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Language policies and corresponding language-in-education policies in the past 50 years have had a major role in the development of nationhood and the formation of national identities. The 21st century has brought new ‘winds of change’ (Lambert, 2000a) to policy makers, with two sharp tendencies as driving forces for policy action: on the one hand, forces of globalisation necessitate intercultural understanding through a common global language or some selected powerful languages; on the other hand, forces of ethnic and grass-roots movements have highlighted the need to shift policy attention to the maintenance of linguistic diversity and pluralism in a rapidly shrinking and homogenising world. In other words, language education policies of the 21st century need to grapple with the challenge that language communities are ‘local and global at the same time’ (Canagarajah, 2005: 17). This volume provides an insight into various language education policy contexts in the world and provides examples of policy responses to these two wider challenges.

English, today, is undoubtedly the most powerful and viable international lingua franca. It represents a bridge across languages and their speakers and, in this sense, it has made a significant contribution to the development of transnational, international and global identities. In a ‘global century’ (Cleveland, 1999) like ours, such progress needs recognition. Still, less powerful languages are often wrongly seen as ‘barriers across nations’ (Smolicz, 1999). The underlying philosophy of economic rationalism (neo-liberalism) (Lambert, 2000b), which drives current language education policy, reinforces the idea that some languages are worth learning while others are not, and some languages deserve a place in educational institutions while others do not. The argument of economic rationalism has been present in language education policy discourse in Australia for the past 20 years, and this volume highlights some of the factors underlying this aspect of policy making (see e.g. Ozolins in this volume). The Australian context, although not the only context in this volume, is also the centre of attention for another reason: this volume is a special edition to recognise the work of a prominent language-in-education policy developer in Australia, David E. Ingram, AM.

The notion of a Festschrift for David Ingram was expressed at the Biennial National Languages Conference of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations in Brisbane in July 2003, where David Ingram gave the Keith Horwood Memorial Lecture (Ingram, 2004). The collaborators were Anikó Hatoss and Denis Cunningham. This led to their contacting special-
ists in the field and, in a spirit of collegiality and solidarity, younger scholars embarking on their careers. The contributions to the Festschrift were many, so it was decided that some articles would be published as a book, *An International Perspective on Language Policies, Practices and Proficiencies* (Cunningham & Hatoss, 2005), and some would constitute a special volume of *Current Issues in Language Planning*. Thus, the current volume should be seen as one component of a dual tribute to David.

To provide a brief overview of the total range of contributions, the Festschrift book, of 420 pages, and this volume bring together an intended mix of articles by luminaries whose names are known to all, and younger scholars who will be leaders of the future. In the Festschrift book, the global overview of language policy by Richard Lambert is complemented by Colin Power's assessment of policy needs for the future. Robert Kaplan considers language-in-education policy as Zeynep F. Beykont documents the development of English-only policies in the USA. György Szépe investigates policy needs in Europe, while Guus Extra evaluates linguistic trends of minority languages in Europe. Francis Mangubhai and Ibrahima Diallo add the further specific language policy contexts of Fiji and Senegal respectively, while David Ingram's historical paper looks at policy developments in Australia. Different perspectives are provided on intercultural communication by Tony Liddicoat and Svetlana Ter-Minasova, while others present incisive views on learner independence (Terry Lamb and Hayo Reinders), communicative peace (Reinhold Freudenstein), cooperative learning (Indra Odina), student perceptions (Shirley O’Neill Chen Nian-Shing, Li Min-Lee, Myoko Kageto and Laurence Quinlivan), research (Indra Karapetjana) and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) (Denis Cunningham). In the context of proficiencies, David Ingram’s paper on language testing is counterbalanced by developments in Europe: the Common European Framework of Reference (Sabine Doff and Jan Franz) and language proficiency levels (Ieva Zuicena). Alan Hedley’s insightful paper on the role of Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) in linguistic diversity gives way to considerations of language based activity and shift in Hungarian (Anikó Hatoss) and French of Franco-Mauritians (Marie-Claire Patron) – and communicative rights (Francisco Gomes de Matos).

This special Festschrift edition of *Current Issues in Language Planning* is dedicated to David Ingram in recognition of his prolific work on language-in-education policy development in Australia and his tireless efforts in promoting language education internationally. David Ingram is a language teacher, an applied linguist, a language policy maker, a language policy activist, a community leader and a humanist. He has published extensively in the areas of applied linguistics, second language teaching, proficiency, testing, language policy, language-in-education policy, multiculturalism and teacher education. He started his career as a primary school teacher in 1958, then as a teacher of French in 1961. Currently, he is Executive Dean in the School of Applied Language Studies, Melbourne University Private, Australia.

It is impossible to summarise David Ingram’s achievements within the limits of this modest introduction, but some of the highlights of his career include the following: between 1977 and 1982 he was President of the Modern Language Teachers Association of Queensland (MLTAQ); in 1978 he graduated with a PhD from the University of Essex; in 1979, he and Elaine Wylie developed the Austra-
lian Second Language Proficiency Ratings (ASLPR) (Ingram & Wylie, 1993), today the International Second Language Proficiency Ratings (ISLPR); between 1982 and 1996, he was President of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations (AFMLTA), and between 1986 and 1992 he was Vice-President of the Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes (FIPLV).

David made a significant contribution to language policy development in Australia, through numerous submissions to Federal and State government ministries and departments. In 1978, in an initial paper, he argued for a national policy on languages in Australia (see Ingram, 1979) which later led to the Senate inquiry into the need for a national policy on languages (Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts, 1984) and indirectly paved the way for the adoption of the first National Policy on Languages in 1987 (Lo Bianco, 1987). This initiative was paired with the formation of strong interest groups which eventually ensured that the policy did not become a ‘political football’ (Ager, 2001, cited by Baldauf in this volume) and did not remain ‘a dead letter’. This could have happened easily as, for example, no similar policy was ever formally adopted in New Zealand ‘despite the existence of many of the same factors’ (Ager, 2001, cited by Baldauf in this volume).

The efforts of David Ingram’s promoting languages and proficiency standards for language teachers in schools (Ingram, 1992) were significant steps in status planning (see Baldauf in this volume). In addition to his efforts in status planning, he also made a significant contribution to language teaching methodologies. In particular, his community engagement framework (see, e.g. Ingram, 1980b) has led to several successful project initiatives. He also consistently argued for developing positive cross-cultural attitudes through language education (Ingram, 1995, 2001a; Ingram & Johns, 1990).

For over a decade, between 1990 and 2003, David was Professor of Applied Linguistics and Director of the Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages (CALL) at Griffith University, Australia. This Centre reflected his vigorous pursuit in the field of applied linguistics. As David himself describes the Centre, ‘[its] services and programs are diverse, its research and consultancy services are specialised . . . [and] cover the full gamut of applied linguistics envisaged as the field that responds to language-related problems or needs in society’ (Ingram, 2001b: 111). His definition of applied linguistics is the definition of a humanist. David sees applied linguistics essentially as a ‘human science’ and in his numerous writings has emphasised that it is concerned with ‘language as an integral part of man in society, i.e. with language in its total human and environmental context’ (Ingram, 1980a: 40). This underlying philosophy is well reflected in the balance of his activist and academic work.

In the 1970s and early 1980s, David did extensive work in language communities and on the general issue of multiculturalism, especially in the context of fostering an appreciation of multiculturalism and its relevance to Australia. This was during the times when the concept of multiculturalism was just being accepted in Australia. Most of this work was activist in nature and it had a strong impact on language policy. As Uldis Ozolins states in this volume, ‘Ingram leapt to an extensive and continual defence of languages as a core component of curriculum’. David wrote numerous papers in which he argued for the inclusion of languages in education on all levels, for example, a series of articles in Babel in the

As a member of the Australian Language and Literacy Council between 1990 and 1996, he contributed considerably to a major paper in 1994 about the needs of Australian business and industry for language skills. The rationale for foreign language education for Australian businesses and industries was a focal point in several of his publications (Ingram, 1986, 1993); others, to which he contributed significantly, included Language Teachers: Pivot of Policy (ALLC, 1996a) and The Implications of Technology for Language Teaching (ALLC, 1996b).

As Director of CALL at Griffith University, he pursued the enhancement of quality language teaching in Australia, fostered applied linguistics, and provided language consultancy services to the communities. In a recent text, Language Centres (Ingram, 2001b), he gives an overview of the Centre and compares it with four other language centres around the world focusing on the centres’ roles, functions and management. Roly Sussex presents a review of this book in this volume.

In David’s definition, language centres are ‘units formed to gain synergy in the area of language education and applied linguistics from bringing together in appropriate facilities enthusiastic, well-qualified personnel working together in pursuit of the goals set for the centre’ (Ingram, 2001b: 3). While the Centre did not lack synergy and academic rigour, thanks to David’s tireless advocacy and academic professionalism, its self-funded nature made it difficult to create the necessary facilities. As a result, much of David’s time and efforts were taken up by the wider context of economic rationalism, which was imposed by Australian governments in the 1990s, and which has ‘led the way in the commercialisation of universities’ intellectual capital’ (Ingram, 2001b: 1). In his capacity as Director of CALL, David made a significant contribution to the way university centres and, more specifically, language centres developed strategies to deal with the tension between traditional roles of established universities and the new roles imposed by commercialisation.

David Ingram’s outstanding work in the area of language education has received national and international recognition. In 1979, he was awarded Honorary Life Membership of Queensland Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (QATESOL), and in 1983 Honorary Life Membership of the Modern Language Teachers’ Association of Queensland (MLTAQ). In 1994, he received the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations (AFMLTA) Medal for Outstanding Service to Language Teaching in Australia and, in 2003, he was made a Member of the Order of Australia ‘for service to education through the development of language policy, through assessment procedures for evaluation of proficiency, and through research and teaching’.

David Ingram made much of his contribution to the field of language education policy during difficult times of change when educational institutions and policy makers had to work within the context of shifting educational policies. On the one hand, there was a shift from traditional roles of universities towards internationalisation and the new roles of ‘managerial exigencies’ (Ingram, 2001b: 11). On the other hand, there was the context of constantly shifting political agendas of Australian governments. David has not only shown an indefatigable abil-
ity to respond to the challenges of these contexts, but became a forerunner in many ways, paving the way for educationalists and policy makers who need to grapple with similar challenges of economic rationalism in our times. He achieved this largely through his role as founder of CALL at Griffith University.

As demonstrated by David Ingram’s continued and consistent battle with government and university departments for the recognition of languages education, and the policy directions described in the papers of the current volume, the forces of economic rationalism continue to prevail in our modern societies and have enormous impact on language education. In fact, a common criticism of contemporary language education policy is that it is driven by economic rationalism, the forces of market society. This view parallels the criticism of market society in general. However, as Polanyi argues, ‘the true criticism of market society is not that it [is] based on economics – in a sense, every and any society must be based on it – but that its economy was based on self-interest’ (Polanyi, 2001: 257). He argues (2001: 258):

The congenital weakness of nineteenth-century society was not that it was industrial but that it was a market society. Industrial civilization will continue to exist when the utopian experiment of a self-regulating market will be no more than a memory.

Although, contrary to 19th century philosophy of economic thought, man’s actions are not solely driven by economic rationality (Polanyi, 2001), as it is essential that market mechanism principles are counter-balanced by policy actions which provide shelter for languages which are not likely to succeed in a liberal ‘open market’. As Polanyi (2001: 201) argues, protection is necessary even in capitalist business, as even capitalist businesses need to be ‘sheltered from the unrestricted working of the market mechanism’. To translate this to the context of language-in-education, deliberate policy and planning actions are necessary to ‘shelter’ less viable languages, and to promote languages which would not be able to stand up to the test of free markets. Much of the discussion in this volume is concerned with such policy and planning actions.

There were around 6000 languages in 2000 (Crystal, 2000: 11). Others placed the figure as low as 3000 or as high as 10,000. The discrepancy may appear extreme, but debate continues on the integrity of languages and the demarcation between language, pidgin, Creole and dialect, among other factors. With 6000 languages across the globe, we should be happy but, as linguists, we are not. In an ideal world, 6000 languages spread evenly across 6 billion potential speakers could lead to 1 million speakers of each, ensuring the continuity of all languages . . . but the world is not like that, is it? The reality is very different, with a continuum of language strength stretching between English at one end and, at the other, the next language to disappear from the globe. The vitality of a language depends not only on the number of speakers but on a range of factors that impact on language choice (Cunningham, 2004: 1–2). There are more native speakers of Chinese across the globe, for example, but one still speaks of English as the global language.

Historically, we have seen the decimation of nations, of tribes, of languages in the wake of colonialism. While the genocide witnessed previously – and the resultant eradication of hundreds of languages – came about through acts of
colonialism, the current threat to linguistic diversity arises from other factors. But the net result, linguistically, will be the same. Between 50% (Crystal, 2000: 165) and 90% (Crystal, 2000: 18) of the globe’s 6000 languages could disappear during this century.

Further, the stark reality is that some of these languages remain ‘alive’ only as long as the sole remaining speaker of the language lives. Put another way, in some cases the death of an individual will constitute the death of another language. This was the situation for 51 of the world’s languages in 1999, with 28 being in Australia (Crystal, 1999). According to Crystal’s data, one language is disappearing on average every two weeks (Crystal, 2000: 19). This is tragic and underlines the fragility with which some languages exist.

All languages could be defined as minority languages in certain contexts – even English, where its speakers could be grossly outnumbered in a given geographical location (e.g. China, Russia, Latin America). Thus, we should see the notion of revitalisation, reinforcement or ‘sheltering’ as relevant in the contexts of: (1) language death; (2) language shift; (3) languages in education policy; and (4) languages policy (Cunningham, 2004: 7–8). The evident advantage of adopting such a position is to increase the cohorts – also with a particular contextualised vested interest – who could support the cause of fighting against the disappearance of languages. Such action would reflect the view of Skutnabb-Kangas (2003: 82) who states: ‘community initiative and involvement seems to be decisive for (language) revitalisation to work’. Languages are also disappearing – or dying – in the context of language shift. As members of a diaspora find themselves moving through generational phases (perhaps) far from their homeland, language maintenance often wanes, giving way to the pressures of another linguistic environment, which is perceived to be stronger, more prosperous and more desirable. Subsequently, the languages of migrant groups disappear over time.

Language choice in schools may also be the basis of linguistic diversity in the educational context. As English appears more desirable to many – perhaps as the only language apart from one’s first – other languages are losing ground in education at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels. As more communities, students and schools select English, there is a resultant decline in the numbers of students taking other major languages of the globe (e.g. French, German, Russian, Spanish in the EU and elsewhere). The governments of these countries appear to be concerned at this decline in the study of their languages – as lack of linguistic and cultural interest could lead to a lack of economic interest – so are taking steps politically (at home and abroad) to promote their languages. France is now doing this as part of a plurilingual platform.

The papers of this volume cover a wide range of geopolitical contexts of language planning, including national level language policy and planning, such as Australia, New Zealand and Malaysia, and supranational level of planning, as exemplified in this volume by the European Union.

Ulids Ozolins provides a historical overview of language policy development in the Australian context. He describes significant and rapid waves of shifts in policy rationales starting from early times, when ‘social processes of assimilation . . . often backed by explicit and little remembered policy’ prevailed and led to a largely monolingual Australian national character, to the times of multiculti-
turalism in the 1970s and the era of economic rationalism in the 1990s. The focus for language teaching evolved dramatically during this time. This is evident in a cursory tracking of language policy documents of which there were none at the national level before 1987. *A National Language Policy* (1984) both followed and generated intense submission-writing and lobbying as groups sought a high profile in language recommendations of the *National Policy on Languages* (Lo Bianco, 1987). Reflecting various rationales for language teaching – enrichment, economics, equality, and external (Lo Bianco, 1987: 44) – those languages identified for ‘wider teaching’ were Mandarin Chinese, Indonesian/Malay, Japanese, French, German, Italian, Modern Greek, Arabic and Spanish (Lo Bianco, 1987: 124–5). This appeared a balanced recommendation, although we, along with others, asked: ‘what about Russian, Vietnamese, Korean? . . .’. In 1991, *Australia’s Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy* became the driving political document where it requested states and territories to identify a core of eight . . . from the following priority languages:

Aboriginal languages, Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Modern Greek, Russian, Spanish, Thai and Vietnamese. (DEET, 1991: 16)

Firmly embedded in the choice are significant languages of the Australian community (e.g. Modern Greek, Italian, Chinese, Vietnamese, German, French, etc.), but the focus was shifting in favour of the economic rationale (DEET, 1991: 16). Later, *Asian Languages and Australia’s Economic Future* (COAG, 1994: v) was blatant in this direction, identifying the ‘big four’: Japanese, Chinese (Mandarin), Indonesian and Korean.

Richard Baldauf Jr provides a brief insight into the history of the development of language policy as a distinct disciplinary field, then proposes a framework, which draws on some ‘classical explanations for the discipline and its practices’ (see Baldauf in this volume). According to this framework, language planning consists of four approaches to goal development: status planning, corpus planning, language-in-education (or acquisition planning) and cultivation planning. As Baldauf argues, ‘these approaches can either be overt (explicit) or covert (implicit); i.e. decisions may be made on issues directly or may be understood from more general statements of intent’ (Baldauf, 1994). The goals that language planners seek to achieve using these approaches may relate to policy planning (the form of the language) or to cultivation planning (how the language is implemented and for whom). Baldauf, then, examines explicit policy in Australia in relation to multiculturalism and later to languages, and finally to literacy, particularly in the educational context. He argues that the present ‘policy vacuum’ characterising Australia is the result of the fact that the Commonwealth Government does not see much political gain in the language issue.

The paper by Gail Spence provides an insight into the New Zealand context and describes events over the last decade that ‘have led to greater political support for, and growing receptivity to, learning languages in New Zealand’s primary and secondary schools, and to an increase in broader public awareness and understanding of the individual and collective benefits of being bilingual/multilingual’ (Spence, 2005, in this volume).
Brian Ridge describes the post-World War II history of nation-building in Malaysia and discusses the challenges faced by education policy developers ‘to balance the demands for indigenous and Malay rights with those of other groups’. The paper provides an example of policy development amid the contrasting forces of globalisation and localisation and shows how national language policy has taken up the fight against English. His ‘special interest . . . is how this more insistent factor of English as a language of wider communication is interacting with Malaysia’s more recent policy shifts for overtly increasing roles for English language in Malaysia of the 21st century’.

The local-global nexus is taken up from another angle by Denis Cunningham. His emphasis is on two serious challenges that language policy-makers face: firstly, the continuity of the linguistic diversity and very existence of languages; secondly, the status of languages and their representation in education. The paper pays particular attention to the work done by UNESCO on the level of acquisition planning, and contrasts the policy discourse with the realities of classroom practices which are often determined by poor language teacher supply. Cunningham calls for action ‘to safeguard the priority and prominence of language teaching in education, recruit graduates to the profession and share with policy decision-makers across the globe not only an awareness of a critical situation, but also provide strategies and solutions to redress the situation’. He also calls for ‘the retention of a balanced focus for language learning which does not single out the economic rationale’.

Anikó Hatoss reviews current language-in-education policy discourse in Australia and in the European Union and argues that language-in-education policies have been responsive to the demands of the ‘global and local’ and have taken up the role of promoting diversity, but this role is primarily symbolic, as there is much work to be done in meeting the challenges of diversity on the global and the local fronts. Continued efforts are necessary for advocacy for linguistic and cultural diversity, the development of cross-cultural attitudes, for which David Ingram has fought. As Hatoss argues, unfortunately economic rationalism puts limits to the pursuit of this goal.

A recurring theme in the volume, as we have seen, is economic rationalism. Polanyi (2001: 171) argued that ‘to separate labour from other activities of life and to subject it to the laws of the market [is] to annihilate all organic forms of existence and to replace them by a different type of organisation, an atomistic and individualistic one’. This principle seems to be a useful principle in language-in-education policy and planning. In the context of language-in-education policy, this statement holds true, as we can argue that to separate language planning from other activities of life and to subject it to the laws of the market means to annihilate all ‘organic’ forms of multilingualism and replace them with a different type of organisation, an atomistic and individualistic one. We would like to present this volume in this spirit, and leave further interpretations to the reader.
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