

Tilburg University

Language Policy Development in Multilingual Societies

Kroon, S.

Published in:

Nationalities and education: Perspectives in policy-making in Russia and the Netherlands: Issues and methods in language policy and school-parents relationships

Publication date:

2000

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kroon, S. (2000). Language Policy Development in Multilingual Societies. In M. den Elt, & T. van der Meer (Eds.), *Nationalities and education: Perspectives in policy-making in Russia and the Netherlands: Issues and methods in language policy and school-parents relationships* (pp. 15-38). Sardes.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

2 Language Policy Development in Multilingual Societies

Sjaak Kroon

1. Introduction

The Dutch-Russian co-operation project on 'Nationalities in Russia: the case of Chuvashia' that has been carried out by Sardes Educational Services (Utrecht, The Netherlands) and the Institute of Education (Cheboksary, Chuvashia), among other things dealt with the issue of multilingualism and educational language policy. I contributed to this project by writing a working paper dealing with the development of such a language policy. This paper, which was discussed at joint Dutch-Russian project meetings in Utrecht, Cheboksary, Sint Petersburg, Jakutsk and Sochi does not provide totally new knowledge, but rather discusses some existing insights into basic aspects of policy development in general and language policy development in particular and it puts these insights in the context of the project.

In this contribution, on the basis mainly of the aforementioned paper (Kroon 1998a), I intend to give an overview of the so-called policy cycle, i.e. the ideal-typical process through which policies come into existence (section 2). After that I will more specifically go into the issue of language policy. In section 3, mainly on the basis of Robert Cooper's (1989) book *Language Planning and Social Change* and Richard Lambert's (1995) overview of language policy, I will deal with different types of language policy. Also on the basis of Cooper (1989), in section 4, different ways of analysing language policy will be summarized. In section 5, finally, I very briefly go into some aspects of the broader societal and political context and discussion in which the development of educational language policies takes place. The article ends with a plea for implementing forms of intercultural education in language teaching.

2. The policy making cycle

In their introductory chapter to a collection of papers on *Ethnic Minority Languages and Education*, Jaspaert & Kroon (1991) distinguish the various contributions to the book in terms of the different stages in the policy making process from which they comment on the importance of minority language teaching. In this policy making process or policy cycle various stages can be distinguished. Jaspaert & Kroon (1991) go into five of these: (1) raising awareness of a problem, (2) analysis of the problem, (3) formulation of a policy plan, (4) implementation of the policy plan, and (5) evaluation of the policy's results. On the basis of mainly Dutch publications in the field of policy making, such as Van de

Graaf & Hoppe (1992) and Hoogerwerf (1993a, 1993b), I will elaborate on this policy making cycle, distinguishing eight consecutive steps: (1) ideology formation, (2) agenda formation, (3) policy preparation, (4) policy formation, (5) policy implementation, (6) policy evaluation, (7) feedback, and (8) policy termination. I consider this cycle a basic tool for, on the one hand, analysing existing (language) policies and, on the other hand, developing new ones. Before going into each of these steps, I will briefly go into the definition of 'policy'.

Following Hoogerwerf (1993a:20) 'policy' can be described as a systematic and purposive activity aiming at achieving well-defined goals using well-defined means in a well-defined time structure. Apart from this formal definition, policy can, at the same time, be defined as an answer to a problem. It can be considered as an attempt to solve, diminish or prevent a problem in a certain way, i.e. by means of purposive thinking and action. A 'problem' in this context, again following Hoogerwerf (1993a:22), can be described as a discrepancy between a norm and an impression of an actual or expected future situation. What is considered to be a problem and the actual definition of a problem, in other words, heavily depends on the (ethical, social, political, cultural) norms that are valued and adhered to by members of a certain society. It goes without saying that the identification and definition of problems, as well as the proposals for policy and action to solve these problems can differ a great deal depending on which societal groups take the lead. The identification, definition and prioritizing of problems that are suitable for policy development are main activities at the beginning stages of the policy making process, dealing with ideology formation and setting the agenda.

Stage 1: Ideology formation

According to Van de Graaf & Hoppe (1992:131) the main purpose of the stage of ideology formation in the policy making process is to reach agreement within a political community with respect to the questions that should be at the centre of the public debate. Without this minimal agreement as to the nature of the common problems a public discussion on conflicting solutions for these problems can hardly be fruitful. From the above definition of a problem as a discrepancy between an actual or expected situation and a norm follows, that at the centre of this stage are questions of norms and value systems. Achieving full agreement, however, on issues of ethics in actual practice, although of central importance as a starting point for the process of policy making, often turns out to be very difficult. For that reason the actors in policy making processes in many cases content themselves with reaching partial agreement, or sometimes even avoid discussing this matter. It will be clear that this can be a serious danger for bringing the actual policy making process to a favourable conclusion.

When it comes to language policy in multilingual societies, the phase of ideology forma-

tion, in my perspective, mainly has to deal with trying to reach agreement on the question whether the existence of individual and societal multilingualism has to be considered a positive or a negative characteristic, a resource or a problem. The underlying question here pertains to defining a position on the continuum of possible reactions to societal and individual diversity, running from 'assimilation' at the one extreme of the continuum to 'pluralism' at the other extreme (see also section 5). These positions inescapably lead to fundamentally different policies with respect to language and multilingualism (cf. Kroon & Vallen 1998).

Stage 2: Agenda formation

Agenda formation is the process through which, be it or not on the basis of the (partial) agreement that has been reached in the ideology formation stage, societal problems are brought to the attention of the public and/or the policymakers, and are agreed upon as really urgent, i.e. deserving a place on the political agenda. An important aspect of this process is raising the public awareness of a certain problem. In such a way problems that at a certain point in time are experienced and perceived of as individual, can develop into a commonly accepted problem that needs to be solved at a societal level. Actors can use different strategies to influence the arena in which the process of agenda formation takes place. One of the most powerful strategies is trying to play a decisive role in defining the problem at hand. Since it is the definition of the problem mainly, that guides the direction of the policy that will be developed and implemented to solve it, it will be clear that especially on this level pressure groups, representing both vested interests and counter-movements unfold great activity.

A revealing example of the importance of defining a 'problem' in the field of language policy can be found in the history of ethnic minority language teaching or home language instruction in The Netherlands. As Extra & Vallen (1997) clearly show,

“developments in this much-debated domain of Dutch education should be evaluated within the context of an official policy perspective on ethnic minority children in terms of socio-economic and second-language 'deficits' rather than ethno-cultural differences.” (Extra & Vallen 1997:164)

For the goals of home language instruction, to give just one example, this disadvantage definition leads to a formulation in terms of dependence: home language instruction is mainly intended to bridge the gap between home and school environment and to promote and facilitate second language acquisition and school success in general. Defining the issue from a cultural difference perspective, however, would lead to arguing for the primacy of intrinsic rather than dependent goals for home language instruction and for the teaching of these languages as languages in their own right.

Stage 3: Policy preparation

In the policy preparation phase the main activity to be carried out is the gathering and analysis of information on the basis of empirical research or relevant reading, in order to refine the formulation of the problem that resulted from Stage 3. The results of this activity lead to suggestions with respect to the actual policy that has to be formulated. It should be borne in mind here, that there does not exist such as thing as value free or neutral research. Especially in the field of policy relevant research it is important to be aware of the fact that societal, political and scientific preferences of researchers with respect to the field under study, consciously or unconsciously so, might influence their research (cf. Tollefson 1991).

An interesting historical case here is Colin Baker's (1996) account on research efforts in establishing the effectiveness of bilingual education programmes in the USA. Especially the review of bilingual education by Keith Baker and Ariana de Kanter that was commissioned by the United States Federal Government in the early 1980s, a period of fierce discussions between supporters and critics of this policy, according to Baker (1996:211)

“needs viewing in its political context. (...) The review looked at bilingual education through ‘transitional’ eyes. It did not start from a neutral, comprehensive look at the various different forms of bilingual education. Notice also the narrow range of expected outcomes of bilingual education (...). Only English language and non-language subject areas were regarded as the desirable outcome of schooling. Other outcomes such as self esteem, employment, preservation of minority languages, the value of different cultures were not considered. Nor were areas such as moral development, social adjustment and personality development considered.”

The conclusion of Baker & De Kanter's (1983) review was that no particular education programme should be legislated or preferred by the US Federal Government. On the contrary:

“Given the American setting, where the language minority child must ultimately function in an English speaking society, carefully conducted second language instruction in all subjects may well be preferable to bilingual methods.” (Baker & De Kanter 1983:51)

The above citation is taken from Baker (1996:212) who comments on it as follows:

“The review therefore came out in support of the dominant government preference for English-only and transitional bilingual education. Func-

tioning in the English language rather than bilingually was preferred. Assimilation and integration appear as the social and political preference that underlies the conclusions.” (Baker 1996:212)

Stage 4: Policy formation

In this phase final decisions are made as to the policy’s content, and the policy plan is written. This document contains a statement and an analysis of the problem, including an overview of policy making with respect to this problem until now. It further indicates, against the background of this overview, the new policy’s (final and intermediate) aims and the means (actions and materials) that will be deployed to achieve these aims, including a time table and a budget indication. Once the policy plan has been decreed, in most cases it needs an operationalisation in terms of concrete actions to be undertaken by the actors who have to implement the policy. The importance of an explicitly formulated policy plan, containing all the information just mentioned, can hardly be overestimated. Without such a plan it is impossible to control and evaluate the implementation and possible outcomes of a policy.

In the field of language policy, there appears to be no long and strong tradition of formulating policy plans. With the exception of (revolutionary) situations leading to the establishment of new states, in which rulers or governments want to use ‘language’ as one of the symbols or means to create or define internal and external unity and coherence, language at first sight does not seem to be considered a very central issue for policy making (cf. Paulston 1994). The Netherlands for example do not have an explicitly stated policy or a constitutional paragraph with respect to the position of Dutch as the official language of the country. What does exist are policy papers and paragraphs in the Dutch Education Act mainly with respect to the position of indigenous and non-indigenous minority languages (cf. Kroon & Vallen 1994 for an overview). As a matter of fact mainly language minority groups plead for language policies to ensure their language rights. According to De Vries (1995) a large range of possible and actually existing negative governmental responses to the claims of linguistic minorities often seem to prevent such policies to emanate. De Vries (1995:141-142) mentions four types of responses:

- “(1) *Studied neglect*: the state either ignores the language problem altogether, or denies the legitimacy of claims for language rights. Generally, the problem is not taken seriously. (...)
- (2) *Ridicule*: the government makes an effort to argue that the problem is ridiculous (and the associated claims for intervention as well). (...)
- (3) *Repression*: the denial of the legitimacy of claims for language rights assumes more severe forms. Negative sanctions against the use of a language are exercised (...).

- (4) *Accommodation*: this can take two forms:
- (a) *concessional accommodation*, i.e. the recognition of claims by minority language communities, often involving the granting of language rights in various domains (...);
 - (b) *structural accommodation*, i.e. the changing of the structure of society to accommodate language claims.”

In De Vries' opinion, regarding the strategies of 'studies neglect', 'ridicule' and 'repression' as forms of language planning would grant too much legitimacy to them. Only the two types of accommodation, according to De Vries (1995), represent real cases of language policy.

Stage 5: Policy implementation

According to Van de Graaf & Hoppe (1993:89) this stage represents an important *caesura* in the policy making process. Until now all energy in the process went to transforming facts and norms into information and knowledge suitable for action. This information and knowledge are translated into policy decisions and mandates accompanied by arguments to justify these. Policy implementation then simply means to put the decreed policy into practice, i.e. implementing the agreed upon means in order to achieve the agreed upon aims. Important in this stage is the relationship between the actors that implement the policy (e.g. civil servants) and the specific target group to which it is directed. Without the real cooperation or coproduction of the target group, a policy cannot be successfully implemented. Decisive for the willingness on the side of the target group to cooperate is a clear vision of the policy's means and aims and the benefits that are to be expected when implementing these. Important here is the relationship between the policy's content and the agreement that has, or has not been reached in the ideology formation stage of the policy making process.

As an example of limited coproduction by the target group in the field of language policy I would like to point at the case of Eritrea. According to Hailemariam, Kroon & Walters (1999) the language policy of the Eritrean government has been based on the fundamental belief that all languages are equal and should get equal opportunity and attention to grow. In line with the guiding principle of unity through diversity, all children of school age have the right to start schooling in their mother tongue, i.e. in one of the nine languages that are spoken by its ethnolinguistic communities. Apart from the problem of limitations with respect to the availability of teachers and teaching materials and with respect to corpus planning aspects of the languages involved, there also seems to be some resistance on the part of some ethnolinguistic communities since they consider using their mother tongues as languages of instruction, a serious impediment for the functioning of their children in a society in which in fact mainly Arabic and Tigrigna are dominant and prestigious.

Stage 6: Policy evaluation

According to Hoogerwerf (1993a:25) policy evaluation has to deal with the content, the implementation process, and the effects of a certain policy on the basis of fixed evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria should be based on the information that is given in the policy plan. A clear distinction should be made here between the effectiveness and the efficiency of a certain policy. This distinction basically has to do with a cost-benefit analysis. It is important to stipulate here that policy evaluation should be carried out independently, i.e. by outside evaluators that are not in one way or another structurally or functionally associated with the institution that developed the policy in the first place.

An interesting example of external language policy evaluation can be found in the activities of the European Communities Comparative Evaluation Group that was set up to undertake a comparative evaluation of 15 pilot projects on the education of migrant workers' children which the European Commission was supporting in Member States, within the framework of the 1977 EC Directive that in Article 3 requires support for the teaching of the language and culture of origin (cf. Reid & Reich 1992). The ECCE Group consisted of specialists from different Member States, and its terms of reference were as follows:

- “- to gather relevant information concerning the pilot projects currently in progress, and to make this information available to interested parties;
- to determine by means of a comparative evaluation the educational provisions and strategies which are worth attention by Member States;
- to define what is necessary and possible in terms of dissemination of educational innovations which have been piloted successfully;
- to identify those areas and situations in which new pilot projects might appear to be appropriate and necessary.” (Reid & Reich 1992:ix)

The ECCE Group produced a number of evaluative case studies that have been published in the book series *Migrantenkinder in den Schulen Europas. Versuche und Erfahrungen* (Reich & Gogolin 1990). A comprehensive summary of results and recommendations has been published by Reid & Reich (1992).

As a final remark with respect to language policy evaluation, especially regarding the cost-benefit analysis that was mentioned above, I would like to refer here to the well-known argument of many opponents of multilingual education, that its high costs in comparison with its modest results are not justifiable (cf. Appel & Muysken 1987 for an overview). From this position, which according to Baker (1996) is hardly ever empirically tested, it is only a small step to a position that considers societal multilingualism an irre-

sponsibly expensive luxury that should not be fostered in any way by policy measures whatsoever. Although for the time being it is not yet clear in what way the costs of multilingualism have to be calculated (see Coulmas 1992, Grin 1996), this position can cause a serious bias or distortion in the evaluation of language policies that consider multilingualism a resource rather than a problem.

Stage 7: Feedback

Giving feedback on the basis of evaluation data with respect to contents, processes and effects of a policy is crucial for enabling policymakers to adapt or change the original plan. Depending on the nature of the feedback that is given, changes can be made on all levels of the policy making process, potentially leading to redoing (parts of) the policy cycle, which then becomes recursive. The consequences of a restart can vary from formulating a new definition of the problem and therefore designing a whole new policy plan, to making minor changes with respect to, for example, the means that will be deployed to reach the policy's unchanged aims. The ultimate consequence of negative feedback is the termination of the current policy.

Also in the field of language policy feedback can lead to (partial) readjustment, a new start or termination, as can be shown by the following examples. The research-based feedback on pilot projects that was given to the European Commission by the ECCE Group (see above) and its predecessors CREDIF (1984) and Forschungsgruppe ALFA (1984) has led to the initiation of new series of projects. The research-based feedback on the effectiveness of bilingual education projects in the USA (see above) has led to a renewed discussion on and rethinking of the Bilingual Education Act. A powerful plea for terminating this policy is articulated by the English Only Movement that aims at amending the US Constitution so that English will become the official national language (cf. Tollefson 1991:119). Research-based feedback on the Dutch policy regarding home language teaching to ethnic minority pupils has led to a number of changes over the years in the formulation of the goals of this policy (see above), but also to changes with respect to its target groups and target languages (cf. Lucassen & Köbben 1992, Extra & Vallen 1997).

Stage 8: Policy termination

Apart from (partially) terminating current policies in view of negative feedback, policies can also be terminated for the simple reason that they fulfilled their aims within the time that was scheduled. In many cases, however, policies are not officially terminated but are tacitly changed gradually into new policies. In such cases, in view of the absence of an explicitly formulated policy plan (see above), control and evaluation of the policy's effects become very difficult if not impossible.

Examples of language policy termination for various reasons can be found in books like Cooper (1989), Tollefson (1992) and Paulston (1994). In most cases, however, there is no explicit mention as to the type of termination and gradual changes to other policies can also be observed.

A critical perspective

As was indicated before, the above account of the policy cycle represents an ideal-typical process of policy development. The underlying idea of the cycle is an image of policy making as an activity based on a functional-rational model. In actual practice, however, policy making, also - or perhaps especially - with respect to language issues, often turns out to be a rather disorganized and ad-hoc process in which all kinds of interest play unverifiable roles. The policy making cycle represents the process of policy making according to the book and can therefore be used to analyse existing policies. In view of the above, in doing this analysis, one has to adopt a critical perspective in which policy making is considered a type of crisis management rather than being a functional-rational undertaking. In the field of language policy analysis this point is heavily stressed by Tollefson (1992). He criticizes the fact that

“language policies are often seen as expressions of natural, common-sense assumptions about language in society” (Tollefson (1992:2))

and develops a so-called historical-structural approach that seeks to locate language policy within a general social theory, and in which language policy is defined as

“the institutionalization of language as a basis for distinctions among social groups (classes). That is, language policy is one mechanism for locating language within social structure so that language determines who has access to political power and economic resources. Language policy is one mechanism by which dominant groups establish hegemony in language use.” (Tollefson 1992:16)

Tollefson's (1992) historical-structural approach - as opposed to a so-called neo-classical approach - can be seen as an example of a critical descriptive framework for the study of language policy. Also Cooper (1989) introduces some descriptive frameworks for language policy. I will come back to these in section 4 after having dealt with various types of language policy.

3. Types of language policy

On the basis of an overview of a dozen different definitions of language policy Cooper (1989:45) defines language policy, or language planning, as he calls it, as follows:

“Language planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes.”

This definition basically refers to three different foci, types or domains of language policy: status planning, corpus planning, and acquisition planning. Following Cooper (1989) I will first briefly go into these three objects of language policy in a general sense and combine these with Lambert's (1995) overview of types of language policy. Finally I will go into Lambert's (1995) classification of societies in term of their ethno-linguistic complexion in relationship with language planning activities. For an application perspective with respect to language policy in Chuvashia, I refer to Cohen de Lara (1998).

Status planning

Status planning as an object of language policy refers to “deliberate efforts to influence the allocation of functions among a community's languages” (Cooper 1989:99). It goes without saying that status planning activities are mainly to be found in situations of multilingualism, where choices have to be made with respect to the question which languages will serve which functions. Status planning is therefore also referred to as language choice policy. According to Lambert (1995) an emphasis on the protection of the linguistic rights of minorities is a special sub-theme in this domain.

The most important function to be allocated to a language is that of official language. An official language functions as “a legally appropriate language for all politically and culturally representative purposes on a nationwide basis” (Cooper 1989:100). A language can be official in three ways: it can be a language that has been “specified constitutionally”, a language “which a government uses as a medium for its day-to-day activities”, and “a language which a government uses as a medium for symbolic purposes, i.e. as a symbol of the state” (o.c.:100); these functions are referred to as statutory language, working language and symbolic language respectively. In the case of Israel, for example, Hebrew is official in all three senses, Arabic is both a statutory and a working official language, and English is a working official language only.

Apart from being an official language, eleven other functions can be allocated to languages. They can serve as provincial or regional official language (e.g. French in Quebec), language of wider communication (e.g. Russian in the former USSR and in the Russian

Federation), international language (e.g. English as a worldwide language for foreign trade), capital language (e.g. Marathi in Bombay city), group language (e.g. languages of immigrant ethnic groups), educational language (e.g. languages of instruction in formal education), school subject language (e.g. languages that are taught as a subject in formal education), literary language (e.g. the use of a vernacular language for literary or scholarly purposes), religious language (e.g. Latin in the Roman Catholic Church), language of the mass media (e.g. Chuvash as newspaper and broadcasting language), and language of work (e.g. French as a work and business language in Quebec).

Referring to such undertakings as

“the imposition of European languages under colonial rule, the diffusion of Russian in the Baltic and Caucasus regions, the current German campaign to interject that language into the vacuum left by the withdrawal of Russian in Eastern Europe, and above all, the seemingly inexorable march of English around the world”

Lambert (1995:2) distinguishes “the projection of linguistic hegemony across national boundaries” as a separate domain of language policy. I would, however, be inclined to consider this, undoubtedly important field an aspect of status planning.

Status planning in education

In the context of this paper it seems useful to, under the heading of status planning, elaborate at some length on the functions of language as a medium of instruction and as a school subject in multilingual settings (see Kroon & Vallen 1998). Societal and individual multilingualism lead to multilingual classrooms in many schools. Theoretically there are two possible answers to the question of which language should be used as a language of instruction in the teaching and learning process in such classrooms: a monolingual and a multilingual approach. Taking these alternatives as a starting point, there are four basic models for language teaching in multilingual settings.

When making the choice of an exclusively *monolingual approach*, the multilingual classroom context is of course not really taken into account. In that case there are two possibilities: the curriculum is taught in the first language (L1; minority language) of the language minority pupils involved or in their second language (L2; majority language). Of course the first option is only possible in situations in which all pupils have the same L1. In those cases the L1 or minority language functions both as a medium of instruction and as a school subject. Within such an approach, that, if applied to children of immigrant ethnic minorities in, for example, The Netherlands can be labelled as a *segregation model*, the L2 can of course be taught as a (foreign) language subject. The second mono-

lingual option is a completely L2 curriculum. In that case the L2 or majority language functions as a medium of instruction and is taught as if it were the native language for all pupils, also for those having another L1. In the example from The Netherlands just mentioned, this approach could be described as an *assimilation model*. Within this model the pupils' first languages might be taught as subjects, there might be special L2 lessons, and the pupils' first languages might be used as auxiliary languages of instruction.

The assimilation model is the most frequently used in mosaic multilingual classrooms where no L1-specific approach is possible in view of the great diversity of the pupils' language backgrounds. The segregation model is only rarely used. An example are high class international English medium schools in a number of countries.

The second basic strategy is to seriously take into account the multilingual classroom situation and to opt for some kind of *bilingual or multilingual approach*. As a consequence there must then be room for more languages in the regular curriculum than L1 or L2 only. Here are two alternatives as well. The first one is a *transitional model* in which the pupils' first languages are considered as helpful tools in order to facilitate a smooth transition from from both the home environment to the school and from the first to the second language. According to this principle, L1 is accepted and used on a limited basis in the first years of education mainly as a medium to introduce pupils into the content of school subjects. L2 is introduced simultaneously or somewhat later as a subject and as a language of instruction. Within a transitional model, L1 is not taught as a compulsory school subject for all pupils but is merely available for language minority pupils as a subject within or outside the regular curriculum, be it or not in combination with additional L2 instruction. In most cases after a relatively short period of time the parallel L1/L2 approach is replaced by an L2-only approach, because L2 proficiency remains the ultimate goal of education within the transitional model. The second alternative is a *language maintenance or language shelter model*. Within this model L1 and L2 both function as a medium of instruction and as a school subject. This means that language minority pupils participate, be it or not together with language majority pupils, in a bilingual programme. There are many different variations of this model as far as the proportional amount of L1 and L2 in the curriculum is concerned, but in all cases there is a substantial amount of time spent on both languages. Within this model it is also possible, of course, to provide specific additional instruction for both language minority and majority pupils in the language that is not their mother tongue; L1 as a school subject is always taught per se. The maintenance model is frequently advocated by language minority groups themselves.

In both, the transitional and the maintenance approaches, a certain homogeneity of the classrooms involved in terms of the language background of their pupils is a necessary prerequisite. In The Netherlands the transitional approach has only been used in experi-

mental contexts with Turkish and Moroccan pupils (see Appel 1984 and Teunissen 1986). The maintenance approach is mainly used in schools in the USA where English and Spanish are both dominant languages (Baker 1996).

Corpus planning

Corpus planning as an object of language policy refers to activities with respect to language form. Corpus planning is therefore also referred to as language form policy. Corpus planning, generally speaking, follows status planning. Especially if a function is allocated to a language that it did not previously have, as in the example of opting for a language variety as the official language of a newly founded multilingual state, this language variety has to be, or has to be made appropriate for this function. As Lambert (1995:2) phrases it: corpus planning has to do with setting the norm for national languages. Where status planning activities mainly belong to the responsibility of politicians, corpus planning activities not doubt require the involvement of linguists and their expertise. According to Cooper (1989:123)

“the corpus planner designs or selects structures on the assumption that a given function, overt or covert, can be served by a modification or treatment of the corpus.”

Cooper (1989) distinguishes three different types of corpus planning: graphization, standardization and modernization. *Graphization* refers to “the provision of writing systems for unwritten languages (...) using an existing system or inventing a new one” (o.c.:126). *Standardization* is the language planning activity that through a process of codification aims at developing a set of linguistic norms for any given language, codified in a grammar, a dictionary and an orthography. Rubin (1977) separates the process of codification in six different but interrelated steps:

“(1) isolation of a norm, (2) evaluation of the norm by some significant groups of people as ‘correct’ or ‘preferred’, and (3) prescription of the norm for specified contexts or functions. The first three components (...) always occur together. If the prescription is unnoticed, standardization fails. For standardization to take effect, the prescribed norm must be (4) accepted, (5) used, and (6) remain in effect until another norm replaces it.” (Cooper 1989:144)

Modernization “refers to the processes which permit a language to fulfil new communicative functions” (o.c.:153). This can apply to dealing with ‘new’ topics and ‘new’ forms of discourse. The most frequent terms to refer to these processes are elaboration and cultivation.

Renovation, finally, refers to efforts “to change an already developed code, whether in the name of efficiency, aesthetics, or national or political ideology” whereby the “renovated language fulfills no new communicative functions” (o.c.:154).

Extensive and interesting corpus planning activities are reported from the early years of post revolutionary language policy development in the former USSR. After having decided to consider in principle all languages equally useful as languages of instruction, a massive effort had to be made in the field of standardization, and even, in some cases in the field of graphization (see Comrie 1981).

Acquisition planning

According to Cooper (1989:33) acquisition planning is directed at “increasing the number of users - speakers, writers, listeners, or readers -” of a language. Language acquisition efforts can be distinguished from one another on the basis of their goals and the methods employed to attain that goals. Following Cooper (1989:159) goals of acquisition planning can be

“(a) acquisition of the language as a second or foreign language, as in the acquisition of Amharic by non-Amharas in Ethiopia, French by Anglophones in Montreal, spoken Mandarin by Taiwanese; (b) reacquisition of the language by populations for whom it once was either a vernacular - as in the reactivation of Hebrew, the attempts to reactivize Irish, and the revitalization of Maori - or a language of specialized function, as in the return of written Chinese to Taiwan; and (c) language maintenance, as in the efforts to prevent the further erosion of Irish in the Gaeltacht.”

With respect to the methods used to reach these goals Cooper (1989:159) distinguishes three types:

“those designed primarily to create or to improve the *opportunity* to learn, those designed primarily to create or to improve the *incentive* to learn, and those designed to create or improve both opportunity and incentive simultaneously.”

In a more concrete sense the first type of methods includes classroom instruction, materials development and the production of literature, newspapers and radio and television programmes in the target language. Examples of the second type are the inclusion of target languages in official examinations and the setting of language prerequisites for employment. At the heart of the third type, i.e. simultaneously enhancing opportunity and incentive, is the introduction of forms of bilingual education. The different options

that are available in this context as to the choice of languages and the organisation of bilingual education has been dealt with in the above.

With respect to acquisition planning Lambert (1995:3), apart from “the organization of language teaching within the formal educational system” which he considers to be a “subset of what is sometimes called acquisition policy”, distinguishes

“the management of language instruction and language use outside the formal educational system: for instance, adult, particularly occupational, language learning and the maintenance and use of language skills by adults. It includes the education of migrants in the language of their host country together with the maintenance of unofficial heritage language schools which transmit home country languages to the children of immigrant communities. It also includes the provision of language services such as translation and interpretation which meet the needs of people not fully competent in all of the languages with which they must work. The huge translation enterprise that renders all of the documents originating in the European Union into the fifteen official languages is a clear case in point. This area - the provision of language instruction and language services for adults - is one that has received the least attention from language planners (...).”

Although, in my opinion, the examples Lambert gives here can for the most part very well be considered a “subset” also of acquisition planning, there seem to be involved some aspects of status planning as well. Especially the issue of provision of “language services” seems to be connected with the status that languages and their speakers have in a given context. Van der Plank (1985) in this context distinguishes between different forms of recognition of a language, being the *principle of necessity*, which has to do with the recognition of individual rights of citizens, in specific circumstances to be addressed to in their own language and to use their own language in communication with the authorities (translation services), the *principle of bilinguality*, which has to do with the recognition of the existence of different language groups in a certain area or state and the membership of each citizen of one of these groups, granting the groups the right to use their own language within the group and in communication with the authorities that have to operate bilingual, and the *principle of equal validity*, which has to do with the recognition of languages as equal in society and binding for all citizens in that society, i.e. a bilingual area or state.

Language planning as an object of analysis

According to Lambert (1995) a final domain, one that is developing rapidly as the field of language policy becomes richer and more self-conscious, takes the language planning process itself as the object of analysis. As an illustration of this domain Lambert refers to Coulmas' (1991) collection of papers entitled *A Language Policy for the European Community*. Although I agree with the importance of this domain, I would prefer to consider it an object of language policy research rather than of language policy proper (I will come back to that in section 4).

Ethno-linguistic complexion of societies and language policy

As Lambert (1995) states a very substantial portion of the work on international language policy is concerned with the relationship between language planning and ethnicity. In order to be able to examine this relationship more closely Lambert (1995:4) proposes not to take "the perspective of the individual ethnic group or its members" but the perspective of "the ethnic complexion of a country". He therefore proposes a typology of countries based on the number of constituent ethno-linguistic groups in the society:

"The first category in this typology comprises countries that are largely linguistically homogeneous. Most such countries contain relatively small, usually geographically and socially marginal, linguistic minorities. (...) These countries I will refer to as homogeneous countries. The second type of countries is divided into two or three relatively equal ethno-linguistic groups. (...) These I will refer to as dyasic (and by extension, triadic, countries). The third type comprises countries with a substantial number of resident ethnic groups. (...) These countries I will refer to as mosaic societies." (Lambert 1995:4)

From the examples that Lambert gives it becomes clear that he considers many of the countries in Western Europe, Latin America, the Russian Federation, the United States, and Japan as belonging to the first category, countries like Belgium, Canada and Switzerland as belonging to the second category, and countries like Nigeria and India as belonging to the third category. In view of developments in the last few decades in the field of immigration and the minorisation of immigrants in at least Western European countries, I would argue to consider also these countries as (developing) mosaic societies (Kroon & Vallen 1998).

Combining his typology of countries with the domains of language policy distinguished earlier, Lambert (1995:4) states that language planning in homogeneous societies mainly tends to focus on corpus aspects, i.e. "the purification and codification of the current or traditional language of the country". If homogeneous countries are big and powerful and

seek standing in the world community or in its region “it will invest its energies (...) in the extension abroad of its linguistic sphere of influence”. Homogeneous countries, finally, tend to invest most heavily in foreign language instruction. In dyadic countries the overwhelming policy concern is in status planning, “that is the use of the two or three component ethnic languages in government and in the school system”. In developed countries there also is substantial emphasis on foreign language instruction. Most mosaic societies concentrate their efforts on “the choice of languages to use in official affairs” (o.c.:11) and, especially in the developing world, on “corpus planning, that is the standardization and the development of orthographies *de novo* in many languages” (o.c.:5) and on “the preparation of pedagogical materials and the spread of literacy” (o.c.:5).

In addition to this general overview, Lambert (1995:5-14) goes into a number of specific language policy issues in all three types of societies. I will list these here without further comment.

With respect to homogeneous societies:

- “are the same policy prescriptions with respect to minority languages useful for all minorities” (long-standing residentially segregated ethnic minorities versus more interspersed settlement pattern of linguistically diverse immigrant groups) (o.c.:6);
- the conceptualization of ethnic minority policy “as a set of hierarchical relationships between linguistic minorities, taken one at a time, and the dominant, presumably undifferentiated, linguistic majority” (o.c.:7);
- should the goal of policy toward linguistic minorities be to “maintain the languages of the minorities permanently, or to provide a shortterm cushioning transition on the way to full immersion in the majority language community” (o.c.:7).

With respect to dyadic societies:

- are dyadic societies “inherently unstable” and is there “a uniform set of political processes that lead eventually to partition” (o.c.:9);
- which is the language “that will be taught and used as a medium of instruction in the formal educational system (o.c.:10);
- what are the consequences of mobility and migration on the territorial concentration of linguistic minorities and what are the effects for language policy.

With respect to mosaic societies:

- the large number of languages involved and the impossibility to equally deal with all these languages in official and educational matters;
- the relationship between language selection and corpus planning;
- the relationship between language selection, corpus planning and the development of teaching materials and language teaching pedagogies, and the training of teachers;

- the relationship between “territorial ethnic concentration” and “linguistic differentiation” (o.c.:13);
- the “immense fluidity of language use and language mixing” versus “the imposition of any language policy (...), with its inevitable rigid definitions, its bureaucratization of institutional practices, and its general need for order and uniformity” (o.c.:13).

According to Lambert (1995:13) this final point refers to a more general problem in language planning:

“It recalls what in physics they call the Heisenberg Principle, which holds that the very process of trying to measure or control a natural phenomenon must change that phenomenon into an unnatural and unrecognizable form. The need for reductionism and order in language policy makes almost any language policy unsuccessful. My guess is that this is not limited to mosaic societies.”

4. The analysis of language policy

As Cooper (1989:163) rightly states, language planning activities never occur in a social vacuum. The difficulties in analysing them and evaluating their effectiveness are therefore considerable. It is only rarely simple to determine the degree to which a given planning goal has been met, and even harder to determine what factors to what extent contributed to success or failure. One of the main reasons for this state of affairs, according to Cooper (1989:58) is the fact that we do not dispose of a comprehensive theory nor a generally accepted descriptive framework for the study of language planning but are still “at the stage of discovering behavioral regularities” (o.c.:57). Looking at descriptive frameworks suggested by other disciplines therefore can be helpful “not only to understand language planning better but also to forward the development of a framework particularly suited for language planning” (o.c.:58). Borrowing from four different descriptive frameworks, Cooper (1989) considers language planning as, in turn, (1) the management of innovation, (2) an instance of marketing, (3) a tool in the acquisition and maintenance of power, and (4) an instance of decision making, reducing each of these approaches to one basic but at the same time complex question:

- With respect to *language planning as the management of information* the question is: “who adopts what, when, where, why, and how?” (o.c.:60)
- With respect to *language planning as marketing* the question has to do with: “developing the right product backed by the right promotion and put in the right place at the right price.” (o.c.:72)
- With respect to *language planning as the pursuit and maintenance of power* the ques-

tion is: “who benefits, when, and how?” (o.c.:80-85)

- With respect to *language planning as decision making* the question is: “who makes what decisions, why, how, under what conditions, and with what effect?” (o.c.:88)

A combination of these questions forms the heart of Cooper’s accounting scheme for the study and analysis of language planning. Following this scheme a descriptively adequate account of any given case of language planning ought to include at the minimum answers with respect to what actors attempt to influence what behaviours, of which people, for what ends, by what means, with what results, under what conditions, and through what policy making process. I include Cooper’s scheme, adding his hope “that it will improve our ability to describe, predict, and explain language planning” (Cooper 1989:97).

5. Language policy development between assimilation and pluralism

According to Kroon & Vallen (1998) the development of educational language policies in multilingual contexts cannot escape from taking a position in societal and political discussions. One of the main questions to be answered in this respect is which position is taken in the discussion on the advantages and disadvantages of monolingual education versus various forms of multilingual education. In The Netherlands, as in other countries, in recent years there has been a lively debate on this issue. It is obvious from these discussions that in politics and policies on language education there is always the dilemma of desirability versus feasibility. To what extent are certain desirable innovative proposals feasible within a given society and within a set time frame? More concretely this means that the following question should be asked: What is the theoretical starting point when we assess the extent to which multi-ethnicity, multiculturalism and multilingualism are accepted in education. On the theoretical continuum of starting points the one extreme is that of unconditional assimilation, while the other is that of unconditional pluralism (Entzinger 1990). Assimilation means that ethnic, cultural or linguistic minority groups are expected to adapt in every way to the dominant society and to give up their own identity, language and culture. Pluralism, by contrast, entails that different people in a society function alongside each other without having to give up their ethnic, cultural and linguistic identity.

For example, the official Dutch political reaction to the multicultural society, that The Netherlands have developed into, is somewhere halfway between assimilation and pluralism. It can be characterized as ‘integration while retaining one’s own identity’. In concrete terms this position sometimes bears the marks of assimilation and sometimes those of pluralism. What does this position of ‘integration while retaining one’s own identity’ mean for developing language education policies in a multilingual society? Or, in other

- I What *actors* (e.g. formal elites, influentials, counterelites, non-elite policy implementers)
- II attempt to influence what *behaviors*
 - A. structural (linguistic) properties of planned behavior (e.g. homogeneity, similarity)
 - B. purposes/functions for which planned behavior is to be used
 - C. desired level of adoption (awareness, evaluation, proficiency, usage)
- III of which *people*
 - A. type of target (e.g. individuals v. organizations, primary v. intermediary)
 - B. opportunity of target to learn planned behavior
 - C. incentives of target to learn/use planned behavior
 - D. incentives of target to reject planned behavior
- IV for what *ends*
 - A. overt (language-related behaviors)
 - B. latent (non-language-related behaviors, the satisfaction of interests)
- V Under what *conditions*
 - A. situational (events, transient conditions)
 - B. structural
 - 1. political
 - 2. economic
 - 3. social/demographic/ecological
 - C. cultural
 - 1. regime norms
 - 2. cultural norms
 - 3. socialization of authorities
 - D. environmental (influences from outside the system)
 - E. informational (data required for a good decision)
- VI by what *means* (e.g. authority, force, promotion, persuasion)
- VII through what *decision-making process* (decision rules)
 - A. formulation of problem/goal
 - B. formulation of means
- VII with what *effect*

Figure 1: An accounting scheme for the study of language planning (Cooper 1989:98)

words, how much pluralism do multilingual pupils need and how much assimilation can they take?

As far as ethnic minorities' native languages are concerned, I believe that they deserve a clear, recognised and established position in education, first of all as an optional subject (e.g. in The Netherlands, teaching Turkish or Arabic as mother tongues for Turkish or Moroccan pupils, or, in a foreign language approach, to other pupils as well). In this context a decision has to be made whether minority language teaching will be scheduled within or outside the formal school curriculum. Secondly, where possible, minority languages should be used as (additional) languages of instruction in a bilingual or multilingual, not only transitional, model (see section 3). This could entail the use of the minority language as a language of instruction (alongside the teaching of and in the majority language) during (part of) primary and, if possible, secondary education. My position towards minority languages in education is therefore a pluralistic one. A school should be able to cope with a certain degree of multilingualism and should use it positively. Its most important aims in doing so would be of a cultural-political and pedagogical nature: the preservation of ethnic minority languages, and native language competence per se, but also as a basis for learning the majority language through a second language approach (Kroon 1998b).

From my perspective, language teaching in a multi-ethnic, multicultural and multilingual society must be framed within the more general principle of 'intercultural education'. This principle should not only be applied in specific, planned lessons in intercultural language study or language awareness in regular education, but also in the teaching of ethnic minority languages and in second language teaching (see Giesbers, Kroon & Liebrand 1989). In this way intercultural education can contribute to a situation in which ethnic minorities may be integrated while retaining their own identity, as well as fostering better understanding on the part of the majority. Achievement of this latter goal is probably what is most urgently needed at the moment in a world that is suffering from major outbursts of xenophobia, discrimination, brutal racism and ethnic conflict.

Literature

- Appel, R. (1984), *Immigrant Children Learning Dutch. Sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of second-language acquisition*. Dordrecht, ICG Printing.
- Appel, R. & P. Muysken (1987), *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London, Edward Arnold.
- Baker, C. (1996), *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon etc., Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, K.A. & A.A. de Kanter (1983), *Bilingual Education*. Lexington MA, Lexington Books.
- Cohen de Lara, H. (1998), *Language maintenance and revival. A framework for action*. In: V.N. Danilov (ed.), *Sovremennaya yasikovaya politika v obrasovanii*. Cheboksary: Isdatelstvo Russika, 66-74.
- Comrie, B. (1981), *The Languages of the Soviet Union*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Cooper, R.L. (1989), *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge etc., Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, F. (1992), *Language and Economy*. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.
- Coulmas, F. (ed.) (1991), *A Language Policy for the European Community*. Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter.
- CREDIF (1984), *Projet d'Evaluation Comparative des expériences pilotes de scolarisation des enfants migrants dans les Etats Membres du Marché Commun (1981-1983)*. Paris, CREDIF.
- De Vries, J. (1995), *Language Policy and Regional Characteristics of Minority Language Communities*. In: W. Fase, K. Jaspaert & S. Kroon (eds.), *The State of Minority languages. International Perspectives on Survival and Decline*. Lisse, Swets & Zeitlinger, 135-151.
- Entzinger, H. (1990), *Overheidsbeleid*. In: H.B. Entzinger & P.J.J. Stijnen (eds.), *Etnische minderheden in Nederland*. Meppel: Boom, 244-264.
- Extra, G. & T. Vallen (1997), *Migration and Multilingualism in Western Europe: A Case Study of The Netherlands*. In: *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 7, 151-169. (= W. Grabe (Ed.), *Multilingualism*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Forschungsgruppe ALFA (1984), *Vergleichende Evaluation von Modellversuchen zum Aufnahmeunterricht, zum Muttersprachlichen Unterricht und zur Curriculumentwicklung für den Unterricht von Migrantenkindern in Mitgliedsstaaten der Europäischen Gemeinschaften*. Essen/Landau, ALFA.
- Giesbers, H., S. Kroon & R. Liebrand (1989), *Language Variation Study in the Classroom*. In: J. Cheshire, V. Edwards, H. Münstermann & B. Weltens (Eds.), *Dialect and Education: Some European Perspectives*. Clevedon/Philadelphia, Multilingual Matters, 242-255.

- Grin, F. (Ed.) (1996), *Economic Approaches to Language and Language Planning*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 121. Berlin/New York, Mouton De Gruyter.
- Hailemariam, C., S. Kroon & J. Walters (1999), *Multilingualism and Nation Building: Language and Education in Eritrea*. In: *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 20, 1-19 (forthcoming).
- Hoogerwerf, A. (1993a), *Beleid, processen en effecten*. In: A. Hoogerwerf (Red.), *Overheidsbeleid. Een inleiding in de beleidswetenschap*. Alphen aan den Rijn, Samsom H.D. Tjeenk Willink, 17-34.
- Hoogerwerf, A. (Red.) (1993b), *Overheidsbeleid. Een inleiding in de beleidswetenschap*. Alphen aan den Rijn, Samsom H.D. Tjeenk Willink.
- Jaspert, K. & S. Kroon (1991), *Ethnic Minority Language Teaching and Language Policy: Introductory Remarks*. In: K. Jaspert & S. Kroon (Eds.), *Ethnic Minority Languages and Education*. Amsterdam/Lisse, Swets & Zeitlinger, 7-14.
- Kroon, S. (1998a), *Aspektyazykovej politiki*. In: V.N. Danilov (Ed.), *Sovremennaya yazykovaya politika v obrasovanii*. Cheboksary: Isdatelstvo Russika, 25-65.
- Kroon, S. (1998b), *Plädoyer für die Selbstverständlichkeit von Mehrsprachigkeit*. In: *Deutsch Lernen*, 23, 1, 46-58.
- Kroon, S. & T. Vallen (1994), *Multilingualism and Education: An Overview of Language and Education Policies for Ethnic Minorities in The Netherlands*. In: *Current Issues in Language and Society*, 1, 2, 103-130.
- Kroon, S. & T. Vallen (1998), *Bilingual Education for Migrant Students in The Netherlands*. In: D. Corson & J. Cummins (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Volume 5. *Bilingual Education*. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 199-208.
- Lambert, R.D. (1995), *Language policy: an overview*. (draft)
- Lucassen, L. & A.J.F. Köbben (1992), *Het partiële gelijk. Controverses over het onderwijs in de eigen taal en cultuur en de rol daarbij van beleid en wetenschap (1951-1991)*. Amsterdam/Lisse, Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Paulston, C.B. (1994), *Linguistic Minorities in Multilingual Settings. Implications for Language Policies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Reid, E. & H. Reich (eds.) (1992), *Breaking the Boundaries. Migrant Workers' Children in the EC*. Clevedon etc., Multilingual Matters.
- Reich, H. & I. Gogolin (Hrsg.) (1990 etc.), *Migrantenkinder in den Schulen Europas. Versuche und Erfahrungen*. 7 Volumes. Münster/New York, Waxmann.
- Rubin, J. (1977), *Language standardization in Indonesia*. In: J. Rubin et al. (eds.), *Language Planning Processes*. The Hague, Mouton, 111-129.
- Teunissen, F. (1986), *Een school, twee talen. Een onderzoek naar de effecten van een tweetalig-bicultureel onderwijsprogramma voor Marokkaanse en Turkse leerlingen op basisscholen te Enschede*. Utrecht: Vakgroep Onderwijskunde Utrecht.

- Tollefson, J.W. (1991), *Planning Language, Planning Inequality. Language Policy in the Community*. London/New York, Longman.
- Van de Graaf, H. & R. Hoppe (1992), *Beleid en politiek. Een inleiding tot de beleidswetenschap en de beleidskunde*. Muiderberg, Coutinho.
- Van der Plank, P. (1985), *Taalsociologie. Een inleiding tot de rol van taal in het maatschappelijk verkeer*. Muiderberg, Coutinho.

Dr. Sjaak Kroon
BABYLON - Center for Studies of Multilingualism in the Multicultural Society
Tilburg University, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands
Phone +3113 4662776
E-mail s.kroon@kub.nl