goals in mind. We believe that they contribute to a conceptual framing of adult migrant language education in Europe through the theoretical grounding and careful and nuanced methodologies of each study, as well as through the findings of each separate investigation of one or more aspects of language learning of migrants in Europe. They offer valuable empirical evidence of the impact and effectiveness of a range of learning settings. This is evidence is drawn from quantitative analysis of large survey and assessment datasets, but also from qualitative analysis of interviews, social interactions, and oral diaries. Finally, these contributions should serve as a practical resource for language professionals, for they identify implications for teaching emerging from the analyses and exemplify a range of creative, innovative teaching practices.

The papers focus on both formal and informal sites for language learning. The formal sites are classrooms. Some of these within an institutionalized language and culture class, such as the integration course in Germany described by Grotlüschen and colleagues, and Tissot and colleagues, or the Swedish for Immigrants course which is the setting for Norlund Shaswar's discussion of digital literacy practices. Others, such as that described by Graham-Brown, are non-formal, not part of the national language education or integration system, often run at the community level.

However, the papers in this volume also remind us that while the classroom is an important site for language acquisition, engagement in language learning involves more than just the acquisition of linguistic knowledge and does not only happen as a direct result of language teaching. Much language learning is informal and takes place outside the classroom. Adult migrants acquire the language of the host community through engagement with the demands of daily life. This is highlighted in the study by Intke-Hernández, who shows us the importance of social interactions in the host country language to her subject Maite. These interactions help Maite develop her language skills, but also help her to understand and grow into her new society. Theories of language socialization suggest that migrants are integrated into their new community through their use of the language of that community, and that interaction with the host community is beneficial to their development of proficiency in the host language. Graham-Brown describes a wide range of such interactions taking place in a public spaces, such as parks and shopping centres, schools and public transport, but also in official spaces such as those in which migrants engage with government social services representatives or look for work, and in more private spaces with neighbours or in the workplace.

One notable element of the language use and language learning described in these chapters is the relative paucity of connections between them. There are very few examples of migrants' language use in informal settings being related to, or exploited by their formal language provision. The migrant women we are introduced to by Graham-Brown are encouraged by their teacher to set up a WhatsApp

group which they use to stay connected and provide mutual support outside the classroom. Participants, such as those presented by Graham-Brown, Al-Dhaif and colleagues, and Intke-Hernández, describe the significance of social interaction for the language learning, and well-being of their subjects, and yet very few references are made to connections between their formal language learning and their informal use of the language in social interactions.

Following this introductory chapter, we have divided the volume into two parts, based on the focus in the papers. Part I considers language learning as part of learners' everyday lives. Opening this part, Minna Intke-Hernández analyses migrant mothers' stories of learning language in everyday life in Finland. Through a nexus analysis (Scollon & Scollon, 2004) of ethnographic data collected over six years, Intke-Hernández notes interesting differences between the sorts of language used for socialisation in what she describes as 'pastime' and 'managing' situations.

In Chap. 3, Nafisha Graham-Brown also presents an ethnographic study of a group of women, six women in community ESOL classes in East London, to explore the relationship between their day-to-day social interactions and their perceptions of their own integration in British society. Graham-Brown found that feelings of belonging are far from a dichotomous matter, identifying four distinct feelings of belonging among the participants: material, relational, cultural, and temporal. Focusing then on relational belonging, she considers multifarious in-person and digital social interactions as potential new ways for teachers and policymakers to think about both the role of socialisation in migrant language learning and about what integration itself means for migrants in their everyday lives.

The focus in Chap. 4 is on a ubiquitous but crucial component of the experiences of many refugees, and particularly asylum seekers, namely mental health consultations. Through a fine-grained, multimodal analysis of video-recorded sessions with asylum-seekers in France, Vanessa Piccoli analyses talk between patients and therapists about language learning, shedding light on some of the psychological impacts of learning a new language, particularly in the tensions between troubles in the participants' daily lives and their experiences learning French. The analysis also reveals just how aware the participants are of cognitive dimensions of the experience.

Part II deals with different aspects of language learning in the classroom. Chapters 5 and 6 offer analyses of formal, institutionalised language education in Germany. Through the oversight and public subsidy at the national level of the German Federal Agency for Migrants and Refugees (BAMF), *Integrationskurse* (integration courses) are offered throughout the country in both public and private adult educational institutions. Our two chapters unpack both survey data as well as test scores to highlight both strengths and weaknesses of this sort of institutionalised system. In Chap. 5, Jana Wienberg, Gregor Dutz, and Anke Grotlüschen analyse test results from integration courses over a four-year period, delving in particular into so-called *Alphabetisierungskurse* (literacy courses) designed to help learners who come with limited or no reading or writing ability in the language of their new home. Chapter 6 by Anna Tissot, Giuseppe Pietrantuono, Nina Rother, Andreea Baier, and Johannes Croisier considers several determinants of language acquisition in German integration courses. Using the results of a large longitudinal survey of

migrants, triangulated with interviews with a subset of survey respondents, as well as with teachers and other representatives of educational institutions providing integration courses, the authors draw on human-capital theory to identify factors of language acquisition specifically related to forced migration, in addition to other individual factors. Their analysis is aimed not only at predicting success in integration courses, rather also at identifying barriers, particularly for women, of attending an integration course at all.

Chapter 7 by Amina Al-Dhaif, Graham Hall, and Rola Naeb delves into issues of identity and investment in adult migrants' English language learning in the UK. Through a nuanced ethnographic exploration of learners' complex relationship with their own integration into British society through language and culture, they show how critical engagement with aspects of religious identity can empower learners and foster agency and investment in the crucial process of language learning.

Exploring quite a different dimension of socialisation in a new home and language, Annika Norlund Shaswar investigates in Chap. 8 digital literacy practices as part of basic literacy education in Sweden. She offers an ethnographic case study of a learner of Swedish, detailing how digital media are used in her everyday life for socialisation purposes, then considers ways that the classroom setting can both better draw upon learners' full range of literacies as well as help expand their literacy practices toward enhancing both classroom learning and socialisation in the learners' new home.

In Chap. 9, Sarah Cox's treatment of language learning in Scotland through an ecological and richly multilingual approach aims to validate and integrate into the pedagogy the multilingual realities in the everyday lives of a group of women who came to Scotland as refugees. Her analysis also brings to bear principles of translanguaging pedagogy (García & Kleifgen, 2010; García & Li Wei, 2014).

Chapter 10 by Sílvia Melo-Pfeifer and Mara Thölkes likewise considers the learners' multilingual subjectivities to challenge conventional approaches to language assessment, though in this case the focus is on refugee learners of foreign languages in school, which for the learners is an additional language beyond their home languages and, in this case, German as the new home-country language. Through interviews with teachers of Spanish and English as a foreign language, the authors bring into relief the tensions between traditional, conventional approaches and perspectives of assessment and a plurilingual approach that may better meet the learners' needs.

4   Conclusion: What This Volume Does and Does Not Do

We hope that the papers in this volume will be useful to researchers, teachers and future teachers, as well as to other stakeholders interested in making language learning for adult migrants a bit easier. We also hope that engagement with the experiences recounted here will encourage further research into language learning of this and other groups of adults. While most of the chapters detail implications for

teaching, collectively they do not propose a particular set of guidelines or a specific pedagogy or approach, rather they highlight areas where development is needed. Also, we note that despite their affinities and areas of alignment and overlap, each paper in this collection stands on its own and has a specific contribution to make. None of the papers takes a comparative approach to national migrant language learning systems, which would be the (welcome) goal of a different volume. That said, we believe that together the papers form a distinctive and useful collection. They bring into relief adult migrant learner identities as complex, dynamic, and deeply context contingent. They reveal the language use of adult migrants in and outside the classroom as plurilingual, thus exposing monolingual norms and approaches as problematic and even unrealistic. They highlight the importance of social engagement in the host country language to both language acquisition and integration. And they peel back some ways that literacies act as a mediator of adults' experience of migration. Finally, in focusing on Europe and specifically some of the countries of northwest Europe, we do not imply that there is or should be cohesion, coherence or standardization; there is no one-size-fits-all, not even or perhaps especially in Europe. However, we do suggest that there are commonalities between the experiences of language learning of migrants in different European countries, and that lessons can be drawn that will improve our understanding of adult migrant language education in Europe and elsewhere.

References

Bajaj, M., Argenal, A., & Canlas, M. (2017). Socio-politically relevant pedagogy for immigrant and refugee youth. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 50*(3), 258–274.

Beacco, J.-C., Krumm, H.-J., Little, D., & Thalgott, P. (Eds.). (2017). *The Linguistic integration of adult migrants/L'intégration linguistique des migrants adultes: Some lessons from research/ Les enseignements de la recherche*. De Gruyter.

Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity. *Diversities, 13*(2), 1–21.

Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory, 7*(1), 14–25.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Burns, A., & Roberts, C. (2010). Migration and adult language learning: Global flows and local transpositions. *TESOL Quarterly, 44*(3), 409–419.

Canagarajah, S. (Ed.). (2017). *The Routledge handbook of migration and language*. Routledge.

Cantone, K. F. (2020). Introduction to the special issue "Multilingual students and language education policy in Europe.". *International Multilingual Research Journal, 14*(2), 97–99.

Catarci, M., Prata Gomes, M., & Siqueira, S. (Eds.). (2019). *Refugees, interculturalism and education*. Routledge.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures*. Routledge.

Council of Europe. (2014). *Languages for democracy and social cohesion. Diversity, equity and quality. Sixty years of European co-operation*. Author. https://rm.coe.int/ CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=090000168069e 7bd. Accessed 30 June 2020

Council of Europe. (2017). *Adult migrants: Integration and education*. Author. https://rm.coe. int/recommendations-resolutions-on-adult-migrants-and-education-rev-2017-/168079335c. Accessed 30 June 2020

Derrida, J., & Dufourmantelle, A. (2000). *Of hospitality* (R. Bowlby, Trans.). Stanford University Press.

DfES. (2001). *Adult literacy core curriculum*. Author. https://api.excellencegateway.org.uk/resource/etf:1286. Accessed 1 June 2020

Ennser-Kananen, J., & Pettitt, N. (2017). "I want to speak like the other people": Second language learning as a virtuous spiral for migrant women? *International Review of Education, 63*, 583–604.

EU High Level Group of Experts on Literacy. (2012). *EU high level group of experts on literacy final report*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/96d782cc-7cad-4389-869a-bbc8e15e5aeb. Accessed 1 June 2020

European Commission. (2016). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Action Plan on the integration of third country nationals*. Author. https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/legal-migration/integration/action-plan-integration-third-country-nationals_en. Accessed 10 June 2020

European Parliament. (2017). Asylum and migration in the EU: facts and figures. *European Parliament News*, 30 June 2017, updated 22 July 2019. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/society/20170629STO78630/asylum-and-migration-in-the-eu-facts-and-figures. Accessed 5 May 2020.

Gabrielatos, C., & Baker, P. (2008). Fleeing, sneaking, flooding: A corpus analysis of discursive constructions of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press, 1996–2005. *Journal of English Linguistics, 36*(1), 5–38.

García, O., & Kleifgen, J. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs and practices for English language learners*. TeachersCollegePress.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Grotlüschen, A., Mallows, D., Reder, S., & Sabatini, J. (2016). *Adults with low proficiency in literacy or numeracy* (OECD Education Working Papers, No. 131). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5jm0v44bnmnx-en. Accessed 1 May 2020.

Holmes, P., Fay, R., & Andrews, J. (2017). Education and migration: Languages foregrounded. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 17*(4), 369–377.

Husain, M. M. (2020). Jai (rest), Chai (tea) and Wi-Fi: Exploring feasibility of mobile language learning app for asylum seekers in Greater Athens. *Journal of International Development*. Early View. https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.3473. Accessed 5 June 2020.

Kassam, A., Scammell, R., Connolly, K., Orange, R., Willsher, K., & Ratcliffe, R. (2015). Europe needs many more babies to avert a population disaster. *The Guardian*, (22 August 2015) https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/aug/23/baby-crisis-europe-brink-depopulation-disaster. Accessed 3 May 2020

Kelsey, R. (2019). Asylum seekers, migrants or refugees: Which word is correct? *BBC News*., 11 Jan. 2019. https://www.bbc.com/news/newsbeat-46747502. Accessed 15 June 2020.

Khan, K. (2017). Citizenship, securitization and suspicion in UK ESOL policy. In K. Arnaut, M. Sif Karrebæk, M. Spotti, & J. Blommaert (Eds.), *Engaging superdiversity: Recombining spaces, times and language practices* (pp. 303–320). Multilingual Matters.

Kirkwood, S., McKinlay, A., & McVittie, C. (2013). The mutually constitutive relationship between place and identity: The role of place-identity in discourse on asylum seekers and refugees. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 23*(6), 453–465.

Kirkwood, S., Goodman, S., McVittie, C., & McKinlay, A. (2016). *The language of asylum: Refugees and discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Korntheuer, A., Pritchard, P., & Maehler, D. B. (Eds.). (2018). *Structural context of refugee integration in Canada and Germany*. GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences.

Lenz, P., & Barras, M. (2017). Does teaching chunks and fluency make a difference in migrants' language learning? Results of an intervention study in intensive German courses for adult migrants. In J.-C. Beacco, H.-J. Krumm, D. Little, & P. Thalgott (Eds.), *The Linguistic integration of adult migrants/L'intégration linguistique des migrants adultes: Some lessons from research/Les enseignements de la recherche* (pp. 195–200). De Gruyter.

Lewis, P., Sinrons, G., & Fennig, C. (Eds.). (2016). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (18th ed.). SIL International. http://www.ethnologue.com. Accessed 19 January 2021

Loescher, G., Betts, A., & Milner, J. (2008). *The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR): The politics and practice of refugee protection into the 21st century*. Routledge.

Mallows, D. (Ed.). (2014). *Language issues in migration and integration: Perspectives from teachers and learners*. British Council.

McGinnity, F., & Gijsberts, M. (2015). Perceived group discrimination among Polish migrants to western Europe: Comparing Germany, The Netherlands, the UK and Ireland. *Ethnicities, 16*(2), 290–315.

Middeke, A., Eichstaedt, A., Jung, M., & Kniffka, G. (Eds.). (2017). *Wie schaffen wir das? Beiträge zur sprachlichen Integration geflüchteter Menschen* (Materialien Deutsch als Fremd- und Zweitsprache, Band 97). Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

Naidoo, L., Wilkinson, J., Adoniou, M., & Langat, K. (Eds.). (2018). *Refugee background students transitioning into higher education*. Springer.

Nation, K. (2006). Reading and genetics: An introduction. *Journal of Research in Reading, 29*(1), 1–10.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*, 60–92.

Phipps, A. (2014). Scotland's future, hospitality and social healing. *Hospitality and Society, 4*(2), 179–192.

Phipps, A. (2019). *Decolonising multilingualism: Struggles to decreate*. Multilingual Matters.

Plassmann, S. (2017). Welche Sprache lehren wir? Zur Rolle der Sprachkurse und -prüfungen im Prozess der Integration. In A. Middeke, A. Eichstaedt, M. Jung, & G. Kniffka (Eds.), Wie schaffen wir das? Beiträge zur sprachlichen Integration geflüchteter Menschen (pp. 325–338). Materialien Deutsch als Fremd- und Zweitsprache, Band 97. Göttingen, Germany: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

Reyes, C., & Carrasco, S. (2018). Unintended effects of the language policy on the transition of immigrant students to upper secondary education in Catalonia. *European Journal of Education, 53*(4), 514–527. Research, Development and Policy.

Rocca, L., Hamnes Carlsen, C., & Deygers, B. (2020). *Linguistic integration of adult migrants: Requirements and learning opportunities. Report on the 2018 Council of Europe and ALTE survey on language and knowledge of society policies for migrants*. Council of Europe. https://rm.coe.int/linguistic-integration-of-adult-migrants-requirements-and-learning-opp/16809b93cb. Accessed 1 May 2020

Romei, V. (2020). In charts: Europe's demographic time-bomb. *Financial Times*, (14 January 2020) https://www.ft.com/content/49e1e106-0231-11ea-b7bc-f3fa4e77dd47. Accessed 2 May 2020

Scheible, J. A., & Rother, N. (2017). Schnell und erfolgreich Deutsch lernen – wie geht das? Erkenntnisse zu den Determinanten des Zweitspracherwerbs unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Geflüchteten. In *Working Paper 72 of Forschungszentrums des Bundesamtes für Migration und Flüchtlinge (BAMF)*. BAMF. https://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Forschung/WorkingPapers/wp72-erfolgreich-deutsch-lernen-wie.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=11. Accessed May 20, 2020

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2004). *Nexus analysis: Discourse and the emerging internet*. Routledge.

Shapiro, S., Farrelly, R., & Curry, M. J. (Eds.). (2018). *Educating refugee-background students: Critical issues and dynamic contexts*. Multilingual Matters.

Simpson, J. (2019). Policy and adult migrant language education in the UK. In M. Cooke & R. Peutrell (Eds.), *Brokering Britain, educating citizens: Exploring ESOL and citizenship* (pp. 25–42). Multilingual Matters.

Simpson, J., & Cooke, M. (2018). Recognising multilingual realities in ESOL: The NATECLA National Conference 2017 Keynote. *Language Issues, 28*(2), 4–11.

Simpson, J., & Whiteside, A. (2015a). Introduction. In J. Simpson & A. Whiteside (Eds.), *Adult language education and migration: Challenging agendas in policy and practice* (pp. 1–18). Routledge.

Simpson, J., & Whiteside, A. (Eds.). (2015b). *Adult language education and migration: Challenging agendas in policy and practice*. Routledge.

Taylor, C. (2019). Conflict and categorisation: A corpus and discourse study of naming participants in forced migration. In M. Evans, L. Jeffries, & J. O'Driscoll (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language in conflict* (pp. 128–144). Routledge.

Taylor, S., & Sidhu, R. K. (2012). Supporting refugee students in schools: What constitutes inclusive education? *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 16*(1), 39–56.

United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHCR). (n.d.). What is a refugee? https://www.unrefugees.org/refugee-facts/what-is-a-refugee/. Accessed 1 June, 2020.

Unterreiner, A., & Weinar, A. (2017). Introduction: Integration as a three-way process. In A. Weinar, A. Unterreiner, & P. Fargues (Eds.), *Migrant integration between homeland and host society* (Global Migration Issues 7) (Vol. 1, pp. 1–19). Springer.

van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. Longman.

Van Mol, C., & de Valk, H. (2016). Migration and immigrants in Europe: A historical and demographic perspective. In B. Garcés-Mascareñas & R. Penninx (Eds.), *Integration processes and policies in Europe* (pp. 31–55). Springer.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6), 1024–1054.

Warriner, D. S. (2007). Language learning and the politics of belonging: Sudanese women refugees becoming and being "American.". *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 38*(4), 343–359.

Young-Scholten, M., & Naeb, R. (2020). Acquisition and assessment of morphosyntax. In J. K. Peyton & M. Young-Scholten (Eds.), *Teaching adult immigrants with limited formal education: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 80–104). Multilingual Matters.

Part I
Language Learning in Everyday Life