Part I

Definition and principles

1

What is language policy?

Bernard Spolsky

At an early meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics (perhaps 1979), one of the founders of the field, Charles Ferguson, remarked on the difficulties that linguists have in naming concepts. Although we agree (and teach) that words mean what everyone uses them to mean, we regularly tell enquirers that a linguist is not someone who speaks many languages but someone who studies language. The field of language policy is no exception: we use the term *planning* in a special sense, and produce esoteric combinations like 'status planning' and even more frighteningly 'corpus planning' for central notions. And we share with sociologists the liking for pretentious Latinate combinations, calling the choice of a variety to speak to a baby 'natural intergenerational language transmission'. In this opening chapter, I will mention these not uncommon terms (in Chapter 6, Julia Sallabank lists terms used when talking about language loss), but try to use more transparent vocabulary to describe the principal concepts of the field.

A first puzzle is the name of the field. It was created as a field of study in the optimistic days after the Second World War, when many societies were facing up to the challenge of rebuilding. As scientists had played such a strong role in wartime victory (in developing radar and the atomic bomb for instance), social scientists expected to be able to help solve postwar problems by developing economic plans. Linguists too were hopeful of resolving the language problems of newly independent states and called their endeavours language 'planning', although it was far from clear what a language plan might look like. Rather, they generally agreed that language planning produced a language 'policy', an officially mandated set of rules for language use and form within a nation-state.[1] The process turned out to be similar to the language policy-making of newly independent nations in the nineteenth century (Norway as studied by Einar Haugen (1966) was the prime exemplar) and the decisions made about the nations carved out of defeated enemy empires at the

end of the First World War, where the underlying principle established by France and Germany in the nineteenth century – a nation is defined by its territory and its language – was generally adopted. The challenge then became what to do about the many other languages, large and small, but defined as 'minority' by their powerlessness (Paulston 1998) within the new or newly defined nations. Europe proved fairly straightforward, as the political divisions set up by the Treaty of Versailles and the forced and voluntary population movements that followed left reasonably homogenous nation-states, which could then decide to ignore or recognize their minorities as expressed in a policy set out in law or constitution.[2] Once the policy allocated a function for each language (the official language in particular being selected for governmental and educational use – this selection process was what Kloss (1966) labelled 'status planning'), it remained to modify the national language to serve its new functions, by standardizing it and its writing system and developing new terminology to handle science, technology and commerce – Kloss called this 'corpus planning'. In the 1960s, the linguists working with the newly independent states of Africa and Asia first tried to define the various functions that language varieties could be called on to perform (see the taxonomy proposed by Stewart (1968)), then to help national governments establish appropriate agencies to enforce the decision and modify the language.

In practice, the linguists' plans (like the plans developed by their economic and social colleagues) seldom worked, for they came up against the counter-pressures of actual demographic situations (the complex sociolinguistic ecology as Haugen 1972 noted that made up the ethnography of communication (Hymes 1974) in a given speech community[3]) and the emotionally powerful factors (nationalism, religion, ethnicity, identity, power, communicative strength) that accounted for the significant values a language variety[4] had for various members of a society. As a result, with little if any formal evaluation, the various classical language planning activities of the 1960s faded, and the language policy that developed in the nations of the world continued to evolve with little reference to plans. Africa is of course the clearest example, as the complexity of the linguistic mix produced by imposing colonial boundaries on constantly moving populations encouraged the undesired continuation of the official and educational status of imperial languages. Central Europe (Kamusella 2008) too and former Soviet nations (e.g. Landau & Kellner-Heinkele 2001; Marshall 1996), once released from the Soviet-imposed Russification, moved to establish national languages (old or invented) to guarantee identity, while meeting the challenge of globalizing English and an idealistic European Union policy of protecting minority languages.

It was not unreasonable in the 1960s to call the efforts to modify national language policy 'language planning',[5] but as Nekvapil (2006)

rightly notes, in the new understanding of the nature of the process, a better term is probably 'language management', with the results seen not as 'plans' but as 'strategies'[6] – approaches that set values and direction but admit the continual need for modification to fit specific and changing situations.[7]

I find it appropriate then to name the field as a whole 'language policy',[8] and see it as made up of three inter-related but independent components (Spolsky 2004). The first of these is the actual language practices of the members of the speech community – what variety do they use for each of the communicative functions they recognize, what variants do they use with various interlocutors, what rules do they agree for speech and silence, for dealing with common topics, for expressing or concealing identity. This is what actually happens, the 'real' language policy of the community, described by sociolinguists as the ecology or the ethnography of speech, exceptions to which may mark the speaker as alien or rebellious. The second component, formed in large measure by the first and confirming its influence, is made up of the values assigned by members of a speech community to each variety and variant and their beliefs about the importance of these values. At times, the beliefs may be organized into ideologies (Blommaert 2006; Silverstein 1998), more elaborate combinations of the values shared by certain members of the community. The third component is what used to be called 'planning' and what I prefer to call 'management',[9] efforts by some members of a speech community who have or believe they have authority over other members to modify their language practice, such as by forcing or encouraging them to use a different variety or even a different variant (Spolsky 2009). In my approach, a constitutional or legal establishment of a national or official language is a clear example of language management, although just as speed limits do not guarantee that all cars abide by them, so a language law does not guarantee observance.

Some of the questions about approach and definitions are answered in Chapter 2 by Björn Jernudd and Jiří Nekvapil who provide a 'sketch' (albeit in considerable detail) of the history of the field and its current state. They start with some early examples of the development of language policy: the significant case of the *Académie française*, the European nationalist movements of the nineteenth century, the remarkable but short-term support of linguistic diversity in the Leninist Soviet Constitution of the 1920s, and the Prague School approach to cultivation of the standard language in the period between the two World Wars. All this provides background to what they call 'classical language planning', the activities of linguists in the 1970s and 1980s who believed that language planning was as possible as economic planning, and applicable to solving the linguistic problems[10] of the newly independent nations of Africa and Asia.

For many in the field, this is still the most common approach: a detailed survey of the language situation in the nation-state,[11] a rational decision

on the language (or occasionally languages) to choose as official (*status planning*), and consideration of the steps required to suit the chosen language to its new tasks (*corpus planning*, or language cultivation including development of the writing system, spelling reform, standardization of grammar, modernization and development of needed terminology. In the 1990s, two main developments shook this approach: first, the failure of economic models and so the loss of confidence in planning in language as well, and secondly the realization of the existence of other actors and agencies besides the nation-state, including especially minorities. This latter point was stressed with the development by Joshua Fishman of the model of 'Reversing Language Shift (Fishman 1990), which recognized the existence of strong counter forces working against the pressure of the central nation-state for linguistic homogeneity; it is supported by movements for recognition of minority rights in the sphere of language too. Jernudd and Nekvapil conclude their survey with an account of their own Language Management Theory which attempts to incorporate all these elements as well as recognizing that language policy occurs not just at the level of the nation-state, but can also be found in other domains and other speech communities, and which relates more strongly to views of language rights.[12]

Chapter 3 by Denise Réaume and Meital Pinto sets out to present recent positions taken by philosophers on language policy. It starts by analysing arguments in support of unilingualism (such as ease of communication) and of multilingualism, the most prominent of which is the argument that diversity in languages is as important as biodiversity; the arguments for each are impressive, but can be answered; and no conclusion is reached, although it is mentioned that many scholars (non-philosophers and philosophers alike) come down strongly in favour of one position or the other. Réaume and Pinto then move to an equally balanced and detailed analysis of the various positions taken on language rights. Again, in spite of the tendency of some language policy scholars to assume that there is a simple solution, they show the difficulty of taking any final position. At the end, the authors draw attention to the gap between philosophers with their tightly argued theories and the complex reality of the data they are trying to account for but seldom cite. They call for closer collaboration between the approaches.

Chapter 4, by Sue Wright, provides a thorough account of the nationalism that has come to govern the ideology of the language policy of nation-states. She starts with the French model, the belief that a nation-state needs a common language to hold it together, and shows how this was bolstered by the German Romantic ideal of states being appropriate expressions of unified languages. As Ammon has remarked (see Chapter 28 in this volume), the French assumed that all their metropolitan and colonial citizens should speak Parisian French, while the Germans took it that any people speaking German should be part of a unified political

unit. Wright traces the view that nationalism requires a monolingual nation, and sets out in some detail the management activities (the classical status, corpus and acquisition planning) intended to achieve this effect. She concludes by considering the changing situation in what some people claim is a post-national situation, the effect of growing recognition of minorities (ethnic and linguistic) and their human rights, and the development of transnationalism and globalization and the growing status of English.

In Chapter 5, Ofelia Garcia describes one major counter-force to the nationalist homogeny and hegemony, the development of ethnic identity. She traces how ethnic identity and language became linked, presenting succinctly Joshua Fishman's pioneering notions on the nature of ethnicity and its close link with language policies of minority groups especially in the mid-twentieth century. Each of the phenomena is complex and evolving; neither language nor ethnicity is the fixed and defined concept that is often assumed. Ethnicity is self-perceived or externally attributed, complex and constantly modified by changing social, political and demographic conditions. Language symbolizes and represents ethnic identity. Because of the fluidity and complexity of identity, it is easy to assume that language can be modified and planned. The link was assumed to be close. The dissolution of empires coincided with the birth of sociolinguistics, which was seen as a natural ally in bolstering the status of previously oppressed ethnic identities. Garcia also describes the postmodern view recognizing the hybridity of ethnic identities and of language practices. In this situation, the manipulation of language and identity (she calls it 'languaging' and 'ethnifying') provides a major tool not just of nation-states but also for individuals within all domains and speech communities. Garcia analyses four cases which illustrate the working of her model: Luxembourgish, where strong ethnic identity plus focused language policy support language maintenance; Māori where strong ethnic identity is backed by ideology and management but practices are weak so that further development depends on finding a way to modify home practice; Tseltal and Tsotsil with strong identity where the languages are used in private but not in public, and so are under threat; and Gallo where identity is moderate and policy is weak leading to language shift.

Julia Sallabank in Chapter 6 deals with the effect of the centralizing tendency of nationalism, modernization and globalization on the smaller languages, describing the recognition of the rapidly increasing death of endangered languages. She defines the basic concepts and the notions of endangerment, moribundity, attrition, obsolescence and loss, as well as the other terms used in discussions of the phenomenon. There are four main categories of causes: natural disasters, war and genocide, resettlement and repression, and political, cultural and economic dominance. She discusses the difficulty of obtaining accurate measures of

language use and knowledge, and the even greater problem of assessing the 'health' of a language and the various scales proposed. She then looks at arguments for the maintenance of linguistic diversity, and describes various attempts being made to achieve this for the myriad of threatened language varieties, including home, school and community revitalization efforts. She concludes by surveying some successful policies.

Chapter 7 by Robichaud and De Schutter returns to a philosophical discussion of language values, seeking to analyse instrumental (as opposed to intrinsic) arguments for a language's value. Six uses (communication, economic success, unity, democracy, cultural diversity, equality) function as arguments for the importance of the dominant language; two (autonomy and dignity) argue for supporting small or minority languages. While they do not aim to support instrumentalism, their analysis helps explain the weight of such considerations in language policy.

Part II moves to the macrolevel of language policy, beginning in Chapter 8 written by Fernand de Varennes with an account of the development and nature of post- and supra-national notions of human and civil rights affecting language as they are proposed and implemented in regional and international organizations. The two conflicting approaches (or ideologies) are efficiency of communication (a force driving towards recognition of the fewest possible languages – even one) and the symbolic recognition of rights of national members of the organization or citizens of the member nations, calling for maximal multilingualism. Fully international organizations (like the United Nations) tend to the efficiency point of view; regional organizations (especially the European Union) favour actual or symbolic recognition of all member states' languages. But in practice, it turns out to be difficult to implement multilingual policies, and there are many exceptions such as ideological monolingual international organizations like the Arab League and Francophonie and historically monolingual organizations like the Universal Postal Union and the World Court. There are also functional differences, such as public meetings of governing bodies, communication between the international organization and its national members, communication among bureaucrats, and communication with individuals.

One method of dealing with the language conflicts of heterogeneous states is discussed in Chapter 9, where Colin Williams describes the territorial model exemplified in Switzerland and Belgium and the granting of a degree of autonomy (including language policy) exemplified in Spain, the United Kingdom and Canada. He provides details of the way the model is implemented, making clear the complexity of the bureaucratic arrangements needed.

Both of these forces may be called on to counteract the homogenizing and centralizing results of imperialism and colonialism, tackled by Robert Phillipson in Chapter 10. Phillipson's first major published research focused on the effects of European conquests of Africa and the

failures of classical language planning to restore the place of indigenous languages. In this survey, he defines various relevant terms like *empire* and *colony*, and sketches the history of associated language policy first in Europe (starting with Rome) and the spread of European imperialism to America, Africa, Asia and the Pacific. He traces the development of philosophies which glorified the metropolitan language and stigmatized local indigenous varieties in Africa and India and elsewhere. Colonial language polices were established by the French, the Spaniards and the British and other imperial powers in the nineteenth century, and continued after independence in the twentieth; he traces in particular the growing power of English which he blames in large measure on policies of the English-speaking countries.

Empires are big government and have good reasons (power and efficiency) to develop strong language policies leading to homogeneity and hegemony. At the other end of the political scale, there is evidence of somewhat different developments. In his pioneering work on municipal language management in a number of cities, Backhaus in Chapter 11 tracks a number of different tendencies. His ground-breaking research focused on Tokyo, a largely monolingual city which made efforts in signs and public services to allow for a growing multilingual population and increasing numbers of tourists. A quite different pattern has emerged in a number of US cities, where the English Only movement, frustrated by the failure of its efforts to make English the sole official language, has managed to have ordinances passed in some towns to work against the earlier acceptance of multilingualism. Ottawa in Canada shows another approach, as a largely bilingual city attempts to establish multilingualism that reflects federal policy. In contrast, in Upper Nazareth (a small Hebrew-speaking town in Israel surrounded by four Arabic-speaking towns), he finds the local municipality working against the official national recognition of Arabic. He finds a similar reluctance to multilingualism in Kosovo, where strong conflicts between Albanian and Serbian speakers are carried over to language policy. Finally, he traces the difficulty of providing local recognition in Capetown and in another South African city of implementing the constitutional status of the eleven official languages.

Continuing the consideration of levels of policy, in Chapter 12 Angelelli surveys language policy in service domains (I take the term and concept from Fishman 1972) dealing first with a theoretical model of the interpreted communicative event, the growing need for interpreting as a result of immigration, and the shortages of interpreters leading to the use of bystanders, amateurs and children as substitutes. She then analyses the three major settings in which interpretive services are required: health, police and legal, and discusses the reasons that they are not provided adequately (cost and lack of concern for minority speakers). Finally, she considers models for education and qualification of interpreters,

concluding with a summary of some recent developments in professionalization of the field and of testing.

One governmental domain where language policy is important (if not studied much) is defence, tackled by Brecht and Rivers in Chapter 13. Rather than attempting a summary of military language policy in various nations and times (as for example Spolsky 2009: 129–43), they focus on the US, the major military power in the world today and one where the defence establishment has recently established and started to implement a complex language policy. They discuss the actual and ideal architecture for such a policy, outlining the steps that have been taken or should in their opinion be taken to develop a working system that will make up for the failures of the US educational system to produce graduates ready to function in a multilingual world.

Education is a key domain for language policy, and two chapters in the Handbook focus on it. In Chapter 14, Walter and Benson present arguments for the importance of the choice of language as medium of instruction in schools. Noting that complexity is often offered as an excuse for ignoring the needs of minorities, they present a survey of empirical studies which establish the commonly ignored principle that the ideal medium for teaching, at least at the level of basic education, is the language that the pupils know best. This notion of using what is commonly called the mother-tongue as medium has been widely promoted since it was endorsed over fifty years ago by UNESCO. They analyse actual practices, showing how many languages and how many pupils are ignored in current choices of educational medium. They discuss in detail the reasons for current policies, before presenting a range of research studies which provide convincing evidence of the value of mother-tongue as language of instruction.

Chapter 15 by Cenoz and Gorter analyses the situation in teaching additional languages. Most school systems teach more than one language. In the first half of the chapter, they show how in much of the world today, English is gradually becoming the first additional language taught, so that 'foreign language teaching' is now being replaced by 'English language teaching'. In the second part, they describe and evaluate European Union efforts to counteract this pressure for English and preserve linguistic diversity, by teaching other major European languages or (more rarely) by giving a place to regional and minority languages.

Readers will have noted that I accept the view, increasingly common in the field, that any speech community has a language policy (practice, values and perhaps management). Moving on from education, Chapter 16 by Alexandre Duchêne and Monica Heller looks at language policy and policies in the workplace. In particular, they trace development of what is called the new economy, where physical labour is replaced by information and communication. Linguistic competence (including control of acceptable style and pronunciation) becomes a key criterion for hiring,