

**This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint *may differ* from the original in pagination and typographic detail.**

Author(s): Nikula, Tarja; Saarinen, Taina; Pöyhönen, Sari; Kangasvieri, Teija

Title: Linguistic Diversity as a Problem and a Resource – Multilingualism in European and Finnish Policy Documents

Year: 2012

Version:

Please cite the original version:

Nikula, T., Saarinen, T., Pöyhönen, S., & Kangasvieri, T. (2012). Linguistic Diversity as a Problem and a Resource – Multilingualism in European and Finnish Policy Documents. In J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, P. Pahta, & T. Räisänen (Eds.), *Dangerous Multilingualism: Northern perspectives on order, purity and normality* (pp. 41-66). Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137283566.0009>

All material supplied via JYX is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY AS A PROBLEM AND A RESOURCE –
MULTILINGUALISM IN EUROPEAN AND FINNISH POLICY
DOCUMENTS

Tarja Nikula, Taina Saarinen, Sari Pöyhönen and Teija Kangasvieri

[A] LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY – A FACTOR IN SOCIETAL
PROCESSES AND POLICY DOCUMENTS

[B] Societal background

Societies in Europe and across the world are under constant pressure to cope with increasing multilingualism and multiculturalism. This development has its roots in different global and local societal and economic processes. On the one hand, globalization is putting pressure on the economy in that more varied language resources are needed in society. On the other hand, immigration is constantly on the increase, giving rise to what Vertovec (2006) has termed super-diversity, a “condition distinguished by a dynamic interplay of variables among an increased number of new, small and scattered, multiple-origin, transnationally connected, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified immigrants.”

Super-diversity has made the language situation in Europe – the focus of our analysis – increasingly diverse over the last decades. This concerns particularly the old immigration countries. Currently, there are over 300 languages of almost 200 nationalities spoken within the boundaries of the European Union. While the official policy of the EU is to promote the freedom of its citizens to speak and write their own language, it is the 23 official languages and to some extent the sixty-odd heritage languages which are given priority.

In Finland the language situation has been traditionally viewed as fairly homogeneous. There are two national languages, Finnish and Swedish, but since the Swedish-speaking Finns comprise only about six per cent of the whole population, the social reality of most Finns can be described as relatively monolingual. In addition to Finland’s official bilingualism, Sámi as indigenous people, Roma and “other groups” have the constitutional right (Finnish Constitution, §17) to “maintain and develop their own language and culture”; this right is thus as much cultural as linguistic. Users of Finnish sign language are also mentioned in the Finnish Constitution, but in terms of physical disability rather than as a cultural or linguistic minority. (Tarnanen & Huhta, 2008; Conama, 2009; for Finnish sign language, see also Tapio & Takkinen, this volume). As regards multilingualism in society, a recent survey on English in Finland (Leppänen et al., 2011) shows that even though Finns perceive themselves as largely monolingual, their social environments have become increasingly multilingual. Nevertheless, the idea of a homogeneous language situation is maintained, mostly due to language minorities in Finland being both relatively and absolutely small in comparison to those in other European countries (Latomaa & Nuolijärvi, 2005; Pöyhönen, 2009). In a similar vein, the dogma of homogeneity (Blommaert & Verschueren 1997) is also in use at the European level, both

to describe social cohesion within the EU and to maintain a sense of national place and identity (Horner, 2009).

The above descriptions give a typical, high modern picture of language situations in certain geo-politically restricted areas: languages are classified, numbered and placed in different positions in the hierarchies of languages as ‘official’, ‘national’ or ‘other’, to structure the diversifying situation rationally. But as Makoni and Mashiri (2007) point out, this kind of enumeration and representation of the language situation is already language-ideological work, an attempt to essentialize languages into countables that can be labelled, contained and controlled. In a situation where these categorizations and enumerations are needed, the warm and fuzzy understanding of multilingualism (in Europe as in Finland) is truly challenged.

Beneath official policies at supranational and national levels there is a complex and messy reality which does not conform to the hygienic and politically correct descriptions of language situations. As Hélot and de Mejía (2008) observe with reference to bilingualism, there is a double vision in that while bilingualism is presented as something that may bring advantages, prestige and power, it is also referred to as something that can give rise to problems and disadvantages. These advantages and disadvantages may be societal (i.e., increased diversification both as a source of cultural richness and as political problems of societal incohesion) or individual (i.e., increased diversification as a personal resource and as an obstacle to particular societal trajectories; Blommaert, Leppänen & Spotti, this volume). The same appears to be true of understandings of multilingualism. While multilingualism may be celebrated for its ability to enrich society, it may also be viewed as abnormal, even dangerous, for a nation-state struggling to maintain its identity (see *ibid*).

We approach constructions of languages and multilingualism as indicative of social change. Following Blommaert, Leppänen and Spotti (this volume), we argue that the documents we have analyzed show a tendency towards ordering the messy realities of everyday social life, or bringing some kind of balance to societies that are under pressure. Multilingualism and its political representations (in our case in the policy documents) provide an insight into the different societal tensions that are brought to the surface as policy actors at different levels meet, much like tectonic plates (Bleiklie & Kogan, 2000, p. 21), making societal change visible. In other words, we see policies of multilingualism as a case of ‘governmental rationality’ or ‘governmentality’ (Foucault, 1991; Rose, 1999). As Rose (1999, p. 1) suggests, conventional forms of political thought are more or less framed for the centralized (controlling, regulative) nation-state, with one collective actor who exercises legitimized power over a geographical area. Consequently, ‘power’ becomes power to control individuality (see also Foucault, 2003), whereas freedom may be defined as absence of coercion or domination (Rose, 1999, p. 1). Disorder, in turn, appears as something that needs to be governed to maintain order, whereas ‘good order’ leads to “the security, tranquillity, prosperity, health and happiness of the authorities” (Rose, 1999, p. 5). Disorder, then, is a consequence of societal exclusion. It may be that the era of super-diversity will create a need for further control and coercion (as Etzioni suggests happened in the 1970s and 1980s, as cited in Vertovec,

2006), revealed as a growing emphasis on nation-state oriented policies. How and whether this shows in policy texts that deal with language issues is a concern of the present chapter.

[B] Introducing the analytical framework and data

In this chapter, we investigate the ways in which multilingualism and the multiplicity of languages are presented in supranational (EU) and national (Finnish) policy documents. Key questions here are ‘what kinds of language hierarchies emerge and what kinds of values are expressed when labelling and controlling languages (Makoni & Mashiri, 2007), implicitly or explicitly?’, ‘how is multilingualism governed (see Foucault, 1991; Rose, 1999)?’ and ‘how are diversity and cohesion dealt with in order to create a ‘manageable’ multilingual space in Europe?’ Like Heller and Martin-Jones (2001, p. 4), we also believe that it is important to explore how linguistic and cultural differences are used in policy documents as a “resource for constructing, levelling, contesting and blurring boundaries”. In other words, policy documents not only reflect social realities but play an important role in constructing, ordering and structuring them, thus acting as instruments of governance, or “governmental rationalizing” (see Rose, 1999). It is therefore all the more important to investigate what kind of values, meanings and ideologies are attached to different languages, and consequently to ‘multilingualism’ in European Union and Finnish (language education) policy documents. As Bailey (2007, p. 258) suggests, “languages or codes can only be understood as distinct objects to the extent to which they are treated as such by the social actors”. Consequently, ways of representing languages are also indicative of the language ideologies and values of the social actors involved. In short, we analyze how order is brought to the simultaneously ordered and messy European language policy situation (Wright, 2004), what underlying values and ideologies are present, and what are the implications for language education policy. We view ‘ideologies’ in critical terms as mediators and legitimizers of existing hierarchies and power relations (Thompson, 1990; Chiapello & Fairclough, 2002). Values, in turn, are ideological systems which can be appealed to or invoked in order to achieve the desired effects (Fairclough, 2003; Bacchi, 2000).

Our data consist of four policy documents from the European Union and from Finland that deal with languages and (language) education (see Table 1). All the documents were published in 2007–8, and represent a particular societal situation. Multilingualism was given a separate portfolio in the European Commission for a three-year period from the beginning of 2007 under Leonard Orban; since the beginning of 2010 it has been amalgamated into the portfolio of Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth. In Finland, political discussion of multilingualism is less common, and it mainly concentrates on the official bilingualism and the wide range of foreign language provision. Both the European Union and Finnish documents reflect an attempt to balance the needs of both global and local (national) policies. These discourses create and support ideologies as mediators of power relations, as defined above.

There may be connections between the two sets of documents but here we are not investigating whether European documents influence Finnish ones, or whether there is any linear relationship between the supranational and national documents. Rather, we explore these policies side by side, to see how multilingualism is constructed in a supranational and national European context at the beginning of the 21st century, a period of time that, in the words of Heller and Duchêne (2007, p. 5) can be described as “one of consolidation of a globalized new economy based on services and information [--] but in which nation-states continue to play an important role”.

In policy documents, some policy views and problems are inevitably foregrounded, which simultaneously narrows the space for alternative views (see Ball, 1993, p. 15). Consequently, the documents also perpetuate particular political views of social reality (Muntigl, 2002), and ultimately exercise power. Apart from their explicit attempt to affect societal circumstances, policy documents also often serve as a source for other texts and thus, through processes of intertextuality and interdiscursivity (Blommaert, 2005), their power to influence both official and public opinion about multilingualism increases. The rationale for exploring policy documents arises from this power they have to affect both official policies and general opinions. As regards the image constructed of multilingualism in policy documents, it is a result of discursive power at play, as these discourses have historical, social and institutional implications (Foucault, 2002, p. 131). Hence, the documents are ‘archives’ of particular institutional practices or policies on multilingualism, and as such well worth investigating.

Table 1 offers an overview of the data. The documents differ in style and orientation. This means that to do full justice to them each one would have to be analyzed in its entirety. However, as this is not possible within the confines of a single chapter, we will only focus on those instances of policy texts that clearly have to do with *language(s)* either explicitly or by implication, since they can be regarded as key elements in the construction of meaning around multilingualism.

Table 1. The data

Document name	Description	Length
Document 1 (EU): Communication 2008. <i>Multilingualism: an asset for Europe and a shared commitment.</i>	The Communications of the Commission are proposed legislation and recommendations to the Council and member states rather than binding directives. Member states are, however, ‘invited’ to adopt actions proposed by the Commission. This particular Communication approaches multilingualism in general terms, not only in connection with education. The goal of policy is to ‘mainstream’ multilingualism into different EU policy areas.	15 printed pages, in English

<p>Document 2 (EU): High level Report 2007. <i>Final Report of the High Level Group on Multilingualism</i></p>	<p>As preparatory work for the strategy on multilingualism, the Commissar for Multilingualism appointed a High Level Group of 11 experts to discuss aspects of multilingualism in the European Union. The final report has no direct authority over multilingualism policies but gives general recommendations to the European Commission and to educational institutions. The document emphasizes the importance of a stronger foothold for multilingualism – or, to be precise, mainstreaming multilingualism – on the policy-making processes of the EU.</p>	<p>32 printed pages, in English</p>
<p>Document 3 (Finland): Development Plan 2008. <i>The development plan for education and research 2007–2012.</i></p>	<p>Development plans are central documents in Finnish education policy: they set the framework for education policies for each five year period that they cover. They also form a bridge between the more abstract goals of government programmes and the more practical, operationalized policy goals and actions in contracts between the Ministry of Education and educational institutions. This document covers the whole field of education, language education only comprising a small part of it.</p>	<p>61 printed pages, in Finnish</p>
<p>Document 4 (Finland): KIEPO 2007. <i>The central recommendations of the National Project on Finnish Language Education Policies (KIEPO).</i></p>	<p>The KIEPO project was funded by the Ministry of Education and the University of Jyväskylä and was set up to examine language education as widely as possible, with particular emphasis on language education as a continuum and on issues of lifelong learning. It had no direct authority or mandate over language education policies but several suggestions found their way into the Development Plan. While the present analysis focuses on the central recommendations with minimal explanation and background of the project, a wider</p>	<p>50 printed pages, in Finnish</p>

(500 page) final report is also available.

To ensure consistent treatment of each document we applied the same analytic grid to each, tracking ‘diversity’, ‘cohesion’ and ‘competitiveness’ in each one, all three representing crucial and recurrent aspects of the policy discourse. In practice, we sought to identify all explicit and implicit references to language(s) and the learning of languages, with particular attention to the following three dimensions: (i) is diversity implied, in either positive or negative terms?, (ii) how is social cohesion mentioned, in society at large or in smaller communities?, and (iii) are multiple languages (or a lack thereof) discussed in the light of the economy, competitiveness or advantages / disadvantages on an individual level or in the labour market? Our focus on diversity and cohesion is inspired, firstly, by a Durkheimian viewpoint (Durkheim, 1964), according to which the existence of societies is based on the co-existence of divisive and cohesive powers. The cohesion of pre-modern societies was brought about by what Durkheim calls ‘mechanical solidarity’; that is, unquestioned societal norms pressing members of society towards similarity. Modern societies, however, were characterized by ‘organic solidarity’; in other words, individuals with different characteristics and skills all having their place in the societal division of labour. In the Durkheimian sense, within ‘good’ diversity all individuals have to develop and maintain specialized skills and tasks in a society where the division of labour is highly advanced. In ‘bad’ diversity, on the other hand, this division of labour ceases to have a specialized role and begins to undermine societal ties instead of strengthening them. Secondly, diversity and cohesion have also been addressed in earlier studies on multilingualism, for instance by Milani (2007), who discusses these processes by drawing on Bakhtin’s (1981) ideas of ‘centrifugal’ and ‘centripetal’ voices; or by Horner (2009), who discusses language requirements as a ‘solution’ to the migration ‘problem’, viewing social cohesion as the dogma of homogeneity and diversity as a “European mosaic”.

The question of competitiveness in our analytical grid arises from those trends of globalization that largely see society in economic terms and competitiveness as a self-evident value (see Saarinen, 2008 on competitiveness as a built-in value of OECD and EU education policies). Our preliminary analysis of the documents showed that also knowledge of languages is presented as an individual and social asset and an economic commodity. ‘Competitiveness’ and language as a social commodity have also been discussed by Grin (2001) and da Silva, McLaughlin and Richards (2007).

Throughout, we also paid attention to the various ways in which languages are conceptualized in the documents and how these descriptions relate to each other. We were interested both in the different terms used to refer to the multiplicity of languages and whether any hierarchies are implied in the way these labels are used.

[A] THE EUROPEAN DIMENSION – UNITED IN DIVERSITY OR MANAGING DIVERSITY?

The two European policy documents which we analyzed show that multilingualism in Europe presents itself as both a central and a problematic issue (see Blommaert, Leppänen & Spotti, this volume). Different sources of tension can be recognized. Firstly, there is tension between societal and individual multilingualism. While multilingualism within the EU is a given due to the wide range of languages in the member states, at the level of the individual multilingualism is something that needs to be fostered and enhanced; current political aims are to make all EU citizens multilingual and to help them recognize and fully exploit the potential that multilingualism can offer in the different areas of their lives. The second type of tension has to do with the many different values attached to multilingualism. On the one hand, it is an asset that needs to be fostered as it can be of service both economically and culturally: multilingualism within the EU is seen as both an economic advantage and a valuable resource in fostering intercultural understanding and overcoming intercultural barriers. On the other hand, increasing multilingualism is also a problem that needs to be managed as it can at its worst threaten social cohesion within the EU. This problematic side of multilingualism reveals that there are, in fact, different types of multilingualism, both ‘good’ (visible and socially accepted) and ‘bad’ (invisible and undervalued) versions (cf. Hélot & de Mejía, 2008). As regards the three central dimensions of analysis introduced above – diversity, cohesion and competitiveness – they all become an issue but with different emphases. Diversity is the one that occupies the central position in the documents as something that can, in the Durkheimian sense, be either beneficial or detrimental to society. Diversity also appears as something that needs to be governed in order to ensure societal competitiveness. In the following, these observations will be discussed in more detail.

[B] From celebratory to managerial discourses

As stated above, diversity is linked to intercultural understanding and multiculturalism in both European documents. In such contexts, multilingualism and diversity clearly have a celebratory tone. For example, according to the High Level Group on Multilingualism from 2007 (henceforth High Level report), ‘Europeans’ are encouraged to learn other languages besides their mother tongue because languages open doors to other cultures and make people willing to interact with each other. In the Commission’s Communication Multilingualism: an asset for Europe and a shared commitment from 2008 (henceforth Commission’s Communication), the linguistic diversity brought by multilingualism is seen as something that can be “an asset for Europe”, as already suggested by the title of the document. Multilingualism is referred to as “the harmonious co-existence of many languages in Europe” and languages are seen as “part of a shared inheritance”. Moreover, the goal of the multilingual EU is to be “united in diversity”. The expressions used present linguistic diversity as something valuable that can become a ‘precious’ asset in enhancing intercultural

dialogue and social cohesion, in increasing people's life opportunities and in giving them access to different services.

While multilingualism is seen as something of benefit to all EU citizens, the documents also suggest that for this benefit to be realised, multilingualism needs to be approached in a certain way: it needs to be controlled and managed. For example, it is recognized that without an "appropriate multilingualism policy" multilingualism can create big "challenges", for example giving the multilingual an advantage over the monolingual and making communication between citizens and cooperation between the member states more difficult. Its absence can also reduce companies' competitiveness. Therefore the main objective is to overcome these challenges and enable everybody – at individual, national and European levels – to make the most of multilingualism. According to the Commission's Communication, multilingualism is also "a shared commitment" as the document suggests that every EU citizen has a responsibility to contribute towards making the EU even more multilingual and to take advantage of the existing opportunities, thus benefiting "European society as a whole". Multilingualism also has an important role in enhancing intercultural dialogue in the external relations of the EU.

The need to manage multilingualism becomes evident in the ways in which languages are described in the documents. The canonized description of the diverse linguistic landscape starts with the official languages of the EU, then goes on to regional and minority languages, and finally to migrant languages. Although not explicitly stated, this ordering seems to be based on an inbuilt hierarchical ranking of languages. Such hierarchies mostly derive from EU legislation but there seem to be cultural rankings, too. For example, multilingualism is described in the High Level report as a *demographic fact*: "An increasingly large number of people living in the Union are multilingual or even multiliterate because they (i) speak an autochthon regional or minority language in addition to the (major) national language, (ii) speak a migrant language in addition to the language of the host country, or (iii) grew up in mixed language families or other multilingual environments (the Erasmus phenomenon)." In addition to the usual jargon of EU legislation the High Level report also uses concepts like "Intra-European languages" or "major non-European world languages", which further suggests a need to manage and govern linguistic diversity by grouping and ranking languages.

In the Commission's Communication the diversity of languages in the EU is also demonstrated by a large repertoire of terms which effectively categorize languages into different subgroups. The scale goes from an individual perspective (e.g. mother tongue, own language, first language, second language, foreign language) via a local perspective (e.g. regional language, local language), to the national perspective (e.g. national language, host country language) to a more global and European (e.g. EU and non-EU language) or official perspective (e.g. official language, business language, the court's language) on languages, not forgetting the Commission's advisory group's (Maalouf, 2008) concept of a "personally adopted language". Thus, there seems to be a constant need to label languages and language users. Thus, these categories serve as instruments of governmentality: they are used to create order and hierarchies in the messy

reality of multilingual Europe. Figure 1 presents how languages are labelled in the documents, and suggests how they can be grouped from different points of view, in totality forming a scale where the emphases range from individual to global concerns.




Figure 1. Terms used to categorize languages

Diversity in the European documents thus gets concretized as a ‘shopping list’ of languages. By ‘shopping list’ we refer to the listing, labelling and categorizing of languages that creates the illusion of a linguistic situation that is controllable. This may have a dual purpose: firstly, it may serve as a form of consciousness-raising of the multiple linguistic realities. Secondly, while the listing of different languages may indeed highlight the need to promote ‘harmonious co-existence’ between them in society, the fact that languages are grouped into different categories also suggests that they have different statuses. As regards multilingualism, it seems to translate into the enumeration of different languages and their parallel co-existence, issues of hybridity and multiple identities brought about by multilingualism remaining in the shadows. This kind of listing, in other words, turns multilingualism into different categories of ‘EU-lingualism’, ‘minority lingualism’, ‘national lingualism’ and so on, which in turn disempowers actual multilingual practices, as they fit these categories poorly.

One exception to the overall hygienic discourse is the use of the term ‘mother tongue’ in the High Level group document. The mother tongue is mentioned in connection with both migrants and “members of the host society” (High Level 2007, p. 11), yet it is explicitly stated that mother tongue is no longer a valid concept: “it would probably be more appropriate to speak of people’s first language or even first languages, as the case may be” (High Level 2007, p. 6).

[B] Social cohesion and migrants as a problematic resource

Besides diversity, social cohesion is another important factor that gets mixed up in discussions about diversity and multilingualism, especially in settings where diversity needs to be managed. The High Level report emphasizes skills in a variety of languages and argues for multilingualism through diversity, but it also argues for social cohesion in European societies. In the report, multilingualism and social cohesion are mostly dealt with when discussing either migrant communities, integrating migrants into societies, or “the co-existence of different language communities”; in other words, cases which pose a potential threat to social cohesion. Diversity as potentially threatening social cohesion is also revealed by “members of the host society” being encouraged to learn migrant languages.

One general message conveyed by the Commission’s Communication seems to be that all languages in Europe are equal: no hierarchies between languages are explicitly presented. However, the listing, labelling and ranking of languages described above serves as an implicit indication that hierarchies do exist. Moreover, when later on in the document *valuing all languages* is at issue, it is also pointed out that due to increased migration and mobility, mastery of the ‘national language(s)’ is very important when an immigrant is integrating into a new home country, which implies that national languages have, in fact, more value than migrant languages. At the same time, however, there is awareness of the need to raise the status of different mother tongues and other languages which are used more informally. When the diversity of the EU is described, migrant languages are also mentioned – but only after the official EU languages and other

languages. The Commission's Communication also suggests that migrant children may be a problem for schools because the language of instruction is a second language for them. This, in turn, necessitates that teachers also acquire teaching skills in teaching their own language as a second or foreign language. In sum, the ideal presented in the document seems to be that, on the one hand, migrants need to learn the 'host-country language', but on the other hand 'their heritage or community languages' should be better taken into account. In other words, ideally the languages of both the host country and the migrants need to be respected. Apart from these references to migrants, however, migrants and their languages are not specifically a focus of attention in the Commission's Communication.

[B] Whose multilingualism is being talked about?

Diversity and social cohesion are often conveyed through references to *mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion*, us and them, especially in discussions of migrant languages and communities. For example, the High Level report states that "by giving value to migrant languages in *our* midst, *we* may well enhance migrants' motivation to learn the language of the host community, and – indeed – other languages, and enable *them* to become competent mediators between different cultures [emphases added]." The use of the *pronouns* 'we' and 'our' in this passage marks a clear boundary between us and them, as the pronouns are used authoritatively: 'we' have the power to give value to 'them', or to exclude 'them' as outsiders rather than include 'them' (see Íñigo-Mora, 2004 on the different uses of 'we' in communities).

One way of concretizing multilingualism is to discuss particular languages. In the High Level report, 11 languages are mentioned. It is worth noting that European languages are not among those mentioned, perhaps to maintain an image of equality between the official EU languages. Instead, the languages referred to are "major world languages", which in practice means non-European languages. It is, for example, argued that "there is a growing demand for major world languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese and Russian, which is currently not matched by provision." Many of these 'major world languages' are also migrant languages in Europe, but not referred to as such. The document seems to suggest that it is EU citizens who are required to learn these languages; the migrants' own multiple linguistic repertoires are not explicitly considered in discussing a broad range of language skills in formal education.

Thus multilingualism is mainly seen from the perspective of an EU citizen and the documents are written exclusively to allegedly authentic members of the European Union, rather than inclusively, encompassing a larger population. For example, in the Commission's Communication the aim is to describe how multilingualism can be utilized by an individual living in the EU. In the document the Barcelona objective (mother tongue plus two languages) is described as the goal that needs to be reached in order to realise all the opportunities that the linguistic diversity of Europe can offer. However, many 'citizens' do not yet have access to these advantages (e.g. monolinguals, school dropouts, senior citizens) and a lot of work needs to be done 'to raise awareness' about the advantages of linguistic diversity. On

the other hand, particularly multilingual EU citizens speaking many different languages are seen as extremely important because they can function as a link between people coming from different cultures.

[B] English – a special case

While the High Level report refers to a number of specific languages, in the Commission's Communication English is the only language actually mentioned by name, referred to on two occasions. The first reference is in connection with *competitiveness*. English is seen as the leading language in business, but it is emphasized that also knowing other languages is the real key to enhancing competitiveness and creating new business relations. English is mentioned for the second time in the context of lifelong learning. It is said that although many EU countries improved their language teaching between the late 1990s and 2005, as was recommended by the two previous Commission's Communications, it was mainly English that was taught more in primary and secondary education. More effort should therefore be directed towards learning other languages. All in all, English is acknowledged as the leading language in business and the most commonly taught language in schools in the member states, but the point is made that other languages are also very much needed as, for example, they give companies a major economic advantage, one that will "allow them to conquer new markets". The economic value of English thus seems to get highlighted even if, as Grin (2001) shows, the extent to which English in fact has, and will continue to have economic value is a highly complex issue. In the High Level report English has a more visible role: it is referred to on several occasions, and closer examination of the occurrences reveals that the report's relationship to English is riddled with tensions, which is not surprising given that the spread of English has recently been hotly debated the world over (see e.g. Phillipson, 2003; Graddoll, 2006; Pennycook, 2007). An obvious tension is visible in the High Level report when it recognizes the usefulness of English as an international lingua franca while at the same time expressing concern about the threat it poses to European multilingualism. This resembles Sergeant's (2008, p. 218) view that discourses on English often have "vacillated between two poles". To concretize this vacillation, the High Level report on the one hand posits that "English has been further gaining ground as a means of non-mediated intra-European and international communication" and "the fact that many people operating at a European level now have a good command of English is bound to have an effect on the demand for interpreting at European level". General proficiency in English is thus linked to economic gains. However, at the same time there are concerns relating to the threat that English poses for both multilingualism and the learning of a wide range of languages: the document strongly argues in favour of the learning of several languages and against this background such a big proportion of Europeans studying English is of course problematic. The fact that "many policy-makers and decision-makers – including parents – firmly believe that all that children at the beginning of the 21st century need to acquire is a good command of English" is also presented in the High Level report as undermining the European ideal of multilingualism. Thus it could be argued that while the

wide spread of English would in principle make it a practical tool for governing linguistic diversity in Europe, it is politically unsuitable as it does not fit into the ‘harmonious diversity’ image of Europe where all national languages are treated equally. This resonates with Wright’s (2000, p. 129–30) reasoning about why it “still remains in the realms of fantasy” that any single language ever would be imposed top-down as a shared language in Europe:

A *lingua franca*, particularly if it were to be English, would be perceived as a threat, carrying with it the distinct possibility of undermining other languages and cultures. Anglicisation might worry many Europeans as much – if not more – than the democratic deficit caused by the lack of a European community of communication.

In the European level documents, multilingualism thus poses itself as both a valuable asset and a challenge. The inherent value of multilingualism is recognized, but managing diversity to make it both economically and culturally advantageous to Europe presents itself as a problem. The most problematic aspect of multilingualism seems to be the one brought about by migration. However, no particular attention is paid to migrants in the documents, at the heart of which seems to lie an idealized notion of ‘European citizens’ which, effectively, excludes migrant populations. Moreover, both documents seem to treat individuals – both citizens and migrants – mainly as monolinguals with one ‘mother tongue’. This picture of multilingualism is what Heller (1999, p. 5) describes as “as a set of parallel monolingualisms, not a hybrid system. What is valued also is a mastery of a standard language, shared across boundaries and a marker of social status.” The role of English as a *lingua franca* is also problematic as its prevalence brings “injustice and inequality into the situation” (Wright, 2009, p. 111) and is seen to hamper rather than foster European multilingualism. In short, then, the European documents highlight the dissonance between inspirational and cautionary discourses on multilingualism: making diversity and social cohesion mutually compatible is not an easy task.

[A] THE FINNISH DIMENSION – PROTECTING NATIONAL INTERESTS AND REACHING OUT TO GLOBAL SPHERES

The Finnish policy documents under examination were produced at around the same time as the European documents – at the beginning of the new millennium – and language issues are a shared concern. However, the Finnish documents do not explicitly focus on multilingualism but are both documents on education. The Development Plan for Education and Research (henceforth the Development Plan) looks at education in its entirety; this analysis deals only with those parts where languages are relevant. In The Central Recommendations of the National Project on Finnish Language Education Policies – KIEPO (henceforth the KIEPO recommendations) the focus is specifically on language education. As shown above, the European documents responded to the diversity brought about by multilingualism with both celebratory and alarmist discourses. The Finnish documents show responses at a national level,

which have some similarities but also some different emphases. Firstly, the division into positive and problematic, or in Hélot's and de Mejía's (2008, p. 1) terms "visible and socially accepted" and "invisible and undervalued" forms of multilingualism is also borne out by the Finnish documents, with a clear division between Finnish nationals and migrant groups, and different requirements and expectations as regards languages for each. Whereas Finnish nationals are expected to attain wide language repertoires, migrants are faced with pressure to fit in and concentrate on acquiring the national language, Finnish. The documents also show that in the era of globalization the protection of national languages is as much an issue as promoting multilingualism. The documents suggest that in Finland reconciling the country's official bilingualism with the increasingly multilingual social reality is not an easy juggling act. There seems to be a fear, if not explicitly stated at least implied, that the growing multilingualism brought about by super-diversity will threaten and undermine the national languages which, consequently, need to be supported and protected. The policy documents that we studied can be seen as a type of supportive act as they attempt to spell out the characteristics of Finnish (language) education, in the process making clear the special status of Finnish and Swedish as national languages, placing them at the top of the language hierarchy. In the process, the increasingly multilingual reality of Finland gets little attention and the speakers of 'other languages' – a total of 190,538 people in 2008 according to Statistics Finland (2011), with speakers of Russian (ca 47,000 speakers), Estonian (ca 22,000), English (ca 12,000) and Somali (ca 10,000) as the biggest groups, followed by Arabic, Chinese, Kurdish and Albanian, all with 5000–10,000 speakers, and various other languages with less than 5000 speakers apiece – remain largely invisible.

[B] Janus-faced diversity

As pointed out above, language diversity is a concern in both Finnish documents: there are obvious tensions between 'good' and 'bad' diversity (cf. Hélot & de Mejía, 2008). This tension is particularly clear in the Development Plan, which depicts diversity as both desirable and threatening. Diversity is constructed as desirable when the speakers of heritage languages (Sámi, Roma) are mentioned and described as minority groups whose 'protection' requires that their access to their heritage language and the possibility of maintaining their language and the associated culture must be ensured – in addition to maintaining the two national languages. More often, however, desirable diversity in the Development Plan is associated with developing school curricula that offer the mainstream population better chances to study a broad selection of foreign languages. Rather than being seen as threatening, this kind of multilingualism is depicted as valuable, an important asset that will help the nation cope in an increasingly international world. Connecting skills in many languages to internationalization shows, for example, in the arguments that in general "international competence rests on good and diverse linguistic skills" and that students and staff in higher education in particular need to be "provided with sufficient linguistic skills for international cooperation in studies and working life". In other words, while questions of cultural identity emerge in the multilingualism of

minority groups, the multilingualism of the mainstream population is seen in more instrumental terms as a useful tool needed in the increasingly international working life. By implication, an ideal Finnish citizen of the future will thus be a mobile worker proficient in several languages. Which languages exactly constitute this desired multilingualism that will help Finns to operate in the global sphere is left open: the Development Plan refrains from mentioning any specific foreign languages in this connection. Instead, there are general calls for more varied language programmes in schools, and for encouraging the study of ‘rare’ or ‘less studied’ foreign languages, that is, by implication, others than the most widely studied foreign language, English. However, general discourses around language education in Finland show that knowing various languages is usually conceptualized as skills in German, French and Russian in particular, in addition to English and Swedish (e.g. Pöyhönen, 2009; Nikula et al., 2010).

These discourses of multilingualism as desirable are counterbalanced in the Development Plan by discourses addressing the problematic nature of increasing diversity. These discourses revolve around immigrant groups in particular and the challenge that increasingly diverse student populations pose in education. The emphasis lies on providing students from immigrant backgrounds with an education which will guarantee ‘sufficient’ skills in Finnish or in Swedish; what counts as sufficient is not dealt with in the documents, which of course leaves considerable leeway for organizers of education to interpret this requirement as they see fit (see also Suni & Latomaa, this volume). What also emerges clearly is that knowledge of the national languages is seen as a prerequisite for the immigrants’ full functioning in society. For example, it is unequivocally stated that “Good Finnish or Swedish language skills are prerequisites for integration into Finnish society, success in studies and employment”. Although the immigrants’ right to maintain and develop their own languages is also mentioned, the main concern in the Development Plan is how these groups can adapt to Finnish society; the impression is that the linguistic diversity brought about by immigrant groups needs to be subdued rather than encouraged in order to maintain social cohesion. Cohesion thus seems to be the motivating force when discussing the language situation of immigrants. Interestingly, studying foreign languages is not mentioned at all in connection with immigrants; their multilingualism beyond their mother tongue and one of the national languages of Finland does not seem to be an aim. It is also worth noting that when immigrants’ education is discussed there is no mention of what their specific languages are nor, indeed, is the label ‘immigrant languages’ used; their various languages thus do not seem to be considered an asset.

The KIEPO recommendations see one of the aims of language education being to enhance and develop multilingualism at both the individual and the social level. Because an overarching aim of the document is to affect political decision making by showing how foreign language education in Finland could be made more varied, diversity in this context is seen as desirable, something required for example by “the increasingly technological and global world” and in most “professions in the knowledge society” (cf. Durkheim, 1964 and the division of labour as a cohesive mechanism in society). Because the KIEPO document specifically deals

with the provision of foreign languages and mother tongues in education, and because it makes recommendations for decision makers in the realm of language education, it operates on a more practical level than the Development Plan. It specifies a number of languages that would contribute to the diversification of Finns' language repertoires: apart from the national languages, Finnish and Swedish, and the most frequently studied foreign language English, it is hoped that more students will in the future study German, French, and Russian in particular, that is, European languages that have a long history as school subjects in Finland but that are not studied as extensively as before. However, Spanish, Chinese, Japanese and Arabic are also mentioned as languages for whose users there will probably be an increasing demand in the globalized labour market.

As regards immigrants, their mother tongues are not specified in the KIEPO recommendations, either. However, more attention than in the Development Plan is paid to the question of how best to establish the teaching of immigrants' native languages in Finnish schools; immigrants' mother tongues are also mentioned as a factor that diversifies the multilingual resources in the country (see also Suni & Latomaa, this volume). In short, then, diversity does not appear as tension-ridden in the KIEPO recommendations as in the Development Plan, which can be seen as evidence of parallel discourses around multilingualism in Finland. On the one hand, there are discursive positions that seem to undermine the multilingualism brought about by immigration, while, on the other hand, there are voices that acknowledge immigrant languages as a useful resource. These somewhat conflicting views seem to reflect on the apparent political confusion regarding attitudes towards immigration in general.

[B] Discourses constructing nation-state interests

As pointed out above, the Development Plan does not specify which foreign languages belong to the desired "broader array of languages" that Finns ought to master in the future. Instead, there are references throughout the document to the two national languages, Finnish and Swedish. This happens particularly often when the Development Plan is dealing with education for students with immigrant backgrounds: the necessity for them to study either Finnish or Swedish is reiterated several times, as well as the need for 'sufficient' skills in these two languages. That this is done in the spirit of creating social cohesion in the nation-state and advocating the monolingual norm rather than multilingualism is not only implied but also explicitly stated: as already pointed out above, knowledge of the national languages is constructed as a prerequisite for adapting into society and for helping immigrants find work (see Milani, 2007 for similar developments in Sweden and Horner, 2009 for a critical perspective on EU policies). There thus seems to be a strong belief (as is shown also in other chapters in this volume) in the interconnection between national languages and the nation-state, with other languages forming a threat to social cohesion. The emphasis on the importance of national languages is accompanied by apparent reluctance to discuss immigrant languages in any detail: using all-encompassing references such as 'students with immigrant backgrounds' is a way to downplay the linguistic heterogeneity within this group, to create a false

sense of unity rather than opening up the inherent diversity involved (see also Suni & Latomaa, this volume). Thus what Moyer and Martin Rojo (2007, p. 145) say about the status of immigrant languages in Spain also applies to Finland: “Rather than considering them an asset, these languages are treated as an obstacle to integration.”

The two national languages are, however, discussed not only in relation to immigrant groups. What is also at issue is the problematic relationship between Finnish and Swedish as national languages (see also Salo, this volume). Given that speakers of Finnish clearly outnumber those of Swedish, a language hierarchy seems to be at play, evident in the protectionist discourse related to Swedish. While education in the Development Plan is mostly dealt with in general terms, there are several references to ‘education in Swedish’ and to the special conditions or requirements relating to it (e.g. “in terms of sectors of education, the need for Swedish-language adult education and training is estimated to be slightly above average in polytechnics and universities”). However, there are no similar references to ‘education in Finnish’, which implies that Finnish is the ‘unmarked’ choice in education. Furthermore, there are formulations with protectionist undertones which express the need to ‘secure’ possibilities for education in Swedish (e.g. “the position of special needs education in Swedish will be secured; the possibilities for Swedish-speaking students to study in their own language will be secured at the current level”). If something needs to be secured it is under threat; Swedish, then, is constructed as less powerful than Finnish and as needing protection.

The emphasis on the two national languages means that multilingualism is mainly dealt with in the Development Plan from the viewpoint of Finland’s official bilingualism; “to strengthen Finland’s bilingualism and general competence in both national languages” is indeed explicitly stated as an aim. This national focus means that the international and global forces and developments leading to increasing multilingualism are not really taken into serious consideration in the Development Plan. Instead, the gaze is directed inwards to Finland’s official bilingualism in ways that assume close correspondence between the two languages and their groups of speakers and disregards the presence of more varied multilingualism and multilingual practices, more difficult to deal with than one language one group constellations. In the words of Moyer and Martin Rojo (2007, p. 156), the willingness to be preoccupied by the existing form of bilingualism can also be interpreted as “the domination of hegemonic, hiding any trace of difference”.

As regards the KIEPO recommendations, its major concern is how to broaden foreign language education in Finland, which is why the overall ethos is more oriented to promoting wider language repertoires than in the Development Plan. However, as with the Development Plan, when immigrant students and their language education are discussed, the importance of the national languages is made clear, Finnish as a second language in particular. The role of immigrants’ own mother tongues is also acknowledged, however. That is, while the document recognizes that integration will be easier with knowledge of Finnish or Swedish, the immigrants’ own languages are not ignored. However, the special role of the Swedish language in Finland is also visible in the KIEPO recommendations,

albeit in a different way when compared to the Development Plan. There are no declarations about the need to uphold the Swedish language, but it is noteworthy how the use of the term ‘toinen kotimainen’ (‘the other national language’) is almost invariably used with reference to Swedish, either explicitly as in “The learning outcomes of the second national language (Swedish) are weak” or more implicitly for example when reference is made to “immersion education in a second language”, which in the Finnish context almost invariably refers to immersion in Swedish. In other words, although protectionist discourses directed at Swedish do not emerge in the same way as in the Development Plan, there are more subtle references which suggest that the position of Swedish in Finland is a politically sensitive topic (see also Salo, this volume; Nikula et al., 2010).

It was pointed out above that the diversity resulting from multilingualism is constructed as less of a threat in the KIEPO recommendations than in the Development Plan. That this diversity is, nevertheless, first and foremost constructed as a national concern is suggested by the frequent use of the metaphorical concept “language skill reserves” (Finnish ‘varanto’ meaning ‘reserve’, as in ‘gold reserve’), much like natural resources, throughout the document. Usually this concept co-occurs in constructions such as “Finland’s language skill reserves” or “the language skills reserves of the country”, which are presented as having increased over time but as now facing the threat of decline. While probably an intertextual echo from other policy texts, the concept is interesting in the way it depicts multilingualism as a valuable resource for the nation in the era of globalization and internationalization. There is thus an obvious link to competitiveness, even though the KIEPO recommendations explicitly mention competitiveness only once, when the following question is posed: “What will happen to Finland’s international competitiveness if the country does not have enough people who know Spanish, Chinese, Japanese or Arabic?” The suggestion thus seems to be that these more rarely studied and from the Finnish perspective exotic languages would give Finland an even more competitive edge than the more usual foreign languages such as English.

Also in the Finnish documents, then, the tension-ridden attitude towards super-diversity becomes evident. Interestingly, when multilingualism is discussed in celebratory terms, the viewpoint is usually that of a multilingual individual, whereas increasing multilingualism in society is less of an issue. Furthermore, due to the nation-state perspective of the documents, the national languages have a prominent role: the position of Finnish and Swedish as necessary components of multilingualism in Finland is made clear. In sum, the documents point towards layered discourses around multilingualism. Firstly, Finnish citizens are expected to have a command of both national languages. Secondly, multilingualism in the form of additional foreign languages is a valuable asset in competitive international markets, especially for Finnish citizens. Thirdly, the existence of migrant groups is recognized, but their multilingualism tends to be depicted as a problem rather than as a resource. These parallel and at times conflicting discourses on multilingualism indicate that the increasing diversity of language resources in Finland is far from a resolved issue.

[A] CONCLUSIONS – BRINGING ORDER TO DISORDER

The policy documents we have analyzed are, essentially, ideological conceptualizations of the many languages and the societies in which these languages are counted, grouped and ordered (e.g. Blommaert, 1999; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007; Heller, 2007). Especially the European documents explicitly celebrate late modern, hybrid forms of multilingualism, but a high modern view of ‘monolingual multilingualism’ emerges implicitly, painting a different kind of picture in the supranational and especially in the national level documents. By ‘monolingual multilingualism’ we refer to the representation of languages as hierarchical entities of *our, national, foreign* and so on, which implies that languages are learned and used separately, each in their own sphere (see also Heller, 1999). In fact, there seems to be little evidence in the European and even less in the Finnish policy documents studied of a recognition of the multilingual everyday realities of individuals (see e.g. Blommaert, Collins & Slembrouck, 2005; Rampton, 2006; Martin-Jones, 2007). It seems that while societies are becoming linguistically more hybrid (Vertovec, 2006), policy documents still see multilingualism as a modern concern, and, in the Finnish case, as still mainly a national concern.

That a hierarchical ordering of languages is used to govern the incoherent multilingual realities shows in our analysis in the thirty-something ways of characterizing different languages in the European documents. It is at the same time both an indication of an explicit attempt to acknowledge the everyday multilingual reality and an implicit hierarchisation of the said languages and their speakers. We agree with the observation by Heller and Duchêne (2007, p. 6) that multilingualism is largely about the “management of diversity within the framework of the opportunities and dangers presented by the globalized new economy”. Even the references to ‘celebratory multilingualism’, that is, multilingualism as a positive resource for society and the individual, are presented in a monolingual manner, as *national languages* and *mother tongues* take precedence over *non-Community languages, immigrant languages* or *foreign languages*. This hierarchisation downplays ‘diversity’ as hybrid, and suggests a linear, essentialist view of languages, which, in turn, is strongly reflected on the national level in views on languages and, consequently, on language education. The ordering of the disarray of languages serves to promote an ordered, ‘monolingual’, high modern kind of understanding of multilingualism over the hybrid multilingualism of the post-modern. All this – construing order in disorder, representing languages and multilingualism hierarchically, producing different identity categories and thus bringing about social order – has societal impacts. As Rose (1996, p. 42) points out, discussing its effects, governmental rationality works towards establishing “divisions between the proper spheres of action of different types of authority”. The particular kind of governmentality apparent in the documents produces policies in which a certain kind of multilingualism is more valuable than others, both for society and the individual. Multilingualism as the knowledge of *European national languages* may produce more cultural, social and economic capital (Bourdieu, 1986) and it may fuel prestigious social trajectories.

Multilingualism as the knowledge of *other* languages or *immigrant languages*, on the other hand – when they are not made totally invisible – seems to create a need for remedial language education of *the national languages*, as we witness in Finnish language education policy.

While the implicit need to govern diversity and disorder appears in both the supranational and national level documents, there are also differences between these documents. At the European level, ‘diversity’ seems to be subordinate to aspects of cohesion and competitiveness; in other words, diversity is needed to enhance (global economic) competence and intercultural dialogue (which is needed to promote the said competitiveness). Diversity is presented from the viewpoint of expected benefits (to both the individual and society). As far as language education is concerned, it is interesting that the High Level report seems to blame schools for the failure of successful multilingualism, implying that multilingualism is about ‘learning languages’.

In the Finnish documents, on the other hand, two kinds of understandings of multilingualism emerge. The ‘socially accepted’ form of ‘official bilingualism’ is evident in discussions on language education for immigrants and their socialization into Finnish society, whereas the multilingualism brought about by immigrants is invisible and, implicitly, undervalued. Especially the Development Plan takes a very cautious stand on multilingualism. However, tensions are also revealed: it seems that multilingualism deriving from immigration is something that needs to be managed to achieve social cohesion, and there are also attempts to downplay the diversity inherent in multilingualism (cf. lumping together numerous languages and cultural backgrounds under the label of “students with immigrant backgrounds”). Our analysis thus resonates with Milani’s (2007, p. 187) analysis of the Swedish language policy document *Mål i Mun*:

Two language ideologies tied to the nation-state seem to be at work here: (1) the ideology of multilingualism, according to which language diversity is a positive societal phenomenon, which needs to be supported; and (2) the ideology of social cohesion, according to which social cohesion is the foundation of civil society and is achieved by means of one common language (Swedish), which therefore needs to be preserved.

Finally, it is worth considering what kind of challenges the various discourses on multilingualism evident in the European and Finnish policy documents might pose for foreign language education (cf. Nikula, 2009), a concern that is largely left untouched in the documents analyzed. While the need to adopt anti-essentialized views of languages and multilingualism that recognize hybridity and the fluidity of boundaries has recently gained ground in research (e.g. Woolard, 1999; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007; Heller & Duchêne, 2007), the question of how such views could be taken into account in language teaching has not been explored to the same extent. Blommaert (2010) argues that language competences in the world of globalization ought best to be perceived in terms of people having ‘truncated repertoires’, composed of specialized but partially and unevenly developed resources, but how the idea of truncated repertoires could be incorporated into discourses on and practices of language education remains an unresolved issue.

Canagarajah (2007) is among the few who have outlined the possible implications for language teaching if we accepted that languages are not discrete codes with strict rights and wrongs, and that people in multilingual encounters are likely to cross the imagined boundaries of languages and to use whatever resources they find useful to accomplish their intended social actions. He (2007, p. 238) suggests that language teaching should orientate students to sociolinguistic and psychological resources with which to cope in multilingual realities, which, in turn, would mean that “we have to move away from an obsession with correctness” in order to help students “shuttle *between* communities, and not to think of only joining *a* community.” Kelly (2009, p. 15) is along the same lines when discussing language education in the age of growing diversity, arguing that ‘target language’ pedagogies are no longer sufficient. While language education has not been problematized much in the documents analyzed, it is inevitable that super-diversity will also have its impact on language education as the national core curricula are renewed in the near future. The impact should be research-driven and informed by meaningful connections between macro-level policies and local practices.

[A] THE DATA

Communication 2008. *Multilingualism: an asset for Europe and a shared commitment. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions*. Brussels, 18 September 2008, COM (2008) 566 final.

High Level 2007. *High Level Group on Multilingualism*. Final report. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
Development plan 2008. *The development plan for Education and research 2007–2012*. Adopted by the Government 5 December 2007. Helsinki: Ministry of Education.

KIEPO 2007. Luukka, M.-R. and S. Pöyhönen: *Kielikoulutuspoliittisen projektin keskeiset suositukset [The central recommendations of the National Project on Finnish Language Education Policies (KIEPO)]*. University of Jyväskylä: Centre for Applied Language Studies.

[A] REFERENCES

Bacchi, C. (2000) Policy as discourse: what does it mean? Where does it get us? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 21(1), pp. 45–57.

Bailey, B. (2007) Heteroglossia and boundaries. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 257–274.

Ball, S. (1993) What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse*, 13(2), pp. 10–7.

- Bleiklie, I. and M. Kogan (2000) Comparison and theories. In M. Kogan, M. Bauer, I. Bleiklie and M. Henkel (eds) *Transforming Higher Education. A Comparative Study*. London: Jessica Kingsley, pp. 11–34.
- Blommaert, J. (2005) *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2010) *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (ed.) (1999) *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blommaert, J., J. Collins and S. Slembrouck (2005) Spaces of multilingualism. *Language & Communication*, 25(3), pp. 197–216.
- Blommaert, J. and J. Verschueren (1998) *Debating Diversity. Analysing the Discourse of Tolerance*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) The forms of capital. In J.G. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Translated by R. Nice. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2007) After disinvention. Possibilities for communication, community and competence. In S. Makoni and A. Pennycook (eds) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 233–9.
- Chiapello, E. and N. Fairclough (2002) Understanding the new management ideology: a transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism. *Discourse & Society*, 13(2), pp. 185–208.
- Conama, J.B. (2009) *Signed languages; What we should do with them in the policy context?* Paper presented at Language Policy and Language Learning: New Paradigms and New Challenges, University of Limerick, Ireland, 18 June 2009.
- da Silva, E., M. McLaughlin and M. Richards (2007) Bilingualism and the globalized new economy: the commodification of language and identity. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 183–206.
- Durkheim, E. (1964) *The Division of Labor in Society* [*De la division du travail social: étude sur l'organisation des sociétés supérieures*]. Translated by G. Simpson; original published in 1893. New York: Free Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analysing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Finnish Constitution (1999) *Finnish Constitution 1999 / 731*. Finlex database. [Online.] Available at: <<http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/1999/19990731>>, date accessed 11 January 2010.
- Foucault, M. (1991) Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect. Studies in Governmentality*. Revised by C. Gordon. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 87–104.
- Foucault, M. (2002) *An Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A.M. Sheridan Smith; originally published in English in 1972. London: Routledge Classics.
- Foucault, M. (2003) *Abnormal. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974–1975*. Translated by G. Burchell. New York: Picador.
- Graddoll, D. (2006) *English Next: Why Global English May Mean the End of 'English as a Foreign Language'*. London: British Council.

- Grin, F. (2001) English as economic value: facts and fallacies. *World Englishes*, 20(1), pp. 65–78.
- Hélot, C. and A.-M. de Mejía (2008) Introduction: different spaces – different languages. Integrated perspectives on bilingual education in majority and minority settings. In C. Hélot and A.-M. de Mejía (eds) *Forging Multilingual Spaces. Integrated Perspectives on Majority and Minority Bilingual Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 1–30.
- Heller, M. (2007) Bilingualism: as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1–22.
- Heller, M. (1999) *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity. A Sociolinguistic Ethnography*. London: Longman.
- Heller, M. and M. Martin-Jones (2001) Introduction: symbolic domination, education and linguistic difference. In M. Heller and M. Martin-Jones (eds) *Voices of Authority: Education and Linguistic Difference*. Westport: Ablex, pp. 1–28.
- Heller, M. and A. Duchêne (eds) (2007) *Discourses of Endangerment*. London: Continuum.
- Horner, K. (2009) Language, citizenship and Europeanization. Unpacking the discourse of integration. In G. Hogan-Brun, C. Mar-Molinero and P. Stevenson (eds) *Discourses on Language and Integration*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 109–28.
- Íñigo-Mora, I. (2004) On the use of the personal pronoun *we* in communities. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3(1), pp. 27–52.
- Kelly, M. (2009) A third space for Europe: intercultural communication in European language policy. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 1(1), pp. 1–20.
- Latomaa, S. and P. Nuolijärvi (2005) The language situation in Finland. In R.B. Kaplan and R.B. Baldauf Jr. (eds) *Language Planning and Policy. Europe, Vol. 1. Finland, Hungary and Sweden*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 125–232.
- Leppänen, S., A. Pitkänen-Huhta, T. Nikula, S. Kytölä, T. Törmäkangas, K. Nissinen, L. Kääntä, T. Räisänen, M. Laitinen, P. Pahta, H. Koskela, S. Lähdesmäki & H. Jousmäki (2011) *National Survey on the English Language in Finland: Uses, Meanings and Attitudes*. Helsinki: Research Unit for Variation, Contacts and Change in English. [Online.] Available at <<http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/05>>, date accessed 2 September 2011.
- Maalouf, A., J. Limbach, S. Pralong, S. Agnello Hornby, D. Green, E. Lourenço, J. de Decker, J. Sokol, J.C. Grøndahl and T. Ben Jelloun (2008) *A Rewarding Challenge. How the Multiplicity of Languages Could Strengthen Europe*. Proposals from the Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue set up at the initiative of the European Commission. Brussels: European Commission.
- Makoni, S. and A. Pennycook (2007) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Makoni, S. and P. Mashiri (2007) Critical historiography: does language planning in Africa need a construct of language as part of its theoretical apparatus? In S. Makoni and A. Pennycook (eds) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 62–89.

- Martin-Jones, M. (2007) Bilingualism, education and the regulation of access to language resources. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 161–82.
- Milani, T.M. (2007) Voices of endangerment: a language ideological debate on the Swedish language. In M. Heller and A. Duchêne (eds) *Discourses of Endangerment*. London: Continuum, pp. 169–96.
- Moyer, M. and L. Martin Rojo (2007) Language, migration and citizenship: new challenges in the regulation of bilingualism. In M. Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 137–60.
- Muntigl, P. (2002) Policy, politics and social control: a systemic functional linguistic analysis of EU employment policy. *Text*, 22(3), pp. 393–441.
- Nikula, T. (2009) *Multilingualism – A Challenge for Language Education*. Plenary lecture at Kielikeskuspäivät [Language Centre Days], University of Turku, Finland, 18–19 May 2009.
- Nikula, T., S. Pöyhönen, A. Huhta and R. Hildén (2010) When MT + 2 is not enough: tensions within foreign language education in Finland. In U. Ammon, J. Darquennes and S. Wright (eds) *Foreign Languages in the Schools of the European Union, Sociolinguistica Yearbook 2010*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 25–42.
- Pennycook, A. (2007) The myth of English as an international language. In A. Pennycook and S. Makoni (eds) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 90–115.
- Phillipson, R. (2003) *English-only Europe? Challenging Language Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Pöyhönen, S. (2009) Foreign language teaching in basic and secondary education in Finland: current situation and future challenges. In S. Lucietto (ed.) *Plurilinguismo e innovazione di sistema. Sfide e ricerche curricolari in ambito nazionale e internazionale*. Provincia Autonoma di Trento: IPRASE del Trentino, pp. 143–74. [Online.] Available at: <http://www.iprase.tn.it/prodotti/materiali_di_lavoro/alis2008/download/Alis_2008.pdf>, date accessed 8 November 2010.
- Rampton, B. (2006) *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, N. (1996) Governing “advanced” liberal democracies. In A. Barry, T. Osborne and N. Rose (eds) *Foucault and Political Reason. Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and Rationalities of Government*. London: University College London Press.
- Rose, N. (1999) *Powers for Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saarinen, T. (2008) Persuasive presuppositions in OECD and EU higher education policy documents. *Discourse Studies*, 10(3), pp. 341–59.
- Sergeant, P. (2008) Language, ideology and ‘English within a globalized context’. *World Englishes*, 27(2), pp. 217–32.
- Tarnanen, M. and A. Huhta (2008) Interaction of language policy and assessment in Finland. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 9(3), pp. 262–81.
- Statistics Finland (2011) *Statistics on Population Structure*. [Online.] Available at

<http://pxweb2.stat.fi/database/StatFin/vrm/vaerak/vaerak_en.asp>, date accessed 2 September 2011.

Thompson, J. (1990) *Ideology and Modern Culture. Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Vertovec, S. (2006) The emergence of super-diversity in Britain. *Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, Working Paper No. 25*. Oxford: University of Oxford.

Woolard, K. (1999) Simultaneity and bivalency as strategies in bilingualism. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 8(1), pp. 3–29.

Wright, S. (2000) *Community and Communication: The Role of Language in Nation State Building and European Integration*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Wright, S. (2004) *Language Policy and Language Planning. From Nationalism to Globalisation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wright, S. (2009) The elephant in the room: language issues in the European Union. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 1(2), pp. 93–119.

