Richard B. Baldauf Jr. and M. Obaidul Hamid

Language planning ‘schools’ and their approaches and methodologies

Abstract This chapter provides an overview of theoretical and methodological issues in the field of language policy and planning (LPP). Specifically, we discuss major directions or ‘schools of thought’ such as the classical LPP, Language Management Theory (LMT), the domain-based approach, ethnographic LPP and critical LPP, and link methodological issues to these ‘groupings’ of scholars and researchers. The individual schools of thought demonstrate the diversity of topical as well as theoretical focuses and interests within the field. We can also see a wide range of methods and techniques being utilized by LPP researchers, suggesting that there is neither ‘fool-proof’ method nor ‘methodological orthodoxy’ in LPP. The chapter will be of value to prospective researchers, who may find in it an understanding of the theoretical and methodological directions in the field.

Keywords language policy and planning, research directions in LPP, LPP methodology

1 Introduction

This paper provides an overview of theoretical and methodological issues in the field of language policy and planning (LPP). Specifically, our aim is to identify and discuss major directions or ‘schools of thought’ such as the classical LPP, Language Management Theory (LMT) and critical LPP within the field, and to link methodological issues to these “groupings” of scholars and researchers. This approach to the discussion of epistemological issues is not unique, since precedents can be found, for example, in Ricento (2000, 2006), Kamwangamalu (2011) and Mwaniki (2011). We seek to provide an up-to-date overview of the field, aiming for a more detailed classification of the major directions in research that the diverse and multidisciplinary field has taken in the past few decades.

Our undertaking is anything but simple or straightforward. Each of the two strands of LPP ‘schools’ and ‘methodology’ is complex in itself, although for different reasons. With regard to the latter, it may not be superfluous to observe that LPP has not been a methodology-driven field, as understood from the extent of coverage of methodological issues in the existing literature. In terms of the former, while a number of directions can be identified in the field along with their underlying theoretical and methodological approaches, there is a danger of omitting some interests and perspectives, no matter how inclusive the classification is. The integration of methods and schools adds to the complexity.

We begin the next section by providing a brief disciplinary history. This is followed by a discussion of the major ‘schools of thought’. We then move to an overview of the current status of the discussion of methodology in LPP. The major focus of the paper is on the section that follows in which we introduce each of the

'schools' along with its methodological preferences referring to specific examples from the literature.

2 A brief history of LPP

The field of LPP is sometimes classified as part of sociolinguistics, which is also sometimes regarded as the quintessential example of applied linguistics (Baldauf & Kaplan 2010; Lo Bianco 2004). It has been defined as systematic, future-oriented change in language code (corpus planning), use (status planning), learning and speaking (language-in-education planning) and/or language promotion (prestige planning) undertaken by some authoritative organization – most frequently by political entities, but increasingly by other organizations (see, e.g., Kaplan & Baldauf 2003; Rubin & Jernudd 1971). Although the two terms are quite often used interchangeably in the literature, a distinction between 'language policy' (i.e., the plan – the laws, regulations, rules, pronouncements or statements of intent that may be substantive or symbolic) and 'language planning' (i.e., the implementation – how plans are put into practice) is also maintained by some scholars (e.g., Kaplan & Baldauf 1997). The distinction indicates that policymaking is a political process, often carried out by non-language planners (e.g., Baldauf & Kaplan 2003), while planning normally refers to the more non-judgmental implementation of policy carried out by linguists, educators, and the like. However, scholars such as Spolsky (2004) prefer the term 'language policy' which is defined as the collective of language practices, beliefs and management of a speech community. Thus, language planning in the sense of language management is subsumed by language policy which, rather than focusing exclusively on macro-level policymaking authority, is related to the wider community.

Although language policy development and planning has a long history – e.g., the Greek and Roman Empires' conquest of the circum-Mediterranean world (see Kahane & Kahane 1988 for details) and the development of Chinese characters (see Zhao & Baldauf 2008) – its practical and philosophical roots in the West can be found in the Napoleonic era in France where a single language was needed to manage the army (Wright 2012) and to the work of scholars in the course of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century who were developing conceptual tools to help them understand and legitimate the birth of new nation states in Europe (Gal & Irvine 1995; Nekvapil 2011). This notion of one nation–one language around a standard to promote inclusion in all aspects of national life still influences current national LPP practices, but it also indicates that LPP has always had a broader focus than just language.

Much of the early impetus for and development of the field of LPP studies came from the breakup of European colonial empires after World War II leading to the emergence of new nations in Africa, South and South East Asia and for the perceived need for national languages under the one nation–one language model (see, e.g., Kaplan 2003; Nekvapil 2011; Ricento 2000). The Ford Foundation – a US philanthropic organization – sponsored early LPP work in East Africa (Fox 1975), while similar work also occurred in Southeast Asia (e.g., Alisjahbana 1974). The Ford Foundation

also supported the Center for Applied Linguistics (Washington, DC), which along with the British Council has contributed to English language development activities in a number of countries where English was seen as a resource that so-called developing polities could use to develop their human capital and bring about fuller lives for their people. Promoting English as a resource has continued with programs such as "English in Action" funded by the UK Department for International Development (DfID) in Bangladesh (Hamid 2010), in French through *la francophonie* (e.g., Djité 1990) a grouping of former French colonies, and in *lusophone* speaking nations – in 1989 through The International Institute of Portuguese Language (Da Silva & Gunnewiek 1992) — who have engaged in international language-related human capital development activities. These educationally—as well as politically—focused language teaching activities constitute another type of language planning activity that has been carried out by the polities just mentioned. Similarly, some of the major international or national language communities including the Chinese, Germans, Italians, Japanese and Spanish are vying for linguistic influence as well as the share of the global linguistic market through language planning work.

As classical language planning volume titles attest (see, e.g., Fishman 1972; Rubin & Jernudd 1971), LPP of the 1960s and 1970s was seen as strongly linked to development, modernization and progress, with the implicit notion widely reflected in the social sciences of that era that considered that language change would lead to desired political and social transformations for the betterment of society through a more unified sociocultural system, a reduction in socioeconomic inequality, and access to educational opportunity. With hindsight, the optimism about the faith in development, modernization and progress by those involved in bringing about changes to the linguistic system is striking. However, the optimism underpinning classical planning came under growing criticisms as the promises were not only undelivered but also that planning contributed to social inequity (see Tollefson 1991).

While the focus in the early classical period was on language planning in new post-colonial nations, by the 1970s it had become apparent that LPP was not unique to so-called developing polities but was relevant to macro problems and situations in all polities (see Kymlicka & Patten 2003; Ozolins 2013). LPP began to be applied in developed polities, particularly to issues as related to migration and linguistic minorities (Edwards 1984; Tollefson 2006). However, at the same time, there was growing doubt about the efficacy of the positivistic economic and social science paradigms that had dominated the three post-World War II decades, and by the 1980s, with the advent of critical sociolinguistics, there was widespread disillusionment with directions in the field (see, e.g., Blommaert 1996; Williams 1992). During this period the growth in the interest in discourse and the tools that make such work possible meant that there was a shift to a more socially oriented examination of language and its role in LPP. At the end of the 20th century, a new world order, postmodernism and linguistic human rights have created new and broader contexts for the field (see Ricento 2000; Nekvapil 2011 for historical overviews) leading to a revival in interest, as those involved in LPP have confronted issues such as language ecology (e.g., Mühlhäusler 2000), language rights (e.g., May 2012), and the place of

English and languages other than English in a globalizing world (e.g., Low & Hashim 2012; Maurais & Morris 2003; Pennycook 1998). As an example of the latter, the rise of Chinese as a foreign language in the wake of the surging global demand of the language on the one hand and the establishment of Confucius Institutes in many parts of the world by the Chinese government on the other is set to influence the global order of languages (see Tsung & Cruickshank 2011).

3 LPP approaches and 'schools'

Since the 1990s, influenced by post-positivist research and critical theory, there has been a revitalization of the field with a growing emphasis on micro or local LPP studies (e.g., Canagarajah 2005) and the role that individual actors and their agency play in LPP research. Tollefson (2013: 25–26) has characterized this new direction in language policy and planning as:

> a division between an 'historical structural approach' that emphasizes social structure, and a 'public sphere approach' that emphasizes the creative energy of individuals and communities. This paradigmatic split in the field has important implications for research methods in language policy and planning.

Tollefson (2013: 28) further argues that "the difference between these two paradigms is not theoretical but instead a matter of emphasis, focus, or perhaps even the temperament of different researchers" and that both approaches may co-occur in a single body of research (e.g., McCarty 2011).

Baldauf (2012a) argued that the historical developments outlined in the previous section and an increased interest in the discipline have resulted in a number of different 'schools' developing, each with a somewhat different theoretical emphasis and preferred set of methods. The 'schools' that were suggested include:

- The classical school
- The language management theory school
- The domain focused school
- The critical studies school

To this we would like to add an 'ethnographic school' which has dominated the field in recent years. It should be noted that there is no implication that these 'schools' have become formalized, but rather that these are groups of researchers and their students with common theoretical understandings and methods who tend to cite one another's work somewhat to the exclusion of others in the field. We are also aware that other scholars may have other ways of understanding the research directions in the field. For instance, Kamwangamalu (2011) has identified Critical Theory, Game Theory, Language Economics and Language Management Theory. Mwaniki (2011) has taken a geographic perspective to divide LPP or language management into three traditions including 1) the Israeli/American tradition; 2) the European/Asia-Pacific tradition; and 3) the African tradition. We also do not rule out the overlap between the five 'schools', particularly between critical theory and ethnography,

as illustrated by Canagarajah's work (e.g., 1999). At the same time, it is possible to consider ethnography predominantly as a methodology, as Kamwangamalu (2011) does in his overview of approaches and methods in LPP. In our view, however, ethnography should be seen more than a set of data collection tools given that it presents a particular conceptualization of language policy as a multi-layered and multi-sited activity engaging multiple actors and their agency (e.g., Hornberger & Johnson 2007).

Before we discuss each of these 'schools' in more detail, we need to consider the current state of methodological issues in the field which we do in the next section.

4 LPP methodology

In this paper methodology is understood in the general sense of the term to indicate ways and means of collecting data—related to language, people or society—to investigate problems, practices, beliefs and management of languages to answer specific research questions. As previously indicated, the question of methodology has, to some extent, been taken for granted in the field (Kaplan & Baldauf 1997). This is partly because, as Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) explain, language planning interests everyone, and everybody can claim, as often they do, some expertise in it. Secondly, being a multidisciplinary enterprise, LPP research has attracted scholars from various disciplines in the social sciences and humanities including sociology, education, economics and political economy. Many of these scholars have drawn on the methodology of their original disciplines in doing language-planning research. Third, given the diversity of language planning research (e.g., planning goals, types of planning, contexts and actors), talking about LPP methodology in a consistent and coherent manner can be a difficult goal to achieve. For instance, methodologies for corpus planning (which essentially means working on the language itself) are different from those for status planning (which means working on the society rather than the language itself) or acquisition planning (which focuses on language acquisition management). Similarly, national or macro-level planning would have the largest scope of planning making it possible to deploy methodologies of corresponding scale including national surveys, while micro-level planning would call for more specific methods in keeping with the limited scope and goal of such planning. Likewise, the involvement of actors and their agency (national, institutional and individual) in language planning work determines what kind of methods are feasible and appropriate. Fourth, the rapid development and popularization of information and communication technologies in the past two decades have made it possible to look for language and language use data in virtual spaces, giving rise to the necessity and development of methodologies for LPP work in such spaces. This has also added to the diversity and complexity of LPP methodology.

For all these and probably other reasons, the question of research methods has received limited attention in the literature, under explicit rubrics of discussions of methodologies. This observation can be substantiated in several ways. For instance, *the Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy* (Spolsky 2012a), the latest volume,

does not have a single chapter on LPP methods. This is somewhat surprising given that the recent handbooks of applied linguistics (Davies & Elder 2004; Kaplan 2010), sociolinguistics (e.g., Bayley, Cameron & Lucas 2013) and research in second language teaching and learning (Hinkel 2011) include chapters on methodology. Similarly, the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (Hornberger & Corson 1997) includes a volume entitled *Research Methods in Language and Education* that "seeks to complement the topical focus of the previous volumes with a comprehensive look at research methods" (Hornberger 1997: xi).

Interesting evidence on attention to methodology can be derived from Li and Liu's (2013) corpus-based study of *Language Problems & Language Planning* (LPLP), an international journal published with that title since 1977. The analysts conducted concordance analyses of the titles and abstracts of all research articles (332), book reviews (928) and articles (39) to the specialist section called 'interlinguistics' (with an Esperantist focus) to understand the changing thematic focuses of the journal from 1977 to 2010. From their analysis, it can be seen that methods and methodology received marginal attention. For instance, the top 20 words that they identify from the abstracts of the research articles for each of the three periods (1977–1990, 1991–2000, 2001–2010) did not contain a single word related to methodology. In their analysis of the topics included in the titles of the articles, they found three topics including model, aspects and classification (with a frequency of 5 for the first and 4 for the last two each) which they linked to "research methods in language planning" (158). Although they did not provide further details, it can be argued that these topics may not necessarily refer to LPP methods in the sense we have used the term in this paper.

So what is the current state of the discussion of methodology in the LPP literature? Our understanding is that this is limited. At the same time, however, we cannot deny the contribution of some publications that we will review briefly in this section.

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) dedicate a chapter to the discussion of LPP methodology. A more detailed coverage of research methods is included, as previously noted, in Vol. 8 of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (Hornberger & Corson 1997), although it has to be understood that the range of methods discussed in the volume is relevant to language and education in general and not exclusively to language planning. Although Ricento's (2000) overview of the field does not exclusively focus on methodology, it does provide an understanding of the methodology and its implications in a broad sense under each of the three historical periods of LPP including 1) decolonization, structuralism and pragmatism; 2) failure of modernization, critical sociolinguistics and access; and 3) new world order, postmodernism and linguistic human rights.

Perhaps the most comprehensive coverage of the topic, reviewing the field, is provided by the edited volume by Ricento (2006) which is divided into three sections: 1) theoretical perspectives; 2) methodological perspectives; and 3) topical areas. Under methodological perspectives, five broad methodological approaches including historical investigation, ethnographic methods, discourse (linguistic) analysis, geolinguistic analysis and psycho-sociological analysis of language policy are discussed. In many

ways, the present chapter is influenced by the structure and content of this volume, but we aim to provide updates on the theoretical and methodological issues by drawing on somewhat different categories of schools of thought in the field.

Discussion of LPP methodology is included in Baldauf (2010) which provides a broadly based review of methods. The corpus-based survey that draws on *Linguistics and Language Behaviour Abstracts* (LLBA) is premised on the observation that although a number of books have been written on applied linguistics methodology in general, "little attention has been paid to the methodology appropriate for one of the other major areas of applied linguistics—language policy and planning" (Baldauf 2010: 437). The LLBA survey data show that around 4% (9082 items excluding book reviews) of all language-related items (285,540 items) abstracted in LLBA were related to LPP. To illustrate different types of LPP studies in the literature, the studies in the survey were divided into four categories: a) as a comment on methodology; b) pre-language policy and planning studies; c) evaluative studies in LPP; and d) descriptive studies. Although the limitations of the methodology and their implications are not overlooked, it was concluded that: "Unlike some other areas of applied linguistics, methodology and theory are, by and large, not issues for metadiscussion in the literature" (p. 451).

Under the category of 'methodological', Baldauf (2010) includes a number of illustrative cases including Haarmann (1990), Hamel (1986), Schiffman (1994), Labrie, Nelde and Weber (1994), Blommaert (1996) and Holmes (1997). However, he concludes: "Although these articles deal with methodological issues, they do not deal with methodology as a topic in its own right" (p. 443).

Kamwangamalu's (2011) chapter in the *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Hinkel 2011) makes an important contribution to the discussion of theoretical and methodological issues in LPP. His overview of the discipline is followed by his discussion of four theoretical approaches including a) language planning and critical theory; b) language planning and game theory; c) language planning and economics; and d) language planning and language management theory. He also discusses three broad methodologies for LPP including ethnographic approaches, language surveys, and geolinguistic analysis which is "a branch of human geography that is concerned with the socio-spatial context of language use and language choice, especially in ethnic minority communities" (Kamwangamalu 2011: 900).

More recent work on LPP methodology includes two entries in the *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (Chapelle 2013): "Qualitative research in language planning and policy" (Payne 2013) and "Sociolinguistic surveys in language planning" (Djité 2013). Both pieces provide an overview of the two topics, although the scope of the genre did not permit a detailed discussion. The edited volume by Hult and Johnson (2015) is the first to discuss research methods in LPP extensively.

5 LPP 'schools' and their methodologies

In this section we introduce each of the five LPP 'schools' previously mentioned and discuss the methodological priorities of each. We follow Tollefson's (2013)

distinction between historical-structural and public sphere approaches and provide specific examples of methodology related to this distinction produced by each of these schools.

5.1 Classical LPP and its methodology

The initial *classical* approach with its roots in modernism was developed from a synthesis of the classical theoretical literature. Haugen's (1983) four-step model has been re-developed as an eight-fold framework by Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, and more fully in 2003; Baldauf 2005) so as to include more recent developments in the field (see also Hornberger 1994, 2006). The framework examines policy planning (form) and cultivation planning (function) across the productive goals of status planning (about society) (van Els 2005), corpus planning (about language) (Haugen 1983), and language-in-education planning (about learning) (Cooper 1989), and the receptive goal of prestige planning (about image) (Ager 2005). These goals (and their sub-goals) occur at different levels ranging from the macro to the meso to the micro (Chua & Baldauf 2011) and may occur in ways which are either explicit or implicit (Baldauf 1994; Eggington 2010). Furthermore, the issue of agency (i.e., the actors, who is it that is involved) increasingly is seen to be centrally important (Cooper 1989; Zhao 2011; Zhao & Baldauf 2012). Kaplan and Baldauf (2003, 2008) have argued that the context – the language ecology – is central to understanding how LPP works.

A series of polity studies that take the historical structural/macro approach have been produced, often by insiders involved in LPP in a particular polity that provide holistic overviews of LPP in specific polities. These studies use primarily descriptive and historical (contextual) methods to develop an understanding of policy development, with most providing some linguistic descriptions of the languages involved. An important example of historical methods can be found in the volume edited by Fishman, Conrad and Rubal-Lopez (1996) in which the contributors investigated the status and functions of English in a number of former British and American colonies in different parts of the world. The volume was a reaction to Phillipson's (1992) linguistic imperialism hypothesis. The country studies included in the volume sought to shed light on the hypothesis by exploring the status of English in the post-colonial societies taking a historical perspective.

Although not actually used to any significant extent, classical studies often suggested the use of sociolinguistic surveys (Djité 2013; Kamwangamalu 2011) as the basis for deciding on language practice (see van Els 2005), although the evidence suggests that macro level practice is most often decided based on political considerations (Baldauf & Kaplan 2003; Kaplan & Baldauf 2007). A recent example of the use of a large-scale sociolinguistic survey is Coleman (2013) which was commissioned by British Council. The volume aimed to describe the language situations in eight countries of Francophone West Africa including Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal and Togo to understand how English fits into this complex linguistic ecology and to describe the current state of the teaching

and learning of English in the region. The survey used a battery of research instruments including questionnaires, interviews and classroom observations to generate data related to the extent of English language use, its teaching and learning and outcomes.

LPP in Australia provides good examples of the historical-structural approach that has been used to provide overviews of LPP and underpins the halcyon days of language policy and planning in the 1980s and early 1990s (see, e.g., Clyne 1997, 2001; Kaplan & Baldauf 2003; Leitner 2004a, 2004b; Lo Bianco 1990; Lo Bianco & Wicker 2001; Ozolins 1993) when government (political) interests in language coincided with those of professional associations and policies such as the *National Policy on Languages* (Lo Bianco 1987) and *Australia's Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy* (DEET 1991) were developed. During this period non-government bodies such as the National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia with centers at universities in all states of Australia and the AMES (Adult Migrant English Services) Center at Macquarie contributed to both policy formation and practice through domain-based studies – making Australia arguably a world leader in the field. Socially focused issues such as English for all, the maintenance and development of Aboriginal languages, opportunities for learning languages in schools for all, language testing, literacy, and the provision of language services were pursued.

Although many classical studies take the historical-structural approach, there is a recognition that LPP occurs at different levels ranging from the macro to the meso to the micro (Chua & Baldauf 2011; Hamid & Baldauf 2014). The public sphere approach or micro LPP (e.g., Liddicoat & Baldauf 2008) uses historical information, surveys, questionnaires and interviews to develop case studies which describe and analyze LPP success or failures in particular situations. Examples of the use of these methods can be found in many of the Asian country studies included in the volumes of Tsui and Tollefson (2007), Kam and Wong (2004) and Hamid, Nguyen and Baldauf (2014) which focus on English at different levels of education and as medium of instruction.

5.2 Language management theory and its methodology

The *language management* approach is a broadly founded general theory which goes beyond linguistics to sociolinguistic and sociocultural issues and which developed almost in parallel with the classical approach – the foundational reference being the Jernudd and Neustupný (1987) article related to language planning in Québec. While there have been calls for replacing the term 'language planning' by 'language management' (see Mwaniki 2011; Ozolins 2013), language management theory (LMT) as propounded by Jernudd and Neustupný and subsequently expanded by Nekvapil and colleagues provides both the rationale for these calls and a potential alternative. This can be understood from LMT's typical focus on the *interplay* of the top-down and bottom-up, macro and micro and structure and agency metaphors in LPP (Nekvapil & Sherman 2015). Tollefson's (2013) historical-structural and public sphere approaches, which we have frequently referred to in

this paper, can be subsumed by LMT. The broader scope of LMT was emphasized by Nekvapil (2009, 2016), who pointed out three elements: a) simple and organized management and the relationship between them; b) management in the sense of both communication and socio-cultural management in addition to mere *language* management; and c) consideration of management as a process. Given this scope, LMT can also incorporate aspects of the ethnographic perspective on LPP.

Language management is defined broadly as any kind of activity which focuses on language or communication, in other words, behavior toward language (Nekvapil & Sherman 2015). Nekvapil (2011: 880–881) explains the language management framework as dealing with the "management of utterances (communicative acts)" which "takes place in concrete interactions (conversations) of individuals". This kind of management is called 'simple management' and it occurs at the micro level, while 'organized management', typically based in institutions, deals with macro issues. The process of simple language management occurs when a linguistic, communicative or socio-cultural phenomenon (for example, a deviation from norms) is noted, evaluated (positively or negatively), and then an adjustment may be designed and implemented. While simple management typically focuses on discourse in its specific context involving individual users of language, organized management has as its object language as a system, involving institutions or social networks, which consider management acts as trans-interactional. Thus, simple and organized management can be associated with bottom-up/micro and top-down/macro contexts, as previously pointed out. However, what is important from the LMT point of view is the relationship between the two contexts which is reflexive or "dialectical", bringing them together under a management cycle (see Nekvapil & Sherman 2015).

In other words, although language management theory is situation oriented, it can go beyond the immediate context to consider language or communication problems at the societal level or deal with language in the sense of both corpus and status planning. At least one historical structural/macro approach to LMT has been produced - an extensive study on the Czech Republic (Neustupný & Nekvapil 2003). However, most research tends to take the public sphere approach or meso/micro focus on how language(s) are managed in a variety of situations, e.g., companies (Nekvapil & Sherman 2013), in educational situations (Marriott 2006) or in contact situations (Sloboda 2009). These studies used methods that included observation based notes, ethnographic observation, systematic (self) observation, semi-structured and narrative interviews, dyadic and group interviews, recordings of naturally occurring conversation, examination of written materials, and language from the linguistic landscape (Nekvapil 2016). Drawing on LMT, Ali (2013) conducted a case study in a higher education institution in Malaysia and investigated the policy and practice of English as a medium of instruction. The methods used for the work included policy and curriculum analysis, classroom observation and interviews of university executives, teachers and students.

Hamid, Zhu and Baldauf (2014) have used LMT, focusing particularly on the simple management in the context of World Englishes. Using the stages of language management including noting, evaluation, adjustment design and implementation,

they explored how a group of post-graduate TESOL-teacher students in an Australian university distinguished between what are called errors in the traditional sense and tokens of new varieties of English in World Englishes. The group was given a language-focused task which was recorded, transcribed and analyzed using the stages of language management in the vein of LMT as an analytical framework.

5.3 Domain-focused LPP and the methodology

The *domain approach* draws on Fishman’s (1972) initial sociolinguistic definition and has been championed by Bernard Spolsky (e.g. 2004, 2009; Shohamy 2006), although he has also been a key figure in bringing the field together through his editorial projects (e.g., Spolsky 2012a), and has not used this term explicitly to describe his work (cf. Spolsky 2012b), preferring to use language policy (and language management) as the umbrella terms to describe the field, as previously mentioned. The approach suggests that LPP is best understood or enacted through the study of language policy domains and their components – language practices (ecology), language beliefs (ideology) and language management (planning) (Shohamy 2006). Some domains Spolsky (2009) has suggested for language policy are the family (Spolsky 2012b), religion (Paulston & Watt 2012), the workplace (Duchêne & Heller 2012), public space (Shohamy & Görter 2009), the school, courts, hospitals, police stations and the military.

We were unable to find any examples of the historical structural approach to domain-based LPP although *The Languages of Israel: Policy, Ideology and Practice* (Spolsky & Shohamy 1999) uses a historical structural approach by examining each through the lens of components and then looking at domains of use, but the volume is not structured around domains. There have been a number of public sphere studies that have a focus on domains. For instance, the language of academic communication (i.e. English in relation to other languages such as German, French, Russian or other national languages) has received considerable attention (e.g., Ammon & McConnell 2002; Hamid 2006). Also in exploring language situations in polities, it is customary to describe the role and functions of English in such domains as education, judiciary, bureaucracy and media, particularly in non-mother tongue English polities (e.g., Hamid 2009). Domain, in this instance, is used as a constituent of a polity, rather than as an independent space of language use. It is also possible to describe domains in a wider sense. For instance, Hamid and Baldauf (2014) refer to public and private domains of English use in Bangladesh and argue that the uniform use of English in these domains is set to give them a macro-like character. Making a distinction between formal (e.g., school) and informal (e.g., family) domains is quite common in talking about the use of English and its functional distribution in non-mother tongue English countries (see Hamid 2006). Kelly-Holmes (2010) focuses on the domain of business to explore different kinds of relationships that can be found between the macro and micro contexts.

Domain-focused studies, as cited as examples here, may not necessarily have an explicit focus on the domain; these may be guided by other motivations. These studies can be descriptive – describing how language operates in a particular domain,

or prescriptive – describing methods that can or are used to develop, sustain or revive languages in a particular domain (e.g., family: raising children bilingually). LMT also produces domain-focused studies, but from a different perspective.

In Australia, domain-based studies have been informed by both structural-historical and public sphere approaches to LPP which have dealt with various topics including language testing (e.g., McNamara 1998, 2005), community languages (Clyne & Kipp 2006), language teaching in schools and higher education (e.g., Leitner 2007; Liddicoat & Scarino 2010; Slaughter 2009), language and culture teaching (e.g., Liddicoat 2009), English for additional learners (Williams 2011), community-based interpreting and translating (Ozolins 1991), and Aboriginal languages (Malcolm 2012; Zuckermann & Walsh 2011).

5.4 Ethnographic LPP and the methodology

In an early critique of language planning, Luke, McHoul, and Mey (1990) suggested that ethnographic methods were the only valid data collection method for LPP (cf. Fishman 1994 for a critique of this position). However, it is only relatively recently that research labelled "ethnographic" has begun to appear. Nancy Hornberger, who has also provided a classically-based framework for LPP (Hornberger 1994, 2006), has been advocating for the development of ethnographic approaches and has recently been involved in the development of Hymesian ethnographic monitoring in South Africa (Hornberger 2013). McCarty (2011) and Hornberger and Johnson (2011) argue that critical ethnography provides a layered approach that allows policy texts with their underlying constructs of power relationships to be related to various actors in local communities who are engaged in the policy making and implementation process, to illuminate the ways in which policy works or is dysfunctional.

Ethnographic studies tend to focus on public sphere approaches in places like schools (e.g., Phyak 2013 in Nepal; Pearson 2014 in Rwanda), or families (e.g., Rubino 1990), or language learning (e.g., Taylor-Leech & Yates 2012). Phyak (2013) brings together the historical structural approach and the public sphere approach through an historical analysis of the sociolinguistic trajectories of the medium of instruction policy in Nepal. He used ethnographic tools including interviews and observations to interpret and explain how policies and local ideologies were influencing which languages were being taught to whom in a primary school. Bhattacharya (2013) uses an ethnographic examination of a suburban Indian village school to highlight the impact of English as a medium of instruction on literacy practices and learning. The study uses the historical structural context to frame the classroom (lack of) learning that occurs through English using interviews with teachers and pupils and extensive classroom observation and examination of educational materials.

Ethnographic methods are particularly useful in bridging the macro-micro divides and providing a holistic understanding of LPP trajectories. Focusing either on the macro context of policies or on the micro context of their implementation,

which is still dominant in research, may provide an inadequate picture of the policy complexity. Moreover, this fragmented and hierarchical approach sees power and agency being located in the macro context, rendering the micro context as a mere implementer of the external policy prescriptions. Ethnographic research has started to shed light on more complex understanding and insights on agency, policy enactment and implementation (Hornberger & Johnson 2007). For instance, it is being understood that macro-level policies cannot be taken as givens; these are subjected to varying interpretations and enactments (Lo Bianco 2010) by policy actors (rather than implementers) in the micro context, authenticating the "agentic space" (Hornberger & Johnson 2007). Classroom-focused ethnographic and ethnographically informed research (e.g., Martin 2005; Zacharias 2013) has played an important role in this regard. For instance, Loring's (2013) ethnographic research shows how the meaning of citizenship as espoused in the policy is interpreted differently in three sites of citizenship classes, with clear implications for what is being taught to citizenship-aspirants in the USA.

5.5 Critical LPP and methodology

Tollefson (2006) has described *critical approaches* to language planning as being a critical reaction to the hegemonic approaches found in classical language planning (also see, Phillipson 1992, 2012). For example, in Africa efforts to replace colonial languages with indigenous languages have not been successful because policy makers have privately subverted public policy (Kamwangamalu 2004; Makoni et al 2012). Tollefson (2006) indicates that a second focus exists with research aimed at social change to reduce various types of inequalities. Key ideas from critical theory that inform this approach include: power struggle, colonization, hegemony and ideology and resistance. The focus of critical study tends to be on critiquing rather than on developing practice. Lin and Martin (2005) expressed similar views. The authors recommended a move from a critical to a constructive approach, where solutions are proposed to resolve language problems.

Two critical approaches that have been used include the historical-structural approach and governmentality. As an example of the former, Tollefson (1991) examines the essentially political nature of language policy domination and exploitation by the state in a number of contexts. Li (2011) has used critical discourse analysis in a recent study to examine the shaping of socialist ideology through language policy for primary schools in the People's Republic of China; Hashimoto (2013) has used it to explore how the national language has been promoted within foreign language policy; and Skerrett (2012) has used this approach to examine the language planning situation in Estonia. In the governmentality approach, the focus shifts to indirect acts of governing where "researchers examine the techniques and practices of politicians, bureaucrats, educators and other state officials at the micro level, as well as the rationales and strategies they adopt" (Tollefson 2006: 49–50; see Pennycook 2002 for examples of such analyses).

6 Summary and conclusion

This paper has tried to bring together aspects of language planning, policy, politics and practices using approaches, 'schools' and methodologies in an overall framework. As we have discussed in the paper (see also Baldauf 2012a), in our view there are five major schools of thought within LPP that suggest the diversity of topical as well as theoretical focuses and interests within the field. Among these various schools, the Language Management Theory, which is the focus of the present volume, is receiving increasing attention. In terms of methodology, we can see a wide range of methods and techniques being utilized by LPP researchers implying that "there is no fool-proof research method" or "methodological orthodoxy" in LPP, as in the sociology of language and education (Fishman 2008).

While our identification of the 'schools' and their methodologies can be seen as theoretically promising, it has been harder to document these in practice, and many studies provide no theoretical framing. Furthermore, while these categories may be useful to frame how 'schools' tend to work within a particular paradigm, some scholars are able to draw on several theoretical perspectives in the formulation of their LPP research (see, e.g., Ali 2013 for tertiary language planning in Malaysia).

We are aware of the scope of the paper and of the limitations of our approach. We do not claim that our classification has included all research directions in the field (see Kamwangamalu 2011 for some other theoretical approaches). For instance, although the growing interest in linguistic landscape or linguistic geography (Görter 2013) can be placed within the domain-focused approach, the scope of linguistic geography may be much wider than what can be denoted by the notion of domain. As previously noted, Kamwangamalu (2011) provides details on linguistic geography as an LPP methodology. His discussion of the topic also covers economic approaches and game theory in language planning which we have not included in our classification. Moreover, bridging macro-micro contexts of LPP has drawn the attention of scholars who have also suggested different theoretical and methodological perspectives (e.g. Cross 2009; Hult 2010).

Despite these shortcomings, our overview of LPP schools and methodologies may lead us to observe that the theoretical understandings that we hold about our discipline frame how we go about collecting data to study it. In that sense, this paper will be of value to prospective researchers who may find in it an understanding of the theoretical and methodological directions in the field.

Note

This paper is based on the first author, Dick Baldauf's presentation at the 3rd International Language Management Symposium at Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic, on 13 September 2013. Dick passed away on 4 June 2014. He had started working on the paper for the present volume but his health deteriorated and he could not continue the writing. The second author, Obaid Hamid, completed the work significantly expanding the discussion of the LPP methodology while keeping

the content of Dick's symposium presentation intact. Obaid would like to acknowledge feedback received from two reviewers of the paper, although some of their comments that required rethinking of the content of the symposium presentation could not be addressed. Nkonko Kamwangamalu read the draft and provided some helpful comments which are acknowledged. The responsibility for all remaining issues, if any, remains with the second author.

References

Ager, D. (2005) Image and prestige planning. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 6 (1), 1–43.

Ali, N. L. (2013) *Language Policy and Planning in Malaysia: Managing English-Medium Instruction at Tertiary Level.* Unpublished PhD thesis. Brisbane, Australia: The University of Queensland.

Alisjahbana, S. T. (1974) Language policy, language engineering and literacy in Indonesia and Malaysia. In J. Fishman (ed.) *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague: Mouton, 391–416.

Ammon, U. & McConnell, G. (2002) *English as an Academic Language in Europe: A Survey of its Use in Teaching (Duisburg Papers on Research on Language and Culture 48).* Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (1994) "Unplanned" language policy and planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 14, 82–89.

Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2005) Micro language planning. In D. Atkinson, P. Bruthiaux, W. Grabe & V. Ramanathan (eds) *Directions in Applied Linguistics: Essays in Honor of Robert B. Kaplan.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 227–239.

Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2010) Methodologies for language policy and planning. In R. B. Kaplan (ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* (2nd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 437–451.

Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2012a) Introduction – Language planning: Where have we been? Where might we be going? *Revista Brasileria de Linguistica Aplicada* 12 (2), 233–248.

Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2012b) Narrowing the English proficiency gap: A language planning perspective. *US-China Foreign Language* 10 (11), 1695–1703.

Baldauf, R. B. Jr. & Kaplan, R. B. (2003) Who are the actors? The role of (applied) linguists in language policy. In P. Ryan & R. Terborg (eds) *Language: Issues of Inequality.* Mexico City: CELE/ Autonomous National University of Mexico, 19–49.

Baldauf, R. B. Jr. & Kaplan, R. B. (2010) Australian applied linguistics in relation to international trends. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 33 (1), 4.1–4.32.

Bayley, R., Cameron, R. & Lucas, C. (eds) (2013) *The Oxford Handbook of Sociolinguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bhattacharya, U. (2013) Mediating inequalities: Exploring English-medium instruction in a suburban Indian village school. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 14 (1), 164–184.

Blommaert, J. (1996) Language planning as a discourse on language and society: The linguistic ideology of a scholarly tradition. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 20, 199–222.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999) *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2005) Reconstructing local knowledge, reconfiguring language studies. In S. Canagarajah (ed.) *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 3–24.

Chapelle, C. A. (ed.) (2013) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.

Chua, S. K. C. & Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2011) Micro language planning. In E. Hinkel (ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2). New York: Routledge, 936–951.

Clyne, M. (1997) Language policy in Australia — Achievements, disappointments, prospects. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 18, 63–71.

Clyne, M. (2001) Can the shift from immigrant languages be reversed in Australia? In J. A. Fishman (ed.) *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 364–390.

Clyne, M. & Kipp, S. (2006) Australia's community languages. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 180, 7–21.

Coleman, H. (2013) *The English Language in Francophone West Africa.* Dakar: British Council.

Cooper, R. L. (1989) *Language Planning and Social Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cross, R. (2009) A sociocultural framework for language policy and planning. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 33 (1), 22–42.

Da Silva, J. F. & Gunnewiek, L. K. (1992) Portuguese and Brazilian efforts to spread Portuguese. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 95, 71–92.

Davies, A. & Elder, C. (eds) (2004) *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Department of Education, Employment and Training (DEET) (1991) *Australia's Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy.* Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service.

Djité, P. G. (1990) Les langues et développement en Afrique. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 14, 20–32.

Djité, P. G. (2013) Sociolinguistic surveys in language planning. In C. A. Chapelle (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (Vol. 9). Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 5301–5304.

Duchêne, A. & Heller, M. (2012) Language policy in the workplace. In B. Spolsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 323–334.

Edwards, J. (ed.) (1984) *Linguistic Minorities, Policies and Pluralism.* London: Academic.

Eggington, W. G. (2010) Unplanned language planning. In R. B. Kaplan (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* (2nd ed.) New York: Oxford University Press, 452–462.

Fishman, J. A. (1972) *The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Fishman, J. (1994) Critiques of language planning: A minority language perspective. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 15, 91–99.

Fishman, J. (2008) Theoretical and historical perspectives on researching the sociology of language and education. In K. A. King & N. H. Hornberger (eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education.* New York: Springer, 3–14.

Fishman, J. A., Conrad, A. W. & Rubal-Lopez, A. (eds) (1996) *Post-imperial English: Status Change in Former British and American Colonies, 1940–1990.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fox, M. J. (1975) *Language and Development: A Retrospective Survey of Ford Foundation Language Projects 1952–1974.* New York: Ford Foundation.

Gal, S. & Irvine, J. T. (1995) The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research* 62, 967–100.

Görter, D. (2013) Linguistic landscapes in a multilingual world. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 33, 190–212.

Haarmann, H. (1990) Language planning in the light of a general theory of language: A methodological framework. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 86, 103–126.

Hamel, R. E. (1986) Language policy and interethnic conflict: Sociolinguistic research issues. *Escritos* 1 (2), 7–36.

Hamid, M. O. (2006) English teachers' choice of language for publication: Qualitative insights from Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 7 (1), 126–140.

Hamid, M. O. (2009) *Sociology of Language Learning: Social Biographies and School English Achievement in Rural Bangladesh.* Unpublished PhD thesis. Brisbane, Australia: The University of Queensland.

Hamid, M. O. (2010) Globalisation, English for everyone and English teacher capacity: Language policy discourses and realities in Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 11 (4), 289–310.

Hamid, M. O. & Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2014) Public-private domain distinction as an aspect of LPP frameworks: A case study of Bangladesh. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 38 (2), 192–210.

Hamid, M. O., Nguyen, H. T. M. & Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (eds) (2014) *Language Planning for Medium of Instruction in Asia.* London: Routledge.

Hamid, M. O., Zhu, L. & Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2014) Norms and varieties of English and TESOL teacher agency. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* 39 (10), 77–95.

Hashimoto, K. (2013) The Japanisation of English language education: Promotion of the national language within foreign language policy. In J. W. Tollefson (ed.) *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues.* (2nd ed.) Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 174–190.

Haugen, E. (1983) The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In J. Cobarrubias & J. A. Fishman (eds) *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 269–289.

Hinkel, E. (ed.) (2011) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. II). New York: Routledge.

Holmes, J. (1997) Keeping tabs on language shift in New Zealand: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 19 (1), 17–39.

Hornberger, N. H. (1994) Literacy and language planning. *Language and Education* 8, 75–86.

Hornberger, N. H. (1997) Introduction. In N. H. Hornberger & D. Corson (eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Vol 8: Research Methods in Language and Education.* Dordrecht; Boston; London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, xi–xvi.

Hornberger, N. H. (2006) Frameworks and models in language policy and planning. In T. Ricento (ed.) *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method.* Malden, MA: Blackwell, 24–41.

Hornberger, N. H. (2013) On not taking language inequality for granted: Hymesian traces in ethnographic monitoring of South Africa's multilingual policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 28 (1), 1–21.

Hornberger, N. H. & Corson, D. (eds) (1997) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education.* Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hornberger, N. H. & Johnson, D. C. (2007) Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly* 41 (3), 509–532.

Hornberger, N. H. & Johnson, D. (2011) Ethnography of policy. In T. McCarty (ed.) *Ethnography and Language Policy.* New York: Routledge, 273–289.

Hult, F. M. (2010) Analysis of language policy discourses across the scales of space and time. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 202, 7–24.

Hult, F. M. & Johnson, D. (eds) (2015) *Research Methods in Language Policy and Planning: A Practical Guide.* Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.

Jernudd, B. H. & Neustupný, J. (1987) Language planning for whom? In L. Laforge (ed.) *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning*. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 69–84.

Kahane, H. & Kahane, R. (1988) Language spread and language policy: The prototype of Greek and Latin. In P. H. Lowenberg (ed.) *Language Spread and Language Policy: Issues, Implications, and Case Studies.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 16–24.

Kam, H. W. & Wong, R. Y. L. (eds) (2004) *Language Policies and Language Education: The Impact in East Asian Countries in the Next Decade.* Singapore: Marshall Cavendish.

Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2004) Language policy/language economics interface and mother-tongue education in post-apartheid South Africa. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 28 (2), 131–146.

Kamwangamalu, N. (2011) Language planning: Approaches and methods. In E. Hinkel (ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2). New York: Routledge, 888–904.

Kaplan, R. B. (2003) CATESOL, Yesterday and today – Tomorrow is left to younger hands. *The CATESOL Journal* 15 (1), 7–18.

Kaplan, R. B. (ed.) (2010) *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

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

Kaplan, R. B. & Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2007) Language policy spread: Learning from health and social policy models. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 31 (2), 107–130.

Kaplan, R. B. & Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2008) An ecological perspective on language planning. In A. Creese, P. Martin & N. H. Hornberger (eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education (2nd Ed.), Vol. 9: Ecology of Language.* Heidelberg: Springer, 41–52.

Kelly-Holmes, H. (2010) Rethinking the macro-micro relationship: Some insights from the marketing domain. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 202, 25–39.

Kymlicka, W. & Patten, A. (eds) (2003) *Language Rights and Political Theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Labrie, N., Nelde, P. H. & Weber, P. J. (1994) Projet d'étude sur les langues moins répandues dans l'UE. *Europa Ethnica* 51 (2), 67–70.

Leitner, G. (2004a) *Australia's Many Voices: Australian English – The National Language.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Leitner, G. (2004b) *Australia's Many Voices: Ethnic Englishes, Indigenous and Migrant Languages. Policy and Education.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Leitner, G. (2007) Australia's "Asia competence" and the uneasy balance between Asian languages and English. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 17 (1), 29–60.

Li, M. (2011) Shaping socialist ideology through language education policy for primary schools in the PRC. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 12 (2), 185–204.

Li, W. & Liu, H. (2013) Language problems and language planning: A corpus-based historical investigation. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 37 (2), 151–177.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2009) Evolving ideologies of the intercultural in Australian multicultural and language education policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 30 (3), 189–203.

Liddicoat, A. J. & Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2008) Language planning in local contexts: Agents, contexts and interactions. In A. J. Liddicoat & R. B. Baldauf Jr. (eds) *Language Planning and Policy: Language Planning in Local Context.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 3–17.

Liddicoat, A. J. & Scarino, A. (eds) (2010) *Languages in Australian Education: Problems, Prospects and Future Directions.* Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.

Lin, A. M. Y. & Martin, P. W. (eds) (2005) *Decolonization, Globalization: Language-in-Education Policy and Practice.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lo Bianco, J. (1987) *National Policy on Languages.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Lo Bianco, J. (1990) Making language policy: Australia's experience. In R. B. Baldauf Jr. & A. Luke (eds) *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 47–79.

Lo Bianco, J. (2004) Language planning as applied linguistics. In A. Davies & C. Elder (eds) *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* Malden, MA: Blackwell, 738–762.

Lo Bianco, J. (2010) Language policy and planning. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (eds) *Sociolinguistics and Language Education.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 143–174.

Lo Bianco, J. & Wickert, R. (eds) (2001) *Australian Policy Activism in Language and Literacy.* Melbourne: Language Australia.

Loring, A. (2013) Classroom meanings and enactments of US citizenship: An ethnographic study. In V. Ramanathan (ed.) *Language Policies and (Dis)citizenship: Rights, Access, Pedagogies.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 188–208.

Low, E.-L. & Hashim, A. (2012) *English in Southeast Asia: Features, Policy and Language in Use.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Luke, A., McHoul, A. W. & Mey, J. L. (1990) On the limits of language planning: Class, state and power. In R. B. Baldauf Jr. & A. Luke (eds) *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 25–44.

Makoni, S., Makoni, B., Abdelhay, A. & Mashiri, P. (2012) Colonial and post-colonial language policies in Africa: Historical and emerging landscapes. In B. Spolsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 523–543.

Malcolm, I. G. (2012) Local and global perspectives on English for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander speakers. In C. Gitsaki & R. B. Baldauf Jr. (eds) *Future Directions in Applied Linguistics: Local and Global Perspectives.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 430–446.

Marriott, H. (2006) Micro language planning for student support in a pharmacy faculty. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 7 (2&3), 328–340.

Martin, P. (2005) Talking knowledge into being in an upriver primary school in Brunei. In A. S. Canagarajah (ed.) *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 225–246.

Maurais, J. & Morris, M. A. (eds) (2003) *Languages in a Globalising World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

May, S. (2012) *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language.* (2nd ed.) New York: Longman.

McCarty, T. L. (2011) Entry conversation: Introducing ethnography and language policy. In T. L. McCarty (ed.) *Ethnography and Language Policy.* New York: Routledge, 1–28.

McNamara, T. (1998) Policy and social considerations in language assessment. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 18, 394–319.

McNamara, T. (2005) 21st century shibboleth: Language tests, identity and intergroup conflict. *Language Policy* 4 (4), 351–370.

Mühlhäusler, P. (2000) Language planning and language ecology. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 1, 306–367.

Mwaniki, M. (2011) Language management in Africa: The dialectics of theory and practice. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 29 (3), 243–257.

Nekvapil, J. (2009) The integrative potential of Language Management Theory. In J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (eds) *Language Management in Contact Situations: Perspectives from Three Continents.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1–11.

Nekvapil, J. (2011) The history and theory of language planning. In E. Hinkel (ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2). New York: Routledge, 871–887.

Nekvapil, J. (2016) Language Management Theory as one approach in Language Policy and Planning. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 17 (1), 11–22.

Nekvapil, J. & Sherman, T. (2013) Language ideologies and linguistic practices: The case of multinational companies in Central Europe. In E. Barát, P. Studer & J. Nekvapil (eds) *Ideological Conceptualizations of Language. Discourses of Linguistic Diversity.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 85–117.

Nekvapil, J. & Sherman, T. (2015) An introduction: Language Management Theory in Language Policy and Planning. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 232, 1–12.

Neustupný, J. V. & Nekvapil, J. (2003) Language management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4 (3&4), 181–366 [reprinted in R. B. Baldauf Jr. & R. B. Kaplan (eds) (2006) *Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol. 2: The Czech Republic, The European Union and Northern Ireland.* Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 16–201].

Ozolins, U. (1991) Language policy in interpreting and translating. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 8, 177–190.

Ozolins, U. (1993) *The Politics of Language in Australia.* Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Ozolins, U. (2013) Language problems as constructs of ideology. In C. A. Chapelle (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (Vol. 5). Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 3107–3116.

Paulston, C. B. & Watt, J. M. (2012) Language policy and religion. In B. Spolsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 335–350.

Payne, M. (2013) Qualitative research in language planning and policy. In C. A. Chapelle (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (Vol. 8). Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 4800–4805.

Pearson, P. (2014) Policy without a plan: English as a medium of instruction in Rwanda. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 15 (1), 39–56.

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

Pennycook, A. (2002) Mother tongues, governmentality and protectionism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 154, 11–28.

Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2012) Imperialism and colonialism. In B. Spolsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 203–225.

Phyak, P. (2013) Language ideologies and local languages as the medium of instruction policy: A critical ethnography of a multilingual school in Nepal. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 14 (1), 127–143.

Ricento, T. (2000) Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4 (2), 196–213.

Ricento, T. (ed.) (2006) *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method.* Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell.

Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B. H. (eds) (1971) *Can Language be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Rubino, A. (1990) From guest to family friend: Fieldwork progress within the Italo-Australian context. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 13 (1), 77–99.

Schiffman, H. F. (1994) Diglossia, linguistic culture and language policy in Southeast Asia. In K. L. Adams & T. J. Huduk (eds) *Papers from the Second Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 1992. Tempe: Arizona State University, 279–307.

Shohamy, E. (2006) *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches.* London, New York: Routledge.

Shohamy, E. & Görter, D. (eds) (2009) *Linguistic Landscape: Expanding the Scenery.* London: Routledge.

Skerrett, D. M. (2012) On discourse, agency and buying eggs: Micro meets macro in Estonian language policy. In C. Gitsaki & R. B. Baldauf Jr. (eds) *Future Directions in Applied Linguistics: Local and Global Perspectives.* Newcastle on Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 469–507.

Slaughter, Y. (2009) Money and policy make languages go round: Language programs in Australia after NALSAS. *Babel* 43 (2), 4–11.

Sloboda, M. (2009) A language management approach to language maintenance and shift: A study from post-Soviet Belarus. In J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (eds) *Language Management in Contact Situations: Perspectives from Three Continents.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 15–47.

Spolsky, B. (2004) *Language Policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2009) *Language Management.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (ed.) (2012a) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2012b) Family language policy – The critical domain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 33 (1), 3–11.

Spolsky, B. & Shohamy, E. (1999) *The Languages of Israel: Policy, Ideology and Practice.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Taylor-Leech, K. & Yates, L. (2012) Strategies for building social connection through English: Challenges for immigrants and implications for teaching English as a second language. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 25 (2), 138–155.

Tollefson, J. W. (1991) *Planning Language, Planning Inequality.* London: Longman.

Tollefson, J. W. (2006) Critical theory in language policy. In T. Ricento (ed.) *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method.* Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell, 42–59.

Tollefson, J. W. (2013) Language policy in a time of crisis and transformation. In J. W. Tollefson (ed.) *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues.* (2nd ed.) Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 11–34.

Tsui, A. B. M. & Tollefson, J. W. (eds) (2007) *Language Policy, Culture and Identity in Asian Contexts.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tsung, L. & Cruickshank, K. (eds) (2011) *Teaching and Learning Chinese in Global Contexts.* New York: Continuum.

van Els, T. (2005) Multilingualism in the European Union. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15, 263–281.

Williams, G. (1992) *Sociolinguistics: A Sociological Critique.* London: Routledge.

Williams, L. J. (2011) Australian dialects and indigenous creoles: Is there a place for non-standard Australian English in the lower secondary English classroom in Australia? *English in Australia* 46 (1), 21–30.

Wright, S. (2012) Language policy, the nation and nationalism. In B. Spolsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 59–78.

Zacharias, N. T. (2013) Navigating through the English-medium-of-instruction policy: Voices from the field. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 14 (1), 98–113.

Zhao, S. (2011) Actors in language planning. In E. Hinkel (ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2). New York: Routledge, 905–923.

Zhao, S. & Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2008) *Planning Chinese Characters: Reaction, Evolution or Revolution?* Dordrecht: Springer.

Zhao, S. & Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2012) Individual agency in language planning: Chinese script reform as a case study. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 36 (1), 1–24.

Zuckermann, G. & Walsh, M. (2011) Stop, revive, survive: Lessons from the Hebrew revival applicable to the reclamation, maintenance and empowerment of Aboriginal languages and cultures. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 31 (1), 111–127.

Lisa Fairbrother / Jiří Nekvapil / Marián Sloboda (eds)

The Language Management Approach

A Focus on Research Methodology

PETER LANG
EDITION

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

ISSN 1866-878X
ISBN 978-3-631-65042-4 (Print)
E-ISBN 978-3-653-04061-6 (E-PDF)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-71065-4 (EPUB)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-71066-1 (MOBI)
DOI 10.3726/b12004

© Peter Lang GmbH
Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften
Frankfurt am Main 2017
All rights reserved.
Peter Lang Edition is an Imprint of Peter Lang GmbH.

Peter Lang – Frankfurt am Main · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Warszawa · Wien

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright. Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

This publication has been peer reviewed.

www.peterlang.com