called propositional attitudes, since they involve the having of an attitude to a content or proposition, for example, having the belief attitude to the 'Paris is a beautiful city' content. These intentional mental states play a central role in cognitive psychology in the explanation of human purposeful behavior. For example, it is because Madge wants to drink some Pepsi and she believes that there is some Pepsi in her refrigerator that she goes to the refrigerator and reaches inside it. On the language of thought (LoT) view, having a belief or a desire, etc., with a certain content entails being in a relation to an internally represented sentence with that content, so the explanation of Madge's refrigerator-oriented behavior will include a specification of the interaction of the sentences that represent the content of her relevant beliefs and desires.

The LoT hypothesis arises in the context of the current computational model of the mind, whereby mental processes, such as reasoning, are sequences of mental states and the transitions between states are effected computationally. Conceiving of these computations as formal/syntactic operations defined over mental representations gives a mechanical explanation for mental processes. That is, they operate on symbols in virtue of the form of the symbol, not in virtue of any semantic property of the symbol, just like the operations performed by a computer or the transitions from line to line in a logic proof. This approach to the causal explanation of mental processes is known as 'methodological solipsism' (Fodor, 1981; Lycan, 1990a). It follows that two beliefs or desires are cognitively distinct if and only if the representations of their contents are formally distinct. For example, consider the desire to meet the husband of Janet Fodor and the desire to meet the staunchest advocate of the language of thought hypothesis. These are identical in their truth-conditional content (given that the definite description in each case picks out the same individual in the world, namely Jerry Fodor). However, so far as cognitive activity is concerned, these are quite distinct types of desire, as they may each be the result of a distinct sequence of thought, and each may cause further different thoughts. Furthermore, they may issue in quite distinct behaviors: in the first case, one might telephone Janet Fodor to ask her and her husband for dinner; in the second, one might seek out conferences on the philosophy of mind. The crucial point here is that thoughts have their causal roles as a function of their formal properties. Semantic properties are respected only in so far as they are mimicked by formal properties, which, of course, they are to at least some extent, since deductive reasoning, which preserves truth, plays a major role in human thought.

Why Should Thoughts Have Syntactic Structure?

One could be an 'intentional realist,' that is, one could accept (a) that beliefs and desires really exist, (b) that they are physically instantiated in the brain, and (c) that they play a causal role in thinking and acting, without positing a **language** of thought in which the objects of attitudes are couched. What's crucial about language is constituent structure, that is, that a sentence is made up of parts and these same parts can occur in a range of different relations with each other in different sentences. So what distinguishes the LoT view from other intentionally realist views is that it entails that belief/desire states are structured states. Fodor (1975) claimed that the language of thought was implicit in the computational approach to psychological explanation since computation presupposes a medium in which to compute. However, the emergence of an alternative computational approach, connectionism (see Sterelney, 1990 for an introduction and *see* **Associationism and Connectionism**), indicates that more argument for structured thought is required, since according to connectionism the mental causes of intelligent behavior can be modeled by patterns of activation across networks of nodes and connections, involving no level of symbolic representation. One of Fodor's (1987b) arguments for syntactic thought turns on the 'productivity' and 'systematicity' of thought. The set of thoughts is potentially infinite and the ability to think any particular thought is intrinsically connected to the ability to think various other thoughts. So, for example, anyone who can form the thought 'the ruthless spy saw the desperate terrorist' can also form the thoughts 'the desperate terrorist saw the ruthless spy' and 'the desperate spy saw the terrorist,' etc. The parallel with natural language is obvious, and since the explanation for the productivity and systematicity of language is its combinatorial syntax and semantics, it is natural to assume that thought too has combinatorial structure.

The Relation between Thought and Public Language

Fodor believes that the semanticity of natural language, that is, the 'about-the-world' property of linguistic expressions, is dependent on the representationality of thought. So, the answer to the question 'How is it that the English sentence, "Paris is a beautiful city," is about Paris?' is, roughly: 'Because that sentence is a vehicle for expressing a thought about Paris.' On this view, an account of the semanticity of natural language follows from an account of how thoughts refer to the world. For interesting ideas about this logically prior theory of 'psychosemantics,' see Fodor (1987a) and Millikan (1989).

See also: Associationism and Connectionism; Cognitive Science: Overview; Fodor, Jerry (b. 1935); Philosophy of Mind.

Bibliography

Carruthers P (1996). *Language, thought and consciousness: an essay in philosophical psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies M (1998). 'Language, thought and the language of thought.' In Carruthers P & Boucher J (eds.) *Language and thought: interdisciplinary themes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 226–247.

Fodor J (1975). *The language of thought*. Sussex: The Harvester Press.

Fodor J (1981). *Representations*. Cambridge, MA: Bradford Books/MIT Press.

Fodor J (1987a). *Psychosemantics: the problem of meaning in the philosophy of mind*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Bradford Books/MIT Press. Reprinted in Lycan (ed.) (1990b), 282–299.

Fodor J (1987b) 'Why there still has to be a language of thought.' In Fodor (1987a), 135–167. Reprinted in Lycan (ed.) (1990b), 282–299.

Lycan W G (1990a). 'The language of thought hypothesis.' In Lycan (ed.) (1990b), 277–281.

Lycan W G (ed.) (1990b). *Mind and cognition: a reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Millikan R (1989). 'Biosemantics.' *The Journal of Philosophy 86(6)*, 281–297.

Sterelney K (1990). *The representational theory of mind*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Language Planning and Policy: Models

B Spolsky, Jerusalem, Israel
R D Lambert, University of Pennsylvania, PA, USA

Just as with many new fields, there continues to be disagreement over the name of this one, variously called language policy (Nesiah, 1954; Sibayan, 1974), language treatment (Neustupný, 1970), language cultivation (Prague School, 1973), language engineering (Sibayan, 1974), language planning (Haugen, 1959), and language management (Jernudd, 2001). While the last five are more or less synonymous, referring to attempts by authorities to modify language behavior, the first can refer to the customary practices in choice of language items and variety in a speech community, or to a specific decision or set of decisions to modify those practices. To avoid confusion, we will use the terms as follows. The language policy of a speech community (an undefined term, ranging in size from a family through a nation-state to a multinational grouping) consists of the commonly agreed set of choices of language items – whether sounds or words or grammar – or language varieties – whether codes or dialects or named languages – and the beliefs or ideologies associated with those choices. It can be found in language practices and beliefs or in formal policy decisions such as laws, constitutions, or regulations. Language management, planning, engineering, cultivation, and treatment are actions taken by formal authorities such as governments or other agencies or people who believe that they have authority, such as parents, teachers, or academies, to modify the language choices made by those they claim to have under their control (Spolsky, 2004). Language management itself has three components: the development of explicit language plans and policies, their implementation (by rules or laws or resource allocation), and the evaluation of results and effects (cf. Rubin and Jernudd, 1979: 2–3).

Managing Bad and Good Language

Language policy makers and analysts apply the term policy and its synonyms to a wide variety of administrative levels ranging from international organizations (Van Els, 2001) to world regions (Extra and Gorter, 2001; Kaplan and Baldauf, 2003) to countries (Grenoble, 2003; Lo Bianco and Wickert, 2001), or to single educational institutions (Karyolemou, 2002). The term has been expanded to include what is referred to as 'grass roots language policy', that is, policy originating in or influenced by the affected members of the speech community (Hornberger, 1996). Cooper (1989) shows that it can usefully be applied to a family level.

The main principles of language policy become evident even at this simplest level. In any family, there is language policy, as shown by the normal choices of language in the speech practices of the group, viz., which variety of language is addressed in practice to each member. For instance, baby talk (Ferguson, 1964) may be used with very young children, heritage

languages (Cummins, 1983) with grandparents, or community languages (Smolicz and Secombe, 1985) with outsiders. In immigrant families, there is commonly a difference in language usage between adults, older children, and younger children. There are socially determined differences concerning who usually has the right to speak and what topics and forms of language are appropriate when the family gathers. In conversations between adult caretakers and children, there are commonly efforts to manage language choice, whether by encouraging the use of one variety or by attempting to discourage bad language. Definitions of what is bad language vary socially. It may consist of presumed mistakes in grammar or pronunciation, or the use of stigmatized forms or expressions such as cursing, obscenity, blasphemy, foreignisms, or inelegancies. Often beliefs or an ideology will be quite different from practice. Immigrant parents may think that their children should use either the heritage or the new language exclusively. Such beliefs may or may not lead to successful efforts at management.

The effort to avoid bad language and teach good language is carried outside the home into other institutions, particularly the school which takes a leading role in efforts to modify the language known and used by its pupils. Because of their central role in language socialization, school teachers are most comfortable, it seems, with a standardized variety of language, with clear statements on what is right and what is wrong. They commonly share the puristic belief, that there is a 'correct' variety of language, and, *contra* King Cnut, the key belief that language management is possible. They believe that they themselves use correct language: French teachers are sure they pronounce the *l* in *il vient* and Palestinian teachers are sure they teach in Modern Standard Arabic.

Correctness, however discovered or defined, is one common criterion for good language (Guitarte and Quintero, 1974). Another is the avoidance of obscenity, sometimes institutionalized in laws and regulations at the local and national government level. The United States has federal laws against obscenity, but standards and definitions are local (Harrison and Gilbert, 2000). Blasphemy, an obvious concern of religious institutions, is unlikely to be a matter of legislation in secular nations, but remains an issue in the many states with religiously dominated constitutions such as Pakistan. Seditious language, as opposed to actual sedition and violent language ('fighting words' in the laws of some southern U.S. states) is also criminalized in some nations.

A more recent criterion for good and bad language is 'political correctness', the avoidance of chauvinist or racist language. The campaign to avoid words or expressions that stigmatize racial or religious groups or that express prejudice based on gender (assigned or constructed) is about half a century old in the West. In the United States it has led to language management efforts especially by publishers and editors who try to ban gender-biased terminology and grammar (Pauwels, 1998).

A common criterion for language management, one that moves us closer to the realm associated with national language policy, is the avoidance of expressions and words considered foreign (Annamalai, 1989). One of the inevitable effects of culture and language contact, and it is difficult to distinguish the two, is a tendency to borrow foreign words along with the new concepts and artifacts that they label. In many situations, ideological opposition to foreign borrowings is nearly as strong as opposition to the use of foreign languages (Kroskrity, 1998). In Latin America from the conquest, there was puristic opposition to the use of 'americanismos', defined as words borrowed from native languages or locally coined, and a similar anti-foreign purism now calls for laws against borrowings from English (Rajagopalan, 2002). The idea of a pure uncontaminated language is widespread (Jernudd and Shapiro, 1989). Preventing linguistic corruption was and remains a key task of the French Academy. Most national language movements hold puristic beliefs, although the particular source of contamination (French in the Dutch-speaking portion of Belgium, Arabic in Turkish, Yiddish in Hebrew, Danish and now English in Icelandic) varies. Presumably, this represents a belief in the identifying and symbolic value of language. By admitting foreign elements, 'I may be weakening my national identity'.

Three important generalizations emerge from the discussion so far. One is the tension between pragmatic communicative goals (for instance, the caretaker aims to give the child the most efficient variety of language) and symbolic and social goals (identifying the speaker with a chosen social group). A second generalization relates to the linguistic and social levels on which policy can apply: linguistically, it can refer to a single sound or word (*ain't*) or to a labeled variety of language (jargon, English); socially, it can apply to a small social group such as a family or to a higher level such as a nation state or an international federation. A third generalization is that policy is manifested in practice, in beliefs or ideology, and in management activities, and while the three aspects are intertwined, they need not be consistent.

National Language Policies

Most analyses of language policy and management are concerned with formal, governmentally backed activities at the national or regional level aimed at controlling language knowledge and use within a country or region.

During the first phase of the study of language planning, Kloss (1969) proposed a useful distinction between what he called status planning, the determination of the status and functions of a language in a community (such as 'official' or 'national') and what he called corpus planning, the specification of the proper form a particular language should take (such as writing system or spelling or approved lexicon or grammar). Planning was considered an appropriate term in the 1960s, as one part of national development planning (Das Gupta and Ferguson, 1977).

Cooper (1989) added to these two the field of acquisition planning, the determination of which languages should be taught to those who do not speak them and how. While these three domains are conceptually distinct, in practice they overlap. Making a language variety official usually involves standardizing it, writing it down, and modernizing it. It also requires teaching it to citizens who do not know it. Foreign and domestic language policies are blended in situations like the status of French in Canada, the retention of colonial languages in Africa, and the status of trans-border languages in ethnic enclaves such as Swedish in Finland or French and Italian in Switzerland or French and German in Italy.

Corpus Planning and Management

Concern for the form of language may be discerned in the efforts of parents, teachers, and other caretakers to make sure that their charges speak clearly and use forms that are acceptable. It appears more fully developed and institutionalized in efforts to maintain the purity and correctness of sacred texts and in the educational systems that take on some responsibility for correctness. Indeed, language management agencies (Dominguez and López, 1995) are often part of a ministry of education.

More generally, in many countries, especially those where the issue of status is not salient, the largest share of language management is concerned with corpus policy, the prescription of the proper form a language should take, and the cultivation of a language to handle appropriate functions (Prague School, 1973). This can take a variety of forms. In many of the least developed countries and among some indigenous groups in developed countries, the principal corpus activity is the adoption or adaptation of a script and the promotion of literacy among its speakers (Fishman, 1977).

Another frequent goal is language purification (Neustupný, 1989). Commonly this involves an attempt to return to a sometimes fictitious primal language, purging the modern language of loan words and expressions imported from other languages (Jernudd and Shapiro, 1989). Examples are the purging of Persian and the substitution of Sanskrit-based words in Hindi, and the reverse in Urdu (R. King, 2001). Similarly, the deletion of foreign influences in German during the Nazi years and the perpetual struggle of French against Franglish (Weinstein, 1989) are of the same order. Sometimes purification is more extensive. For instance, under Atatürk, a deliberate attempt was made to simplify and modernize Turkish (G. Lewis, 1999). Older linguistic forms borrowed from Ottoman Turkish, Persian, and Arabic were replaced with elements identified with a Turkic past, and the Perso-Arabic script was converted to a Roman one. Similarly, in China the development of Putonghua was accompanied by extensive modernization of vocabulary and morphology (Coulmas, 1991). In a similar vein, the attempt to create a pan-national standard Arabic and to diffuse it throughout the Middle East and North Africa, overlaying the sometimes mutually unintelligible country dialects, has required major innovation in the writing system, grammar, and lexicon of the language (Suleiman, 2003).

Sometimes corpus activity has been directed to the revival or rejuvenation of a language that historically had become fossilized or marginalized, for instance, the attempt to support the use of Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes (K. King, 2000). Similar management may be found in the attempts to spread the use of Celtic languages in Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Cornwall, and Brittany. In the case of Cornish, extinct for nearly two centuries, and with only medieval texts available, the decision to revive the language required a major effort to rebuild the vocabulary.

Another example showing how corpus management fosters the status of marginalized languages is the use of institutional power to promote selected languages. For instance, the status of Hebrew was transformed from a sacred and literary language in the Jewish diaspora to the recognized language for everyday use in the Jewish community in Mandatory Palestine, a development which prepared for it for its role as the official language in Israel (Spolsky and Shohamy, 1999). Classical Arabic has been used to enhance religious identity among Muslims; in the Arabic speaking countries, it is usually listed alongside religion in the constitutional definition of the state. After Indian independence, Sanskrit was listed in the Constitution as one of the official languages of India, was proposed as a medium for the transmission of news on the radio, and is now set as the medium of instruction in three universities. The new

draft constitution of Iraq moves Kurdish close to equality with Arabic. An Official Maori Language Act in New Zealand provided official status for what was considered an endangered language. Official status is not enough – Ireland and New Zealand and Valencia were able to increase the numbers who have learned Irish and Maori and Catalan by adding resources for teaching the languages, but they have not so far been able to increase the number of people actually using the language.

The converse of the policy of promoting little-used languages is the deliberate removal or downgrading of languages. The systematic suppression of the use of Tibetan in China or Kurdish in Turkey or the autochthonous languages among the American North, Central, and South American Indians are clear examples. In the same vein, but less dramatic, are the efforts by the former Soviet states (Hogan-Brun and Ramoniene, 2003; Landau and Kellner-Heinkele, 2001) to replace Russian with their titular language. While most of this policy is directed at language use – in government, the press, the media, the educational system – it also includes changes in the language itself. These changes include the purging of Russian forms and vocabulary (added during the period of Stalinist Russification) from the titular language, a search for alternative cultural and historical roots – in the case of Muslim states emphasizing Turkic origins – and the creation of neologisms both to replace Russian borrowings and to modernize the traditional language (Grenoble, 2003). In most of these nations, shifts to roman scripts had begun even before independence, but then became more pervasive. In some of the former satellite Baltic and Eastern European states, the Russian language has been stripped of its dominant position in government and the educational system.

Status Management

The status of a language variety refers to the domains and extent of its use and to its associated rankings in society. More particularly, status management usually refers to the designation of languages as official for use in the public sector and in the educational system. Most scholarly analysis of language planning and policy is concerned with status, although, as Fishman (2000) points out, status and corpus are usually intertwined. The nature of status policy depends substantially on differences in the number and types of languages spoken in a country (Lambert, 1999). Countries with a single dominant language face a different set of policy issues compared with linguistically dyadic or triadic countries – those with two or three relatively equal languages. Similarly, countries that are linguistic-mosaics, that have a large number of significant languages, have different sets of problems from monolingual and dyadic or triadic language countries.

Ideologically Monolingual Countries

Few countries are truly linguistically homogeneous – Iceland is probably the closest (Vikor, 2001) – but many countries in Western Europe, the Americas, and Asia have perceived themselves as being essentially monolingual. In Europe, this is especially striking in the face of persistent multilingualism. The recently published *Encyclopedia of the Languages of Europe* (Price, 2000) listed some 300 historical and currently used languages in Europe. Several of the countries in East Asia, too, essentially see themselves as monolingual although each contains important language minorities. In these cases, there is generally what Fishman (1969) labeled a single Great Tradition, which is associated with a single language. Generally, these countries leave the interest in the selection and standardization of the national language to the field of historical linguistics, but for those with a more recent history, there are studies looking at the first congress proclaiming the language (Fishman, 1993) and of the struggle for standardization. In linguistically homogeneous countries (Fishman, 1966a), the principal focus of language policy has been on corpus management, the cultivation and purification of the national language (for instance, Pedersen, 2003), supplemented in some countries – notably France, Germany, and Japan – by efforts to export the national language abroad (language diffusion policy) (Cooper, 1982).

Within ideologically 'linguistically homogeneous' countries, language policies that relate to linguistic minorities depend in part on the kind of minority involved.

Ethno-Linguistic Regional Minorities Long-standing, geographically concentrated minorities with a recognized history and culture receive the bulk of attention in both governmental and educational language policy, as well as in academic analysis. Examples of such minorities are the Swedish-speaking minority in Finland, the Sami in Finland, Sweden, and Russia, and the Celtic language communities in Ireland, Great Britain, and France. The dominant paradigm in European status policy and in academic analysis is the protection of such linguistic minorities against the absorptive effects of the dominant national language.

A wide variety of country and language specific case studies is now available (Dorian, 1998; Fishman, 2002; Grenoble and Whaley, 1998; Hale, 1991; Krauss, 1991). Most of them exemplify this approach. The use of terms such as 'threatened', 'dying', 'endangered' languages and at the extreme, 'language death', and 'linguistic genocide' reflect the nature of such analyses. The intended effect of these terms is to characterize the aspirations of ethno-linguistic minorities in terms of group and individual rights. These rights are elaborated by law in many monolingual countries, as well as in covenants and resolutions enacted by international bodies: The European Charter for Minority or Regional Languages, a Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, The Oslo Recommendations regarding the Linguistic Rights of National Minorities, The Hague Recommendation Regarding the Education Rights of National Minorities, and the Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights (Ferguson, 1968; May, 2001; Nic Shuibhne, 2001). For instance, the term 'other languages' of Europe is a product of an international organization, the European Union. It refers to "all languages apart from the eleven official languages that are ignored in public and official activities of the European Union (Extra and Gorter, 2001: 1)." In practical European Union policy, with its first principle of national sovereignty, the identification of a protected linguistic minority is reserved to the founder states, which have the option to exclude any variety they label as a dialect, as Sweden in 1995 decided that the Charter applied to Sami, Tornedal Finnish, Finnish, Romani Chib, and Yiddish, but not Skanian with 1.5 million speakers, and France prefers not to recognize Occitan.

The effect of official designation of a minority language, whether within a country or internationally, can be of substantial benefit to the group, expanding its claim to educational and governmental support. Consequently, there is constant pressure to expand the list, drawing the line further down the continuum from language to dialect or giving legal identity to different types of languages. For instance, the deaf community has sought recognition of sign languages as separate minority languages, but the European Union continues to resist this. Efforts have also been made in the United States to declare Black English a minority language, and thus subject to special protection. There has been a movement to imbed the concept of language rights in a larger framework, the promotion of multilingualism for the general population, autochthonous or immigrant (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

Policies toward linguistic minorities differ according to their relative size, their degree of geographic concentration, their historical roots, their extra-country linkages, the strength of their ethnic identification, and the political activism of their leadership (Paulston, 1994). The features of official language policy that vary according to these characteristics are: (a) a language's role in the education system, in particular the class and school levels in which it is used, and whether it is taught as a subject or used as a medium of instruction; (b) its role in governmental affairs – the legislature, judiciary, administrative services, the military; (c) its role in the media, particularly that portion controlled by government; (d) the possibility of using it in access to governmental and commercial institutions, and (e) its use in the workplace.

In academic analyses of minority language policy, a number of constructs have been proposed to arrange language minorities along continua of relative vitality. A widely used scale is the Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (Fishman, 1991) based upon a language's presence in governmental affairs, education, adult use, and intergenerational transfer. The scale also purports to advise linguistic minorities on how to advance their status and how to promote the use of the language. It ranges from the most threatened eighth stage, where any effort needs to start with 're-assembling' the language from 'vestigial users . . . socially isolated old folks' and teaching it to adults, to the highest stage, where the language is used to some extent in 'higher level educational, occupational, governmental, and media efforts' but lacks the safety of political independence. In between, there are another half dozen levels, the most significant of which are probably the sixth ('intergenerational informal oracy'), the fifth ('institutional unsupported literacy') and the fourth ('use in official lower education'). In Fishman (2001), where various scholars are asked to comment on the scale, several raise questions about the ordering of the scale: for instance, there are many cases where institutionalized literacy teaching (commonly of a religiously sanctified language) continues even without much everyday oral use.

Fishman's scale was developed to account for the process that he labeled Reversing Language Shift, an attempt by supporters of a language to re-establish or establish its status. Also named 'language revival', the process of re-establishing natural intergenerational transmission (language revitalization) or vernacular use of a literary language (revernacularization) is most clearly exemplified by Hebrew.

The success of the Celtic revivals in various countries has depended on the extent to which they are backed by political power, as in Ireland where the Celtic language, Gaelic, has become a symbol of nationhood, or in Wales, where a regional government has championed its use. However, even in countries and regions where there is strong governmental backing, only a minority of the population actually speaks the Celtic language. Other cases of revival involve territorial linguistic minorities.

Territorial Linguistic Minorities Territorial linguistic minorities also differ in the extent to which their speakers seek full political autonomy, as do the Tamils of Sri Lanka, and some of the Basques in Spain. For most groups, however, the goal is limited to the use of the minority language in governmental affairs and at various levels of the education system. For instance, in Spain in three constitutionally mandated autonomous regions, Basque, Catalan, and Galician languages are not only taught in schools, but public use of the language is actively promoted, and, because their speakers occupy their own political units within Spain, they can determine their own official language policy within their territory (Turell, 2001). By way of contrast, in France, the Basque-speaking sections bordering on Spain are not officially recognized as separate language groups, they do not comprise a separate political unit, and they cannot determine linguistic policies. In France, the promotion of the Basque language is left to voluntary initiatives. In a similar vein, the various Celtic languages represent different kinds of territorially specific language minorities with varying claims on governmental power – one result of autonomy for Wales and Scotland has been to boost the claims of Welsh and Scottish Gaelic. In New Zealand, the campaign for Maori language regeneration accompanied a series of legal claims before a Tribunal set up to remedy failures to carry out provisions of the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, most of which sought financial reparations for lost land and hunting and fishing rights (Spolsky, 2003).

There are many other territorially-concentrated linguistic minorities elsewhere in Europe, such as the Frisians in the Netherlands who receive special treatment in support for their bilingual education but not in their dealings with government (Gorter, 2001). Special accommodation is also made for territorial linguistic enclaves whose residents are speakers of languages of neighboring countries. For instance the Swedes in the southwestern corner of Finland (Vikor, 2000), and the Germans in the contiguous border regions of Belgium (Aunger, 1993), Italy, and France are examples of transborder linguistic minorities, the former deriving recognition from historic political union and continuing territoriality.

There are a few long-established linguistic minorities that are not geographically concentrated and that typically receive less policy attention. Of these, the most notable are the Roma or Romani, who are scattered and peripheralized. In its negotiations with new candidates for membership, the European Union generally exerted considerable pressure to have these languages supported, following a principle of 'do what I say and not what I do' and not giving them the privilege accorded to foundation members of choosing which varieties to support. While the main goal of Chinese language policy has to do with developing the common language (Putonghua) and in simplifying the characters used for writing Chinese, the cultivation and preservation of minority languages has now been added as a goal (White, 1997). After most speakers of Yiddish in Europe have been killed or have emigrated, some European countries now recognize Yiddish as a minority language (Hult, 2004).

Paulston (2004) has proposed what she calls "extrinsic linguistic (or ethnic) minorities," groups such as the Russians in Baltic Republics who went from being majorities to minorities by legal measures or the moving of borders or grants of independence, but who continue to show strong language loyalty.

Aboriginals Like other territorially concentrated linguistic minorities within homogeneous states, culturally distinct autochthonous groups receive a great deal of attention both in language policy and in academic analyses. Often the languages of such groups are in a wide variety of stages of development. Hence, a primary focus of management is on alphabetization and the promotion of literacy and oracy. In most cases, the drive for language rights among aboriginal groups is tied to cultural revival and reinforcement. Linguistic groups whose members are still active speakers of their languages and who are territorially concentrated, such as the Samis in the Nordic countries (Jernsletten, 1993) and Russia, or the Quichua (K. King, 2000) in the Andean highlands of Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador have greater success in achieving special treatment in language policy. More dispersed aboriginal groups such as the American Indians and the aboriginal tribes in Australia who are dispersed through a hundred different regions (Lo Bianco and Rhydwen, 2001), have an even greater difficulty in language maintenance – although the Navajo have had some success (McCarty, 2002; Spolsky, 2002). An exception are the Maoris in New Zealand who have had great success in cultural and linguistic revival through concentrated political agitation and through the use of Maori in Te Kohanga Reo, the preschool 'language nest' programs and the subsequent development of immersion education in elementary schools (Benton and Benton, 2001). Autochthonous minorities, although commonly suffering from political and social and economic discrimination, at least can claim that they were there first. Autochthonous languages are obviously especially endangered, for they lack other territories where they are spoken.

Immigrants Language policies are much less accommodating to the needs of immigrant groups. In fact, almost all of the international covenants supporting the rights of linguistic minorities apply only to citizens, arguing that immigrants chose to live in the country and so can reasonably be expected to make an effort to learn its language. In addition, the claim that the preservation of immigrant languages is required for maintenance of language diversity is a weak one, for their languages are usually spoken in the country from which they come. However, recently this distinction has been blurred (Hornberger, 1998). In the early years immediately after World War II during the first major flow of 'guest workers' into Europe, they were expected to go back to their home countries after a brief sojourn. Moreover, at that time, any service of their linguistic needs in education was supposed to be provided by their home countries. In addition, immigrant groups tended to be widely dispersed in cities and did not constitute a separate territorial unit. Over more recent decades, their numbers have grown immensely, particularly with Eastern Europeans migrating into Western Europe, citizens of former colonies moving to the metropolitan homeland, and a major wave of migrants from Islamic countries. As their numbers have grown, they have not tended to form separate territorial groups, although their concentration in urban areas, their numbers, and their growing political influence have come to require special educational and governmental accommodation. These may include the provision of instruction in the home language in primary schools, the translation of government documents and court proceedings into the home language, and, in some countries, support for instruction of new immigrants in the national language of the country. In spite of expressions of support for immigrants and their human rights, there has been a tendency to require proficiency in the official language for citizenship and in some cases for immigration.

The United States provides a clear example of this transformation. Over two centuries, massive waves of immigrants have been absorbed. Historically, they tended to be widely dispersed into a number of cities, where little islands would be created. Each group, however, was expected in time to merge into the general population, including the learning of English (Fishman, 1966b). After a period when immigration was restricted by legal quotas, the number of immigrants has increased rapidly. As a result, there are now 3 million children in the United States who speak at home a language other than English. They are referred to as Limited English Proficiency (LEP) children. Three-fourths of the LEP students are Hispanic, and instead of dispersing throughout the country they have become a major territorial language minority in Florida and the American southwest and West, particularly California. One result was the institution of language rights accorded territorial linguistic minorities elsewhere, including a highly institutionalized system of bilingual education in primary schools, and representation of Spanish in public life and the media (Roca, 2000). This development has given rise in some states to reverse pressure to enact legislation banning bilingual education and making English the only official language (Baron, 1990).

Dyadic or Triadic Societies

Countries that have two or three major recognized languages such as Canada, Belgium, Switzerland, Sri Lanka, and Cyprus, each with its own territory, have problems of language policy different from those facing ideologically homogeneous countries. In such countries, language management issues tend to pervade large sectors of the educational system and public life. As in linguistically homogeneous countries, some provision may be made for lesser language minorities, but the fabric of the state itself tends to be linguistically consociational involving only the primary languages. The preferred solution to any conflict is territorial: governmental and educational institutions are organized separately in the different language areas, and political power is carefully balanced between the linguistic units. An extreme example is Belgium, a country historically formed by uniting monolingual territories. After four governmental crises based on language issues between 1979 and 1990, the country was partitioned into different language regions: (a) areas that are exclusively monolingual in Dutch or French, (b) areas such as Brussels that are officially bilingual, and (c) areas that are monolingual but provide some minority language rights (Deprez and Du Plessis, 2000). Switzerland has a longer-established form of consociational linguistic territoriality, but restricts its implementation primarily to educational and governmental affairs; each of the 27 cantons is autonomous in language choice. Canada, too, was formed out of previous, distinct French and English territories. To maintain unity, it is formally bilingual, but French-speaking Quebec periodically attempts to gain independence from the other, primarily Anglophone-speaking, provinces of Canada. A series of referenda for Quebec's independence has not gained a majority of votes in Quebec, defeated by negative votes from a combination of Anglophones, aborigines, and immigrant communities. However, in Quebec province itself, the use of French in all governmental affairs, education, and public displays is mandated (Bourhis,

2001). In Anglophone Canada, an innovative policy was introduced whose intent was to disarm the Quebec separatist drive. Schools for non-francophones require their students to enroll in immersion classes to make them proficient in French. This widely watched program has been only modestly successful.

In some countries, the relationship between the ethno-linguistic groups is so contentious that the country breaks apart, as in the former Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia (Bugarski, 2001). In post-independence Pakistan, two linguistically different sectors were separated by a thousand miles – a Bengali-speaking Eastern half and an Urdu-, Punjabi-, and Sindhi-speaking western half (Rahman, 2002). After a bitter war, the eastern sector became a separate country, Bangladesh. A two millennia-old conflict between Tamils and Sinhalese in Sri Lanka is in danger of partitioning the island into two countries, as is the conflict between the Greece- and Turkey-oriented halves of Cyprus. Sometimes in binary societies, one language group dominates the other as in the Sudan where the Arabic-speaking North dominates the lower multilingual, tribal-based south, or in Israel, officially bilingual in Hebrew and Arabic, where Arabic (though benefiting from more use in education than in many nominally Arab countries (Amara and Mar'i, 2002) is clearly dominated by Hebrew.

In dyadic nation states, then, the key management problem usually remains the resolution of competing demands for status between two languages with strong claims.

Mosaic Societies

Most countries are neither homogeneous nor dyadic nor triadic in composition. Indeed, the majority of countries in the world are made up of five or more important ethno-linguistic and territorially discrete segments. The problems of language policy, both corpus and status, in mosaic countries such as India, Indonesia, the Philippines, and most of the countries of Africa are immense and complex. Here, status and corpus are inexorably linked: a language's claim to official recognition is clearly bounded by its state of cultivation, for it is difficult to use an unwritten language in schools or an unmodernized language to teach science. In many of these countries, the overwhelming primary concern is corpus management, in particular the development of a written form of the languages, the promotion of literacy among the public, modernization by developing new terminology, the staging and duration of language instruction at the various levels of the educational system, and the preparation of teaching materials and teachers. Moreover, the solutions to status policy issues that are available in ideologically monolingual, dyadic, or triadic countries do not apply where there are many languages.

In mosaic societies, even the number of languages spoken in a country is often uncertain. Various counts have enumerated between 1000 and 2000 languages in Africa. In Nigeria alone, a variety of linguistic censuses have found 200 to 400 languages. At last count, there are 535 languages in India. In the late 19th century, Grierson counted a thousand. In all of these countries, the number of language varies immensely in part because the dividing line between languages and dialects is indistinct and political rather than linguistic.

Those who wish to develop language policy in such countries face a number of special challenges. In many of them, a single over-arching language was introduced by the former colonial power and is still used by a small elite. There were two major approaches to colonial language policy. France and Portugal (like Spain in Latin America) were consistently ruthless in requiring the metropolitan language for all government and for any education they supported. After its experience in India, Britain in other parts of the world followed what might be called a modified Oriental policy, providing initial education (at least the first two or three years and sometimes up to secondary school) in reasonably populous indigenous vernacular languages, at least those with a writing system. German and Belgian colonial policy similarly allowed a small place for vernacular languages. After the primary level, both approaches then accepted the centrality of the metropolitan language, but the British did encourage some continued cultivation of some indigenous varieties.

In the optimistic days after World War II, post-colonial political pressure was to dethrone the colonial language and nativize the choices of national languages. A number of African and Asian former colonies started to indigenize their schools. However, the initial pressure for abolishing the colonial tradition has had to be balanced against the tendency among indigenous elites in many former colonial countries to distinguish themselves by their command of the colonial language (Myers-Scotton, 1993), and increasing proportions of the population see the command of that language as the path to upward mobility. Moreover, the exclusive choice of native languages sacrifices links to modernity and international communication. As a result, the use of ex-colonial languages lingers and may be growing. For instance, while the Indian constitution prescribes that English was to be abandoned as a national language within ten years, it still remains one of the official languages. Moreover, Indians of all social classes see the mastery of English as the avenue for upward mobility, and enrollment in English-medium private schools is growing (Dua, 1996). Similarly, in most former Francophone states in Africa, French remained the official language after independence, to be threatened most recently by globalizing English rather than by local national languages (Chumbow and Bobda, 2000).

The process of nativization, with its shift to indigenous languages, is handicapped by the number of those languages and their regional or tribal identification, with all of the status implications resulting from selection of one or a few languages and so favoring its speakers over others. Solutions adopted in a variety of countries include the creation of a fresh lingua franca, usually adopting a local dialect, often one close to the capital city, or adopting a regional language. The use of the new lingua franca is then promoted for use in the education system, in government, and in the media. One of the most striking examples is Bahasa Indonesia, developed out of Malay and now the national language (Dardjowidjojo, 1998). Malay was also the basis of Bahasa Malaysia, and the slight variant Bahasa Melayu developed in Malaysia and Brunei, but there are new pressures for English to be used there (Omar, 1998). Other cases are Tok Pisin, in Papua/New Guinea, Filipino, a variant of Tagalog, in the Philippines, and the adoption of Swahili in Tanzania and East Africa. It should be noted that in Malaysia, there has been a decision to move to English-medium instruction at all educational levels (Gill, 2002).

Many mosaic countries have chosen a language policy model which reflects one or another stage in the history of language policy in the former Soviet Union (E. Lewis, 1972). In the early Soviet period, the languages of the 15 principal language regions were declared to be of equal status. Each was declared the official language and taught in the schools in its own region. Every child had the right to be educated in his or her own language. Russian was to be *primus inter pares*. The decision to encourage and cultivate the vernaculars was based on the principle that it would be the fastest way to develop communism among illiterate peoples, and Grenoble (2003) notes that this policy did result in the rapid development of literacy. Under Stalin, with the pressure for central control, the status of the regional languages was downgraded and the spread of Russian was promoted.

India initially adopted the Soviet model. At Independence, the boundaries of the states were redrawn from the multilingual units they had been under British rule to more or less monolingual units, taking into account the major literary languages, as the political parties in the independence movement had urged. In the years immediately after independence, there was a great deal of concern in India about the balkanizing effect of this decision. To combat what were called 'fissiparous tendencies' Hindi – a Sanskritized form of Hindustani – was chosen to be the bridging national language. However, the states in southern India, whose languages belong to an entirely different family, strongly objected. As happens in many mosaic societies, the resulting compromise piled on languages in the educational system. The medium of instruction in the primary school was to be the local language, with various other languages added in secondary and higher education, serving as either media of instruction or as subjects of study. India's compromise was called the Three Language Formula – in primary school the local language would be used; in secondary school Hindi, English, and the regional language would be taught. In the Hindi area in the north, another regional or European language was to be substituted. As yet this policy has not been rigorously applied and, *de facto*, the local languages still seem dominant with English serving as the bridge language. While such compromises mitigate political difficulties in mosaic countries, the problem of governmental communication remains, particularly which languages can be used in governmental affairs. This usually requires the adoption of one or a few working languages, or allowing the use of many languages but providing a mechanism for interpretation and translation (Bagi and Singh, 2002).

The People's Republic of China essentially continued a 2000-year old tradition for Chinese languages by continuing the ideology that they were all dialects, united by their single writing system (Zhou, 2004). Language management then became a matter of finding a way to simplify the characters, supplement them with a more or less phonetic alphabet, and encourage a shift to Putonghua, the variety of Mandarin based on the Beijing dialect. For the non-Chinese languages, the initial policy was based on the Soviet model, with the development of literacy in and recognition of a manageable number of varieties, originally (as in the Soviet approach) selecting one dialect as the basis of standardization. There was, however, no effort to force them to accept the Chinese writing system, but rather acceptance of various traditional scripts or use of modified Roman or Cyrillic alphabets. At one period, there was a strong effort to assimilate these groups, too, linguistically as well as culturally, but more recently, there is an acceptance of bilingual solutions for the larger languages (Zhou, 2003).

Most African nations are afflicted with the effect of the lack of congruence between imperially established and tribal or linguistic boundaries. They generally

include many languages, many of which are spoken by large numbers in bordering states. In former French colonies, the position of French as language of government and advanced education is well established (Salhi, 2002), in spite of efforts in North Africa to establish the status of Arabic (Daoud, 2001). Portuguese, too, remains dominant in former Portuguese colonies, though in some countries Creoles are developing and becoming important (Vilela, 2002). In West Africa, Bamgbose (2000) complains, there are national language policies that do not reflect an understanding of local linguistic practices and that are seldom seriously implemented. Illiteracy rates are high; colonial language policies mainly remain in effect. In Botswana, Nyati-Ramahobo (2000) reports, the indigenous languages other than Setswana have been ignored or discouraged, and English is favored over it in government and education. Summarizing the current status in Africa, Batibo (2004) notes that only 2 countries (Egypt and Libya) have adopted indigenous languages as their official medium, 8 use an indigenous language alongside an ex-colonial language, 27 use an ex-colonial language with some symbolic secondary use of an indigenous language, and 18 have ex-colonial languages as the only official national language. In other words, 80% have failed in any efforts to establish indigenous languages as official languages. Two countries that use indigenous languages in the school system, Botswana and Tanzania, require its use by all students, whatever their mother tongue. Many are hopeful that the recognition of a number of indigenous languages in the South African constitution alongside English and Afrikaans will lead to multilingual policies (Kamwangamalu, 2000; Mesthrie, 2002), but studies are suggesting how slow the process is (Heugh, 2003).

This same problem of mosaic societies is not limited to single countries, but faces international organizations with sovereign states as members who must communicate in multilingual contexts. The Council of Europe, for instance, now has 45 member states. It has adopted French and English as its official languages of communication. The United Nations publishes its daily journal in English and French, but has six 'working languages' in which official statements may be made: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish. If a delegation wants to communicate in another language, it must provide translators and interpreters. The European Union provides for translation and interpretation among the languages of all its members, requiring about 200 simultaneous translators for a single session if all possible language pairs are to be covered.

The issue of language policy in international organizations with their presumption of equality among the languages of member states illustrates the more general problem of the tension between status considerations in language choice and the need to make communication in multilingual contexts effective (Ammon, 2002; de Swaan, 1999; Van Els, 2001). The *de facto* primacy of English as the language of communication is not without its critics (Phillipson, 2003). Elsewhere, when the need for international communication is paramount, the trend is to use English as the common language. For instance, 85% of the citations in the world's scientific literature are published in English (Garfield and Alfred, 1990). While the multilingual capacity of the computer and the Internet has belied the prediction that only English would be used, the pressure for English appears to continue unabated. The growing predominance of English in international communication, of course, is a major handicap to speakers of other languages, and there are numerous attempts such as 'English as a Lingua Franca' or 'World English' to modify the language to make it more accessible to non-native speakers. The perennial attempts to foster the use of Esperanto serve the same purpose.

Foreign Language Teaching Policies

There is some overlap in language teaching policy between domestic and foreign languages. For instance, French is both a domestic and foreign language in Canada, as are French and English in many ex-colonial countries. However, in the main, foreign language policies are usually quite distinct from, and less developed and conflicted than, policies with respect to national language(s) and those of intra-country minorities. They also tend to be given less attention in scholarly analyses of language policy. In addition, such policies tend to be piecemeal rather than coordinated. Only a few overall national foreign language teaching policies have been adopted. The national plan for The Netherlands (van Els, 1992) is one of the few that were based upon surveys of adult use and national need. Australia's national policy statement (Lo Bianco, 1987) included policies with respect to indigenous peoples and immigrants as well as foreign languages. Comprehensive national policy in England was until recently either expressed as part of official curricula for all instruction, or is addressed by non-governmental organizations (Moys, 1998), including a new policy document developed from the 2000 Nuffield Report (Department for Education and Skills, 2004). Foreign language policy normally relates only to the educational system, although France and Egypt try to limit the use of English outside the educational system. Within the education system, there are a number of common issues that foreign language policy must face (Bergentoft, 1994).

One basic decision concerns the proportionate role of foreign language instruction in the curriculum. In most mosaic countries, the promotion of multilingualism in intra-country languages and perhaps the colonial language leaves little time for foreign languages. The study of foreign languages is most fully developed in Western Europe, where statutory mandates usually require the study of one, and in most countries, two, foreign languages. It appears that the reason for a two-foreign-language policy is to ensure that languages other than English, which is almost always the first choice, are included. Language study may take up a substantial proportion of curricular time. In Sweden, for instance, language study may absorb 15% of total curricular time. In Luxembourg, where French, German, English, in addition to Luxemburgish, are required, the proportion of time taken up in language study is much higher.

Time spent on foreign language study is generally less in the English-speaking countries (Moys, 1998). In the United States, although some state governments which have authority over education do mandate the teaching of foreign languages, the decision on how much foreign language should be offered is usually left to individual districts and schools. All 50 states include the study of foreign languages in their secondary school curricula, although no state requires the study of foreign language in secondary school as a graduation requirement for all students, and only ten states require language study for college-bound students. Unlike other countries, in the United States students may start their language study in higher educational institutions. In 2002, there were 1.4 million students enrolled in foreign language classes in 780 colleges and universities. However, unlike other countries where students enroll in foreign language study in primary school and continue throughout secondary school, enrollments in the United States foreign language classes tend to start in secondary school or college, and drop on the average by half from one language course level to the next. In many countries there is an increasing tendency to start language study earlier and earlier in primary schools, but the practice is still uncommon in the United States. In England, where a decision was made to drop the requirement for foreign language study after the age of fourteen in comprehensive schools, and in the United States, where budgetary pressures became intense, the number of foreign language courses dropped precipitously.

Foreign language teaching policy specifies which languages are to be studied and in what order of priority. This choice is determined by government fiat in some countries. In many countries, however, school and student choices are primary. In England, and formerly in the United States, the traditional order of language selection for modern languages was French and then German. In the United States, Spanish has become the overall favorite, with French and German in steep decline. French, a language spoken in a country a short journey away, remains the favorite in England. In the other countries of Western Europe, the language chosen after English is likely to be German, followed by French and Spanish. In almost all non-English speaking countries that require foreign language study, the first language to be studied is English, selected by eighty per cent or more of the students, often starting in primary school (Bergentoft, 1994). In the United States, federal governmental support, provided during the Cold War for the teaching of Russian, now promotes the study of the languages of Asia and the Middle East at the higher education level; this support has been boosted since 9/11. Except for instruction specifically aimed at immigrants, Asian languages are seldom taught in countries outside of their home regions.

While some countries specify the method of teaching in language classrooms, in the main, the choice of style of classroom instruction is left to teachers, school districts, and textbook publishers. Indeed, the general trend is away from centralized control of language education to more localized and individual teacher decisions. There are, however, some general trends in the style of language teaching that are taking place in most countries. Particularly in Europe there has been a tendency toward the adoption of what is called communicative competence-oriented language instruction and the primacy of oracy over reading and writing skills. Moreover, the Council of Europe has been instrumental in bringing about a modernization and uniformity in language teaching in many countries. In the early 1990s, what was referred to as the Threshold Level (van Ek, 1975) was introduced by the Council of Europe. It provided specific communicative competence goals that students were expected to achieve. The Threshold Level has been adopted throughout Europe for the teaching of 20 languages, and more advanced levels have been described (Ek and Trim, 1991, 2001). The Council also provided to its members a widely adopted series of guidelines for everything from teacher training, elementary school language instruction, and language education

for vocational students. The European Union supported research throughout Europe on improvement of foreign language teaching and provided advice on general language instructional strategies to all of its member states (European Commission, 1997).

Much of the control of the nature of foreign language instruction lies with the adoption of uniform strategies for assessment. In this regard, once again the international organizations in Europe have been helpful. The Council of Europe developed a set of language assessment standards, the Common European Framework (Council of Europe, 2001) intended to promote a degree of uniformity among its members, with a goal of facilitating the growing practice of student exchanges (Scharer and North, 1992). These standards have been widely adopted throughout Europe and are influential elsewhere. In the United States the most important, indeed the only, national attempt to make uniform policy for foreign language instruction is the development of a set of standards for a substantial number of languages. Developed by a teachers' organization, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, the ACTFL guidelines (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1986) has had a major effect on the modernizing of foreign language instruction throughout the United States.

In China, after the end of the Cultural Revolution and even more with the access to the World Trade Organization, there has been a centrally mandated increase in foreign language teaching, with an emphasis now on English (as opposed to an earlier emphasis on Russian) but with a wide choice of other languages. Methodology, too, is being revised, with a new concern for oral language and for humanistic approaches.

Conclusion

In summary, both the development and analysis of language policy have grown immensely in the past several decades. Earlier interest in corpus management has now been overshadowed by a surge of interest in status policy, particularly as it relates to the rights of territorial, regional, and aboriginal minorities. There has also been an increase of interest in language acquisition policy, but it still receives less attention and is almost entirely unrelated to the rest of language policy. However, anyone following the topic in the world's press can usually find two or three stories about language policy a day, and scholarly activity is burgeoning to keep up. It seems safe to predict that the study of language policy in general will continue to develop rapidly.

See also: Endangered Languages: Identity and Language; Language Ideology; Language Loyalty; Language Maintenance and Shift; Language Policy in Multilingual Educational Contexts; Linguistic Decolonization; Minorities and Language; Nationalism and Linguistics; Norms and Correctness; Politics and Language: Overview; Power and Pragmatics; Reversing Language Shift; Spelling Reform.

Bibliography

Amara M H & Mar'i A A-R (2002). *Language education policy: the Arab minority in Israel*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishing.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (1986). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines*. New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Ammon U (2002). *Present and future language conflict as a consequence of the integration and expansion of the European Union (EU)*. Paper presented at the XXXVI Congresso Internazionale di Studi della Società di Linguistica Italiana, Bergamo.

Annamalai E (1989). 'The linguistic and social dimensions of purism.' In Jernudd B & Shapiro M J (eds.). 225–231.

Aunger E A (1993). 'Regional, national and official languages in Belgium.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 104*, 31–48.

Bamgbose A (2000). 'Language planning in West Africa.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 141*, 101–118.

Baron D E (1990). *The English only question*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Batibo H (2004). *Marginalisation through educational medium: the case of the linguistically disadvantaged groups in Botswana and Tanzania*. (LAUD Paper 605). Essen, Germany: University of Duisburg-Essen.

Benton R A & Benton N (2001). 'RLS in Aotearoa/New Zealand 1989–1999.' In Fishman J A (ed.). 422–449.

Bergentoft R (1994). 'Foreign language instruction: a comparative perspective.' In Lambert R D (ed.) *Language planning around the world: contexts and systemic change*. Washington, D.C.: National Foreign Language Center. 17–46.

Bouthis R Y (2001). 'Reversing language shift in Quebec.' In Fishman J A (ed.). 101–141.

Bugarski R (2001). 'Language, nationalism, and war in Yugoslavia.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 151*, 69–87.

Chumbow B S & Bobda A S (2000). 'French in West Africa: a sociolinguistic perspective.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 141*, 39–60.

Cooper R L (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cooper R L (ed.) (1982). *Language spread: studies in diffusion and social change*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Coulmas F (1991). 'The future of Chinese characters.' In Cooper R L & Spolsky B (eds.) *The influence of language on culture and thought: essays in honor of Joshua A. Fishman's sixty-fifth birthday*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 227–243.

Council of Europe (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins J (ed.) (1983). *Heritage language education: proceedings of a conference organized by the Multilingualism Directorate of the Department of the Secretary of State, Saskatoon*. Canada: Multiculturalism Canada.

Daoud M (2001). 'The language situation in Tunisia.' *Current Issues in Language Planning 1(1)*, 1–52.

Dardjowidjojo S (1998). 'Strategies for a successful national language policy: the Indonesian case.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 130*, 35–47.

DasGupta J & Ferguson C A (1977). 'Problems of language planning.' In Rubin J, Jernudd B, Das Gupta J, Fishman J A & Ferguson C A (eds.) *Language planning processes*. The Hague: Mouton. 3–7.

de Swaan A (1999). *The language constellation of the European Union*. Paper presented at the International status and use of national languages in Europe: contributions to a European language policy, Brussels.

Department for Education Skills (2004). *Languages for all: languages for life: a strategy for England*. London: Department for Education and Skills.

Deprez K & DuPlessis T (eds.) (2000). *Multilingualism and government: Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Former Yugoslavia, and South Africa*. Pretoria, South Africa: Van Schaik Publishers.

Dominguez F & López N (1995). *Sociolinguistic and language planning organizations*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dorian N (1998). 'Western language ideologies and small-language prospects.' In Grenoble L A & Whaley L J (eds.) *Endangered languages: current issues and future prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3–21.

Dua H R (1996). 'The spread of English in India: politics of language conflict and language power.' In Fishman J A, Rubal-Lopez A & Conrad A W (eds.) *Post-Imperial English*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 557–588.

Ek J A van & Trim J L M (1991). *Waystage 1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ek J A van & Trim J L M (2001). *Vantage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

European Commission (1997). *Learning of modern languages at school in the European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Extra G & Gorter D (eds.) (2001). *The other languages of Europe: demographic, sociolinguistics and educational perspectives*. Clevedon, England/Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Ferguson C A (1964). 'Baby talk in six languages.' *American Anthropologist 66(6.2)*, 103–114.

Ferguson C A (1968). 'St. Stefan of Perm and applied linguistics.' In Fishman J A, Ferguson C A & Das Gupta J (eds.) *Language problems of developing nations*. New York: Wiley. 253–265.

Fishman J A (1966a). 'Some contrasts between linguistically homogeneous and linguistically heterogeneous polities.' *Sociological Inquiry 36*, 146–158.

Fishman J A (ed.) (1966b). *Language loyalty in the United States: the maintenance and perpetuation of non-English mother tongues by American ethnic and religious groups*. The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman J A (1969). 'National languages and languages of wider communication in the developing nations.' *Anthropological Linguistics 11*, 111–135.

Fishman J A (ed.) (1977). *Advances in the creation and revision of writing systems*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.

Fishman J A (1991). *Reversing language shift: theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Fishman J A (ed.) (1993). *The earliest stage of language planning: the "First Congress" Phenomenon*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

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*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 43–52.

Fishman J A (ed.) (2001). *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: a 21st century perspective*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Fishman J A (2002). Endangered minority languages: prospects for sociolinguistic research. *MOST Journal of Multicultural Studies 4(2)*.

Garfield E & Alfred W-D (1990). 'Language use in international research: a citation analysis.' In Lambert R D (ed.) *Foreign language in the workplace*. Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Gill S K (2002). *International communication: English language challenges for Malaysia*. Serdang, Malaysia: Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.

Gorter D (2001). 'A Frisian update of reversing language shift.' In Fishman J A (ed.). 215–234.

Grenoble L A & Whaley L J (eds.) (1998). *Endangered languages: current issues and future prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grenoble L A (2003). *Soviet language policy*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Guitarte G L & Quintero R T (1974). 'Linguistic correctness and the role of the academies in Latin America.' In Fishman J A (ed.) *Advances in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton. 315–368.

Hale K (1991). 'On endangered languages and the safeguarding of diversity.' *Language 68(1)*, 1–3.

Harrison M & Gilbert S (eds.) (2000). *Obscenity and pornography decisions of the United States Supreme Court*. Carlsbad, CA: Excellent Books.

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

Heugh K (2003). *Language policy and democracy in South Africa: the prospects of equality within rights-based policy and planning*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Stockholm.

Hogan-Brun G & Ramoniene M (2003). 'Emerging language and education policies in Lithuania.' *Language Policy 2(1)*, 27–45.
Hornberger N H (1998). 'Language policy, language education, language rights: indigenous, immigrant, and international perspectives.' *Language in Society 27(4)*, 439–458.
Hornberger N H (ed.) (1996). *Indigenous literacies in the Americas: language planning from the bottom up*. Berlin: Mouton.
Huls F M (2004). 'Planning for multilingualism and minority language rights in Sweden.' *Language Policy 3(2)*.
Itagi N H & Singh S K (eds.) (2002). *Linguistic landscaping in India with particular reference to the new states: proceedings of a seminar*. Mysore, India: Central Institute of Indian Languages and Mahatma Gandhi International Hindi University.
Jernsletten N (1993). 'Sami language communities and the conflict between Sami and Norwegian.' In Jahr E H (ed.) *Language conflict and language planning*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 115–132.
Jernudd B & Shapiro M J (eds.) (1989). *The politics of language purism*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Jernudd B (ed.) (2001). *Language management and language problems: special issue of Journal of Asian Pacific Communications 11:1* (Vol. 2). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Kamwangamalu N M (2000). 'The new South Africa, language, and ethnicity: a prognosis.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 144*, 137–138.
Kaplan R B & Baldauf R B (2003). *Language and language-in-education planning in the Pacific Basin*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Karyolemou M (2002). 'When language policies change without changing: the University of Cyprus.' *Language Policy 1(3)*, 213–236.
King K A (2000). *Language revitalization process and prospects: Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
King R D (2001). 'The poisonous potency of script: Hindi and Urdu.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 150*, 43–59.
Kloss H (1969). *Research possibilities on group bilingualism: a report*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.
Krauss M (1991). *Endangered languages*. Paper presented at the Linguistic Society of America Annual meeting.
Kroskrity P V (1998). 'Arizona Tewa Kiva speech as a manifestation of a dominant language ideology.' In Schieffelin B B, Woolard K A & Kroskrity P V (eds.) *Language ideologies: practice and theory*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press. 103–122.
Limbert R D (1999). 'A scaffolding for language policy.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 137*, 3–25.
Landau J & Kellner-Heinkele B (2001). *Politics of language in the ex-Soviet Muslim states: Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Tajikistan*. London/Ann Arbor, MI: C. Hurst & Co./The University of Michigan Press.
Lewis E G (1972). *Multilingualism in the Soviet Union*. The Hague: Mouton.
Lewis G (1999). *The Turkish language reform: a catastrophic success*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lo Bianco Joseph (1987). *National policy on languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
Lo Bianco J & Rhydwen M (2001). 'Is the extinction of Australia's indigenous languages inevitable?' In Fishman J A (ed.). 391–422.
Lo Bianco J & Wickert R (eds.) (2001). *Australian policy activism in language and literacy*. Canberra, Australia: Language Australia.
May Stephen (2001). *Language and minority rights: ethnicity, nationalism, and the politics of language*. Harlow: Essex, England. New York: Longman.
McCarty T L (2002). *A place to be Navajo: Rough Rock and the struggle for self-determination in indigenous schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Mesthrie R (ed.) (2002). *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Moys A (ed.) (1998). *Where are we going with languages?* London: Nuffield Foundation.
Myers-Scotton C (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Nesiah K (1954). *The mother tongue in education and a language policy for Ceylon*. Colombo: Ola Book.
Neustupný J V (1970). 'Basic types of treatment of language problems.' *Linguistic Communications 1*, 77–98.
Neustupný J V (1989). 'Language purism as a type of language correction.' In Jernudd B & Shapiro M J (eds.) *The politics of language purism*. Berlin/York: Mouton de Gruyter. 211–223.
NicShuibhne N (2001). 'The European Union and minority language rights.' *MOST journal of multicultural studies 3(2)*.
Nyati-Ramahobo L (2000). 'The language situation in Botswana.' *Current Issues in Language Planning 1(2)*, 243–300.
Omar A H (1998). 'Language planning and image building: the case of Malay in Malaysia.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 130*, 49–65.
Paulston C B (1994). *Linguistic minorities in multilingual settings: implications for language policies*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Paulston C B (2004). *Preliminary thoughts on extrinsic linguistic minorities*. (LAUD Paper 605). Essen, Germany: University of Duisburg-Essen.
Pauwels A (1998). *Women changing languages*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
Pedersen I L (2003). 'Traditional dialects of Danish and the de-dialectization 1900-2000.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 159*, 9–28.
Phillipson R (2003). *English-only Europe?: challenging language policy*. London: Routledge.
Prague School (1973). 'General principles for the cultivation of good language'. Garvin Paul L (trans.) In Rubin J. & Shuy R (eds.) *Language planning: current issues and research*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 102–111.
Price G (ed.) (2000). *Encyclopedia of the languages of Europe*. London: Blackwell.
Rahman T (2002). *Language, ideology and power: language-learning among the Muslims of North India and Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
Rajagopalan K (2002). 'National languages as flags of allegiance, or the linguistics that failed us: a close look at emergent linguistic chauvinism in Brazil.' *Journal of Language and Politics 1(1)*, 115–147.
Roca A (ed.) (2000). *Research on Spanish in the United States: linguistic issues and challenges*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
Rubin J & Jernudd B (1979). *References for students of language planning*. Honolulu: East-West Center.
Salhi K (2002). 'Critical imperatives of the French language in the francophone world: colonial legacy – postcolonial policy.' *Current Issues in Language Planning 3(3)*, 317–345.
Scharer R & North B (1992). *Toward a common European framework for reporting language competency*. (Position paper). Washington, D.C.: National Foreign Language Center.
Sibayan B (1974). 'Language policy, language engineering and literacy in the Philippines.' In Fishman J A (ed.) *Advances in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton. 221–254.
Skutnabb-Kangas T (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education, or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
Smolicz J J & Secombe M (1985). 'Community languages, core values, and cultural maintenance: the Australian experience with special reference to Greek, Latvian, and Polish groups.' In Clyne M (ed.) *Australia: meeting place of languages*. Canberra, Australia: Australian National University.
Spolsky B (2002). 'Prospects for the survival of the Navajo language: a reconsideration.' *Anthropology & Education Quarterly 33(2)*, 1–24.
Spolsky B (2003). Reassessing Maori regeneration. *Language in Society 32(4)*, 553–578.
Spolsky B (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Spolsky B & Shohamy E (1999). *The languages of Israel: policy, ideology and practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Suleiman Y (2003). *The Arabic language and national identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
Turell M Teresa (ed.) (2001). *Multilingualism in Spain*. Clevedon, England/Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
van Ek J A (1975). *The threshold level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
van Els Theo J M (1992). *The Dutch national action programme on foreign languages*. (English translation): Ministry of Education and Science.
Van Els T J M (2001). 'The European Union, its institutions and its languages: some language political observations.' *Current Issues in Language Planning 2*, 311–369.
Vikor L S (2000). 'Northern Europe: languages as prime markers of ethnic and national identity.' In Barbour S & Carmichael C (eds.) *Language and nationalism in Europe*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press. 105–129.
Vikor L S (2001). *The Nordic languages. Their status and interrelations*. Oslo: Novus Press.
Vilela M (2002). Reflections on language policy in African countries with Portuguese as an official language. *Current Issues in Language Planning 3(3)*, 306–316.
Weinstein B (1989). 'Francophonie: purism at the international level.' In Jernudd B & Shapiro M J (eds.) *The politics of language purism*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 53–80.
White D (1997). 'The position and roles of minority languages and their writing systems in China.' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 97*, 47–57.
Zhou M (2003). *Multilingualism in China: the politics of writing reforms for minority languages 1949-2002*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Zhou M (ed.) (2004). *Language policy in the People's Republic of China: theory and practice since 1949*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Language Policies: Policies on Language in Europe

R de Cillia and B Busch, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Theoretical Framework, Terminology

Language Policies, Language Politics, Policies on Language

Questions of language politics and policy on language are always present in society, even when one is not aware of them: it is immaterial whether it is a question of international communication or conflicts to do with minority languages, new minorities and migration, gender-neutral formulations or politically correct use of language. Nevertheless, scientific interest in language policies is relatively young, and the research on language policies has not resulted in the development of any unified theory so far. Even in the area of terminology, there are many ambiguities (Labrie, 1996: 828), complicated by the fact that the