

Lo Bianco, Joseph (2008). Policy Activity for Heritage Languages: Connections with Representation and Citizenship

Copyright © 2008 From Heritage Language Education: a new field emerging by D. M. Brinton, O. Kagan & S. Bauckus (Eds). Reproduced by permission of Taylor and Francis Group, LLC a division of Informa plc.

This material is strictly for personal use only. For any other use, the user must contact Taylor & Francis directly at this address: permissions.mailbox@taylorandfrancis.com. Printing, photocopying, sharing via any means is a violation of copyright.

Policy Activity for Heritage Languages: Connections with Representation and Citizenship

Joseph Lo Bianco

Introduction

Most writing on language maintenance and language shift, as well as on heritage language, uses the conceptual apparatus of sociolinguistics, and is located under the category Language in Society. As such it is linked to analysis and data about language use patterns, code variation, endogamous and exogamous marriage, bilingualism and parenting, and diglossia and the identity-language correlations, with social psychological perspectives sometimes informing the sociolinguistic orientation. Language policy and planning theory, which straddles applied linguistics and sociolinguistics, is sometimes drawn on as an informing sub-discipline. The effect is that heritage languages are typically discussed from perspectives informed by applied and socially influenced linguistics, both rather code-centered, as well as by language policy and planning, which also reveals the influence of code-based language sciences.

Less common are analyses of how language maintenance issues are constructed, represented and positioned in political discourse, i.e., discursive representation, and explorations of how the policy sciences could contribute to enhancing the prospects for the intergenerational retention of heritage languages. This latter approach is adopted here, hence the present discussion concerns how policy documents and policy discourses characterize the interests and intended policy treatments towards languages of minority communities ("heritage" or "community" languages, of both indigenous and recent immigrant origin) in societies where these languages do not have active territory-based political separatism claims. This is a discussion, then, of how heritage languages are represented in texts that announce public policy and the desirability of heritage language support.

My examples are drawn from recent developments in Scotland and Australia. Both share English as the powerful other language in relation to which advocacy responds, thereby adding problems of global modernity to the challenges of dealing with intra-national questions of identity and loyalty that face all minority language advocacy. Scotland is particularly interesting because political devolution in the UK in 1997 has produced a sense of national revival, and a kind of state-making practice is in evidence there. The Australian section discusses how with the post-Second World War immigration program language policy was undertaken in the context of new citizenship created in 1948, extended to indigenous people from 1967, and culminated in the permitting of dual citizenship from 2002. Each of these liberalizing moves in formal citizenship connects to a policy moment and offers insights into how "heritage" itself is construed as a cultural commodity.

Previous work on policy representation for heritage languages has discussed the United States (Lo

Bianco, 1999), Australia (Lo Bianco, 2001a), the United States, the UK, and Australia in comparison (Lo Bianco, 2001b), and Scotland (Lo Bianco, 2001c). In this work it was suggested that intergenerational language maintenance implies and requires institutional supports, ethnic loyalty, ideological beliefs about nation-state-person, and makes heritage language policy different from other kinds of language education advocacy.

Attitudes and Discourse as Language Policymaking Practices

All policy involves both "texts" (the legislative or administrative, policy report, form) and "discourse" (persuasive talking and writing that precedes, succeeds and accompanies policy texts) (Ball, 1993).

The dominant perspective in official policy is statist, and in many Europeanized countries it links to ideologies and traditions of monolingual state making, of a unitary notion of national culture expressed by a single and ethnically expressive national language. This set of associations makes one language co-terminus with national identity and citizenship, and has the effect of separating civic from ethnic identity, designating the latter as a pre-modern identification practice of minorities. This separation in turn represents the social interaction required for intergenerational maintenance of heritage languages as marginal, atavistic, or even nationally divisive.

The result is that the efforts towards revitalizing threatened languages or sustaining heritage languages are vulnerable in policy discourse because they are often associated with anti-modern atavism. In policy debates, these arguments can be abstract and hypothetical. However they have a direct analogue in educational settings in the differential evaluations attributed to bilingualism. Heritage language-based bilingualism, for example, is often devalued by comparison with majority-community bilingualism that attracts celebration. Zelasko (1991) has called this phenomenon a "bilingual double standard." Writing about the United States, she observed that the bilingualism attained by speakers who learn English and maintain their minority language is rarely appreciated as a skill, whereas the acquisition of foreign languages by majority English speakers is treated as a demonstration of talent and is celebrated as an achievement. Variations on this differential evaluation of a two-language skill are also noted by Roca (1999), who finds that minority speakers are seen to constitute difficulties for the majority, and Shannon (1999), who notes that English-speaking children acquiring Spanish receive more praise than Spanish-speaking learners' attainments in English (p. 193). In these examples, we see ideology becoming policy, and the practice and habits of language operating as default policy.

Sedition and Parochialism

In *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved?* (2001) Joshua Fishman surveys the range of obstacles that beset language revitalization efforts, asking: "Why is it so hard to strengthen threatened languages?" (p. 1). He offers five reasons:

1. Language loss follows already advanced processes of cultural attrition and substitution of rival identities that are not based on active intergenerational maintenance of the language;
2. Advocating for language maintenance is seen as competing with the replacing language, opposed to social mobility, and as parochial and anti-modern;
3. Stable intergenerational language maintenance requires some social and institutional differentiation;
4. Retained minority language functions require constant reinforcement; and,
5. Opposed to language maintenance is a statist and supra-statist discourse that characterizes language maintenance as "simultaneously disruptive of local civility and of higher order

international advantage" (p. 21).

Fishman comments that advocates of reversing language shift are susceptible to criticisms of "sedition" and "parochialism" (p. 21). This vulnerability does not face other kinds of language advocacy. Deployed against efforts to reverse language shift is an overarching discourse that Fishman labels "incorporative modernity" (p. 21).

In related work on Canadian First Nation languages, Fettes (1997) articulates three criteria for sustaining threatened languages: critical awareness, local knowledges, and living relationships. Critical awareness means contesting negative characterizations of threatened languages. The second dimension, local knowledges, involves re-invigorating local, intra-family and intra-community use-functions for threatened languages. Essentially this means finding spaces in the daily lives of communities and families in which the minority language is the natural and exclusive medium of conducting at least some differentiated affairs of life. Living relationships involve children and adults recreating intact discourses in the language.

Spolsky (2002) discusses the rarity of conjoining in a single language policy heritage language, national security issues in relation to language (i.e., strategic interests), and traditional foreign languages. The latter are usually sustained by humanistic rationales; the strategic interest generates its own, usually separate, policy, and heritage languages are treated to separate processes of policy determination, though more often are relegated to the realm of policy neglect. Spolsky proposes that an "ecological view" would be able to overcome the competitive interests that preclude comprehensive language planning (p. 103). Like the points made by Fishman and Fettes, we have here a sense that underlying the lower priority given to heritage languages is a discursive representation that aligns heritage language advocacy with interests contrary to or at least dissonant with "the national interest", even, *in extremis*, potentially disrupting "national security".

Language Policy Texts in Post-Devolution Scotland

In 1997 a large majority of Scots voted in favor of a devolution package proposed by the British government of Prime Minister Tony Blair. The result was that the administrative control vested in Scotland, compared to Westminster, expanded in range and depth, and, most importantly, that a directly elected Parliament was established at Edinburgh, the first since the Union of the Parliaments in 1707. The state or semi-state emerging from this process provides an important experience of language and nation connections for language planning analysis.

The political devolution within the United Kingdom supplies evidence of how implied policy (i.e., policy as a collection of prevailing attitudes) is transformed into explicit and overt policy attention at moments when political jurisdiction more closely aligns with specific linguistic and territorial associations. Although, by comparison with other parts of the UK, Scotland had enjoyed a relatively high degree of administrative autonomy before 1997, since devolution the "question" of Scottish Gaelic, and of language policy in general, has repeatedly surfaced for prominent attention.

In Scotland the context of devolution is evident in the number and range of policy investigations, reports and analyses commissioned by the new Parliament. In addition there are active committees devoted to language issues and Parliamentary debates on language questions. Among the language issues that have been considered for policy treatment are English (child and adult literacy, English as a second language), British Sign Language, Scots and its regional varieties, Gaelic, immigrant origin community languages, and foreign languages (especially the official languages of the European Union). Of these issues progress from discourse to text and resources has been easiest for adult literacy and hardest for Scots, most embellished for Gaelic, and least productive for modern and

community languages. In what follows I discuss some key texts and debates in these areas trying to unravel both process and outcome.

A Policy on Culture

Creating our Future...Minding our Past: Scotland's National Cultural Strategy (Scottish Executive, 2000) is at base a policy text for distributing public finance to the arts. It also devotes considerable attention to identity, language, ethnic pluralism and cultural production, and has made available and legitimated a way to discourse on state, culture and nation in the post-devolution context. The Strategy deployed makes difference a central organizing idea: "This strategy takes a broad view of Scotland's culture" (p. 4); "everyone contributes" (p. 5); "Celebrating Scotland's cultural heritage in its full diversity" (p. 23). At the same time, the Strategy makes explicit connections between Culture and Economy via creative industries.

The Strategy lists among its key aims "Promoting Scotland's languages as cultural expressions and as means of accessing Scotland's culture" and identifies English as "both asset and threat" in its impact on Scotland's "other languages and dialects" and on the motivation of Scots to learn other languages (p. 23). The Strategy is very positively disposed towards Gaelic, identifying initiatives for its support, and also for the support of the Scots language, about which it says: "The Scots language continues to be widely spoken today and has a long and important history" (p. 24). Similarly supportive statements are made for "other languages". Within this discourse of celebration of diversity the Strategy is also shaped by an understanding of the "practical benefits" that can be seen to derive from the active use and transmission of heritage languages, and so it explicitly argues an economic connection for languages.

In effect, *Creating our Future ... Minding our Past* constitutes a framework for conservation of the linguistic heritage and resources of Scotland and for integrating language diversity into wider state and national objectives and policies. It also offers legitimation for public participation around issues of difference and diversity as unthreatening to the new state, contributing rhetorical tools and support for community advocates to engage in citizenship-based policy conversations.

Gaelic

In 1901, 5.2% of the population, or 210,677 persons, declared that they were regular users of Scottish Gaelic (McKinnon, 1991). Scotland's Census 2001 revealed that of the population of 5,062,011 Scots, 27,219 responded that they understand spoken Gaelic but cannot speak, read, or write it; 31,235 that they speak, read, and write Gaelic; 19,466 that they speak and read but cannot write Gaelic; 7,949 that they speak and read but cannot write Gaelic; 4,758 that they read but neither speak nor write Gaelic; 901 that they write but neither speak nor read Gaelic; 1,435 that they read and write but do not speak the language; and 319 that they have some other combination of Gaelic language skills, while 4,968,729 have no knowledge of the language at all (Scotland's Census Results on Line, 2001). Effectively these figures signify a dramatic decline in active proficiency so that only 58,650 persons claim spoken skill in Gaelic, a decline of almost 70% since 1901. The census figures reveal three levels of reduction and restriction: decline in absolute numbers of speakers; restriction in the age profile so that fewer younger people acquire Gaelic in their homes; and decline in the proportion of the overall population represented by Gaelic speakers.

The Scottish Parliament has devoted the most energy to Gaelic, although action on behalf of the language had begun prior to devolution, with the major public examination, "Cor na Gàidhlig" (The State of Gaelic) in 1982, leading to the formation of the organization "Comunn na Gàidhlig" (Society

for the Gaelic Language) to supervise initiatives to support the language. The new Parliament appointed a Minister, among whose other responsibilities resides Gaelic, and established the MacPherson Taskforce (Scottish Executive Taskforce, 2000) to enquire into the state of the language. The Taskforce report, *Revitalising Gaelic: A National Asset*, concluded that: "Gaelic is in a precarious, even critical, condition and ... without significant Government support it will not survive beyond the mid-point of the 21st century" (p. 14).

In commissioning the MacPherson examination, then Minister Alasdair Morrison made the association between Scottish national identity and Gaelic paramount:

Gaelic is a precious jewel in the heart and soul of Scotland. It is not constrained within strict boundaries or herded into tight corners. Gaelic is national, European and international. It is fundamental to Scotland; it is not on the periphery or on the fringes. It must be normalised and its rights must be secured. (as cited in Taskforce Report, iv)

The MacPherson Taskforce used the metaphors of illness and fragility to characterize Gaelic; it was as "a critically ill patient on life support" (p. 14) and "It is hanging on by a thread which is getting more frayed by the day. Despite occasional signs of remission, the prognosis is bleak" (p.15) and described its historical treatment graphically: "The history of the Gaelic language has been a chronicle of dereliction: official negligence; malicious intent; deliberate denial; and, perhaps most damaging of all, benign neglect. The language has suffered from stigmatization and from attrition through outward migration, loss of population and decline of community" (p.16). The taskforce also commented on public perception "that the Gaels do not have their act together, that resources are being duplicated, and that public money is not being prudently apportioned or spent. While much of the 'Gaelic debate' is candid, open and healthy it occasionally generates more heat than light and the rhetoric sometimes assumes greater importance than the language itself" (p. 16).

In response to MacPherson, an additional group was convened, the Ministerial Advisory Group on Gaelic, which reported in May 2002 (the Meek Report, Scottish Executive Advisory Group, 2002). This report, *A Fresh Start for Gaelic*, proposes a series of measures in keeping with the broad approach of MacPherson, focused on a Gaelic Language Act "to establish secure status for the language," and the creation of a new Gaelic Development Agency with national powers to require public sector bodies to collaborate in supporting Gaelic, as well as providing a *National Plan for Gaelic*, combining strategic priorities, key actions, targeted research, and a call for a *National Policy for Gaelic* to be prepared by February 2003. After delays the Cultural Policy Division of the Scottish Executive issued a new consultation report in January 2007 entitled "A Strategy for Scotland's Languages" which includes references to Scottish Gaelic and Scots as well as other language issues. It is too early to determine what will result.

The MacPherson and Meek reports are impressive in coherence, consistency and sophistication of analysis and sober and serious assessment of the prospects of success. They are also impressive rhetorically, making available to the public ways to constitute Gaelic's role in the emergent polity.

The authorizing remit for this intensive period of heritage language planning is the *Programme of Government* (Scottish Executive, 1999) that followed devolution and which commits Scotland to support the revitalization of Scottish Gaelic. Contained in *Revitalising Gaelic: A National Asset* is a discourse seeking to express the vision driving these efforts:

a foundation-stone in the building of the new Scotland, the Gaelic language will be an integral and dynamic component of a self-assured community with economic and social stability and pride in its linguistic and cultural identity. (p.2)

Work on behalf of Gaelic occurs in concrete community level regeneration activity, in schools, media, culture, and industry (McLeod, 1998), as well as in the policy discourses. There has been considerable success in some areas of revitalization. Whereas in 1984 there were probably no students undertaking a Gaelic-medium education, by 1999 some 1,850 pupils were enrolled in such programs. In 2000 the first-ever graduates in Gaelic-medium higher education took degrees from the College set up by the University of the Highlands and Islands, *Sabhal Mór Ostaig*, through the Open University. Also in 2000 the first full Gaelic-medium school (primary level) commenced operations in Glasgow, and Gaelic-medium secondary units are planned. Success has also been achieved in broadcasting, both radio and television. Finally, the Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act of 2005 received Royal Assent in June 2005 and came into effect in February 2006. The Act established a Gaelic Language Board with advisory functions and aims to develop a Language Plan as well as other strengthening proposals.

Scots

For Scots, both the action and the prose are missing (Scott, 1998). Thus far the Scottish Executive has not produced any major policy-related documentation for the Scots language that would compare with MacPherson and Meek for Gaelic, with Mulgrew for modern languages, with the activity on behalf of British Sign Language, or with adult literacy. Moreover, the amount of national funding directed to the Scots language is minute in comparison to what is provided nationally for Gaelic, for modern languages through schooling, or indeed for any identifiable language category. There has also been a refusal thus far to have Scots language signage in the Parliament to accompany existing English and Gaelic signs.

Scots advocacy devotes considerable time responding to questions about whether Scots is a separate language, "just a dialect," or "English without the Norman invasion." Often the discursive effect is to erode seriousness of purpose and mobilization. However, the new Parliament may have instigated a move forward, in the form of a cross-party grouping of interested Parliamentarians that meets with representatives from the Scots language community. The transfer from community to Parliament, two orders differentiated by their capability of resource disbursement, of a mandate to commission formal investigative texts on Scots, holds promise that devolution may yet produce language planning for Scots too. A new and different discourse would surely result, given that Scots, is more readily associated with separatist Scottish nationalism than Gaelic, less restricted geographically, being mostly urban-based, widely used, and prominent in many academic institutions. The policy principle proposed under "A Strategy for Scotland's Languages" is simply that "...the Scots language will be treated with respect and pride," at least acknowledging its status but making few concrete steps for improvement.

Adult Literacy

Adult literacy is perhaps the single most effective language policy activity undertaken since devolution, in which the progress from an initial policy investigation process, subsequent policy determination, and resource allocation and program implementation has been very fast. The process has manifested a language more transactional or propositional, less persuasive and rhetorical, more reflective of the businesslike approach of public administration, with most talk about economy and social inequality.

The advocacy put forward for action used staple talk of economic transformation under globalization, the knowledge-basis of production and the resultant labor market demands and declining occupational prospects for older workers, as well as the serious consequences for the young with

literacy difficulties. The result is a potent mixture that aligned the mainstream and expected language of contemporary governance with professional advocacy for literacy provision in a series of funded, publicly supported initiatives governed by an overall policy of provision and review.

The importance of literacy, print, and working in globalizing economies occupies education everywhere since most education and training systems operate within a framework that sees education as investment in human capital (OECD, 1998). Adult literacy therefore is a kind of mainstream language planning, in Scotland as elsewhere, working within parameters shaped by existing government priority, even if challenged by some practitioners, researchers and minority language communities (Hamilton, MaCrae, & Tett, 2001).

Shared assumptions about human capital, the technical economy, and literacy in Standard English reveal the officially sanctioned hierarchy among languages. The use of English for most literacy action has considerable consequences for Scots speakers (Addison, 2001), but these have been mostly ignored, and virtually no attention has been paid to language literacy in other minority languages.

Modern Languages

In school languages education, as in adult literacy (but without its conspicuous success) the new Parliament has also been active. First, a 1999 report by Her Majesty's Inspectorate, Standards and Quality in Primary and Secondary Schools 1994-1998: Modern Languages (Scottish Office, 1999) and then a full scale Ministerial investigation, the Action Group for Languages (Ministerial Action Group 2000, the Mulgrew Report) indicate the effort devoted to the field.

Although the proportion of students taking languages is greater in Scotland than in England (Nuffield, 2000) the range of languages offered is narrower, mostly the official European Union languages, predominantly French, some German, less Spanish and Italian, and some community languages, mainly Urdu and Chinese (Powney, McPake, Hall, & Lyall, 1998).

The Mulgrew Report (p. 5) deploys a rationale for languages that seeks to go beyond "conventional reasons" to associate the case for an enhanced place in Scottish education with "the major changes ... sweeping across Scottish and international society." These changes are noted as: European mobility, social inclusion, citizenship and democracy, the "age of information": cultural diversity and the "evolving identity" of Scotland. The Report addresses "economic regeneration" of Scotland and benefits for individual learners. Mulgrew's recommendations center on the proposal that all students should be entitled to a continuous and serious experience of learning a modern language and that heritage and community languages, including Scottish Gaelic, feature prominently. Since its release, the Report has become mired in administrative changes; devolution to local areas and the implementation of its policy goals have been stalled. The Report's aim of diversification of offerings away from mostly French appears unlikely to succeed, and its attempt to recruit a discourse of economy, citizenship, European integration and Scotland's global connections to a reinvigorated interest for languages in general seems equally challenged.

In Mulgrew the Minister for Education, Europe and External Affairs drew attention to the need for continual improvements in the quality of teaching and learning of languages, commenting that the European Union constitutes a kind of inevitable internationalization for Scotland, in which multilingual proficiency will be prominent (McConnell, 2000). But the wider educational devolution to local authorities has depleted the case for modern and community languages at a national level, and deprived a place in the national conversation about the future of Scotland and its identity. Worst affected are heritage languages of recent immigration without claims to place, territory, or ancestral history. Thus far the arguments mounted for these languages succeed best when connected to

enhanced educational outcomes for learners and, to a lesser extent, to stemming the waste of linguistic proficiency, and the skills of language competence that minority language speakers donate to their community.

British Sign Language

An important debate on the rights and opportunities of hearing-impaired Scots took place in the Scottish Parliament on February 16, 2000. Some speakers suggested that British Sign Language (BSL) is an ancient heritage of the nation; others talked about the need to deliver public services more effectively, others spoke of social inclusion, or welfare, opportunity and rights (SIM-529; *Sign Language*, 2002).

Users of BSL number some 100,000 though this is likely to be an underestimate given the use of BSL by hearing members of the families, friends, and co-workers of the hearing impaired. According to the Royal National Institute for Deaf People, about one in seven persons in the UK have hearing loss, or well over nine million people, over half probably being over the age of 60. The profoundly deaf number about 698,000, and an additional 450,000 are unable to use a voice telephone.

The survival of BSL in the face of strong assimilative pressures in favor of speech over signing recalls struggles of other language minority groups for recognition of linguistic legitimacy in societies of which they are an integral part. BSL users are a community with a history of struggle for recognition as a component group of society, a distinctive community culture, and therefore a heritage language community.

BSL advocacy includes a range of discursive representations similar to those for other heritage languages: some positions stress community and ethnicity, its distinctive modes of expression, and identity; others locate the issue within welfarist understanding, some medicalize deafness, and some are dismissive and 'rejecting of culture and community-based representations. In addition, policy discussions about deafness and sign language are rarely constructed as language planning, or as cultural and citizenship entitlements, for sign language users. The Parliament has made signing an issue of language rights, as well as social opportunity, but appears still to be seeking a principled way to integrate this perspective into the array of other representations that jostle for prominence.

Nations and Languages

Scholars who write on national feeling and identity have long worked with a distinction between civic and ethnic national bonds. Civic nationalism is sometimes considered a political variety and ethnic nationalisms a blood-ancestry variety. Greenfeld (1992) applies these distinctions to combinations of individualism and collectivism to propose three ways that a sense of nation can be experienced: an individualistic and civic sense of nation, a collectivist and civic sense of nation and a collectivist and ethnic sense of nation. Combining individualism with civic bonds underlying national belonging means that political sovereignty is a compact of free and equal individuals. Combining collectivist identity with civic identity produces a nation that is imagined as a "collective individual" in which the state's interests are independent of human individuals and take priority over them. And combining a collectivist nation with ethnicity-based nationality produces a pronounced ethnic nation. Greenfeld identifies England and the United States with the first type, and nominates France as an exemplar of the second and Germany and Russia of the third.

The civic and the ethnic are a dichotomy and each expresses a powerful characterization of state and nation histories. However, exclusively associating national identity with ethnicity fails to account for

the emergence of civil society in many originally ethnic-based nations, which may even transcend the original ethnicity basis of state-making nationalism or reduce it to ritual. Relatedly, stressing the civic basis of nations obscures persisting, invented, or recovered ethnic bonds.

For much of the 20th century, modernists have had the upper hand in thinking about nations and nationalism. It seemed that either cold war politics or global capital would bring about the obsolescence of nationalism. The latter part of the 20th century, however, has shown a resilience and re-emergence of nationalist advocacy utilizing language, ethnicity, and religious markers of identification. These are as vibrant and persisting as those encountered in any previous era. We cannot sensibly theorize the existence of national states entirely within modernist parameters, with only civic and no ethnic dimensions.

Europe and Passports

Citizenship, the connection between a state and its people, is manifested in the passport. The European Union represents the most evolved example of declining sovereignty. Its constant use of the term *citizenship* is interesting in that it does not formally issue citizenship, though it does make possible shared citizenship among its still sovereign member states. The EU is concerned therefore with a kind of supra-national substantive citizenship, and in this light its language policies are particularly important. The EU's language policies have made smooth progress when justified by economically motivated mobility, but policy development has been far more problematical for regional languages. Language policy reports often use the term *passport* as a metaphorical claim for languages: as in a "language is a passport to the world." In fact, the connection is close and meaningful. The EU regularly invokes the idea of passport and citizenship, language that brings the individual legally and culturally into a union of states, nations, and peoples (Council of Europe, 2001; European Commission, 1996; European Commission, Eurostat, and EURYDICE, 1995).

Janoski (1998) has examined the meaning of citizenship in this more elaborated form identifying four general types of citizenship rights: legal rights (e.g., rights to equal treatment, expressive rights such as freedom of speech, right to own property); political rights (right to vote, right to hold office, right to form or join a political party); social rights ("enabling" rights such as access to health care, "opportunity rights" such as access to education); and participation rights (rights to job security, collective bargaining) (p. 31).

European integration is found most concretely in its human mobility entitlements. It is a right of all citizens of the EU to seek employment, education, recreational, and residential opportunities across the Union. In a 1995 Policy the European Commission set the objective of all EU citizens being proficient in three European languages. It stated: "Proficiency in several Community Languages has become a precondition if citizens of the European Union are to benefit from the occupational and personal opportunities open to them in the border-free single market. This language proficiency must be backed up by the ability to adapt to working and living environments characterised by different cultures" (European Commission, 1996, p. 67). In 2001 the specification that the languages should be official languages of member states was removed. The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages has, by contrast, encountered a slower, more contested, path. Despite being adopted in 1992 by the EU, it was only signed into law by the UK Government in March 2000 and ratified in July 2001. The Charter makes specific mention of both Scottish Gaelic and Scots. The specific consequence is the required provision of Gaelic in certain defined civil proceedings in geographic areas of Scotland where Gaelic speakers predominate (Council of Europe, 1992).

The Passport, Australian Citizenship and Heritage Languages

The period from the late 1940s to the late 1990s not only provides a symmetrical pattern but also frames remarkably well major developments in notions of language as heritage and identity in Australia. Each development is signaled by a practical alteration to the passport, in turn signaling a wider social, cultural and language change.

An Australian Passport

During the celebrations of its 50th anniversary, the Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) was described as a "passport" to the future, and its anniversary conference was entitled "50 years of Nation Building." By any criterion the AMEP is Australia's most successful language policy initiative. More than 40,000 new arrivals from nearly 90 language backgrounds were learning English under the program in 2001, and more than 1.5 million people since it commenced. That the policy and program are also associated with nation building is not surprising; many nation-states have used language criteria for self-definition. The link with passports was more than metaphorical, since at the same time national citizenship was created with the introduction of a national passport. This convergence of citizenship, language policy and population-building was a result of the national impetus stimulated by a sense of vulnerability experienced during the Second World War, producing a commitment to a larger population, one unable to be generated domestically.

The progressive new passport was denied to the Indigenous population, who did not even count in censuses, and non-Whites were excluded from the nation building by being excluded from immigration (Jupp, 2002). At all stages, the building of a new and bigger permanent population was accompanied by the assertion of the national identity to which new settlers would be expected to accommodate, but this national identity was itself not static; based initially on the evolving identity of existing Australians, it came to include the new Australians and eventually even those excluded initially.

An Inclusive Passport

A period of remarkable growth in linguistic and cultural pluralism characterizes the early 1970s. The creation of the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia indicated a professionalized appreciation towards language problems. The extension to children of specialist English, the formalization of the adult provision with the Immigration (Education) Act of 1971, and the granting of initial language rights to indigenous Australians signaled new pathways to incorporative policies for minorities. The emergence and success of the community languages movement make this period one of productive change.

These changes, especially those relating to first-language maintenance for immigrants, the community languages movement, the beginnings of the Asian languages movement, and new discourses of identity and participation that were pluralist and civic, made possible "heritage talk" in relation to languages. In Australia policy agitation for heritage languages has always been conducted under the term "community languages." This term was used to distinguish immigrant and indigenous languages from foreign and classical languages and to suggest that locally used languages should have priority, or at least equality, of esteem. This was all part of an emerging, and ultimately successful, discursive politics that linked pluralism to the state, eventually becoming a shared political project of all mainstream political parties.

Australian bilingual education, which had enjoyed a flourishing nineteenth century history (Clyne, 1991), had fallen victim to a 1917 cultural policy that defined Australian identity in terms of English language and the British Empire. In 1973, for the first time since 1917, Australian primary schools

started to teach languages. Until then, only elite European languages were taught, and then not for speaking and daily usage, but for writing and reading, and, in fact, for selection into higher education. But in 1968 institutional changes removed the requirement for language study as a criterion for university entry, resulting in a collapse in numbers. By the mid-1970s schools were expected to get close to their communities, and many of the communities were multilingual and made up of newly confident citizens. Heritage language advocacy became prominent, but the term *community languages* was and is preferred. Inserted into policy discourses was new imagery about national multilingualism.

The post-war immigration program had wanted a larger population of Australian-passport-carrying-Australians, but not a plural, diverse, and multi-ethnic population, with communication needs for which the state was unprepared. The infrastructure for such diversity was created in the 1970s, led by second generation new Australians, professional language experts, and the newly enfranchised original Australians. This policy phase produced the world's first Telephone Interpreting Service, which provided language mediation, first for emergencies and later for more general assistance, in health and medical situations, in courts of law, and policing.

Over time, both conservative and social democratic parties embraced multiculturalism in their distinctive forms. The result was far-reaching. Relatively liberal citizenship laws, combined with compulsory voting, contributed to the emergence of a large urban constituency that the political classes appealed to with cultural politics and a discourse of heritage and pluralism.

Critically, this decade also saw radical revision of the Asia-Australian relationship. The signal moment was Britain's accession to the then European Economic Community. This move cost Australia its guaranteed markets for many export items, but its cultural importance lay in the pragmatic and urgent need to communicate with its regional neighbors. The face of language education in the 1980s and 1990s underwent a consequent revolution, from elite European foreign tongues, for elites and elite purposes, to community languages for community purposes, including indigenous languages for indigenous purposes. Trade and geo-politics shifted language education towards Asian languages, again elite ones, and often for foreign purposes too. Immigration policy eventually caught up with geographic location, and language policy did likewise.

Dual Passports

Being able to belong to more than one state extends profoundly what 50 years ago was the invention of local citizenship, separate from Britain's. The expansion has involved three major shifts. An endogenous citizenship in 1948, its extension to inclusion of indigenous Australians in 1967, and, in 2002, the granting of multiple citizenship rights. On April 9, 2002, the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs announced the repeal of Section 17 of the Citizenship Act of 1948 (Hardgrave, 2002) which precluded multiple citizenships. What had been instituted as a device for arresting potential disloyalty was discarded as a consequence of "the reality of global labour markets" and international consistency. Multiple citizenships, as Schuck (1998) shows, represent a growing pattern resulting from increasingly plural populations, and they have considerable language policy implications, globalizing the structure and experience of a "homeland" and "diaspora" for most language and ethnic groups.

Today the AMEP brings immigrant and indigenous Australians into contact as well. They encounter each other as part of Reconciliation processes in the *Wanyaarri* program, which teaches new arrivals about Aboriginal culture and its traditions. This type of contact suggests a new kind of citizenship, extending "beyond a binary "yes" or "no" to include certain attitudes, knowledge and ideas, moving towards a notion of substantive knowledge and attitudes for public participation.

Concluding Remarks

In the history of constitutionalism, Tully (1997) identifies the present time as the "Age of Diversity." According to his analysis, plural populations are challenging constitutional practice, especially the past practice in constitutions that imply or make explicit the idea of a cultural union between rulers and ruled. This cultural union invariably made use of a single distinctive national language.

Globalization has produced increasingly fluid and multiple identities in all parts of the world. The vast international movement of peoples under globalization has made citizenship status an area of contention and debate. Formal (legal) citizenship may include evidence of the adult new arrival's ability in the national/official language and is usually defined and conferred by a national authority. This kind of citizenship is undifferentiated, i.e., it applies to all equally. In reality, however, participatory citizenship calls on the skills, knowledge, and capabilities of citizens to claim citizenship rights and fulfill their citizenship duties, which are highly differentiated. This *normative* citizenship challenges states to ensure that the language for public participation is available widely. What are the implications for heritage languages in policy?

The struggle to constitute Scottish Gaelic in Scotland and community languages in Australia as proper objects for policy attention is in one powerful sense a struggle to find a language of advocacy, a persuasive discourse that contests such deeply entrenched public belief and operates as policy even in the absence of overt and formal policy. Under the conditions of new constitutionalism, claims to heritage have been universalized, but new citizens are expected to separate their claims to heritage since these are seen to attach to other nations, possibly rival ones.

As long as nations associate language with the corporate identity of the nation, and then link nation with state, heritage language advocacy is vulnerable to accusations of nation undermining, or sedition. And as long as modernity is associated with consumerism, capital and individualism, heritage language advocacy risks being declared parochial.

Both criticisms are powerful, and new discourses that reconcile civic identity with continuing attachments of heritage and origins will be required to ground productive policy measures in society, institutions, policy texts, and policy conversations. Notions of participatory citizenship create both new challenges and new possibilities to make heritage attachments consonant with civic identity and participation.

References

- Addison, A. F. P. (2001). Using Scots literacy in family literacy work. In J. Crowther (Ed.), *Powerful literacies* (pp. 155-165). Leicester, UK: National Institute of Continuing Adult Education.
- Ball, S. J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse* 13(2), 10-17.
- Clyne, M. G. (1991). *Community languages: The Australian experience*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe (1992), *European charter for regional or minority languages*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- European Commission. (1996). *White paper on education and training: Teaching and learning-towards the learning society* (COM (95) 590). Brussels: Author.
- European Commission, Eurostat, and EURYDICE. (1995). Key data on education in Europe, 1994. Luxembourg: Office for the Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Fettes, M. (1997). Stabilising what? An ecological approach to language renewal. In J. Reyhner (Ed.),

- teaching indigenous languages* [Electronic version], (pp. 301-318). Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University. Retrieved June 7, 2004, from http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/TIL_25.html.
- Fishman, J. A. (2001). *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift revisited: A 21st century perspective*. Clevedon, Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act. (2005, ASP 7). Available at: <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/legislation/scotland/acts2005/2005007.htm>.
- Greenfeld, L. (1992). *Nationalism: Five roads to modernity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hamilton, M., Macrae, C., & Tett, L. (2001). Powerful literacies: The policy context. In J. Crowther, M. Hamilton, & L. Teti (Eds.), *Powerful literacies* (pp. 23-42). Leicester, UK: National Institute of Continuing Adult Education.
- Hardgrave, G. (April 9, 2002). Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs, Media Release. *Changes to citizenship laws (H36/2002)*. Parliament House, Canberra, Australia.
- Janoski, T. (1998). *Citizenship and civil society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Journal of Parliamentary Proceedings*. Sign Language. Edinburgh: Scottish Parliament, Number 52, Item 7, SIM-529 (2000).
- Jupp, J. (2002). *From white Australia to Woomera. The story of Australian immigration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lo Bianco, J. (1999). The language of policy: What sort of policy making is the officialization of English in the United States? In T. Huebner & K. A. Davis (Eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA* (pp. 40-65). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2001a). Policy literacy. *Language and Education*, 15(2-3), 212-227.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2001b). From policy to anti-policy: How fear of language rights took policy making out of community hands. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (Eds.), *Australian policy activism in language and literacy* (pp. 11-45). Melbourne: Language Australia Publications.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2001c). Language policies: State texts for silencing and giving voice. In P. Freebody, S. Muspratt, & B. Dwyer (Eds.), *Difference, silence, and textual practice: Studies in critical literacy* (pp. 31-71). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- McKinnon, K. (1991). Language-retreat and regeneration in the present-day Scottish Gaidhealtachd. In C. H. Williams (Ed.), *Linguistic minorities, society and territory* (pp. 121-149). Clevedon, Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- McConnell, J. (2000, December 12). McConnell Outlines Support for Languages [Press release]. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive, Press Releases, SE3197/2000.
- McLeod, W. (1998). Scotland's languages in Scotland's parliament. *Scottish Affairs* 24, 68-82.
- Ministerial Action Group on Languages. (2000). *Citizens of a multilingual world*. [The Mulgrew Report]. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- The Nuffield Foundation (2000). *Languages The Next Generation - The final report and recommendations for the Nuffield Languages inquiry*. London: Author.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). (1998). *Human Capital Investment: international comparison*. Paris: Author.
- Powncy, J., McPake, J., Hall, S., & Lyall, L. (1998). *Education of Minority ethnic groups in Scotland: A review of research*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Council for Research in Education.
- Roca, A. (1999). Foreign language policy and planning in higher education. In T. Huebner & K. A. Davis (Eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA* (pp. 297-313). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Royal National Institute for Deaf People. (n.d.). *Facts and Figures about deafness*. Available from: <http://www.rnid.org.uk>.
- Schuck, P. (1998). Plural Citizenships. In N. Pickus (Ed.), *Immigration and citizenship in the twenty-first century* (pp. 149-191). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Scott, P.H. (1998). Review essay: The future of the Scots language, *Scottish Affairs*, 21, 83-97.
- Scotland's Census Results Online (SCROL). (2001). Analyzer, Scotland's Census. General Register

- Office for Scotland. Available at: <http://www.scrol.gov.uk/scrolfcommon/home/jsp>.
- Scottish Executive. A Strategy for Scotland's Languages. (2007). Available at: <http://scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2007/01/24130746/0>.
- Scottish Executive. (2000). *Creating our future ...minding our past: Scotland's national cultural strategy*. Edinburgh: Author.
- Scottish Executive (1999). *Making it work together: A programme for government*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Executive, Ministerial Advisory Group on Gaelic (Donald E. Meek, Chair). (2002). *A fresh start for Gaelic* [Meek Report]. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Executive, Taskforce on Public Funding of Gaelic. (2000). *Revitalising Gaelic: A national asset / Gaidhlig ag ath-bheothachadh Gaidhlig. neamhuid naiseanta*. [Macpherson Report]. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Office, Education and Industry Department, Her Majesty's inspectorate of Schools. (1999). *Standards and quality in primary and secondary schools 1994-98: Modern languages*. Edinburgh, London: The Stationery Office.
- Shannon, S.M. (1999). The debate on bilingual education in the US. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 171-201). Berlin: Mouton.
- Spolsky, B. (2002). Heritage languages and national security: An ecological view. In S. Baker (Ed.), *Language policy: Lesson from global models* (pp. 103-115). Monterey, CA: Monterey Institute for International Studies.
- Tully, J. (1997). *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an age of diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zelasko, N. F. (1991). *The bilingual double standard: Mainstream Americans' attitudes towards bilingualism*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Georgetown University, Washington, DC.



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Lo Bianco, J

Title:

Policy activity for heritage languages: Connections with representation and citizenship

Date:

2017-01-01

Citation:

Lo Bianco, J. (2017). Policy activity for heritage languages: Connections with representation and citizenship. Brinton, DM (Ed.). Kagan, O (Ed.). Bauckus, S (Ed.). Heritage Language Education: A New Field Emerging, (1), pp.53-69. Taylor & Francis Inc..

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/112279>