Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol.1

LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY
Series Editors: A/Professor Richard B. Baldauf Jr., *University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia*
Professor Robert B. Kaplan, *University of Southern California, USA*

Other Books in the Series
Language Planning and Policy in Africa, Vol.1: Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa
*R*ichard B. Baldauf Jr. and Robert B. Kaplan (eds)

Other Books of Interest
Identity, Insecurity and Image: France and Language
Dennis Ager
Community and Communication: The Role of Language in Nation State Building and European Integration
Sue Wright
Can Threatened Languages be Saved?
Joshua Fishman (ed.)
Language and Society in a Changing Italy
Arturo Tosi
Language Planning From Practice to Theory
Robert B. Kaplan and Richard B. Baldauf Jr. (eds)
The Other Languages of Europe
Guus Extra and Durk Gorter (eds)
Motivation in Language Planning and Language Policy
Dennis Ager
Multilingualism in Spain
M. Teresa Turell (ed.)
Beyond Boundaries: Language and Identity in Contemporary Europe
Paul Gubbins and Mike Holt (eds)
Ideology and Image: Britain and Language
Dennis Ager
Where East Looks West: Success in English in Goa and on the Konkan Coast
Dennis Kurzon
English in Africa: After the Cold War
Alamin M. Mazrui
Politeness in Europe
Leo Hickey and Miranda Stewart (eds)
Language in Jewish Society: Towards a New Understanding
John Myhill
Maintaining a Minority Language
John Gibbons and Elizabeth Ramirez
Urban Multilingualism in Europe
Guus Extra and Kutlay Yagmur (eds)
Cultural and Linguistic Policy Abroad: The Italian Experience
Mariella Totaro-Genevois
Language Decline and Death in Africa: Causes, Consequences and Challenges
Herman M. Batibo

Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol.1
Hungary, Finland and Sweden

Edited by
Robert B. Kaplan and Richard B. Baldauf Jr.

Printed and bound in the United States of America.

Contents

Series Overview

Since 1998 and 1999 when the first six polity studies on language policy and planning – addressing the language situation in particular polities – were published in the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13 studies (through the end of 2003) have been published in *Current Issues in Language Planning*. These studies have all addressed, to a greater or lesser extent, 22 common questions or issues (Appendix A), thus giving them some degree of consistency. However, we are keenly aware that these studies have been published in the order in which they were completed. While such an arrangement is reasonable for journal publication, the result does not serve the needs of area specialists nor are the various monographs easily accessible to the wider public. As the number of available polity studies has grown, we have planned to update (where necessary) and republish these studies in coherent areal volumes.

The first such volume published concerned Africa (i.e., Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa) (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004), both because a significant number of studies had become available and because Africa constituted an area that is significantly under-represented in the language planning literature and yet is marked by extremely interesting language policy and planning issues. This second volume – including Finland, Hungary and Sweden – focuses on Europe, again examining polities that have not been the subject of much published language planning and policy activity – at least in English. This volume will shortly be followed by a third volume, also with a focus on Europe (i.e., The Czech Republic, the European Union and Northern Ireland.)

We hope that these areal volumes will better serve the needs of specialists. It is our intent to continue to publish other areal volumes subsequently as sufficient studies are completed. We will do so in the hope that such volumes will be of interest to areal scholars and others interested in language policies and language planning in geographically coherent regions. The areas in which we are planning to produce future volumes, and some of the polities which may be included, are:

> **Africa** (2), including Algeria, Burundi and Rwanda, Côte d'Ivoire, Nigeria, Tunisia, Zimbabwe;
> **Asia**, including Bangladesh, Malaysia, Nepal, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka and Taiwan;
> **Europe** (3), including the Ireland, Italy and Malta;
> **Latin America**, including Ecuador, Mexico and Paraguay;
> **Pacific Basin**, including Fiji and Vanuatu.

In the meantime, we will continue to bring out *Current Issues in Language Planning*, adding to the list of polities available for inclusion in areal volumes. At this point, we cannot predict the intervals over which such areal volumes will appear, since those intervals will be defined by the ability of contributors to complete work on already committed polity studies.

Assumptions Relating to Polity Studies

There are a number of assumptions that we have made about the nature of language policy and planning that have influenced the nature of the studies presented. First, we do not believe that there is, yet, a broader and more coherent paradigm to address the complex questions of language policy/planning development. On the other hand, we do believe that the collection of a large body of more or less comparable data and the careful analysis of that data will give rise to a better paradigm. Therefore, in soliciting the polity studies, we have asked each of the contributors to address some two dozen questions (to the extent that such questions were pertinent to each particular polity); the questions were offered as suggestions of topics that might be covered. (See Appendix A.) Some contributors have followed the questions rather closely; others have been more independent in approaching the task. It should be obvious that, in framing those questions, we were moving from a perhaps inchoate notion of an underlying theory. The reality that our notion was inchoate becomes clear in each of the polity studies.

Second, we have sought to find authors who had an intimate involvement with the language planning and policy decisions made in the polity about which they were writing; i.e., we were looking for insider knowledge and perspectives about the polities. Furthermore, we have asked authors to locate those policies in the local socio-historical context. However, as insiders are part of the process, they may find it difficult to take the part of the 'other' – to be critical of that process. But it is not necessary or even appropriate that they should do so – this can be left to others. As Pennycook (1998: 126) argues:

> One of the lessons we need to draw from this account of colonial language policy [i.e., in Hong Kong] is that, in order to make sense of language policies we need to understand both their location historically and their location contextually. What I mean by this is that we can not assume that the promotion of local languages instead of a dominant language, or the promotion of a dominant language at the expense of a local language, are in themselves good or bad. Too often we view these things through the lenses of liberalism, pluralism or anti-imperialism, without understanding the actual location of such policies.

While some authors do take a theoretical or critical stance, or one based on a theoretical approach to the data, many of the studies are primarily descriptive, bringing together and revealing, we hope, the nature of the language development experience in the particular polity. We believe this is a valuable contribution to the theory/paradigm development of the field. As interesting and challenging as it may be to provide a priori descriptions of the nature of the field (e.g., language management; Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003; minority language rights; May, 2003) based on partial data – nor have we been completely immune from this ourselves (e.g., Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003, Chapter 12), we believe the development of a sufficient data base is an important prerequisite for paradigm development.

An Invitation to Contribute

We welcome additional polity contributions. Our views on a number of the issues can be found in Kaplan and Baldauf (1997; 2003); sample polity mono-

graphs have appeared in the extant issues of *Current Issues in Language Planning* <http://www.cilp.net/> and in previously published volumes in this series. Interested authors should contact the editors, present a proposal for a monograph, and provide a sample list of references. It is also useful to provide a brief biographical note, indicating any personal involvement in language planning activities in the polity proposed for study as well as any relevant research/publication in LPP. All contributions should, of course, be original, unpublished works. We expect to work with contributors during the preparation of monographs. All monographs will, of course, be reviewed for quality, completeness, accuracy, and style. Experience suggests that co-authored contributions may be very successful, but we want to stress that we are seeking unified monographs on particular polities, not an edited compilation of various authors' efforts. Questions may be addressed to either of us.

<div align="right">Robert B. Kaplan (rkaplan@olypen.com)
Richard B. Baldauf, Jr. (rbaldauf@bigpond.com)</div>

References

Baldauf, R. B., Jr., and Kaplan, R. B. (eds) (2004) *Language Planning and Policy in Africa, Vol. I: Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kaplan, R. B. and Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2003) *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kaplan, R. B. and Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (1997) *Language Planning From Practice to Theory.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

May, S. (2003) Language planning and linguistic human rights. *Current Issues in Language Planning 4*, 95–125.

Neustupný, J. and Nekvapil, J. (2003) Language management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4, 181–366.

Pennycook, A. (1998) *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Volume previously published in this series

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. and Kaplan, R. B. (eds) (2004) *Language Planning and Policy in Africa, Vol. I: Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Appendix A

Part I: The Language Profile of . . .

1. Name and briefly describe the national/official language(s) (*de jure* or *de facto*).
2. Name and describe the major minority language(s).
3. *Name and describe the lesser minority language(s) (include 'dialects', pidgins, creoles and other important aspects of language variation)*; the definition of minority language/dialect/pidgin will need to be discussed in terms of the sociolinguistic context.
4. *Name and describe the major religious language(s)*; In some polities religious languages and/or missionary policies have had a major impact on the language situation and provide *de facto* language planning. In some contexts religion has been a vehicle for introducing exogenous languages while in other cases it has served to promote indigenous languages.

5. Name and describe the major language(s) of literacy, assuming that it is/ they are not one of those described above.
6. Provide a table indicating the number of speakers of each of the above languages, what percentage of the population they constitute and whether those speakers are largely urban or rural.
7. Where appropriate, provide a map(s) showing the distribution of speakers, key cities and other features referenced in the text.

Part II: Language Spread

8. Specify which languages are taught through the educational system, to whom they are taught, when they are taught and for how long they are taught.
9. Discuss the objectives of language education and the methods of assessment to determine that the objectives are met.
10. To the extent possible, trace the historical development of the policies/ practices identified in items 8 and 9 (may be integrated with 8/9).
11. Name and discuss the major media language(s) and the distribution of media by socio-economic class, ethnic group, urban/rural distinction (including the historical context where possible). For minority language, note the extent that any literature is (has been) available in the language.
12. How has immigration effected language distribution and what measures are in place to cater for learning the national language(s) and/or to support the use of immigrant languages.

Part III: Language Policy and Planning

13. Describe any language planning legislation, policy or implementation that is currently in place.
14. Describe any literacy planning legislation, policy or implementation that is currently in place.
15. To the extent possible, trace the historical development of the policies/ practices identified in items 13 and 14 (may be integrated with these items).
16. Describe and discuss any language planning agencies/organisations operating in the polity (both formal and informal).
17. Describe and discuss any regional/international influences affecting language planning and policy in the polity (include any external language promotion efforts).
18. To the extent possible, trace the historical development of the policies/ practices identified in items 16 and 17 (may be integrated with these items)**.**

Part IV: Language Maintenance and Prospects

19. Describe and discuss intergenerational transmission of the major language(s); (is this changing over time?).
20. Describe and discuss the probabilities of language death among any of the languages/language varieties in the polity, any language revival efforts as well as any emerging pidgins or creoles.
21. Add anything you wish to clarify about the language situation and its probable direction of change over the next generation or two.

22. Add pertinent references/bibliography and any necessary appendices (e.g., a general plan of the educational system to clarify the answers to questions 8, 9 and 14).

Language Policy and Planning
in Hungary, Finland and Sweden:
Some Common Issues

Robert B. Kaplan
Professor Emeritus, Applied Linguistics, University of Southern California. Postal address: PO Box 577, Port Angeles, WA 98362 USA (rkaplan@olypen.com)

Richard B. Baldauf Jr.
Associate Professor of TESOL, School of Education, University of Queensland, QLD 4072 Australia (r.baldauf@bigpond.com)

Introduction

Methodological and historical barriers to language policy and planning (LPP) research have often made generalizability of results difficult if not impossible – sometimes because comparable information has not been produced, but often because basic data is simply unavailable. In many polities, Côte d'Ivoire (Djité, 2000) for example, conditions and the state of academic research (i.e., not only the work published about the polity, but access to journals and recent books, computer facilities, time to do research, adequate salaries and working condi- tions, let alone funds for travel and research projects, etc.) are such that many LPP issues, such as those represented by the 22 questions suggested for these studies, simply could not be adequately addressed (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004: 7).

Furthermore, LPP research, unlike science, does not have a rich culture of controlled experiments – nor perhaps, despite some early thinking to the contrary (see, e.g., Rubin & Jernudd, 1971), is such work possible. Instead, a wide variety of methodological perspectives have been used to examine various aspects of LPP (see, Baldauf, 2002), but central to this body of work, a descriptive culture of citing 'best practice' has evolved, which is inherently anecdotal (see, e.g., Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003). Furthermore, as Noss (1985) noted twenty years ago in relation to language-in-education planning, evaluation of language plan- ning is relatively rare. This remains the case, and what evaluative work is done, at least at the macro level, is often poorly funded, empirical reports and experi- mental follow-ups that describe the 'effects' of some recent 'innovation,' often forgetting the basic tenet of science that association is not causation.

Thus, there has been a global tendancy to view LPP research as one fad (or one 'innovation') after another, each with a typical life span of five to ten years (often tied to the life of a political administration) (see, e.g., Kaplan & Tse, 1982). It is rare that anyone critically examines the evidence that validates one or another new practice. This soft approach to LPP research has led to redundancy and has inspired cynicism and existential fatigue among policy makers, journalists, and the public. In the process, LPP research has become a low-status undertaking, increasingly open to critique, although unfortunately much of the critique has focused on the way the discipline is seen to operate through its 'involvement' in issues like 'linguistic imperialism' or 'minority language rights', rather than on

developing research based studies that appropriately address and try to understand the issues involved.[1]

Another recent direction taken by some scholars has been to attempt to deal with language policy activities in terms of a dichotomy of *success* and *failure*. Given that language policy activity is commonly an on-going or continuous process, it is quite impossible to dichotomise LPP outcomes in such terms, though there are other attempts at structuring order that may be more useful.

For example, Pennycook (1998) provides a critical analysis of English and the discourses of colonialism, especially the tension between views of 'the self' and 'the other', between the 'insider' and the 'outsider', the emic and the etic. His primary focus of analysis is on colonialism – both historic and in its Eurocentric neo-colonialist forms – and the positive manner in which Europeans portrayed themselves versus the way they portrayed the colonised others. Following from this, he points out that there is a need to look 'more contextually . . . at the sites and causes of the development of colonial discourses on language . . . ' as there is a 'constant negotiation of colonial language policy images of the Self and the Other' where 'culture and language were always being produced, developed and redefined' (1998: 128). This dichotomy and interaction between the Self and the Other – which Pennycook illustrates with Hong Kong as an example – is also characteristic of the tension in perspectives that individual LPP authors bring to their studies (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2004: 8).

Another obstacle to dichotomising outcomes – i.e., as successes or as failures – lies in the matter of the actors. Key actors in language policy designs can warp those designs to support quite different objectives (e.g., Kaplan & Baldauf 2003, the discussion of the role of Kim Il Sung in North Korea). In some polities, language policy activity has had a quite specific political objective, often without reference to the realities of language use in the polity, and sometimes to the detriment of the speaker population. As Kayambazinthu points out (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004: 79), in her study of language planning in Malawi, ' . . . language planning practices (past and present) present an interesting case study of pervasive ad hoc and reactive planning, based more on self-interest and political whim than research.' In such cases, dichotomising outcomes becomes futile.

Furthermore, policy efforts may show some successes and some failures simultaneously. But, as we have pointed out earlier, ' . . . there is a great deal of language planning that occurs in other societal contexts [not necessarily at governmental level] at more modest levels for other purposes' (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997: 3). At these more micro levels, it is virtually impossible meaningfully to discuss *success* and *failure*. In short, dichotomising outcomes on a two-part scale seems not to constitute a useful activity – the world is not 'black and white'; rather it consists of many shades of grey. Indeed, there is a variety of policy and planning that occurs without planning (e.g., Baldauf, 1994; Eggington, 2002) – i.e., a situation in which some language planning occurs as fall-out from some other planning activity; e.g., the multi-polity accords of the International Postal Union on the required mode for addressing envelopes to assure international delivery.

A purpose of this series is to work with authors, involved in LPP in their polities, to bring together the available research in its socio-historical context, exploring with them what has happened, and the extent to which this has been

documented in their particular polity. Hopefully this will help us to understand the language planning process better.

In particular, this volume brings together three language policy and planning studies related to Northern and Eastern Europe.[2] (See the 'Series Overview' in this volume for a more general discussion of the nature of the series, Appendix A for the 22 questions each study set out to address, and Kaplan *et al.* (2000) for a discussion of our underlying concepts for the studies themselves.) In this introductory paper, rather than trying to provide an introductory summary of the material covered in these studies, we have tried to draw out and discuss some of the more general issues raised by these studies in light of the debates which have been going on in the field.

Polity Planning Characteristics

Except that all three of these polities fall within the broad definition of *Europe* (and that all three are included within the European Union), the three studies included in this volume do not represent any sort of geographic or linguistic coherence. Hungarian and Finnish are languages belonging to the same language family – the Uralic family; however, the relationship between these two languages can only be established on historical linguistic grounds. Sweden and Finland are part of the Nordic region – together with Denmark, Iceland and Norway. In addition, Finland was part of the Swedish empire for nearly five centuries from 1323 to 1809 and the Swedish language as well as the legal and social structures left their mark on the country. Indeed, Finnish and Swedish are the Constitutional national languages of Finland, and some 300,000 Swedish speakers reside in Finland (out of a total population of about five million, thus just under six per cent of the population). Sweden, on the other hand, has two distinct Finnish speaking populations; those more recent 'economic' migrants speaking standard Finnish and those speaking Meänkieli (Tornedalen Finnish), distinguished by the relative amount of 'Swedisation'. Finnish is not officially recognised as a national language in the Swedish Constitution.

It is important to recall that Hungarian and Swedish have long histories and especially that they were at one time 'imperial' languages which have now been reduced essentially to minor roles in the context of contemporary Europe and in the context of the European Union (EU). At the same time, virtually hundreds of new 'minority' languages have appeared in Europe, in part as the result of the political rearrangements occurring within Europe over the past two centuries, and in part as the result of significant immigration from non-European areas echoing the movement of populations toward seemingly better economic conditions and relative political stability. These population movements, combined with current concerns for minority language rights within the EU, raise language policy and planning concerns in each of the polities.

Minority populations in all three polities are, nevertheless, quite small, but of course in some respects this makes the problem of language provision and support even more difficult. Varietal variation in some groups (e.g. the Roma) increases the problem.

- Finland's minority populations include: Russian 28,205, Estonian 10,176, English 6.919, Somali 6,454, Arabic 4,892, Vietnamese 3,588, German 3,298,

Albanian 3,293, Kurdish 3,115, Chinese 2,907 (out of a total population of five million). None of these groups approaches 1% of the total population.

- Hungary's minority populations are also more fully defined: Roma 142,683, German 30,824, Croatian 13,570, Romanian 10,740, Slovak 10,459, Serbian 2,905, Slovenian 1,930 (out of a total population of ten million). None of these groups approaches 1% of the population.
- Sweden's minority populations are only available as estimates: Saami 5,000 to 10,000; Tornedalians 25,000 to 70,000; Swedish Finns 200,000 to 250,000; Roma 5,000 to 15,000, and Jews about 3,000 (out of a total population of about nine million). The largest of these groups represents only about 2% of the population. The small Jewish population is attributable to some extent to antisemitism over the past 300 years.

While the numbers of speakers of languages other than the respective national languages are really quite small, it is apparent that all of these polities are multilingual and multicultural.

As Figure 1 indicates, while these polities differ in a number of ways, they are all smaller states within the European context in population size, in area, and in GDP (as compared with, e. g., France [population = 59,329,691; area = 547,030 sq. km.; GDP = $1.32 trillion; 5th republic] or Germany [population = 82,797,408; area = 356,910 sq. km.; GDP = $1.813 trillion; parliamentary democracy]).

Country Name	*Population*	*Area in sq. km.*	*GDP* in US$ (billions)*	*Type of Government*
Finland	c. 5,000,000	337,000	$103.6	Republic
Hungary	c. 10,000,000	93,000	$75.4	Republic
Sweden	c. 9,000,000	449,000	$175.0	Constitutional Monarchy

Figure 1 Basic facts pertaining to Finland, Hungary and Sweden

* Gross Domestic Product

Finland and Sweden also share some minority languages – Saami (see, e.g., Bull, 2002), Yiddish (and to some extent Hebrew as a language of religion) and Romani; Finland also includes communities of Tatar and Russian speakers. After World War II, and especially after 1980, groups of immigrants migrated to the Nordic Countries – speakers of Arabic, Chinese (various regionalect varieties), English, Farsi, French, German, Greek, Japanese, Polish, Spanish, Turkish, and Vietnamese – though the population numbers of these communities are quite small. Hungary, like much of the rest of Europe, also has communities of speakers of these languages. All three of these polities have reported special problems with respect to speakers of Romani.

It is interesting to note the extent to which the respective Ministries of Education are basically responsible for language policy. In all three polities, it is the Ministry of Education that is responsible for first language education – Swedish in Sweden, Hungarian in Hungary and both Finnish and Swedish in Finland. It is also of interest that the minority languages are defined by the Ministries of Education. While all three polities have problems with respect to the Romani-speaking populations, and while Finland and Sweden have special problems