WARWICK
THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript
The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:
http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/131697

How to cite:
Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:
The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:
Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

warwick.ac.uk/lib-publications

Language policy and planning for language maintenance: The macro and meso levels

1. LPP as a field of study

Language policy and planning (LPP) has often been considered as an important factor in language maintenance (e.g. Hornberger and Coronel-Molina 2004). However, the position of LPP scholarship in language maintenance research has been ambiguous and it has often been omitted from studies of language maintenance – for example, García (2003) explicitly excludes language policy research from her state-of-the-art survey. Part of the cause of this ambiguity appears to come from an understanding of LPP as an activity solely of nation-states and governments. This view constructs LPP as of limited relevance to language maintenance, as much language maintenance happens without specific government policy.

In discussions of LPP, there is often disagreement about the relationship between the terms "policy" and "planning". For some, language planning is subsumed in language policy (Schiffman 1996), for others policy is part of planning (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997), and for yet others they are separate but related activities (Djité 1994), or the two have coalesced in such a way that making a distinction is no longer useful (Hornberger 2006). In this chapter I will use LPP as a general term, acknowledging Hornberger's arguments about the coalescing of the field, but sometimes use the more specific terms "policy" or "planning" to emphasise different aspects of action around language. Where "planning" refers to decision-making processes and "policy" refers to decisions, principles or guiding ideas that result from some explicit or implicit decision-making process.

LPP scholarship has developed a more nuanced understanding of LPP as a focus of study and considers LPP as a wide range of activities relating to language use, not just in formal policy and planning documents. LPP needs to be considered in two interrelated ways: as text and as discourse (Ball, 1 1993). LPP documents are "textual interventions into practice" (Ball, 1 1993: 12) and they intervene by constructing representations of a particular future state of society (aspects of future language learning or language use) that is to be enacted through the implementation of the actions the planning and policy requires. In articulating desired future states, planning and policy actors seek to control agendas and constrain the field of interpretation of their texts. However, they cannot control the ways in which documents are interpreted by readers, as any interpretation happens within systems of values, priorities, beliefs and contexts. As a result, LPP is changing and contested representations. Different readers are likely to have different interpretations and may seek to shape implementation of provisions to achieve their own valued aims. Implementation therefore needs to be negotiated by those involved in its enactment in specific contexts. Therefore, local actors have forms of agency in implementing LPP provisions in their local contexts (Baldauf 2006; Glasgow and Bouchard 2019). Such agency does not amount to free will, but rather is constrained by aspects of society and context (Liddicoat 2019).

LPP does not just exercise authority by requiring people to act in particular ways, but also by shaping how the phenomena they address are understood in the society; for languages, LPP can state and shape beliefs and values about languages, their utility and the criteria against which their utility, their place in the social fabric, etc. will be evaluated. Thus, LPP documents are not simply administrative documents, they are ideological constructs. As ideologies are inherent in any form of language use (Voloshinov 1929), LPP is not confined to administrative documents but is also present in other texts (both written and spoken) and in practices that construct beliefs about languages and how they are used, and that create affordances or constraints on language-related practice (Lo Bianco 2005). Such a view opens up the scope of what can constitute LPP and recognises that LPP is not only overtly expressed in documents

but also covertly expressed in decisions taken at any level of society that influence languages, their learning and their use (Shohamy 2006). In this way, it is possible and useful to treat practices around language learning and language use as forms of LPP, whether they are formally articulated or not.

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) argue that LPP work operates at a number of different levels within any society: macro, meso and micro. This more nuanced view of LPP is useful for understanding the field when studying language maintenance, as it brings to light the complex, interacting, and often conflicting policy positionings that occur at different social levels as they are enacted by different actors. While the terms macro-, meso- and micro-level have come to be widely used in LLP studies, the distinction between the levels is not fixed, and what any particular author may mean by a term often has much to do with the context and point of view of a particular study. The macro-level in LPP is most typically the work of government and government agencies (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997). This has been the classical focus of LPP scholarship. The place of government will vary according to the ways that societies are structured. In countries with strong centralisation, such as France or Japan, the macro-level may be the national government. However, in federal systems, such as Australia, the United States or Belgium, where some aspects of government responsibility are located at regional levels (states, provinces, etc.), these levels may also be considered part of the macro-level. The macro-level may also include supranational bodies, such as the United Nations or the European Union. The influence of such bodies may be less direct and less immediate than that of governments, but they may nonetheless represent an important part of the context in which national level policies are articulated and implemented. Often macro-level LPP is represented by explicit texts, such as constitutions, laws and policy documents, but may also be covert, existing in ideologies and cultural assumptions (Schiffman 1996) or in the silences in which languages and their speakers are passed over and thus have no place in representations of language learning and use in a particular polity.

The meso-level has not been well conceptualised in LPP research and has been treated as different things by different authors. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) focus on the targets of LPP and define the meso-level as LPP for a sector of society or for a particular group of individuals. However, they do not focus on who the actors are at meso-levels. This means that while macro-level actors are usually identified as governments and micro-level actors are understood as agents acting in local contexts (Liddicoat and Baldauf 2008), there is less clarity about who meso-level actors are. Miranda, Berdugo and Tejada (2016), studying university language policy, attempt to resolve this issue by understanding the meso-level as a fluid concept, with the macro being represented by actors outside the university, the micro-level by academics and students and the meso-level by all actors between the two. This more fluid conceptualisation is quite sensitive to context with the micro-level being the most local level of actors and the meso-level those actors that intervene between the macro- and the micro-level. Following from this conceptualisation, for language maintenance, the micro-level can be considered to be language users themselves, especially families, the macro-level is the level of government, and the meso-level are entities intermediate the two. Each level of policy interacts with language maintenance in different ways and, in any attempt to understand LPP and language maintenance, it is important to consider how the various layers work. This issue of family LPP is addressed elsewhere in the present volume (Curdt-Christiansen and Huang; Lanza and Lomeu; Schwartz; Smith Christmas; Palviainen, all this volume) and will not be developed further here. Rather this chapter will focus on the macro- and meso-levels that provide a backdrop against which family LPP is enacted.

Across the three levels, there are two main types of LPP that have implications for home language maintenance (see Kaplan and Baldauf 1997). These are language status LPP, which deals with the use and functions of language varieties, and language-in-education LPP, which

deals with language teaching and learning. Status planning may open or close spaces for the public use of language (van Els 2005). Language-in-education planning may open or close spaces for languages in educational contexts and foster or inhibit opportunities for development of literacy or expanded registers in particular language varieties and for overall educational success (Liddicoat 2013). However, other forms of LPP, such as corpus LPP involving the development of scripts, orthography, lexicon, codified grammar, etc., and prestige or image planning, which seeks to address issues of perception of language varieties, can also influence language maintenance. Where languages have not created scripts, orthographies or specialised lexicon, these may be seen as motivations to exclude such languages from valued contexts, especially education (Liddicoat 2005). Prestige planning may alter how particular languages varieties are seen by speakers and so promote or impede language maintenance (Baldauf 2004). This chapter will; now turn to considering how macro and meso level LPP can influence home language maintenance.

2. Macro-level LPP

Macro-level LPP provide a socio-political context in which language maintenance occurs. They do this by expressing the value that is given to language maintenance (e.g. through status planning) and secondly by providing support (e.g. through language-in-education planning).

Arguably, declaring a language to be an official or national language at national or regional level provides the potential for strong support for a minority language at risk of shift or loss, e.g. Irish in Ireland, Māori in New Zealand, Sámi in parts of Norway. Such policies are usually status policies (van Els 2005) that identify the functions a language will have in society, rather than focusing specifically on questions of maintenance. Granting a language official status is a symbolic act of recognition of the language and its place in the nation and a positive affirmation of the language and its speakers, and therefore can provide a positive context for the transmission of a language to future generations. Such policies may also provide for resources, educational programmes and other forms of support for the language maintenance effort. However, what is entailed in making a language official can mean very different things in terms of how such documents address language maintenance. In some cases, status planning documents may only relate to language use. Article 8 of the Irish Constitution recognises Irish as the national and first official language and makes provision for its possible exclusive use in official communication. Thus, it gives recognition of the language as a symbol of Irish identity and allocates to it possible functions but makes no comment on language maintenance or the role of the Irish state in this. Instead, language maintenance is addressed primarily through language-in-education policy, which has strongly supported the provision of Irish-medium education and Irish language lessons in schools. In other contexts, there may be reference to language maintenance in status planning documents. In the case of Sámi, Norway has integrated a responsibility for language maintenance in Article 108 of the Constitution: "It is the responsibility of the authorities of the State to create conditions enabling the Sámi people to preserve and develop its language, culture and way of life". That is, the text has an explicit statement of state responsibility for language maintenance but details of how this will be done are operationalised in other laws and policy documents. Macro-level documents such as constitutions and language laws are usually very succinct statements about the language and do little more than frame the general context for language use. More developed policy for language maintenance usually occurs in other forms of policy, especially for language education.

Language-in-education policy provisions for education in minority languages is a common way in which macro-level policy has supported maintenance. There are different ways in which macro-level language-in-education policy can provide for language maintenance. In

some cases, policies for language maintenance may involve the teaching and learning of minority languages in schools. In Colombia, the government policy of *etnoeducación* (ethnoeducation) aimed at making access to indigenous languages a normal part of schooling for indigenous children (Liddicoat and Curnow 2007). Access to education in indigenous languages is recognised as a right in Article 10 of the constitution. While the policy was originally intended only for indigenous groups, Afro-Colombian groups have since argued that they too should have access to such programs as ethnolinguistic minorities, and the policy has since been extended to cover them (Castillo Guzmán 2016). In laws developed to implement the constitutional provision, ethnoeducation is represented as a primary school program that aims to assist children in their early educational development and facilitate their transition to Spanish-medium education. While Colombia's policy guarantees access to indigenous language education, local conditions, such as teacher supply, availability of materials, etc. often mean that provision of programs may be limited or problematic (Liddicoat and Curnow 2007). Alternatively, language maintenance programs may be provided through complementary provision. Australia's adoption of a policy of multiculturalism led to the introduction in 1981 of the Ethnic Schools Program[1] (see Baldauf 2005). The program provided financial support for schools run by ethnic communities as part of their language maintenance work. Government-funded ethnic schools are organized outside normal school provision and usually take the form of after-hours or weekend classes. The policy provides resources for communities to offer education in their languages, but leaves responsibility for maintenance programmes with community groups; language maintenance is therefore a task for individual communities rather than part of schooling (Liddicoat 2013). These examples of macro-level policy from Colombia and Australia represent rather formal, explicit and funded intervention into language maintenance work, but macro-level policy may also be much vaguer and general in the way it states a government's commitment and responsibility for maintaining minority languages. Japan's policy relating to Ainu states only that the government supports the promotion and teaching of Ainu culture, but gives little direction to this (Maher 2001). These examples show that officially articulated policies may not be enough in themselves to ensure provision and that support is needed in their implementation to turn the rhetoric into a reality.

At the international level, LPP favouring language maintenance has received some support in documents relating to human rights (see Annamalai & Skuttnab-Kangas, this volume), such as the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which includes in Article 27 a provision for minorities to "use their own language". This covenant provides a negative right to use language free from government interference. The 1992 Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities further strengthens the possibilities for language maintenance stating in Article 1 that governments should "encourage" conditions for the promotion and protection of linguistic identities. Such documents provide a form of international level support for language maintenance as a legitimate activity for minority groups, but are often quite remote from the realities of individual groups seeking to maintain their languages (Romaine 2015).

Macro-level policies may also be antagonist to language maintenance and seek to prevent it. In Spain, LPP under Franco represented a hostile environment for language maintenance as minority languages were treated as a threat to national identity and stability, and policy was aimed at removing these languages from the national language ecology (Vallverdú 1991). The explicit policy of Franco's regime was to remove the languages from the cultural sphere, close down minority language media newspapers, and forbid the use of minority languages in everyday contexts: names of children, commerce and even in telephone conversations (Ben-Ami 1991). Further, the minority languages were stigmatized and ridiculed in public discourse:

[1] Later renamed the Community Languages Element

e.g. *No ladres: habla el idioma del Imperio* [Don't bark: speak the language of the empire], which equates minority language use with a sub-human form of behaviour. More recently, Kurdish language maintenance in Turkey has been associated with terrorist activity; it has been constructed in law as a form of material support for the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) and militant Kurdish separatism (Liddicoat 2018b). Skutnabb-Kangas and Fernandes (2008) reported a number of court cases where supporters of Kurdish language education were found guilty of terrorist offenses for activities such as speaking publicly in favour of Kurdish language education for Kurdish children, demanding Kurdish language tuition, and asking for optional Kurdish language courses. In such contexts, language maintenance may become highly politicized as a form of resistance to the state, be carried out covertly, or be allowed to lapse in favour of safer linguistic practices.

In most cases, however, macro-level LPP may be ambivalent. Educational policy in Bhutan (Dukpa 2019) states that multilingualism in local minority languages, Dzongkha and English is a key educational goal: "This plan of transition from home language to Dzongkha to English can be seen as a golden balance between the goals of multicultural identity, multilingual competence" (School Education and Research Unit 2012: 133). However, it allocates no place for minority languages in the school curriculum: "students acquire their home languages at home and Dzongkha and English language in the school" (School Education and Research Unit 2012: 103). Thus, Bhutan's education policy gives value to home language maintenance but allocates responsibility entirely to the home context.

Even where policies may appear to be supportive of language maintenance, the actual situation is more complex as language maintenance is enacted within contexts of covert policy that construct less supportive discourses (Liddicoat and Curnow 2014). Liddicoat and Curnow argue that there are three prevailing discourses that threaten the place of minorities' languages in school education: discourses about social cohesion, about competition between languages in the school curriculum, and discourses about language maintenance as a private matter. The discourse of language maintenance as contrary to social cohesion is a manifestation of an enduring one nation–one language ideology on understandings of national identity and citizenship (see also Chiro 2014; Heugh 2014). Linguistic diversity can be seen as a threat to national unity and stability and thus language maintenance programmes can be perceived as in conflict with the nation-building role of schooling. This view is behind the bans on Kurdish and minority languages in Spain discussed above. Similar discourses can be present in even nominally supportive contexts as can be seen in some framings of the debate over the recent (re)introduction of mother tongue education in Kenya. The response of the Kenyan National Teachers Union, as articulated by its chairperson Mudzo Nzili, rejected mother tongue education as contrary to the social role of schooling:

> "As already indicated, the country is moving towards social integration and this cannot be achieved when at the same time we have policies with tribal references as mother tongue shall always prioritise tribes," he [Nzili] said. "Education in Kenya is to promote unity within the community". (Waweru 2014)

Language maintenance can thus be constructed as contrary to the core purpose of education and so even where overt policy is supportive of language maintenance, covert policy may not be.

LPP for language maintenance may also be in conflict with a "common sense" belief (Ferris and Politzer 1981) that more time spent on learning a dominant language will lead to better acquisition of that language. Language maintenance and LPP that support it may thus be conceived as problematic for the learning of the dominant language and viewed as problematic for the future life choices of language minority students. As Liddicoat and Curnow (2014: 282) argue this is "a view of language that denies the possibility of any inter-relationship between

languages in the learning process and sees languages as fundamentally in competition". It leads to a discursive construction of linguistic abilities in a minority language as a deficit to be overcome through education rather than as a social, educational or identity resource, and thus sees little value in the development of that language as a goal for educational practice or policy.

This conceptualisation of minority languages as barriers to the acquisition of the dominant language has influenced government policy in relation to bilingual programs for speakers of Aboriginal languages in Australia's Northern Territory and has led to the withdrawal of support for these languages in favour of English (Liddicoat 2018a; Liddicoat and Curnow 2014). In 2008, the then Minister for Education introduced an educational reform which required that all schools in the Northern Territory teach in English for the first four hours of schooling. The goal of this policy was to promote English language literacy by increasing the time spent on English in bilingual schools (Devlin 2017a, 2017b). This reform thus explicitly restricted the amount of time that bilingual programs could allocate to students' home languages in order to defend the curriculum space allocated to English-only education. In her media release announcing the policy, the Minister stated: "I support preserving our Indigenous languages and culture – but our Indigenous children need to be given the best possible chance to learn English" (Scrymgour 2008), thus constructing Aboriginal languages and cultures as a limitation on the chances that students have to acquire English. The maintenance of Aboriginal languages is therefore a problem in education, because it conflicts with what is perceived as the main language goal of education – the development of English literacy. Similarly, in the United States, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) policy emphasized the place of English and in so doing undermined the legitimacy and relevance of bilingual education programs established under the Bilingual Education Act (BEA) of 1968. The BEA has originally created space in education for bilingual programs that would enable minority language speakers to develop literacy in a minority language before transitioning to English medium education. The emphasis in NCLB on moving students into English-medium education as quickly as possible constructed English language acquisition as the main goal of education and undermined the importance of developing students' own languages, even constructing it as an impediment to English learning (Evans and Hornberger 2005). Policies for language maintenance can thus be vulnerable to an ideological position that the teaching of one language is seen as presenting an impediment to the acquisition of another. Liddicoat and Curnow (2014) argue that such discourses normalise limited linguistic repertoires in education and preclude the possibility of conceptualising multilingualism as a normal form of human language use (cf. Agnihotri 2014).

In addition, the way that language-in-education policies position the learning of minority languages in education overall may be problematic. Where LPP constructs minority language learning as transitional, LPP may appear to include minority languages in education, and so promote their maintenance, but may actually ultimately reflect a view of minority languages as having limited utility (Liddicoat 2013). These dynamics can be seen in in the case of a USAID project in Ghana known as the National Literacy Acceleration Program (NALAP) for early childhood education (Rosekrans, Sherris and Chatry-Komarek 2012; Sherris 2013). NALAP aimed to provide literacy resources and literacy instruction in 11 Ghanaian languages in kindergarten early primary schooling (Grades 1-3) before a transition to English-only education. Ghanaian language literacy was developed alongside English as an additional language in preparation for transition in grade 4. NALAP replaced an earlier English-only approach to education from the beginning of education and so can be considered as potentially contributing to language maintenance work by providing for the development of literacy in local languages and in so doing opening new, valued domains of language use. However, such literacy programs, while they are beneficial for minority language learners, may not support language maintenance in the long term. This is so especially where literacy in local languages lacks value in the local context of family and community, where oral capabilities are more important and

opportunities to use literacy for authentic purposes may be very constrained (Kamwangamalu 2010), and lack relevance in the wider context, which operates in the dominant language. If there are no contexts for the application of literacy in minority languages in the valued domains of the market, it is difficult to see how minority languages can enter into the ideologies of value that are held by governing elites. The valued repertoire for many minority students is seen only in terms of the dominant language and their plurilingualism is not seen as something to be developed through education but rather a problem that needs to be resolved for education to be successful (cf. Ruíz 1984). Unless LPP also gives value to the non-dominant language in its own right instead of seeing the value of such languages only in terms of what they contribute to the learning of more valued languages, such programs may perpetuate prevailing ideologies that construct official languages as the sole legitimate languages.

The usual focus of macro-level LPP is on the official, dominant languages of a society. Much LPP is in fact silent about language maintenance efforts, seeing them as private matters for individuals, families or communities. In some cases, such private efforts may receive symbolic support from policy discourses that express a value for maintaining linguistic diversity (e.g. multicultural policy in Australia) and states may even implement policies that provide resources to support community level language maintenance work (e.g. ethnic schools in Australia). Where policy is silent on the role, value or status of other languages, this silence is consequential for the social realities of languages in the nation; explicit policies inevitably construct hierarchies among languages, with languages named in policies being awarded a higher place on the hierarchy than languages that are not mentioned. Silence about languages thus can equate with a perception that 'missing' languages are seen as less useful, less worthwhile or less desirable than languages that are present in policies. Because of this, macro-level policy contexts can frequently provide constraints on language maintenance by representing such activities as less valued by the society and so making the efforts required to maintain a language appear to be less rewarded and less rewarding.

3. Meso-level LPP

Between the macro-level of the state and the micro-level of the family there are a number of LPP actors that can have an influence on language maintenance. Some of the key actors at the meso-level are community cultural and leisure organisations, religious organisations, individual schools, media and other language- and literacy-related services. The LPP of such actors can play a supportive role in language maintenance when attention is given to the use of minority languages and this section will consider how the language decisions of some of these actors can support language maintenance.

3.1. Community organisations as language maintenance policy actors

In many contexts of language maintenance, the linguistic community is the major LPP actor for language maintenance outside the family. Many communities establish organisations for language or cultural maintenance that can provide either contexts of language use or more specific support for maintenance in the form of language schools. As mentioned above, schools are important sites of language maintenance, but such schools are not always supported by macro-level policies and institutions. Where this is the case meso-level actors may provide the only LPP work that directly supports educational development in a minority language (Liddicoat and Baldauf 2008).

Mougeon, Beniak and Valois (1985) argue that schooling in a community language can be crucial for language maintenance in contexts where children are constantly exposed to the dominant language. However, such education is not often provided by the regular school

system and where this is the case, community organisations may play an active role in language maintenance by providing educational programmes to support language and literacy development either alongside or in addition to mainstream schooling provided by government. In some cases, minority language communities may set up schools, usually in the private sector, to cater to their community and to offer education in their home language. Such schools are often associated with institutions that can provide financial support for their establishment. Private sector schools have been a feature of Greek community language maintenance efforts in a number of countries such as Australia (Kalantzis 1985), South Africa (McDuling and Barnes 2012) and the United States (Fishman 1980). Complementary schools may adopt LPP in which the home language is the normal language of instruction, or they may teach in the dominant language but provide the home language as an important subject in the curriculum. Such schools require considerable capital investment and so may not be a viable option for many communities, especially smaller and less wealthy ones.

A common model for schooling is for communities to provide education in the community language as a complement to mainstream schooling as such programs are less demanding in terms of financial resources and do not need to be located within regulatory and bureaucratic mechanisms within the society. Such schools not only open spaces for educational development in languages not offered in mainstream schooling but can also provide an important community resource that supports language maintenance efforts more widely. As Creese argues:

> Complementary schools serve as a social, linguistic, and cultural resource to their respective communities and help counter the expected monolingualising mainstream. Their multilingualism provides an institutional space to connect the languages of the home and community (Creese 2009: 272).

One particularly successful example of a community-based project supporting language maintenance can be seen in the work by Māori to develop Māori medium education in New Zealand, beginning in early childhood education with *Kōhanga reo* (language nests) and then moving into higher levels (Reedy 2000). These institutions represent significant interventions by the community into the educational domain and a reconstruction of the possibilities for language use, development and education within their local context. Such activities have the potential to be instances of what Alexander (1992) calls *language planning from below*, contexts in which successful grassroots community efforts influence macro-level LPP work.

Community organisations outside the domain of education can also be relevant policy actors for supporting language maintenance. Communities may sponsor cultural groups that have as their aim the continuing of folkloric, artistic or performance traditions. Nahirny and Fishman (1965) note that such organisations can play a significant role in language maintenance work because they may function using the community language and in so doing provide a context for language use and open spaces for new language domains. However, for such groups language maintenance is not the key focus and so their contribution to language maintenance will depend very much on their LPP, whether explicit or implicit, and whether use of the community's language is seen as relevant to or facilitative of their non-language goals. The same is true for sporting clubs and other leisure organisations. Where community organisations sponsor sporting clubs for community members, and where the LPP of the clubs includes the community language as the normal language of communication in training and on the field, such clubs may be an important domain for language use and thus contribute to language maintenance efforts. Such sporting clubs have been shown to have had an important role in the maintenance of community languages in Australia (see Janik 1996: for Polish; Martín 1996: for Spanish).

Community organisations often represent a point at which macro and meso level policies may intersect. Australia's Ethnic School's Program, discussed above, is an instance of a macro-level LPP that actively supports such meso-level actors by providing both funding and an institutional structure through which community run complementary schooling can operate. In immigrant contexts, they may also be supported by governments from the immigrants' home countries (Hatoss 2006). Such organisations can therefore provide links between a diasporic community and the core community of language users. They also represent sites at which macro-level LPP of external agencies can find contexts of enactment in other countries.

3.2. Religious organisations as language maintenance policy actors

Spolsky (2009: 43) argues that "religious language planning can play an important role in providing support for the maintenance of a heritage language". The LPP of religious institutions can support language maintenance in a range of different ways. The religious institution can provide a context in which the home language of a community is used for religious services (Liddicoat 2012). The decision to use a minority language for religious purposes is often not taken specifically for language maintenance reasons; it tends to be a response to the needs of adult worshipers. However, the use of a minority language for religious purposes does provide a context for language use outside the home and is often associated with informal communication or activities using the language outside the worship of the church. Thus, the LPP of the institution, in terms of its religious use of a language, can create a hub around which other language practices are used and developed.

Religious institutions also develop LPP in relation to how they teach faith lessons for children (Liddicoat 2012). Souza, Kwapong, and Woodham (2012) discuss the LPP of a number of churches in the UK that cater for immigrant communities and use the communities' languages in their teaching of their faith. They describe contexts where teachers of religion draw on their students' languages in different ways to promote learning, but also implicitly or explicitly contribute to language maintenance. They report on a Catholic church catering for immigrants from Brazil, where catechism is taught in Portuguese as a way of ensuring that Portuguese-speaking parents can have a central role in their children's catechesis. This means that the church's LPP is one that can harmonise with the family LPP of their congregation. This policy does have consequences for how the catechism classes operate as, although they use materials written in Portuguese, the children themselves are not literate in Portuguese and so the classes have to rely on oral language use only. The classes focus mainly on spoken language rather than on teaching literacy and as such they can be considered more as providing opportunities for use of the language in a religious context. At the same time, the classes do provide for the use and development of specific registers of language – the language of religion – that may not be developed in everyday home contexts and also integrate the language into a culturally significant set of social practices. Souza, Kwapong, and Woodham (2012) report that maintaining cultural traditions is an explicit motivation for faith lessons in churches and that this motivation is central in the decision to use the community language rather than English as the usual language of the lessons. Souza, Kwapong, and Woodham (2012) also discuss a different model for supporting language maintenance in the case of a Polish Catholic church in the UK which operates a Polish language school on Saturdays. The school teaches catechism, but this is only a part of the school's curriculum. Most of the work of the school involves teaching literacy and language development in Polish, and in this way the work of the church is similar to other community organisations that take on educational functions.

Where religious practice does not take minority languages into consideration, the result can be a reinforcement of pressures to shift to another, more dominant language. Wang (2016) argues that the decision by Malaysian Catholic churches to use Mandarin rather than Hakka in

its liturgy has contributed to the loss of Hakka in the community, as it has influenced local language ideologies about the value and role of Hakka and has affected the linguistic ecology in which Hakka exits.

3.3. Individual schools as language maintenance policy actors

Corson (1999) argues that schools can construct environments of inequality for minority language speakers because they are routinely environments where the dominant group exercises power. Schools therefore can be significant sites operating against language maintenance. In fact, it is often after children begin to attend school that family LPP become difficult to sustain. Even where macro-level policy is supportive of language maintenance, this does not mean that all schools respond in the same way, or that similar support for language maintenance is found at all schools.

It is often the case that where there is macro-level support for maintenance programs in mainstream education, this support is only given where school leaders opt to provide programs for minority language students. Scarino et al. (2013) found that, although there was government funding for first language maintenance programs in schools in South Australia, whether a school offered such a program was dependent on whether or not local school leaders felt that such programmes had educational value for their students and so applied for the money. Thus, school leaders may be important gate-keepers providing or withholding access to language maintenance programs where these are supported by macro-level policy. Similarly, Brown's (2010) study of the Võro language in Estonia describes a situation in which Estonia's policy of elective study of the minorities' languages was operationalised differently in different schools. Some schools maintained the language in a minoritised and devalued position by excluding it from the regular curriculum and offering it after hours. Other schools, however, presented the language as a regular, non-elective, part of the curriculum and enacted structures that gave value to the language and positioned it as important.

Even where macro-level policy does not explicitly support language maintenance, individual schools may do so by providing language programs for minority language students within their curricula. Schools, thus, are not simply institutions that implement policies that have an impact on language maintenance but exercise local agency in ways that can enhance or constrain possibilities for local communities.

3.4. Media as language maintenance policy actors

Fishman (1991) has questioned the significance of the media in LPP, arguing that other domains such as family, community or education played a more important role. However, there is evidence that media LPP can and does have an impact on language maintenance (e.g. Cormack 2007; Riggins 1992), and the significance of media may have become even more important with the widespread use of social media (Cormack 2013; Takam 2017).

Access to media is a key factor for minority language maintenance, and having access to band-width for broadcasting is controlled by governments, whose macro-level policies may influence access. In some cases, public broadcasting policies may open spaces for minority language presence in the media which can be taken up by community organisations. Minority language media may also be subsidised by government, as for example SBS broadcasting, especially radio services, in Australia (Dreher 2009). The development of public broadcasting has thus been important in giving minority language communities access to the technologies of broadcasting. The development of computer mediated communication and the growth of the internet has had an important impact on language maintenance work by opening new opportunities for communication for minority communities (Arnold and Plymire 2000). Meso-

level actors are now likely to use online modes, which are frequently cheaper and easier to manage than other media.

As Cormack (2007) acknowledges, media have a much wider role than language maintenance, but can play a significant role in assisting maintenance efforts, by creating a stronger sense of community identity, showing that the community is modernised and able to participate in contemporary life, and contributing large amounts of language to the public sphere. Media thus can play an important role in language maintenance by creating contexts for language use in valued domains and may give the languages greater status and may encourage speakers to revive and maintain their language (Ó Laoire 2000).

Media LPP that support minority languages are thus forms of prestige or image planning (Ager 2006) – planning to enhance the perceived social value of non-dominant language varieties – but they can also contribute to the perceived ethnolinguistic vitality of the language. This was the motivation for the establishment of minority language literary and cultural groups, such as the Catalan *Renaixença*, the Occitan *Félibrige* or the more formally constituted Frisian *Selskip foar Taal- en Skiftekenisse*) in the nineteenth century, and thus modern media are continuing and expanding a tradition that has a longer history. One of the key aims of media actors is to provide media communication that is equivalent to that provided by mainstream, dominant language media, and often have materials directed to young people that may provide for motivation to continue using the language rather than shifting to the dominant language in order to access valued aspects of popular culture. For example, the Brezhoweb internet television station, which has broadcast in Breton since 2006, provides Breton language programming across a range of genres, including films, animation, news and current affairs, documentaries, sit coms and sports broadcasts. Programmes are either produced in Breton or existing material is dubbed into Breton, thus creating a wide range of media products for the audience across a broad range of ages (Buannic 2009).

In the case of media organisations, LPP that makes minority languages available is not enough in itself to support language maintenance and the quality of material broadcast is also important. Sepeheri (2010) found that, although media in Azerbaijani is available in parts of Iran, low quality and unattractive content mean that the programs provided are not much used by the local community and that Azerbaijani speakers are more likely to use mainstream media, which has better content and better quality. Thus, an important part of the work of media language planners involves not only decisions about language use but also decisions that allow the language to be used for content that parallels the content and production standards on mainstream media. This means that LPP overlaps with editorial policy and frequently involves a strong level of support for translation as part of media activity.

The development of online media has led to the emergence of new possibilities for using media in language maintenance contexts (Hatoss, this volume) and allows groups and even individuals to become involved in making decisions about the presence and use of languages in the media. Electronic media, including social media thus blur the boundaries between the meso and micro levels of LPP by creating affordances for both groups and individuals to engage in media LPP. Engaging in minority language use on the internet has the potential to bring about changes in language ideologies and challenge existing language regimes (Cru 2015). The availability of social media in a minority language can provide authentic opportunities for using the language and at the same time support the development of social networks of language learners (Lee 2006). Social media have the possibility of extending language use beyond the local community and create peer social networks and popular culture groupings that can provide significant sites for socialization into patterns of language use (Friedman 2011). Because they are not tied to geography, such media may also draw in speakers who may otherwise not have access to a community of language users because of migration (Cru 2015; Lee 2006).

4. Conclusion

Language maintenance takes place in a context that is shaped by the ideologies (Albury, this volume) and language practices of a wider society and these constitute the policy context in which decisions are made about maintaining a language or shifting to another. In any society, the language of the dominant group exerts influence, covertly or overtly, on the language practices of minority language speakers and promotes a shift to the dominant language. Where no explicit policy exists at macro-level or meso-level to support maintenance of minority languages, then micro-level actors maintain languages against the pressure exerted by the discourses that support the dominant language. LPP at macro and meso levels that are supportive of language maintenance provide a context that can make it easier to resist the pressure of dominant languages.

Macro-level policies supporting language maintenance may do little more than shape the context for language maintenance in a positive way by giving positive symbolic value to the continued use of languages and to societal multilingualism. Additionally, they may also provide supportive structures in terms of educational programmes or by officially sanctioning the use of the language in valued domains in the society.

Meso-level policy actors can support language maintenance in two keys ways. Firstly, they can provide resources for language learning or use that the family may not be able to provide. Thus, schools can provide opportunities for developing literate language use and libraries and media can provide resources for entertainment and information. They also play another, and perhaps more important, role in language maintenance work. As institutions, meso-level actors can provide social environments for language use and language socialisation. Thus, a football club, a religious community, or a cultural group may afford opportunities to interact with peers and to develop social relationships through the minority language. By creating contexts where a minority language is required for participation, they may offer tangible social rewards for language use. The LPP of meso-level actors may contribute to the perceived ethnolinguistic vitality of a minority language by providing for an expanded range of domains of use and especially by providing for language use in valued domains.

Ultimately language maintenance depends on decision-making at the micro level as it is at this level that languages are used and transmitted to future generations. Such decision-making is, however, supported or constrained by policies that exist at other levels.

5. References

Ager, Denis E. 2006. Image and prestige planning *Current Issues in Language Planning* 6(1). 1–43.

Agnihotri, Rama Kant. 2014. Multilinguality, education and harmony. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 11(3). 364–379.

Albury, Nathan. this volume. Language attitudes and ideologies on linguistic diversity.

Alexander, Neville. 1992. Language planning from below. In Robert K. Herbert (ed.), *Language and Society in Africa*, 56–68. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Annamalai, E. & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas. this volume. Social justice and inclusiveness through linguistic human rights in education.

Arnold, Ellen L. & Darcy C. Plymire 2000. The Cherokee Indians and the Internet. In David Gauntlett (ed.), *Web studies: Rewiring media studies for the digital age*, 186–193. London: Edward Arnold.

Baldauf, Richard B. 2004. Issues of prestige and image in language-in-education planning in Australia. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 5(4). 376–388.

Baldauf, Richard B. 2005. Coordinating government and community support for community language teaching in Australia: Overview with special attention to New South Wales. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 8(2–3). 132–144.
Baldauf, Richard B. 2006. Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current Issues in Language Planning,* 7(2&3), 147–170.
Ball, Stephen J. 1993. What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 13(2), 10–17.
Ben-Ami, Shlomo. 1991. Basque nationalism between archaism and modernity. *Journal of Contemporary History,* 26(3/4), 493–521.
Brown, Kara. 2010. Teachers as language-policy actors: Contending with the erasure of lesser-used languages in schools. 41(3), 298–314.
Buannic, Lionel. (2009). Brezhoweb : Le breton se lâche sur internet. *Ouest-France*. Retrieved from https://brest.maville.com/actu/actudet_-brezhoweb-le-breton-se-lache-sur-internet-_6-1147981_actu.Htm. (accessed 25 October 2018).
Castillo Guzmán, Elizabeth. 2016. Etnoeducación afropacífica y pedagogías de la dignificación. *Revista Colombiana de Educación,* 71, 343–360.
Chiro, Giancarlo. 2014. Cultural and linguistic diversity in Australia: Navigating between the Scylla of nationhood and the Charybdis of globalisation. *International Journal of Multilingualism,* 11(3), 334–346.
Cormack, Mike. 2007. The media and language maintenance. In Mike Cormack & Niamh Hourigan (eds.), *Minority language media: Concepts, critiques and case studies*, 52–68. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Cormack, Mike. 2013. Concluding remarks: Towards an understanding of media impact on minority language use. In Elin Haf Gruyffudd Jones & Enrique Uribe-Jongbloed (eds.), *Social media and minority languages: Convergence and the creative industries*, 255–265. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Corson, David. 1999. *Language policy in schools: A resource for teachers and administrators*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Creese, Angela. 2009. Building on young people's linguistic and cultural continuity: Complementary schools in the United Kingdom. *Theory Into Practice,* 48(4), 267–273.
Cru, Josep. 2015. Language revitalisation from the ground up: Promoting Yucatec Maya on Facebook. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 36(3), 284–296.
Curdt-Christiansen, Xiao Lan & Jing Huang. this volume. Factors impacting on family language policy: A multi-scalar perspective.
Devlin, Brian. 2017a. Policy change in 2008: Evidence-based or a knee-jerk response? In Brian Devlin, Samantha Disbray, & Nancy Devlin (eds.), *History of bilingual education in the Northern Territory: People, programs and policies*, 203–218. Singapore: Springer Singapore.
Devlin, Brian. 2017b. Threatened closure: Resistance and compromise (1998–2000). In Brian Devlin, Samantha Disbray, & Nancy Devlin (eds.), *History of bilingual education in the Northern Territory: People, programs and policies*, 165–178. Singapore: Springer Singapore.
Djité, Paulin. 1994. *From language policy to language planning*. Canberra: National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia.
Dreher, Tanja. 2009. Listening across difference: Media and multiculturalism beyond the politics of voice. *Continuum,* 23(4), 445–458.
Dukpa, Lhundup. 2019. Language policy in Bhutan. In Andy Kirkpatrick & Anthony J. Liddicoat (eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of language education policy in Asia*, 355–363. New York: Routledge.

Evans, Bruce A., & Nancy H. Hornberger. 2005. No Child Left Behind: Repealing and "unpeeling" federal language education policy in the United States. *Language Policy,* 2, 87–106.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1980. Ethnic community mother tongue schools in the U.S.A.: Dynamics and distributions. *International Migration Review,* 14(2), 235–247.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1991. *Reversing language shift : theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Friedman, Debra A. 2011 Language socialization and language revitalization. In Alessandro Duranti, Elinore Ochs, & Bambi B. Schieffelin (eds.), *The handbook of language socialization*, 631–647. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, Mary Ellen. 2003. Recent research on language maintenance. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 23, 22–43.

Glasgow, Gregory Paul, & Bouchard, Jeremie. 2019. Introduction. In Jeremie Bouchard & Gregory P. Glasgow (eds.), *Agency in language policy and planning: Critical inquiries* 1–21. New York & London: Routledge.

Hatoss, Anikó. 2006. Community-level approaches in language planning: The case of Hungarian in Australia. *Current Issues in Language Planning,* 7(2&3), 287–306.

Hatoss, Anikó. this volume. Transnational grassroots language planning in the era of mobility and the Internet.

Heugh, Kathleen. 2014. Turbulence and dilemma: Implications of diversity and multilingualism in Australian education. *International Journal of Multilingualism,* 11(3), 347–363.

Hornberger, Nancy H. 2006. Frameworks and models in language policy and planning. In Thomas Ricento (ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hornberger, Nancy H., & Serafín M. Coronel-Molina. 2004. Quechua language shift, maintenance, and revitalization in the Andes: the case for language planning *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 167, 9-67.

Janik, Janusz. 1996. Polish language maintenance of the Polish students at Princes Hill Saturday School in Melbourne. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 17(1), 3–16.

Kalantzis, Mary. 1985. Community languages: Politics or pedagogy. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics. S Series,* 2, 168–179.

Kamwangamalu, Nkonko M. 2010. Vernacularization, globalization, and language economics in non-English-speaking countries in Africa. *Language Problems & Language Planning,* 34(1), 1–23.

Kaplan, Robert B., & Richard B.Baldauf. 1997. *Language planning: From practice to theory*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lanza, Elizabeth & Rafael Lomeu. this volume. Family language policy – an overview.

Lee, Jin Sook. 2006. Exploring the relationship between electronic literacy and heritage language maintenance. *Language Learning & Technology,* 10(2), 93–113.

Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2005. Corpus planning: Syllabus and materials development. In Eli Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, 993–1012. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2012. Language planning as an element of religious practice. *Current Issues in Language Planning,* 13(2), 121–144.

Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2013. *Language-in-education policies: The discursive construction of intercultural relations*. Bristol: Multilingual matters.

Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2018a. Ideologies of value and the place of Australian indigenous languages in education. In Delombera Negga, Daniel K. G. Chan & Monika Szirmai

(eds.), *Language policy, ideology and educational practices in a globalized world*, 59–70. Paris: Editions des archives contemporaines.

Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2018b. National security as a motivation in language-in-education policy. In Catherine K. S. Chua (ed.), *Un(intended) language planning in a globalising world: Multiple levels of players at work*, 113–128. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2019. Constraints on agency in micro-language policy and planning in schools: A case study of curriculum change. In Jeremie Bouchard & Greogory P. Glasgow (eds.), *Agency in language policy and planning: Critical inquiries* 149–170. New York & London: Routledge.

Liddicoat, Anthony J., & Richard B. Baldauf. 2008. Language planning in local contexts: Agents, contexts and interactions. In Anthony J. Liddicoat & Richard B. Baldauf (eds.), *Language Planning in Local Contexts*, 3–17. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Liddicoat, Anthony J., & Timothy Jowan Curnow. 2007. Language-in-education policy in the context of language death: Policy and practice in Colombian ethnoeducation. In Jeff Siegel, John Lynch, & Diana Eades, (eds.), *Language description, history and development*, 419–430. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Liddicoat, Anthony J., & Timothy Jowan Curnow. 2014. Students' home languages and the struggle for space in the curriculum. *International Journal of Multilingualism,* 11(3), 273–288.

Lo Bianco, Joseph. 2005. Including discourse in language planning theory. In Paul Bruthiaux, Dwight Atkinson, William G. Eggington, William Grabe, & Vaidehi Ramanathan, (eds.), *Directions in Applied Linguistics: Essays in Honor of Robert B. Kaplan*, 255–264. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Maher, John C. 2001. Ainu Itak – Our language, your language – Ainu in Japan. In Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved*, 323–349. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Martín, M. Daniel. (1996). *Spanish language maintenance and shift in Australia.* (PhD thesis), Australian National University, Canberra.

McDuling, Allistair & Barnes, Lawrie. 2012. What is the future of Greek in South Africa? Language shift and maintenance in the Greek community of Johannesburg. *Language Matters,* 43(2), 166–183.

Miranda, Norbella, Martha Berdugo & Harvey Tejada. 2016. Conflicting views on language policy and planning at a Colombian university. *Current Issues in Language Planning,* 17(3–4), 422–440.

Mougeon, Raymond, Edouard Beniak & Daniel Valois. 1985. A sociolinguistic study of language contact, shift, and change. *Linguistics*, 23(3), 455-488.

Nahirny, Vladimir C., & Joshua A. Fishman. 1965. American immigrant groups: ethnic identification and the problem of generations. *The Sociological Review* 13(3). 311–326.

Ó Laoire, Muiris. 2000. Language policy and the broadcast media: A response. *Current Issues in Language and Society* 7(2). 149–154.

Palviainen, Åsa. this volume. Future prospects and visions for family language policy research.

Reedy, Tamati. 2000. Te Reo Māori: The past 20 years and looking forward. *Oceanic Linguistics,* 39(1), 157–169.

Riggins, Stephen H. 1992. Promise and limits of ethnic minority media. In Stephen H. Riggins (ed.), *Minority media: An international perspective*, 277–288. Newbury Park: Sage.

Romaine, Suzanne. 2015. The global extinction of languages and its consequences for cultural diversity. In Heiko F. Marten, Michael Rießler, Janne Saarikivi & Reetta Toivanen (eds.), *Cultural and linguistic minorities in the Russian Federation and the European Union: Comparative studies on equality and diversity*, 31–46. Cham: Springer International.

Rosekrans, Kristin, Arieh Sherris & Marie Chatry-Komarek. 2012. Education reform for the expansion of mother-tongue education in Ghana. *International Review of Education/Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft/Revue Internationale de l'Education,* 58(5), 593–618.

Ruíz, Richard. 1984. Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal,* 8(2), 15–34.

Scarino, Angela, Timothy Jowan Curnow, Kathleen Heugh & Anthony J. Liddicoat. 2013. *Review of the first language maintenance and development program*. Adelaide, Department for Education and Child Development.

Schiffman, Harold F. 1996. *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London: Routledge.

School Education and Research Unit. 2012. *The national education framework: Shaping Bhutan's future*. Thimphu: Royal Education Council.

Schwartz, Mila. this volume. Strategies and practices of home language maintenance.

Sepeheri, Mohammed Bagher. 2010. Local radio audiences in Iran: An analysis of Ardeblian people's trust in and satisfaction with 'Sabalan' radio. *Journal of Radio and Audio Media,* 17(2), 236–250.

Sherris, Arieh. 2013. Re-envisioning the Ghanaian ecolinguistic landscape: Local illustration and literacy. *Intercultural Education,* 24(4), 348–354.

Shohamy, Elana. 2006. *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London & New York: Routledge.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Desmond Fernandes. 2008. Kurds in Turkey and in (Iraqi)Kurdistan: A comparison of Kurdish educational language policy in two situations of occupation. *Genocide Studies and Prevention,* 3(1), 43–73.

Smith Christmas, Cassie. this volume. Children's agency and caregivers' roles in home language maintenance.

Souza, Ana, Amoafi Kwapong & Malgorzata Woodham. 2012. Pentecostal and Catholic migrant churches in London – the role of ideologies in the language planning of faith lessons. *Current Issues in Language Planning,* 13(2), 105–120.

Spolsky, Bernard. 2009. *Language management*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Takam, Alain Flaubert. 2017. Les langues minoritaires dans la communication médiatique *Linguistica Atlantica* 36(2). 111–139.

Vallverdú, Francesc. 1991. Los estudios sociolingüísticos en España, especialmente la Cataluña. In Carol A. Klee & Luis A. Ramos García (eds.), *Sociolinguistics of the Spanish-speaking world*. Tempe, AZ: Bilingual Press.

van Els, Theo. 2005. Status planning for learning and teaching. In Eli Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, 971–992. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Voloshinov, Valentin Nikolaevich. 1929. *Марксизм и философия языка* [Marxism and the philosphy of language]. Leningrad: Priboy.

Wang, Xiaomei. 2016. Language maintenance or language shift? The role of religion in a Hakka Catholic community in Malaysia. *International Multilingual Research Journal,* 10(4), 273–288.

Waweru, Nduta. (2014, 13 February). Parents divided over language policy. *The Star (Kenya).* Retrieved from http://allafrica.com/stories/201402130728.html (accessed 5 May 2014).