Multilingualism studies and translation studies

Still a long road ahead

Reine Meylaerts and Theo du Plessis
KU Leuven / University of the Free State, Bloemfontein

This chapter explores the relation between multilingual studies and translation and interpreting by focusing on two interrelated fields in multilingual studies, conveniently referred to as language policy and planning. By focusing particularly on this specialised field, one is able to understand the role of translation and interpreting better and thus chart the way forward how to deal with this relation in translation studies. The chapter first prese   historical overview by establishing at what point and for what purpose translation and interpreting felt the need to adopt the concept of 'translation'. It then moves on to describe how this concept has been adapted to and been understood in language policy and planning, including how it is defined. Specific attention is then given to theoretical and methodological exchanges between language policy and planning and translation and interpreting. Despite some interesting developments the authors conclude that one still sees very little evidence of constructive exchanges between language policy and planning studies and translation studies. It is argued that a real theoretical, conceptual and methodological exchange would benefit both disciplines but that many challenges remain.

Keywords: language policy and planning, language management, translation policy and planning

1. Introduction

Multilingualism Studies (MS) has been described as a "multi-layered" field of inquiry into the phenomenon of multilingualism drawing from various fields in linguistics (including sociolinguistics, educational linguistics, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, etc.) but also from various fields in anthropology, education, communication, sociology, etc. (Aronin & Hufeisen 2009: 104). It is a field of study where the primary interest is in what Edwards (1994) has originally identified as

the three main "elements" of multilingualism, namely speech, setting and language, and which Aronin and Singleton (2012:117) have more recently amended as user, environment and language. A glance at the content pages of some of the recognised journals devoted to MS, such as the *International Journal of Multilingualism* (IJM), *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development* (JMMD), and the *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism* (IJBEB), as well as specialist book series like *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (edited by Nancy Hornberger and Colin Baker), *Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism* (edited by Peter Siemund, Barbara Hänel-Faulhaber and Christoph Gabriel), *Linguistic Diversity and Language Rights* (edited by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas), *Multilingual Matters* (edited by John Edwards) and *Studies in Bilingualism* (edited by Dalila Ayoun and Robert DeKeyser) gives a good impression of the diversity of approaches and foci (Ecke 2009) in dealing with these three elements. One is particularly struck by how MS engages with "… issues of stability and change, with issues of time and space, and with issues of complexity", as Aronin and Singleton (2012:168) capture the diversity within the field; Edwards (1994) refers tongue in the cheek to some of these issues as "consequences of Babel".

One definite "consequence" is that multilingual societies are constantly faced with language choices, both at micro- and macro-level (Coulmas 2005). The latter category relates to matters such as code-switching, diglossia, language contact, language maintenance and language shift, language revitalisation and language promotion. Issues like these somehow also led to discussions about public language choices by means of language regulation, language engineering and other forms of language intervention, including language policy and language planning. Another "consequence" that also requires some form of intervention is that of language barriers. Edwards (1994) identifies at least two types of interventions that can help to overcome this dilemma, e.g. using a language of wider communication (including restricted or constructed languages) and translation (including interpreting). This second view, of translation as an instrument to bridge a language gap, is of interest to Translation Studies (TS), as it represents a somewhat narrow view of translation (and interpreting) as phenomena that also relate to multilingualism. It is therefore necessary to explore the relation between MS, and translation and interpreting (T&I) further.

We have chosen to explore this relationship by focusing on two interrelated fields in MS, conveniently referred to as Language Policy and Planning (LPP). This is done because T&I does feature in LPP studies, as the reference above already indicates. By focusing particularly on LPP as a specialised field in MS, one is able to understand the role of T&I better and thus chart the way forward how to deal with this in TS.

Although still used as such, LPP as intertwined concept is a contested one. While some, like Spolsky (2004) would argue language policy is more of an overarching concept, others such as Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) would argue language policy is subsumed in language planning. Despite this contestation and for calls even to move to another broader concept, Language Management (LM) (Jernudd & Neustupny 1987), current conventions are to continue using LPP. According to Johnson (2013: 3), this is done out of respect for the tradition of the research over more than 50 years in the field of language planning, as well as because of the close proximity of the two fields. Hornberger (2006: 25) aptly acknowledges, "(t)he truth is that the LPP designation is useful", as a reminder of how inextricably the two fields are related and as a way around the problem of exactly how these two are related. We will subscribe to the rationale to continue the LPP convention. The joined concept also happens to refer to two distinctly different, but closely related aspects of language intervention (Du Plessis 1995), in other words, efforts to steer a language situation in a specific direction or influence people's language choice within that situation.

The concept of translation (and interpreting) was adopted in the LPP discipline according to two traditions. In one, T&I is treated as a dimension of a specific language-planning goal that ultimately is directed at cultivating the status and function of a literate language. In this tradition language policy and language planning are seen as closely related, albeit distinctly different activities. A second tradition treats T&I as an aspect of LM, in other words, as an effort to modify people's beliefs or practices in lieu of solving language problems. Here the emphasis falls on T&I as intervention, even as a kind of language service. The difference between the two traditions is a matter of nuance, as one shall see.

2. T&I as language planning goal

The tradition of treating T&I as language planning goal is closely related to the development of what Hornberger (2006: 24) calls "(f)rameworks and models in language policy and planning". Central to these frameworks and models are three theoretical constructs, LPP types, LPP approaches and LPP goals. T&I in particular relates to the latter of the three; more specifically to a language planning goal identified by Nahir (1984 – reprinted in Nahir 2003) as *Interlingual communication (IC)*. According to Nahir (2003: 436), IC is a LPP goal "facilitating linguistic communication between members of *different* speech communities"; in other words, an intervention towards "bridging the language gap" (Becker 1997) or communicating "across language barriers" (Pool & Fettes 1998: 2).

Nahir (2003) original identified two broad IC types, i.e. worldwide IC (auxiliary languages or language of wider communication) and regional IC (regional lingua franca or mutual intelligibility between cognate languages). Explicit references to T&I as a component of IC remain, however, exceptional.

The notion of T&I as IC was first introduced by Kaplan and Baldauf (1997: 76–77) some three decennia after the development of TS as an independent field. Kaplan and Baldauf include T&I as a dimension of IC in a comprehensive summary of the different language planning goals that various authors have identified over time (ibid.: 61). Elaborating their summary, Kaplan and Baldauf (ibid.: 76–77) identify three IC types, i.e. Worldwide Interlingual Communication (Auxiliary Languages and English as a *lingua franca*), Regional Interlingual Communication (developing a regional *lingua franca* such as Spanish in Latin America or Swahili in East Africa, or improving mutual intelligibility between cognate languages) and T&I. They criticise Nahir for not including T&I as IC, in other words, as a dimension of the facilitation of linguistic communication between members of different speech communities. At the publication of Nahir's original work, T&I has not *per se* been associated with language planning. One could probably attribute this to the fact that one school of thought (still) considers T&I as a literary practice (see also below) related to the field of applied linguistics (Davies & Elder 2004: 2; Murray & Crichton 2010: 15.11).

Post-Nahir interest in IC as a language policy area has grown, as did the realisation of T&I as one of a range of IC solutions. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) therefore propose T&I as a third IC type, distinguishing between the translation of written (often literary) text from one language to another and interpreting as the simultaneous rendering of speech from one language in another. Community interpreting is mentioned as a growing area in legal situations, as important for access to health services, as well as government information and as functional in industrial situations. The authors also mention the development of machine translation and related "computer-based technologies". They emphasise that, due to the increase of global communication the demand for T&I has grown dramatically. Kaplan (2002: 442) also mentions the "ever-growing need" for IC and its consequences for translation products and the training of translators.

In a follow-up study Kaplan and Baldauf (2003: 201) gives recognition to Hornberger (1994), who was the first to integrate the range of language planning goals that has been identified since the mid-1960s with the model of LPP developed by some of the leading authors during this period (see Table 1). A reprint of her original integrative framework appears in Hornberger (2006: 29).

Hornberger distinguishes between the three conventional language-planning types (status, acquisition and corpus) and the two conventional language-planning approaches (policy and cultivation). She considers IC as a status language-planning

Table 1. Hornberger's integrative framework of LPP goals (Hornberger 2006: 29).

Approaches Types	Policy planning (on form) Goals	Cultivation planning (on function) Goals
Status planning (about uses of language)	Standardisation Status Officialisation Nationalisation Proscription	Revival Maintenance Interlingual communication International Intranational Spread
Acquisition planning (about users of language)	Group Education/School Literature Religion Mass media Work	Reacquisition Maintenance Foreign language/Second language Shift
Corpus planning (about language)	Standardisation Corpus Auxiliary code Graphisation	Modernisation Lexical Stylistic Renovation Purification Reform Stylistic simplification Terminological unification

effort (planning about language use) where a cultivation planning approach is followed. This kind of approach focuses on a language's function in society. As such, Hornberger categorises IC in a cell together with other typical cultivation interventions such as language revival, language maintenance and language spread. These are all language planning efforts directed at a literary language; that is, a language with a considerable literary corpus and that is used for obtaining appropriate literacy. Hornberger furthermore identifies international IC and intranational IC as the two essential elements of interlingual communication, but does not elaborate on the specific role of translation and interpreting; neither do Kaplan and Baldauf (2003: 202) in a revised version of Hornberger's 1994 framework (see Kaplan and Baldauf 2003).

Notably the authors now add some more detail to their revised framework as well as two more quadrants (Language Promotion and Intellectualisation) related to Language prestige planning, a notion originally developed by Haarmann (1990). If, as Hornberger (1994) originally stressed (repeated in Hornberger 2006: 32–33), one accepts the fact that the LPP goals in the different quadrants are not independent and not pursued in isolation, the addition of Prestige planning as LPP type

is important for IC. For instance, T&I can play an important role in pursuing intellectualisation goals, such as developing a language of science, etc. However, this relation is not always recognised in LPP literature. Interestingly, one finds this perspective in language development discourses, as reflected in Alexander (2005). He mentions a 2003 symposium on the topic of the intellectualisation of African languages where "practical issues" such as terminology development, human language technology and translation have been identified as central matters that require further attention. Alexander specifically leans on the work of TS scholars such as Kelly (1979) and Venuti (1998) in making a case for promoting a translation programme as mechanism for intellectualising African languages. Translation remains subservient: a means to an end, a tool to reach a higher goal.

Thus far, we have covered the one tradition in LPP studies of treating T&I as a specific dimension of intercultural communication and as a language-planning goal directed at cultivating the status of a designated language. This is an approach that recognises the instrumental value of T&I as a means to an end. However, we have seen that the notion is not developed in more depth and is mostly dealt with as secondary phenomenon; this despite the fact that authors such as Sibayan (1999) and Alexander (2005) do see a developmental role for translation in LPP.

3.   T&I as LM intervention

A second tradition treats T&I as LM intervention. This tradition originates within two evolving schools of thought, both adamant to make a clear distinction between language planning as a period-bound, specific field of study that focuses on the deliberate regulation of language and linguistic behaviour and LM, a broader field of study (Nekvapil 2006: 4). The first school of thought originated with authors such as Jernudd and Neustupny (1987), who see LM as behaviour towards language, whether in simple form (at speaker level) or organised form (at organisational level) and pursue thinking about it within the framework of LM theory (Nekvapil 2006: 6). A five-staged (processual) model of LM is envisaged: (1) deviations from norms (e.g. language problems), (2) noting of deviations, (3) evaluating deviations, (4) designing adjustments and (5) implementing these (ibid.). The second school of thought originated primarily with scholars such as Spolsky (2004), followed by Shohamy (2006), as part of endeavours to develop a theory of language policy. Spolsky (2004: 5) identifies language policy as language practices, language beliefs or ideology and LM, the latter referring to specific efforts "to modify or influence" language practices or manipulate a language situation (ibid.: 8). A next book followed, dedicated in total to the latter aspect of language policy, namely LM (Spolsky 2009). In the latter, Spolsky acknowledges

the work of the earlier LM theorists (Nekvapil 2012: 9). We shall briefly look at how T&I is approached in these two schools of thought about LM.

Within the LM-theory school of thought, T&I features as part of the implementation of an adjustment made to a communication act that has been noted as deviating from the norm and evaluated negatively. Nekvapil and Nekula (2008: 283) understand T&I as "aimed at eliminating fundamental communicative problems". More specifically, they see T&I as forms of organised LM, in other words "directed and systematic" (ibid.: 271). Other forms of organised LM could include language courses or the simulated use of languages (using a foreign language in a majority language situation so that people can exercise their skills in the aforementioned).

Sloboda (2009: 43), for instance, considers the use of "translation services" to address the language problems experienced at a faculty of a Belarusian university using both Belarusian and Russian as functional languages. Such services can aid parallel bilingualism as solution, thereby helping to create linguistically parallel discourses. Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003: 230) argue in similar vein that translation into Czech became an "important vehicle of language management" from the 19th century onwards. Also, in recent times, with the Czech Republic being part of the European Union (EU), T&I is an important "language management act" (ibid.: 297). Thus, they address the asymmetric status of Czech within the EU as a language problem. Nekvapil (2009: 1) distinguishes this use of the concept T&I as an aspect of implementation within the LM model from the use of the term *language management* within the sphere of "practical language planning" to refer to the provision of language services (or to the development of language skills through language courses, etc.).

For Spolsky (2009: 248), language services ["of various kinds – interpreters, translators, reference books, computerized translators" – p. 246] represent "a way to deal with an unsolved communication problem by providing a translator or interpreter". Spolsky (ibid.: 246) sees language services metaphorically as first aid in LM, "dealing with immediate problems and providing shortcuts to relieve symptoms while waiting for longer-term management to be effective". He also sees translators and interpreters metaphorically as "the first line of defence against the problems of multilingualism" (ibid.). Although Spolsky (ibid.: 4–5) accepts the distinction between simple and organised LM, and treats T&I as related to the latter (ibid.: 259), his work does not necessarily align with the Neustupny-Jernudd paradigm. Nevertheless, in their treatment of T&I it seems the two schools of thought in the LM tradition do seem to agree, that language services are a LM type of intervention directed at addressing communication problems arising from a multilingual situation.

Both schools of thought therefore concentrate on a communication inadequacy that needs addressing. In fact, Spolsky (ibid.: 248) even goes so far as to postulate that affordable and accurate translation (probably including interpreting as well) might completely do away with the need to make a LM intervention at all. Still, as suggested by the expressions used – "language services", "first aid", "immediate problems", "first line of defence" – T&I as LM intervention is not seen as part of long-term strategic options. Here obviously lies a challenge for TS: making clear both within TS and to LPP how T&I is a fundamental part of long-term strategic Translation Policy and Planning (TPP) and LPP. In the domain of multilingual communication of international companies, Janssens, Lambert and Steyaert (2004) were the first to show the need for interdisciplinary research going beyond an instrumental approach towards language and translation and examining the long-term effects of specific LPP and TPP for companies' economic, political and cultural dimension.

Compared in the final instance to the first tradition discussed above, the LM understanding of T&I really boils down to a matter of accentuation. The tradition of focusing on T&I as IC also departs from a language problem, solving difficulties in communication between speakers from different languages. However, one needs to note the different accentuation being placed on IC as forming part of a larger type of intervention aimed at language development, specifically cultivating the status of a language. Stating it simply: the first school of thought emphasises T&I as (language) problem solving, and the second as mechanism of language cultivation or development. The LM approach also does not discuss T&I as part of TPP. The emphasis here also falls on T&I as a means to an end within a broader LPP framework.

4.   T&I within an LPP theoretical framework

Despite attempts to situate T&I within a LPP (or LM) theoretical framework, very few dedicated studies have actually adapted the approaches flowing from this framing. T&I mostly features incidentally and sometimes only addressed in part. As an example of this tendency, two relatively recent studies are discussed below, also to illustrate the difference between the two approaches to T&I that are highlighted above.

Nekvapil and Nekula (2008) present an analysis of LM at a subsidiary of the Siemens VDO Automotive Corporation, a setting they refer to as "the PLANT". The PLANT provides work to Czech- and German-speaking employees. English is the corporate language. Organised management at the PLANT is directed at preventing the linguistic and communicative problems employees encounter in

their individual interactions. Four types of interventions are discussed, i.e. the organisation and promotion of language courses, the simulated use of languages (at meetings and other occasions), semiotic appearances at the PLANT and T&I. According to Nekvapil and Nekula (2008: 283), the T&I services offered at the PLANT are "aimed at eliminating fundamental communicative problems". The authors point out that interpreting is used at the level of top management to accommodate employees who have an insufficient command of English and that translations are provided for shorter text. All of these "services" are provided by employees with a good command of English. No professional language specialists are employed. This is a logical consequence of the view of T&I as an *ad hoc* intervention. For the translation of longer texts, especially of a more technical nature, an external firm is used. Although T&I is not the primary focus of this study, one nevertheless sees an application of the LM approach where T&I in this specific instance is presented as organised management at micro-level to preventing linguistic and communicative problems and not as part of long-term strategic policy and planning.

Lasimbang and Kinajil (2008) discuss the role of the Kadazandusun Language Foundation (KLF), an official language body responsible for monitoring and coordinating work on the Kadazandusun language in Malaysia and mobilising community involvement. The KLF manages four programme areas, i.e. Linguistics and Anthropology, Literacy and Literature, Training and Development and Translation and Community Service. Lasimbang and Kinajil (ibid.: 176) briefly mention the translation service that KLF have been providing to several government agencies over the years. They also mention how the KLF has started to respond to the needs of using the Kadazandusun language to address a wider audience and explore marketing materials and ideas. T&I is not the main focus of the study, but an element of an overall language planning programme, namely that of the KLF. As Lasimbang and Kinajil (ibid.: 177–8) point out in their conclusion, this programme is geared "to assist language practitioners at all levels of language development". They thus refer to T&I as part of a language cultivation exercise in an effort to enhance the status of the Kadazandusun language "in its final stage of development" (ibid.: 178). However, no mention is made about the LPP frameworks developed up to this point.

Neither of these studies attempts to develop either notions of T&I further within their respective theoretical frameworks. Nevertheless, both studies do recognise the importance of T&I as language service and its role in language development (specifically in the second study) to some extent. As already suggested, these examples undoubtedly show that there is many opportunities for TS concepts to be incorporated into LPP and to increase the field's performance in addressing certain societal needs. LPP and TPP go hand in hand as two sides of a coin. On

the other hand, for TS it is important to realise that T&I is bound up in a large continuum of language and translation practices and that it makes no sense to isolate T&I from them.

Two rare exceptions to the incidental nature of dealing with T&I illustrated above are the work of Beukes (2006a, 2006b) and Siegel (2013). Both authors pertinently relate to the LPP framework, Beukes latching on to the IC notion (which she adapts as "interlingual mediation" – Beukes 2006b: 1) and Siegel (2013) applying literary translation (more particularly discourse about it) to some of the language planning types from the LPP Framework.

Being a hybrid scholar, teaching TS and LPP, Beukes (2006a: 15–6) explicitly uses the expression translation policy, in the sense of legislation and government statements. She delves into the "nexus" between translation policy and its implementation. For her, translation offers an instrumental purpose by facilitating communication, but it could also play a role in promoting tolerance and understanding within the South African nation-building project. She briefly deals with two basic matters, the statutory context of translation and the T&I infrastructure. In her overview she finds very little evidence of systematic translation planning and management, or of a "dedicated translation implementation plan" (Beukes ibid.: 21) in support of all of the statutory provisions on language. She concludes that the role of translation as developmental tool has been neglected in the post-apartheid South African context. According to her, this has an impact on the "normalising function of translation", referring here to corpus planning (lexical and stylistic modernisation), prestige planning (languages of higher culture) and discourse planning. Due to the linguistic embeddedness of civic identities, her research thus shows (although mainly implicitly) that the worth of translation reaches far beyond its instrumental functions.

One could argue that, worldwide, authorities have to be sensitive to this linguistic embeddedness and formulate responsive approaches to the particular needs of their multilingual populations. Still, neither in Beukes (2006a), nor in the fields of TS or LPP, have translation policies (in the Spolskyan sense) been subjected to a systematic investigation, whether for their own sake or in their relation with language policies. No consistent body of knowledge exists for translation legislation (sometimes implicitly as part of language legislation), the actual translation practices carried out as a result of translation legislation or independently from any legal framework, the effect of these translation practices on linguistic evolution (language promotion and planning, standardisation or hybridisation, terminology …), on linguistic and human rights, on accessibility of services, on citizenship, on inclusion and nation building, … However, such knowledge is necessary if one wants to understand the key role of translation policies in language policies worldwide.

In a follow-up study, Beukes (2006b) investigates "interlingual mediation" as a LPP goal in South Africa, leaning on the Kaplan and Baldauf extension of Hornberger's framework. She relates translation (and interpreting) more specifically to language development, thus emphasising T&I as "a developmental and intellectualisation tool for (minority) languages" (ibid.: 2). She draws heavily on the work of Millán-Varela, who examines translation activities as "crucial tools in the (re-)construction and development" (Hogan-Brun & Wolff 2003: 10) of the Galician language. Beukes concretely sees a place for planning translation activities in order to increase domains of functionality and to aid language development. In her conclusion (2006b: 5), she echoes her earlier thinking, namely that top-down translation policy implementation in South Africa has largely failed, both in terms of implementation ("routinised translation practices" have not been established) and especially in terms of aiding language development (of the formerly "marginalised" languages).

In her study of literary translation as LPP, Siegel (2013) aims to show that "the practice of and circulating discourses about literary translation can drive important forces of language policy and planning" (ibid.: 127). She discusses four case studies in literary translation (and discourse about translators and their work) and their relation to status, corpus, prestige and discourse planning. The cases demonstrate some interconnectedness between different language planning types. In the Corsican and Irish cases literary translation historically contributed to the enhancement of language prestige. It also served to enhancing discourses about purity and hybridity, in the Corsican case, nurturing anti-French solidarity and in the Irish case, aligning with the national politics of resistance. The first led to driving the formation of an imagined Corsican-speaking and -reading public, the second to converting texts from the minority language to the language of the (oppressive) regime. Reading translated texts in English is therefore not seen as a threat to the imagined national Irish identity and results in a kind of indirect LPP for the Irish language, elevating its status and prestige through the promotion of translated literature in English (ibid.: 131). In the Indian case, Siegel highlights one role of translation in promoting the anti-West notion of harmony in plurality and interdependence among languages. Hindi and English serve as proxy languages that mediate the creation of texts in regional languages, inadvertently enhancing the status and corpus of the Indian languages and promoting functional pluralism (ibid.: 132–133).

Another role of translation is found in "translational resistance" whereby central features of different languages are retained in English texts. In other words, the language of the oppressor is re-appropriated for the literary and ideological aims of minoritised speakers constructing an imagined community (ibid.: 135). Both translation approaches led to cultivating a post-independence Indian nationalism and

constitute a discourse planning in order to combat monolingualist language ideologies. Siegel's study is close to a long research tradition in TS on the role of literary translation in language and culture planning (e.g. Berman [1984] for Romantic Germany), on translation in a postcolonial context (e.g. Tymoczko [1999] for early Irish literature in English translation), on politics and resistance (e.g. Tonkin et al. [2010] for South Africa).

Scholars such as Pool and Fettes (1998) and Fettes (2003) take a more critical position on the role of LPP as such within the traditional nation-state. They propose the notion of interlingualism ("i.e. linguistic strategies to foster global communication in cooperative, equitable ways which promote linguistic diversity" – Maurais & Morris 2003:2) to overcome some of the shortcomings they have identified. T&I forms part of one such strategy they call language brokers.

Fettes (2003:37) responds to the dominance of politicostrategies of language in the field of LPP. His criticism is that because these strategies are developed in tandem with the nation and state, they are generally aimed at entrenching a single language in the official domains of language use (i.e. public administration, education, etc.). Consequently, LPP efforts are therefore directed at either maintaining old "linguistic monopolies" or seeking to establish new ones. Still, as shown in Meylaerts (2011a), states like South Africa, Canada, Belgium, or Switzerland are officially multilingual and accordingly develop the necessary translation strategies, which can become policies of their own (see also further). Moreover, as Meylaerts (2011a) argues, monolingualism also requires a strict translation policy. On the one hand, it entails obligatory translation of allophone documents and messages into the official language in order to become legally valid. This means that EU laws and guidelines have to be translated into the national languages of the member states in order to become valid. On the other hand, monolingualism requires non-translation or limited translation through a (sometimes legally enacted) ban on translations into minority or immigrant languages.

The above example illustrates the importance of politicostrategies of language and translation developed in tandem with the nation and state for the inclusion or exclusion of linguistic minorities. However, due to a variety of global developments that brought about greater mobility, the growth of communication networks and the growth of language awareness among communities (as opposed to nations), strategies in tandem with the nation and the state are, according to Fettes, no longer adequate. A new dynamic world system of languages is developing where interactions across language borders present different challenges. As an answer to this challenge, he advances the "principles of interlingualism", in other words, seeking "an optimal balance between linguistic diversity, integration, equity, efficiency and sustainability, integrating solutions at levels from the local to the global" (Fettes 2003:44).

Interlingualism as concept was originally developed by Pool and Fettes (1998). Fettes (2003) expounds on the five "geostrategies" involved in creating an interlingual world, i.e. (personal) plurilingualism, world English, language brokers, technologism and Esperantism. T&I typically relates to the strategy of language brokers (professional translators and interpreters) and technologism (automatic translation and other forms of technological interconnectedness). These strategies are supplemental to those of elite plurilingualism.

From a TS perspective, it is certainly refreshing to see T&I within a continuum of "geostrategies". This confirms recent calls to study T&I in relation to other transfer techniques (D'hulst 2012). According to Fettes (2003: 41), technologism can contribute to making T&I more efficient and affordable. This will enable translators and interpreters to promote the interlingual goals of diversity, integration and equity. Efficient T&I can actually make it possible for monolingualism to be maintained and for people to cultivate their own languages.

However, one dilemma arising is that so far most efforts went into maintaining the major languages. This resulted in a gap developing between them and the smaller and minority languages. Pool and Fettes (1998) believe technologism as interlingual strategy could help to eradicate this *de facto* inequality through the massification of appropriate software and applications. Paradoxically this might weaken the attractiveness of personal plurilingualism and increase the position of world English, although the emergence of markets in the Far East could neutralise this advance and actually promote a new form of plurilingualism involving the major languages of this region. Along similar lines, TS studies like that of Bowker (2009) analyse the use of Machine Translation (MT) "as a cost-effective means of increasing translation services in Canadian official language minority communities" (ibid.: 123). If MT is used as a means to contribute to cultural preservation and promotion, Bowker argues, MT output should be followed by thorough postediting, which again illustrates the importance to study and teach T&I in relation to other transfer strategies and techniques.

In the end, Fettes (2003: 44) identifies an overarching geostrategy, which he terms "language ecology" and with which he intends to counter the conventional politicostrategies. This strategy avoids imposing specific languages, but rather seeks to ensure their coexistence. T&I could play a role by increasing the range of linguistic possibilities. The notion of interlingualism therefore goes further than that of IC. Interlingualism inherently not only enhances language development, but also seeks to erode existing language hierarchies and establish a linguistic ecological balance that will benefit language communities more directly than language-based states and nations. They therefore propose that language policies be developed in such a way that the different strategies are employed in a complementary way.

Tonkin and Reagan (2006: 7) find that the five geostrategies need further re-examination unless the alternative is accepted, i.e. "the gradual and unequal erosion of linguistic and cultural diversity in ways likely to advantage the strong and disadvantage the weak". Their call for further examination is based on three assumptions about the management of linguistic diversity; first, that organisations might be willing to step back and take a rational approach to the issue of linguistic diversity. Secondly, a rational approach would have a decisive effect on received opinion and would led to a measure of consensus. Thirdly, if consensus emerges, ample political will exists to take firm action. The alternative is a free linguistic market, which pushes out weaker languages. Unfortunately, the authors do not consider the implications of the different strategies of interlingualism for T&I. Research on translation in international institutions from a TS perspective partly contradicts the link between a strong *lingua franca* and the erosion of linguistic diversity. As is argued by Pym (2001), the so-called 'diversity paradox' shows that the increased use of a *lingua franca* and the increase of translation go hand in hand, leading to a [increase] and a decrease of linguistic diversity at the same time. This is the case, more in particular when non-translation is used within the institution, combined with translation for communication between the institution and the outside.

Given the above overview of how it entered the LPP fray, translation in LPP can be defined as a specific dimension of the language planning goal interlingual communication, directed at facilitating linguistic communication between members of different speech communities as part of cultivating a literary language. In this way, its function in different domains of both official and non-official language use could be enhanced and as such its status in society be elevated and consequently its prestige enhanced.

5.   Theoretical/conceptual/methodological exchange/input between LPP and TS

The first level of exchange between LPP and TS is at a conceptual level, namely how LPP is perceived. The phrase "there is no language policy without a translation policy" first introduced in French by the TS scholar Meylaerts (2009) and later in English by Meylaerts (2010: 229) perhaps best describes exchange between LPP studies as MS and TS. In her 2009 article, Meylaerts does not explicitly refer to the field of LPP nor does she give a clear definition of translation policy. However, she seems the first to distinguish between various types of policy, going from institutional monolingualism with obligatory and forbidden translation (ibid.: 10), over an intermediate policy of institutional monolingualism combined with occasional

translation (ibid.: 14–5), to institutional multilingualism and obligatory multi-directional translation (ibid.: 14). In her later publications, translation policy is more precisely defined as "a set of legal rules that regulate translation in the public domain: in education, in legal affairs, in political institutions, in administration, in the media" (Meylaerts 2011: 165).

The term *glottopolitics* seems to have relevance here. According to Karam (1974: 104) Robert Hall first introduced this term to the Anglophone world during the 1950s, (initially) to refer to the "… application of linguistic science to government policy for determining the best means of achieving bilingualism in colonial areas, and other areas, where two of more cultures are in contact". (Also see Cooper 1989: 29.) Sharma (2004: 33) refers to a later work of Hall during the 1960s where he more generally uses the term to refer to "… problems which involve language matters at the level of political decisions and governmental policy". She proposes a revival of the term in a new sense, "tongue politics or language politics". The latter conceptualisation corresponds with the way the Francophone use of the term, *glotto-politique,* is sometimes understood, as one sees, for instance in Sørensen (1995: 165). However, as Zabus (1991: 17) points out, what the French call *la politique linguistique* might be more appropriate when referring to Sharma's latter adaptation. As originally developed in the Francophone world during the mid-1980s, Louis Guespin and Jean-Baptiste Marcellesi use the term *glotto-politique* in similar fashion than Hall, referring according to Babault and Caitucoli (2012: 165), to "all the language phenomena where societal actions take the form of policy". The emphasis thus falls on regulatory measures or policy, obviously not denying that "politics" can be involved. Meylaerts also emphasises political decisions (about translation) in the public domain (in other words, institutional) expressed through translation or language policy.

A second level of exchange can be found with regard to the domains of language use (or domains of institutional language). This view closely relates to the work of Turi (1994), who has identified four domains of language use where "legal rules" regarding language apply, i.e. legislation, justice, public administration and education. In other words, these are the domains of language use usually covered by "official language legislation" (ibid.: 112). Non-official domains of language use he identifies and where institutionalising language legislation has an impact albeit indirectly ("translation policy beyond official settings – Meylaerts 2011: 167) include the domains of labour, communications, culture, commerce and business. Language rights to one or more designated languages are usually related to the official domains of language use (Turi 1994: 113). From this, we may therefore gather that a right to translation flows from the language rights granted within official domains; the one presupposes the other, as Meylaerts (2011: 165) would argue.

The study on translation policy in Northern Ireland by Núñez (2013) delves deeper into the translation (policy) implications of language policy and particularly studies about language domain-based policies. This particular author finds Meylaerts' definition "too narrow" and thus attempts his description of the phenomenon by leaning on the tripartite approach of Spolsky also mentioned above. His findings point to the complexity of translation policy evolving in the judiciary and public administration (specifically healthcare and local government) in Northern Ireland. His findings suggest that a variety of demographic, historical, cultural, economic and political factors and local, regional and national actors contribute to the development of translation policy and that it does not necessarily stem specifically from "a language policy". Translation policy, his study shows, is built on decisions with regard to language institutionalisation, constitutional structure and legislative enactments. However, according to him it also evolves from local practice and beliefs about its role in cultivating identity (Núñez 2013: 486). It thus fits into Spolsky's tripartite definition of language policy.

Tosi (2013) presents an interesting discussion on translation policy in the EU in relation to the linguistic ecosystem of the European languages. Due to a variety of factors a new lingua franca is emerging in the EU, which some would call "Euro-English". This lingua franca has become the original text for all translations, largely produced within a speech community of non-native speakers of English. The author alerts us to the implications for the vitality of the European languages of this practice and therefore raises questions about the role of translation in all of this. From this particular discussion one may conclude that translation for the sake of translation can have unforeseen outcomes for different eco-linguistic systems. The problem Tosi (ibid.) highlights, relates to what Kaplan and Baldauf (1997: 301) refer to as "unplanned language change". They identify this as a real problem for language planners since it alters the linguistic ecosystem. They also stress that unplanned LPP often goes unnoticed and thus not documented. The discussion by Tosi (2013) about the unplanned language change because of the EU's translation policy thus addresses an important shortcoming in LPP studies.

Elaborating on the notion of language ecology, Fouces (2010), another TS scholar, looks specially at "ecolinguistic planning". He assumes that, "the rational management of linguistic ecosystems [ecolinguistic planning] is a valuable tool for regulating ecolinguistic balance and that ecolinguistic policies, necessarily including translation policy, can be a prime tool for this purpose" (ibid.: 5). The author proposes "a first attempt to systematise some of the main strategies aimed at maintaining the appropriate conditions for specific linguistic practices in order to remain viable in a given ecolinguistic space" (ibid.: 16). Language mediation (translation, interpretation, subtitling, localisation, etc.), and more particularly

T&I as language mediation take central stage in this task. T&I is important for the relationship between ecolinguistic spaces and for the management of the ecolinguistic space of individual languages.

Fouces specifically looks at different policy types that are designed to regulate both external and internal exchanges in order to preserve the use-value of designated languages.

With regard to the regulation of external exchanges, Fouces (ibid.: 9–10) proposes six appropriate policy types, which can be paired together in three overall clusters (see Table 2.1 below):

Table 2.1 Typology of policy types relating to external exchanges taken directly from Fouces (2010: 14).

Policy types 1–2: Relating to cultural industries
1. *Policies for the spread and diffusion abroad (of cultural products)* are based on subsidies to export own linguistic-cultural goods, in order to expand their market;
2. *Policies that restrict imports of cultural products* are protectionist strategies intended to safeguard language value and, therefore, social capital;

Policy types 3–4: Relating to language teaching
3. *Policies to promote teaching of the own language abroad* are intended to increase language value by encouraging the integration of new users who can go on to create positive externalities;
4. *Policies to promote foreign language teaching* help increase the human capital of a community in a selective way;

Policy types 5–6: Relating to translation
5. *Policies to promote translation from the own language* constitute protectionist measures designed to support the use of their own language-technology;
6. *Policies to promote translation into the own language* of valuable foreign products help boost individuals self-esteem, thereby preventing linguistic defection.

Each pair has an expansive or promotional as well as protectionist element, the first aimed at increasing the ecolinguistic space of the designated language and the second at preventing an encroachment on the established ecolinguistic space of a designated language. As such, the approach adds value to the second quadrant of the LPP Framework that deals with the cultivation of the functions of a language in order to enhance its status. It also relates to the sixth quadrant dealing with the cultivation of the language's function in education and as language to be acquired. These interventions are required to prevent what Fouces (2010: 4) terms *linguistic subordination* to set in. Fouces (ibid.: 5) sees these interventions as ecolinguistic planning and management, needed to at least maintain ecolinguistic habitats.

With regard to the regulation of internal exchanges between government and its citizens, Fouces (ibid.: 14) proposes a typology that shows many interesting

parallels with Meylaerts (2009). He refers to two main strategies governments can adopt and a range of further possibilities to be employed. Notably, translation as language mediation stands central in this typology (cf. Table 2.2). The typology shows how the Administration approaches translation and how citizens utilise translation.

Table 2.2 Typology of policy types for the regulation of internal exchanges (Fouces 2010: 14).

Main strategies	Administration	Citizens
Institutional monolingualism	a. No translation	Mandatory translation
	b. Supportive translation	Frequent mandatory translation
Institutional multilingualism	c. Official translation	Occasional mandatory translation
	d. Total Translation / Zero translation	Zero translation

Policy type (d) represents the one extreme where the Administration provides translations for everything or produces multilingual outputs from the onset. It is a type rarely found; the closest example being the EU, as was already mentioned in Meylaerts (2009). Within this type, there is (obviously) no need for citizens to undertake their own translations. Echoing Meylaerts (2009), for Fouces the other extreme, policy type (a), is also relatively rare and could be related to authoritarian political systems. Citizens in these states who do not speak the official language(s) are continually reliant on translation and interpretation (which the state does not provide). Type (b) states are probably more common at this end of the scale, where languages other than those granted official status are ignored but supportive translation offered, for instance into immigrant languages in limited cases. According to Fouces (ibid.: 15) multilingual states such as Belgium would be categorised as type (c) states where official documentation is (supposed to be) bilingual. As shown by Meylaerts (2009, 2011a), the situation is more complicated in Belgium and other so-called multilingual states: they combine institutional monolingualism and institutional multilingualism according to the level: monolingualism at local level (Flanders and Wallonia in Belgium) and multilingualism with multidirectional mandatory translation at the superior (e.g. Belgian federal) level or vice versa (Meylaerts 2011a: 752). According to Fouces, policy type (c) corresponds with states where one finds a degree of political and administrative decentralisation.

Fouces' typology is useful for understanding the conditions for state-sponsored (top-down) and self-initiated (bottom-up) T&I services and the role of these services in preserving an ecolinguistic habitat or space. The typology particularly stresses the importance of T&I in the protection of languages that are not necessarily recognised, or where an encroachment on the ecolinguistic space is eminent. He concludes that, given the volatility of the globalised world, translation

might even become relevant for speakers of languages that are hegemonic today, as the boundaries between hegemonic communities and subordinate communities become blurred. As such, the work of Fouces complements the LPP Framework to some extent, but also broadens the perspective about T&I as LPP goal within an ecolinguistic planning setting. This approach shifts the attention away from LPP towards (a) major language(s) to LPP for multiple languages. Incidentally, this different accentuation ties in with ideas about the "ecology of the linguistic environment" or the "linguistic eco-system" mooted by Kaplan and Baldauf (1997: 269ff.), following on the work of Haugen (1972), one of the founding fathers of LPP. Fouces' work thus strengthens an ecological perspective on LPP, a theme that probably deserves further attention, despite some scepticism about the biomorphic nature of the metaphor (Johnson 2013: 52).

Baxter (2010), another TS scholar, contributes to the debate about the instrumental value of T&I in language development, a perspective expressed in the work of Millán-Varela (Hogan-Brun & Wolff 2003: 10) as well. In similar vein, Baxter (2010: 7) argues that translation plays a central role at the level of *normalisation* ('status planning') and *normativisation* ('corpus planning'). As such, he echoes a view expressed by Fouces in a paper at a 2004 symposium on translation, terminology and interpretation in Cuba and Canada about the role of linguistic mediators as "agents of language". Translation actively helps to bolster the literary corpus of "underdeveloped" languages such as Galician, Baxter (2010: 7) and others would argue. He also emphasises the importance of such corpus in cultivating a national identity – the underlying notion of national identity apparently being perceived as monolingual.

The chapter by Angelelli (2012) in the *Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy* (Spolsky 2012) is one of the first contributions to LPP studies from a primarily TS perspective. This contribution provides some theoretical background about the interpreted communicative event, the need for interpreting, some shortcomings in the profession, etc. The author then specifically concentrates on interpreting in three settings, health, policy and legal, and identifies some dilemmas with regard to the services rendered here. Finally, the author looks at models for training interpreters and provides a summary of recent developments aimed at professionalising the field. Angelelli thus provides the LPP scholar with an overview of interpreting as discipline, service and profession. However, she fails to deal in more depth with TPP as such and hence with the relation between LPP and interpreting.

6.   Conclusion: Exchange between LPP and TS

Toury (2003: 401) writes about "the almost total non-existence of translation as topic" in the LPP world and the virtual absence of the socio-cultural notion of planning in TS. He contends that it should have been possible during the hey-day of language planning (studies) in the 1970s to have given more prominence to translation, had it not been for the relatively more focus on corpus planning rather than on status planning. Translation was limited in the planning literature to "a mere mention, a recommendation … a demonstration of potentials", Toury continues. Originally written in 1999 (Fouces 2010: 3), Toury's concern still holds today. Despite the developments discussed above, one still sees very little evidence of constructive exchanges between LPP and TS. This also applies to the emerging LM field. It should have become clear that a real theoretical, conceptual and methodological exchange between LPP and TS would benefit both disciplines but that there is still a long road ahead…

References

Alexander, N. 2005. The potential role of translation as social practice for the intellectualisa-tion of African languages. Keynote address delivered at the *XVII World Congress of the International Federation of Translators held at Tampere*, Finland, 4–7 August 2005. s.l.:s.n.

Angelelli, C. 2012. "Language policy and management in service domains: Brokering communi-cation for linguistic minorities in the community". In *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*, B. Spolsky (ed.), 243–261. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511979026.015

Aronin, L. and Hufeisen, B. 2009. "Methods of research in multilingualism studies. Reaching a comprehensive perspective". In *The exploration of multilingualism: development of research on L3, multilingualism, and multiple language acquisition*, L. Aronin and B. Hufeisen (eds), 103–120. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/aals.6.06ch6

Aronin, L. and Singleton, D. 2012. *Multilingualism*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/impact.30

Babault, S. and Caitucoli, C. 2012. "Linguistic policy and education in Francophone countries". In *Encyclopedia of language and education: Language policy and political issues in education*, R. Wodak &. D. Corson (eds), 159–168. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Baxter, R. 2010. "Approaching androcentrism in Galician translation: Trends and patterns". *Galicia* 21(1): 3–25.

Becker, H. 1997. Project on interlingual communication. [Online] Available at: http://research.fss.uu.nl/hb/intlin.htm [Accessed 25 November 2013].

Beukes, A.-M. 2006a. "Looking back on translation and interpreting in South Africa: a useful tool in the efficient management of linguistic diversity?" In *The politics of language in South Africa*, V. Webb and T. du Plessis (eds), 15–24. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Beukes, A.-M. 2006b. "Translation in South Africa: the politics of transmission". *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 24(1): 1–6. doi:10.2989/16073610609486402

Cooper, R. 1989. *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

Coulmas, F. 2005. *Sociolinguistics: The study of speakers' choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511815522

Davies, A. and Elder, C. 2004. "General introduction. Applied Linguistics: Subject to Discipline?" In *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, A. Davies and C. Elder (eds), 1–16. Malden/Oxford/Victoria: Blackwell Publishing. doi:10.1002/9780470757000.ch

Du Plessis, L. 1995. *Die evaluering van taalbeplanningsprosesse* [The evaluation of language planning processes]. Howick: Brevitas.

Ecke, P. 2009. "Multilingualism resources: Associations, journals, book series, bibliographies and conference lists". In *The exploration of multilingualism: development of research on L3, multilingualism, and multiple language acquisition*, L. Aronin and B. Hufeisen (eds), 139–154. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/aals.6.08ch8

Edwards, J. 1994. *Multilingualism*. London: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203430927

Fettes, M. 2003. "The geostrategies of interlingualism". In *Languages in a globalising world*, J. Maurais and M. Morris (eds), 37–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511613739.003

Fouces, O. 2010. "(Eco)linguistic planning and language-exchange management". Translated from English by R.N. Baxter. *MonTI* 2: 1–19.

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. doi:10.1515/ijsl.1990.86.103

Haugen, E. 1972. "The ecology of language". In *The ecology of language: Essays by Einar Haugen*, A.S. Dil (Ed.), 325–339. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hogan-Brun, G. and Wolff, S. 2003. "Minority languages in Europe: An introduction to the current debate". In *Minority languages in Europe. Frameworks, status, prospects*, G. Hogun-Brun and S. Wolff (eds), 3–15. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan. doi:10.1057/9780230502994

Hornberger, N. 1994. "Literacy and language planning". *Language and Education* 8(1–2): 75–86. doi:10.1080/09500789409541380

Hornberger, N. 2006. "Frameworks and models in language policy and planning". In *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*, T. Ricento (ed.), 24–41. Malden/Oxford/Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.

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

Johnson, D. 2013. *Language policy*. Hampshire/New York: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/9781137316202

Kaplan, R.B. and Baldauf, R.B. Jr. 1997. *Language planning from practice to theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kaplan, R.B. and Baldauf, R.B. Jr. 2003. *Language and language-in-education planning in the Pacific Basin*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers. doi:10.1007/978-94-017-0145-7

Kaplan, R. 2002. *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Karam, F. 1974. "Toward a definition of language planning". In *Advances in language planning*, J. Fishman (ed.), 103–124. The Hague: Walter de Gruyter.

Kelly, L. 1979. *The true interpreter. A history of translation theory and practice in the West*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Lasimbang, R. and Kinajil, T. 2008. "Changing the language ecology of Kadazandusun: The role of the Kadazandusun Language Foundation". In *Language planning and language policy: Language planning in local context*, A. J. Liddicoat and R. B. Baldauf Jr (eds), 171–179. Clevedon/New York/Ontario: Multilingual Matters.

Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. 2003. "Introduction". In *Languages in a globalising world*, J. Maurais and M. A. Morris (eds), 1–10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511613739.001

Meylaerts, R. 2009. "'Et pour les Flamands, la même chose': quelle politique de traduction pour quelles minorités linguistiques?" *Meta* 54(1): 7–21. doi:10.7202/029790ar

Meylaerts, R. 2010. "Multilingualism and translation". In *Handbook of translation studies*. Volume 1, Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer (eds), 227–230). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/hts.1.mul1

Meylaerts, R. 2011. "Translation policy". In *Handbook of translation studies*, vol. 2, Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer (eds), 163–168. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/hts.2.tra10

Murray, N. and Crichton, J. 2010. "What's in a name? Degree programs and what they tell us about 'Applied Linguistics' in Australia". *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 33(2): 15.1–15.15. doi:10.2104/aral1015

Nahir, M. 2003. "Language planning goals: A classification". In *Sociolinguistics. The essential readings*. C. B. Paulston (Ed.), 423–448. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Nekvapil, J. and Nekula, M. 2008. "On language management in multinational companies in the Czech Republic". In *Language planning in local contexts*, A. J. Liddicoat and R. B. Baldauf Jr (eds), 268–287. Clevedon/New York/Ontario: Multilingual Matters.

Nekvapil, J. 2006. "From language planning to language management". *Sociolinguistica* 20: 92–104.

Nekvapil, J. 2009. "The integrative potential of Language Management Theory". In *Language management in contact situations. Perspectives from three continents*, J. Nekvapil and T. Sherman (eds), 1–11. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Nekvapil, J. 2012. "From language planning to language management: J. V. Neustupný's heritage". *Communication Studies* 63: 5–21.

Neustupny, J. V. and Nekvapil, J. 2003. "Language management in the Czech Republic". *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4(3/4): 181–366. doi:10.1080/14664200308668057

Núñez, G. 2013. "Translating for linguistic minorities in Northern Ireland: a look at translation policy in the judiciary, healthcare, and local government". *Current Issues in Language Planning* 14(3–4): 474–489. doi:10.1080/14664208.2013.827036

Pool, J. and Fettes, M. 1998. "The challenge of interlingualism: A research invitation". *Esperantic Studies* 10: 1–3.

Pym, A. 2001. "Translation and international institutions. Explaining the diversity paradox". [Online] Available at: http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/on-line/translation/diversity.html [Accessed 26 September 2013].

Sharma, R. 2004. *Applied linguistics: Stylistics and language teaching*. New-Delhi: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.

Shohamy, E. 2006. *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London and New York: Routledge.

Sibayan, B. 1999. *The intellectualization of Filipino*. Manila: The Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Siegel, J. 2013. "Literary translation as a nexus of language planning". *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 28(1): 119–140.

Sloboda, M. 2009. "A language management approach to language maintenance and shift: A study from post-Soviet Belarus". In *Language management in contact situations. Perspectives from three continents*, J. Nekvapil and T. Sherman (eds), 15–47. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Sørensen, N. 1995. *European identities: Cultural diversity and integration in Europe since 1700*. Odense: Odense University Press.

Spolsky, B. 2012. *The Cambridge handbook of language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511979026

Spolsky, B. 2004. *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. 2009. *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511626470

Tonkin, H. and Reagan, T. 2006. Alternative communication strategies in international organizations. Paper delivered at a *Conference on Perspectives on Language Policy and Language Rights in the European Union*, Bratislava, Slovakia, 24–25 November 2006. s.l.:s.n.

Tosi, A. 2013. "Translation as a test of language vitality". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 23(1): 1–14. doi:10.1111/ijal.12016

Toury, G. 2003. "Culture planning and translation". In *Translation, translation*, S. Petrilli (ed.), 399–412. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

Turi, J.-G. 1994. "Typology of language legislation". In *Linguistic human rights. Overcoming linguistic discrimination*, T. Skutnabb-Kangas and R. Phillipson (eds), 111–120. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Venuti, L. 1998. *The scandals of translation. Towards an ethics of difference*. London/New York: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203269701

Zabus, C. 1991. *The African palimpsest: Indigenization of language in the West African Europhone novel*. Digital printing 2004 ed. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.