Language Policy

Ofelia García, Graduate Center, The City University of New York, New York, NY, USA

Abstract

This article reviews the field of language policy, and presents a historical overview of the theoretical perspectives. It reviews the activities of classical language planning from the mid-twentieth century to the more critical and post-structural perspective of the field today. By presenting a framework of motivations for language policy, the article also presents different cases of types of language policy.

The field of language policy can be considered a branch of macro-sociolinguistics, also known as sociology of language. Not only has the field of language policy evolved in relation to changes in the social sciences, including sociolinguistics, and our epistemologies in the twenty-first century, but also the naming of the field itself has shifted. Originally scholars referred to the field as *language planning*, focusing on what could be done by the state to systematically promote linguistic change (Cooper, 1989; Fishman et al., 1968; Fishman, 1971; Haugen, 1959, 1966; Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997). Cooper (1989) defines language planning as "*deliberate* efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocations of their language codes" (p. 45, my italics). But post-structuralist and critical scholarship has challenged the idea that a community's way of speaking could be planned and changed by authoritative agencies. There are beliefs, practices, and even regulations that impact the ways in which people use language. Thus, the naming of the field itself has shifted to *language policy*, as it recognizes the multiple forces that influence behavior toward language (*LP*) (Ricento, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Spolsky, 2004, 2012). Some scholars, however, have preferred to speak about *language policy and planning* (LPP) (Hornberger and Ricento, 1996; Hornberger, 2006) or *language policy and language planning* (LPLP) (Wright, 2004), suggesting that both terms are needed in order to capture their distinctive roles – one referring to language changes by the state or authoritative organizations, the other communicating behaviors and beliefs or attitudes toward language that shape the way that language is managed and used in society.

The Beginnings: Classic Language Planning

Language planning became an important field of study during the 1960s and 1970s, in what Ricento (2000: 206) has called *classic language planning*. Einar Haugen, a Scandinavian language specialist is credited with having used the term *language planning* for the first time in 1959 to refer to "the activity of preparing a normative orthography, grammar, and dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogeneous speech community" (p. 8). The term itself was first used by Uriel Weinreich in a 1957 seminar at Columbia University (Cooper, 1989: 29).

In 1965 Joshua Fishman published his now classic article entitled "Who speaks what language to whom and when," the basis for the development of macro-sociolinguistics or sociology of language, which focuses on the social organization of language behavior, "including not only language usage per se, but also language attitudes and overt behaviors toward language and toward language users" (Fishman, 1972: 1). Fishman argued, and has continued to do so, that social action was needed on behalf of languages and its speakers, and that language could be planned just in the same way that there is economic planning.

Around the same time, in a study of Modern Norwegian, Einar Haugen defined language planning as consisting of four prongs: (1) norm selection, (2) codification, (3) implementation of language functions by spread, and (4) elaboration of functions to meet language needs (1966). Norm selection refers to the formal role that language was to have in society; for example, as an official or national language. Codification includes the choice of linguistic forms, including standardization and graphization. Implementation has to do with whether the policy would be accepted and followed. Finally, elaboration refers to continued linguistic reforms that have societal aims such as modernization, purification, and other stylistic reforms.

In 1968, Fishman, Ferguson, and Das Gupta published *Language Problems of Developing Nations*, perhaps what could be considered the first formal text in the field of language policy. It was the 'problems' of developing nations, and specifically the fact that national identity and national language did not coincide with either ethnic identity nor language use, that in many ways fueled the development of the field (Jernudd and Das Gupta, 1971). Language planning was put in the service of 'solving' the language 'problems' of the newly independent African and Asian states, by assessing the sociolinguistic situation and prescribing certain changes in how language was to be used (Das Gupta and Ferguson, 1977). Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971: 211) summarize the charge of language planning by saying that it is "a political and administrative activity for solving language problems in society." It is clear that these early language planners strongly believed in the social intervention of the state on behalf of languages and their users.

Language planning was originally studied as consisting of two types:

1. *Corpus planning* refers to changes in the linguistic form of the language itself through standardization (standardizing language forms), graphization (developing a writing system), and modernization (coining new words and terms).

2. *Status planning* refers to changes in the functions of language in order to elevate its prestige and increase the uses of a language.

These terms are attributed to the German sociolinguist, Heinz Kloss (1969).

Although described as two processes, Joshua A. Fishman insists that this distinction is clearer in theory than in practice, and that it is only possible to engage both types jointly (Fishman, 2006).

From the very beginning of language planning activities, there was questioning of whether language could indeed be planned, as reflected in the title of Rubin and Jernudd's influential early book, *Can Language be Planned?* (1971). The questioning of whether it was possible to definitely plan the form that a language takes, as well as its uses, emerged from the field itself. Einar Haugen had referred to the *ecology of language*; that is, to the "interactions between any given language and its environment" (1972: 57). Haugen defines that environment as being social and natural, in part psychological, and in part sociological. And he states: "The ecology of language is determined by the people who learn it, use it, and transmit it to others" (p. 57). By putting language in the hands of people and in the interactions between individual choices and socio-psychological possibilities and restrictions, deliberate language planning by governments and authoritative agencies takes a backward step, as the more flexible concept of language policy began to overtake the field.

From Language Planning to Language Policy

In 1989, Robert Cooper published his influential book, *Language Planning and Social Change*. With the now classic question, "What actors attempt to influence what behaviors of which people for what ends under what conditions by what means through what decision-making process with what effect?" (p. 98), Cooper changed the lens of language planning from one of mere description to one engaged in theorizing social action. Language planning, said Cooper, was not only in the hands of governments and authoritative bodies as the Académie Française, but also in the hands of individuals (like Ben Yehuda in the case of revitalization of Hebrew in Israel) and in the hands of communities and groups (such as women opposing sexist language). Cooper also introduced a third type of language planning, beyond corpus and status planning, that he termed *acquisition planning*. This type of language planning focuses on increasing the number of users of the language through two means: (1) the teaching of foreign/second languages, (2) the use of the home language as medium of instruction so as to spur language maintenance or to reacquire the language. Because of the importance of education in acquisition planning, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) have called it language-in-education planning (LiEP), and many scholars refer to it as language education planning (Shohamy, 2006).

What is important about Cooper's contribution is that it expands the classical language planning activity. Beyond states and authoritative agencies, other agents are included as language planners, and the activity is not restricted to a single thing. As we cited in the introduction of this article, Cooper defined language planning as: "deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocations of their language codes" (p. 45). Cooper's definition talks about "influencing" linguistic 'behavior,' rather than changing it (since the activity may just modify or maintain behaviors). The emphasis in Cooper's work is on influencing behaviors and not on solving problems.

At around the same time James Tollefson (1991) published *Planning Language, Planning Inequality*. Interestingly enough, the subtitle of the book was *Language Policy in the Community*. In this important book, Tollefson advances a central idea in the shift from classical language planning to what we know today as language policy. He says:

> In this book language planning-policy means the institutionalization of language as a basis for distinctions among social groups (classes). That is, language policy is one mechanism for locating language within social structure so that language determines who has access to political power and economic resources. Language policy is one mechanism by which dominant groups establish hegemony in language use.
>
> p. 16

Tollefson points to the fact that language actions and choices are always constrained by ideological or structural (class) means, having to do with power, hegemony, and dominance. Structural constraints can block understanding of inequality, leading then to ideology. And he signals that language is an arena for struggle, since social groups exercise power through it. Tollefson adds: "Language policy is a form of disciplinary power. Its success depends in part upon the ability of the state to structure into the institutions of society the differentiation of individuals into 'insider' and 'outsiders'" (Tollefson, 1991: 207). Thus, Tollefson posits an alternative conception of language policy referring to both governmental and nongovernmental activity and focusing on the dynamic relationship between social structural relations and language practices that could result in structural equality. In keeping with Foucault's concept of governmentality, Tollefson views the operation of power as not limited to the state, but also to diverse practices.

Building on the critical work of Tollefson, and influenced by the work of Pierre Bourdieu, other scholars have maintained that all language behaviors and attitudes are always ideological and enmeshed in social systems of domination and subordination of groups, having to do not only with ethnicity, but also with class, gender, and race (Irvine and Gal, 2000). Bourdieu (1991) refers to habitus as a "system of dispositions common to all products of the same conditionings" (p. 59) by which the material form of life is "embodied and turned into second nature" (p. 63). This explains why speakers who do not control language practices that are considered 'standard' consider these to be more credible or legitimate than those they do speak. Language policy thus signals ideological positions and boundary markers of group identity for inclusion and exclusion (Kroskrity, 2000), and for constructing and effacing an other (Suleiman, 2004).

Power is said to operate in practices and ideologies and beliefs, and not only in laws and regulations. It is precisely these new understandings that have expanded the field of language policy from its original conceptualization as simply 'planning' at the state level and carried out by official language 'managers,' to one that today incorporates families,

faith communities, employers and educators (Spolsky, 2009). Spolsky points out (2009: 8):

> Many countries and institutions and social groups do not have formal or written language policies, so that the nature of their language policy must be derived from a study of their language practice or beliefs. Even where there is a formal, written language policy, its effect on language practices, is neither guaranteed nor consistent.

Thus, Spolsky (2004) expands our understandings of language policy to encompass three components:

1. *Language management* – also known as language planning, language intervention, language engineering, or language treatment, and referring to direct efforts to modify language practice beyond just government.
2. *Language practices* – the habitual pattern of selecting among varieties that make up the linguistic repertoire; that is, what people actually do.
3. *Language beliefs* or ideology – the values assigned to language and language use; that is, what people think should be done.

The first component, language management, was suggested by Jernudd (1993) to expand language planning from its emphasis on state as decision maker, to include more bottom-up and discourse-based planning. Jernudd (1997: 136) comments that language management includes:

> a broad range of different sociolinguistic situations at different levels of enlargement (from nation to firm), of a broad range of different interests and populations (from women to refugees), under widely different communicative circumstances (of media, channels, information processing), and foremost, of the different ideological and real, global and local sociopolitical conditions.

The variability of features inherent in language, the different ways in which language can be used at different times and with various interlocutors, as well as the various attitudes and beliefs held about language features and practices, is what makes language policy possible. Because choices must be made about all of this, either by individuals and groups themselves, or by outsiders, language policy has to be understood as a most important component of sociolinguistics.

Language choice and language beliefs are not neutral. As Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004: 1, 2) propose:

> [L]anguage choice and attitudes are inseparable from political arrangements, relations of power, language ideologies, and interlocutors' views of their own and others' identities. Ongoing social, economic, and political changes affect these constellations, modifying identity options offered to individuals at a given moment in history and ideologies that legitimize and value particular identities more than others.

Bringing the classical language planning strand together with the more flexible language policy strand, Shohamy (2006) points to the important distinction between 'overt policy' – having to do with the use of language to influence sociolinguistic use and norms, and thus social life – and 'covert or hidden policy' – not explicitly addressing language itself but relying on the discursive power of language to have the same social effects. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) had already noticed that there has always been unplanned language policy and planning which goes unnoticed and unrecorded (p. 299). This has been the focus of Hornberger's work and especially of her important contribution on this topic – *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom Up* (1996). Hornberger's text and her use of the phrase 'bottom-up,' remind us that language policy does not always flow from the top-down. As Sutton and Levinson (2001: p. 3) have said, individuals and groups "engage in situated behaviors that are both constrained and enabled by existing structures, but which allow the person to exercise agency in the emerging situation." Thus, both the structure and the activity are parts of a complex process of dynamic construction in multiple directions and with multiple stakeholders. The line of power is not always linear from top to bottom since speakers have agency and language policy interacts with ideologies, global, national, and local forces. This more dynamic view of language policy, has spurred the recent focus on ethnographic studies of language policy (Hornberger and Johnson, 2007, Johnson, 2009; McCarty, 2011). These more grounded studies of language policy have taken a lens of language not as a system of structures, but of language as embodied practice, as interactions and practices, as languaging (Becker, 1995). Thus, language policy has taken up the attitudes, uses and management of languaging, and its pluralization, translanguaging (García, 2009). Translanguaging refers to the entire linguistic repertoire of bilingual people as they adjust their fluid discourse to different social, cultural, and political contexts, thus giving voice to new social realities.

Spolsky (2004) makes clear that if language policy takes on an ecological lens, two things follow:

1. Language policy must consider not just those language varieties that are recognized, but the entire sociolinguistic repertoire of the community.
2. Language policy cannot be considered except in relationship to the "social, political, economic, cultural, religious and ideological context that makes up human society" (p. 218).

But it is important to consider not only what language planning is and how it evolved, but also what have been the goals of the enterprise and why it is that this field has emerged and that these efforts have happened. We turn now to the goals and motivations for language planning, providing the context for some of the language policy efforts that we have been describing.

Goals and Motivations for Language Policy

Goals and motivations are different aspects of the same thing. Goals refer to what the action of language planning directs us toward. Motivation, however, is why we're impelled toward that goal. While classical language planning was more directed toward specific goals, the development of the field has emphasized how motivations are ideological and political. I first review the goals from a classical language planning perspective and then turn to how psychological and linguistic

motivations for language planning interact with socio-political and economic ones.

Goals: Linguistic and Social Goals

Nahir (1984) identified 11 goals for language planning:

1. *Language purification*, that is, maintaining linguistic consistency and standards of a language, usually through the development of prescriptive grammars and dictionaries.
2. *Language revival*, language revitalization and language reversal, encompassing efforts at restoring the language.
3. *Language reform*, that is, changing the orthography, spelling, lexicon, or grammar of a language in order to facilitate language use.
4. *Language standardization* for effective communication, accomplished usually through pedagogical grammars and dictionaries.
5. *Language spread*, an attempt to increase the number of speakers of a language, usually by having speakers shift to another language.
6. *Lexical modernization*, that is, expanding the capacity of a language to deal with new concepts and technology;
7. *Terminological unification*, also known as term planning, and having to do with development of equivalent terminology across geographic areas, especially terms having to do with medicine, science, industries, aviation and maritime navigation, and technology.
8. *Stylistic simplification*, attempts to make text more readable and less complex in lexicon and syntax.
9. *Interlingual communication* to facilitate communication between members of different speech communities.
10. *Language maintenance*, having to do with the preservation of a language.
11. *Auxiliary code standardization*. Here Nahir (1984) refers to "signs for the deaf, place names, and rules of transliteration and transcription" (p. 318).

All of these are important goals of the language planning enterprise and may be seen this way today. But what are the motivations for language planning? Why is it that these goals are pursued? What are the wishes and desires that motivate government, agencies, families, special groups, and individuals to pursue, adopt, or negotiate language policies? These questions are better answered by the scholarship of Joshua A. Fishman.

Motivations: Independence versus Interdependence

Fishman (2000, 2006) has pointed out that all efforts of language planning boil down to a super-factor of *independence versus interdependence*. By independence Fishman means whether the social group wants to be considered self-sufficient and autonomous of another. Interdependence refers to wanting to be affiliated with another social group. He develops a motivational theory for language policy that is divided into these two super-factors.

Language Policy for Independence

According to Fishman, *language policy for independence* is carried out through four processes: (1) ausbau, (2) uniqueness, (3) purification, and (4) classicization. Some of the cases that follow

are from Fishman (2006), whereas others are from other sources, and especially from García and Fishman (2012).

1. *Ausbau*. This process builds on the work of Heinz Kloss (1967) who spoke about *abstandsprache* (language by virtue of linguistic distance) and *ausbausprache* (language by virtue of development). For Fishman the process of ausbau refers to language policy where the purpose is to build a language away from another; that is, to distance it from another. To contextualize this process, I provide the reader with some examples.
   a. Noah Webster developed the American English dictionary in 1783 as a way of distancing American English from British English.
   b. Urdu and Hindi adopted different scripts to differentiate one from the other. Hindi uses the Devanagari script, while Urdu uses a modified version of the Perso-Arabic script, with Nasta'liq the preferred calligraphic style. Although Hindi borrows strongly from Sanskrit, Urdu draws on Persian and Arabic.
   c. Norway has spurred several reforms in order to differentiate Norwegian from Danish. The result has been two written standards – Bokmål (book language) and Nynorsk (new Norwegian).
   d. In Central Asia the case of Azerbaijani/Turkish and Tajik/Farsi are important cases of *ausbau* by which languages that had been previously considered to be one language are now claimed to be autonomous from others, as they are linked to specific ethnic identities, thus claiming to be separate nations needing a state. For example, shortly after independence in Azerbaijan, the state language was first identified, in 1992, as 'Turkish' (türk dili). But there were also competing names proposed, 'Azerbaijani Turkic' and 'Azerbaijani.' In the 1995 constitution, the name 'Azerbaijani' was chosen. Thus, renaming the language emphasized the link between language and a separate Azerbaijani nationhood. Similarly, in Tajikistan, the 1989 language law referred to the language as 'Tajik (Farsi).' But in 1999 the word 'Farsi' was removed from the state language law, emphasizing separateness and autonomy as a nation of Tajikistan.
   e. This same process of ausbau has operated in the Slavic World (Hroch, 2010) by naming Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin, for example, when they were all previously considered Serbo-Croatian.
2. *Uniqueness*. Some language policy efforts aim to make a language more heavily one's own.
   a. Johannes Aavik (1880–1973) selected 'artificial' syllables for Estonian, ensuring that it would not be mistaken for Finnish or swallowed up by Russian.
3. *Purification*. This type of language policy is driven by fear of the language being contaminated. The first two examples have to do with languages, but the next two have to do with languaging; that is, the action of using language.
   a. The Loi Toubon in France that was passed in 1994 was meant to protect French from English. The law states: "By virtue of the Constitution, French is the language of the Republic, and the French language is a fundamental element of the character and heritage of France." As such, French is mandated in all official government

publications, advertisements, workplace, commercial contracts, and government-financed schools.

b. The promotion of Hebrew as a result of the revitalization that accompanied the formation of the state of Israel was accompanied by a ban on Yiddish, which was the language of most Ashkenazi Jews in the state. The Pure Language Society was set up in 1889 to stamp out Yiddish because of fear that it would contaminate the Hebrew of Israel.

c. The efforts of language academies such as the Académie Française and the Real Academia Española in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This last one had a motto that said to "limpia, fija y da esplendor" (cleanses, stabilizes, and gives splendor).

d. The management of bad language, as with swearing or crude language, obscenities, profane language, blasphemy, racist, and sexist language.

4. *Classicization* refers to the policies that attempt to keep the language very close to its classical source. Examples follow:
   a. As explained in point 1, Hindi draws on Sanskrit, whereas Urdu draws on Arabic and Persian. Both languages attempt in this way to get closer to their classical source.
   b. Modern Tamil has attempted to shed Sanskrit loanwords in order to show continuity with its classical past as Old Tamil. This was the platform of the Pure Tamil movement of the early twentieth century.

Language Policy for Interdependence

In contrast to the four processes identified above, *language policy for interdependence* follows four different courses of action: (1) einbau, (2) internationalization, (3) regionalization, and (4) vernacularization. Again, examples are from Fishman (2006) and from García and Fishman (2012).

1. *Einbau*. This process is the opposite of ausbau. The language development is not meant to distance the languages from each other; instead, it brings them closer. There are many examples of this process:
   a. The Republic of Moldova declared itself independent in 1991 after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The Language Law speaks of a Moldovan-Romanian linguistic identity, and little by little the few distinctions that once existed between Romanian and Moldovan are disappearing. Linguists and politicians have been acknowledging that the two languages are identical, although many continue to call their language Moldovan.
   b. Chinese authorities insist that the many languages spoken by Han Chinese are all 'dialects' of Chinese, despite the fact that they are all mutually unintelligible and could be considered different languages.

2. *Internationalization*. Some language policies are meant to bring language into compliance with the international community or as a focus of interest in the international community.
   a. Under the rule of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, Turkish was westernized by adopting the Latin script, and adopting many French influences. In 1928, the Arabic-based Ottoman Turkish alphabet was replaced by the Latin alphabet. Afterward, a Turkish Language Association was established to replace loanwords of Arabic and Persian origin with Turkish equivalents.
   b. Although Kazakh, Kyrgyz, and Tajik are still written in Cyrillic, Azerbaijani, Turkmen, and Uzbek are written in the Latin alphabet, emphasizing their growing internationalization.
   c. The choice of the Latin script for the Oromo language in Ethiopia, as opposed to the Ge'ez used for Amharic and Tigrinya, has put Oromo in an internationalization path.
   d. The British Council and the US government have supported the greater use of English in international communication (Phillipson, 1992). The Goethe Institute, the Japanese Foundation, and the Instituto Cervantes do the same for German, Japanese, and Spanish, respectively.

3. *Regionalization*. Some language policies are meant to bring people from similar regions together.
   a. Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia derive from Bahasa Melayu (Malay) and despite their differences, borrow broadly from each other.

4. *Vernacularization*. Language policies that favor popular usage have the capacity to bring languages closer together.

But not all language planning has to do with choosing between independence and interdependence. Beyond the model proposed by Fishman (2006), we can identify motivations as stemming from three other supra-factors – exclusion, inclusion and cultural autonomy. I turn now to the ideological aspects of inclusion and exclusion that motivates language policy.

Motivations: Exclusion, Inclusion, and Cultural Autonomy

Seen from an ideological angle, language policies respond to three axes that have more to do with the speakers of a language than with language itself – exclusion, inclusion, and cultural autonomy.

Language Policy for Exclusion

When the motivation for language policy is exclusion, it is carried out through three processes:

1. *Shaming*. These language policies, often the result of language-in-education policies, result in stigmatization and exclusion of minority groups. They were prevalent in colonial contexts, and continue to be exercised in many states today.
   a. In Ghana, students who spoke African languages during colonial times were forced to wear a sign on their chest that said: "I'm stupid, I spoke a vernacular on the school's premises today."
   b. Indigenous children throughout the world are subjected to monolingual education policies with a purpose of shaming students who speak these languages. This is also the case of autochthonous minorities throughout Europe, of immigrant children throughout the world, and of other minorities. This shaming also includes those who speak varieties of language that are stigmatized, for example, African Americans in the USA.
   c. Until recently, Deaf children were educated through oralism which insisted on speech production and forbade them to use sign language.

    d. Latino students in the USA are often made to think that they speak a corrupted 'Spanglish,' when the translanguaging they perform is the discursive norm of all bilingual communities.

2. *Othering*. Language minorities today are not openly excluded from society and education with 'sticks.' Instead, other systems exclude those who do not conform linguistically.

    a. Students in the UK and the USA are excluded from educational opportunities when they do not do well in standardized examinations that test the use of standard English.

    b. Immigrants who do not speak the language of the state are excluded from citizenship opportunities by language tests. For example, the Dutch government requires that immigrant applicants take a Dutch language proficiency exam.

    c. In the UK and the USA, the use of standard English in education and assessment responds to a political ideology of monolingualism. In the UK, the Swann Report (1985) established policy that there should not be any 'separate provision' for language minority children and that bilingual education should not be supported. In the USA the No Child Left Behind Act requires states to assess student development of standard English.

3. *Silencing*. Language policy often attempts to silence other voices, erasing the power of people.

    a. Basing its dominance on its shape as a perfect hexagon, France has maintained that only French is tied to French identity. As a result, the other languages of France – Basque, Breton, Catalan, Corsican, German, Occitan, and Flemish – have been silenced until recently. The presence of regional languages in the regions where they are spoken was recognized by the French constitution (Article 75-1, 23 July 2008). Nevertheless, France's hesitation to ratify the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages has to do with its fear to extend the expression of French identity to languages other than French.

    b. The banning of signing at schools for the deaf in the 1880s was motivated by an ideology that oral speech was the only way to pray to God, and thus, for deaf children to be saved.

    c. When Algeria obtained independence from France in 1962, it declared Classical Arabic the sole official and national language, rejecting Algerian Arabic and the Berber languages (also known as *Tamazight*).

    d. The Education Act of 1870 in Wales prohibited Welsh children from speaking Welsh at school, and required them to learn English.

    e. In the USA, California, Arizona, and Massachusetts have passed legislation banning bilingual education and the use of languages other than English as a means of instruction. And the word 'bilingual' has been silenced in all public discourse.

Language Policy for Inclusion

Even though most language education policy efforts have focused on exclusion of groups and peoples, we can also identify policies that do the opposite; that is, that include. *Language policy for inclusion* is carried out through three different means:

1. Bilingualism/multilingualism

    a. In Canada, the declaration of the Official Languages Act (1969), made English and French languages of Canadian identity.

    b. Singapore has adopted four official languages – Mandarin, Malay, Tamil, and English. The first three were chosen for identity purposes of the three major ethno-linguistic groups. And yet, these languages are mother tongues of only 17% of the Malay, Indian, and Chinese population. Malay is the mother tongue of 12% of Malays, Tamil of 5% of Indians, and Mandarin of .1% of the Chinese population (Rubdy, 2005: 57). English, however, was selected as a neutral 'other language' to serve as the language of interethnic communication.

2. Language teaching

    a. Some languages are taught to give advantage to people. This is the case especially of English throughout the world. In Africa, it is the case of Swahili in Eastern Africa, Wolof in Senegal, Akan in Ghana, Hausa in Northern Nigeria, and Lingala in Zaire.

    b. In some bilingual education programs, translanguaging is accepted as the norm of language practices in bilingual communities, and used to teach.

3. Diversity and pluralism

    a. In the 1970s and 1980s, many advocated for the use of nonsexist language, a use that is the norm today.

    b. In *Lau versus Nichols* (1974), the US Supreme Court ruled that educating English Language Learners in a language they did not understand was not equal educational opportunity and that something had to be done about the language of instruction.

Language Policy for Cultural Autonomy

Cultural autonomy refers to choices people make to be free "from domination by outsiders, not freedom to be independent" (García and Fishman, 2012: 143).

1. Since the Statute of Autonomy that was passed in 1979 after Francisco Franco's death, Catalan has been the only language used in the government of the *Generalitat de Catalunya* (the government), and must be used as medium of instruction, since it is the 'lengua propia' (own language) of the people. Since 1983, Catalonia has followed a policy of 'linguistic normalization' intended to protect and extend the use of Catalan.

2. In 1974 Québec declared French the sole official language of Québec, the language of Québecois identity, and Bill 101, the Charter of the French Language in 1977, made French the language of work, business, and education in Québec.

Conclusion

Depending on the ecological relationship between the social, historical, and political context and language, language policies act differently. The global world of today, with its interconnectedness made possible by technology produces different kinds of

language policies. Often the language policies are in conflict with each other, responding to the different wishes and motivations of sectors in society. The field has evolved from one where descriptions abounded and the state was in charge to one that is developing a theory of social action motivated by the struggle created by power and inequality. With a critical ethnographic lens, language policy is now equipped to teach us much about the ideological, socio-structural, and historical bases of language use, language attitudes, and language management.

See also: Areal Linguistics; Code Switching: Linguistic; Corpus Linguistics; Dialectology; Indo-European Languages; Language Contact; Language and Social Class; Linguistic Typology; Pidgin and Creole Languages; Sign Language: Psychological and Neural Aspects.

Bibliography

Becker, A.L., 1995. Beyond Translation: Essays toward a Modern Philosophy. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

Bourdieu, P., 1991. Language and Symbolic Power. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Cooper, R.L., 1989. Language Planning and Social Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Das Gupta, J., Ferguson, C., 1977. Problems of language planning. In: Rubin, J., Jernudd, B., Das Gupta, J., Fishman, J.A., Ferguson, C. (Eds.), Language Planning Processes. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 3–8.

Fishman, J.A., 1965. Who speaks what language to whom and when? La Linguistique 2, 67–88.

Fishman, J.A., 1971. In: Rubin, J., Jernudd, B.H. (Eds.), The Impact of Nationalism on Language Planning: Some Comparisons Between early Twentieth-Century Europe and More Recent Years in South and Southeast Asia, pp. 3–20.

Fishman, J.A., 1972. The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society. Newbury House Publishers, Rowley, MA.

Fishman, J.A., 2000. The status agenda in corpus planning. In: Lambert, R.D., Shohamy, E. (Eds.), Language Policy and Pedagogy: Essays in Honor of A. Ronald Walton. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 43–51.

Fishman, J.A., 2006. Do Not Leave Your Language Alone: The Hidden Status Agendas within Corpus Planning in Language Policy. Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.

Fishman, J.A., Ferguson, C., Das Gupta, J. (Eds.), 1968. Language Problems of Developing Nations. John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Fishman, J.A., García, O. (Eds.), 2010. Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity Disciplinary and Regional Perspectives, second ed., vol. 1. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Fishman, J.A., García, O. (Eds.), 2011. Handbook of language and ethnic identity. The Success and Failure Continuum, vol. 2. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

García, O., 2009. Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective. Blackwell/Wiley, Malden, MA and Oxford.

García, O., 2010. In: Fishman, J.A., García, O. (Eds.), Languaging and Ethnifying, pp. 519–534.

García, O., Fishman, J.A., 2012. Power-sharing and cultural autonomy: some sociolinguistic principles. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 213, 143–148.

Haugen, E., 1959. Planning for a standard language in Norway. Anthropological Linguistics 1 (3), 8–21.

Haugen, E., 1966. Linguistics and language planning. In: Bright, W. (Ed.), Sociolinguistics. Mouton, The Hague.

Haugen, E., 1972. The Ecology of Language. Stanford University press, Stanford.

Hornberger, N., 1996. Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom Up. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Hornberger, N., 2006. Frameworks and models in language policy and planning. In: Ricenton, T. (Ed.), Language Policy: Theory and Method. Blackwell, Malden, MA, pp. 24–41.

Hornberger, N., Johnson, D.C., 2007. Slicing the onion ethnographically: layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. TESOL Quarterly 41, 509–532.

Hornberger, N., Ricento, T.K. (Eds.), 1996. Language Planning and Policy. TESOL Quarterly 30 (3) (special issue).

Hroch, M., 2010. The Slavic World. In: Fishman, J.A., García, O. (Eds.), Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity, vol. 1. Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York, pp. 269–284.

Irvine, J., Gal, S., 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In: Kroskrity, P. (Ed.), Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities and Identities. School of American Research Press, and Oxford: James Currey, Santa Fe, NM, pp. 34–84.

Jernudd, B.H., 1993. Language planning form a management perspective: an interpretation of findings. In: Jahr, E.H. (Ed.), Language Conflict and Language Planning. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 133–142.

Jernudd, B.H., 1997. The revolution of sociolinguistics. In: Paulston, C.B., Tucker, R.G. (Eds.), The Early Days of Sociolinguistics. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Dallas, pp. 131–138.

Jernudd, B.H., Das Gupta, J., 1971. Towards a theory of language planning. In: Rubin, J., Jernudd, B. (Eds.), Can Language Be Planned? University Press of Hawaii, Honolulu, pp. 195–216.

Johnson, D.C., 2009. Ethnography of language policy. Language Policy 8, 139–159.

Kaplan, R.B., Baldauf, R.B., 1997. Language Planning: From Practice to Theory. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, UK.

Kloss, H., 1967. Types of multilingual communities: a discussion of ten variables. In: Lieberson, S. (Ed.), Explorations in Sociolinguistics. Indiana U., Bloomington, pp. 7–17. Originally published in The Sociolinguistic Inquiry, 36(2), Spring (1966).

Kloss, H., 1969. Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report. International Center for Research on Bilingualism, Quebec.

Kroskrity, P. (Ed.), 2000. Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities and Identities. School of American Research Press, & Oxford: James Currey, Santa Fe, NM.

McCarty, T.L. (Ed.), 2011. Ethnography and Language Policy. Routledge, New York and London.

Nahir, M., 1984. Language planning goals: a classification. Language Problems and Language Planning 8, 294–327.

Pavlenko, A., Blackledge, A., 2004. Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, UK.

Phillipson, R., 1992. Linguistic Imperialism. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ricento, T., 2000. Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. Journal of Sociolinguistics 4, 196–213.

Ricento, T. (Ed.), 2006. An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method. Blackwell, Malden, MA.

Rubin, J., Jernudd, B. (Eds.), 1971. Can Language Be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations. East-West Center and University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu.

Rubdy, R., 2005. Remaking Singapore for the New Age: official ideology and the realities of practice in language-in-education. In: Lin, A., Martin, P.W. (Eds.), Decolonisation, Globalisation. Language-in-Education Policy and Practice. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, UK, pp. 55–73.

Shohamy, E., 2006. Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches. Routledge, London and New York.

Spolsky, B., 2004. Language Policy. Cambridge University press, Cambridge.

Spolsky, B., 2009. Language Management. Cambridge University press, Cambridge.

Spolsky, B. (Ed.), 2012. The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Suleiman, Y., 2004. A War of Words: Language and Conflict in the Middle East. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Sutton, M., Levinson, B.A.U. (Eds.), 2001. Policy as Practice: Toward a Comparative Sociocultural Analysis of Educational Policy. Ablex, Westport, CT.

Tollefson, J.W., 1991. Planning Language, Planning Inequality: Language Policy in the Community. Longman, London.

Woolard, K., Schieffelin, B., 1994. Language ideology. Annual Review of Anthropology 23, 55–82.

Wright, S., 2004. Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalism to Globalisation. Palgrave, New York.