

**I for one welcome our plurilingual overlords: a Critical Discourse Analysis of the values and ideologies connected with plurilingualism in the policy document *From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*.**

**Master's thesis  
Paavo Pihavaara**

University of Jyväskylä  
Department of Languages  
English  
October 2015



## ABSTRACT

Tiedekunta –Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Paavo Ilmari Pihavaara	
Työn nimi – Title I for one welcome our plurilingual overlords: a Critical Discourse Analysis of the values embedded in the concept of plurilingualism in the policy document <i>From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe</i> .	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Kesäkuu 2015	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 92 sivua
Tiivistelmä – Abstract Monikielisyys eli plurilingualismi on 1970-luvulta asti nousussa ollut ideologia kielten opetuksessa, ja varsinkin viime aikoina se on noussut yhä enemmän etualalle Euroopan Unionissa. Monikielisyys on päässyt näkyvämmälle asemalle Unionin johtavana periaatteena kielten opetuksessa, ja yhtenä taustatoimijana tämän kehityksen taustalla on Euroopan neuvosto, joka on myös julkaissut tässä tutkimuksessa tarkasteltavat tekstit.  Tämän tutkielman tavoitteena on luoda syvempi katsaus niihin ideologioihin ja arvoihin jotka vaikuttavat monikielisuuden periaatteeseen eurooppalaisessa kielen opetuksessa. Tutkielman materiaalina on Euroopan neuvoston (Council of Europe) vuonna 2007 julkaisema <i>From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe</i> ja sen mukana julkaistut 22 sitä tukevaa tutkimusta. Metodina on käytetty pääasiassa kriittistä diskurssianalyysiä ja sen piirissä varsin keskeistä Faircloughin kolmiosaista analyysimetodia. Keskeisiä käsitteitä ovat kieli-ideologia ja valta, joita on tutkittu kriittisen diskurssianalyysin näkökulmasta, erityisesti kuten Fairclough ja myöhemmistä kirjoittajista Blommaert ovat ne määritelleet.  Työn tuloksena selvisi että monikielisuuden periaatteet ja ideologia pohjautuvat melko vahvasti yleisiin länsimaisiin vapauden ja kansalaisoikeuksien periaatteisiin, mutta myös varsinkin englannin kielen ylivallan pysäyttämiseen ja vastustamiseen. Kielten laaja opetus nähdään varsinkin keinona lisätä kansalaisten suvaitsevaisuutta, sekä myös yrityksenä luoda yhtenäisyyttä Euroopan Unionin poliittisen kokonaisuuden sisällä. Myös taloudellisten näkökulmien ja realiteettien vaikutus päätöksiin kielen opetuksessa oli huomattavasti laajempaa kuin olisi voinut arvata etukäteen.	
Asiasanat – Keywords Language education policy, language ideology, plurilingualism, multilingualism, European Union, Critical Discourse Analysis	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository Kielten laitos, JYX	



# Table of contents

1 Introduction .....	7
2 Critical Discourse Analysis .....	14
2.1 Discourse, context and intertextuality .....	18
2.2 Power and hegemony .....	23
2.3 Ideology .....	28
2.4 Critique to CDA and additional viewpoints.....	31
2.5 Previous research.....	36
3 Methodology.....	39
3.1 Research questions .....	39
3.2 Data.....	40
3.3 Analytical Method .....	41
4. Analysis of different aspects of plurilingualism in the Guide .....	44
4.1 Plurilingualism and English.....	49
4.2 Problems and opponents of plurilingualism .....	71
4.3 Advantages and benefits of plurilingualism.....	87
4.4 Plurilingualism in education .....	94
4.5 Plurilingualism and economics .....	101
4.6 Protection, politics and other small themes .....	106
5. Discussion and conclusion.....	111
Bibliography .....	118



## 1 Introduction

As a future teacher of languages, education policy decisions are very relevant to me personally. Nevertheless, they are also relevant on a larger scale when looking at the current developments in Europe, especially the tendencies for greater economic, cultural and political integration. For example the language questions can rise in the European Parliament, when discussing the costs and benefits of each member being able to discuss in their native language. The actual costs of translation have come up more than once already. In addition, while the economic integration is mainly headed with removing barriers of trade, a common language can act as a sort of bridge between members. Embracing pluralism in languages could be the glue that could hold this diverse Union closer together, or also another flashpoint where disagreements come to the forefront. How we deal with the plurality of languages will show a great deal about what kind of Union we are building.

The purpose of the present study is to look at the language education policies regarding multilingualism coming from the Council of Europe through a series of academic texts published in 2007, to discover if there are common themes or ideologies. The main source will be the supporting studies for the *From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*, but the preface for the Guide is also included. For the present study, I will refer to it as simply the Guide. The focus will be to discover what kind of power relations exist in the ideologies behind these policies, and to look at how far the unification of Europe has come in the educational sphere. According to Blommaert et al.(2012:1), the EU has begun to champion the idea of multilingualism in recent years, while previously it was

only taken seriously by sociolinguists when the concept was first invented in the 1960s. It is obvious that unification through a single language is not possible in Europe since national languages are well entrenched and strong, thus multilingualism seems a better alternative. However, Blommaert et al. (ibid.) caution against seeing multilingualism as a system with only benefits and no drawbacks. In addition, much of what multilingualism is about is in direct opposition to language policies that have been used by nation states for a long time before, and it would be safe to assume that implementation of multilingualism from the supranational level would be opposed on the national level. In the present study another starting point is that, as argued by Cooper (1989), that language planning is never done purely for linguistic reasons, but for social, political, economical or other ones. These other reasons are, to me, much more interesting than just pure linguistics that is detached from the society. In the context of the present study the project of European unification through EU, and how the current linguistic policies reflect and mold this ongoing development are of the essence.

The present study focuses specifically on how multilingualism or plurilingualism is presented in social scientific texts compiled in the Guide published by the European Council. According to the Guide on page 17 in Chapter 1, plurilingualism has a dual meaning as a competence and as a value.

The intrinsic capacity of all speakers to use and learn, alone or through teaching, more than one language. The ability to use several languages to varying degrees and for distinct purposes... The goal of teaching is to develop this competence (hence the expression: *plurilingualism as a competence*).

An educational value that is the basis of linguistic tolerance, in other words, positive acceptance of diversity: speakers' awareness of their plurilingualism may lead them to give equal value to each of



the varieties they themselves and other speakers use, even if they do not have the same functions (private, professional or official communication, language of affiliation, etc.). But this awareness should be assisted and structured by the language of schooling since it is no sense automatic (hence the expression: *plurilingualism as a value*).

Here in the Guide multilingualism is defined more briefly simply as the existence of several languages in any given space. Here we can see how in this context the term plurilingualism is already an ideologically loaded one. However, in the supporting studies and other literature the term multilingualism is much more widely used, and it can be assumed, at least partly with the same ideological load as plurilingualism in the Guide. This can cause some problems, which is why I have decided to use the two terms interchangeably in the present study, and assume that unless specifically stated they both refer to the more ideologically loaded term of plurilingualism.

The 22 analysed texts are all studies about different aspects of multilingualism and how it relates to education policy, and they were all published online along with the Guide with the explicit intention of supporting it. These studies are from countries within and outside EU, and it must be remembered that each discusses multilingualism in a local context. According to Abélès (quoted in Wodak 2009: 58), multilingualism was an important part of the European Union identity more than twenty years ago when there were less member countries than today. One of the interesting points is to see how the idea of a shared, multilingual identity can hold up in the strain as more and more languages demand attention. Not only are more and more member states being accepted in the European Union, but globalization and immigration are exposing European societies to new challenges brought by large populations of immigrants in urban centers,

while at the same time language minorities are getting more organized.

The main research questions are how multilingualism is represented in these texts, and what values and concepts are attached to it. Further questions are if these values display any ideologies currently in power or other power relations at play. According to Pietikäinen & Mäntynen (2009:59), multilingualism is an interesting phenomenon where conflicts on discursive, historical and power relations have surfaced today, which would support that this question is relevant and interesting also in relation to contemporary policies of the EU. Especially interesting is how national languages are conflicting with other national languages, and how the idea of multilingualism connects (or is in conflict?) with the preservation of minority languages. Plurilingualism is a relevant issue at the moment because it is linked to both the past and the future of Europe. The idea has risen from the past experiences in the area, as it is rich with strong cultures and languages that have existed alongside for a long time, and now as the EU is becoming more than just a collection of nations, pluralism is one of the values that this greater unity is being built on. Languages have played a large role in nation building since the rise of modern nation states, and so it is interesting to see how pluralism of languages can be used for the same purpose in Europe today.

To summarize briefly the research questions of the present study are as follows:

- What kind of ideological concepts are attached to the terms *plurilingualism* and *multilingualism* in the material?
- What kind of power relations or struggles are made visible in the use of these terms?

- To see if plurilingualism relates to the political, economic and ideological struggles within EU and Europe at the moment?

This subject is relevant in my opinion because it displays which way education might be changing in the future in the EU, and what kind of ideology is shaping that change. I am not ready to pass judgment on it, but knowing where we are headed seems useful. Also education could be used as a mirror to see which way the EU is headed in general. At the moment it seems that there is a tri-polar struggle going on between different ideologies on language. The sides are multilingualism, national monolingualism and global English. The main material is going to be official documents relating to education policy in the EU, but ones coming from a source that does not have direct bureaucratic power itself. Thus the power relations are far from simple and transparent. Since CDA and especially Fairclough (1992: 5) focus on linguistic developments that display power relations and especially struggle and social and cultural changes, it seems like the proper viewpoint for looking at the current situation of multilingualism in Europe. Resistance against the domination or hegemony of global English seems to be common for the other two, but national language ideologies could be seen to be also resisting the implementation of multilingualism. Of course it would be a bit too simplistic to lump up all national languages together, because in reality it is a less coherent clump and more like many different individual languages each in their own territory. In the same way it would be too simple to represent global English as a single clump, since now many different major regions have appropriated their own version of global English and it is far from uniform.

Out of the three major ideologies, national languages as an ideology have been around the longest, dating back to the foundation of nation states. The foundations of global English were laid by its use in the colonies of the British Empire, while the cultural struggle in the Cold War pushed American culture and language all around the globe in an effort to resist communism. Also, its role as the language of technology especially in computer technology should not be underestimated. Historically, multilingualism as an ideology is a very recent development, and it bears the question how much is it a counter-move to try and check the domination of English in Europe, or how much is it a political move to try and create a European identity that can fit different language groups. For example, Wilson and Millar (2007: 5) note that unless a common European identity is created, political attachment to EU and its institutions is going to be underwhelming. Another thing creating stress between multilingualism and national languages is that the heterogeneous view on language makes multilingualism ideologically incompatible with the idea of one national language in most nation states.

Finally, in terms of language policies, the European Union is a very challenging object for study, because it does not fit the usual definitions of political entities. It is somewhere in between nation state and a federal entity, but not purely a federal entity like for example the United States because members retain much more political autonomy. It is also currently in the process of change, which is always interesting if difficult. The map of EU is very heterogeneous politically, economically and culturally. The current time of political changes makes the EU both a challenge and an opportunity, because the changes in society are more rapid and visible than normally. For example, Marsh (2013) claims that the European economic crisis, that started to become visible in 2008 was the result of incomplete economic union when the common currency was

implemented. The same phenomenon of incomplete integration and struggle between forces between more and less integration can also be seen in all other areas of the European Union. In this present study I hold on to the idea that political, economic and cultural spheres are all connected and especially major events in any field can have influence on the others too. For example, to prove or disprove that economic considerations influence texts about education policy is beyond the scope of the present study, but I doubt it could be argued that education and economy are completely separate from each other. Instead, it is only a matter of how strong the ties are. If multilingualism is argued for or against in terms of how it would influence the economy, it would prove that these spheres are linked strongly enough to be relevant.

In chapter 2 the main theoretical concepts such as hegemony, ideology and power, as well as background will be described and evaluated for use in the present study, as well as a general look into the history of Critical Discourse Analysis. These will be mostly drawn from mainstream CDA as well as a few closely related but separate disciplines of research. In chapter 3 the methods used in the present study will be presented along with how the material was collected and how it was used in the study. The methods are derived from CDA, especially the three-level method of text analysis used by Fairclough. The data for analysis consists of one long article and 22 supporting articles that are significantly shorter. Chapter 4 contains the actual analysis of the material, divided into sections based on the findings. Since this means the material will be reorganized to fit into the study, special attention must be paid that the material will justify how it is organized as well as any findings. Chapter 5 contains comparisons to previous findings as well as conclusions that can be drawn from the material.

## 2 Critical Discourse Analysis

The beginning of this chapter describes the main analytical background of the present study. It is followed by closer discussion of key concepts, as they are understood in this particular method, in following subchapters. Finally it is followed by a closer look at the possible weaknesses of the chosen method, as well as critique towards it in general.

The main theoretical background for the present study is Critical Discourse Analysis, along with nexus analysis and Discourse-Historical Approach, which are closely related to it in background theory and methods. They all rely heavily on the sociological work of Foucault (1994), especially on the theory of power in society. Central terms from these disciplines that are relevant to the present study include power, ideology, context, inequality, hegemony, intertextuality, interdiscursivity, and of course discourse. All of these need to be defined both in relation to the present study and how they are formed in the theories of CDA.

The term *Critical Discourse Analysis* or CDA for short is made up of two main terms, *Discourse Analysis* and *Critical*. One definition of *Discourse Analysis* by Johnstone (2002:1-3): “Discourse analysis is the study of language, in the everyday sense in which most people use the term.”, in effect the study of language and how it affects human interaction. In this sense discourse analysis a very broad definition, it encompasses written, spoken and all kinds of communication, and also different ways of analysis. The defining factor is just that results are derived from the communication between

humans. The definition of the second term, *Critical*, can vary more according to the researcher as well as more broadly in society, but in general it describes an attitude of doubt, that everything is not accepted at face value but instead the truthfulness of the pieces of discourse is evaluated by the reader. In CDA this means that the analyst tries to find out what values and attitudes are behind the expressions used in the discourse. This also includes the power relations between participants.

This present study also touches on other fields in social sciences, most importantly politics and sociology. This is another reason I have chosen Critical Discourse Analysis as the theoretical framework and as a method. However, because of the anti-structuralist nature of CDA I am able to pick and choose the method best suited to this particular problem. Wodak (2009:163) states that politics, media and economy are interdependent, and I wish to add research into this complex entity. For these reasons I have chosen Fairclough's three-stage method for the present study. This method has been described by Fairclough in several books (1989, 1992 and 1995), and it consists of three phases of analysis: description, analysis and explanation. The description phase consists of linguistically analyzing the text as meticulously as possible on the textual level. The analysis phase consists of reading between the lines of the text to what function it is actually trying to accomplish, and what is not being said in the text but is assumed or taken for granted. The explanation phase consists of spelling out the beliefs and reasons that have shaped out the text. Because all the later, deeper, phases of analysis and explanation rely on proof from the first phase, there is much emphasis on doing the first phase as accurately as possible. Because of criticism that has been leveled at CDA, which will be discussed more closely later, I have also used some concepts from other methods. Mainly the concept of nexus by Scollon&Scollon(2004) and the historical layer from the Discourse-Historical Approach by Wodak (2009).

The theoretical field of this present study is Critical Discourse Analysis, because it focuses on power relations and it is quite suitable for multidisciplinary research. In the present study multidisciplinaryity is shown mainly in the use of sociological and historical viewpoints along with linguistic ones. So the multidisciplinary step is not a very long one. However, in the present study it is mostly necessary only to give more than one viewpoint when going into the broader social analysis.

Especially when research is used to legitimize policy choices I think it warrants looking into from the perspective of CDA. Another thing to keep in mind is, that with a set of discourse handed down from top-down so to say, there is always a possibility that it has been manufactured or at least steered to a direction that for example by the cultural elite or a specific political entity who wish to direct the public opinion. In this case attempting to speak for the “every European citizen” is an attempt at establishing hegemony as it is described by Fairclough (1992:91-96) by naturalizing the viewpoint of a specific group by claiming to represent the viewpoint of everybody. Of course this is something that would be hard to prove or disprove, but it is certainly something worth keeping in mind just in case.

Critical Discourse Analysis is being applied in many different areas where power and inequalities are found, with the intent of repairing and fighting against misuse of power. This often takes place where a victim can be found, but this does not have to be the case. Language policies have always entailed power relations, because when put simply it is just one group of people telling other groups of people what languages to use,



because they have or want to have the power to do that. Only because the message is a bit different this time, it does not mean there is no reason to look at it more closely, even if just to make sure everything is as it appears.

According to Rogers (2-3: 2004), there is no single orthodox approach to doing critical discourse analysis, but instead every researcher is free to choose their methods that are best suitable for the current problem. However, there are few schools of critical discourse analysis that have been formed around certain researchers and their methods. Since it is a fairly new discipline, formed in the 1990s, and because of its anti-structuralist nature the exact definition is still being argued and changed by practitioners. For this thesis, I will be using methods of *Critical Discourse Analysis* as first used by Norman Fairclough (1989), which I think is most suitable for the task, because Fairclough focuses on hidden power relations and how texts represent the values and opinions of the writer. In practise for the present study it mainly means that I will be using Fairclough's three-stage method of analysis, as well as the theoretical background and definitions of central terms such as ideology, power and discourse. In the context of the present study, especially how different languages are valued and grouped in teaching and society, this should provide some insight on whether they have different values, especially which languages are given priority and why. However, it would be misleading to call Critical Discourse Analysis a school of thought in the usual common sense meaning of the word, since there is no orthodox methodology and definitions even within CDA. According to Weis and Wodak (2003: 5-6), this is actually a good thing because it creates dialogue between theories and disciplines, and is within the spirit of critique inherent in this theory. Still, it does tend to also make CDA somewhat challenging and intimidating for the novice, because of the lack of

consistency. Billig (2003:35-46) even opposes the use of the abbreviation on the grounds that becoming an established discipline with a brand and renowned expert names would be detrimental to the critical nature. He does not explicitly accuse anyone of selling out to the same capitalist system they are critical of, but instead just reminds us as critical discourse analysts that everything should be viewed critically for the sake of retaining creativity, including your own discipline. In the present study I will use the abbreviation for convenience to simply refer to the method and theoretical background and take no stance on this particular discussion.

## ***2.1 Discourse, context and intertextuality***

Discourse is a term used to underline the social dimension in speech, writing and other communication, and how the social dimension is intertwined and influences communication and is in turn influenced by it. Discourse studies emerged in the 1970s as a reaction against previous linguistic studies that were structuralistic, focused on formal texts and confined to pieces of text or speech no longer than a sentence. These studies did not contribute any social insight but were confined only within the narrow field of linguistics (Pietikäinen & Mäntynen,2009.)

According to Pietikäinen & Mäntynen (2009:23-25), the main point of social constructivism is that we use language to make sense of reality, that meaning is not the reflection of reality but is instead the result of discourse activity. Put another way, we make sense of reality through our own system of discourse instead of perceiving reality as it is. This is also why ideologies are of special interest to discourse analysts, because they affect the way we perceive reality (Pietikäinen & Mäntynen 2009:25). In a way

this challenges all claims of totally objective knowledge, as reality is always seen from a subjective perspective.

The term discourse is also problematic because of its interdisciplinary nature, its meaning varies within different fields and even between different researchers in the same field. This is why each user has to define it for them (Pietikäinen & Mäntynen 2009:22). This is both advantageous and dangerous. There is a lot of flexibility that allows the methods to be customized to specific situations, but it is also possible to remain too vague or undefined to hold up the criteria of scientific research. This is also why as a method it is not the easiest for beginners to use. Interdisciplinary research in social and linguistic studies has only been around since the 1970s and can be considered quite new historically, which could explain why central terms and concepts are still fluid. Some proponents of Critical Discourse Analysis even make a point of protecting this fluidity, and make a point of contrasting it with the rigidity of the old system against which discourse studies originally rose up against.

According to Pietikäinen & Mäntynen (2009:28-37), the context in which texts and discourse appear should be one of the main points of analysis, especially from a historical point of view. The meaning of words is never created just by the words alone, but is always related and influenced by the context it appears in, so words should also be analyzed in relation to the background from which they appear. Similarly in Fairclough's method (1989, 1992, 1995) context is understood as the discursive and social practices that define the limits of discourse available to participants. This means that there should always be a twofold focus in discourse analysis, with one eye on the specific details on whatever it is being analyzed, and the other eye on the general

background against which and from where the text has been created. Both Pietikäinen and Fairclough agree on that context should have an influence on analysis, and that texts cannot be analysed critically in a vacuum. Pietikäinen & Mäntynen (ibid.) uses a metaphor of water running through many layers of soil to emphasize this concept. Since social conventions and discourses can be created and changed over long periods of time, a very historical point of view is useful when looking at context. For example in this study, it might be possible although not very practical to trace discourses of European unity all the way back to the Roman Empire or the heyday of the catholic church, while discourses from the time of the War of the Reformation could be used to explain religious tensions still present between northern and southern Europe. A useful concept for the analysis of context is the concept of orders of discourse, which was coined by Foucault and used by Fairclough (1995:10) to represent the variability of language use in different situations. It is simply put the idea that language is used differently according to the context in which it is used, and also that these orders of discourse can be related to how language is used to create hierarchies between different language varieties, which in turn allows for differences in value of different varieties. To put it in another way, having hierarchical relations between different language varieties allows some languages or varieties to possess lots of power while leaving others with very little or none. This is because Fairclough (1995:13) claims that there can be a connection between the orders of discourse used in politics and research, at least when presented in mass media, which would have direct influence on how to interpret the material for the present study.

Another thing that can cause confusion is that the term discourse is used for both the broad macro-level historical practices and for the specific micro-level pieces of

discourse. According to Pietikäinen & Mäntynen (2009:27-28) what is meant by macro here are the grand historical developments that are represented through ideologies and cultures. The micro refers to individual texts and other tangible pieces of discourse, it is the visible level of discourse. Both of these levels are also connected to each other. Each individual discourse is influenced by the ideas and ideologies behind it, but the ideas can also be influenced and changed only through specific pieces of discourse. This is the main argument behind the idea that unwritten social ideas can be analyzed through text. To make this clear I will use the two definitions by James Gee (2005: 7-8), where discourse is defined either by a capital D and with an article in front of it, or with just a lower-case d. Discourse with a lower-case d refers to the theoretical concept of language as a social and situational resource. It is more of a general theoretical starting point for doing discourse studies. Discourse with an article and a capital D refers to a specific way of using a language that is used by members of a language group to identify each other and to differentiate themselves from others. Examples of this could be feminist discourse, racist discourse or hip-hop discourse. These kinds of discourses are historically persistent ways of describing and giving meaning to events from a specific viewpoint, and that makes them identifiable when used in interaction. In a sense they represent the way a specific group sees reality, and what the power relations between groups and their Discourses/discourses are is what Critical Discourse Analysis is looking for. However, for the present study I will use the grammatically correct spelling for discourse and will leave it up to the context to make clear which definition is used.

Intertextuality is defined by Fairclough (1992: 101-137) as a term he borrowed from the work of Bakhtin (1986, quoted in Fairclough 1992: 101) through the works of Kristeva. Simply put it states that all texts are connected and are always responding to earlier

texts and anticipating future responses. This means all texts are always connected to other texts, and so should never be analysed in isolation. What is also interesting is the choice of to what previous texts are being responded, because in general this means that those texts are important and worth responding to, even if it is just to disprove or oppose them. Interdiscursivity is practically the same thing, except it expands the same thing to include discourses and practises. In politics and sociology, all texts are necessarily related to earlier texts and so need to be analysed as a part of a continuum. In the present study these terms will be used mostly to link the texts being analyzed to the broader discussion that is going on, through linking them to earlier texts that have been written on the same matter.

Another defining trait of CDA is the interdisciplinary nature of the method. Since CDA is yet open to be defined differently by each researcher, it is often used in conjunction with other disciplines. This is done either to make up for things that are lacking in CDA or to get several different viewpoints on the subject. Graham (2003:126-127) points out that disciplines themselves are historically founded artificial boundaries that represent our current industrially dominated society, and must be understood in order to create genuine understanding of humanity. He advocates that with this insight CDA is not an end but merely a beginning for any future critical social science. This critical view into the nature of academic disciplines certainly dismisses any restrictions on combining methods from different disciplines, because they are all merely fractured views of the same total science. Blommaert (2005) raises some interesting points about the limitations of mainstream CDA. While he is critical of some tendencies such as over-reliance on texts and ideological predispositions as part of the analysis, he still believes that the main objective of seeking social wrongs and righting them is something that

CDA does better than other systems of discourse analysis such as Conversation Analysis. He puts forward a call for a method that does not treat texts as existing in a vacuum, but instead that texts should be analysed with history as a relevant part. He claims that only this way can CDA actually fulfil any useful role as an interdisciplinary social science. As the object of the present study can be seen to be closely related to fields outside linguistics, especially sociology and political studies, a method that has the capability to include a multidisciplinary approach is seen as necessary.

## ***2.2 Power and hegemony***

It is important to start with defining the two concepts that are central to CDA, which are power and discourse. According to van Dijk (1997:16-20), power is defined as a relation between social groups or institutions, and the ability of one group to dictate the actions of the other. Three different kinds of power can be identified, which are named coercive, persuasive and hegemony. Coercive power is power that comes from one group's ability to literally twist the other group's arm, from either actual violence or the threat of it. Persuasive power is based on arguments. While there is no threat of violence, these arguments may be backed by a threat of being left without some goods such as money, jobs, prestige and so on. Hegemony is the most subtle form of power in these definitions, it means a situation where the power relationship is seen as the natural order of things, which makes it the hardest to resist or change.

According to Pietikäinen & Mäntynen (2009:52-53), linguistic power is manifested through three different ways, through representation of the world and the actors, what kinds of identities are given to different actors and how actions are organized

linguistically. While van Dijk's definition is more general view on power and refers to power between groups of people and the amount of physical coercion, the definition of linguistic power by Pietikäinen is more like soft power, it comes closest to hegemony from van Dijk in a way, since it exists behind the perceptions that people share, and is usually invisible to most who are affected. Both are valid and do not exclude the other, for example the hegemony of one group may be shown in how they are represented as individuals in the broader society. Central to all these definitions of linguistic power is that the power in language comes from the ability to construct reality. I think whoever gets to construct reality from their own perspective is much better off than those who have to adapt to it or try to challenge it. The work of Foucault (1994) was central in broadening the definition of power and especially on questioning the methods of power that had been previously considered neutral and not ideological. He considered terms of war and fighting much more appropriate than terms of cooperation normally associated with discourse analysis in describing the power relations in speech and writing. Of course in society there can be more than two opposing views, all fighting for hegemony, and some might overlap and work in unison instead. This makes getting a clear view of total power relations in a society a very complex task, which is why clear limitations on context are important in order to keep the task possible.

It is interesting that in the definitions of power by van Dijk (1997:20-25) power relations happen in an environment that can be defined as a zero-sum game, that is all gains by one party must always mean equal losses by others. Therefore, Foucault's (1994: 116) idea that power becomes visible through conflict would fit very well.

Whenever a group gains power other groups would lose equally, and this would result in struggle whenever any group tries to gain more power. In the linguistic arena this means



when there are conflicts about language use, the result will be decided by the difference in power between the groups represented by the languages. It will be interesting to see how well this theory works in describing language and education policy in the EU.

At the same time power is not defined automatically as good or bad, instead it is relative to how it affects the group in question. This leads away from simple top-down power structures and to a more chaotic definition where countless agents push and pull and power relations must always be inspected relative to the context. According to Pietikäinen & Mäntynen (2009:32), context is a useful tool for discourse analysis since it also helps to limit the power relations that are in the focus of analysis. Even a full human lifetime would not be enough to fully chart out the power relations of even a short period, therefore limiting the scope through context is important. Through looking at what kind of social roles are enacted, what is possible or impossible for different parties and through how language resources are divided between parties, it is possible to make deductions about the power relations in that particular setting. In the context of the present study, it is important to look at who can say what about education, as well as what options are dismissed without a word. Especially since there is no direct chain of command in the EU in this area, but that the higher authorities have to rely on suggestions and influencing opinions, since the final power of ratifying any changes lies with the national governments.

Another viewpoint on power in social situations is through different power-roles that can be enacted in society and by whom they are enacted by. According to Weber's (1978: 215-216) definition, there are three different roles of authority, legal, traditional and charismatic. Legal power comes through belief in the rules and the rationality of

those rules. Traditional power is embedded in roles that have had power for a long time and therefore can make decisions, such as a mayor or a chieftain. Charismatic power comes directly from the charismatic personality of the wielder that makes people follow their orders or lead, and it is the hardest to define, because personality traits such as charisma are not easy to define. Of course Weber (*ibid.*) states that none of these are present in completely pure form, but in reality they are hybrid in some degree. For example a lecture held by a famous researcher could contain some form of charismatic authority. For the present study legal power will have the focus with traditional power as a second, since scientific texts are a medium that does not lend itself easily to charismatic influence, but instead very much rely on how rational the rules are perceived. Any group that goes against the established order or makes changes to it cannot utilize traditional authority effectively, unless it can refer to a tradition that precedes the current one. This is why successfully portraying legal power is important, because it is the most accessible base of power available for the material under scrutiny in the present study.

The second central term used in CDA is the definition of hegemony made by Gramsci, which is how a group can maintain social and cultural domination in a society not only through strength but also through consensus. The term as defined by Gramsci has been used by many CDA writers including van Dijk (1997:16-20) earlier in the chapter, who used it in his list of different kinds of power. Gramsci never wrote his theories down in academic form, so the easiest way to access them is through later writings about him. Mouffe (1975: 178-185) interprets the definition put forward by Gramsci as different from the typical socialist or communist theories of his time, in that instead of describing it simply as a struggle between two antagonistic groups, it allowed for a much more

complex description of social and political reality. Hegemony is described as being achieved by two different methods, gaining the consent of allied groups through moral and ideological leadership, as well as dominating opposing groups through force. According to Mouffe (1975:179), “Gramsci no longer applies it only to the *strategy* of the proletariat, but uses it to think of the practices of the ruling classes in general”. The idea has become more theoretical and is probably the reason why it has survived for so long, after the original situation it was conceived in has changed.

One way hegemony is gained and resisted is through social struggle between groups. As Blommaert (2005:4) puts forward the definition of discourse as a site of social struggle between groups of people. Central in his theory is the idea of voice as defined by Bakhtin (quoted in Blommaert 2005:5) and how possessing different voices can either empower or disempower people and groups. In the present study some attention is given to different voices when they are clearly present, but in academic texts the voice is usually kept as toneless as possible, which is the aim of most researchers.

Another important aspect of power is legitimation, as the appearance of legitimacy is quite important in the area of the present study, because the policies are transmitted to the member states through laws that the members need to put into force themselves. Thus, the appearance of legitimacy is important in order to persuade the member states to make the decision to enact these laws. To put it briefly, legitimation means how things are justified as right or best option. It is directly derived from the different types of authority described by Weber (1978:215-216) earlier, to the legal type of authority. Since legitimacy is a matter of perspective, how actions are *perceived* as legitimate, it is directly linked to both discourse and power. Discourse can be used to both reinforce and

weaken the perceived legitimacy of any action, and being perceived as legitimate is obviously a much more powerful position than the lack of it. From the perspective of discourse and power, looking at what values are used for legitimation can give clues to what values are dominant in society, because the values must be shared and respected by most of society for legitimation to be effective based on them. To define legitimation further in the present study, I will use the four different types of legitimation described by van Leeuwen (2008:106) that are authoritative, moral, rational and mythopoesis. Authoritative legitimation uses some authority figure to justify why something is done, on the grounds that the authoritative figure knows best. Moral legitimation refers to a value system where the thing is seen as good, while rational legitimation refers to the actual benefits or results that are gained. Mythopoesis is the most tricky to define, because it uses a narrative such as stories where certain actions lead to certain results as the reason. These stories can display the moral values of the community by showing what kind of traits and behaviour lead to favourable results for example. Out of these moral legitimation seems most essential to the present study, because it allows the analyst to look at the value system that must be shared between participants for this kind of legitimation to be successful. However, van Leeuwen (2008:109-112) warns that moral legitimation cannot be identified by analysts, but only recognized on the basis of the analyst's common sense knowledge. He states that the actual identification is the job of social historians who can trace the discourse back to the original moral discourse.

### **2.3 Ideology**

While ideology is a central concept in Critical Discourse Analysis, it is, however, quite hard to define specifically. Blommaert (2005:158) describes it as a “morass of

contradictory definitions, widely varying approaches and huge controversies over terms, phenomena or modes of analysis”. He then divides the authors to two groups that define it as either a very specific set of symbolic representations, serving the specific purpose of a specific group, and to those who describe ideology as a “a *general* phenomenon characterising the *totality* of a particular social or political system, and operated by *every* member or actor in that system” (ibid., italics in the original). Another definition of ideology that does not rule out the previous one, according to Eagleton (quoted in Määttä and Pietikäinen 2014: 1) is that among scholars ideology is divided into two predominant lines of thought, the Marxist tradition and the sociological tradition. The Marxist tradition views ideology in generally negative terms and defines it as “illusion, distortion and mystification”, while the sociological tradition views it as “schematic, inflexible way of seeing the world”. The definition of ideology in CDA, that is also the one used in the present study, certainly falls into the Marxist tradition. For example, in relation to language policy, ideology consists of the way of seeing what is considered language learning and what language learning should consist of.

Especially in the early works of Fairclough (1989, 1992) ideology is seen as the invisible yet irresistible driving force behind social actions. Groups are defined and driven by their shared ideology, and discourse analysis is seen as a method for making the ideology behind the actions visible as well as changing it. Another central concept in his works is that the dominant ideology wants to be seen as “unideological” or neutral, and that the way to displace this domination is through exposing its ideological nature. According to Blommaert (2005: 160), the truly dominant ideology is not any kind of ism such as communism, but “the invisible and self-evident systemic core which we fail to recognise as ideological because it is *our* ideology.” For most CDA writers such as

Fairclough and Blommaert, it is represented by capitalism, the ideology of the middle class. This is once again related to the ideas of power and hegemony discussed earlier, where the bourgeois/capitalist ideology is seen as being in the position of hegemony, because it is not being perceived as an ideology at all, which is the most strongest position of power for any ideology. It could be simplified a lot to say, that according to these theories the ruling ideology is usually the one that is not being perceived as ideological at all.

According to Määttä and Pietikäinen (2014: 11-12), there are also two views on if ideology should be defined in isolation from discourse, or to view the relationship between these two concepts as complementary. Especially when doing research on wider social, economic and political processes, they suggest that it would be better to view these two terms as complementary. The relationship between ideology and discourse is complex, but in simple terms it could be said that it is one of mutual and simultaneous influencing. Ideology influences what kind of discourses are in use, but discourse is also the arena on which ideologies are contested and changed. For example, in the discourse on racism specific words are given much attention, because the words are how we create reality and they also affect how we perceive reality. Thus changing or forbidding the use of certain words is an attempt to change the overall perception of reality. I will try to use a water-based metaphor to describe the relationship between discourse and ideology. Discourse is the surface waves of a lake, while ideology is the deep currents which are slower to change and harder to see, but in the end it's all water. The emergence of plurilingualism into the mainstream of language learning is one such deep current coming on the surface.

## ***2.4 Critique to CDA and additional viewpoints***

While, or because, CDA is a fairly new approach, it has attracted a fair share of criticism. In this chapter I will list the relevant arguments against it and how proponents of CDA have responded to them. Following that I will then present some additional theoretical viewpoints that have been chosen in order to cover up possible weaknesses in the method, in order to strengthen the analysis.

During the early years of CDA, a dialogue of criticism ensued between Norman Fairclough and Henry Widdowson. Tischer et al (2000:163-164) summarizes it in broad strokes as follows: Widdowson criticized the vagueness of the concept of discourse and the line between what is discourse and what is text. In addition, Widdowson attacked the position of CDA as a scientific analysis because of its ideological position, thus comparing it more to an opinion than analysis. Fairclough responded by pointing out the open-endedness of results in his method, and that all methods are influenced ideologically and his method is just more honest about it.

Because CDA has been criticized for lack of objectivity and usually a leftist bias as mentioned previously, and because the response from critical analysts such as Fairclough has usually been to make their own viewpoint explicit (Fairclough 1995), I have chosen to do the same. In the spirit of this I will also elaborate shortly on my own viewpoint and relevant information in what is hopefully an objective self-reflection. As a student of history my interest and focus on political matters is general and of historical scope. If asked to define my viewpoint on the political scale it is very moderately left from the middle, however I have no affiliation or interest in any political parties. But mainly my interest in the subject is from the viewpoint of a future teacher and how these matters will affect the educational system in Finland and in the EU in general. In the same line with Blommaert (2005:21-38), the critical study can remain objective and scientific as long as each step of analysis is kept explicit, and no ideological leaps are

taken without spelling out why and on what grounds.

A second viewpoint that will be used for the present study is what Scollon & Scollon (2004) call nexus analysis, but mostly just to borrow their central concept of nexus to better define the nature of power relations, as it better describes the complex web of influence being studied here. In addition, the Discourse-Historical approach (DHA) by Wodak (2008) will also be used for the historical viewpoint. Both of these systems will be used only to complement the analysis, mostly to fill the gaps perceived in Fairclough's CDA method. The methods of Nexus analysis could not be used directly in the present study anyway, because according to Scollon & Scollon (2004) it is only useful for analysing actual spoken text and discourse. This is probably because the roots of nexus analysis are in anthropology. Instead, the concept of a nexus as defined by Scollon & Scollon (*ibid.*) is integrated into the methods of CDA. The Discourse-Historical approach and the works of Wodak in general are more focused on political texts, and her methods should offer further insight for the actual analysis.

While Nexus analysis is in some ways similar to CDA, there are also differences and some interesting ideas that could give a better perspective to analysis. The largest is of course the same as in the name of the discipline, the idea of a nexus. In nexus analysis, instead of seeing the main point as a ground of conflict between two opposing views or ideologies, the main point is seen as a nexus, where many different discourses overlap on top of each other. While CDA also claims that discourses are complex things, discourse is often reduced to a struggle between dominant and resisting ideologies. These limitations of CDA are why I have decided to use extra viewpoints, as nexus analysis would allow for more than two different forces at play, which can all work



together with some and against others, while also possibly not pulling either way. The conceptual tools of Nexus analysis are a welcome addition that should help visualize a complex environment much better than CDA, and the concept of nexus is useful when applied to plurilingualism. However, in the end, for the present study both Nexus analysis and DHA are there just to let me borrow few useful ideas and concepts. For example, at the same time the discussion around multilingualism could be seen as a struggle between nationalistic monolingualism and supranationalistic pluralism, while the discourse of economy is not either side but on the side. This would allow for a much greater level of complexity, and especially it would give a tool on how to visually represent this complexity.

Blommaert (2005:134) has a somewhat similar view to DHA on the historicity of discourse, which he calls layered simultaneity. In the field of Discourse studies I would place Blommaert in a new wave of CDA, as a researcher who has taken the method and applied it outside the context it was originally created in (white, Anglo-American, modern societies) and has shown that it has potential for more general and global application as well. In his view, texts in one specific place in time are always affected by many layers of underlying discourse at the same time. These layers can be of different depth too, where the deepest are the very long-term discourses that are so naturalised that they are invisible, while the most shallow are the shortest-lived discourses which can more often be seen and noticed by humans during our lifetimes. So, the different layers work at different speeds and scales. What is called a nexus in nexus-analysis is called synchronization by Blommaert (2005:131-137). However, there is a subtle difference between the meanings of these terms. For Blommaert, synchronization is a mistake of the one looking, a failure to see the historical scope of

things, but instead interpreting historical data on the basis of the viewpoint of the present. This distorts the data especially when deeper layers of discourse are looked at, and is often used in political speech because of that according to him.

While nexus analysis also has a three-step method for analysis (Scollon & Scollon 2004:152), it is quite different from CDA. It is much more influenced by anthropology and takes an approach that is much more personal and small-scale, and the analyst is seen as an active participant that can change the results of the study than a neutral observer. Instead of striving for neutrality, activism regarding the issue is actually encouraged. The three steps are engaging, navigating and changing the nexus. Engaging means getting familiar with the issue and identifying all the participants and actors and in general making notes on the subject. Navigating is the part that contains doing discourse analysis and mapping out how the different discourses interact. There is also an activity called circumferencing that is based on the idea of discourses having a circle of life that comes around, and trying to map out how long it takes and how wide is the circle. The last part is activism, where the results are used to try changing something about the nexus.

To further define the concept of circumferencing Scollon & Scollon (2004:101-107) use examples from their own anthropological studies among Alaskan natives. In order to get the whole picture they map out individual points on how their discourse makes them function when telling stories, working with authorities or making an educational book about beadwork. By defining how they act in each of these different events they can map out what belongs in this specific discourse and what does not, and thus they are able to define the boundaries of that particular discourse.

Another important part about this is finding out how members of other discourse groups react to users of specific discourses. It is especially important how members of dominant discourse groups react. If using a specific discourse can gain a positive reaction it can be classified as a resource or an advantage, while if the reaction is negative it could be classified as a disadvantage. To use an example from Scollon & Scollon (2004:84-85), a person using a similar discourse as the probation officer during questioning gets off with a much lighter sentence for the same offence, than a person using native Alaskan discourse. The difference between advantage and disadvantage becomes quite tangible when you are talking about a longer jail sentence, opposed to a shorter or even none. Who knows if similar differences exist in the school and job market, where different language skills open or close doors without any obvious warning? However, for the present study the concept of activism is not used, unless of course it sparks a driving passion about education policy in a person.

The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) described by Wodak (2009:38) integrates historical background information into the CDA method. It distinguishes three different dimensions in discourse, topics, discursive strategies and linguistic means. It also takes into account the historical context of the discourse in much more detail than usually in CDA analysis. Because of the long history of multilingualism in the EU and even longer history in Europe in general, in my opinion any analysis that excludes the historical aspect would be incomplete. As has been stated previously, context is a central matter when performing CDA analysis, and so when analysing historically long term developments, the scope of the context must be broad enough for the purpose.

According to Tischer et al. (2000:158), the difference from DHA to CDA lies in the greater emphasis on interdisciplinarity, especially the use of ethnographic methods as well as use of the concept of triangulation in analyzing texts. DHA also places more emphasis on very strict description of the text on all levels, perhaps because CDA has been criticized on that account as mentioned earlier in the chapter. So effectively DHA is very much the same as CDA, except that pure linguistic analysis is discouraged and reliance on methods from other fields is instead encouraged. In the present study DHA is mostly used in the background as a method for making comparisons to previous historical reality during the analysis.

## **2.5 Previous research**

The matter of multilingualism has been an object of research since the 1960s, but here I will focus more on the recent studies on it in relation to the EU. As Blommaert (2012:1-2) states, multilingualism is usually represented only as a good thing in most research. It would indeed be very difficult to find fault in an ideology where all languages are treated equally, so most of his critique is aimed at the practical application of it. There is also a mild admonishment by Blommaert (ibid.) directed at an unspecified party that “[i]t is good to champion equality among peoples and their languages, but the best way of doing that (and we echo Hymes, 1996 here) is to actively combat the actual inequalities that exist between them.” It remains unclear if this is addressed to researchers on multilingualism or EU officials in charge of spreading multilingualism, or both.

One study in this vein is by Nikula et al. (2012:41-63), who compared official EU documents on how to implement multilingualism with the Finnish national education documents to see how well multilingualism is implemented on a national level. While they notice the celebratory view on multilingualism, they also observed nationalistic monolingual ideologies at work in the background of the documents, especially in the

national Finnish documents. This might show that there is still friction between the national and EU level in these matters and that policies are not fully and immediately implemented by member states. Hierarchical inequalities also still exist between languages, as is shown by Lähteenmäki and Vanhala-Aniszewski (2012: 121-142) in their article about language prestige issues related to speakers with a Russian-Finnish identity. It shows certain languages and ways of using language are still more prestigious than others, and conversely that others have low or negative prestige attached to them.

The role of global English in the debates about multilingualism is a sort of third position that is clearly separate from the idealistic multilingualism and the entrenched national monolingualism. In general, English is seen as a threat to both. Leppänen and Pahta (2012: 142-167) look at different ways in which English is seen as endangering in public debates in the Finnish national press. While global English is no longer possessed by the British, it is still seen as an outside aggressor that comes to either contaminate or subdue not only the language but in the words of Leppänen and Pahta (2012:143) "...threatening to tarnish the purity of not only the Finnish language and culture, but also that of the nation state, national identity and even Finns' minds."

In another study Millar (2007:113-115) has looked into argumentative strategies used by Danish people, through writings in the public section of local newspapers, in constructing their version of the reality of the European Union,. This study was prompted by the victory of the 'no' votes in Denmark to further integration in 1992. She is especially interested in bringing into focus the vague definition of Europe and what it is to be European. The analysis of argumentation strategies used by both sides of the question of further European integration is used to construct a picture of the identities of the competing sides. A similar study was conducted by Vallaste (2013) on how proponents and opponents of European Union were portrayed in Estonian newspapers, what kinds of attributes were attached to both sides. Interestingly, as Vallaste (2013:22-26) notes, opponents or critics of more European unification are often unfairly constructed as emotional and thus less rational than the proponents, a snare which Millar (2007:118) also falls into: "We might expect a stronger tendency towards *pathos* among

the no-voters, since themes such as patriotism and national sovereignty (and perceived threats to them) arouse deep emotions.” Both Millar and Vallaste focus on how opponents and proponents of European integration are perceived in the public media. Although media texts and academic texts are two different genres, some of their observations could still be relevant in describing academic discourse too.

Vallaste (2013) has framed out some problems, especially onesided and surface-only representations in media discussions about the EU and further integration among member states, and how the eurosceptic opinion has been misrepresented in media. This is somewhat relevant to the present study, because academic articles can also be seen as forming and responding to public opinion. In addition, similar tendencies can be seen in the obviously pro-EU texts in the present study.

### 3 Methodology

This chapter begins with a set of research questions for the present study, which is then followed by a description of the data used in the study, and finally by what methods are used in the analysis of this data.

#### **3.1 Research questions**

The questions that are being sought here are to try and define what ideological concepts and values are being attached to the terms plurilingualism and multilingualism. The reason for this is to try and make the power relations and possible struggles visible in the discussions related to linguistic policies in the EU, and perhaps to get a view of any other kinds of struggles related to the language questions. The reason is that according to CDA theory struggles are often the site where power relations are made visible. The research questions already outlined in the introduction are repeated again for convenience:

- To find out what kind of ideological concepts are attached to the terms *plurilingualism* and *multilingualism* in the material.
- To see if any power relations or struggles are made visible in the use of these terms.
- To see how plurilingualism relates to the political, economic and ideological struggles within EU and Europe at the moment.

These research questions are intentionally left quite open, so that they will not exclude anything important that comes up from the material. However, they also narrow down the inquiry to focus on plurilingualism from political, economical and ideological viewpoints. Because of the method of analysis the ideological side will probably have more representation over the others, but on the other hand that will also allow for greater accuracy and detail in describing the ideological ties to these questions.

### **3.2 Data**

The material for the present study consists of 22 supporting studies for the *From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*. The material was chosen because at the time this study was begun the Guide was the latest official document related to language education policy on the EU level, and because education policy seemed like a good area for an aspiring teacher to study. Of the main Guide there were two versions, of which the full version was used for the present study instead of the shorter executive version. First, the Guide and all the supporting studies were downloaded from the Council of Europe homepage under the language unit (<http://www.coe.int/lang>) on April 25 in 2012. All the texts were included in the study, so the choices about what to include should reflect the opinions of the organization and not the researcher.

Later on it became apparent that the amount of data to be analysed was too large for the present study, so it had to be narrowed down in order for the study to be ever completed. The main focus was shifted to the supporting studies, as the initial work had shown that they seemed to contain more targets for analysis. The main Guide was moved to the



background, but it still influences the study because it is the one link that brings all the support studies together.

### **3.3 Analytical Method**

The method for the present study is that of CDA as used by Fairclough. However some methods from nexus analysis and Discourse-Historical Approach are used to complement it. As stated above, the main method of the study is Fairclough's three-stage method of CDA. This is supplemented by concepts and additional theoretical tools from Nexus analysis by Scollon&Scollon (2004), and DHA by Wodak (2009). More specifically, the concept of nexus is borrowed from its namesake analysis method, and which is then applied to plurilingualism. In a sense plurilingualism is viewed as a nexus point, which both influences and is influenced by many various others, and the first part of the task is just simply name these other influences. From DHA the main contribution is the use of historical continuity, especially as a good excuse for me to draw examples and references from further back in history.

Another thing borrowed from Nexus analysis (Scollon 2004) to the method is the idea to first engage the nexus of practice, or in other words to identify the salient parts of the text is used. At first the main goal is not to find answers, but to find questions. As Scollon (2004:143-144) states, finding good questions is more important than trying to find out the answers right away. Secondly, the Guide and the supporting studies were read in order to get an overall view of each one, and then all the paragraphs containing direct or obviously indirect references to multilingualism were copied onto a separate file. All the paragraphs were kept under headings denoting which text they came from.

This should allow for the analysis to be focused, while also maintaining clear overall view on the matter, or the big picture.

The material also had to be narrowed down in order to focus only on the question at hand. This was done by cutting out the paragraphs from the texts that specifically dealt with multilingualism and leaving the rest of the text outside the analysis, unless a specific reason requires it to be included. After the first round these pieces of text were then grouped according to any common features discovered. In the third phase of the analysis, the paragraphs were regrouped according to themes or underlying discourses that have surfaced in the first parts of analysis. This was the final part of the present study, and text references were grouped in order to support any findings or arguments that are made from the data.

After the data had been narrowed down, I used what Tischer et al (2000:153-154) describes as Fairclough's method. It consists of three phases: description, interpretation and explanation. In the description phase the analyst takes the text apart into small pieces and analyses the text's syntax, metaphors and rhetorical devices. In the interpretation phase the analyst maps out how the text constructs and displays power relations. In the explanation phase the analyst describes the broader social currents and ideologies that have affected the writer of the text. Fairclough (1992:73) also describes the concept behind his method with another three-point definition of discourse. It is divided into text, discourse practices and social practices, where each includes the former. Thus discourse practices encompass texts, while social practices include both. Text is used for any recorded events of communication, while discourse practices means

the established ways of using texts in a society, and social practices include both use of text and other social relations. Out of these the analysis of text is the starting point, but the goal of analysis is especially to find out how discourse practices both shape and display existing social practices. For example, the assumed reason of these texts is to alter the linguistic reality of schools, and through that indirectly the entire society to have values that will be following chapter will describe in more detail.

#### 4. Analysis of different aspects of plurilingualism in the Guide

The present study is a textual analysis of a political document published by the Council of Europe called *From Linguistic diversity to Plurilingual Education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe* published in 2007, and 22 complementary articles that are supposed to expand and support the arguments of the main document. The main thrust of the analysis is to look at the use of the terms plurilingualism and multilingualism in these documents.

The first part of the analysis was to pick out all paragraphs that referred plurilingualism either directly or implicitly. According to Fairclough (1995:5), what is 'in' a text can be either explicit or implicit, with two categories of implicit content defined by Levinson (Levinson 1983, quoted in Fairclough 1995: 5) as presupposition and implication.

Fairclough sees implicit content as specifically valuable for sociological analysis, because implied content is seen as commonsense and taken for granted. One of the main points of CDA is to uncover values that are taken for granted, and exposing the ideology behind these values. In this case the aim was to find out what values are implied when plurilingualism is mentioned. However, there is a serious issue here with how to keep the opinions of the analyst from influencing the results and a strict guideline is needed to prevent that from happening. Thus, plurilingualism is taken to be implied in the text only when the word could be inserted into the phrase without altering the content at all.

It is probably reasonable to begin the analysis with a short description of how the material came to be in the first place. According to the Guide : “The essential nature of the form and contents ... was conceived during meetings of a Scientific Committee

composed in preparation for the conference held at Innsbruck in May 1999.” After that it has gone through several versions and a two-year consultation process, and it has been rewritten by J-C. Beacco. What that all means remains quite unclear to the reader, except that a lot of time has been spent on it and that the process may or may not have been influenced by several unnamed participants in addition to the two official writers J-C. Beacco and M. Byram. It is probably implied that the writers of the supporting studies are the ones who have been a part of this interaction, but I could not find any explanation for why these studies were chosen to support the Guide.

The supporting studies come from a wide variety of different countries both from within the European Union and globally, but all are in English. However, it is interesting to note that the global contributors come mainly from countries where English has a strong traditional hold, such as Canada, Australia, South Africa and USA. It is outside the scope of the present study to find out why, but an uneducated guess would be that these countries are socially closer to the EU. Or just have closer academic relations with each other. Another possibility is that some have been translated into English.

The actual analysis consists of three main parts described below. First the relevant paragraphs were picked out of the material. This was mostly mechanical work as the criteria consisted of that the paragraph included a mention of plurilingualism, multilingualism or bilingualism. There were also a few paragraphs where I have thought plurilingualism is either unsaid but intended, or they contain arguments that are closely relevant to it. These will be placed under a specific heading and contain explicit reasoning for their inclusion. This narrowed the material to 64 pages in font size 10 for

the supporting studies after the thematically chosen text was copied into another file, which was still too much for a detailed discourse analysis of every sentence.

Secondly, the paragraphs were subjected to a rudimentary thematic analysis to place them under different headings for further analysis, based on how they appeared to represent plurilingualism or values related to plurilingualism. This resulted in six headings total: 1) Plurilingualism and English with 8 articles, 2) Problems and opponents of plurilingualism with 9 articles, 3) Advantages and benefits of plurilingualism with 7 articles 4) Plurilingualism in education with 9 articles, 5) Plurilingualism and economics with 8 articles and 6) Protection, politics and other small themes which contained data from 4 articles. Since the articles also overlap, this means that some articles may have been left outside the scope of this study during the several phases of trimming the data.

Each paragraph was either placed under an existing heading or a new one was created for them in case it did not fit inside the existing ones. If a paragraph could be placed under several headings, as it was in few cases, it was placed under each heading it could relate to. The list of articles and the headings are presented in the following table.

Table 1. Themes related to plurilingualism in the analysed articles

Number	Heading on article	Related themes
1	Language policy unit. Plurilingual education in Europe. 50 years of international cooperation.	Education, Advantages, Economics, Society
2	Breidback, S. Plurilingualism, Democratic Citizenship in Europe and the Role of English	English, Problems, Identity, Economics, Preservation
3	Castelloti, V and Moore, D. Social Representations of languages and teaching	Problems, Advantages, Society, Monolingualism
4	Churchill, S. Language Education, Canadian Civic Identity and the Identities of Canadians	Problems, Advantages, Identity, Politics
5	Costanzo, E. Language education in Italy: an experience that could benefit Europe?	Education, Preservation, History
6	Doyé, P. Intercomprehension	English, Education, Politics, Preservation
7	Gogolin, I. Linguistic diversity and new minorities in Europe	Problems, Advantages, Economics, Borders, Society, Monolingualism
8	Grin, F. Using language economics and education economics in language education policy	English, Advantages, Politics, Economics
9	Huhta, M. Tools for planning language training	Education, Economics
10	Johnstone, R. Addressing 'the age factor': some implications for language policy	Education, Age, Problems
11	Neuner, G. Policy approaches to English	English, Preservation
12	Neville.A. Language education policy, national and sub-national identities in South Africa	English, Identity, Politics
13	Lo Bianco, J. Language policy: an Australian perspective	English, Education, Problems, Identity, Politics, Economics, Preservation, Monolingualism, History
14	Ó'Riagáin, P. The Consequences of Demographic Trends for Language Learning and Diversity	Age, Society
15	Piri, R. Teaching and learning less widely spoken languages in other countries	Education, Economics, Preservation, Borders
16	Raasch, A. Europe, frontiers and languages	Problems, Advantages, Borders
17	Riagáin, P and Lüdi, G. Bilingual Education: Some policy issues	Education, Problems, Advantages, Politics, Economics
18	Seidlhofer, B. A concept of international English and related issues: from 'real English' to 'realistic English'?	English
19	Skutnabb-Kangas, T. Why should linguistic diversity be maintained and supported in Europe? Some arguments	Economics, Preservation, Monolingualism
20	Starkey, H. Democratic Citizenship, Languages, Diversity and Human Rights	Education, Politics, Preservation
21	Truchot, C. Key aspects in the use of English in Europe	English
22	Willems, G. Language teacher education policy promoting linguistic diversity and intercultural communication	Problems, Society

Finally I would analyze all the text under one heading, and then choose paragraphs from under each heading that best represent each group and subject it to a full written analysis using Fairclough's method. In all phases of analysis I have tried to be totally explicit on the reasons for the placement of texts to keep the analysis as transparent as possible. Themes were analyzed in order from largest to smallest, counting both total amount of text and how many different articles the theme was mentioned in. In the case of 4.2 and 4.3 where the themes were obviously linked to each other as well, they had to be placed in succession.



## **4.1 Plurilingualism and English**

After a cursory examination of the material and rising familiarity with the subject matter, I had expected that the relationship between plurilingualism and English as a global language, or *lingua franca*, would be the most popular subject. While the present study is not quantitative in nature, that the relationship with English should be mentioned in eight (8) out of the twenty-two (22) studies and has the most pages of text after thematic analysis. The aim is to discuss one theme that comes up from the text entirely, then move on to the next one that comes up. However, the themes are not organized purposefully for this, but are in the order that the articles were processed in the earlier phase. The prevalence of the issue of English should be a strong indicator that it is an issue that holds a central position in how plurilingualism is defined. Not only because of the global significance of English, but perhaps this also tells us that if the purpose of multilingualism is to displace or challenge English from this role? It would be logical that a lot of effort is spent on this question if that was the case. This is explicitly stated in for example the preface of the article 18 by Barbara Seidlhofer:

The aim here is to review the issue of English in relation to plurilingualism, which many Council of Europe Recommendations have pinpointed as a principle and goal of language education policies. It is essential that plurilingualism be valued at the level of the individual and that their responsibility in this matter be assumed by all the education institutions concerned.

Here, the “issue of English” is placed in the position of object in the first sentence, within the main sentence. Rest of the sentence and the paragraph are used for describing the object to which it is being placed in relation to. In the first sentence, it is left unsaid who the subject of the sentence is, but it is assumably the study being presented that “aims to review” it. In the second sentence the agent, all the education institutes

concerned, is placed at the end of the paragraph to emphasise it. It is connected to the verbs value and assume (responsibility).

The word most closely related to English in this paragraph is the issue, which has slightly negative and passive connotation, while valuing and taking responsibility have positive and active connotations. This creates the image of English as a passive problem that needs to be solved by the actions of “all the education institutes concerned”. This shows that plurilingualism is being constructed as something needing active participation, and at the same time something worth actively participating for.

The same study, however, also describes English as a force that is aligned with plurilingualism on pages 9-10 (article 18).

It would go beyond the scope of the present paper to elaborate on the significant ways in which Brutt-Griffler's perspective challenges accounts of 'linguistic imperialism' and 'linguistic genocide'. In a nutshell, she demonstrates that English owes its global spread as much to the struggle *against* imperialism as to imperialism itself (op.cit.: chapter 4). What needs to be emphasized in the present context, however, is that in Brutt-Griffler's account, bi- or plurilingualism is an intrinsic design feature of World English. She provides a carefully researched and well-argued basis for acknowledging the active role of EIL users as *agents* in its spread and in its linguistic development: they are not just at the receiving end, but contribute to the shaping of the language and the functions it fulfils. This is a perspective with very considerable implications for educational questions concerning the conceptualisation of English in European curricula.

In the second sentence, English is placed in the position of subject connected to the verb *owes* immediately afterwards. It is left uncertain if the emphasis on *against* is from this author or the one being cited. Still, this places English in a dualistic position where it is both an agent for and against cultural imperialism, with more emphasis on the latter. In the next sentence, in the last subordinate clause, plurilingualism as a predicative in the sentence, is placed before the subject of World English, to which the noun phrase “an intrinsic design feature of World English” is linked. This structure places the most

emphasis plurilingualism. Another interesting thing are the words linking these two, the “intrinsic design feature”. They imply a designer, however none is named and by common knowledge English, especially World English that is mainly used by heterogenous non-natives, is seen as language that rejects conscious designing. The author’s opinion of who this designer is is revealed on page 11 (article 18).

Whatever happens in the long term, EIL as the product of a world market and other global developments...

Here, EIL (English as an International Language) is first and foremost given as being product of global economic forces and secondly of other unspecified global developments. Again the actual identity of this designer is left in the dark. Perhaps it refers to American multinational corporate interest, perhaps something else. What is possible to deduct from these is that the author views that there should be some designer behind linguistic changes, maybe reflecting the situation with plurilingualism which is the top-down project of European agencies. Presenting this contradiction on what actually causes linguistic changes, and if it can be controlled or not is an interesting point of argument that in my opinion is yet unsolved. However, given the nature of these articles it would be safe to assume they tend to lean towards the idea that linguistic design should be the monopoly of (national or supranational) states.

Even if the designers of EIL are left a bit unclear, this study gives the non-native users of English the power to “shape” it. This is referred to in both pages 7 and 10 (article 18).

It reminds us that English is used by plurilingual and monolingual people alike (but obviously, due to the numerical predominance of non-native speakers, the plurilinguals outnumber the monolinguals), and, lastly, that it is the non-native speakers of English who will be the main agents in the ways English is used, is maintained, and changes, and who will shape the ideologies and beliefs associated with it.

She provides a carefully researched and well-argued basis for acknowledging the active role of EIL users as *agents* in its spread and in its linguistic development: they are not just at the receiving end, but contribute to the shaping of the language

and the functions it fulfils. This is a perspective with very considerable implications for educational questions concerning the conceptualisation of English in European curricula.

Here, the non-native speakers are first established as the most numerous users of EIL, and then that implicitly because of their numerical superiority, they will have a leading role in how it is shaped. This shows that a democracy of numbers, and that a very heterogenous majority can oppose the power of a more unified minority, in this case the actual native speakers of English. Both of these previous issues show that the plurilingualist ideology contains room for both top-down as well as bottom-up change.

On pages 22 and 23 (article 18) this study sheds a little light on the meaning of linguistic competence in plurilingualism. This rather long piece is analysed in shorter pieces below.

First and foremost, a re-orientation of 'English' away from the fascination with ENL and towards the cross-cultural role of EIL will make it easier to take on board findings from research into *intercultural communication* (eg Buttjes & Byram 1990, Byram & Fleming 1998, Byram & Zarate 1997, Knapp & Knapp-Pothoff 1990, Vollmer 2001) and *language awareness* (eg Doughty *et al* 1971, James & Garrett 1991, van Lier 1995). Abandoning unrealistic notions of achieving 'perfect' communication through 'native-like' proficiency in English would free up resources for focusing on skills and procedures that are likely to be useful in EIL talk. These are discussed in work on *communication strategies* (eg Kasper & Kellerman 1997) and *accommodation skills* (g Giles & Coupland 1991, Jenkins 2000: ch. 7) and include the following: drawing on extralinguistic cues, gauging interlocutors' linguistic repertoires, supportive listening, signalling non-comprehension in a face-saving way, asking for repetition, paraphrasing, etc. Needless to say, exposure to a wide range of varieties of English and a multilingual/comparative approach (in the spirit of the *Eveil aux Langues* project, cf. e.g. Candelier & Macaire 2000; KIESEL materials, etc.) are likely to facilitate the acquisition of these communicative abilities. Such a synergy achieved through the meeting of languages in classrooms would also make overlong instruction in English (conceptualised as ENL) superfluous. Indeed, it would no longer be self-evident that a subject 'English' needs to remain in all language teaching curricula – for some contexts, it might be worth considering whether 'English' courses in secondary school that sometimes range over up to eight or even nine years could give way to a subject 'language awareness' which includes instruction in EIL as one element. The focus here would be on teaching *language* rather than *languages*. (cf. Edmondson 1999).

There seems to be a consensus that realistic policies for plurilingualism in Europe 'plurilingualism' do not imply a simplistic, quantitative approach aiming at 'proficiency in as many language as possible'. Especially with reference to English, the qualitative concept implied in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* "not seen as the superposition or juxtaposition of distinct competences, but rather as the existence of a complex or even composite competence" (Council of Europe, 2001: 168) is most likely to be realised by relinquishing the elusive goal of native-speaker competence and by embracing

the emergent realistic goal of intercultural competence achieved through a plurilingualism that integrates rather than ostracizes EIL.

Here in the first sentence, “fascination” with English as spoken by natives is contrasted with the ability to “take on board” scientific findings about language learning. In the next sentence native-like proficiency is even more strongly expressed as an “unrealistic notion”, which stands in the way of “useful skills”. Both of these expressions display that the current notion of teaching English is based more on emotions instead of reason, and that currently too much time is given to English as is clearly stated in the clip below. This argument again shows the writers desire for more controlled, and thus logical, linguistic design instead of leaving it to parties who are prone to “emotional decisions”. The ideology that state (in this case EU) should have more control is again being pushed, perhaps for the reason of making such developments more acceptable in the future.

Such a synergy achieved through the meeting of languages in classrooms would also make overlong instruction in English (conceptualised as ENL) superfluous. Indeed, it would no longer be self-evident that a subject 'English' needs to remain in all language teaching curricula

Here, later in the same passage in article 18, the adjective overlong is attached to teaching English as a Native Language, and the object self-evident, on the more prominent position in the second sentence. Indeed, it can be deduced that according to this author there is currently too much teaching of English and that the hours dedicated to it should be pushed back in favour of other languages. From there it can be deduced that plurilingualism in fact opposes the current order of things where English is in a position of hegemony and cultural domination, and instead proposes to replace it with one where it gets less hours and non-native speakers have more power to “shape the ideologies and beliefs associated with it”.

This view is further advanced by the definition of plurilingualism later in the same passage in article 18 as:

“not seen as the superposition or juxtaposition of distinct competences, but rather as the existence of a complex or even composite competence”.

The adjectives superposition or juxtaposition, and distinct, all refer to the old way of seeing languages as competitors, while plurilingualism is attached to the more positive sounding adjectives complex and composite. While all the adjectives referring to the old system imply a competition or languages being placed in opposition to each other, the adjectives referring to plurilingualism, while not ruling it out, place competition in the background. Composite materials are generally stronger than pure ones, so the same is implied that a composite language competence would be stronger too. This emphasis on finding common strength could show that language policy is aimed at trying to bring the diverse people of Europe closer together, under the aegis of the EU.

The destructive history of English language towards minority languages is pointed at more strongly in the article 12 by Alexander Neville, but of course the context of apartheid in South Africa should also be taken into account when analysing the tone of the text. On page 10:

To put it differently, the anglophile orientation of the black leadership stunted the development of a reading culture and, thus, of creative writing and scholarly endeavour in the African languages. The political leadership of the white minority, which ruled the country for 90 years (between 1905 and 1994) adopted a policy of colonial bilingualism in terms of which all white citizens, regardless of language or cultural background had to be bilingual in English and Afrikaans. At the same time, the white leadership was content with tolerating the offspring of the mission elite in the milieu of the “white society” as long as its individual members were fluent in either English or Afrikaans, or in both languages. Towards the African languages, a position of benign neglect was adopted, one which reinforced the complete marginality of these languages in South African political, economic and even cultural life.

In the first sentence, the black leadership is described by the adjective of anglophile orientation, and is linked to the verb stunted when referring to the local reading culture. So their overt love of English is thus given as the reason for their negative effect on the local literary culture. In this way, the English language is portrayed as partially or even mostly responsible for this destruction. In the last sentence a particularly English

expression of “benign neglect” is used, where in theory the positive connotation of benign is used to offset the negative one of neglect. However, it is given as a force that reinforces the marginality of the native languages, thus making the connotation mostly negative in effect. The reason for this is probably to display English as an imperialistic, killer language, as opposed to plurilingualism as a protector of endangered languages which will be more thoroughly investigated in a following chapter.

In article 21, Marc Truchot writes on the rising position of English from another perspective, specifically of the French language and its use in the diplomatic circles. On pages 16-17:

This table shows the rise of English and the relative fall of French in written use over a 14-year period. In fact, during the 1980s and 1990s the factors favouring English continued to accumulate. Among them were the effects of internationalisation of the economy and of globalisation resulting in the use of English in the chief fields falling within EU competence, the spread of English teaching and the expansion in knowledge of the language, the training of new generations of diplomats and officials in American and British universities or in English-language faculties in Europe and the enlargement of the EU in 1995 to embrace countries where English is in common use. It is conceivable that diplomats and officials who have a much better mastery of English than French have difficulty in accepting a power system where French occupies a substantial place and would prefer to replace it with another based on the preponderance of English. However, French is still very present, with a certain form of bilingualism appearing to be the rule in the institutions (Wright, 2000).

From this the author’s perspective on English is clearly from how it affects the French language, especially its position as a *lingua franca* of diplomats and officials. French replaced Latin in this role in Europe relatively late in historical terms, in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. In the first sentence these two languages are placed in competition, with the rise of English contrasted with the fall of French, while the causal relation between these two is left unsaid. Interesting is the choice of word for ‘factors’ in favour of increased English. This word moves them outside the conscious planning and more in realm of things that just happen for some reason. In the last two sentences the point of view of the author become even more clear, as in “It is conceivable (from a French perspective)

that diplomats and officials... have difficulty in accepting a power system where French occupies a substantial place” and “However, French is still very present, with a certain form of bilingualism appearing to be the rule in the institutions (wright, 2000)”. I would like to point out the choice of word of bilingualism to describe the situation, accompanied by several softening expressions such as “certain form of” and “appearing to be” would suggest that in this sphere the ideas of plurilingualism are not present, but instead a more competitive relations between these two languages. This is further supported by the author pointing out that “French is still very present”, which suggests that in future the opposite could also be possible. This also shows that one motivation for plurilingualism or bilingualism could be the preservation of existing power structures that would otherwise be taken over by the preponderance of English. A clip from page 17 (article 21) would seem to support this at least in some way.

English is not a mandatory supranational language. But there is a tendency to make it so. This is very clearly the case in the EU institutions despite genuine efforts to encourage plurilingualism. In the many other institutional co-operation bodies which are appearing in Europe it is found that use of that language is regarded as automatic, even though no other mode of communication has been investigated.

The first sentence is a straight denial of any official sanction for English to be used in this role. The second is a statement that that it happens regardless. Interesting is the expression “there is a tendency”, which obscures who the proponents for English in this case are, or if they even exist. Again English is displayed as a sort of passive-aggressive entity that just takes over things without any specific people supporting it, or perhaps intentionally obscuring the supporters is just a tactic from the writer to avoid the fact that if the choice is automatic it is probably supported by most of the parties concerned. In the third sentence, “despite genuine efforts to encourage plurilingualism”, clearly shows that plurilingualism is seen as a method to oppose English taking over the role previously held by French. Whatever the case may be, it shows there is at least some



confrontational or competitive relationship between English and French languages, especially in prestigious contexts such as international diplomacy.

Later on pages 20-21 (article 21) the author again displays his views as opposed to English.

Yet the status of English in language education policies, that is to say its place and the teaching methods used in education systems, is based on piecemeal data and on the subjective elements referred to above. It is hard to see what other grounds a French Minister of Education could have had for his suggestion in 1997 that English be given the status of second language in the education system. Following the same logic, David Graddol, the author in 1997 of a study for the British Council on the future of English, considers in a further study (2001) that it is necessary to take into account the "the repositioning" of English as a *lingua franca* in Europe" and teach it as a second language. He takes a critical view of the *Common European Framework of Reference for languages* of the Council of Europe, which sees it as a foreign language. However, the examples he quotes in order to illustrate this new position are drawn from studies done in Denmark, a country which cannot really be deemed representative of Europe as a whole in this matter. Furthermore, because of its political, cultural and social implications, such a status for English cannot be based simply on a recognition of that language's position.

Here the arguments for English as a *lingua franca* are opposed on the ground that they are based on "piecemeal data" and "subjective elements", implying that they are incorrect for making this kind of decision. Later on he attacks the studies done in Denmark as unfit to be applied to the greater sphere of Europe. Lastly he quotes unspecified political, cultural and social implications. This would suggest that the text is targeted at a like-minded group who can infer the exact meaning of these. I am unsure how much of this is just French-English rivalry, but nevertheless this shows that at least for a part of supporters, plurilingualism is a way to maintain the existing status quo and preserve the power relations in place, with a very definite view that language power relations are still a zero-sum game, regardless of how much respect and tolerance goes around. This could mean that some of the values expressed here are different or even contradictory to those that plurilingualism explicitly supports, as defined in the

introduction to the Guide. For example holding up existing power relations and the pecking order of prestige can be seen as opposite to the lofty goals that all languages should be equally respected.

The preface to article 2 by Stephan Breidback includes some interesting word choices about why plurilingualism should be supported.

This debate should also be seen in relation to the “*From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education: Guide for the development of language education policies in Europe*.” This *Guide* is both a descriptive and forward-looking document aimed at highlighting the complexity of the issues involved in language education, which are often addressed too simplistically. It endeavours to describe the methods and conceptual tools for analysing different language teaching situations and organising language education in accordance with Council of Europe principles. The present document also broaches this major issue, but given its subject-matter, it obviously cannot address it exhaustively.

Referring to the article as a *debate* in the very first sentence already sets the tone for further juxtaposition, and the next sentence makes it clear that this article stands on the side of plurilingualism, with the Guide being described as *descriptive* and *forward-looking*. While the other side of the debate is described as addressing the complex problems too simplistically. The other side of the argument is explained later on pages 7-8 (article 2), while still being vague on who actually support it. This way of leaving the supporters of the other side of the argument sort of invisible probably has several reasons behind it, at least to discredit the argument on the basis of its supporters being less important, or even non-existent. Another reason could be that the supporters are actually groups, like EU member states, that the writer does not wish to antagonize too much. But, back to pages 7-8 (article 2) where the other sides of the three-way debate are made more clear.

European communicative integration, being founded on plurilingualism, is antonymous to linguistic seclusionism as it is to linguistic homogenisation. The former would lead to a status of ‘isolation in diversity’ with linguistic majorities dominating linguistic minorities. The latter would be the foreseeable result of unstructured language education left to the invisible but heavily biased hand of

the market. Its very probable outcome, in terms of foreign language teaching, would be a de facto *English only* situation. It is exactly because English can be allocated a clearly definable place in a desirable linguistic repertoire of European citizens, that resistance against a *monopoly* of English is necessary. So, promotion of plurilingualism should include considerations about the role of English against the backdrop of Europe as a polity in which citizenship means both a multitude of (linguistic) identities and the ability to enter public discourse.

The opponents of plurilingualism are named linguistic seclusionism as well as linguistic homogenisation. Seclusionism refers to the ideology of one national language that is still going strong in European nation states, and shows that there is a tension between member states individually and the higher EU organisation. Left alone, member states would exist in *isolation* instead of *integration*, content to dominate their respective spheres with a single language. This shows that the writer sees language both as a tool for unity as well as opposition. In addition, since the Council has to work with the member states, antagonising them by naming them as opponents of this development is instead left unsaid.

Linguistic homogenisation is defined as the domination of English, leading to a *de facto English only* situation when members of different linguistic groups communicate. On the surface the proponent here is not a group of people, but a term of capitalist theory, the invisible hand of the market. The invisible hand of the market refers to the ability of supply and demand to influence society, through the purchase decisions of individual buyers. The word *invisible* is a part of the original term, and is less loaded with negative connotations, as it ultimately leads back to the decisions of the individual people. Perhaps that is why the writer has decided to further describe it as *heavily biased* towards domination by the English language. Further on, English is described as a *monopoly*, which is another economic term. This could be, perhaps simplistically and exaggerating a little, be described also as calling to oppose and resist the individual

choices made by people on the economic grounds to use English. Perhaps the researcher knows best, but opposing the teaching of English on economic grounds seems a bit weak, especially if a large portion of the people study it to gain an economic advantage.

A much stronger argument for resisting English homogenisation is in the last sentence, where the (European) citizenship is described both as having individual linguistic identities, and being able to enter into public discourse. People who are using their native language in public discourse are generally thought of as having a stronger position to express their opinions than those who have to use an alien language. So, if a state of English dominance would be the norm, English people would thus have a stronger position in public discourse, at the cost of everyone else. This again shows both that linguistic and social matters are interconnected, and that these relations are being viewed as a zero-sum game where gains by one group essentially mean a loss for some other or others.

The setting of plurilingualism as a force to counteract exclusion is returned to on page 18 (Article 2):

Under the conditions of such complexity of communicative participation, European communicative integration needs to take plurilingualism as its conceptual base. Otherwise, it would undermine or even curtail participation on at least the sub- and supra-national levels drastically. Hence, European communicative integration is as opposed to linguistic isolationism as it is to linguistic homogenisation. Both will lead to undesirable results with respect to the chances of democratic participation in political and cultural decision-making processes. Two forms of social exclusion must therefore be counteracted: exclusion through the depreciation of individuals' linguistically and culturally diverse identities, and exclusion through the lack of capacity for the individual to express him/herself in democratic processes.

This is a repetition of putting up plurilingualism as a third alternative to domination by either single national languages within nation states, or to English domination in

supranational context is the same as stated before. One interesting fact is what is left unsaid, for example that on a national level native languages are not under any threat. This shows that the focus of this whole text is on the levels above and below the national one. It can be assumed that the main focus is on increasing social inclusion and cohesion, as the strongly worded imperative sentence “*Two forms of social exclusion must therefore be counteracted...*” demands. Building European unity through getting citizens more involved in the supranational political processes is an obvious goal, while protecting the minorities is both an ethical and practical solution to decreasing grassroots resistance and championing a cause that most people view as a positive. The second one relates to the theme of preservation that will be returned to in more detail in the subsection 4.6.

Coming back to the relationship between plurilingualism and English, page 18 (article 2) contains more explicit formation of these opinions:

The Council of Europe is aware that the dominance of English as the most widely taught foreign language is problematic for the promotion of linguistic diversity through foreign language teaching...  
...the pursuit of diversity and plurilingualism however, requires a political will and action to counteract economic factors and popular misperceptions, which will otherwise lead to reduction of the number of languages known and linguistic homogenisation in general, with the plurilingualism of individuals only existing among social elites

Here the Council of Europe is given as an active agent who is both *aware* and (sees) that the position of English is *problematic*. The primacy of English is given as a factor that works against linguistic diversity through foreign language teaching. The forces supporting English dominance are again both economic and popular. In fact the expression *popular misperceptions* is particularly interesting here. It would suggest that a large portion of population has an opinion on this matter, and that it is wrong. The public opinion is designated as short-sighted in the last subordinate sentence, because it

will lead to the negative results of reduction of linguistic diversity and linguistic diversity being confined to the social elites. Here it seems that linguists are calling to make the decisions on behalf of the common populace, because the common population is unable to make the right choices themselves. In this case that plurilingualism needs to be protected even if the majority opinion would prefer another opinion, because as experts on the matter, linguists view themselves able to make the better long-term call. While this seems undemocratic, it is in line with how expert authority generally functions.

One of the ways the domination of global English would shift power away from non-speakers of English is underlined on page 20 (article 2):

Obviously, under circumstances of implicit power structures, which put the noncompetent speaker of English at a considerable disadvantage, it is unlikely that global problems would be communicated or solved in a democratic manner.

It is stated quite plainly that the domination of English would put the less competent speakers of English in a weaker position politically, while on the other hand giving “too much” power to the ones who speak English fluently.

However, the writer’s view on English is not completely one-dimensional, as shown later on page 20 (article 2):

If plurilingual education is to counterbalance the gravitational force of English as a *lingua franca*, English itself may function as a direct mediator between participants in a discourse who would otherwise have to rely on translation or a third party. Furthermore, English has already become the very linguistic means to give speakers, especially of lesser-used languages, their voice within a European public discourse.

Here some benefits are given, although grudgingly, for English. Both the word choices and the highly conditional expression of *may function* and *who would otherwise have to*

*rely on translation* suggest that while English would not be the first choice, in absence of other options it could be used. These effects are in fact the same ones that plurilingualism is supposed to give, facilitating discourse between both large groups and minorities. This would mean that plurilingualism is in direct competition with English for the same functions. So, for plurilingualism to succeed it must in fact displace English, at least from this role of facilitating discourse and protecting minority languages.

In article 11 by Gerhard Neuner this rivalry between English and plurilingualism is expressed even more directly. On page 10:

As a result of the socio-political changes of the last decades (cf. section 1) the position of English has been strengthened not only worldwide but also in Europe. It holds the first place among foreign languages offered in the curriculum, in almost all Member States of the Council of Europe (outside the English-speaking countries), not only in compulsory education (school level) but also in institutions for adult education and lifelong learning.

This development is irreversible and it presents a certain danger to the concept of European language policy (cf. section 2), since it might lead to a reduction – or even extinction – of linguistic diversity in Europe.

Since English holds this important strategic role in language policy, the question is how to harness the potentials of English for the development of a plurilingual concept.

The first paragraph only states that the position of English has strengthened both globally and specifically in Europe. The second paragraph elaborates on the threatening nature of this development. Words like *irreversible*, *danger*, *reduction*, and *extinction* are all loaded with alarm. They are probably used to invoke a reaction that even though it will be hard, something has to be done about this. What this action should be is left quite unclear in the third paragraph, as there are no concrete examples given how to actually harness the potential of English for the cause of plurilingualism.

Article 6 by Peter Doye gives some more examples of the views of English as a threat to other languages. On pages 7-8:

The advocates of intercomprehension regard it as an alternative or complement to the use of a *lingua franca*.

Undoubtedly, the universal employment of a *lingua franca* has one singular advantage over any form of communication between people of different first languages ...

...But the general acceptance of the *lingua franca* idea, so strong until the turn of the century, has recently given way to a more differentiated and critical view. Educators begin to see – besides the obvious advantage – some serious handicaps of a global language. The most important of these are:

- the danger of linguistic imperialism
- the disadvantage of culture-free use of *lingua franca*
- insufficient communication and potential depreciation of the mother tongue

Several authors have examined these handicaps carefully and treated them in their recent works... Phillipson is especially concerned about 'English linguistic imperialism' which he describes as 'dominance by the establishment and the continuous reconstitution of structural inequalities between English and other languages'(1992:80)

The definition of intercomprehension itself falls outside the scope of the present study, but put shortly it is a method for understanding foreign languages through guessing and intuition based on knowledge of related languages. As the several hedges in the first sentence show, it is now a widespread or powerful idea at the moment. The first hedge is saying that the *advocates regard it*, which could mean others are either ignorant or disagree about the following statement. The second hedge is that its function is given as an *either alternative or complement*, meaning that it is not quite clear which is it or if it even fills either one. Both of these quite indirect references could mean that the position of intercomprehension is very precarious compared, as it should be compared when assessing power relations, to the position of world English. World English, which is referred to with words like *undoubtedly* and *obvious advantage*, signaling its much more powerful position to this new alternative.

Another thing is that while in the first part of the text the domination of global English is given as something everyone knows and does not need specific examples, while the



recently discovered disadvantages are listed more specifically in the later part. This seems like a logical way to build an argument from a weaker position against a much stronger one. This article, and many earlier ones, all seem to show that one defining part of plurilingualism is indeed contesting the stronger position held by English as a lingua franca. This would mean that one of the unspoken ideologies behind plurilingualism is that of resistance.

Another direct quote from article 6 on page 9 underlines this quite plainly, even if the one language that dominates is not named explicitly:

If Europe wants to preserve its multilingual wealth, then it is not acceptable that one language dominates the others.

From the context of the entire article it should be obvious that English is being referred to here. However, not directly naming it could be because of several reasons. Perhaps the writer wishes to not further antagonize English readers, or is just attempting to keep the discussion on a general level by not naming the target, and keeping it open that the same conclusions would be applicable to other situations and languages as well. Here the agent that should be acting against language domination is Europe itself, in order to preserve its perceived wealth. This presupposes a coherent European entity that is able to take action and successfully resist domination, presumably the EU for the lack of other candidates. This would lead back to another force behind plurilingualism: that of creating tighter cohesion between the currently divergent member states.

Article 8 takes a wholly different approach and uses the viewpoint of language economics and education economics to look at this issue of relationship between English and plurilingualism. On page 15 the relationship to English is first touched on:

Sociolinguists themselves have claimed that their discipline has not produced a general theory of language dynamics (Appel and Myusken, 1987). This issue has been attracting considerable attention, particularly in the case of English (Crystal, 1997, 2000; Graddol, 1997), but a general theory still needs to be developed, although considerable progress has been made with Fishman's analysis of *threatened* language revitalisation (under the expressive of *reverse language shift*; see Fishman, 1991).

The phrase starts with the sociolinguists being named an agent, who are related to the object *general theory of language dynamics*, but through the negation that they have not in fact produced such a thing. But the unspoken yet is hinted at with the use of the verb *claim*, which would suggest there are other opinions. In the second sentence this is again suggested twice, both by stating that the issue itself is attracting attention, as well as a direct imperative that it *needs to be developed*. Especially the second one places the author in a position of power, where he can be seen as issuing a direct order to sociolinguists to make it so. The reasoning is that, *particularly in case of English*, this theory needs to be developed to explain the current situation why English is currently in such a powerful position globally. While this article is more focused on explaining the economic benefits of plurilingualism, on page 32 (article 8) a direct suggestion is made in regard to English in economic terms:

What emerges is a complex picture in which English can be interpreted as a valuable commodity, but where it would be incorrect to assume that policy should be content with promoting English and forget about other languages.

Here, English is referred to as valuable in the economic sense of the word, that proficiency in it is something that can give economic benefits to those who learn it. But it is immediately followed by suggestions that policy should not be *content to forget* about other languages. Both of these words create the impression that a policymaker

would be lazy and unprofessional to act in this way, as both of these verbs can also function as adjectives when describing a person, for example a policymaker. This sentence is probably an appeal to the better nature of these unspecified policymakers. Later on in pages 32-33 (article 8) more non-economic reasons are given, while the economic arguments referred to will be returned to later in the chapter discussing economics and plurilingualism:

In addition, a number of reasons speak in favour of teaching a broader range of languages. Apart from economic considerations above, two types of arguments can be invoked. First, bypassing any reference to economic analysis, the teaching and learning of other languages can be advocated for case-specific historical, political or cultural reasons. Second, it bears repeating that *non-market* values need to be taken into account, and that large segments of the opinion can be made aware, if they are not already, that linguistic diversity is an important element in the quality of our linguistic environment. Hence, teaching a variety of languages is not just a question of political principles, but one of welfare in the economic sense.

Here, while not going into any specific examples, the learning of several languages is linked welfare and quality of life, which are both terms from economic analysis too as stated here. While the arguments are general and united only in being very opaque, the focus here is on the bottom line or the end result. While being vague on the how, plurilingualism is given as a force that will also increase economic benefits through better welfare. This ties up the different fields of economics, politics and linguistics to all support the implementation of plurilingualism.

Article 13 by Joseph Lo Bianco is an interesting one, as it was the one with most thematic connections of all the articles. It is also written from an Australian perspective, which is geographically far away but socially and politically still close enough to the “old world”. On page 9 the writer explicitly describes the other reasons for language planning through negation in the specific Australian context:

As intimated above, in many respects Australia is an improbable state to embark on explicit language planning. It lacks the problem-solving, secession –stemming, or commodity-acquiring motivation of most countries’ national language plans... Despite having a multicultural and multilingual population the institutions of Australian society are dominated by English, seamlessly connected to English-using international

bilingualism.

Through stating that the Australian case is *improbable*, the writer outlines what he sees as the usual motivations for language planning. The Australians are not trying to solve problems, to stem secession or acquire commodities. At the same time that statement says that those are the motivations for language planning normally, implicitly including the European case.

Another interesting word choice is the use of *dominated by English*. Here the domination is related quite neutrally to the existence of multilingual population and bilingualism. This would in fact suggest that this writer does not see English domination as something that has to threaten the use of minority languages. This viewpoint is interesting because it contradicts some of the earlier articles that at least implicitly viewed English as a threat to them. On page 13 (article 13) the writer instead places this view in the past:

Education policy on indigenous languages has been a tormented affair. For most of its history officials have framed it around assimilation and specifically around how to impart effective English literacy. Both communities and professional educators and linguists have contested this view

The past tense *has been* in the first sentence, and the *for most of its history* both suggest that trying to replace indigenous languages with English is a thing of the unhappy past. The use of the adjective *tormented* in relation to policy would suggest that it has been a painful experience for both the target, as well as the policymakers. It would hint that this decision was carried out for emotional reasons instead of logical ones, as the officials had been tormented with the idea. On page 19 (article 13) these problems are again placed in the past:

This Australianist cultural assertion, because it was internal to English, developed an initial problematic relationship with the later emergence of multiculturalism.

Multiculturalism advocated the legitimacy of non-English ways to know and describe Australia, and the legitimacy of their experiences in Australia.

Here again both past tense and word choices are used to place the problems and juxtapositions in to the historic past. The conflict here seems to have been about legitimacy, or more accurately about non-English viewpoints struggling to gain it for their descriptions of social reality. These viewpoints had been described in more detail on page 14 earlier in the article:

Assimilationist and neo-colonial discourses, overtly or silently, deploy the instrumental power of English literacy, economic opportunity, and poverty alleviation, alongside a youthful gratification consumerism. Dominant and liberal political notions of participatory modernity often construe the desires of minority groups for ethnolinguistic vitality as demands for separation. Problematically for minority advocacy, preserving the distinctive languages requires some measure of dedicated institutional space, or the ability to create and transmit to the new generations distinctive cultural meanings, generated linguistically.

Here are listed both the positive and negative reasons why English has been seen to threaten minority languages. The economic benefits for English are underlined several times, while noting that the dominant English-speaking group could also see minority languages as vehicles for separatism, which is generally seen as an undesirable feature in minority groups by the majority. However, it needs to be remembered that these examples are from a country where the official national language is English, and as such do not directly apply to the European situation.

In conclusion, the relationship between English and plurilingualism can be seen as a complex and sometimes contradictory affair. Still, a few major points can be generalized from these articles. Firstly, global English is clearly seen as the more powerful partner to plurilingualism. This is taken for granted in all the articles, and in most cases this hegemony of English is seen as an obstacle to the spread of plurilingualism. However, ideas on how to deal with this problem vary between articles. Some suggest resistance,

while others would like to think of a way to use English to help spread plurilingualism. Moreover, resistance is usually the way of the weaker party in a struggle, which would further support the assumption that currently plurilingualism is or is seen as the weaker side. Mostly, a competitive relationship between these two options is seen, as they are both in a sense competing for the same function of communication between different language groups.

Secondly, English is seen as a threat. It is portrayed as a killer language that can cause the extinction of other languages is left unchecked. However, it seems to me that most of this threat is not at the national level, but instead only on both supra-national and sub-national levels, where it is being used to communicate between members of different linguistic groups. This is probably why it is resisted most by the members of language groups, whose language is currently being used for this function, most notably the French language, as they are the ones who have most to lose if their language is replaced by English. The reason is probably that having your language used by others is a source of prestige, as well as having a little extra social power in settings such as the European Parliament, as you can communicate more effortlessly in your native language.

Thirdly, there is an ideological struggle between English and plurilingualism. Plurilingualism has been attached with a lot of ideological “baggage”, as it clearly represents the values being promoted by the European Union. These values are different from those attached to English, which is seen as the language of international trade, technology and computers, as well as the vehicle for Anglo-American cultural domination. So it is not just a linguistic choice but it contains a more hidden ideological

one as well, and both sides carry lots of extra baggage. Respect for differences, cooperation and tolerance are all attached to plurilingualism, as well as European superiority and common background. All of these ideas are ones that would support further integration within Europe, so we could regain a position of importance in the world that has been lost. It is not the place for this present study to judge these ideologies, but only to note that they are there.

#### ***4.2 Problems and opponents of plurilingualism***

A second central theme in relation to plurilingualism is how its problems and opponents are described, especially if the articles are viewed as argumentative in nature, where the balance of benefits and problems is essential. While not making any overt assumptions, it seems very logical that in order to promote the system of plurilingualism, the pros and cons should be examined in much detail. As most articles should be supportive of plurilingualism, the negative sides of it need to be displayed as lesser than the benefits, and as something that can be overcome without too much effort, while the benefits should be described as worthy and possible to accomplish. For the purposes of this study, these themes are separated into different subsections 4.2 and 4.3, but they are obviously linked together. The theme of problems and opponents is handled first because it had more references in the thematic analysis, being mentioned in 9 different articles and 9 pages of text in total. In fact it was the most widespread theme mentioned in more articles than any other. Another assumption here is that if plurilingualism is something that can expect to be resisted on some levels. Beforehand I would have bet that the theme of problems would have more attention given to it, however the

difference between text dedicated to these two themes is small enough not to really support that.

In article 10 by Richard Johnstone, which mostly deals with the theme of age, there is one paragraph on pages 15-16 that displays how the writer sees the problems and opponents of plurilingualism:

To its credit, the Council of Europe has given an unambiguous lead in advocating the benefits of individual plurilingualism within a culturally diverse, multilingual larger European society. However, the world, including Europe, is not a totally civilised place. There are profound underlying problems of stereotyping, prejudice, exclusion, fundamentalism and top-down standardisation to confront. This means that issues of societal attitude and motivation somehow have to be addressed, including attitudes to 'otherness', and to other languages, their speakers and associated cultures.

In the first sentence, the word structure is very clear with the Council of Europe as the agent, advocating for a clearly stated goal as the object. The sentence also contains several adjectives with positive connotations like *unambiguous*, *culturally diverse* and *larger (society)*, as well as the object of the sentence, *benefits*. All of this sets the tone for both the Council of Europe and plurilingualism as highly positive, which is contrasted immediately afterwards with the problems. Beginning with a general statement that the world is not a civilised or a nice place in the second sentence, these problems are described in more detail in the third one. These social problems are the subject of the third sentence, and the agent is left unsaid. According to Fairclough (1989: 123-124), leaving the agent in the dark or obfuscating the agency is a clue that the sentence could be ideologically significant. Here, it could be used for example as a technique for discrediting these arguments, because it suggests that they are not actually supported by any specific group, or that that group does not wish to publicly support them. Or perhaps in this case, as these problems are all negative traits of individuals or groups, the writer does not wish to take on a too judgmental tone in order to not come



off as preaching. After all, perhaps some of the readers are here indirectly asked to fix their own attitudes in order to make plurilingualism possible. Perhaps one of the problems facing plurilingualism at a very core level is all these negative characteristics of individual people. Here again as in the previous subsection, the theme of improving the level of civilization and uplifting the attitudes of common people in Europe is visible, that the current attitudes are poor and perhaps opposed to plurilingualism. The idea here probably is that linguists, as experts, should make this kind of decisions even against public opposition.

Article 17 by Pádraig Riagan and Georges Lüdi starts with some historic arguments and opinions that were expressed against plurilingualism in the past few centuries. In the preface:

In many contexts, children grow up bilingual or even plurilingual, mainly because two or more languages are spoken in their environment. In Western societies of the 19th and early 20th century, this was considered to be a burden rather than an opportunity... In addition, the dominant ideology of nationalism assumed that national boundaries coincided 'naturally' with monolingual language territories - and being a member of two nations simultaneously seemed suspicious. Bilinguals were considered as potential traitors.

Fortunately, these stereotypes are nowadays largely out of date.

Here, the first sentence gives a very liberal definition of plurilingualism, as the only requirement for being one is to grow up in an environment where several languages are spoken. This is then linked to the historic view of the past few centuries and the nationalistic ideology that placed great emphasis on language as a unifying force for the society. Being considered a traitor, even just a potential one is a very strong expression of distrust. This all is to show the reader that plurilingualism can carry a stigma with it as well as benefits.

However, what is most interesting is the one word choice in the next paragraph, the word *largely*. It suggests that while the negative views about plurilingualism are outdated and out of favour, they still have some influence left. At the same time opponents of plurilingualism and supporters of monolingual nationalism are both also being painted with the same brush, as suspicious and behind the times. This would suggest that one of the problems facing plurilingualism is the opposition from groups who support national monolingualism, as these two ideologies are mutually exclusive. The reason for this is to support the arguments for plurilingualism, while displaying the opponents as less logical, and thus as ones whose opinion need not be taken into account as much. This also shows how the language questions are linked to larger debates and ideologies, and thus cannot be studied in isolation.

The same argumentative strategy is used later on in pages 23-24 (article 17) much more openly:

Before dealing with the results of evaluations of different models and types of bilingual education, it is helpful to look first at some of the most frequently expressed concerns about bilingual education. These concerns are often based on prejudices and/or unreliable information. It is clear that many fears have their origin in a confusion between different models of bilingual education or in inappropriate transfers of outcomes from one situation to the other. Nevertheless, they constitute a severe handicap for any policy of bilingual education and may have a negative impact on its results.

Here, the tone is slightly less severe, probably because the target of the arguments are parents of children making education choices and expressing their opinion on education policy. Those who oppose plurilingualism are represented as making their decisions based on emotions like *fears or confusion*, or *inappropriate transfers of outcomes from one situation to the other*, which is a fancy way of saying mistakes. Again, the

opponents of plurilingualism are painted as illogical and mostly emotional persons. However, this time they constitute *a severe handicap*, which could suggest that the opposition to plurilingualism is more powerful than previously stated.

This means that one of the opponents of plurilingualism is in fact an emotional instead of logical attitude towards language learning. For example opposing or supporting certain languages because of things that happened over a hundred years ago such as wars, or because of cultural stereotypes associated with the language. Whether it is just an argumentative strategy to display the opponent as emotional in order to portray them as illogical, or just the plain fact that monolingual nationalism does in fact evoke a stronger emotional response from citizens, remains unclear.

In article 13 the comments about the relationship between nationalism and narratives give some additional insight into this on pages 30-31:

As Bhabha (1991) points out nations are also 'narrated' into existence, telling and hearing narratives of endless repetition. Beyond territory, administration and economy nation-states involve and produce "cultural signification". Cultural signification for pluralism is its own distinctive narration that seeks to enshrine plurilingualism, whereas states fashioned on single ethnicities bolstered only single languages. Since pluralism has not been the narrative of states and nations it won't be possible to be confident, or pessimistic, of its prospects until the stories are devised and told. Anderson (1991: 53) is sceptical about whether trans-national structures and entities, say, the Association of South East Asian Nations, or indeed, the European Union and Council of Europe can produce attachment. He writes: "...*in themselves*, market-zones, natural-geographic or politico-administrative, do not create attachments. Who will die for Comecon or the EEC?". But there are many kinds and degrees of attachment and emotional commitment...

This paragraph highlights the problem that plurilingualism is facing in relation to ideologies of national languages, that those ideologies have been around and in use for a long time, while plurilingualism is a relative newcomer. And the last two sentences underline another problem, the fact that so far pluralist ideologies are unable to create emotional attachment that can match up with nationalistic ones. So, the emotional

response, or lack of it, can be seen as one of the biggest problems facing plurilingualism.

On page 25 the article 13 lists some other arguments against plurilingualism:

*How does bilingual education affect the students' culture?*

A fundamentalist argument against bilingual education is that languages are linked to cultures, and therefore, a person can only belong to one culture and the biculturalism which accompanies bilingualism will exclude the student from both culture.

...

*Should literacy not be restricted to one language only?*

In the framework of research on specific models of bilingual education, biliteracy is often seen as a pedagogical problem. Do literacy knowledge and skills in one language promote or inhibit the learning of literacy knowledge and skills in the other?

Here the most significant cultural and pedagogical arguments against plurilingualism are listed quite briefly. Both are based on how it is assumed to affect the student negatively in the future, either socially or indirectly in the job market, where weaker literacy could have an impact. The choice of the adjective *fundamentalist*, which has a strong religious and intolerant connotations would suggest that the argument as outdated and illogical. In the other argument the question about the scientific results of whether plurilingual education promotes or inhibits is left open. This probably suggests there are results supporting both sides, and neither one has gained acceptance over the other. The article comes back to both of these later on page 29 (article 13), where the standing point of the article is put more openly:

Bilingual education will be a novel experience for many, if not most or all, parents in a given situation. While they may be encouraged by the prospects of a bilingual education for their children, the power of residual stereotypical fears that bilingualism will have a negative impact remains a potent factor. These preoccupations have to be taken seriously.

The audience that are addressed here are the parents of children receiving education, and their emotions. Their fears and hopes for the children are taken as important for these policy decisions. Also, their implied *residual stereotyping* is a factor that needs to

be taken into account according to the article. So again the realm that the article is trying to alter is in fact the attitudes and emotions of relevant citizens, to become more tolerant and positive. For plurilingualism to succeed, it seems that the people themselves need to become better.

In article 4 by Stacy Churchill on page 7, the demarcation line of plurilingualism and politics is made clearer, along with some other good points:

Commentators both in Europe and Canada are often troubled by the contradictory perception that, while Canadian policies on official language education are supposed to be highly successful when viewed in a comparative international context, the continuing debate about the status of Quebec in Canadian federation is deemed to represent a failure of the same policies. It is my contention (a) that the media and an anxious but naïve public “bought” official language policies as a near-panacea for national unity during the late 1960s, (b) that this selling job was abetted by enthusiasts for bilingualism (including senior bureaucrats and many elected politicians), but (c) that the actual policies addressed only a few of the issues underlying the debate over Quebec status, most of which were nonlinguistic.

This piece starts with the dichotomy between success and failure of the Canadian language policy in the past in relation to Quebec separatism. Simply put in Canada there are two national languages, English and French. English is the majority language in most of Canada except in the state of Quebec where there is a strong French-speaking majority. This situation is relevant to Europe where a similar one of strong local language minorities is common.

The main point is that linguistic policy can be successful while a relevant but separate policy, national cohesion, fails. This also implies that linguistic policy alone is not strong enough to bind separate political entities together. In point (a) the public and media are described as naïve and emotional, who are being taken advantage of by bureaucrats and politicians as described in point (b). Both the term *selling job* and the verb *abetted* have dishonest or even criminal connotations, something that could be

even used to describe a con, suggesting the public was sold something they did not actually need, if not against their will then against their better judgment. The time of this event also coincides with the rise of plurilingualism as an ideology, so enthusiasm for it was probably high, while actual results were not yet available.

Another interesting choice of roles here is that bureaucrats and elected officials are displayed as pushing their own separate agenda, here plurilingualism, against the benefit of the general public who are described as ignorant. This would suggest that public decisions are made on the grounds of private enthusiasm of specific individuals who happen to be placed in a position of power. This image of a top-down policy that is being implemented either against the will or due to ignorance of the public is a serious problem for plurilingualism, as in my opinion it cannot succeed if it is being viewed as such. It would probably spark endless resistance on the grass-roots level when it would actually clash with the desires of individuals.

Pages 14-15 (article 4) echo previous religious word choices used in article 17, where religious differences are displayed as another factor keeping language groups apart, alongside economic considerations:

Complaints of Anglophone parents that their children's French language skills are not adequate preparation for working in a French language job market are often echoed by Francophone parents who fear their children will not learn enough English to benefit from the economic advantages of bilingualism. In addition, under the system of splitting schooling along denominational lines between majority Francophone Catholic school commissions and majority Anglophone Protestant commissions, Anglophone parents often complained about the quality and choice of English-language instructional options available to their children in the Catholic system (cf. Churchill with Kates Peat Marwick & Partners 1987).

The first sentence shows a situation where neither side is happy with the outcome, as both groups of parents feel the language instruction is not good enough to bring the economic benefits they desire. This is further underlined in the second sentence, where

the words describing religious segregation, such as *splitting* and *denominational lines* show that religion has an effect on the language education choices available to parents. Also, both Francophone and Anglophone linguistic preferences are being linked to Catholic and Protestant religious systems respectively in the word order, when they are used in adjective couples describing the noun in the sentence, *commissions*. Finally, perceived poor quality of teaching the “other” language in these separate systems is what causes the parents to complain. This could show that alongside other cultural and social factors, when religious borderlines exist they can work against language pluralism. In Europe a similar Catholic/Protestant division exists inside several states, such as Germany, as well as between member states. However, the articles written in Europe did not mention religion at all, so it might not be relevant in Europe today.

On page 20 article 4 responds to another common accusation directed towards plurilingual education, that of elitism. The central argument is that results are positive because the ones participating in the program are “elite” students, who would do better than average in any program:

Critics of immersion have often attributed the success of immersion students in learning a second language well without corresponding loss of achievement in other subjects, including English, to the idea that the programs tend to recruit “elite” students. The charges of elitism have been contradicted by growth in the numbers of students participating. In cities like Ottawa and Montreal and in the province of New Brunswick, up to a third of Anglophone students are enrolled in French immersion at one time.

Here the agent in the first sentence is defined as a group, the *critics of immersion*, in an active sentence that is contradicted by the passive structure of the second sentence. The passive structure is probably used to convey the idea that the facts speak for themselves here, followed by a matter of fact example speaking in favour of this. This piece is probably an answer to an argument *often* used by critics, meaning it is one that is used a

lot. The main point of this sentence structure and word choices is probably just to weaken the opposing argument.

Article 22 by Gerard Willems starts out on page 8 with another, very specific problem related to plurilingualism as a system for conducting politics inside the European

Union:

There was a time when the lack of command by Europeans of European languages other than their own was considered by the European Commission as 'the Achilles heel' of European unification. This time seems somewhat disturbingly behind us. At present, discussions seem to be concerned mainly with solving cumbersome communication problems at government level. The basic question in these discussions is whether we have to 'go for' English alone, or for English and French, and possibly German, Spanish and Italian, as so-called 'bridge-languages'.

Here the first thing is that lack of language skills of the common people in Europe is being described from the point of view of the European Commission as *the Achilles heel*, meaning the weak spot, of achieving unification. This also implies that unification is in fact the aim of the EC all along. However, in the second and third sentences the voice of the text changes to the author of this text, who uses a very interesting expression *disturbingly*. He is disturbed and alarmed by something that has changed, since its *time is behind us*. It is not said out explicitly what this disturbing issue is, but it can be deducted to mean the change of focus into government level problems. The actors are no longer the people, but bureaucrats and officials, and their *cumbersome problems*. The word cumbersome suggests these are large and unwieldy. However, the main problem is stated in the last sentence, its essentially the question of what language to use. The choice of language used in parliamentary debates is a complex one, and the following paragraph lists problems and sums up some arguments that are mainly against the use on English only:



The debate, after smouldering beneath the surface for a long time, was recently re-initiated with the prospect of the Union's extension to include central European language speaking countries. Translation, spoken or written, so the argument runs, will amount to such an investment of time and money that other, simpler and less costly, solutions, will have to be found. Besides, European Parliament members admit that, in spite of costly translation facilities, they often cannot make sense of what they hear in their earphones in their own language, miss or misinterpret important points or, as a consequence, even vote wrongly. Forcing monolinguals to use a *lingua franca* foreign to them cannot be the solution. Indeed, democratic debate will suffer as it will be restricted to monologues for lack of easy command of the *lingua franca* by the speakers. Furthermore, voters at home may no longer be able to follow what their representatives in the European Parliament say and lose interest in the European democratic process. Moreover, the use of one lingua franca like English may give what has been called a 'false sense of mutual intelligibility' (Garcia and Otheguy, 1989) and legal texts, for obvious reasons, will have to be translated anyway.

So, linguistic diversity should be an option in spite of voices claiming it cannot automatically be a first choice (van Els, 2000; Grin, 1997). No doubt, the debate will rage on for some time to come. When all is said and done, however, there are additional and convincing reasons that plead for language diversity and plurilingualism in Europe and the world, as we shall see below.

The first sentence describes this debate as *smouldering beneath the surface for a long time*. This metaphor of a fire would suggest that language choices in the European Parliament are both a point of contention, and that it had not been satisfactorily resolved the first time. Thus, along with the addition of new member states, that are allegedly bad at foreign languages, new fuel is thrown to the fire. This is shown in the second sentence, where it lists arguments against the current method of translation, but interestingly it uses an alien voice instead of the authors, with devices like *so the argument runs* clearly showing that the writer wants to distance himself from these arguments, instead listing them as what someone else has said. Still, the imperative in the end *will have to be found* shows that this argument has some forceful backing from somebody. The translation facilities are also described as both expensive and inefficient, as in the word choices *such an investment* or just plain *costly*. Additionally, representatives are described as *often* being unable to make sense or misinterpret what they hear, which leads to the largest/most significant problem when they *vote wrongly*. This linguistic confusion is also linked to voters at home being unable to follow the

debates and losing interest, which is another central problem this kind of multinational political progress is facing at the moment. All of these arguments are leveled against the current system of massive translation.

Lastly the use of English alone is opposed on the grounds that it would lead to a *'false sense of mutual intelligibility'* (Garcia and Otheguy, 1989). This is a very interesting expression that refers to an older scientific article, but here it probably means that participants would believe they are communicating while in the meanwhile they are speaking of different things, because of the different levels of language proficiency in English. This false intelligibility is contrasted with plurilingualism, which is logically taken to represent the opposite, as a method that brings some kind of true interaction.

The last paragraph is simply a claim for the use of plurilingualism. Interestingly, some of the *voices claiming it cannot be a first choice* are named, and include Francois Grin who has written one of the other articles being studied here. The tone is certain that this will not be a quick and easy win for plurilingualism, as the second sentence states. The use of the verb *rage* keeps with the theme of referring to this argument as a fire too.

In article 2 another argument against linguistic plurality is answered on pages 14-15:

Beierwaltes (1998: 11) opposes the view that linguistic plurality might eventually turn out to be the limiting factor for European democracy. He argues “that a common language could well strengthen the communicative integration of a community but that such a degree of homogeneity would not be required as an absolute precondition for a European public space and thus for European democracy.”

Here, the argument that linguistic plurality could limit democracy in Europe is presented inside the first sentence. It is not given here who has proposed this, but the counter-argument is given with a clear sense of who is supporting it. In the first

sentence the agent is given by his name, and in the second one as a he. The sentence structure is also direct in both sentences. The argument itself could be summed up as while a common language could be useful, it is not necessary in this case. This could be that, because the effect of a common language cannot be countered, it can still be circumvented in order to legitimize the choice of plurilingualism as a method for democracy and a *European public space*. This is further elaborated later on:

Once the general principle of pluralism and diversity is accepted, the question arises how legitimacy can be generated in the light of and out of linguistic diversity. Decisions and actions which claim democratic legitimacy, since they are founded on knowledge and opinion, require communication, interaction and exchange. It seems quite clear that a common communicative sphere is required for the people in Europe to negotiate their perspectives on the future shape of a polity they can identify with – both culturally and politically. But, as was the case with ‘citizenship’, such a sphere cannot be conceived of as ‘monolithic’.

But how can language education policies avoid Scylla and Charybdis of a market-driven tendency towards linguistic homogenisation on the one hand and communicative isolation within multilingual diversity on the other?

Here in the first sentence, the triumph of plurilingualism is given as a certainty, using the expression *once ... is accepted*. The problem presented is only how to generate legitimacy for the inevitable. The creation of a common communicative sphere is called for, but no practical advice on this is actually given, only saying what it cannot be. In this case it cannot be *monolithic*, which literally means “made out of a single stone”. Thus, logically plurilingualism should be constructed from many small stones instead, but as to how exactly is left unsaid.

In the last paragraph is another negative definition of what is not desirable. Market-driven tendency towards single languages and nationalistic linguistic isolation as described as the Scylla and Charybdis, twin beasts of ancient Greek legends. In the common sense it means the choice between two evils, as these options are given here. The choice of metaphor here is interesting, as it portrays both of them as evil, leaving

plurilingualism to be portrayed as good, but is kind of inaccurate since in this argument there are three major sides. However, on the other hand in this metaphor it also means they are the only two options, and the one with less damage needs to be chosen. This would signal that the ideology of plurilingualism is still also weak when compared to the “big two”, the nationalistic languages and global English.

Article 3 by Veronique Castellotti and Daniele Moore comes back to a more practical standpoint, and describes some of the actual problems young learners associate with plurilingualism. On pages 13-14:

Children tend to have very complicated images of how languages are organised in the brain. At the same time, the way in which they divide the brain's language system into compartments conflicts with their ideas about plurilingual production:

...

Plurilingualism is often associated with confusion, forgetfulness and muddle. Plurilingual speakers are thought to be confused primarily about lexical decisions and language selection. Their difficulties appear to stem from failings in automatic processes: they “look for” their words, and have to think, try things out, have a go, start again: “no it's not that language” (Castellotti and Moore 1999).

The first paragraph describes children as having both complicated and simple ideas about languages. Interestingly, the ideas about plurilingualism are attributed to them, with the word *their*, while at the same time describing the simple compartmentalised idea of languages. The paradoxical problem is elaborated on in the second paragraph, where the problems of plurilingualism are attributed mainly to the automatic processes in language, and the failures that sometimes happen in it. On the other hand the benefits of a deeper understanding of languages as a system in general, once language skill is matured are left unsaid. This is probably because the problems described here are attributed to children, who are generally seen as beginners in language learning. This

could be interpreted as a statement that the problems with plurilingualism are the problems of beginners, while the benefits are there for those who reach higher levels.

In conclusion, the problems and opponents facing plurilingualism are manifold, but they can be grouped into a three main categories. First is the view that people in general are not developed enough to accept it, perhaps due to emotional, religious or other limitations. This is coupled with the fact that as a mainly intellectual ideology, plurilingualism is not as attractive on the emotional level. Instead, nationalistic tendencies have much stronger sway in influencing the language choices of citizens. After all, ever since the era of nationalism language and nation have been very closely tied. Secondly, since language questions are also related to other political issues, it is impossible to make these decisions purely on linguistic grounds, instead they always have to include political compromises. Thirdly, negative results for children in research can mobilize parents against it, if they see it as damaging to the economic and other possibilities for their offspring.

Another minor point that comes to the forefront in this subsection, is who are the assumed audience of these texts. In many places there is an underlying juxtaposition between experts (linguists) and the ignorant common folk who oppose plurilingualism for many “wrong” reasons. This would suggest that these texts are mainly targeted at political decisionmakers and bureaucrats, since this kind of view is not exactly likely to persuade a common person to change their views. It could also mean that plurilingualism might actually be opposed on a grass-roots level if it conflicts with peoples goals on an individual level.

However, the most significant problem facing plurilingualism seems to be something that is not directly addressed in any of these texts, but which is almost always present in the background. It is the assumption that plurilingualism is not strong enough to compete on its own, and instead requires support from the EU to succeed. This is only natural in texts that are in essence designed to support one argument over others, but even so it can also give an insight into the ideology behind it. Bottom line is that, at least in part, supporters of plurilingualism see the situation as such that plurilingualism would not fare well if left unsupported against the competitors. Of course the competing ideologies are also being supported by someone or many people who feel it does not represent their ideology or view of how things should be. One reason this group is unnamed in some texts could be that the writers do not wish to offend a major part of population who are opposed to their views. This means that things like ideologies cannot be assessed and weighed in a vacuum, that they are also in part evaluated on the grounds of who supports them. At least on the basis of these examples, it looks like plurilingualism is in an underdog position, but one that is being favoured by the experts who should know what they are doing.

### **4.3 Advantages and benefits of plurilingualism**

This third section follows logically after the previous one which dealt with the perceived problems of plurilingualism. Both this and the previous chapter should be viewed together as a whole. The main reason that the benefits and advantages follow the disadvantages is because this theme has less pages and articles referring to it. As a result of the thematic analysis, there were 7 articles with 8 pages of text that referred to the benefits and advantages of plurilingualism.

One reason this is an interesting theme is that while looking at what is given as advantageous in this context, the texts can also highlight what is ideologically viewed as desirable by the writers. These desirable issues are likely to be something that the writers would probably wish to see implemented in society in general.

Starting with a list from article 17 on page 22, listing some of the benefits from adopting plurilingualism:

The advantages of bilingual education are:

Language acquisition is more spontaneous when it is used in authentic situations of communication (the teaching of geography, mathematics, etc.). The learners can thus activate to a maximum their natural faculty of acquiring languages. The formal teaching of the L2 is adapted to the needs of the subject which leads to an optimal combination between tutored and untutored learning.

Subjects that raise the learners' interest constitute important sources of primary motivation which arises directly from the immediate learning situation and must not be derived from a potential future advantage to which the knowledge of the language could lead. Learning the language and learning non-linguistic contents are integrated processes that favour the learning processes.

Bilingual teaching is demanding for the teachers who have to make a conscious use of the language for the purposes of subject teaching through more than one language. Dealing intensively with the difficulties inherent to the subjects taught strengthens the learners' language awareness and contributes to the development of the language curriculum across subject borders.

Here each short paragraph lists one advantage of plurilingualism, or in this case bilingual education, from top to bottom: spontaneity, motivation and awareness. However, the first paragraph seems to describe CLIL or Content and Language Integrated Learning, therefore it does not really apply to plurilingualism as such. The second paragraph deals with the internal motivations of the student, and thus does not really apply either. However, the last paragraph gets to the point of plurilingualism.

Although the teaching process is described as more difficult with adjectives like *demanding*, the adverb *intensively*, *having to make a conscious effort* or even more plainly *difficulties inherent to the subjects*. Together all these expressions portray it as much more difficult than “regular” teaching, but the benefit of awareness is assumed to be worth it. Both the added awareness and proficiency *across subject borders* can be interpreted to lead to similar development later in life in other areas, such as democratic citizenship in the EU. However there is one more benefit listed in the same article on the next page, page 23 (article 17):

Because of its efficiency, bilingual education is increasingly replacing traditional forms of language teaching. Once teachers are trained and teaching materials elaborated, it does not cost more than a monolingual form of education. On the other hand, society benefits from the high rewards that diversified linguistic competences bring to the individual and to the community. Studies in the economics of language learning and teaching show that competences in one, or several, foreign languages can translate into higher salaries, in comparison to others who have the same basic qualifications and types of job.

Here in the first two sentences bilingual education is described as more efficient than traditional education for the same cost. However, this efficiency is not elaborated on further, and is not the main point of the paragraph in any case. Later on in this extract, language skills are directly connected to higher salaries, thus for the individual the economical benefits are seen as a primary source of motivation. It should also be noted that the word *can* is used to hedge this promise, making the point that language learning is not a total guarantee of higher income. All this would suggest that while on a general level there can be more idealistic, on an individual level the greatest motivation are larger earnings. This same concern is repeated in article 4 on pages 21-22 (article 17):

We have already discussed one part of this trend, the success of French immersion schooling - a success that demonstrated “ordinary” people could “really” learn to speak French in school. The second factor was the growing groundswell of popular support for bilingualism as a symbol of Canadian identity and the conviction of many parents that knowing French would be a significant job market advantage for their children in their adult years.

Here in the context of Canadian bilingualism, the individual economic benefit was a major concern when making decisions about education, along with identity and feasibility. As Canada is culturally and politically similar to Europe in many ways, these conclusions could easily apply to the EU as well. This piece also underlines how individual people make language choices on quite logical grounds, on how much money in future earnings is it worth to learn a language.



On page 30 of article 17 there is another list of the more idealistic benefits of plurilingualism:

Research studies have shown that students can quickly acquire considerable fluency in the second language when they are exposed to it in the environment and at school but despite this rapid growth in conversational fluency, it generally takes a minimum of about five years (and frequently much longer) for them to catch up to native-speakers in academic aspects of the language...

As stated, the main problems are: How to distinguish between content assessment and language assessment; How to cope with the distance between a high cognitive level and limited language skills in L2; How to cope, at the beginning, with the gap between receptive and productive skills; How to trace the "advantages" of bilingualism (increased creativity, tolerance, social competence, flexibility, etc.).

At the end of the paragraph there is a more straightforward list of the personality traits associated with bilingualism, and very likely plurilingualism too. It should be noted that quotation marks are used with the word *advantages* and that the list is left open-ended with *et cetera*, both devices which cast doubt or uncertainty on the whole list. Perhaps it is just a way of expression of the fact that the advantages listed are all quite hard to define precisely or quantify, or just more simply that the writer wants to express some doubt in the value of these advantages. In the case of articles attached to the Guide promoting plurilingualism, it seems likely that they should be more positively tuned towards plurilingualism, so this kind of doubt at the value of the aims seems especially striking.

In article 16 on page 19, the opportunities for plurilingualism especially in border regions are underlined:

Encouragement of the learning of foreign languages in frontier regions must exploit the opportunities offered by daily life to make languages a means of exchanging interests, viewpoints and specific and often differing patterns of behaviour. The teaching and learning of foreign languages for frontier regions must allot a special place to the neighbouring language and to the out-of-school learning and use of that language in the daily round of frontier life. Such teaching and learning must therefore take place in all areas of life, including the media sector.

The first thing that stands out in this paragraph is the straight imperative forms use in each sentence. Every one contains the word *must* and it is directly linked to the verb every time. The voice using the command here is probably the writer, who as an expert

is using that authority to imply strongly to the educational authorities, in this case of border regions. This kind of strong expression is probably meant to underline the importance of this, since the command is coming from outside the usual authority structure. The verb *exploit* is used in the first sentence in a positive sense, describing the interests, viewpoints and patterns of behaviour as sort of resources to be exploited. But more importantly, this paragraph underlines one trait of the plurilingualism that is less often mentioned outright, that it is going to be a system that is going to be tied to geography. People are going to learn the languages they have borders with. This is both an advantage as shown here with the availability of exploitable linguistic resources in these areas, but it is also going to be tied down to the same geography, and it could end up strengthening the existence of these borders too.

In article 4 on pages 42-43 the role of bilingualism as a means of increased cohesion and as a national symbol is also brought up in the Canadian context:

The Canadian model of using official languages in education has been pursued for more than three decades with considerable success and has raised the concept of official languages to the status of a powerful shared symbol of the Canadian nation-state. The successes achieved are important but incomplete. None of the successes could have been achieved without the converging efforts of both federal and provincial authorities.

The role of bilingualism as a national symbol here is one that is portrayed as a result of government activity. In the first sentence, the unsaid agent in the verb *pursued* can be assumed to be the government. As it is said in the last sentence, all levels of authority had a hand in making it happen. Another interesting point is the repeating of the words *success* and *achieved* several times, pointing out that this is a thing that has already happened. This kind of a symbol would be quite useful for the EU too, as the ones used by the mainly monolingual member states do not quite fit the purpose. Another interesting thing is that in this example the project for bilingualism had the backing of several levels of government, which relates to the conclusion in the previous chapter that plurilingualism, too, needs to be supported by officials to succeed. The Canadian example would suggest that plurilingualism in Europe is both feasible and desirable. It is also interesting that Canada is being used as a model for bilingualism, since countries like Finland or Belgium have also been praised as successfully bilingual experiences, and they would be both member states and geographically much closer. Perhaps this is

just because of the lack of suitable scientific articles.

From the point of view of learning and education, the main thing is whether plurilingualism helps students to learn languages better. Several of the articles support this view. In article 7 on page 15 the writer makes the point that plurilingualism helps children become better at languages in general:

Language acquisition theory and research definitely indicate that the linguistic property of a bilingual child differs in both its languages from the one of a child which grew up monolingually in one of the languages. From research into cognitive development we gain powerful indications for the assumption that bilingualism in early childhood is most beneficial for language development as a whole and for cognitive development as well. This is attributed to the very fact that children cannot exploit their language environment effortlessly. They are permanently confronted with special challenges like the following: they must distinguish between their languages and develop criteria for the differentiation; they must identify which of their languages is appropriate with a particular person or in a particular situation; they must learn to switch codes at the right moment, to translate or interpret; and they are more often than monolinguals provoked to bridge comprehension difficulties. The abilities necessary for the solution of problems like these are called 'metalinguistic competence', a means of reception and expression which are not strictly bound to a specific language but to language as such.

The argument here is that while plurilingual children might not gain the mastery of one language as quickly or easily, their metalinguistic experience give them better skills in language use in general. They might be able to use guesswork and similarities to get on by with a limited language skills in related languages, as suggested in article 3 on page 18:

Other approaches are more resolutely plurilingual. These include activities on intercomprehension of related languages, which are designed to open up a linguistic area (such as Romance languages) to speakers, enabling them to read any other Romance language. Studies by the Galatea team (*ELA 104*, 1996) and the EuRom4 team (*Le Français dans le Monde* 1997) focus on how similarities between related languages are recognised and processed, in order to explore ways of promoting intercomprehension of Romance languages, particularly through the development of translinguistic tools and instruments.

Both of these articles show that the kind of linguistic competence desired in plurilingualism is not the formal mastery of a language, but the more hybrid kind of competence communicating meaning and just getting on by are more important. This is underlined in the preface of article 3:

to create through reflection and exchange of experience and expertise, the consensus necessary for European societies, characterised by their differences and the transcultural currents which create 'globalised nations', not to become lost in the search for the 'perfect' language or languages valued at the expense of

others. They should rather recognise the plurality of the languages of Europe and the plurilingualism, actual or potential, of all those who live in this space, as a condition for collective creativity and for development, a component of democratic citizenship through linguistic tolerance, and therefore as a fundamental value of their actions in languages and language teaching.

In conclusion on plurilingualism in relation to language learning, most of the articles listed here show a definite shift from the “old” model of language learning of perfect nativelylike competence, towards the more “modern” view that language learning should aim to maximise the communicative competence of individuals where communicating ideas is more important than not making mistakes. It is accepted that while plurilingual learners might make more basic mistakes, the communicative and metalinguistic gains will outweigh the possible miscommunications. Plurilingual education is also seen as promoting other ideological values as well, which are listed in the next paragraph. In article 1 on page 17:

Plurilingualism needs to be developed, therefore, not just for utilitarian or professional reasons, but also as a value that plays an essential role in raising awareness of and respect for linguistic diversity.

The values of creativity, toleration, awareness and respect are repeated in the previous paragraphs and others before, leading to the assumption that they are some of the main ideological and idealistic values attached to plurilingualism. These are all values for a multipolar society such as the EU, and can be contrasted to the traditional values of nationalistic states such as purity and uniformity.

In summary, the benefits of plurilingualism can be viewed from several points. For individuals, there is the promise of better economic possibilities. As shown in the article on Canada and others, economic considerations are a major influence on why individuals choose to learn languages, and so plurilingualism is attractive since it would help learn more languages and thus give individuals more benefits.

For the EU politically, it can function as a symbol for unity and cohesion, but a new one that is not already appropriated by the existing member states, and one that is ideologically compatible with the heterogeneous nature of the institution. The values of

tolerance, awareness and respect are the same that have been advertised as European values for some time now.

For students and children the greater metalinguistic knowledge, acquired through the initial difficulties, can be used to benefit from hybrid and incomplete language competences that focus on communication of intent instead of form. This probably appears as the shakiest benefit, since it is partially in conflict with how language learning used to be viewed, and how many older people probably still view it since it is the way they have learned. Saying that making mistakes is acceptable if the intent is communicated correctly is probably going to be hard to adjust for some, even if this informal style is better in other areas. Another difficulty is that metalinguistic competence is going to be harder to judge for example by teachers, and that it just is a more difficult concept to grasp by people in general.

## 4.4 Plurilingualism in education

Another unsurprisingly large theme is the relationship of plurilingualism to education, as *the Guide* is a policy document directly related to education policy. It was referred to in 9 articles with a total of 6 pages after the second round of thematic analysis. This matter is also one that is directly connected to the previous ones, since it is through changes in the education system that the other changes are being attempted. You could say education is a nexus point for all these articles and the Guide. Direct links to other previous EU initiatives related to education such as the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* were also common, showing it is a continuation of a direction of development and immediately place these texts into a greater context, that of social change through education choices. This is quite plainly stated for example in the preface to article 10:

This text, part of a series published by the *Language Policy Division*, is clearly significant in its own right because it deals with certain influential factors in the organisation and sociolinguistic foundations of language teaching and in the linguistic ideologies at work in problems related to the languages of Europe. It is however part of a larger project since it is one element of a collection of publications focused on the *From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*.

The relationships displayed in this paragraph are quite clear, and interestingly some actors are also named. The Language Policy Division, as the publisher of the text, is a clear agent in addition to the actual writer of the article. In addition, the text is referred to as a single element of a larger body of texts which are assumed to have a single goal, as it is shown by the use of the verb *focused* in the last sentence. This focus would suggest, that this text and the others had an motivation to, assumedly, support the arguments in the *Guide*.

What is the role of education in the greater political and cultural society in the EU then?

Article 20 by Hugh Starkey would suggest one on page 15:

With the aim of enabling individuals and groups to live together in plurilingual and pluricultural societies which need to develop all kinds of contacts with their international environment (immediate or distant), school plays an essential role in ensuring a pacific climate of inter-individual and inter-community relations.

In the first main clause the choice of verb *enable* is an interesting one. It puts the agency of the action in the hands of the individuals and groups, as opposed to being forced into peaceful coexistence from above at government level. This would suggest a kind of “soft” government, one that offers possibilities instead of ordering. Schools are portrayed here as places where you do not only learn subject matter, but also how to build relations with different people. This is also linked to earlier findings in subsection 4.2, where the mental character of people was being seen as a problem to plurilingualism, and schooling would be the way to influence the ideology of future voters to better suit plurilingualism.

Here the underlying assumption is that in order to create peaceful relations, at least some knowledge of the partners language is required, as well as an tolerant attitude that is built from experience with different people in the early age. This underlines the role of schools as actors in society, where important skills for the later life are learned, or not learned. However, controlling what people learn or don't learn is of course not as clearcut as it would first seem, as is shown in this short paragraph from article 17 on page 10:

Thus, while there are no easy answers to the questions posed by multilingualism and linguistic diversity, there is a good degree of agreement about the variables which are known to influence educational outcomes, and it is intended to draw attention to these in the following chapters.

The first main clause is an hedge that functions to make the following claims not quite as direct by claiming that there are no *easy answers*. The hedging is continued with *good decree of agreement* and limiting it to *variables which are known*. All of this is meant to soften the following results about language diversity, use, attitudes and policy. This is summed up later on page 16 (article 17):

Economic competitiveness, social inclusion and human rights have become the key goals around which language policy is constructed, implemented and evaluated in contemporary Europe. Taken together, they form a complex mix of goals which are not always easy to reconcile. The language policy required to maximise the goal of economic competitiveness may, for example, be in more or less direct conflict with the kind of policy required to maximise the goal of social inclusion or human rights.

The underlying complexity and conflict in education policy is made apparent here with the statement that it might not be possible to reach all the goals set for it, but instead choices or compromises must be made. It is probably not a coincidence that the example used to open this further uses economic competitiveness as something that might not be able to coexist with the rest. People will in general learn languages in order of which gives the most economical benefit to them, but this could lead for example into a situation where most learn English first because it is important economically, but do not see any reason to learn other languages since the other people have also learnt English first for the same reason. This is probably how the writer sees why economic goals might be in opposition to other ones stated above. Later on the same page the choice is narrowed down considerably, into a single dualistic option between plurilingualism and monolingualism:

However broader societal goals are incorporated into language policy, the ultimate linguistic objective of the state will implicitly or explicitly incline towards monolingualism or bi-/plurilingualism.

Monolingual objectives in their extreme form lead to assimilationist policies. Policies of this type are designed, with or without the agreement of the minority language group, to assimilate it into the language and culture of the majority as quickly as possible. At worst, there may well be deliberate actions to suppress the language...

Additive (or enrichment) bilingual policies seek the linguistic equivalent of peaceful co-existence. These types of policies are referred to as multicultural or pluralist. Two (or more) languages are seen as necessary, but it is also recognised that the weaker one(s) require(s) some special measures of assistance. In terms of the linguistic market concept, the policy seeks to protect the healthy functioning of the internal linguistic market...

This would simplify the options into two incompatible ones. The monolingual policy is described mostly in negative terms, leading to (at worst) to cultural assimilation, while bilingual or pluralist policy is described in positive terms. This would make it quite clear which option the writer would prefer to be taken. Taking a complex argument and simplifying it to a single choice where one option clearly represents desirable values and the other one undesirable ones is an obvious argumentative strategy. Here the positive values being put forward are peaceful co-existence and protection of weaker languages, without forgetting the economic considerations.



Another value connected to plurilingual education seems to be increased sensitivity, as shown in article 15 by Riitta Piri on page 17:

Some countries have launched sensitisation projects. This means that language learning begins in pre-school or primary school with the introduction of several languages instead of one. The aim is to sensitise the child to plurilingualism. The experiences gained indicate that this kind of teaching could open the way to plurilingualism and multiculturalism to an extent which is not possible if language choices are left entirely to parents. Free choice seems to favour major languages (Blondin et al. 1998).

The repeated use of *sensitisation* both as a verb and adjective, as something that is being done to the children by an agent that is left unsaid, but could be read both as schools and as a general we. The main point is probably that increased sensitivity to other languages, which is clearly the goal, is something that children would not do on their own, or if it is left up to their parents. This would suggest that schools need to take an active role in making value decisions for the children, even against the wishes of the parents, who are described indirectly as supporters of monolingualism. This echoes earlier findings where the expert position was being defended against people, here parents, making the “wrong” choices. A more cynical view would be to see that the parents are already a lost cause, too set in their ways to change, so they must be bypassed in order to influence the children.

In the preface of article 9 by Marjatta Huhta some new values related to plurilingualism are listed explicitly:

This specific aspect of the problems of language education policies in Europe gives a perspective on the general view taken in the *Guide* but nonetheless this text is a part of the fundamental project of the *Language Policy Division*: to create through reflection and exchange of experience and expertise, the consensus necessary for European societies, characterised by their differences and the transcultural currents which create 'globalised nations', not to become lost in the search for the 'perfect' language or languages valued at the expense of others. They should rather recognise the plurality of the languages of Europe and the plurilingualism, actual or potential, of all those who live in this space, as a condition for collective creativity and for development, a component of democratic citizenship through linguistic tolerance, and therefore as a fundamental value of their actions in languages and language teaching.

The values associated to plurilingualistic education here are creativity and tolerance. It is contrasted with competitiveness that gets benefits at the expense of others. The way to gain creativity and tolerance is through actual *experience* with the currents and

societies in Europe, and as mentioned earlier this experience is assumed to be gained early in the schools. The nationalistic tendency to monolingualism is described here as being *lost* in search of a *perfect* language, also at *the expense of others*. Both word choices lost and at the expense would suggest that language purity, or perfection, is being viewed critically. It is not only seen as an errand where there is no end, but also one that would only cause expenses if it is pursued. This would show that the writer opposes nationalistic language development quite strongly.

In preface to article 6 a competing idea to replace the use of a *lingua franca* with an approach called 'intercomprehension' in education is being proposed:

This text by Peter Doyé discusses one specific approach to implementation which extends the boundaries of traditional thinking about the nature and content of language teaching. In the principle of 'intercomprehension' there is an alternative to the oft-mooted proposal for an emphasis on a *lingua franca*, and at the same time the development of an understanding of the nature of language and human communication. Intercomprehension might for example take the form of reciprocal understanding between two speakers/writers as each speaks/writes their own language and understands the other and from this receptive knowledge there might grow at a later point in time an ability to use the language productively, thus adding another dimension to their plurilingual competence. Intercomprehension, the use of linguistic and non-linguistic skills and knowledge to understand an 'unknown' language, offers the opportunity to benefit from the commonalities in human communication and languages. It depends on raising awareness of what we already know but do not realise, our knowledge of how communication works, how human beings interact with each other, and then drawing on this to make 'educated guesses' at the unknown. The application of these ideas among the language families of Europe is a starting point, but Doyé also suggests that access to languages of other families is possible and developing the skills of access can be one of the aims of language teaching. There are unresolved issues but intercomprehension is an approach which is being investigated and experimented, and offers a complement to other ways of promoting multilingualism.

This piece of text illustrates the reality of what plurilingual communication would be like. In essence it would mean that all participants communicative in their own respective languages and expect the others to understand *unknown* languages simply on the grounds of equality or at best *educated guesses* based on knowledge of other languages of the same family they might know. As an educational tool this seems like a decent enough solution, where linguistic and meta-linguistic skills would certainly grow out of continued practise. However, and this is just my opinion, this seems like a highly questionable mode of communication in real use, especially if it is meant to replace *lingua franca* in communication. From what I can tell this could be a desperate attempt to come up with any kind of alternative to the growing use of English, and so this text ties up with the first subsection 4.1 of this analysis. Or just repeating of the benefits of plurilingualism in subsection 4.3. On page 11 (article 6) the same values already

repeated in many other texts are given as reasons:

To reach this aim, intercomprehensive learning and teaching are particularly suited. The fact that in intercomprehension the interlocutors are on a par with each other is an essential advantage: it requires that they learn to see and treat one another as partners and develop the attitudes and skills needed in intercultural communication, namely respect, tolerance and co-operation.

Equality, respect, tolerance and co-operation are again being put forward as the desirable attitudes and values that language education should aim to increase, and what plurilingualism would provide. Another benefit for plurilingualism is that it claims to make students more intelligent, as Skutnabb-Kangas claims in article 19 on pages 14-15:

Plurilingualism enhances creativity. High-level Plurilinguals as a group do better than corresponding monolinguals on tests measuring several aspects of 'intelligence', creativity, divergent thinking, cognitive flexibility, etc. In an information society, those parts of the world will do well where multilingualism has been and is the norm (as it is in most countries with linguistic mega-diversity), even among people with no or little formal education. This presupposes that the plurilinguals there obtain access to exchanging and refining these knowledges - which they may, in a thoroughly wired satellite- and chip-driven global society. This presupposes in most cases education through the medium of the mother tongue, even for numerically small groups. Thus education that leads to high levels of plurilingualism produces not only local linguistic and cultural capital but knowledge capital that will be exchangeable to other types of capital in the information society.

Plurilinguals *do better*, it *enhances creativity* and it *produces linguistic, cultural and knowledge capital*. All of these are goals for education in a modern information society. Especially the choice of the word *capital* in many interpretations of the word would suggest this also means economic benefit, linking this to the discussion of plurilingualism and economics. This seems like a very strong suggestion that plurilingualism has concrete benefits for learners and that is why it should be supported. However, it also pays to keep in mind what is not being said, for example in the second sentence. Only some aspects of intelligence were enhanced by plurilingualism, which would suggest there was either no difference or weaker results for the ones not being listed.

In conclusion, it would probably be possible to claim that these four values (equality, respect, tolerance and co-operation) are the common thread that defines the aims of plurilinguistic education. The means which through they are achieved are actual experience with different languages and cultures early on in the schools, and through top-down decisions to enforce them. The assumption is that if these values are learned early in school, they would continue to have an effect later in life, where the children would grow up to be better than their parents, who would choose monolingualism if given the choice. This also shows that schools are an important battleground in the ideological struggle, perhaps because early experiences will continue to carry a strong influence later on in life.

Another conclusion is that education is closely linked to the benefits of learning languages. People make logical decisions on what languages to learn based on the benefits they get from the effort. Plurilingualism promises many benefits for language learning, especially increased metalinguistic competence. While experts understand and support it, it remains to be seen if parents are equally enthusiastic about it. This is probably why it is being put forward as a clear benefit so strongly by many writers of these articles, in order to get it accepted as a concrete benefit. After all, seeing the benefit of metalinguistic knowledge is one important part of seeing the benefit of plurilingualism in general.

## 4.5 Plurilingualism and economics

The relationship between plurilingualism and economic considerations has already been briefly touched upon in previous chapters, especially in the chapter on the advantages and opportunities of plurilingualism. The benefits to individuals from broad linguistic skills in the job market are quite undeniable, but can plurilingualism bring increased income and productivity to the larger society, or do the costs outweigh the benefits? The theme of Plurilingualism and economics was discussed in 8 articles with 6 pages of text, but references to it were also made in texts in connection with other themes, so it can be viewed as a larger theme than those numbers would suggest.

Furthermore, economics seems like a theme that also divides opinions much more clearly than the other themes inspected here. Some articles used extensive economic terminology to argue for or against plurilingualism based on the economic starting point and views, while other articles outright rejected making linguistic decisions from an economic point of view. Article 7 gives a good example of the former on pages 16-18:

Thus education systems play a decisive role in the opportunity European societies have to profit from linguistic and cultural diversity. Arrangements can be made for marginal profits for all those concerned, in that individual bi- or plurilingualism is ignored or even despised at school, or for the best possible profit, in that it is explicitly developed further by language education and thereby transformed into a rich resource for the community as a whole.

...

In this conception, vital day-to-day multilingual practice itself is a rich resource for language education. In order to protect and safeguard this wealth, or even to expand it with a minimum of investment...

Both of these paragraphs are very *rich* in economic terms that both describe linguistic diversity as a type of *wealth* unique to Europe, and even how it could be exploited just like any other resource to produce more wealth. This would suggest that the proponents for plurilingualism have not only appropriated economic terms to be used for the task, but also the viewpoint and ideology as well. Perhaps this is why others are so opposed to this view, because market-driven reasoning is not quite in alignment with some of the others aspects of plurilingualism. To make this point a short paragraph from article 2 on page 15 follows:

But how can language education policies avoid Scylla and Charybdis of a market-driven tendency towards linguistic homogenisation on the one hand and communicative isolation within multilingual diversity on the other?

This is the same paragraph that has already been discussed in a previous chapter on problems and opponents of plurilingualism. The argument here is clear that decisions made purely on the grounds of market-driven logic would be more in favour of a single language, for example English, to be used for the majority of intercultural communication. In addition, if one relies purely on market logic the preservation of minority languages could easily be seen as an unnecessary cost. Article 5 sums up the argument against purely economic point of view quite well on page 18:

In fact, both plurilingualism, defined in this way – certainly not in an “economic“ sense, but in a manner in keeping with what Hagège calls “constantly keeping an open mind to multiplicity“ – and the democratic *educazione linguistica* of the Ten Precepts are hugely important in political terms and, to conclude, ideologically different from other approaches.

Here, the *economic sense* is clearly contrasted with the way the writer defines plurilingualism as open to multiplicity, making the implicit claim that the economic sense would be closed to multiplicity.

One of the concrete benefits of plurilingualism is that the knowledge of the languages of the trading partners seems to still be a major factor in maintaining foreign trade relations. In article 15 on page 9-10 Piri makes the following argument:

There are also economic reasons for promoting linguistic pluralism. Despite extensive international trade and the globalised world economy, it is self-evident that the best language in trade is the language spoken by the client. In fact, 'winning a speaker is winning a client, a customer, a consumer; it is also a way of getting staff accustomed to a company's culture, all of which must be objectives in the context of globalisation' (Truchot, 1998).

The point here is that while international trade may be more open and globalisation more extensive than before, there is still a lot of value on trading relationships between two partners. Skill in the language of the partner is not only an asset in communication, but also a gateway into better understanding of the (corporate) culture too. The argument here seems to be that greater knowledge of foreign language that plurilingualism gives can be used to create more external trade relationships and thus to create more foreign trade. Article 9 would support this argument on page 7 as well:

Several companies, governments and organizations in contemporary multilingual Europe have identified language as a crucial element of workplace communication. The language issue can be approached by constructive measures that improve communication in the organization. The objective is clear:

purposeful, unambiguous communication with external interest groups as well as internal contacts, despite barriers of language. In this context language is understood as the interaction system for communicating messages at work, whether verbal, non-verbal or cultural.

From this we can also deduct that ambiguity and barriers of language are currently a problem for companies, both in internal and external communication. Especially in case of non-verbal and cultural difficulties, which are much more difficult to teach and learn without actual experience. This could be linked to the point made in the section on education, that if schools provide more opportunities for actual experience with foreign languages, the realistic use of language would also teach non-verbal and cultural communication skills to be used later in life.

Another issue raised in many articles is that how to compare the benefits of plurilingualism to the costs it incurs. Whether it is the cost of translation, hiring or training language skills or even just printing costs, maintaining a reasonable way to use more languages costs money. One example is the quite significant translation costs of the European Parliament, and if the member states or EU wish to support more languages it is going to cost. A good example of bringing out this side of plurilingualism is the article 8, written by Francois Grin. The preface to this article sums it up with the following:

In this text Francois Grin presents the contribution to policy development which can be made by considering the costs and benefits of language learning. He does this by drawing on the discipline of economics. He provides an overview of the ways in which values for language learning and teaching can be calculated but also points out that quantification is not the only way to approach the issues. He argues that the value of language learning can be calculated for societies as a whole and for individuals in their contexts. This paper thus provides policy makers with a basis for considering economic advantages and disadvantages of certain policy choices although it does not pretend that decisions can be made only on economic grounds.

The last sentence in this preface once again shows the opposition to economic valuation on linguistic issues. The word *pretend* is used to show that the writer of the preface, who are the writers of the *Guide* view that while useful economics should not overstep their bounds when linguistic policy decisions are made. While the modern use of the word *pretend* is associated with falsehood, an older interpretation would give it a much more neutral tone, as a noun pretender used to mean simply a contender for something. For example, a pretender to a throne only meant someone who could press a legitimate claim on it. In this sense the word is not out of place in the context of linguistic policy

decisions, as these different ideologies can be seen as competitors in the decision-making.

Page 20 (article 8) has some quite strong criticism for some of the other articles in this list:

At some stage or other, much of the political debate about language raises the question of the 'value of language', with some participants in this debate referring to language as a 'treasure', a form of wealth, etc. It is easy to forget that most of the time, such statements amount to little more than metaphor; some seem to consider the notion that language is 'valuable' as a foregone conclusion, and go on to assume that *as a consequence*, languages are obviously valuable *in an economic sense*.

Here the writer makes explicit the use of words relating to value that have been used in other related articles, and through this seems to want to challenge the idea of directly using the economic sense of value when describing languages. Starting the second sentence with *it is easy to forget* as well as *amount to little more than metaphor*, as well as *foregone conclusion* and the sarcastic *obviously*, it seems that he is trying to show that some proponents for plurilingualism have been jumping to conclusions in the statements about the value of languages. This seems to be a clear criticism about the way economic terms have been used in other articles, although none are mentioned specifically. Still, it would again suggest that plurilingualism and economics are perhaps not quite in alignment, or just that this article wishes to highlight how some other writers do not understand basic economic concepts.

Later on page 27 there is another criticism as well as a summary:

However, one general theoretical result can be ventured regarding the relative value of more or less diverse linguistic environments. It suggests that society is likely to be best off not when it tries to eliminate diversity, nor when it attempts to embrace limitless diversity. The argument goes as follows: diversity carries advantages and drawbacks, which for simplicity we shall call benefits and costs, it being understood that these are not confined to monetary ones (i.e., non-market elements are taking into consideration).

...

Though apparently innocuous, the result that socially optimal diversity is *positive* and *finite* has major political implications, because it implies that from an economic standpoint, policies striving to preserve or impose linguistic homogeneity – or, in other words, 'zero diversity' – are ill-advised, since they underestimate the benefits and overestimate the costs of diversity. Conversely, generous calls (often motivated by 'human rights' concerns) to embrace boundless linguistic diversity, and to set up policies for the integral recognition of all languages in society, including those of immigrant groups, however small, tend to make the symmetrical mistake.

Here, again while being conscious of the correct economic terms, the first paragraph goes on to suggest that a middle solution would seem best from an economic point of



view. In the second paragraph there is another criticism directed towards *generous* actors calling for unlimited diversity, as that standpoint is compared as similar to those who would want absolute monolingualism, the only difference being that they would over-estimate the benefits of diversity and under-estimate the costs.

In conclusion, a paragraph from article 1 on page 17 will do well to summarise the most common viewpoint of plurilingualism in relation to economics:

The Council of Europe will continue to contribute to the promotion of linguistic diversity and plurilingualism in language education policy. Policies to develop plurilingualism among individuals need to counterbalance the market forces which tend to lead to linguistic homogenisation, thus limiting the potential of citizens to develop their unique individual linguistic repertoire.

It is clear that one of the main driving reasons for plurilingualism is to provide a *counterbalance* to the *market forces* aiming to implement linguistic homogenisation, assumedly in English. Plurilingualism can, in a sense, be defined as a reactionary force working against these *market forces*, while at the same time there is an attempt to appropriate and redefine some of the terms used by the other side, such as value. Of course this does not mean plurilingualism is anti-capitalist or anti-market, but the stress of competition for power is evident. In the article 8 Grin states that for the individual in a job market any language skill is always a competitive edge, and one reason for societies is that knowledge of the partners language is always a stronger bond for the economic relations. Thus having more speakers of foreign languages would mean having better chances of forming lasting trade relations with foreign states. Of course it needs to be reminded that trade relations are made on several grounds, but language skill is a useful lubricant.

## **4.6 Protection, politics and other small themes**

This chapter contains the analysis of the remaining smaller themes. These themes had less connections and were mentioned in fewer articles than the previous ones, and it would have taken too much space for a study of this scope to review each of them in detail. This is why the remaining themes are selected and discussed only if they have connections to the previous larger ones. Thus some themes have been left out, but the remaining ones will be linked to the ones discussed in previous subsections. The reason for this is that even after several limitations, plurilingualism is such a large issue that it goes outside the scope of the present study to include everything from all articles.

The theme of protection was the largest of the remaining small themes, and it makes plenty of connections for linguistic rights as part of human rights and as a tool for social inclusion. This is directly linked to the values discussed previously, where plurilingualism is meant as a means for building a more tolerant and free society. For example about the theme of protection is the piece from article 2 on pages 7-8:

The general argument in this draws on three justifications for plurilingualism in particular (ibid: 9-10):

“1. Language rights are part of human rights:

Education policies should facilitate the use of all varieties of languages spoken by the citizens of Europe, and the recognition of other people’s language rights by all; the resolution of social conflicts is in part dependent on recognition of language rights.

2. The exercise of democracy and social inclusion depends on language education policy:

The capacity and opportunity to use one’s full linguistic repertoire is crucial to participation in democratic and social processes and therefore to policies of social inclusion.

3. Individual plurilingualism is a significant influence on the evolution of an European identity:

Since Europe is a multilingual area in its entirety and in any given part, the sense of belonging to Europe and the acceptance of an European identity is dependent on the ability to interact and communicate with other Europeans using the full range of one’s linguistic repertoire.”

Here in the first part language right are linked to human rights, but also as a factor in defining social groups who can be a part of a social conflict. This would suggest that languages are an important factor in defining what social group one belongs to. Another interesting thing is that language rights are defined very broadly here; the only requirement is being a citizen of Europe. This would place immigrant languages on the

same level as the ones that have been traditionally seen as European languages, which has been a point of contest in the past.

The second interesting thing here is the phrase *full linguistic repertoire* that is repeated in points two and three. The assumption is that in order to fully participate in society and politics everyone should be able to use their native language, because it is the one they are fully fluent in, and if forced to use a language they are less skilled in it would put them at a weaker position. Both of these arguments proceed from the assumption that language is a major defining factor for all social groups.

However, another view on who exactly should be included in the language protection is to extend it only to languages and groups that are historically seen as European. For example in article 11 on page 8:

It is a fundamental characteristic of Europe as a whole and most Member States of the Council of Europe individually that they are *multicultural and multilingual*. The situation in Europe is characterized by the *diversity of dozens of languages and cultures* (more than 80 in over 40 countries with very different numbers of native speakers, cultural background, geographic distribution, etc.).

These numbers correspond roughly with the amount of cultural groups that have existed in Europe for more than one hundred years. While this definition includes a wide variety of groups with different amount of speakers, it also excludes most immigrant groups that have been in Europe for less time. However, these groups are probably the ones that could have direct links with foreign trade partners, which were mentioned in the economics chapter as one reason how plurilingualism could enhance trade. Thus the question of who exactly gets protection is an interesting question, since it is a direct signal about which languages are valued higher than others.

On the question of politics, the perceived esteem and prestige associated to different languages becomes a central issue too. In article 12 by Alexander Neville on pages 15-16 this is viewed from a South African perspective:

If apartheid language policy had intentionally promoted and entrenched old and new social divisions, the language policy of the new South Africa is clearly geared to the strategy of reconciliation and nation building, which was the

defining feature of former President Mandela's government. Both the constitution of the country and the language policy in education take it as their point of departure that the 11 official languages shall have equality of status and "parity of esteem". All the languages used in the country are deemed to be assets rather than problems.

The similarities with the stance in South Africa and Europe would suggest that *nation building* is one motivation for the policy of linguistic equality in Europe as well, along with earlier examples from the article on Canada, although on the multinational level between member states instead. However, the increased prestige for every language can be conversely viewed as the decreasing of the prestige of the old powerful languages such as English as well. Later on in the same paragraph it is predicted that language could in fact become the next big issue in South African politics:

That is to say, once the preoccupation of South Africans with the race question is no longer as central as it continues to be today, it is very likely that the language marker will become the next major plank for political mobilisation. In this sense, the present agitation of the Afrikaans-speaking community for the maintenance and expansion of their linguistic human rights, even if some circles are motivated by ethnicist and overtly racist, considerations, will become a model for other "linguistic communities".

In this text the linguistic question is ranked as a possible second issue for contest after the race question. Word *once* and *is no longer as central* put it below racism in priority. The latter sentence also links these two together on some level, since the question is motivated in *some circles* by *ethnicist and overly racists, considerations*. This might suggest that once racism is politically suicidal to support, its supporters might switch over to linguistic struggle to continue pushing the same goals. However, the writer states that this would only be the case for some minority circles. Still, the use of linguistic questions as a platform, or *plank* for racism is something that cannot be bypassed entirely.

Article 7 by Ingrid Gogolin offers some examples on the contest between plurilingualism and national monolingualism on page 17 that have been discussed earlier in the tri-partite struggle between plurilingualism, global English and national monolingualism:

A European language policy addressing education and literacy will have to set up and implement strategies which allow a balance between the positive and the negative connotations of plurilingualism and cultural plurality. As a pre-requisite of the development of such a policy we have to be aware that negative perceptions of diversity are to a large extent the result of the strategies used in the historical process of nation-building itself. It was only this process in the 18th and 19th centuries that led to monolingual self-conceptions: to the conviction that living in culturally and linguistically plural circumstances is difficult, that learning in or of foreign languages is complicated, that bi- or plurilingualism too early in childhood may be dangerous for both the linguistic and the cognitive development of the individual, and further, similar beliefs (cf. Gogolin, 1994; Hobsbawm, 1990). The historical strategy of developing the notion of national homogeneity was in fact most successful in creating a negative climate, individual rejection or ambivalence towards plurilingualism and language learning.

Here the historical context is used to bring forward how some of the problems facing plurilingualism are in fact caused by the historical development of nation states a few centuries back. The expression *negative perceptions of diversity are to a large extent the result* places a large part of the blame on that. She then lists some of these negative points along with *similar beliefs* and follows up with how these create *negative climate, individual rejection or ambivalence towards plurilingualism*. Especially the expression *similar beliefs* would suggest that they are a way of saying they are historical mistakes, that should now be corrected. This would indeed suggest that in order for plurilingualism to flourish, the strong position of national monolingualism needs to be weakened or reduced. Another piece from page 20 (article 7) supports the view that national monolingualism has indeed a strong position at the moment:

Revision of the traditional curricula of all school subjects because of their implicit presupposition of monolingualism as 'normal' among individuals and societies.

According to CDA theory, being viewed as the *normal* or natural choice is in fact a position of hegemony, the most strong position possible. Of course in this text, since the word *normal* appears in single quotes and is being called for revision, it would suggest that it is being criticised. This means it is a call to reduce or break this favoured position currently being occupied by national monolingualism.

In conclusion, protection of minor languages was a theme that was linked to the ideology and values that plurilingualism promotes. In order to have a fair and tolerant society, especially endangered languages need to be protected for moral reasons as well as practical. This is necessary because the values attached to plurilingualism would be an empty letter if minority languages were not protected. Politically, linguistic debate has always been a ground for contest between groups, as well as for other things such as possibly the racism debate in South Africa. Historical arguments are being used by many sides to justify changes or keeping things as they are. If nothing else, especially this last subsection illustrates how plurilingualism is not a simple thing, but complex and multilayered in many ways.

## 5. Discussion and conclusions

The aim of the present study was to have a look into the ideological concepts attached to the terms plurilingualism and multilingualism, and also to observe any power relations or struggles related to them, as well as to see how this matter relates to the current political, economic and ideological development in the EU and Europe. Since this is a linguistic study it is also important to not overreach or make conclusions that are not supported by the material, and instead keep the focus on how specific word choices can reflect underlying ideologies.

The theoretical background and method that were used come from the school of Critical Discourse Analysis with few additions that helped provide fresh viewpoints. The method and theory themselves state that they are not free of ideology as well, so it is important to keep this in mind. However, the justification from for example Fairclough (1995) is that as long as the viewpoint of the analyst is explicit and honest, and all steps are recorded clearly for the reader to agree or disagree, it will not bias the research.

The statements here have been reached starting from a few specific viewpoints. Firstly, according to Fairclough (1992, 1989) that language is a field of conflict between different social groups within a larger society. Secondly, according to Cooper (1989) that language planning performed by a state, or a similar body, is never done solely on linguistic grounds, but that it always has social and political motives. In case of a multinational entity such as the EU, there are even more layers as the individual states consist of heterogeneous social groups. In addition different groups have varying amounts of political power in relation to each other. Furthermore, it is impossible to be

certain why things are done, so the best thing I can hope here is to make convincing interpretations backed up by reasoning, and discourse analysis.

It is taken granted for here that one common language for all Europeans is an impossibility, it is an unthinkable thing. However, it seems that at least in part plurilingualism – as represented in the Guide – is trying to fulfil the same function that a national language has done for nation states especially during their formation. It is an attempt to create cohesion and a sense of belonging together between different social groups that share history and culture. How well a language ideology can fill the role of a common language remains to be seen, but it can be said it does not evoke the same kind of emotional response as a national mother tongue.

Secondly, although the official definition of plurilingualism is all-inclusive, it is also a vehicle for protecting the existing power relations between languages in Europe. In the texts analysed this can be seen from the relationship between plurilingualism and global English, and especially from the relationship between French and English. For one, there is a competition for prestige between the old and new lingua francas, and for now plurilingualism is siding with the old, while it would seem that currently English is in the lead in this contest. Another is the attention given to protecting endangered and small languages, especially as English is sometimes seen and portrayed as a “killer” language causing the extinction of minor languages. Thirdly, both plurilingualism and global English carry additional ideological baggage, for example plurilingualism is loaded with liberal and idealistic notions, while English always carries some trace of Anglo-American cultural domination. Nevertheless, in the end it would seem that plurilingualism is attempting to become a realistic option for the use of global English,



at least in the geographical area of Europe as far as the views presented in the Guide are concerned.

Another problem raised by the articles is that for the uninitiated voter, who should in the end decide these things, these are things that probably do not raise much emotional response, unless they are directly affected by them, and thus already a minority. This could be one reason why the writers of some of the articles have in fact taken an attitude where linguists, as experts, should make these decisions even against a popular majority. This is a very delicate matter, especially given that the EU is already somewhat suffering from the image of opaque and bureaucratic government; going against the democratic majority opinion is therefore always risky.

It would seem based on the analysis that researchers and officials are assuming a position of expert authority on this matter, and are even willing to go against the majority opinions of the people on this ground if necessary. For example, the analysis of page 18 of article 2 in subsection 4.1 would suggest this kind of attitude, and of course implicitly one of the aims of these articles and the Guide is to influence exactly these opinions too. The juxtaposition of expert versus layman is present in several sections of analysis. The lay opinion is described as emotionally influenced, short-sighted and at best only looking out for personal advantage, which also means that conversely the expert opinion is *taken for granted* to be the opposite as logical, forward-looking and out to improve the greater good of society. This would be a clear indication that one of the reasons behind the Guide and articles is to strengthen the position of linguistic experts against resistance from the public. To me this logic and operational procedure seem similar to what many moral reformers in history have used previously.

In the articles relating to economics and economical point of view, the relationship between broader language competence and higher earnings for the individual is highlighted. While competence in more languages is undoubtedly an asset for the individual, it still begs the question whether the same thing works at the level of national economies? And while the positive opportunities of plurilingualistic language prowess are displayed, the possible costs, such as the high translation costs incurred by the working of the European Parliament are left unsaid. One of the main arguments of the proponents of single or fewer main languages is that it would cut down these costs, and in my opinion plurilingualism needs to address this matter too if it wishes to be a viable alternative in an economic sense. Another interesting point is that while economic terms and point of view are being appropriated, their correct use is also a point of contention in these discussions. This would suggest that an economic point of view is not completely compatible with all the aspects of plurilingualism.

In conclusion, when viewed together the different values and ideas attached to plurilingualism are mostly inspired by modern Western views on freedom and civil rights, however they also contain some controversy. Values of tolerance, awareness and coming together as a whole are prevalent, and cultural and linguistic domination are opposed. Both global English and linguistic isolationism into monolingual nationalistic blocks are regularly listed as things plurilingualism opposes. But how to define when a *lingua franca* stops being a useful tool and becomes one for domination? In a sense this puts Europe into a special place between these two powerful forces, and it is impossible to predict if this is going to lead into new opportunities or just being left alone with a set of values that nobody else shares.

However, another clear goal for this set of values is its function as a sort of tool for “nation building” and social cohesion for the EU. As the European Union is a new and unique project, it seems obvious that it needs new tools too. Since the historically normal method of unity through a single language is both politically and ideologically impossible, it seems that embracing pluralism is the only way to create something that would hold us together. But is it possible to support this structure on these common values? If it is not, it is possible we could return to a sort of modern medieval society, where a plurilingual elite layer rules a patchwork empire of diverse national and social groups who are limited to geographically or socially close connections only. While this question might seem a bit fantastic or exaggerated, it is still one that needs to be asked.

The results of the present study are somewhat in line with other CDA research on the subject. For example, they are similar to how Wodak (2009) described the internal operations of the European Parliament through the everyday life of members and how the realities of that life can also affect policy decisions. The articles and the Guide studied here could very well be partly aimed just to influence the opinions of these members. Most of the work by Fairclough (1989,1991,1995) has also been aimed at uncovering political and ideological reasons behind many different language choices in society. For an interesting view on the discourse used by one of the opponents of European integration, the thesis by Vallaste (2013) is in line with what the arguments being used against plurilingualism as well, even if a strong critical voices were obviously not present in the material. Still, the other opinions are always present in the larger discussion that these articles are part of. As one of the aims of CDA is to find out

and make visible the ideologies concerning language choices, this would mean that from the point of view the present study has been at least moderately successful.

The study has brought up several interesting avenues for further research. Due to constraints of time and space the analysis of individual themes was somewhat limited, and at least some of the themes could be targets for further study in themselves. A more long-term study could also further explore the historical development of plurilingualism from long before the 1970s, in order to show how the European values it is founded on have developed, as well as if and how the more contemporary events such as the euro economic crisis have affected plurilingualism. For example, questions could include if it has been pushed to the background due to these events, or perhaps if some of the facets of it have changed due to these events. Also since the Guide is now several years old, it could be compared to any newer similar publications on education policy published in the EU.

In a hindsight, it seems that perhaps CDA was perhaps not the best method for this material for several reasons. For one, the amount of material was too large for precise analysis that it focuses on, and it could only be covered at the expense of accuracy. Thus either the material should have been trimmed down even more on some grounds, or another method chosen. Secondly, the nature of the material was chosen too ambitiously. While the texts were in a sense examples of “natural” discourse in scientific articles, the principles of academic writing made it very difficult to get a good hold of the underlying ideologies, as the texts were too polished for a beginner analyst. However, despite its limitations it is still better than the alternatives which focus purely on linguistics and leaves out the social context of discourse, such as Conversation

Analysis, for digging into the ideologies and for taking into the big picture, and all the failures are my own and not the method. In addition, the present study came up a little short on the third research question about political, ideological and economic struggles in the EU, except for the rivalry between the English and the French, which is an unsurprising finding. Perhaps uncovering them would have required more knowledge of the context, or maybe scientific texts just tend to try remain outside them.

In the end, from the point of view of any person influenced by language ideologies and education policy, such as language teachers, this present study should give some insight at least. It should also interest anyone who cares where the supranational European project is headed, as the values and ideologies being analysed here can in part show where we might be headed. To me it seems that while most values being advocated here are worthy and good, there are still many disagreements and struggles going on too. Certainly embracing linguistic diversity seems like the only realistic option to increase political and other cohesion in the EU. Another interesting development to follow is the tri-party struggle where official plurilingualism is being pressured by both international English and national monolingualism, and to see if it can hold up as a real third alternative to them. It could also be speculated that building a more free and tolerant society is one way for Europe to regain some position of cultural leadership globally. As far as political ambitions go, there are many worse ones out there.

## ***Bibliography***

Primary sources:

Council of Europe. 2007. *From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*.

Secondary sources:

Blommaert, J. 2005. *Discourse: Critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Blommaert, J. & et al. 2012. *Dangerous multilingualism. Northern perspectives on order, purity and normality*. Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Cooper, R. 1989. *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and power*. London and New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical discourse analysis. The critical study of language*. London and New York: Longman.

Foucault, M. 1994. In J.D. Faubion, *Michel Foucault. Power. Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984. Volume 3*. Clays Ltd, St Ives plc: Penguin books.

Gee, J. 2005. *An introduction to discourse analysis. Theory and method*. Second edition. New York: Routledge.

Graham, P. 2003. Critical Discourse Analysis and Evaluative Meaning: Interdisciplinarity as a Critical Turn. In Weiss, G and Wodak, R. *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and interdisciplinarity*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnstone, B. 2002. *Discourse Analysis*. Malden, Oxford and Victoria: Blackwell publishing.

Kallo, J and Rinne, R. 2006. *Supranational regimes and national education policies: encountering challenge*. Helsinki: Finnish Education Research Association

Leppänen, S. and Pahta, P. 2012. Finnish Culture and Language Endangered - Language Ideological Debates on English in the Finnish Press from 1995 to 2007. In J. Blommaert, S. Leppänen, P. Pahta and T. Räisänen (eds.), *Dangerous Multilingualism: Northern perspectives on order, purity and normality*. Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

- Lähtenmäki, M and Vanhala-Aniszewski. 2012. Hard Currency or a Stigma - Russian-Finnish Bilingualism among Young Russian-Speaking Immigrants in Finland. In J.
- Marsh, D. 2013. Europe's deadlock : how the euro crisis could be solved – and why it won't happen. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Millar, S and Wilson, J. 2007. Rhetoricians at work: Constructing the European Union in Denmark. In *The Discourse of Europe: talk and text in everyday life*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub, 2007.
- Mouffe, C. 1979. Hegemony and ideology in Gramsci. In *Gramsci and Marxist theory*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Määttä, S and Pietikäinen, S. 2014. Ideology. In Östman J-O and Verschueren, J. *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nikula, T., Saarinen, T., Pöyhönen S. and 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 and T. Räisänen (eds.), *Dangerous Multilingualism: Northern perspectives on order, purity and normality*. Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Pietikäinen, S. and Mäntynen A. *Kurssi kohti diskurssia*. Tallinna: Vastapaino, 2009.
- Rogers, R. 2004. An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education. In Rogers, R. *Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum associates.
- Scollon, R and Scollon, S. 2004. *Nexus analysis: discourse and the emerging internet*. London: Routledge.
- Tischer, S., Jenner, B, Meyer, M., Wodak, R. and Vetter, E. 2000. *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London, SAGE.
- Vallaste, K. 2013. *Euroscepticism: problem or solution: framing Euroscepticism in mainstream media and writings by Eurosceptics in Sweden, Finland and Estonia 2000-2006*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Van Dijk, T. 1997. Discourse as interaction in society. In van Dijk, *Discourse as Social Interaction*. Sage publications, London.
- Van Leeuwen, T. 2008. *Discourse and Practise. New tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, M. 1978. *Economy and Society. An outline of interpretative sociology*. University of California press: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Weiss, G and R. Wodak. 2003. Introduction. In Weiss, G and Wodak, R. *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and interdisciplinarity*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R. 2009. The Discourse of Politics in Action. *Politics as Usual*. Basingstroke: Palgrave Macmillan.