Reference:

Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching

Edited by

Sandra Lee McKay

San Francisco State University

Nancy H. Hornberger

University of Pennsylvania

CAMBRIDGE

UNIVERSITY

4 Language planning and policy

Terrence G. Wiley

Introduction

This chapter provides a brief introduction to the fields of language planning and language policy. It is divided into five major sections: The introduction addresses basic issues and assumptions which underlie and influence the direction of the study of language planning and policy. The second section discusses key definitions, describes various levels and types of language planning, and identifies those who are officially and unofficially involved in it. The third part contrasts influential schol-arly orientations and approaches toward language planning and policy analysis and briefly reviews the work of several authorities in terms of their approaches. The next section describes and analyzes major goals for language planning, that is, language goals, political goals, and economic goals. The fifth section focuses on language in education planning and deals with two important legal challenges to established policies and practices. It also revisits a contentious debate over appropriate instruction for language minorities and considers issues of professional responsibility for linguists and language teachers. Next, it examines the impact of negative institutional language policies and practices and provides examples of positive steps that educators can take in promoting education for language minorities. In the discussion of issues, an attempt is made to maintain a critical stance toward controversial matters in order to avoid glossing over some of the underlying conflicts and tensions within the field. A brief conclusion completes the chapter.

Language planning is relatively young as a field of formal academic study, dating roughly from the 1960s. Much of its literature has been concerned with language issues in "developing" countries and in countries undergoing major processes of social, economic, or political change. Despite its recency as an academic field, language planning and policy analysis have long existed as activities of states and empires, though not always explicitly under these labels. In the absence of formal policies, language decisions have long figured in the agendas of powerful commercial interests, of modernizers, and of writers and stylists. Official language decisions are imposed as explicit policies handed

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

down by governments. Unofficial policies, which also have influence, result from the pronouncements of language academies or flow from the works of "great" writers or various "authorities" such as lexicogra-phers, influential publishers, or religious reformers. The stated reasons for promoting language change often sound noble and frequently cite the greater good that will result from the change. However, there is usually more at issue than just language, because decisions about lan-guage often lead to benefits for some and loss of privilege, status, and rights for others (Leibowitz, 1971, 1974). Since language becomes a focal point in social, political, and economic struggles, it is important for applied linguists and language educators to reflect on their roles as active participants in these struggles.

Before an attempt is made to define language planning and to discuss its relevance for applied linguists and language teachers, it is useful to make explicit several issues which underlie this discussion by addressing some basic questions. The first is: How do general assumptions about the study of language influence the study of language planning and language policy? This issue relates to how we conceive of language since that will determine how we study and analyze it. Broadly speaking, language can be seen both as a code and as social behavior. As a conventionalized code, it is a rule-governed system composed of subsys-tems. As codes, all languages and varieties of languages are adequate in allowing their speakers to attribute meaning, to represent logical thought processes, and generally to communicate among themselves. But language is more than just a code; it also involves social behavior. As social behavior, language enters a realm in which there are norms for behavior either based upon a consensus regarding what appropriate linguistic behavior is or based upon the ability of some individuals to impose their standard on others. Those doing the imposing may believe that there is an "inherent" superiority in their language norms and practices over those of others. Such beliefs, however, confuse the ade-quacy of language as a code with social rules of appropriateness. They confuse grammar with language etiquette. (See Wolfram & Fasold, 1974, for an elaboration of this distinction. See also Labov, 1982, for a discussion of the logical adequacy of nonstandard varieties of lan-guage.)

Even when it is studied as a social phenomenon, language is often described in neutral, technical-sounding terms as a "means of communi-cation" for "social intercourse." Leibowitz (1974), however, maintains that language is more aptly viewed as a means of social control. From this perspective, language planning and policy must consider the social, economic, political, and educational contexts in which groups with unequal power and resources contend with one another. As an instru-ment of social control, language often becomes a surrogate for other

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

factors underlying the language conflict (cf. Mullard, 1989; Phillipson, 1989, 1992).

Another basic question that may be asked is: How does attributing higher status to some varieties of language over others through language planning affect the status of the speakers of each variety? The attribution of status to the language varieties can become a subtle means of social control. The term *dialect,* for example, in popular usage often carries a connotation of substandard. Linguists usually approach dia-lects in descriptively neutral terms, seeing them as regionally or socially distinct varieties of a language that are mutually intelligible with other varieties. Although some linguists object to the term *dialect* for technical reasons, most believe that it is applicable to all varieties of languages including the standard (Crystal, 1987). However, as Roy (1987) explains, "[LJanguage varieties that coexist within the same environment may have different social values, particularly if one variety is used as a medium of wider communication. The language variety that has the higher social value is called a 'Language', and the language variety with the lower social value is called a 'dialect'. It has been said with only slight flippancy that a language is a dialect with an army" (p. 234) . As we shall see, the label applied in both popular and scholarly usage can have great significance, not only for the status of the language vari-ety, but also for its speakers (see Rickford, this volume; Sridhar, this volume).

Motivations to use language as an instrument of social control are influenced by scholarly and popular attitudes toward language variation and multilingualism. In this regard it is useful to ask: What attitudes do scholars and laypeople have toward language diversity? The image of Babel (see Crawford, 1992a; Haugen, 1973, 1992), that is, of a fall from a state of unified linguistic grace into a condition of linguistic chaos is frequently evoked in countries where there are deeper majori-tarian - or dominant group - fears and prejudices directed at other groups. In societies where the majority of the population is monolin-gual, as in many Anglophone countries including the United States, there is often an underlying assumption that monolingualism - espe-cially in English - represents an ideal natural state, whereas multilin-gualism represents a temporarily abnormal condition. Bhatia (1984), however, counters that monolingualism, even in monolingual majority societies, is never absolute, "because no speech community is either linguistically homogeneous or free from variation" (p. 24). Many peo-ple nonetheless see multilingualism as a "normal" condition. From their perspective, the imposition of one-language-only policies is more of a problem than a solution. There is a need to be aware of the underlying language ideologies of both scholars and laypersons, for their beliefs will affect the policies they support or oppose (cf. Fishman, 1978,

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

1981). It is easy to overemphasize language attitudes and by so doing fail to see how they relate to — or act as surrogates for — other social attitudes toward race, ethnicity, religion, or economic status (Mullard, 1989; Pattanayak, 1989).

Although language planning frequently attempts to solve conflicts over language, it can also result in creating conflicts. Thus, we may ask: What is the relationship between language planning and various types of conflicts — social, legal, economic, political, educational? Language planning affects speakers of regional and social varieties within the language, immigrants who do not speak the standard or majority language, and indigenous conquered peoples and colonized peoples who speak languages other than the dominant one. In struggles for power and dominance between groups, language is often the surface focal point for deeper conflicts. Applied linguists and language teachers are not immune from these conflicts but must consider how their skills and work relate to them.

There are a great number of areas in which conflicts arise over language (Crawford, 1992a; Weinstein, 1983). Language planning can be a factor either in solving communication problems or in causing them. Some of the more common causes of conflicts occur during periods of rapid social and demographic change. People who had pre-viously enjoyed privilege and high status feel threatened by a newly mobilized language minority[1] group. Fearing the loss of their position, the elite argue for a "unifying" official language - theirs, of course. They may also point to a literacy crisis and call for the promotion of language and literacy skills — naturally in their language. Meanwhile, the language minority people become frustrated in their attempts to improve their social, political, or economic positions, for they suddenly find themselves blocked by their purported lack of "proper" language skills — a situation caused by the imposition of new language policy barriers.[2] Language minorities begin to realize that the language ante for participation has been raised too high and surmise that language requirements may have hidden purpose. They might try to promote their own language as equal to or superior to the dominant language. In this case, elites might then seek to mobilize the dominant group to

The label *language minority* is problematic, since it may refer either to a numerical minority or to lesser power among speakers who constitute a numerical majority but speak a nondominant language. Recently, some investigators have suggested dropping the term, since it can also be seen as ascribing a lower status to the people to which it refers. In analysis of language conflict situations between groups with unequal power and resources, the term *minority* is probably no less ascriptive than *nondominant.*

Examples include designating a specific language for public use and oral language and literacy requirements related to, for example, immigration and voting, admission to higher education, employment and promotion, and establishing business and conducting business (cf. Crawford, 1992b; Leibowitz, 1969).

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

"defend" its language - calling it the *common language* - and claim that one language is needed as a means of promoting national unity. Elites are thereby using language as a means of deflecting a "class-based" challenge to their position. They recast class antagonisms as "threats from another ethnic or national group, thereby promoting cultural solidarity over and above class" (Weinstein, 1983, p. 121).

Attacks on language can be more fundamentally related to attempts to deprive people of access, status, and power. In the extreme, struggles that supposedly originated over language can lead to resistance, widespread interethnic conflict, and even civil war. Ethnic cleansing is not far removed from, or unrelated to, "linguistic cleansing.[5,3] The outcome of such conflicts may result in the redrawing of "administrative districts within a country to ensure autonomy" or in the creation of "indepen-dent states with language as the rallying point of identity" (Weinstein, 1983, p. 121).

A final question that can be asked is: What are some of the major assumptions about language rights? Macfas (1979) made two important distinctions concerning language rights which help to explain the contexts in which a commitment to language rights is exercised:

> There are here two kinds of rights: (1) the right to freedom from discrimination on the basis of language(s); and (2) the right to use one's language in the activities of communal life. There is no right to choice of language, of governmental service for example, except as itflowsfrom these two rights above in combination with other rights, such as due process, equal enforcement of the laws, and so on. But, the identifiability and legal standing of a class based on language is recognized throughout the international community, (p. 41—42)

Macias also notes that the focal point for human rights in much of the Western, that is, European and American, discussion is located in the individual rather than in the group. Marxists and many leaders from other parts of the world take a collective view of rights (p. 42). Framing language rights issues from the perspective of either the indi-vidual or the group as the locus of rights has implications for how we approach language planning, since individual protections can either supersede or be overruled by those of the group.

Key definitions used within the field

Corpus, status, and language acquisition planning

Language planning is generally seen as entailing the formation and implementation of a policy designed to prescribe, or influence, the language(s) and varieties of language that will be used and the purposes

I owe this phrase to my colleague Professor Robert Berdan of California State University at Long Beach.

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

for which they will be used. The *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* offers the following definition of *language planning:*

> deliberate, systematic, and theory-based *attempt to solve the communica-tion problems* of a community by studying the various languages or dialects it uses, and developing a policy concerning their selection and use; also some-times called language engineering or language treatment. *Corpus planning* deals with norm selection and codification, as in the writing of grammars and the standardization of spelling; *status planning* deals with initial choice of lan-guage, including attitudes toward alternative languages and the political impli-cations of various choices. (Bright, 1992, Vol. 4, pp. 310-311; emphasis added)

According to this definition, *language planning* involves two interrelated components: corpus planning and status planning (this distinction was originally proposed by Heinz Kloss, 1969). *Corpus planning* involves "activities such as coining new terms, reforming spelling, and adopting a new script. It refers, in short, to the creation of new forms, the modification of old ones, or the selection from alternative forms in a spoken or written code" (Cooper, 1989, p. 31). It entails efforts to change the body or corpus of a language. Corpus planning may include attempts to define or reform the standard language by changing or introducing forms in spelling, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. It may include orthography planning, which involves the creation and reform of alphabets, syllabaries, and ideographic writing systems. Ex-amples of corpus planning include the reforms of Hebrew, Norwegian, and Turkish and, in the case of Chinese, the promotion of a common spoken form, *Putonghua* (in the People's Republic of China), and a provision for a romanized written form, *Pinyin.* Efforts to rid languages of gender bias are also examples of corpus planning.

Status planning has several dimensions. It has been linked to the official recognition which national governments attach to various lan-guages, especially in the case of minority languages, and to authoritative attempts to extend or restrict language use in various contexts (Cooper, 1989, p. 32). (See also Kloss, 1971, 1977; Leibowitz, 1971, 1982, for an extended discussion of these issues.) Status planning issues include, for example, the designation of the language(s) of instruction in schools and decisions regarding whether (and in which languages) bilingual ballots may be used. In these cases, status planning concerns the rela-tionship between languages rather than changes within them. However, status planning is also concerned with the position of different varieties of a single language. In this case, status planning becomes a function of corpus planning. Historically, the creation of a standard language often begins with the selection of a regional or social variety - usually a written variety - that provides a base language for grammatical re-

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

finement and vocabulary. This initial language choice confers privilege upon those whose speech and writing most closely conform to the newly selected standard. It inevitably elevates one variety of language over other varieties. Here, again, corpus planning determines status planning, since the process of standardization results in what is usually called the *proper* or *correct* variety or is sometimes called the *preferred* or *power* variety. All these terms indicate that the standard is more valued than other varieties (see also Williams, 1992).

Cooper (1989) proposes a third major type of language planning, *language acquisition planning,* which follows from this definition: "Language policy-making involves decisions concerning the teaching and use of language, and their careful formulation by those empowered to do so, for the guidance of others" (p. 31). He contends that this additional category is needed because considerable planning energy is directed toward language spread, especially through education. Technically, status planning relates to increasing or restricting the *uses* of a language but not to increasing the number of its *speakers.* Thus Cooper argues for acquisition planning as a separate major category of language planning. *Language spread* can be thought of as promoting the acquisition of a new language or as promoting a variety of a particular language as the standard.

Other definitions help us to grasp the purported motivations underly-ing language planning and help to identify those who do planning. According to Jahr (1992; cf. Fishman, 1974), language planning (LP) involves:

> [Organized activity *{private* or *official)* which *attempts to solve language problems* within a given society, usually at the national level. Through LP, attempts are made to *direct, change,* or *preserve* the linguistic norm or the social status (and communicative function) of a given written or spoken language variety of a language. LP is usually conducted according to a declared program or a de-fined set of criteria, and with a deliberate goal by *officially appointed commit-tees* or bodies, by *private organizations,* or by *prescriptive linguists working on behalf of official authorities.* Its object is to establish norms *{primarily written)* which are *validated by high social status;* oral norms connected with these writ-ten standards follow, (pp. 12—13; emphasis added)

Here, as in the first definition of *language planning* in this section, a claim is made that language planning attempts to solve communication or language problems. In pursuing these ends, language planning ap-pears to be a practical activity that attempts to produce socially benefi-cial results. However, additional issues may be raised. For example, who defines *language problems?* How do they become problems? For whom are they a problem? And, perhaps most important, does language planning itself ever cause language and communication problems? In

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

other words, how do we reconcile the benevolent-sounding attempt to solve communication problems with the fact that the attempt can impose a form of social control? (cf. Fairclough, 1989; Tollefson, 1991).
There is much more that could be said on the subject of definitions and many more definitions that could be considered. Cooper (1989), for example, has identified twelve definitions and then offers his own:

> Language planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of oth-ers with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes, (p. 45)

This definition has a number of virtues, which are succinctly stated in Cooper's own defense of his definition:

> This definition neither restricts the planners to authoritative agencies, nor re-stricts the type of target group, nor specifies an ideal type of planning. Further it is couched in behavioral rather than problem-solving terms. Finally, it im-plies *influence* rather than change inasmuch as the former includes the mainte-nance or preservation of current behavior, a plausible goal of language plan-ning, as well as the change of current behavior, (p. 45; emphasis in the original)

The use of *influence* suggests that planning is not limited to those who have official power or have armies at their disposal. It should also be noted, however, that influence often functions within a context of ideological control. Change may be explicitly forced, but influence operates in a wider domain wherein consent can be manufactured rather than coerced (cf. Fairclough, 1989; see Tollefson, 1991).

Government planning and language strategists

In addition to technical definitions regarding language policy, there are also definitional issues related to the level at which language planning occurs and concerning just who language planners are. In some countries, such as Australia, language policy formation is more centralized than in the United States. Language planning in the United States has the appearance of being more open. Policies may be derived from de facto planners, such as state educational agencies, or from tradition more broadly (McKay, 1993, see especially Chap. 2). The principal questions in both centralized and decentralized contexts are: How are language decisions made, and by whom? Weinstein (1979, 1983) con-tends that there are two major forces in determining societal language choices: (1) governmental planning, which he sees explicitly as plan-ning, and (2) individual, that is, influential individuals, whom he calls *language strategists.* In this regard, Tollefson (1991) makes an im-portant distinction between government and state. "*Government* im-plies a group of individuals sharing equally in the exercise of power,

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

whereas *state* refers to the apparatus by which dominant groups maintain their power" (p. 10; emphasis in the original). Language policies are one tool by which the state can solidify and expand its power and thereby the power of those who control the state. Historically, the emerging modern European nation-states promoted "national" vernaculars as a means of creating "imagined communities" that would have a sense of national unity and loyalty among their peoples (Anderson, 1991; see also Hobsbawm, 1992). (Although I do not wish to belabor this issue here, Tollefson's point is well taken. In this chapter, the use of the term *government* should be seen as embodying Tollefson's sense of the term *state.)* This division is somewhat heuristic, however, since individual strategists can influence policy making or in some cases can play the role of leader of state and of language strategist. King Alfonso X (r. 1252-1284) of Spain is probably the best example, for he was both king and a lexicographer who replaced Latin and Arabic technical terms with Castilian equivalents (Weinstein, 1983, p. 63).

From Weinstein's perspective, language choices are involved in both formal language policies and in the promotion of informal (or market-related) language strategies. Both can result in language decisions which either expand or constrain the language choices of most people. Language decisions in decentralized contexts — such as in the United States - appear to be more open because the lines of influence and authority are not clearly drawn. Heath (1976) suggests using the frame-work of a language policy configuration to explain the various forces which converge to shape policies. A *language policy configuration* in-cludes a focus on unofficial, but influential, practices which come to have the force of policy (see also Tollefson, 1981).

When prescriptive linguists or applied linguists are employed by the state to help solve communication problems, or when language teachers (working in state-supported institutions) attempt to promote the standard, or when they teach a second language, they work within a politi-cal context. Also, private organizations that retain linguists and lan-guage teachers have agendas of their own. Regardless of whether language decisions are initiated by official governmental language plan-ners or through the influence of language strategists, the decisions have social and political impact. As Weinstein (1983) notes:

> [Planning of any kind is dynamic, which is to say that it is the instrument of leaders who desire to change society; it implies a skepticism about the efficacy of "natural" forces and aims at "change by means of rationally coordinated state actions." Specifically, language structure and usage become a communica-tion problem when they present a barrier to the nonlinguistic changes that the government is promoting, (p. 37)

This observation underscores Leibowitz's position on language policies as instruments of social control and the stance taken in the structural-

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

historical approach (discussed later in this chapter). When the state decides to act on a communication problem, it has nonlinguistic agendas. Weinstein (1979, 1983) is also keen to observe that there are other influential players in language planning and in the formation of language policy; that is, the language strategists:

> Writers, translators, poets, missionaries, publishers, and dictionary makers can shape language for political and economic purposes; their effectiveness may be greater than government. These cultural elites have the power to transform language into a symbol for new community frontiers and interests which are defined and defended by political and economic elites with whom they are allied. Attaching a positive value to a variety of language transforms it into a form of capital, useful for gaining entry into a community or for claiming economic benefits. Not all writers wish to intervene in language matters, and many writers who innovate do so for aesthetic reasons. Those who innovate linguistically in order to promote political, social or economic interests should be called "language strategists." [1983, p. 62)

Historically, there are many well-known language strategists, among them Chaucer, who broke with Norman French in favor of English and expanded the use of English, and Dante, who created some of his greatest work in his native Tuscan (which he claimed was dialect-free). There was Nebrija of Spain, who sought to purify Castilian and defend it against the "corruption" of vernaculars; Martin Luther, who con-vinced others that God could speak languages other than Latin; and Noah Webster, who "labored" to rid American English of the British *labour.* Rabrindranath Tagore promoted Bengali, and Lu Xun chose vernacular over classical Chinese. More recently, influential advocates of antiracist and antisexist[4] discourse can also be seen as language strategists who recognize the power of words to ascribe status. Their opponents attempt to trivialize their prescriptions for nonracist and nonsexist terminology efforts with the *PC* ("politically correct") label. By so doing, influential spokespersons of the anti- PC movement are also language strategists who attempt to maintain the linguistic status quo.

Both governmental language planners and language strategists are involved in the "deliberate" attempt to make or even impose language decisions. Contrary to much of the field of linguistics, which prides itself on its detached descriptivism, language planning strives to *pre-scribe* policy for the stated purpose of solving "communication prob-lems," which it often does. Again, however, communication problems can also result from the imposition of language policies by one group upon another.

See Frank & Anshen (1983) for a detailed proposal for nonsexist language. See also Freeman & McElhinny, this volume for a review of issues in language and gender.

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

Explicit versus implicit language planning

Finally, in defining language policies there is also a need to distinguish between *explicit* or *official* policies and those which are *implicit* or even *tacit,* embedded in institutional practices (cf. Baldauf, 1994, regarding "unplanned" language policy and planning). For example, although the U.S. government has never specified English as the official language, English is required in most of its operations. English is the language of courtrooms. Applications for federal grants, for example, carry a requirement that they be submitted in English. Many job announcements carry requirements that applicants speak English. Historically, English language and literacy requirements have served a gatekeeping function in immigration (McKay & Weinstein-Shr, 1993) and have provided "legal sanction" for discrimination (Leibowitz, 1969).

Implicit language policies have been equated with accidental policies, as in the case of the English-only policies that the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs imposed on Native-American children (Kaplan, 1991, p. 153). This is, however, a dubious example of an "accidental" policy, since the plain purpose of the policy was language eradication and cultural dominance. According to Norgren and Nanda (1988):

> The aim [of Indian boarding schools] was not merely to teach children the dominant language and culture, but to wrench them completely away from their native cultures and estrange them from their parents and the influence of their tribes. In these schools there was an absolute prohibition on Native Amer-ican children speaking their own languages, and those that did were humili-ated, beaten, and had their mouths washed with lye soap. Though most chil-dren were forced to stay in schools, some parents, despite great obstacles, did remove their children when they realized the unswerving intent of officials to use the schools to destroy their cultures and languages, (p. 186; see also Lei-bowitz, 1971)

Implicit or tacit policies can become hegemonic. *Hegemony* refers to the ability of dominant groups to maintain and exercise power either through coercion or by the manufacture of consent; that is, through their ability "to gain consent for existing power relationships from those in subordinate positions" (Tollefson, 1991, p. 11). Linguistic hegemony is achieved when dominant groups create a consensus by convincing others to accept their language norms and usage as standard or paradigmatic. Hegemony is ensured when they can convince those who fail to meet those standards to view their failure as being the result of the inadequacy of their own language (cf. J. Collins, 1991). Schools have been the principal instruments in promoting a consensus regarding the alleged superiority of standardized languages.

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

Scholarly orientations and approaches toward language planning

One reason why there are so many definitions of language planning is the fact that language policy theorists and planners adopt markedly different perspectives toward language planning. Consideration of the major orientations is important, since "Clearly what language planners seek to do will derive largely from how they perceive language change" (G. Williams, 1992, p. 123). Ruiz (1984) provides an important analysis of the two dominant orientations toward language planning, *language as problem* and *language as right,* and proposes a third, *language as resource.* In Ruiz's sense, *orientation* refers to:

> *complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward lan-guages and their role in society.* These dispositions may be largely unconscious and pre-rational because they are at the most fundamental level of arguments about language. . . . Orientations are basic to language planning in that they . . . determine the basic questions we ask, the conclusions we draw from the data, and even the data themselves. . . . In short, orientations determine what is thinkable about language in society, (p. 16, emphasis in original)

Ruiz contends that the majority of the work done by language planners "has been focused on the identification of language problems[55] (p. 18). He attributes this emphasis to the fact that language planning is seen either as an instrument for national development or as a remedy for social problems that are presumed to result from the linguistic mismatch between language minorities and the dominant society. Ruiz identifies a number of difficulties associated with this orientation, the most salient of which is its outlook on cultural and social diversity as "problems.[55]

Ruiz also identifies the source of the language as right orientation. The rise of this orientation follows from the recognition that "since language touches many aspects of social life, any comprehensive state-ment about language rights cannot confine itself to merely linguistic considerations[55] (p. 22). Ruiz observes that "[b]y extension, this means that discrimination as to language has important effects in many other areas[55] (p. 22; cf. Leibowitz, 1969, 1971, 1974). Ruiz further notes that there are many unresolved problems and technical issues associated with this orientation, especially since language planners who have this orientation enter into confrontation, activism, and advocacy.

Based upon what he sees as limitations of the first two orientations, Ruiz suggests - within the context of language planning in the United States - that the language as resource orientation resolves some of the difficulties of the other two. He contends that

> A closer look at the idea of language-as-resource could reveal some promise for alleviating some of the conflicts emerging out of the other two orientations:

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

it can have a direct impact on enhancing the language status of subordinate languages; it can help to ease tensions between majority and minority communities; it can serve as a more consistent way of viewing the role of non-English languages in U.S. society; and it highlights the importance of cooperative language planning, (pp. 25—26)

In recent years, many scholars and language teachers have embraced language as a resource as a basic tenet of their fields.

Neoclassical versus historical-structural approach

Other scholars have focused on the notion of approaches to language planning. Tollefson (1991), for example, contrasts two broad approaches: (1) the *neoclassical approach* and (2) the *historical-structural approach.* The notion of an *approach,* as it is used here, refers to how language planning is done, that is, to the methods employed, the man-ner in which it is undertaken, and the way in which issues are framed. Approaches are influenced by *orientations* in the sense that Ruiz uses the term. Tollefson (1991, p. 31) describes the major differences between the neoclassical and historical-structural approaches as involving:

> The unit of analysis each employs (the neoclassical emphasizes individual choices, whereas the historical-structural considers the influence of sociohistorical factors on language use)
> The role of the historical perspective (the neoclassical approach tends to focus more on the current language situation; the historical-structural approach considers the past relationships between groups)
> Criteria for evaluating plans and policies (i.e., the neoclassical approach often presents its evaluations in ahistorical and amoral terms, whereas the historical-structural approach is concerned with issues of class dominance and oppression)
> The role of the social scientist (the neoclassical model typically assumes that the field of applied linguistics and teachers are apolitical; the historical-structural approach concludes that a political stance is inescapable, for those who avoid political questions inad-vertently support the status quo)

Tollefson's analysis strongly parallels Street's (1984, 1993; cf. Hornberger, 1994b; see also McKay's discussion of Street, this volume) analysis of underlying models in the study of literacy and literacy policies. The inclusion of literacy policy is warranted here, because much — though not all, by any means - that falls under the heading of language planning policy involves literacy. Much of the activity in corpus planning is focused on attempts to standardize the written language. Street uses the terms *autonomous* and *ideological models,* which are roughly

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

parallel to Tollefson's *neoclassical* and *historical-structural approaches,* respectively. Both authors have made significant critical contributions within their respective areas. Taken together, they demonstrate a strikingly parallel approach to underlying assumptions in the fields of language and literacy planning, policy, and instruction. Both authors maintain that the neoclassical-autonomous camp has generally been dominant, and both conclude that this approach has been limited by its lack of concern with social, historical, and ideological contexts. Their conclusions can be characterized as revisionist insofar as they have broken with prior dominant paradigms within the field. From the perspective of Ruiz's orientations, the historical-structural and ideological approaches can essentially be placed in both the language as right and the language as resource orientations because language planners adhering to them frequently become advocates for language rights and also try to promote the maintenance and/or development of minority languages as social, cultural, and political resources.

The appeal of the neoclassical-autonomous approach arises from its formal neatness and alleged neutrality. Because it focuses on the formal properties of language and the structural characteristics of language varieties, analysis is tidy; that is, it is relatively uncontaminated by the complexity and inequality of the real world. Applied to corpus plan-ning, this approach tends to focus on the formal properties of language to the exclusion of their use within social contexts. From the standpoint of status planning, language communities are characterized in terms of the "structural characteristics of language varieties and the degrees of multilingualism" (Tollefson, 1991, p. 29). Concerning acquisition theory, the success of the learner in acquiring a new language is seen as correlating with individual psychological factors such as motivation to assimilate into the dominant society. The approach ignores the histori-cal and social context within which individuals live; that is, it overlooks differential power between groups. It neglects the way in which the dominant group treats minority groups, and by so doing, it ignores the factors that affect individual motivation to learn or to be assimilated. Nor does it question assimilation as a goal or consider alternatives to assimilation.

When focused on the study of literacy, the neoclassical-autonomous approach sees the invention and utilization of print as having "cognitive consequences" for individuals and for whole societies. These alleged cognitive consequences are viewed as resulting more from print as a technology than from the social practices in which it is used (see McKay, this volume; Street, 1984, 1993; Wiley, in press). Thus, lan-guage planning as a factor in promoting mass literacy in "developing" countries is approached largely as a technical problem, rather than as a sociohistorical and political one. "It does not include analysis of the

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

forces that lead to the adoption of the planning approach . . . " (Tollefson, 1991, p. 28; cf. G. Williams, 1992).

The historical-structural and ideological approach views language planning and literacy issues differently. It sees language and literacy development and language reform in terms of how they relate to social, economic, and political purposes which enable people to direct their own lives in ways they find meaningful. This approach also sees societal planning and policy as largely resulting from the dominant social and political institutions in which they are embedded. They cannot be treated as separate, autonomous things unto themselves. Similarly, "lan-guage problems" are seen to result from social stratification, that is, from the differential power and resources of groups. Institutions and social relationships between groups are seen as being rooted in history. Thus, the history of institutions and group relationships must be ana-lyzed if the sources of conflict that lead to language problems are to be understood. Finally, this approach assumes that language and literacy policies are more likely to be accepted when they build upon the linguistic resources that people already have.

Examples of each of these approaches can be seen in the works of several scholars, which are briefly described in the following passages. The classification scheme used here is analytic; it does not necessarily represent how these scholars would categorize the approach of their own work. It is also necessary to point out that the totality of the work of each writer does not always fall neatly into only one category or the other.

Neoclassical-autonomous aspects of Einar Haugen s approach toward language planning

Einar Haugen is widely regarded as one of the pioneers and more influential theorists in language planning (see Haugen, 1966, 1973/ 1992, 1983). His contributions include the development of a major theoretical framework in which he outlines four phases of language planning. On the whole, Haugen's work demonstrates aspects of both the neoclassical and the historical-structural approaches. His discussion of the notion of *linguistic racism* (1973/1992), for example, anticipated more recent analyses representative of the historical-structural approach (e.g., Mullard, 1988; Phillipson, 1988, 1992). Nevertheless, Haugen's phases of language planning provide an example of the neoclassical approach and can be outlined as follows:

> The selection of a language variety or varieties that provide the basis for a new norm; the language chosen may be an indigenous language variety (typically a regionally or socially prestigious one)

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

Codification, through the choice of script, the determination of phonology and its correspondence to an orthography, and of morphology and rules of word formation (this involves issues of corpus planning and sometimes orthographic planning)

Implementation, which pertains to initial diffusion of the new codified norm throughout society (usually by means of schools and official and/or religious and commercial agencies)

Elaboration and modernization, which involve ongoing efforts to spread the norm and to extend its ability to meet various communication needs of the society (adapted from Jahr, 1992, pp. 13-14; cf. Crystal, 1987, p. 364.)

Haugen's approach here is to view language planning as a largely technocratic process concerned with systematizing and cultivating a standardized language code in an effort to solve communication problems. He emphasizes the importance of the written standard over the spoken:

It will be quite impossible even to enter upon the subject if we maintain the usual position of linguists . . . that writing is 'merely a way of recording [oral] language by means of visible marks.' . . . [I]n the study of LP we shall have to reverse this relationship. (1972/1966, p. 163)

Haugen observed that linguistic norms are based upon a taught, written standard. He notes that dialects are commonly considered, at best, charming nuisances which can only be "tolerated[55]:

It seems to me that all the activities of rhetoricians and normative grammarians, from Samuel Johnson to the lowliest school-marm in American rural schools, need to be reevaluated in terms of this model. *Dialects, whether regional or social, have their charms, but they hamper communication by calling attention to features which either are or ought to be irrelevant to the message.* They label their man by his social history, and their maintenance is often advocated precisely by those who wish to maintain a snobbish distinction of class. *If dialects are to be tolerated,* the teaching of tolerance must begin with other and more basic features of inequality in society than the purely linguistic one. (1972/1962, p. 253; emphasis added)

As Haugen was aware, language planning cannot avoid the historical relationships between groups; nor can it avoid the political, ethnic, racial, social, and economic issues that are involved in defining their current relationships. His appeal to teach tolerance by focusing on the "more basic features of inequality[55] is well taken; however, from a historical-structural view, the more germane point would be to demon-strate how language prejudices and discriminatory language policies function in conjunction with them.

Despite his concern for equality *among* standard languages, he saw

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

"nonstandard" variation *within* languages as problematic, as the following illustrates:

> It would be nice if we could persuade polite society to accept Eliza Doolittle as she is, but in our heart of hearts most of us would prefer to associate with her after Dr. Higgins has straightened out her aiches. (1972/1962, p. 154)

Here, Haugen, yields to the dominance of literate, standardized forms of language over the irregularity of dialects as a cure for the problems associated with the disease of linguistic variation. He valued diversity among languages, that is, among taught, standardized varieties; however, the existence of competing varieties within a language posed a problem from the standpoint of language planning. A language was to be defined only in terms of its literary, standardized form.

Heinz Kloss: A middle ground between the approaches

Heinz Kloss is a major contributor to the literature on the history of language policy formation and its implications for language rights (see Kloss, 1971, 1977). His work establishes the importance of the state in creating policies toward immigrant majority languages that can (1) promote, (2) accommodate, (3) tolerate, or (4) suppress them. In the case of U.S. history, Kloss asserts that immigrant language minorities existed in a climate of toleration- oriented rights in which they were left to their own devices and energies to maintain their native language.

> As our study shows . . . the non-English ethnic groups in the United States were Anglicized not *because of* nationality laws which were *unfavorable* toward their languages but *in spite of* nationality laws which were relatively *fa-vorable* to them. Not by legal provisions and measures of authorities, not by governmental coercion did the nationalities become assimilated, but rather by the absorbing power of the highly developed American society. (1977, p. 283; emphasis in original)

For Kloss, linguistic assimilation was voluntary, given the opportuni-ties offered by the society as a whole. He contends that voluntary linguistic assimilation was possible, given the openness of the U.S. society, and because many immigrants saw opportunities in the United States as being superior to those in their countries of origin. In drawing these conclusions, Kloss is functioning from within a European - if not mostly Western European — immigrant paradigm. He seems to equate linguistic assimilation with economic and political assimilation. Kloss tends to understate the differences between the experiences of Western European immigrants and those of immigrants from Asia and Latin America, not to mention those of indigenous and colonized peoples. Kloss does acknowledge instances of discrimination:

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

[Discrimination [in voting] consequently prevented the Mexicans from developing into a genuine national minority which possesses the citizenship of the host country. 'If you become a citizen but are treated as a foreigner, what have you gained?' was a typical complaint . . . . *It should not be overlooked, however, that naturalization is frequently not coveted because the immigrant, following his Mexican and Latin tradition, considers problems of government and the community as something that has to be cared for by officials who are paid to do this.* . . . Authorities, on the other hand, often treat even members of the second generation as aliens. (1977, p. 51, emphasis added)

Kloss's ambivalence is demonstrated here. On the one hand, he notes the disincentive toward assimilation based upon discrimination; on the other hand, he finds fault with "Mexican and 'Latin' tradition," Kloss does, however, offer examples of when the United States has accommo-dated minority languages and admits to one major exception to this pattern, that is, the case of the outright suppression of German-Americans during World War I (see later discussion in this chapter). Kloss's ideas move in the direction of the historical-structural approach because he recognizes the importance of the state's policies toward minority languages, as the following illustrates:

The withholding of political rights is incidentally subject to the same considerations as that of human rights: the Mexicans are affected by such withholding not because they speak a foreign language but because they have a different color of skin. (1977, p. 51)

Again, however, he downplays more systematic institutional racism and language discrimination, as the following indicates:

There were only isolated instances of an oppressive state policy aiming at the elimination of non-English languages. There were, however, a great many instances in which individuals (including public school teachers) and groups exerted unofficial moral pressure upon members of the minority groups, especially children, so as to make them feel that to stick to a "foreign" tongue meant being backward or even un-American. (1977, p. 284)

Kloss's framing of language discrimination as a problem of individuals is typical of the neoclassical approach. There is no systematic analysis of the attitudes and practices of the host society across a broad field of social practices (cf. Leibowitz, 1969, 1971, 1974). In fact, social prac-tices are relegated to a position of secondary importance, as the follow-ing passage illustrates:

In individual cases knowledge of the English language was made a prerequisite for ordinary vocational positions which were in no way connected with politics. An 1897 Pennsylvania law required that laborers occupied in mines who intended to become miners had to take an examination during which they . . . had to prove their command of English; this was designed to keep out Slavic workers. . . . Much more frequent than is evident from such isolated state regulation were cases of actual discrimination against members of non-English

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

groups in the open labor market. But in such cases *society, and not the state, discriminated; such discrimination is not directly related to the legal status of linguistic minorities.* (1977, p. 51, emphasis added)

Kloss tended to avoid looking at how language policies function in conjunction with institutional racism (see Haas, 1992; Weinberg, 1990a) and other forms of social discrimination that often underlie the imposition of restrictive language practices. There is a considerable body of evidence that the "unofficial moral pressure" occurred across a broad range of social and institutional contexts (see Leibowitz, 1969, 1971, 1974; Luebke, 1980; Weinberg, 1977). By focusing on formal statutes rather than on the sociopolitical climate in which minority language groups must function, we avoid confronting the tacit policies which are often at odds with official policies.

Arnold Leibowitz's historical-structural–ideological approach

Arnold Leibowitz concentrates on the imposition of English language requirements for access to and participation in a variety of contexts: political, legal, economic, and educational (see Leibowitz, 1969, 1971, 1974, 1980, 1982, 1984). He looks at the experiences of immigrants of European origin, such as German-Americans, but then turns to those of Japanese and Chinese immigrants, to Native Americans (indigenous-language minorities), to people of Mexican origin (both immigrants and colonized peoples), and to Puerto Rican Americans (as colonized peoples). By focusing on language as an instrument of social control, Leibowitz departs from the immigrant language policy concern that preoccupies much of the literature on language policy in the United States.

For example, he notes that English literacy requirements were used by the Massachusetts and Connecticut legislatures to exclude English-speaking Irish Catholics from voting during the 1850s (1974). During the same time period that English language and literacy requirements were being imposed on European immigrants, English literacy require-ments were being used to exclude African-Americans from voting. Lei-bowitz concludes that the motivation to impose English language and literacy requirements has been based upon the "degree of hostility[5]' of the majority toward the language minority group "usually because of race, color, or religion" (1971, p. 4). Thus, language restriction is not something that has occurred in isolation from other forms of discrimi-nation. He notes that attacks on language have always clearly signaled to the groups affected that there was more involved, since the act of imposing language requirements or restrictions itself often takes on more significance than its substantive effects.

Leibowitz suggests that, if language is viewed as a means of social

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

control, a variety of disciplines can converge in an effort to understand not just "communication problems" but the sources of deep societal conflicts that result from differential power among groups (1974). He can reach these conclusions only because he casts his net more widely across sociopolitical and sociohistorical contexts than neoclassical scholars do. Leibowitz's analyses of a variety of social, political, economic, and educational contexts in his earlier work (1969, 1971, 1974) seems to have anticipated the more overtly historical-structural—ideological approach of more recent scholars (e.g., Fairclough, 1989; Grillo, 1989; Lippi-Green, 1994; Phillipson, 1992; Roberts, Davis, & Jupp, 1992; Tollefson, 1991; G. Williams, 1992).

Goals of language planning

Language goals

Whether language policies are implicit or explicit, they involve goals. On the surface these goals may be seen as either (1) language -related (wherein language issues appear to be the major focus as an end in themselves) or (2) politically and economically motivated (wherein language appears to be a means to an end). Upon closer inspection, however, even goals that appear to be mostly language related are generally not without political or economic connection and impact. Among language-related goals, three broad types of policies can be identified:

language shift policy, (2) language maintenance policy, and (3) language enrichment policy. How language diversity is seen has a major bearing on the agendas for language policy. As noted above, Ruiz (1984) contends that language diversity can either be seen as a problem, a right, or a resource (see also Crawford, 1992a; Hornberger, 1994a; McKay & Wong, 1988).

Historically, given the many contexts for contact between peoples (e.g., nation formation, migration, trade, wars, conquest and coloniza-tion, religious proselytization, intermarriage), language shift is a rela-tively common occurrence. Language shift can occur as a gradual pro-cess, or it can be explicitly planned. When language diversity is seen as a problem, language shift policy is a goal for language acquisition planning, whether explicit or implicit. Bright (1992) describes language shift as "The gradual or sudden move from the use of one language to another, either by an individual or a group" (Vol. 4, p. 311). Assuming its inevitability, some scholars have attempted to determine the rate of language shift among immigrant groups. In the case of the United States, Veltman's analysis of census data (1983) determined the rate of shift to be roughly a three generational one (from native language

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

monolingualism to English monolingualism). However, several of Veltman's assumptions have been questioned. Most curious is his exclusion of bilingualism as a circumstance equal to monolingualism. If bilingualism is not considered, language shift is seen as an either- or phenomenon toward a *language* rather than toward *multilingualism* (Wiley, 1990—1991, in press).

Fishman (1981) notes that a considerable degree of language shift has occurred in the United States although there has been neither a constitutional mandate nor a subsequent legal declaration that English be the official language. Rather, the shift has resulted from an implicit policy fostered by "a complex web of customs, institutions, and programs [which] has long fostered well-nigh exclusive reliance upon English in public life" (p. 517). In the absence of an explicit policy, for two centuries "literally hundreds of millions of Americans have been led, cajoled, persuaded, embarrassed into, and forced to forget, forego and even deny languages that were either their mother tongues, their communal languages, or their personal or communal additional tongues" (p. 517).

Despite implicit language shift policies and intergenerational drifts toward dominant languages, there are numerous reasons why many individuals who have a minority language status do not shift but remain loyal to their native languages (Fishman, 1966) . *Language loyalty* refers to the attachment to one's native language. It has been defined as "A concern to preserve the use of a language or the traditional form of a language, when that language is perceived to be under threat[55] (Bright, 1992, Vol. 4, p. 310). According to Fishman (1981), language loyalty is based upon the persistent attempt to preserve ethnic identity in the face of linguistic and cultural dominance. In education, policies that pro-mote native language maintenance are seen as providing both a cogni-tive foundation for the transfer of literacy skills from a student's native language to his or her second language (i.e., the dominant language of instruction) and a means of fostering the self-confidence and sense of a self-worth deemed essential for promoting academic success (Crawford, 1991; Cummins, 1981, 1984a, 1984b, 1985). Fishman (1981) observes that in the United States, policies to promote language maintenance have not been considered (by powerful elites) in the public's (i.e., the dominant group's) interest. He concludes: "Until it can be so consid-ered, it must be freed from the suspicion of divisiveness and incompati-bility with progress, modernity, and efficiency[55] (p. 522). The major attempts to promote language maintenance policy have been in connec-tion with bilingual education. Although initially embraced with enthusi-asm as "a major effort to Anglify the last 'unfortunates[5 55] (p. 519), bilingual education has been steadily attacked, especially since the early 1980s, allegedly out of Anglophone majoritarian fears that maintenance

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

promotes separatism. The idea that societal bilingualism could be a goal in its own right is lost amid fears of linguistic balkanization (see Crawford, 1992a; Simon, 1988).

Probably more than any other scholar, Fishman (e.g., 1981, 1991) has drawn attention to what he terms *language enrichment policy* by exploring ways to reverse language shift. His position is analogous to that of environmentalists who try to preserve endangered species in the face of imminent species extinction. Fishman pursues ways to maintain endangered languages in the face of imminent "linguicide." He attempts to find ways to provide practical and theoretical assistance "to communities whose native languages are threatened because their intergenerational continuity is proceeding negatively" (Fishman, 1991, p. 1). His goal is to extend promotion-oriented rights to the world's "endangered" languages. This issue is tied to the larger theme, identified by Tucker (1994), of *ethnic revitalization.* (See Haacke, 1994; Hornberger, 1994a; Kaplan, 1994; & Patthey-Chavez, 1994, for related discussions in various international contexts.) As the discussion now moves to goals other than language, it is important to realize that many of these goals are mutually exclusive (see also Coulmas, 1994).

Political goals

Among the more explicitly political goals of language planning are those that attempt to use language as a means to promote *nation building.* Historically, language planning played a major role in the development of the modern European nation- state. It played this role partly because of the invention of the printing press and the expansion of vernacular literacy (Anderson, 1991).

> It remains only to emphasize that in their origins, the fixing of print-languages and the differentiation of status between them were largely unselfconscious processes resulting from the explosive interaction between capitalism, technology and human diversity. But as with much else in the history of nationalism, once 'there', they could become formal models to be imitated, and, where expedient, consciously exploited in a Machiavellian spirit, (p. 45)

Taking its cue from the historical role of language in promoting national unification, language planning has taken on considerable im-portance in the creation of new nations from former colonies. Often the geographical boundaries of such states are more political than linguistic. They often correspond more to the former imperial boundaries than to language, ethnic, or religious distribution. Language planning in such countries, then, is not only important as a means of solving communica-tion problems amid linguistic diversity; it is a means of unifying people whose primary common attribute is that they were formerly dominated by a foreign power. Language planning offers them the opportunity to

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

continue their relationship under a new national (i.e., state) authority in the absence of their former colonial masters. The plan, however, does not always work. Consider how "well" the Tamils have identified with Sri Lanka. And, for those who believe that one language is a requisite for national unity, note the language situation in India, the world's second-most-populous country and its largest democracy:

> [T]here are 1,652 mother tongues. Depending on how people count, there are between 200 and 700 languages. . . . These languages belong to four language families. There are eight major script systems not counting Roman and Arabic. All these eight belong to a single script family and are derived from Brahmi. (Pattanayak, 1989, p. 379)

In response to the question of whether such linguistic diversity leads to national disintegration, Pattanayak responds:

> No. Many languages are like petals of a lotus. Many languages form a na-tional mosaic. If some petals wither and fall off or some chips are displaced from the mosaic, then the lotus and the mosaic look ugly. With the death of languages the country will be poorer, (p. 379)

A number of European states and postcolonial states, however, have used linguistic unification as a means of promoting national unification. When a single language is used to help define a nation, it operates on horizontal and vertical axes. Along the horizontal axis the promotion of a normative, "standard[55] variety — among mutually intelligible varie-ties — allows the state to expand its influence among speakers and to convince them that they are one people. The promotion of a standard is thus an inclusive language policy, for it seeks to unite speakers of a so-called common language. First, however, they must be convinced that it is their common language. To do this, a standard must be developed or selected. The selection of a standard often involves choosing a regional variety that is associated with centers of power and cultural prestige (see Grillo, 1989). Its selection may involve an attempt to disguise the regional bias under the guise of its "transnationalism.[55] Sometimes, speakers of a closely related oral language, Serbs and Croats during the nineteenth century, for example, are separated by the lack of a common script (Weinstein, 1983). Orthography planning provided a means for trying to bring together groups who perceived themselves as different. Conversely, Turks in the early twentieth century created a romanized script to distance their people from Arabs (Weinstein, 1983).

Furthermore, established as the standard, the "national[55] language lends itself to defining a vertical social hierarchy. Along the vertical axis, language proficiency in the standard functions as a means of enhancing and reinforcing stratification among speakers of the same language. Thus, the standard may be used as a gatekeeping mechanism to limit upward mobility to those who have acquired it. Schools play a

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

critical role because they teach the standard and promote continued academic learning through it. Instruction in the literature written by "great writers" (language strategists) of the standard adds status legitimacy to the standard. High-status varieties are associated with the educated, who, through privilege, have access to schools and to the "national" literature canonized therein. In Europe, the bourgeoisie tended to rally behind the standard. In such cases, acquisition planning can be seen as a divisive force along a vertical axis (between classes), since all groups do not have equal access to acquiring the standard through an extended elite education.

Just as an analysis of language planning and language policies is important in the study of nationalism, so too it is significant in the study of imperialism. Phillipson (1992; see also Tollefson, 1991) has undertaken a sweeping analysis of linguistic imperialism. Following Galtung (1980, p. 107), Phillipson defines imperialism as "a relation-ship where one society . . . can dominate another" (p. 52). He notes that "Galtung's *imperialism theory* posits six mutually interlocking types of imperialism: *economic, political, military, communicative, . . . cultural, and social"* (p. 52). Phillipson identifies linguistic imperialism as a subtype of cultural imperialism.

Economic goals

Language planning often pursues economically motivated goals, such as those pertaining to communication and marketing in international trade (Simon, 1988). Australia has attempted to promote foreign language instruction to improve communication with trading partners who speak Chinese, Indonesian, Japanese, and Korean (Kaplan, 1991). Among other issues are communication and language discrimination in the workplace (Roberts et al., 1992) and language rights in the workplace, just to mention a few. There are also costs associated with changes in language policies and with language. It is estimated that Quebec's promotion of French costs Can$ 100 million annually (Coulmas, 1992). Companies may overtly impose language requirements on workers and applicants. Often, however, implicit or tacit policies are operative:

> For example, in Germany no one can become a branch director of a bank without being accepted by the Federal Office of the Supervision of the Banking Busi-ness in Berlin. Although its examination focuses on contents rather than on lan-guage, it forces non-German-speaking applicants to be proficient in German, since no allowances are made for limited German proficiency. Hence, even though the management of a foreign bank may not share the conviction that German language proficiency is indispensable for heading a branch office in Germany, it cannot but comply with this requirement. (Coulmas, 1992, p. 134)

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

Lack of language and literacy skills in the dominant language is frequently cited as if it were the cause of poor economic performance, trade deficits, and low productivity, and as if it were responsible for the social "costs" of crime. For example, Kaplan (1991) contends:

> There is evidence that the highest arrest rates and conviction rates lie among certain linguistic minorities, and there is also evidence that the greatest draw upon social-welfare services *originates* in those same linguistic minorities. In or-der to reduce the societal costs imposed on the welfare system and criminal-justice system, certain linguistic minorities need to receive linguistic help; i.e., to have greater access to majority-language functions, (p. 163, emphasis added)

Here, as Brodkey (1991) notes, language problems are depicted as a "personal misery" with "public consequences" that can be abrogated only through the intervention of language planning programs (p. 164). In this description, the language minority status of certain (unspecified) groups appears to be their most important attribute, since no other attributes are mentioned. But is language background really the salient factor associated with these social costs? Are wealthy language minorit-ies also disproportionately represented in criminal and social welfare statistics? Are the poor generally, regardless of language background, more likely to be represented in such statistics? Framing "social cost" issues solely in terms of language reflects a majoritarian or dominant group perspective. It imputes agency to "certain" language minority groups who "impose" their costs on the dominant society. The remedy for reducing these societal costs is apparently solely linguistic, involving providing "greater access to majority language functions." Yet histori-cal evidence regarding how best to reduce social costs among immigrant and language minority groups suggests that language or literacy prob-lems are not the cause of social ills but result from them. In the United States, for example, economic and social gains among immigrant lan-guage minorities "have been more the results of long-term organized efforts to win better working conditions and benefits than of the acqui-sition of English language and literacy" (Weinberg; cited in Wiley, 1993). Many of these gains occurred as a result of the great expansion of unionism during the 1930s, and many of the new unionists were from the "undesirable" groups (Wiley, in press). Even with the interven-tion of mass literacy campaigns, social problems persisted (Graff, 1979). Graff (1987) concludes:

> Criminal prosecution, and probably apprehension as well, derived from the facts of inequality. Punishment, stratification, and illiteracy too were rooted in the social structure; pervasive structures of inequality which emanated from the ethnic and sexual ascription ordered groups and individuals. . . . Achieve-ment of literacy [i.e., in the standard language] or education had little impact upon these structures, and in many cases only reinforced them. (p. 210)

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

Why should this be so? As language minorities with lower socioeconomic status (SES) make educational gains, the rest of society makes gains too. If a scarcity of "good" jobs persists, the result is what R. Collins (1979) calls *credential inflation,* that is, for example, as lower SES language minorities increase their years of schooling and language skills, their gains are negated as job requirements call for advanced degrees and professional credentials — all of which demand higher levels of language proficiency - that often are not really needed to do the job. To acknowledge credential inflation is not to argue against language in education planning. Rather, credential inflation demonstrates that language planning alone cannot be seen as a cure for deeper societal ills related to social stratification and job scarcity. To make it so is to blame the victim, for the image of remedy (i.e., more schooling and language instruction) is provided without the substance of remedy (economic mobility through better jobs and benefits).

Language planning, especially as it relates to literacy, is commonly seen as having a positive impact on the national economy in technologi-cal societies. For example, Vargas (1986) contends that "the need for the nation's work force to be continuously replenished by adequately trained and functionally literate workers becomes increasingly im-portant" (p. 9). However, the causality between national economic well-being and language and literacy planning may be overestimated. Coulmas (1992) notes that during a Nicaraguan literacy campaign of the 1980s there were no "immediate or medium-term consequences for the development of social wealth in that country" despite a 10 percent increase in the literacy rate (p. 211) . He concludes that "the socioeco-nomic value of literacy cannot be measured on a scale with linear progress" (p. 211).

There are also a number of social contexts in local communities where language planning goals are pursued. Many local language plan-ning initiatives are linked to immigration. According to U.N. estimates, as many as a hundred million people may now be trying to migrate voluntarily or involuntarily, fleeing war, genocide, or extreme poverty. Although immigration issues are usually framed as issues of national policy, it is often at the local level where decisions are made that affect accommodation for language differences. In the absence of a stated governmental policy, local community agencies often create their own. Many policies related to access to housing, jobs, schooling, and other social services could be cited, but the case of health care will suffice.

In many communities, health care agencies are staffed by medical personnel who speak the dominant language; some workers, however, may be native speakers of other languages. In California, for example, a nursing shortage (not unrelated to low wages and benefits) resulted in

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

the "importing" of well- trained native speakers of Korean, Illocano, and Tagalog from Korea and the Philippines. All these occupational immigrants, however, are required to speak and have literacy skills in English. Yet, in many local California communities large numbers of patients may speak Vietnamese, Hmong, Khmer, or Spanish. Kaplan (1991) sees this type of situation as being typical of the kind of communication problem which may be addressed through language planning:

> severe social problem can be created by differences between the language in which certain services can be delivered and the language of the population most in need of services. This is most likely to occur in relation to medical services; it is often the case that medical practitioners are trained in a world language, but deliver medical services to populations who do not speak the language in which medical practitioners were trained, (p. 163)

A number of questions can be raised here, for example: How should we analyze and solve the communication problems in this case? Should this case be framed merely as an example of a mismatch of the lan-guages of the medical service providers and the populations they serve? Should the health care agency be required to provide translators or bilingual doctors and nurses if many of its clients cannot understand the language spoken by those who provide the health care? Or does it raise questions regarding the role of language between groups with differential status, resources, and power? In the provision of medical services, for whom is the inability to communicate more of a problem: doctors, nurses, or their patients? For whom do the doctors and nurses work: primarily for the hospital or department of public health or for their patients? In terms of paying for public health, should the taxpayers have the final say regarding whether interpreters will be provided? Whom do we have in mind when we appeal to the taxpayers, only members of the majority or dominant group? If translators are utilized, for whom do they work? For the doctors and nurses? Or for the pa-tients? Or for the taxpayers? If translators recognize a cultural conflict between the doctors and nurses and the patients, what should they do?: Should they attempt to mediate as cross-cultural referees? Should they take the side of the health care provider or of the patient? Should the translators be highly paid because of their bilingual skills? Should the health care agency be required to recruit bilingual personnel to fill the ranks of its "regular[55] personnel (i.e., its doctors, nurses, clerks, custodians, and laboratory personnel) so that the agency begins to look like the community it serves? If the answer to the last question is yes, should it be yes for both public and private health care agencies? Obviously, the communication problem is related to many other prob-lems which must be considered as part of the language planning process (see Wiley, 1986).

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

Language in education planning

In modern societies, education provides one of the major means of promoting language acquisition planning and language shift policy. *Language in education planning* is the primary form of language acquisition planning.[5] Like other forms of language planning, it cannot be discussed in isolation from sociopolitical issues, since it is related to a broader purpose in education, namely, socialization, and since it is an extension of overall governmental policy (Judd, 1991, p. 170). Al-though schools play an important role in community-based language planning, they also play a major role in promoting national standard languages and thereby help to extend the influence of the state along its horizontal axis across groups. The standard must be explicitly taught as opposed to acquired. There is some irony here, since native speakers of language X must go to school to learn the language they supposedly already speak. Illich (1979) offers a provocative critique here as he pro-tests:

> We first allow standard language to degrade ethnic, black, or hillbilly language, and then spend money to teach their counterfeits [i.e. the standardized school languages] as academic subjects. Administrators and entertainers, admen and newsmen, ethnic politicians and 'radical' professionals, form powerful interest groups, each fighting for a larger slice of the language pie. (p. *55)*

Although many people hold the rather simplistic notion that writing is merely speech encoded in print, there is more at work. As Haugen understood, schooling facilitates the imposition of the norms of the written or formal standard upon oral varieties of language. Language in education policies also include designating the language(s) of instruction; recruiting teachers based on their language and literacy backgrounds; providing for first, second, and foreign language instruction; and developing curricula, syllabi, and materials that are sensitive to the language and cultural backgrounds of the students (cf. Corson, 1989; Ingram, 1990, 1991).

In the United States, conflicts over language in education have tended to parallel the majority's disposition toward language minority groups in other spheres. Not all groups were treated equally or afforded equal access or resources. Some groups were vigorously discriminated against (Leibowitz, 1971, 1974). Language policies affecting various language minority groups reflected the prejudice or tolerance toward each group's race, ethnicity, and religion (see Kaplan, 1994, p. 157, regard-

See Paulston and McLaughlin (1994) for a discussion of language in education planning in international contexts.

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

ing "vestigial racism[55] in New Zealand) . The issue is not whether U.S. educational language policies have been successful or unsuccessful, but for whom, and under what circumstances, they have been successful or unsuccessful. It is only by looking at the experience of specific groups in schools and elsewhere that we can conclude that language planning can be said to have solved communication problems or promoted social control. Language minority "language problems[55] have, for the most part, been defined by the majority and its institutions, and the absence of a minority voice in these institutions is a problem. Foremost among language-related cases in the United States that have found their way to the courts are *Meyer v. Nebraska* (1923), *Lau v. Nichols* (1974), and *Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School Children v. Ann Arbor Board of Education* (1979). The Lau decision has received considerable attention in the literature (e.g., Crawford, 1991, 1992a, 1992b); therefore, attention here will be concentrated on the other two cases, which demonstrate the responses of U.S. courts to language policies and practices.

Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390 (1923), involved the attempt to restrict all forms of instruction in the United States to the English language. Meyer taught in a parochial school in Nebraska and used a German Bible history book as a text for reading. He was fined according to a 1919 Nebraska statute that forbade teaching in any language other than English. The Supreme Court decided that the Nebraska law was an unconstitutional violation of the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment by a 7 to 2 margin (Murphy, 1992, p. 543). The significant factor in this case, which regarded language rights in educational contexts, is that the court viewed its decision as a defense of other individual liberties. Language was important not in its own right but only in association with other liberties. Oliver Wendell Holmes[5]s dissent was most telling in that he argued that all citizens of the United States should be required to speak a common tongue (Murphy, 1992). The Court's majority did not dispute that position; rather, it affirmed it: "The power of the state to compel attendance at some school and to make reasonable regulations for all schools, *including a requirement that they shall give instructions in English is not questioned"* (cited in Norgren & Nanda, 1988, p. 188, emphasis added; see also Crawford, 1992b).

What is particularly fascinating about this case is the social and political climate that preceded it. The World War I era and the first Red Scare period that followed it were marked by extremism and intoler-ance. The period from 1880 to 1920 experienced the highest levels of immigration (as a percentage of total population) of any period in the history of the United States. Nativism was in full force; there were

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

recurring attempts to restrict immigration. The Americanization movement sought to promote the English language and social assimilation. Racial minorities, such as African-Americans, continued to be perennial targets of racism and discrimination. In 1917 the United States entered the war against Germany, and intolerance was pursued along linguistic lines as well. German was the second-most commonly spoken language in the United States. Its position was analogous to that of Spanish in the United States today. With the war, xenophobia reached its high-water mark with a frontal assault on all things German, especially the language. Across the country, communities banned German books and instruction. Edicts were passed against public use of German. In the Midwest alone, 18,000 citations were issued for language violations (Crawford, 1991), and an anti-German mob spirit took over in many communities (Luebke, 1980, pp. 9—10).

Where did educators stand in all of this? Luebke (1980) notes that "Many educators lent their authority to the war on German- language instruction in the schools[55] (p. 5). The attack on German was devastating, and German usage never recovered. Despite *Meyer,* the effect of a popular ideology, fanned by World War I, resulted in the removal of German from the school curriculum. If we were to concentrate only on formal policies in legal statutes, we could not explain how, in just 7 years, German language instruction in high schools went from a high in 1915 of 324,000 students to fewer than 14,000 students of German in 1922. Nor could we explain how, between 1915 and 1948, the percentage of high school students studying German had dropped from 25 percent to less than 1 percent (Leibowitz, 1971). To explain these events, a historical-structural analysis is necessary. Clearly, the fate of German in the United States illustrates that language teachers are not immune from the sociohistorical contexts in which they teach. Simi-larly, political upheavals in, for example, the former Soviet Union and former Yugoslavia have led to significant changes in official language policies that have also affected designated languages of instruction. Teachers in these societies have likewise not been unscathed by the linguistic reversals of fortune under their new governments.

In the United States since the early 1960s, controversy has sur-rounded the status of African-American varieties of language and the extent to which there is a need for specialized training for teachers of African-American children. Another hotly debated issue has been whether, and to what extent, they should receive formal instruction in African-American language (see Dillard, 1972). Adding to the contro-versy is the fact that many of the prescriptions for the education of African-American children have been put forth by white social scientists (e.g., Baratz, 1973; Stewart, 1964; Wolfram & Fasold, 1973), whose

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

intentions and prescriptions have been severely criticized by some commentators (e.g., Sledd, *1969,* 1973).[6]

African-American parents have been divided over issues involving language in education, but they have been united in a desire for their children to have access to quality education. In 1979, in Michigan, plaintiffs acting on behalf of African-American children sued the Ann Arbor Board of Education, under the Equal Opportunities Act, for failing to overcome language barriers which obstructed the equal partic-ipation of African-American students. The suit resulted in a landmark case, *Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary School Children v. Ann Arbor Board of Education* (henceforth referred to as *Ann Arbor).* One of the most complicated issues in the case dealt with whether African-American children should be given special educational treatment be-cause their language variety was sufficiently different from standard English to pose a barrier to their educational progress (Crawford, 1992b; Norgren *&c* Nanda, 1988). Linguists figured prominently in the case as expert witnesses. Central to the prosecution's case was the contention that the linguistic differences between African-American speech and standard English were significant enough to pose an instruc-tional barrier, especially for basic reading instruction. Judge Joiner, who presided in the case, defined the plaintiffs position:

> This case is not an effort on the part of the plaintiffs to require that they be taught "black English/' or that a dual language program be provided. . . . It is a straightforward effort to require the court to intervene on the children's be-half to require the defendant School District Board to take appropriate action to teach them to read in standard English of the school, the commercial world, the arts, the science and professions. This action is a cry for help in opening the doors to the establishment... to keep another generation from becoming functionally illiterate, (cited in Norgren & Nanda, 1988, p. 190)

Judge Joiner sided with the plaintiffs. Since the time of the decision, it is not clear that language differences among African-American chil-dren in the United States have been accommodated in any systematic way. Moreover, the decision bypassed the more controversial issue, which had been acrimoniously debated during the 1960s and early 1970s, of whether students should be taught in "black English." Never-theless, applied linguists have continued to be involved in prescribing remedies for intervention in teacher education and in educational prac-tice for African-American children in the wake of the decision (see Rickford, this volume; see also Whiteman, 1980). In recent years, there have again been sporadic calls for instruction in African-American lan-

See also O'Neil's (1973) criticism of bidialectal instruction, Shuy's (1980) reflection on the controversy during the 1960s and 1970s, Wolfram's (1994) recent reassessment, and Wiley's discussion (in press).

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

guage coming from some African-American linguists and educators (see Smith, 1993; S. Williams, 1991), and the issue remains controversial.

Issues of professional responsibility

During the early 1980s, Labov (1982)[7] reviewed the role of linguists in *Ann Arbor* and raised important issues of professional responsibility that remain worthy of consideration by linguists and language teachers today. For social scientists, his primary question is: "How can we reconcile the objectivity we need for scientific research with the social commitment we need to apply our knowledge in the social world?[55] (p. 194; cf. Shuy, 1993, for a related discussion). For teachers, a similar question can be raised: How can we provide appropriate instruction for all our students, given both historical and contemporary inequities in the education of many language minority students? Labov (1982) offers four principles to guide professional involvement (and suggests a fifth, which is also given here):

The first is called the *principle of error correction:*

> A scientist who becomes aware of a widespread idea or social practice with important consequences that is invalidated by his own data is obligated to bring this error to the attention of the widest possible audience, (p. 172)

The second is the *principle of debt incurred:*

> An investigator who has obtained linguistic data from members of a speech community has an obligation to use the knowledge based on that data for the benefit of the community, when it has need of it. (p. 173)

The third is the *principle of linguistic democracy:*

> Linguists support the use of a standard dialect in so far as it is an instrument of wider communication for the general population, but oppose its use as a bar-rier to social mobility, (p. 186)

The fourth is the *principle of linguistic autonomy:*

> The choice of what language or dialect is to be used in a given domain of a speech community is reserved to members of that community, (p. 186)

In discussing how a consensus was formed in *Ann Arbor* among linguists regarding the uniqueness of the language spoken by African-Americans, Labov points to the importance of the entrance of black linguists into the field. This suggests a fifth principle: The *principle of representation in the field:*

> Every field that is dominated by members of one group, who study and prescribe remedies for the "problems" of another, needs to ensure representation

Labov has also had his share of critics; again, see Sledd (1969, 1973) regarding Labov's earlier work.

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

from the target group in order to guarantee that its voice and insights are not excluded and that assumptions and perspectives of the dominant group are not imposed on it.

This could also be stated as a principle that attempts to ensure the integrity of the field by means of opening it to multiple perspectives. Such a principle helps to avoid either the appearance or the actuality of imposing — even if unintentionally — the biases of the dominant group in the field upon others. Moreover, it allows the profession to begin to look more like (i.e., to be representative of) the people whose needs they are attempting to address. To support this principle is not to advocate a so-called quota system; rather, it is to acknowledge that it is always a good idea to include members of a target population when members of one group are attempting to educate or solve the problems of another.

With slight modification, Labov's principles appear to be equally relevant for language teachers. The principle of error correction might be modified as follows:

> Any language teacher who becomes aware of a widespread language in education policy or practice which has detrimental consequences for his or her students has an obligation to bring this policy or practice to the attention of appropriate audiences (e.g., colleagues, administrators, and parents).

The principle of debt incurred, as it applies to language teachers, could be modified as:

Since students are teacher's clients, teachers have a responsibility to learn as much as possible about them regarding their linguistic, cultural, and class back-grounds in order to provide appropriate instruction.

The remaining principles need no modification, for they are equally relevant for linguistics and teachers alike.

Labov's principles provide a basis upon which to begin the dialogue on professional responsibility, but questions remain for both linguists and language teachers. In *Ann Arbor,* for example, the contribution of linguists was limited mostly to establishing the existence of a distinct variety of African-American language. The judge and the plaintiff steered clear of the controversial language planning and policy questions such as: Given the distinctiveness of African-American language, what should the language in education policies be? Should they involve only accommodation, as the court decreed? Or should they involve language enrichment policy, as some Afro-centrists have recently argued? In the years since *Ann Arbor,* how much has the educational achievement of African-Americans in the United States improved? Is the persistence of educational underachievement a result of the failure of a language accommodation policy, or is it the result of the failure to implement that policy? In terms of representation, how many African-

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

American language planners have entered the field since Labov made his observations? To what extent are these issues related to the persis-tence of more fundamental societal problems such as racism and lack of economic opportunity? (See Kozol, 1991, for a discussion of larger societal inequities which go well beyond those solely focused on language.)

Language policies and practices in institutional contexts

In order to apply Labov's principles, it is useful to examine the institutional contexts in which policies are carried out. As noted earlier in this chapter, language policies can either be implicit or explicit. Many educational language policies tend to be implicit because they result more from institutional practices than official policies. Haas (1992) has examined such practices in terms of how they relate to institutional racism. *Institutional racism* refers to *systematic* institutional practices which have the effect of advantaging some groups and disadvantaging others — regardless of whether they were intended to do so. In an analysis of the state of Hawaii, he identifies a number of instances in institutional practices involving language which have adversely affected language minorities (both speakers of languages other than English and speakers of "nonstandard" varieties of English). For example, after 1924 a test of oral English was used to segregate nonstandard English-speaking children into separate schools from those with mainland (i.e., standard) accents. "Many of the brightest immigrant children went to nonstandard schools, whereas less intelligent native-English speaking students went to standard schools, so both standard and nonstandard schools enrolled students heterogeneous in abilities[55] according to other measures of aptitude (Haas, 1992, p. 191). In other words, language assessment was used to separate children largely on the basis of race. Haas notes that this practice was abolished only after many children of color acquired "mainland sounding accents[55] (p. 191). Among forty-four specific examples of institutional racism documented by Haas, six were related to institutional language policies. Although these referred specifically to the case of Hawaii, they are broadly applicable.

Insufficient use of minority languages in communicating with parents

Unequal grade distributions by race, ethnicity, or language background

Underidentification of students in need of language assistance

Underserving of students needing language assistance

Inappropriate staff composition to provide language assistance to LEP/NELP students

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

Discriminatory requirements for language certification (adapted from pp. 191-214)

Other practices, in addition to those identified by Haas, could be added to the list, for example:

Segregation into separate educational tracks based upon language background
Unequal access to core academic curricula based upon language background
Unequal expectations for success based upon language background
Failure to provide members of a speech community with a choice of the language or dialect of instruction

As discussed, several principles related to the professional responsi-bility of teachers are relevant to redressing these discriminatory institu-tional practices. For example, the principle of error correction applies to items 1 to 3 and 5 to 9, for these policies and practices need to be exposed and corrected. The principle of representation in the field relates to item 4. Item 10 involves the principle of linguistic autonomy.

Among the more persistent institutional practices that need scrutiny is the use of language tests as one of the primary means of sorting children into special language classifications. Such classifications result in segregated programs within otherwise integrated schools. In the United States, these include non-English proficient (NEP), limited En-glish proficient (LEP), and fluent English proficient (FEP). Classifica-tions such as these were intended to identify students so that they could receive appropriate educational treatment. Nevertheless, they are based solely on proficiency in the socially dominant language, English. Any other linguistic abilities that the children have are ignored (see Macias, 1993) . Such language classifications can have the force of racial labeling or act as a surrogate for it (Wiley, in press). Related to this issue is the question of whether language minority children receive appropriate treatment once assessed, classified, and tracked. If appropriate instruc-tion is being provided, why are many children initially classified as LEP, but subsequently reclassified as "learning disabled[55] several years later? (see Trueba, 1988; Trueba, Jacobs, & Kirton, 1990).

Fortunately, educational language planning can contribute to solving some of these problems when the principles of professional responsibil-ity are used as a guide. Recommendations from the New Zealand Department of Education (1988; cited by Cummins, 1989, p. 61) pro-vide examples of ways in which schools can incorporate minority lan-guages and thereby elevate the status of those languages in the eyes of their speakers. Elevating the status of the students[5] native languages helps enhance their positive self-identity and promotes *additive bilin-*

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

gualism (oral and academic ability in two languages). The specific recommendations are to:

Reflect the various cultural groups in the school district by providing signs in the main office and elsewhere that welcome people in different languages
Encourage students to use their LI (native language) around the school
Provide opportunities for students from the same ethnic group to communicate with one another in their LI where possible (e.g., in cooperative learning groups on at least several occasions)
Recruit people who can tutor students in their LI
Provide books written in various languages in both classrooms and the school library
Incorporate greetings and information in the various languages in newsletters and other official school communications
Provide bilingual and/or multilingual signs
Display pictures and objects of the various cultures represented at the school
Create units of work that incorporate other languages in addition to the school language
Provide opportunities for students to study their LI in elective subjects and/or in extracurricular clubs
Encourage parents to help in the classroom, library, playground, and clubs
Invite second language learners to use their LI during assemblies, prize givings, and other official functions
Invite people from ethnic minority communities to act as resource people and to speak to students in both formal and informal set-tings

This list can be evaluated in terms of how it relates to principles of professional responsibility and to language policy and planning more generally. Items 1 and 2 involve the principle of debt incurred; items 4 and 13 relate to the principle of representation in the field; and all the items can be linked to the principle of linguistic democracy.
What can this list tell us about the New Zealand Department of Education's approach to language policy and planning more generally? First, note that some of these recommendations can be seen as institutional efforts as status planning by improving the visibility of minority languages and their speakers. Items 4, 5, 11, and 13 tend to improve language resources when there is a lack of materials and trained personnel, but in any case, they draw upon the linguistic and cultural resources of the language minority community by involving parents and other members of the community in the expanding language resources.

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

Despite their positive features, blanket recommendations such as these can rarely be implemented without an assessment of the local situation and negotiation with those affected; that is, information about the school and the community is needed before they can be implemented as policies. For example, the relationship between the language minority community and the school should be understood. To what extent does the school personnel reflect the community it serves? If there is a serious mismatch, is it because the language minority population has only recently arrived? Or has the population been there long enough so that the lack of representation in the schools signals that there are more fundamental historical inequities between the groups? Will the recommendations be negotiated with adequate representation from the surrounding community? Will all major constituencies have some voice in discussing these recommendations? Can some opposition be expected from more dominant groups? If they see the implementation of the recommendations as pandering to minorities, what is the best strategy to use in dealing with their fears or prejudices? Does the language minority community see these steps as solutions or as token gestures?

In the absence of any previous attempts to incorporate minority languages and cultures, these suggestions are positive steps to promote the status of previously ignored languages and cultures. They do not, however, elevate minority languages to positions of equality. To do this, other educational language plans such as two-way bilingual pro-grams are more beneficial. Individual programs can be guided by a commitment to general principles involving language rights, by what we know about effective language minority instruction generally. Since local contexts vary, it is necessary to gather as much data as possible in collaboration with the members of the communities to be served. Because many countries have large numbers of both indigenous and immigrant language minorities, language in education planning must be adaptable to meet the needs of students within their school and community contexts (Edelsky & Hudelson, 1991) and must be based upon explicit, adequately funded policies that reflect both local and international varieties of language (see Stubbs, 1994).

Conclusion

Promoting language change or language preservation is not merely a technical question of determining which language, when, and in what variety. Similarly, providing appropriate language instruction for all students involves more than assessment based upon the dominant language. How we view issues related to language change, language preservation, and language in education planning is influenced by (as Ruiz, 1984, and others have noted) whether we see language diversity as a problem or as a resource. When language diversity is seen as a problem,

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

in the society as a whole and in its schools, minority languages tend to be suppressed, ignored, or, at best, accommodated. When language diversity is seen as a resource, minority languages are protected and nurtured. As applied linguists and language teachers, we can play a role in promoting such a view, or we can reinforce what Fishman (1980) called the "ethnicity versus the anti-ethnicity treadmill" (p. 544), in which language policies function as a "bar" rather than as a "door" (Hornberger, 1994b). As Labov (1982) recommends, a commitment to promoting languages and equitable education for language minorities is needed in teaching, given the persistence of social dominance and in-equality.

Suggestions for further reading

Corson, D. (1989). *Language policy across the curriculum,* Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.

This study surveys a broad range of topics related to language policy across the school curriculum. It details policymaking at the school site level and at the national level. Examples are provided from a variety of nations including Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the former Soviet Union. The book addresses policy issues related to bilingual education and foreign language instruction. It also addresses social justice issues related to language policy.

Crawford, J. (1991). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Series.

This introductory work is highly accessible for the new reader to the field; yet it is well documented and contains important background information that demonstrates the importance of the sociopolitical and sociohistorical contexts of language planning and policy formation related to bilingual education in the United States.

Crawford, J. (1992). *Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of "English only."* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

This highly readable but mature work provides a critical history of the push behind the "English only" movement. It demonstrates the role of language strategists on both sides of the debate.

Leibowitz, A. H. (1971). *Educational policy and political acceptance: The imposition of English as the language of instruction in American schools.* ERIC ED 047 321.

This unpublished piece has largely been overlooked. It contains a major thesis regarding the reasons for the imposition of English as the language of instruction and the consequences for various language minority groups. This work is being reprinted in a collection of Leibowitz's work being prepared by the California State University at Long Beach and expected to appear in 1995.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

This work investigates the dominance of English as a world language. It traces the ascendancy of English historically and its influence as a language of dominance in Third World countries. The book also analyzes the rela-

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

tionship between the English teaching profession and the dominance of English as a world language.

Tollefson, J. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community.* New York: Longman.

Tollefson critiques the neoclassical orientation. He looks at language poli-cies in several international contexts and at the ideologies promoting En-glish as a world language. He provides practical examples and raises provocative ethical questions regarding the role of teachers in the language planning process.

References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso.

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (1994). "Unplanned" language policy and planning. In W. Grabe (Ed.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 14,* 82—89. Cambridge University Press.

Baratz, J. C. (1973). Teaching reading in an urban Negro school system. In R. H. Bentley, *&c* S. D. Crawford (Eds.), *Black language reader* (pp. 154— 171). Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Bright, W. (Ed.) (1992). *International encyclopedia of linguistics,* vols. 1—4. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bhatia, T. K. (1984). Literacy in monolingual societies. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.). *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 1983* 23—38.

Brodkey, L. (1991). Tropics of literacy. In C. Mitchell & K. Weiler (Eds.), *Rewriting literacy: Culture and the discourse of the other* (pp. 161—168). New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Collins, J. (1991). Hegemonic practice: Literacy and standard language in public education. In C. Mitchell & K. Weiler (Eds.), *Rewriting literacy: Culture and the discourse of the other* (pp. 229-253). New York: Bergin *&C* Garvey.

Collins, R. (1979). *The credential society: A historical sociology of education and stratification.* New York: Academic Press.

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

Corson, D. (1989). *Language policy across the curriculum.* Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.

Coulmas, F. (1992). *Language and economy.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Coulmas, F. (1994). Language policy and planning: Political perspectives. In W. Grabe (Ed.) *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 14:34—52.* Cam-bridge University Press.

Crawford, J. (1991). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Services.

Crawford, J. (1992a). *Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of "English only."* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Crawford, J. (1992b). *Language loyalties: A source book on the official English controversy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In Office of Bilingual Education, California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3—49). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University at Los Angeles.
Cummins, J. (1984a). Wanted: A theoretical framework for relating language proficiency to academic achievement among bilingual students. In C. Ri-vera (Ed.), *Language proficiency and academic achievement* (pp. 2—19). Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.
Cummins, J. (1984b). Language proficiency and academic achievement revis-ited: A response. In C. Rivera (Ed.), *Language proficiency and academic achievement* (pp. 71—76). Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.
Cummins, J. (1985). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy.* San Diego, CA: College-Hill Press.
Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students.* Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE).
Dillard, J. L. (1972). *Black English: Its history and usage in the United States.* New York: Vintage/Random House.
Edelsky, C, *&c* Hudelson, S. (1991). Contextual complexities: Written lan-guage policies for bilingual programs. In S. Benesch (Ed.), *ESL in America: Myths and possibilities* (pp. 75—90). Portsmouth, NH: Boyton/Cook, Heinemann.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power.* New York: Longman.
Fishman, J. A. (Ed.) (1966). *Language loyalty in the United States.* The Hague: Mouton.
Fishman, J. A. (Ed.) (1974). *Advances in language planning.* The Hague: Mouton.
Fishman, J. A. (1978). Positive bilingualism: Some overlooked rationales and forefathers. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
Fishman, J. A. (1980). Language maintenance. In S. T. Thernstrom, A. Orlov, *&C* O. Handlin (Eds.), *Harvard encyclopedia of American ethnic groups* (pp. 629-638). Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard Univer-sity Press.

Fishman, J. A. (1981). Language policy: Past, present, and future. In C. A. Ferguson & S. B. Heath (Eds.), *Language in the U.S.A.* (pp. 516—526). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages.* Philadelphia: Multilin-gual Matters.
Frank, F., & Anshen, F. (1983). *Language and the sexes.* Albany, NY: State University Press.
Galtung, J. (1980). *The true worlds. A transnational perspective.* New York: The Free Press.
Gibbons, J. (1991). Sociology of language. In W. Bright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of linguistics* (vol. 4, pp. 22—25). New York: Oxford Univer-sity Press.
Graff, H. J. (1979). *The literacy myth: Literacy and social structure in the nineteenth century city.* New York: Academic Press.

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

Graff, H. J. (1987). Illiteracy and criminality in the nineteenth century. In H. J. Graff (Ed.), *The labyrinths of literacy: Reflections on literacy past and present* (pp. 187-213). London: The Falmer Press.
Grillo, R. D. (1989). *Dominant languages: Language and hierarchy in Britain and France.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Haacke, W. (1994). Language policy and planning in Namibia. In W. Grabe (Ed.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 14,* 240-253. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Haas, M. (1992). *Institutional racism: The case of Hawaii.* Westport, CN: Praeger.
Haugen, E. (1966). *Language conflict and language planning: The case of modern Norwegian.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Haugen, E. (1972/1962). Schizoglossia and the linguistic norm. In A. S. Dil (Selected), *The ecology of language: Essays by Einar Haugen* (pp. 148— 189). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Haugen, E. (1972/1966) . Linguistics and language planning. In A. S. Dil (Selected), *The ecology of language: Essays by Einar Haugen* (pp. 159—190.) Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Originally published in W. Bright (Ed.) (1966), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 50—70). The Hague: Mouton.
Haugen, E. (1973/1992). The curse of Babel. In J. Crawford (Ed.), *Language loyalties: A source book on the official English controversy* (pp. 309— 409). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Reprinted from *Daedalus, 102* (Summer, 1973), 47-57.
Haugen, E. (1983). The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In J. Cobarrubias & J. A. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in language planning* (pp. 269—289). The Hague: Mouton.
Heath, S. B. (1976). Colonial language status achievement: Mexico, Peru, and the United States. In A. Verdoodt *&c* R. Kjolseth (Eds.), *Language and sociology.* Louvin: Peeters.
Hobsbawn, E. J. (1992). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hornberger, N. H. (1994a). Language policy and planning in South America. In W. Grabe (Ed.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 14,* 220-239. Cambridge University Press.
Hornberger, N. H. (1994b). Literacy and language planning. *Language and Education.* 8:(l-2), 75-86.
Illich, I. (1979). Vernacular values and education. *Teacher's College Record,* 81(1), 31-75.
Ingram, D. E. (1990). Language-in-education planning. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 1989.* New York: Cambridge Uni-versity Press.
Ingram, D. E. (1991). Language-in-education planning. In W. Bright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of linguistics,* vol. 2, pp. 302-305. New York: Oxford University Press.
Jahr, E. H. (1992). Sociolinguistics: Minorities and sociolinguistics. In W. Bright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of linguistics* (Vol. 4, pp. 12—15). New York: Oxford University Press.
Judd, E. (1991). Language-in-education policy and planning. In W. Grabe and R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 169-188). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
Kaplan, R. B. (1991). Applied linguistics and language policy and planning. In

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

W. Grabe and R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 143-168). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
Kaplan, R. B. (1994). Language policy and planning in New Zealand. In W. Grabe (Ed.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 14:156-173.* Cam-bridge University Press.
Kloss, H. (1969). *Research possibilities on group bilingualism: A report.* Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.
Kloss, H. (1971) . Language rights of immigrant groups. *International Migration Review, 5,* 250—268.
Kloss, H. (1977). *The American bilingual tradition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools.* New York: Crown Publishers.
Labov, W. (1982). Objectivity and commitment in linguistic science: The case of the Black English trial in Ann Arbor. *Language in Society, 11,* 165—201.
Leibowitz, A. H. (1969). English literacy: Legal sanction for discrimination. *Notre Dame Lawyer, 25* (1), 7—66.
Leibowitz, A. H. (1971). *Educational policy and political acceptance: The imposition of English as the language of instruction in American schools.* ERIC No. ED 047 321.
Leibowitz, A. H. (1974, August) . Language as a means of social control. Paper presented at the VIII World Congress of Sociology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.
Leibowitz, A. H. (1980). *The Bilingual Education Act: A legislative analysis.* Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education.
Leibowitz, A. H. (1982). *Federal recognition of the rights of minority language groups.* Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education.
Leibowitz, A. H. (1984). The official character of language in the United States: Literacy requirements for citizenship, and entrance requirements into American life. *Aztlan,* 15(1), 25-70.
Lippi-Green, R. (1994). Accent, standard language ideology, and discriminatory pretext in courts. *Language in Society, 23,* 163—198.
Luebke, F. C. (1980). Legal restrictions on foreign languages in the Great Plains states, 1917—1923. In P. Schach (Ed.), *Languages in conflict: Linguistic acculturation on the Great Plains* (pp. 1—19). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
Marias, R. F. (1979). Choice of language as a human right — Public policy implications in the United States. In R. V. Padilla (Ed.), *Bilingual educa-tion and public policy in the United States. Ethnoperspectives in bilingual education research* (Vol. 1, (pp. 39—75). Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan Uni-versity.
Marias, R. F. (1993, May). Language and ethnic classification of language minorities: Chicano and Latino students in the 1990s. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences,* i5(2), 230—257.
McKay, S. L. (1993). *Agendas for second language literacy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
McKay, S. L., *&C* Weinstein-Shr, G. (1993, Autumn). English literacy in the U.S.: National policies, personal consequences. *TESOL Quarterly,* 27(3), 399_419.
McKay, S. L., & Wong, S. C. (Eds.) (1988). *Language diversity: Resource or*

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

problem? A social and educational perspective on language minorities in the United States. Cambridge: Newbury House.
Milliard, C. (1988). Racism, ethnicism and etharchy or not? The principles of progressive control and transformative change. In T. Skutnabb- Kangas *&c* J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 359 - 378). London: Multilingual Matters.
Murphy, P. L. (1992) . *Meyer v. Nebraska.* In K. L. Hall (Ed.), *The Oxford companion to the Supreme Court of the United States* (pp. 543—544). New York: Oxford University Press.
Norgren, J., & Nanda, S. (1988). *American cultural pluralism and the law* (Language, culture, and the courts, Chap. 10 pp. 185-199). New York: Praeger.
O'Neil, W. (1973). The politics of bidiabctism. In R. H. Bentley *&c* S. D. Crawford (Eds.), *Black language reader* (pp. 184—191). Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
Pattanayak, D. P. (1989). Monolingual myopia and the petals of the Indian lotus. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas 8c J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 379—389). London: Multilingual Matters.
Patthey-Chavez, G. G. (1994). Language policy and planning in Mexico: Indigenous language policy. In W. Grabe (Ed.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 14,* 200—219. Cambridge University Press.
Paulston, C. B., *&c* McLaughlin, S. (1994). Language-in-education policy and planning. In W. Grabe (Ed.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 14,* 53—81. Cambridge University Press.
Phillipson, R. (1988). Linguicism: Structures and ideologies in linguistic imperialism. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 339—358). London: Multilingual Matters.
Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ray, S. R. (1968). Language standardization. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language* (pp. 754—765). New York: Mouton.
Roberts, C, Davis, E., &: Jupp, T. (1992). *Language and discrimination: A study of communication in multi-ethnic workplaces.* New York: Longman.
Roy, J. D. (1987). The linguistic and sociolinguistic position of black English and the issue of bidialectism in education. In P. Homel, M. Palij, *&C* D. Aaronson (Eds.), *Childhood bilingualism: Aspects of linguistic, cognitive, and social development* (pp. 231—242). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal,* 8(2), 15—34.
Shuy, R. (1980). Vernacular Black English: Setting the issues in time. In M. Farr Whiteman (Ed.), *Reactions to Ann Arbor: Vernacular Black English and education* (pp. 1-9). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Shuy, R. (1993). *Language crimes: The use and abuse of language evidence in the courtroom.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Simon, P. (1988). *The tongue-tied American: Confronting the foreign language crisis* (2nd ed.). New York: Continuum.
Sledd, J. (1969) . Bi-dialectism: The linguistics of white supremacy. *English journal, 58,* 1307-1315, 1329.
Sledd, J. (1973). Doublespeak: Dialectology in the service of Big Brother. In

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

R. H. Bentley & S. D. Crawford (Eds.), *Black language reader* (pp. 191—214). Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
Smith, E. A. (1993). The black child in the schools: Ebonics and its implications for the transformation of American education. In Antonia Darder (Ed.), *Bicultural studies in education: The struggle for educational justice* (pp. 58—76). Claremont, CA: Institute for Education in Transformation, the Claremont Graduate School.
Stewart, W. (1964). Foreign language teaching methods in quasi-foreign language situations. In W. (Ed.), *Non-standard speech and the teaching of English.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Street, B. V. (Ed.) (1993). *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Stubbs, M. (1994). Educational language planning in England and Wales: Multicultural rhetoric and assimilationist assumptions. In J. Maybin (Ed.), *Language and literacy in social practice* (pp. 193-214). Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters and the Open University.
Tollefson, J. W. (1981). Centralized and decentralized language planning. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 5,* 175—188.
Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community.* New York: Longman.
Trueba, H. T. (1988). English literacy acquisition: From cultural trauma to learning disabilities in minority students. *Linguistics and Education, 1,* 125-152.
Trueba, H. T., Jacobs, L., *&c* Kirton, E. (1990). *Cultural conflict and adaptation: The case of Hmong children in American society.* New York: The Falmer Press.
Tucker, G. R. (1994). Concluding thoughts: Language planning issues for the coming decade. In W. Grabe (Ed.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 14,* 277-286. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Vargas, A. (1986). Illiteracy in the Hispanic community. Washington, DC: National Council of La Raza.
Veltman, F. (1983). *Language shift in the United States.* Berlin: Mouton.
Weinberg, M. (1990a). *A chance to learn: A history of race and education in the United States.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Weinberg, M. (1990b). *Racism in the United States.* West Port, CT: Greenwood Press.
Weinstein, B. (1979). Language strategists: Redefining political frontiers on the basis of linguistic choices. *World Politics,* 31(3) 344-364.
Weinstein, B. (1983). *The civic tongue: Political consequences of language choices.* New York: Longman.
Whiteman, M. Farr (Ed.) (1980). *Reactions to Ann Arbor: Vernacular Black English and education.* Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Wiley, T. G. (1986) . The significance of language and cultural barriers for the Euro-American elderly. In C. L. Hayes, R. A. Kalish, & D. Guttman (Eds.), *European-American elderly: A guide for practice* (pp. 35—50). New York: Springer.
Wiley, T. (1990—1991). Disembedding Chicano literacy: The need for a group-

Cambridge Books Online © Cambridge University Press, 2009

specific focus on adult literacy, *journal of the School of Education, CSU Stanislaus, 8(1),* 49-54.
Wiley, T. G. (1993, Autumn). Discussion of Klassen *&c* Burnaby and McKay & Weinstein-Shr: Beyond assimilationist literacy policies. *TESOL Quarterly,* 27(3):421-430.
Wiley, T. G. (in press). *Literacy and language diversity in the United States. Language in Education: Theory and Practice.* McHerny, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
Williams, G. (1992). *Sociolinguistics: A sociological critique.* London: Routledge.
Williams, S. W. (1991). Classroom use of African American language: Educational tool or social weapon? In C. E. Sleeter (Ed.), *Empowerment through multicultural education* (pp. 199-215). New York: SUNY Press.
Wolfram, W. (1994). Bidialectal literacy in the United States. In D. Spener (Ed.), *Adult Biliteracy in the United States* (pp. 71-88). *Language in Education: Theory and Practice, 83.* McHerny, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
Wolfram, W., *&C* Fasold, R. W. (1973). Toward reading materials for speakers of Black English: Three linguistically appropriate passages. In R. H. Bent-ley & S. D. Crawford (Eds.), *Black language reader* (pp. 172—184). Glen-view, IL: Scott Foresman.
Wolfram, W., & Fasold, R. W. (1974). *The study of social dialects in American English.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.