

Fishmanian Sociolinguistics (1949 to the Present)

OFELIA GARCÍA AND HAROLD SCHIFFMAN
with the assistance of Zeena Zakharia

*They shall yield fruit even in old age;
vigorous and fresh shall they be.*
Psalm 92, as quoted by J.A. Fishman
in relation to Yiddish (1991b: 9)

Introduction

Before an intellectual prophet and leader

It has been humbling to reread the scholarly work of Joshua A. Fishman spanning the last 55 years. We both met Fishman after he had been established as the founding father of the Sociology of Language. We knew then that his work had been trailblazing, insightful, inspirational. Being in his presence as a teacher and a colleague was indeed a transforming experience, for he not only taught us well, but also included us in many scholarly enterprises. One of us (García) is frequently heard to exclaim, 'Everything I know, I learned in Fishman 101.' But it took this careful rereading of his work, both his early work as well as his recent work, to understand his prophetic vision, evident as early as 1949 when he published the prizewinning monograph, *Bilingualism in a Yiddish School*.

As Joshua A. Fishman turns 80 years old,¹ we are inspired not only by his gift of intellectual prophesy manifested so early, but also by his extensive scholarly contribution. His fecund scholarship is attested in this volume by the bibliography of well over 1000 items that his wife and partner in the sociolinguistic enterprise, Gella Schweid Fishman, has been able to assemble.² We can say about Joshua A. Fishman what the Psalmist in the epigraph of this article attested, for he continues to yield vigorous and fresh fruit even in old age. As we write, Fishman continues to publish – a total of five books, sixteen articles, and two reviews are currently in press. As we will see, Fishman's intellectual contributions are important, not only because they anticipate many future understandings, thus rendering his prophesy important, but also because they are broad-ranging, making him a true intellectual giant.

Fishman's work dedicates much attention to leaders who develop and mobilize positive ethnolinguistic consciousness. For example, *Bilingualism in the Barrio* studies the language consciousness and language loyalty of Puerto Rican intellectuals. And both in his first major research study, 'Language Loyalty in the United States' (1960–1965), as in its update, 'Language Resources in the United States' (1981–1985), the views of ethnic activists received special attention (see, for example, 'Ethnic Activists View the Ethnic Revival and its Language Consequences: An Interview Study of Three American Ethnolinguistic Minorities').³ Fishman has also intensively studied the leadership role that Nathan Birnbaum held at the Tschernovits Language Conference on Yiddish (see, for example, Fishman, 1987).

This essay gives attention to the role of Joshua A. Fishman as a leader who has mobilized and energized younger scholars throughout the world to study language and behavior, especially as it relates to ethnolinguistic consciousness. Beyond anticipation and the size of his intellectual endeavor,⁴ Fishman has been, and continues to be, a leader in an intellectual field – one who has mobilized hundreds, if not thousands, of scholars, educators, language planners and government bureaucrats to study multilingualism and to act on its behalf, and especially on behalf of language minorities. At times Fishman has openly expressed his interest in having a leadership role. Writing about bilingual education, he states, '[I]t is my fond and fundamental hope to *lead* bilingual educators in the USA and elsewhere to consider themselves to be a *single* community of interest, each learning from the other and correcting each other's experimental and attitudinal limitations' [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1976: viii).⁵ Fishman's scholarship is not only ideologically mobilized, but it is energizing for the rest of us who read him and study him.

Joshua A. Fishman's clear leadership role in the founding and development of the sociology of language is unquestionable and has been well established by various scholars. Fernando Peñalosa (1981: 4), for example, calls Fishman 'the leading figure in the development and characterization of the sociology of language as an identifiable discipline.' According to Glyn Williams (1992: 97), Fishman, 'more than anyone, has been responsible for the development of the sociology of language.' Wright (2004: 11) calls Fishman, 'a key figure in LPLP (Language Policy Language Planning) studies.' In a recent text on sociolinguistics, Florian Coulmas (2005: 158) describes Fishman as the scholar 'who more than anyone else laid the groundwork for the scientific investigation of language shift.' And Spolsky (2004: 188) has lately said: 'The study of the efforts of linguistic minorities to preserve their languages is another field initiated by the creative scholarship of Joshua Fishman. Just as his work pioneered research into language maintenance and the spread of English, so he too inaugurated the field that he calls reversing language shift.' In Dell Hymes' foreword to Fishman's

first text on the sociology of language, Hymes (1972: v) writes: 'In several major areas of the field [sociology of language] – language loyalty, language development, bilingualism – Professor Fishman has been a leader in research; at the same time, he has worked to build the field as a whole.'

But which field is it that Fishman has built? It is clear that the work of Joshua A. Fishman goes beyond the two disciplines that the term 'sociology of language' evokes. His intellectual enterprise is grounded in language in society, but also encompasses psychology, political science, anthropology, history, education, geography, religion and literature. The danger of continuing to refer to the field that Fishman has so richly developed as 'sociology of language' is that it reduces it only to sociological inquiry about language. We propose here, based on Fishman's own reclaiming of the term 'sociolinguistics' (see 'Growing pains' section below), that we speak of *Fishmanian sociolinguistics*, as a way to build a space for the rich interdisciplinary field that he has developed and in which language in society remains at the core.

This essay

Though we are unable to fully do justice to Joshua A. Fishman's intellectual genius, we nonetheless have found permission to do so in Fishman's own words, which we quote below. Speaking about the way in which research should and could be done and the way it is done in the real world, Fishman asks:

Why is there such a difference? Because researchers are limited in time, funds, ideas and ability; nevertheless, they must do the best they can with what they have. They cannot wait until the best of all possible worlds comes to pass (for it never will), so they try to *conduct their studies as best they can*. (Fishman, 1996a: 7)

We have tried to write this integrative essay 'as best we can,' knowing full well that it cannot represent or fully grasp Joshua A. Fishman's profound scholarship.

Because this volume includes Peltz's integrative essay about Joshua A. Fishman's work about Yiddish and in Yiddish, we omit the Yiddish category from our analysis. But we acknowledge from the outset the important role that Yiddish has had in Fishman's work. Fishman has always acknowledged the importance of what he calls 'listening to Yiddish with the third ear' in his work (1990: 114).

This integrative essay identifies some of the conceptual threads in Joshua A. Fishman's work over the last 50 years and attempts to analyze, in Fishman's (1971: 607) own words, 'How the worm has turned!' The essay is organized along conceptual threads that appear interwoven, and even entangled, in Fishman's own work, often in relationship to each other.

Although artificially separated here, we have chosen to disentangle them for the reader so that we might provide some guideposts as to how Fishman's thinking has remained the same, and yet has evolved. *Sociology of Language*, the interdisciplinary enterprise established and developed by Joshua A. Fishman himself, has evolved into what we might call today, because of its integrative and yet distinctive character – *Fishmanian Sociolinguistics*. Fishmanian Sociolinguistics subsumes the following categories of study:

- language and behavior;
- multilingualism;
- language maintenance/language shift/reversing language shift;
- language spread;
- language attitudes and language and ethnicity/nationalism/identity/religion/power;
- language planning and language policy;
- bilingual education and minority language group education.

In drawing out the threads in this volume, we quote Joshua A. Fishman extensively. We do so because much of his early work has not been reprinted, and it remains out of reach for younger scholars. His words here provide the light to the guideposts that bring his ideas alive.

Language and Behavior and Fishmanian Sociolinguistics

The pioneering efforts

Trained as a social psychologist⁶ Joshua A. Fishman was strongly influenced during his high school years by the work of Max Weinreich and his son Uriel Weinreich on Yiddish Linguistics. Fishman's interest in language in different sociocultural settings was evident when, as a young professor of social psychology at The City College of New York, he used Joseph Bram's *Language and Society* as a required text. After a brief stay as Director of Research for the College Entrance Examination Board, Fishman returned to his native Philadelphia as Associate Professor of Human Relations and Psychology and Director of Research at the Albert M. Greenfield Center for Human Relations at the University of Pennsylvania, where he taught the first course in *Sociology of Language* during the 1958/59 academic year. In 1960, after receiving his first major grant for sociolinguistic research for his 'Language Resources Project,' Fishman returned to New York City as Professor of Psychology and Sociology at Yeshiva University, where he also served as Dean of the Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences. From 1966 to 1972 his Doctoral Program in Language and Behavior became the first interdisciplinary program at Ferkauf, later succeeded by the PhD Program in Bilingual Educational Developmental Psychology (1981 to 89).⁷

Sociolinguistics has been said to have taken shape during the 1964 summer seminar at Indiana University's Bloomington campus, sponsored by the Social Science Research Council and the National Science Foundation. This seminar, which took place within the general framework of the annual summer Linguistic Institute, brought together the major actors of what would be the sociolinguistic enterprise – Gumperz, Haugen, Labov, Bright, Ervin, Rubin and Grimshaw, among others. Although this marks the official beginnings of sociolinguistics for some, Fishman makes clear that by 1964, he had been teaching the sociology of language for five years; he had submitted his 'Language Loyalty in the United States' report to the United States Office of Education; and he was putting finishing touches on his first edited volume about the topic, *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, which was published four years later in 1968.⁸

Definitions

A 1965 article entitled 'Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When?' established in a nutshell the question that sociology of language was to pursue for the next 40 years. In the first major publication to name the field, *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (1968), Fishman describes why the sociology of language is needed:

Since languages normally function in a social matrix and since societies depend heavily on language as a medium (if not as a symbol) of interaction, it is certainly appropriate to expect that their observable manifestations, language behavior and social behavior, will be appreciably related in many lawful ways. (Fishman, 1968: 6)

Fishman defines the sociology of language as an enterprise that:

[E]xamines the interaction between these two aspects of human behavior: the use of language and the social organization of behavior. Briefly put, the sociology of language focuses upon the entire gamut of topics related to the social organization of language behavior, including not only language usage per se, but also language attitudes and overt behaviors toward language and toward language users. (Fishman, 1972a: 1)

But the sociology of language is concerned with more than just language behavior. Sociology of language, Fishman (1991b: 2) says, 'is centrally concerned not only with societally patterned behavior through language but with societally patterned behavior *toward* language, whether positive or negative' [emphasis ours]. It is this belief in *social action* on behalf of language that spurs the shaping of the subfields of Language Maintenance, Reversing Language Shift, and Language Planning, which we treat later in the chapter.

From the beginning, Fishman talks about sociology of language as an

interdisciplinary and future-oriented field. Sociology of language, Fishman (1968: 6) says, needs 'work and workers with sensitivity and sympathy' and as such, is an inclusive, rather than an exclusive field. The sociology of language is (Fishman, 1968: 5) '*one of several recent approaches to the study of the patterned co-variation of language and society*' [emphasis ours].

**Growing pains: Sociolinguistics vs. sociology of language.
'And never the twain shall meet?' (1972a: 278)**

The term sociolinguistics was broadly used by Joshua A. Fishman during the early developmental phase of Fishmanian sociolinguistics. Publishing the very first textbook under the title *Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction* in 1970, Fishman used the term 'sociolinguistics' to include both behavior toward language (attitudes, movements, planning) and language concomitants of social processes, large and small (societal formation, societal interaction, societal change and dislocation). But Fishman constantly argued for balance and interpenetration between linguistics and sociology, and he pushed linguistics to truly include sociolinguistics:

If economics answers all questions with supply and demand, and psychology with it all depends, then the first contribution of sociolinguistics to linguistics is doubtlessly to make us aware of the fact that the relations and interpenetrations between language and society are 'a little more complicated than that,' whatever that may be. (Fishman, 1972a: 311)

This call for the expansion of linguistics to be more inclusive of social concerns is one that Fishman has continued to make throughout his career:

Certainly, linguistics as a science and linguists as scientists cannot and should not try to escape from the values and loyalties, dreams and intuitions, visions and sensitivities that move them and that touch them. (Fishman, 1982, as cited in 1989: 575–6)

Just a few years after the legendary Bloomington seminar of 1964, Fishman started differentiating what he then called 'modern sociolinguistics' from what he defined as the sociology of language. In 1967, at an International Seminar held in Moncton, Canada, Fishman proposed a critique of 'modern sociolinguistics.' This paper, published as 'The Description of Societal Bilingualism' both in the proceedings of the conference edited by L.G. Kelly in 1967, and also included in the 'Theoretical Addendum' to his 1971 *Bilingualism in the Barrio*, criticizes the focus of sociolinguistics on micro processes. Fishman (1971: 610) warns that 'We need studies of societal bilingualism that do not get so lost in the minutiae of description (in terms of any current equilibrium model) that they are unable to demonstrate changes in the bilingual pattern as a result of social change.'

By 1972, Fishman was beginning to have doubts about the use of the term 'sociolinguistics.' In *Language in Sociocultural Change*, Fishman (1972a: 268) argued against the use of the term 'sociolinguistics' saying, 'It smacked to me of linguistic priority, if not of linguistic imperialism.' He adds,

The term [sociology of language] now stands in my mind for the reborn field, the revitalized field, whereas 'sociolinguistics' has increasingly come to stand for a 'kind of linguistics' and, therefore, for a possibly important preoccupation, but for one with which I do not and cannot fully identify. ... [T]he sociology of language must be much more vigorously in touch with social and comparative history, with social geography and with political science than with linguistics. (Fishman, 1972a: 270, 272)

As such, his 1972 introductory text was titled, *The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society*.

Joshua A. Fishman's use of the two terms – sociolinguistics and sociology of language – in his work reflects his changing relationships with the field. From 1968 to 1972, he preferred the term 'sociolinguistics,' and this appeared in the title of his articles ten times, whereas 'sociology of language' was not used in any title during that period. 'Sociolinguistics' was used in Fishman's work from 1968 to 1972 to refer to the language of developing programs, national development, bilingualism, neighborhoods and censuses. In 1972, however, both 'sociology of language' and 'sociolinguistics' start to appear in titles, with sociology of language receiving more attention. That year, Fishman used the term 'sociology of language' in six of his titles, and reserved 'sociolinguistics' for only two. Throughout the mid-1970s and 1980s, Fishman referred to his contribution and the field he was shaping as Sociology of Language, and used the term 'sociology of language' to refer to his work, although he used the term 'sociolinguistics' in a 1973 title in connection to nationalism, and again in 1979 ('The Sociolinguistic "Normalization" of the Jewish People'), and 1982 ('Sociolinguistic Foundations of Bilingual Education').

Despite the growth of the field, by 1990 Fishman signaled that the sociology of language had entered a mid-life crisis. He complained that instead of 'progressing firmly on two legs, sociolinguistics was trying to move ahead primarily on the linguistic front while merely 'shuffling on the social.' His was a call to put 'socio more into prominence' (1991a: 128). When at the end of the 20th century it became clear to Fishman that sociolinguistics had taken off as a branch of linguistics, leaving sociology behind, he insisted on placing his work within 'the sociolinguistics enterprise,' which he envisioned in his edited volume, *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*, as an 'embrace of both sociology of language and sociolinguistics' (Fishman, 1999: 152). Throughout the years, Fishman has clam-

ored for inclusion and balance between the linguistic and the social, and he has not ceased to lose hope that the field will work hard to do both: 'The field will only really fulfill its potential when we have the critical mass of case study knowledge that will allow us to aggregate the particular to get a clear view of the general' (Fishman, 2002: x).

With prophetic vision, Fishman had argued in 1972 that the term sociolinguistics would not disappear because 'it is too catchy.' But he opposed the division of sociology of language into two separate parts – one of sociolinguistics of language, and the other of sociolinguistics of society (as Fasold, 1984, did years later) – arguing instead for the *interpenetration* of language in society and society in language that makes the division impossible. Fishman claimed that language and societal behavior are 'equal partners rather than one or the other of them being "boss" and "giving orders" to the other' (1972a: 301). 'Micro- and macro-sociolinguistics are both conceptually and methodologically complementary,' Fishman (1971: 598) reminds us. Arguing for inclusiveness and expansion in the sociolinguistic enterprise, he says:

I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet but I do know what my 'druthers' are and which are so fanciful as to be best kept to myself. I hope that the links between micro and macro will become ever stronger, to the point that they will be viewed much like the links between organic and inorganic chemistry: important and self evident rather than dubious or controversial... Without bridges, the gap between micro and macro will grow... The middle ground is represented by the vision that calls for the relationship between small events or processes and large scale aggregates or structures, for the natural and the formalized, for the empirical as well as for theoretical parsimony.' (Fishman, 1972a: 280)

It is the middle ground that Fishman develops throughout his work, and that is the core of Fishmanian sociolinguistics.

Growth and hopes

Precisely to develop the 'middle ground,' the interpenetration, Joshua A. Fishman founded both a book series and a journal. Since 1972 he has been the editor of Walter de Gruyter/Mouton's *Contributions to the Sociology of Language* (for a complete list of the volumes published, see Appendix 1). Starting with Fishman's own *Advances in the Sociology of Language*, the series has published 80 titles of senior and junior scholars from around the world, many of which have become classics. Although published in English, the series was quick to include scholars from developing countries. Early attention was also paid to the developing world. For example, in the 1970s, the titles included language cases in Indonesia and Malaysia, Albania and New Guinea. The most recent books address such diverse language-in-society

situations as Mexico's indigenous languages, Australia's many languages and Englishes, multilingualism in China, and languages in New York City.

Since 1974, Joshua A. Fishman has also been the General Editor of *The International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (IJSL), the most important academic publication in the field of international macro-sociolinguistics. Reflecting on the characteristics of the journal, Fishman describes them as:

(a) interdisciplinary, reaching far beyond the field of linguistics (particularly, beyond narrowly linguistics-focused sociolinguistics), (b) truly international in content, and (c) macro-level oriented with a special concern for the status of indigenous and immigrant minority language communities. (Fishman 1997c: 237)

The growth of the field itself is reflected in the fact that in the early years, only three issues appeared each year, but by 1976 four issues were being published annually. After 1981, six issues appeared every year (see Appendix 2, for a list of the IJSL titles). Again, from the beginning, attention was paid to different areas of the world – issues in the 1970s were dedicated to languages in Israel, Southeast Asia, Sweden and Finland, Belgium, the American southwest, and to languages as varied as Romani and Yiddish. Since the 1990s, IJSL has, in Fishman's words (1997c: 238), 'provided sociolinguistic endeavor with difficult-to-achieve entrée' into China, Korea, the Maghreb, Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, South Africa, Sub-Saharan Africa, Morocco, Aboriginal Australia and Latin America.

Multilingualism

Multilingualism in Fishmanian sociolinguistic perspective

Joshua A. Fishman's early interest in Yiddish distinguished him from other early sociolinguists who were interested in language variation within the same language. From the very beginning, Fishman had a special interest in bilingual situations precisely because of the more marked sociolinguistic variations that this afforded and the possibility of studying this variation with clearer parameters. Recently Fishman (1999) commented on his interest in multilingualism:

Bilingual or multilingual settings are very commonly studied in order to gauge sociolinguistic variation (and to relate such variation to the identity and purpose of speakers on different occasions and in different contexts), because the variation between languages *is easier to monitor (particularly by sociologists)* than is the variation within one and the same language. [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1999: 153)

Fishman has always been interested in multilingualism as *an intra-group* phenomenon that is *widespread and stable*, rather than as an inter-group

process. His early work focused on developing and mobilizing consciousness of minority languages and ethnicities in the United States, a country with a skewed vision of bilingualism as a 'vanishing phenomenon, as a temporary dislocation from a presumably more normal state of affairs' (Fishman, 1971: 584) – see, for example, his books *Bilingualism in a Yiddish School*, *Language Loyalty in the United States*, *Yiddish in America*, and *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. But very early on (1968), Fishman broadened his attention to include inter-group bilingualism also, as his *Language Problems of Developing Nations* book demonstrates. His work, however, never abandoned the interest in, and focus on, widespread and stable intra-group bilingualism. In the present era of globalization, when multilingualism is increasingly an intra-group phenomenon within inter-group interactions, Fishman's conception of multilingualism is more valid than ever before.

Fishman's work defines 'multilingualism' as the interaction between bilingualism (preferred by psychologists) and diglossia (preferred by sociologists). (For more on this, see the 'Diglossia' section below.) As such, multilingualism in Fishmanian sociolinguistics focuses on the intra-group widespread and stable use of two or more languages.

Viewing multilingualism differently

The importance of Fishmanian sociolinguistics for the study of multilingualism is precisely that it goes beyond the term 'bilingual' as understood in the 1960s by psychologists, linguists and sociologists. Much of Fishman's early work is devoted to debunking the ideas proposed by psychologists on how to study and understand bilingualism, especially the concepts of *balanced bilingualism* and *dominance* that were so prevalent in the psychological literature concerning bilingualism in the 1960s.

Speaking against the concept of *dominance* as tested by psychologists with translation speed tests, Fishman argues that where bilingualism is socially constructed, and not merely an occupation or hobby, very little translation occurs. Speaking against translation speed tests, he wrote: 'such usage makes it exceedingly cumbersome to deal with those bilinguals whose dominant (i.e. most used) language is not their most proficient language...' (Fishman, 1971: 557). Years later, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) would expand upon this difference between function and competence as she developed a definition of mother tongue based on the plural criteria of function, competence, origin and identification.

The debunking of *balanced bilingualism* and the advancement of Fishman's concept of domains of language behavior (see the next section) reminds us of the notion of 'plurilingualism' that has become so important in the European Union today. European plurilingualism today is defined as 'proficiency, of varying degrees, in several languages and experience of several cultures' (*Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*, 2002: 168).

For Coste (2001: 15), plurilingualism involves practices and values that are not equivalent or even homologous in different languages, but that are *integrated, variable, flexible and changing*. This is an expansion of Fishman's early notion that balanced bilingualism is an impossibility.

Linguists have sometimes been the culprits in contributing to the misunderstandings surrounding bilingualism. Following Weinreich's (1953) *Languages in Contact*, linguists have looked at the two languages separately as reflecting two groups, and not one group. In typical Fishman mocking style, Fishman says in 1971 (p. 561): 'The linguist has traditionally seen his task, in relation to the study of bilingualism, as being similar to that of a housewife looking for smears of wet paint.' In ways that remind us of the hybridity proposed by Bakhtin (1981) and that is so prevalent in the post-modernist work of scholars like Bhahba (1994), Anzaldúa (1997) and Gutiérrez *et al.* (1999), and sociolinguists like Canagarajah (2005), Fishman blames linguists for having a model of pure monolithic *langue* that leads them to find interference only as something harmful. He argues for studying the bilingual varieties as varieties in their own right. Fishman (1971: 562) claims: 'Like other people bilinguals constitute speech communities characterized by certain general social patterns of rights, obligations daily round and interactions.' The ways in which languages are used are not random, but are governed by norms of bilingual usage understood by the members of the bilingual community itself.

Fishman (1971: 3) has also pointed out that second language acquisition, a favorite topic of study for many psycholinguists who study bilingualism, is not of interest to the sociology of language since 'bilingualism is acquired by exposure to, and interaction with, a community that lives in accord with the norms of usage and that is involved in the normal process of change to which most communities and most norms are exposed.' Fishman warns:

Any speech community is characterized by definite norms of language and behavior, which not only encompass the speech varieties (or languages) that exist within the speech community for its own internal communicative needs but also relate them to the types of other-than-speech behaviors – the interactions, the mutual rights and obligations, the roles and statuses, the purposes and identifications – in which various networks within the community are engaged. It follows that the description and measurement of an individual's bilingualism (as of an individual's repertoire range with respect to the language varieties that exist even within monolingual communities of any complexity) should reflect and disclose the sociolinguistic norms of the speech networks and the speech community of which he is a part, precisely because these sociolinguistic norms underlie the individual's bilingualism. (Fishman, 1971: 3)

Referring to the spread of English 33 years later, Brutt-Griffler (2004: 138) expands upon this concept to propose 'macroacquisition' as the 'acquisition of a second language by a speech community. It is a process of social second language acquisition, the embodiment of the process of language spread and change, or language change through its spread.'

Fishman's criticism of how bilingualism has been studied also extends to sociologists who have not conducted their own self-reports but who have depended on governmental censuses. Fishman questions the traditional social categories that sociologists use and cries out for lower-order validation of such categories with different populations, in diverse situations. Fishman's early contributions include the development of instruments that could be used to assess language use and behavior (see, for example, *Bilingualism in the Barrio*).

Joshua A. Fishman's ways of looking at multilingualism have given psychologists, linguists and sociologists new understandings about how languages function in stable, widespread, intra-group bilingualism. As Fishman (1971: 605) himself said, 'Instead of witch-hunting for bilingual interference, modern sociolinguistics recognizes the linguistic repertoires of bilingual speech communities as an instance of the repertoires that characterize all functionally diversified speech communities.'

A Fishmanian sociolinguistic model for the study of multilingualism: Methodological propositions

Joshua A. Fishman's early work provided a sociolinguistic model for studying multilingualism and at the same time it advanced theories about how multilingualism functioned in society. Both the theoretical and the methodological propositions were founded on the sociocultural contextualization of the data, as well as the interrelationships of the parameters.

An important methodological contribution made by Fishman's early work was his proposal that researchers have to identify with the speech community they are studying. This is a position that Fishman has maintained throughout his scholarly life. In 1991, he said: 'The sociology of language, like all of social science, is inevitably perspectival and a good bit of any observers' values and beliefs therefore rub off on his or her observations' (1991b: 8). And in his recent article on 'sociolinguistics' in the *Handbook of Language and Ethnicity* (1999: 160) he added: 'Without adequately taking into consideration the 'insider' views, convictions and interpretations, no full or richly nuanced understanding of the behaviors being researched is possible.'

In *Bilingual Education: An International Perspective* (1976), Fishman talks about his focus not only on empirical data, but also on communicating feelings and values. The preface starts out by saying:

This is a partisan volume. Not only is it unabashedly in favor of bilingual education, but it is strongly in favor of a certain context for bilingual education: a context that values it as enrichment for one and all. ... I have written this book because I want to bring this view, and the data and reasoning on which it is based, to teachers, teacher-trainees, educational administrators, a wide variety of other educational specialists, and educationally concerned laymen. ... I hope I will be pardoned for feeling deeply and for communicating feelings and values in addition to information and conclusions. I believe it is my duty as an empirical researcher to do the former as well as the latter because bilingual education urgently requires not only attention and understanding but also sympathy, assistance and dedication. (Fishman, 1976: viii)

Fishman has defended this 'voice from within,' even when the political tide supports research that is contrary to this position and has left him with little funding for research. In his book titled, *In Praise of the Beloved Language* (1996a), he explains:

The chief debit of the 'voice from within' is that it is self-interest biased, but at least it is admittedly so. However, the voices from without are also necessarily biased – in perspective and in expected audience and reward (and therefore, also in self-interest) – no matter how much they dress themselves up in the garb of science, objectivity, theory and fashionable philosophy or ideology. Like insider views, outsider views too are often reductionist and simplistic (and therefore, neither fully informed nor informing), a charge that outside viewers have long hurled at insider viewers. (Fishman, 1996a: 119)

But to this insider's view, Fishman, the researcher, has always added an analytical perspective. In his book *Language and Nationalism* (1972b), he speaks about how the three nationalist movements that are at the center of his life – Yiddish secularism, Hebrew Zionism and the African American movement – have shaped his interest in language and nationalism. But he describes how he obtained scholarly distance:

I have decided to do so [understand them better] by engaging in a once removed, twice removed, thrice removed mode of analysis, in the hope that the wider canvas would illumine the narrower, while the narrower passion would drive me on to examine one hidden corner after another in the broader picture. (Fishman, 1972b: xiii)

As a way to study multilingualism, the Fishmanian sociolinguistic model (1971) relies first on ethnographic observations through which behavioral or attitudinal clusters associated with different speech varieties

are hypothesized. These clusters are then used for further observations, interviews, questionnaires, or attitude scales.

Fishman's methodological contributions to large-scale social investigations consist of the early development of self-report instruments, censuses, questionnaires, interview guides and word association tests, that were then subjected to factor analysis, analyses of variances and multiple regression analyses. But methodology to him is subservient to the topic at hand. In what was to be his second large scale sociolinguistic study, *Bilingualism in the Barrio*, Fishman (1971: xiii) says: 'It is one of the hallmarks of scientific social inquiry that methods are selected as a result of problem specifications rather than independently of them.' This is an area to which Fishman has always paid attention. As Research Director of the College Board in the late 1950s, he used correlations, regressions and identification of predictors that attempt to approximate criteria, but he demanded that selection and admissions to college must be anchored in a philosophy of education (Fishman & Passanella, 1960).

Throughout his work, Fishman has been concerned with the tension between group data and individual data, but he has not been moved to give one up for the other. He sustains:

The need to summarize and group language usage data necessarily leads to some loss of refinement when proceeding from specific instances of actual speech in face to face interaction to grouped or categorized data. However, such summarization or simplification is an inevitable aspect of the scientific process of discovering meaning in continuous multivariate data by attending to differential relationships, central tendencies, relative variabilities and other similar characterization. (Fishman, 1972a: 91)

Because the same process may result in differences in varied cases, Fishman proposes that a comparative method be used to find cross-cultural and diachronic regularities. As early as 1968, he suggested four scenarios for comparative work with language groups being the same or different, and similar or dissimilar with regards to primary sociocultural processes and contact types. The four resulting scenarios are (Fishman, 1972a: 103):

- (1) *same* language group in two separate interaction contexts: *similar*;
- (2) *same* language group in two separate interaction contexts: *dissimilar*;
- (3) *different* language groups in two separate interaction contexts: *similar*;
- (4) *different* language groups in two separate interaction contexts: *dissimilar*.

As Fishman's conceptual universe grew, his methodology continued to reflect his positive attitude toward the minority speech community or the problem that he was studying. He also developed ways of continuing to compare and contrast his thinking on particular sociolinguistic situations

with others, and his own thinking with those of others in what he says may 'not be the best of all possible worlds.' This is evident, for example, in the book that he dedicates to positive ethnolinguistic consciousness, *In Praise of the Beloved Language* (1996a). Drawing from examples of the many languages that make up the compendium of languages in the book, Fishman (1996a: 4) proceeds to compare the answers that these texts reveal about the following questions:

- What are the positive views about their vernaculars that have been expressed by peoples the world over?
- Are there any regularities to these views, across time and across space?
- Are there more common and less common themes and, if so, which are which?
- Are some themes more distinctly European and others less so, or have some themes now become rather uncommon in Europe while they have become more common elsewhere?

With considerable detail, Fishman tells us how he went about creating the categories for the content analysis.

Fishman is mostly interested in social factors, dimensions and parameters, rather than individuals:

The individual, any individual, is merely error variance from the perspective of social research. Each individual's behavior is overdetermined in terms of his or her personal dynamics. Social research, on the other hand, is concerned with factors, dimensions and parameters that are demonstrable over and above the varying tendencies, dispositions and idiosyncrasies of unique individuals. All of our much vaunted statistical tests are built upon this very principle: to contrast between-group variance with within-group variance. Only when the former is sufficiently greater than the latter do we call our findings 'statistically significant'. (Fishman, 1987: 2)

Yet Fishman often also pays attention to individuals. He devotes an entire book to the man who had captured his imagination as the organizer of the First Yiddish Language Conference in Austro-Hungarian Tshernovits in 1908 – Nathan Birnbaum.

Fishman's 2001, *Can Threatened Languages be Saved?* is a collection of case studies that puts to the test his theoretical conceptualizations about Reversing Language Shift (see below). In many contributions, Fishman tests his own conceptualizations, and in so doing, draws other scholars to reflect and expand upon his own theories and cases. In the preface to *Can Threatened Languages be Saved?* Fishman (2001) writes:

Just as any single-authored volume inevitably overestimates the degree of coherence and confirmation vis-à-vis the author's views, any multi-authored volume is likely to reveal a reverse imbalance, over-representing differences and disconfirmations relative to the views of that same particular author's approach. (Fishman, 2001: xiii)

One of us (García) always remembers Fishman, the teacher, saying that 'increasing the variance' was important in all research. It is a lesson that Fishman the scholar has always acted upon, demanding that the voices of 'little people' and 'little languages' also be included.

Recently, Fishman has chided the ethnographic revolution of the post-modern world for paying little attention to ethnicity and not considering poetic and romantic imagery and folk analogies. As he puts it,

We have often championed late modernizers and 'native peoples,' but we have even more commonly refocused our intellectualizations from modernization to post-modernization without letting these peoples speak their own words or disclose their own hearts and minds. (Fishman: 1996a: 120)

Fishman has never closed the door to ways of looking deeply in various ways. About his work, he has said:

I feel strongly that there is more 'out there' (even more to the sociology of language) than science can grasp, and I have a personal need for poets, artists, mystics and philosophers too for a deeper understanding of all that puzzles me. (Fishman, 1990: 123)

A Fishmanian sociolinguistic model for the study of multilingualism: Theoretical propositions

Domains

One of the main early concepts proposed by Fishman to study multilingualism was that of *domain*. The concept of domain, Fishman explains, was first elaborated among *Auslandsdeutsche*⁹ students in pre-World War II multilingual settings. Domains 'are defined, regardless of their number, in terms of institutional contexts and their congruent behavioral co-occurrences. They attempt to summate the major clusters of interaction that occur in clusters of multilingual settings and involving clusters of interlocutors' (Fishman, 1971: 586). Domains allow scholars to make connections between clusters of interaction and interlocutors and more concrete social situations.

The interest in defining 'domains' grew out of Fishman's methodological concern that analytic parameters be in touch with reality and be abstracted from domain – appropriate persons, places and times. Domains structure the data of social behavior. Fishman tells us that domain variance is the

most *parsimonious* and fruitful designation of the societally or institutionally clusterable occasions in which one language (variant, dialect, style, etc.) is habitually employed rather than (or in addition to) another. (Fishman, 1972a: 80)

Throughout his work, Fishman has reserved a special place for the family domain, saying that: 'Multilingualism often begins in the family and depends upon it for encouragement if not for protection' (Fishman, 1972a: 82). And much later, when he proposes his model for Reversing Language Shift (RLS, see below), Fishman (1991b: 113) declares: 'Without intergenerational mother tongue transmission, no language maintenance is possible. That which is not transmitted cannot be maintained.' This is why in the *Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale* proposed in his RLS model, Stage 6 – the stage in which language X (the minority or non-dominant language) is the normal language of informal, spoken interaction between and within the family – is crucial to language maintenance and RLS. Commenting on globalization and the multimodal discourses that have been made possible by recent technology, Fishman insists on the power of the family over the power of the Internet, stating that:

Nothing can substitute for face-to-face interaction with real family imbedded in real community. Ultimately, nothing is as crucial for basic RLS success as intergenerational mother tongue transmission. *Gemeinschaft* (the intimate community whose members are related to one another via bonds of kinship, affection and communality of interest and purpose) is the real secret weapon of RLS. (Fishman, 2001: 458)

Diglossia

Another of the major contributions of Joshua A. Fishman to the study of societal multilingualism has been his extension and expansion of the concept of *diglossia* as proposed by Ferguson (1959). Ferguson used diglossia to describe a society that used a H(igh) variety of a language in religion, education and other domains, and a L(ow) variety in the home and lower work sphere. Fishman (1964) traces the maintenance and disruption of diglossia to the national or societal level and extends it to include cases of societal bilingualism. He warns that 'socially patterned bilingualism can exist as a stabilized phenomenon only if there is functional differentiation between two languages' (Fishman, 1971: 560) and says:

If the roles were not kept separate (compartmentalized) by the power of their association with quite separate though complementary values, domains of activity and everyday situations, one language or variety would displace the other as role and value distinctions became blurred or merged. (Fishman, 1972a: 140)

Fishman renders the compartmentalization between the H(igh) and L(ow) language in the form of a diagram:



with the line between the two indicating functional separation, a boundary. Fishman explains that without diglossia, stable balanced bilingualism cannot be obtained, and continues:

From the point of view of sociolinguistics, any society that produces functionally balanced bilinguals (i.e. bilinguals who use both their languages equally and equally well in all contexts) must soon cease to be bilingual because no society needs two languages for one and the same set of functions. (Fishman, 1972a: 140)

Diglossia provides the impetus for language maintenance or shift, which we will discuss later. Fishman declares:

Without separate though complementary norms and values to establish and maintain functional separation of the speech varieties, that language or variety which is fortunate enough to be associated with the predominant drift of social forces tends to displace the others. (Fishman, 1972a: 149)

In 1987, in the book that he dedicates to Nathan Birnbaum, the organizer of the First Yiddish Conference in Tschernovits in 1908, Fishman reiterates:

A culture that can no longer control its own boundaries is doomed to a cultural version of the 'acquired immune deficiency syndrome.'...There must be a boundary that cannot be overstepped. (Fishman, 1987: 138)

Diglossia, as the stable maintenance of two complementary value systems and thus two languages, is expressed in two complementary sets of domains. Fishman distinguishes bilingualism from diglossia as follows:

[B]ilingualism is essentially a characterization of individual linguistic versatility while diglossia is a characterization of the societal allocation of functions to different languages or varieties. (Fishman, 1972a: 145)

In 1967, Fishman published his now famous and much cited 'Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia; Diglossia With and Without Bilingualism.' In this article, he outlined four possible situational cells:

- (1) diglossia with bilingualism;
- (2) diglossia without bilingualism;
- (3) bilingualism without diglossia;
- (4) neither diglossia nor bilingualism.

Fishman devotes most attention to the fruitful bilingualism of the first of these (diglossia with bilingualism) which he illustrates with examples such as Paraguay where Guaraní is used at home and Spanish is used in education, religion, government and work. Social groups in this cell are usually fairly large speech communities that offer a range of compartmentalized roles, as well as access to those roles to its members (Fishman, 1971).

The second cell (diglossia without bilingualism) is exemplified by polities that are for the most part 'economically underdeveloped and unmobilized.' In these polities, the elites speak one language and the masses another, but they have never really formed a single speech community – 'their linguistic repertoires were discontinuous and their inter-communications were by means of translators or interpreters' (Fishman, 1972a: 143).

Bilingualism without diglossia exists in social groups with great social unrest or rapid social change, such as is the case of immigrants and refugees. Finally, there are very few societies where neither diglossia nor bilingualism occur.

But as the world has become more interdependent, Fishman's concept of diglossia has acquired some fluidity. In 1985 he warns that diglossia requires control, but not the 'freezing' of intercultural boundaries.' Speaking about the relationship between English and Dutch in the Netherlands, Fishman explains:

The result of such boundary maintenance is that English never becomes a requirement for membership in the Dutch ethnoculture, although it does become a widespread skill advantageously associated with such membership. ... It [English] is definitely not intended to be, nor will it become, an inside language of Dutch society at large. (Fishman, 1985, as cited in 1989: 227)

Despite the insistence that there must be some functional allocation between two languages in order for stable intra-group bilingualism to be maintained, Fishman posits that he espouses cultural pluralism, rather than cultural separatism. For North American ethnolinguistic minorities, he supports 'language maintenance within the framework of *mutual interaction* with American core society' (Fishman, 1972a: 22). Fishman increasingly acknowledges the interdependency of a globalized world:

In a world that is continually more and more interactive and interdependent, modernization can be delayed and 'locally colored,' but rarely can it be interminably delayed or fully controlled. (Fishman, 1996a: 93)

When Fishman conceptualizes the field of Reversing Language Shift (RLS), he concedes overlapping and interactive functions. But he insists on the protection and stability of what he calls the X-ish functions, in the face of Y-ish functions, with X representing co-territorial threatened languages,

and *Y* denoting unthreatened or less threatened languages. Fishman (1991b: 85) explains that 'Bilingualism is protective of *X*-ishness and *interactive* with *Y*-ishness' [emphasis ours].

Fishman (2001) acknowledges that threatened languages (*Th* below) usually aspire to discharge the powerful functions of employment, higher education, mass media, government, etc. That is, threatened languages aim to fulfill those functions that diglossia had previously noted as High, as well as the informal and less powerful functions to which it had been previously relegated (previously noted as Low).

But Fishman describes a more realistic and initial goal for threatened languages in which some of the social functions that had previously been relegated to the more powerful (or High) language; for example, secondary education or local employment; would be shared with the non-threatened language (*n-Th* below). Fishman represents this diglossic relationship, with powerful functions above the line, as:

$$\frac{n-Th/Th}{Th}$$

That is, although the *Th*(reatened) language, previously noted as *L*(ow), may share some of the functions of the *n*(on)-*Th*(reatened) language, previously noted as *H*(igh) in the more formal and powerful domains, the informal domains of intimacy and informality, and especially home, must be reserved solely for the *Th*(reatened) language. In other words, there must not be any fluidity over the horizontal line, and the *Th*(reatened) language carefully guards its functions in the home domain.

Fishman warns that RLS's goal is not just to elevate the threatened language so that it is in a position to assume powerful functions. It must also *guard the invasion of the non-threatened powerful language into the less powerful domains, especially the family*, where it can destroy the possibility of intergenerational transmission by destroying the creation of any mother tongue speakers within one generation. It is especially *X*, the threatened language, that has to be functionally separated. Fishman explains:

When intragroup bilingualism is stabilized so that *X*-ish has its functions and *Y*-ish has its functions and these two sets of functions overlap minimally, then *X*-ish will have its own space, functions in which it and it alone is normatively expected. (Fishman, 1991b: 85)

Facing the threats of globalization in the 21st century, Fishman acknowledges the importance of the 'Big Brother language.' He concedes that: '[A]n internal societal re-allocation of languages to functions is pursued that will also be partially acceptive of the culturally stronger Big Brother language' (Fishman, 2001: 7). Speaking of what he calls late- and later-modernizer languages, he states that they:

may find that multilingualism and multiliteracy are actually their best options for more quickly attaining both symbolic vernacular recognition on the one hand and the greater material advantages that are associated with languages of wider communication on the other. (Fishman, 1999: 161)

Language Maintenance/Language Shift/Reversing Language Shift

Language maintenance/language shift

Language maintenance and language shift have been important fields of inquiry in the sociology of language from the very beginning ('Language Maintenance and Language Shift as a Field of Inquiry,' 1964). They were originally defined thus:

The study of language maintenance and language shift is concerned with the relationship between change or stability in habitual language use, on the one hand, and ongoing psychological, social or cultural processes of change and stability, on the other hand. (as cited in Fishman, 1971: 603, note 3)

In 1968, Fishman revisits this definition and extends it by saying:

The study of language maintenance and language shift is concerned with the relationship between change (or stability) in language usage patterns, on the one hand, and ongoing psychological, social or cultural processes, on the other hand, in populations that utilize more than one speech variety *for intra-group or for inter-group purposes.*' [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1968: 76)

Fishman's initial interest in intra-group multilingualism was quickly extended to encompass inter-group processes, as he faced the developing world and his interest in language planning (see below). It is this extension that he highlights in his revised definition.

The three main topics of language maintenance and language shift are identified as (Fishman, 1964, 1968):

- (1) habitual language use and the measurement of degree and location of bilingualism along sociologically relevant dimensions;
- (2) psychological, social and cultural processes and their relationship to stability or change in habitual language use;
- (3) behavior toward language, including attitudinal behavior, cognitive behavior or overt behavior.

In a style that is typical of Fishman throughout his career, he articulates his theoretical conceptualization of language maintenance and language shift

by presenting a series of counter-arguments to his thinking, which he then critiques (Fishman, 1972a):

- (1) language maintenance is a function of intactness of group membership or group loyalty, particularly nationalism;
- (2) urban dwellers are more inclined to shift. Rural dwellers who are more conservative and isolated are less inclined;
- (3) the most prestigious language displaces the less prestigious language.

To the first argument, Fishman provides counter-evidence from such varied ethnolinguistic groups as the Guayqueries of Venezuela, the lower caste groups in India, the Raetoromans in Switzerland and the *Auslandsdeutsche* in the midst of Polish and Ukrainian majorities. He concludes:

Language maintenance may depend most on nationalist ideologies in populations whose lives have otherwise been greatly dislocated and it may also depend least on such ideologies in those populations that have best preserved their total social context against the winds of change. (Fishman, 1972a: 97)

Fishman then makes the point that language loyalty and language revival movements are mostly urban phenomena, and gives example of some low prestige languages that have historically displaced more prestigious ones. By so doing, Fishman proposes that the same process may have different outcomes in different societies and at different times. He says, for example:

Urbanization may result in language shift away from hitherto traditional language in some cases, in language shift back to traditional languages in other cases, while revealing significantly unaltered maintenance of the status quo in still others. (Fishman, 1972a: 100)

The significance of this quote is that it contains the germinating seeds for Fishman's later work on reversing language shift (RLS) – see next section.

With a vision that well anticipates Richard Ruiz's (1984) division of language ideology as viewing language as a problem, as a resource, or as a right, Fishman says about language in the United States:

The recommendations advanced here are derived from the point of view that language maintenance in the United States is desirable, in that the non-English language *resources* of American minority groups have already helped meet our urgent national need for speakers of various non-English languages, and that these resources can be reinforced and developed so as to do so to a very much greater extent in the future. [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1972a: 18)

The seeds for RLS are also in Fishman's 1966 article titled 'Planned Reinforcement of Language Maintenance in the United States. Suggestions for the Conservation of a Neglected National Resource.' This article already puts Fishman in the position of recommending and planning social action on behalf of threatened languages. He explains:

[M]ost social scientists feel more comfortable with diagnosis (study design, instrument construction, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation) than with therapy (recommendations for action, planning action, involvement with action-oriented branches of government or segments of the community)... Although it is frequently admitted that applied settings can provide powerful stimulation for theoretical developments, the leap from the role of scholar to that of *consultant or activist* is still rarely attempted among behavioral scientists. [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1972a: 16, 17)

Fishman, however, dares to make the leap to activist, and also has the courage to admit his values and biases – his social philosophy. He tells us: 'Recommendations leading to language reinforcement imply a willingness to espouse certain values, and to assist certain groups in an informed pursuit of "the art of the possible"' [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1972a: 19). Clearly the seeds for RLS were sown in the 1960s and early 1970s.

Reversing language shift (RLS)

While many scholars complain about threatened and endangered languages in the world today, Fishman has turned his conceptualization of language maintenance and language shift into a program of social action. Threatened languages, Fishman (1991b) reminds us, are not replacing themselves demographically and are unrelated to higher social status. But something can be done to assist them; resources such as intelligence, funds, time and effort can be mobilized. Fishman first establishes that RLS is both necessary and desirable. Posing the question, 'Can anything be done?' he answers in the affirmative, and suggests that one has to decide 'which functions to tackle first ... and which specific steps to take in order to (re)gain those functions among specific target populations' (Fishman, 1991b: 12). Fishman proposes his *Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS)* where, the higher the score, the lower the language maintenance prospects of a group.

The GIDS provides a way by which groups can assess the threatened state of their languages (X) and can mobilize resources on their behalf:

- Stage 8: X spoken by socially isolated old folks;
- Stage 7: X spoken by people who are socially integrated and ethnolinguistically active, but beyond child-bearing age;

- Stage 6: X is normal language of informal spoken interaction between and within all three generations of family, with Y reserved for greater formality and technicality than those common of daily family life;
- Stage 5: X is also used for literacy in home, school and community, but such literacy is not reinforced extra-communally;
- Stage 4: X is used in lower education that meets requirements of compulsory education laws;
- Stage 3: X is used in lower work sphere, outside of the community, and involving interaction between both speech communities;
- Stage 2: X is used in lower governmental services and mass media, but not higher levels;
- Stage 1: X is used in higher level educational, occupational, governmental and media efforts.

The crucial stage beyond which there is no intergenerational mother tongue transmission, and therefore, no possibility of language maintenance is Stage 6. As we noted before, 'Face-to-face interaction with real family imbedded in real community,' Fishman (2001: 458) reminds us, 'is the real secret weapon of RLS.' Reacting to the importance that scholars of multimodal discourse give to the web community (Jewett & Kress, 2003; Kress, 2003), Fishman (2001: 455) says that 'community and 'virtual community' are not the same thing at all as far as intergenerational mother tongue transmission are concerned.'

Groups that fall between stages 5 and 8 are attempting to work out some kind of diglossia, what Fishman sees as the program minimum of RLS. Groups that fall between stages 1 and 4 have transcended diglossic status, and are in search of increased power sharing.

RLS is especially important in the 21st century as a way to balance globalization. Fishman says:

RLSers aim at nothing more than to achieve greater self-regulation over the processes of sociocultural change which globalisation fosters. They want to be able to tame globalisation somewhat, to counterbalance it with more of their own language-and-culture institutions, processes and outcomes. (Fishman, 2001: 6)

Thus, RLS theoretical contributions make room for both – globalization and particularism. Fishman (2001) points to the important multilingual and multi-ethnic interactions that will be necessary in the world of the future:

The languages of the world will either all help one another survive or they will succumb separately to the global dangers that must assuredly await us all (English included) in the century ahead. (Fishman, 2001: 481)

Language Spread

As we have seen, Fishman's sociology of language was first concerned with the measurement of habitual language use and the sociocultural processes leading to or inhibiting language maintenance and language shift in immigrant settings. But from the beginning, Fishman also turned to the study of the opposite side of this coin, namely the diffusion process of a language of wider communication. In 1967, he published the first article that was to deal with this topic: 'The Breadth and Depth of English in the United States.' The spread of English offered a new perspective for the study of language maintenance and language shift. On the one hand, English was widely present in very different societal contexts. On the other hand, it was present in many educational systems, and was often more read than spoken. Furthermore, sociocultural processes, and especially the role of power, were more visible in the study of English language spread than in the study of language maintenance and shift of immigrant communities. Fishman says:

Bilingualism is repeatedly skewed in favor of the more powerful, with the language of greater power being acquired and used much more frequently than that of lesser power. (Fishman, 1976, as cited in 1989: 241)

About English, Fishman adds:

On the whole, English as an additional language is more learned than used and more used than liked. The three (learning, using and liking) are little related to each other. (Fishman, 1976, as cited in 1989: 254)

The fact that English is not particularly liked worldwide is linked to its power. Fishman asserts:

Small languages and weak polities in the modern world quickly realize that they require strong partners to protect and complement them. Large languages and strong polities lack this realization and, therefore, run a particular risk of parochialism, provincialism, and philistinism – a risk that is all the more terrifying because miscalculations derived therefrom can have truly calamitous results. (Fishman *et al.*, 1977: 334)

It is a lesson for the United States and the powerful English-speaking world that Fishman delivers again and again.

But from the beginning, Fishman also explains that the spread of English does not have to result in the loss of local languages. This early position reminds us of Louis-Jean Calvet's (1999) 'gravitational model' of diglossia, a model that proposes that today's spread of global powerful languages like English can coexist and not threaten local languages. In fact, Fishman,

Cooper and Conrad (1977) prophesy that the use of local languages might increase as a result of English language spread:

English is clearly the major link-language in the world today and that alone shows signs of continuing as such, at least in the short run, while the use of local languages for official literacy/education-related purposes is also likely to increase. (Cooper & Conrad, 1977: 56)

In 1980, in an article titled 'Language Maintenance and Ethnicity,' Fishman had already identified the two contradictory trends that according to Maurais and Morris (2004) characterize languages in the globalized world of the 21st century:

- (1) the spread of a single lingua franca (English) 'for supra-local, economic, political, diplomatic, educational and touristic purposes';
- (2) the recognition of more languages than ever before 'for governmental and governmentally protected functions.' (as cited in Fishman, 1989: 220)

And yet, Fishman, Cooper and Conrad call for the English-speaking world to assist the rest of the world in preserving their local vernaculars. Fishman says:

International sociolinguistic balance rests on the spread of English, the control of English, and the fostering of local/regional/national vernaculars. ... Of these three, the one that is currently most dynamic is that relating to the vernaculars, many of which are straining for further recognition. Thus it becomes all the more crucial not only whether native speakers of English can hold on to their technological superiority but also whether they can really meet the 'others' halfway in the crucial sociopsychological arena of *mutual acceptance*. [emphasis ours] (Fishman *et al.*, 1977: 335)

Fishman pursues this topic of the role of English in former British and American colonies in the book he edits with Andrew Conrad and Alma Rubal-López, *Post-Imperial English: Status Change in Former British and American Colonies 1940–1990*. In a series of case studies authored by different scholars, Fishman studies the presence of English along seven dimensions – elementary education, tertiary education, print media, non-print media, technology/commerce/industry, governmental services and operations and indigenous informal usage. Although most cases confirm the presence of English especially in the econotechnical realms at the supra-local level, Fishman concludes that there is no evidence of alienation from the local culture, and certainly no evidence of linguicide. Despite the threats to endangered languages, which Fishman acknowledges and has spent his academic life trying to protect and save, it is the need for assis-

tance to local indigenous vernaculars that Fishman's work emphasizes. In other words, he wastes no intellectual energy trying to stop the spread of English. He acknowledges that:

The socioeconomic factors that are behind the spread of English are now indigenous in most countries of the world and part and parcel of indigenous daily life and social stratification. (Fishman, 1996b: 637)

So it is the role of the vernacular, and its weaker (or at least weakening) status in indigenous daily life that is important for Joshua A. Fishman, with language attitudes and ideologies playing an important role in the shaping of that role.

Language Attitudes and Language and Ethnicity/ Nationalism/Identity/Religion/Power

Language attitudes

Fishmanian sociolinguistics has always included research aimed at discovering 'the nature, determinants, effects and measurement of attitudes' (Cooper & Fishman, 1974: 6). That is, affective behaviors always have had a place in sociology of language studies, alongside overt behaviors and cognitive behaviors. But Fishman has also signaled the contradictions between affective and overt behaviors. In an article on 'Language Policy in the USA,' Fishman (1989: 408) comments that 'it is possible for language attitudes to improve in compensatory fashion as both use and knowledge decrease.'

In 1996, Fishman dedicated an entire book to language attitudes. His *In Praise of the Beloved Language. A Comparative View of Positive Ethnolinguistic Consciousness* is an attempt to understand language attitudes towards the vernacular. Fishman makes clear that although nationalist movements have used these attitudes in mobilizing populations, positive ethnolinguistic consciousness is not in itself nationalism. Fishman also acknowledges that positive ethnolinguistic consciousness is not the only type of language consciousness. Language consciousness can also be inter-ethnic, and even supra-ethnic in the case of shared lingua francas.

The concept of positive ethnolinguistic consciousness ties the understandings of language attitudes with those of language identity and language and nationalism which we will discuss below. Fishman explains that:

The phenomenology of most ongoing positive ethnolinguistic consciousness recognizes a ... reality in which the ethnic language, the ethnic identity and the ethnic culture (behaviors, beliefs, artifacts) are all completely intertwined. It is this very intertwining that constitutes the 'heart of the matter.' (Fishman, 1996a: 61)

Despite this intertwining, we address each of these components individually below.

Language and ethnicity

In a 1997 essay entitled 'Language and Ethnicity: The View from Within,' Joshua Fishman explains that the term ethnicity is derived from the Greek '*ethnos*' and shares its negative semantic load of 'unrefined.' The earliest Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible used the term '*ethnos*' as the counterpart to the Hebrew '*goy*' which meant 'god-obeying.' When the terms race, national origin and culture became inapplicable because they were no longer useful, the term ethnicity was brought to the fore.

In an early article that Fishman published in 1965 entitled 'Varieties of Ethnicity and Varieties of Language Consciousness,' Fishman says:

Ethnicity refers most basically to a primordial holistic guide to human behavior ... An all-embracing constellation, limited in its contacts with the outside world, limited in its consciousness of self, limited in the internal differentiation or specialization that it recognizes or permits; a 'given' that is viewed as no more subject to change than one's kin and one's birthplace; a 'given' that operates quite literally with these two differentiations (kinship and birthplace) uppermost in mind; a 'given' in which kinship and birthplace completely regulate friendship, worship and workmanship. (as cited in Fishman, 1972a: 180)

More than 15 years later, in an article entitled 'Language Maintenance and Ethnicity,' Fishman (1989: 180) defines ethnicity as 'peopleness, i.e. belonging or pertaining to a phenomenologically complete, separate, historically deep cultural collectivity, a collectivity polarized on perceived authenticity.' Ethnicity, Fishman says much later, is about macro-group 'belongingness' or the identification dimensions of culture. He distinguishes it from culture by saying that ethnicity is both narrower than culture and more perspectival than culture, that is, 'the attribution of ethnicity is fundamentally subjective, variable and very possibly non-consensual' (Fishman, 1997b: 329). But Fishman (1972a: 180) warns that 'primordial ethnicity is a web that comes apart and becomes segmentized, bit by bit during periods of sociocultural change.'

Of language, Fishman (1996a: 61) says: 'Language is an intimately experienced and highly valued verity, a palpable object of esteem, affection, reverence and dedication.' According to Fishman (1989: 673), language 'is both part of, indexical of, and symbolic of ethnocultural behavior.' The 'beloved language,' he tells us is 'flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone' (Fishman, 1996a: 91).

The fact that language is the link to ethnicity is a constant thread throughout all of Fishman's work.

[L]anguage is the recorder of paternity, the expresser of patrimony and the carrier of phenomenology. Any vehicle carrying such precious freight must come to be viewed as equally precious, as part of the freight, indeed, as precious in and of itself. The link between language and ethnicity is thus one of sanctity-by-association. (Fishman, 1989: 32)

In the book that he devotes to positive ethnolinguistic consciousness, *In Praise of the Beloved Language*, Fishman (1996a) explains that language is a symbol system of the human species. Every vernacular can become symbolic of the speech community, utilized intergenerationally and for cultural boundary-maintenance. Some languages have a sanctity dimension, that is, they are expressed as the spirit or the soul of the ethnonational collectivity. Some are outright Holy languages in which the word of God and the disciples and prophets was spread – Biblical Hebrew, Koranic Arabic, Sanskrit, Pali, Classical Mandarin, Javanese, Syriac, Latin, Greek, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Old Church Slavonic and several scriptural languages of the Eastern Orthodox Churches. The majority of the world's ethnocultures, Fishman (1997b) reminds us, are predominantly linked to traditionally associated religions. Most of the time the language and ethnicity link is clear, denoting kinship, heritage, hearth and home.

In ways that remind us of the work on linguistic ideologies of anthropologists today (Irvine & Gal, 2000; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004; Woolard, 1998), Fishman (1991b: 388) explains that language 'not only implies and reflects core boundaries but it constantly creates and legitimizes them as well.' Fishman (1997b) further points out that the link between language and ethnicity is variable; that is, sometimes language is a prime indicator of ethnicity, and at other times it is marginal and optional. Ethnicity itself 'waxes and wanes and changes in response to more powerful and encompassing developments' (Fishman, 1983, as cited in 1989: 686).

Fishman also introduces the concept of language as a resource, and as a worldwide societal asset. He dedicates much of his work to understanding Benjamin Lee Whorf's contributions and especially what he calls 'Whorfianism of the third kind' (Fishman, 1982). Whorf, a student of Edward Sapir, had extended Sapir's argument that each language represents a worldview, and posited that particular languages carve up experience according to their structures and categories. But beyond the *linguistic relativity* and the *linguistic determinism* hypotheses that Whorf posed, and that have been discarded as untenable, Fishman (1989: 568) values Whorf as a 'neo-Herderian champion of a multilingual, multicultural world in which "little peoples" and "little languages" would not only be respected, but valued.' The work of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803) is cited frequently by Fishman, who supports Herder's views that the mother tongue expresses a nationality's soul and that:

[L]anguage was also the surest way for individuals to safeguard (or recover) the authenticity they had inherited from their ancestors as well as to hand it on to generations yet unborn, and finally, that world-wide diversity in language and in culture was a good and beautiful thing in and of itself, whereas imitation led to corruption and stagnation. (Fishman, 1972b: 46)

The link between language and ethnicity can be 'energized by collective grievances,' Fishman (1996a: 161) explains. He suggests that the relationship between language and ethnicity is not uni-directional:

Just as ethnic identity is fostered by intergroup grievances, so the language use corresponding to such identity is fostered. Thus when use of one's ethnically associated language is restricted or denigrated, the users who identify with it are more likely to use it among themselves ... than if no such grievance existed. (Fishman, 1996a: 154)

Taking sides, as always, with those who grieve, Fishman warns:

When the late-modernizing or late-autonomy-gaining worm finally turns, it will necessarily disturb the peace and quiet of those who have attained recognition earlier and at the latecomers' expense. But in their own eyes the latecomers 'turning' will not only seem justified but long-overdue and, indeed, merely following an example well established in the surrounding world of nations and peoples. ... In the pursuit of ethnolinguistic dreams, what's sauce for the goose is oft-times considered sauce for the goslings as well, whether or not this is realistic or desired by the now older, wiser and fatter geese. (Fishman, 1996a: 91)

Fishman (1996a: 93) warns us that ethnolinguistic consciousness of what he calls 'late' or 'peripheral' languages will 'continue to alarm self-satisfied neighbors' and 'disturb the peace of those who are already contextually comfortable.' The only way to work out this dilemma is 'greater reciprocal bilingualism, with each side evincing a willingness to compromise "its position maximum"' (Fishman, 1996a: 93).

Responding to scholars and critics who view the process of globalization as making ethnicity and language differences unnecessary, Fishman notes:

Some of the very processes of globalization and post-modernism that were supposed to be most deleterious to purportedly 'parochial' identities have actually contributed most to their re-emergence as 'part-identities.' The increasing ubiquity of the civil state, of civil nationalism and, therefore, of a shared supra-ethnic civil nationalism as part of the identity constellation of all citizens, has resulted in more rather than less recognition of multiculturalism at the institutional level and a more widespread implementation of local ethnicity as a

counterbalance to civil nationalism at the level of organized part-identity. (Fishman, 2001: 460)

As globalization has advanced, the link between language and ethnicity has become more salient in consciousness. And it is precisely globalization that is responsible for the social action language programs proposed by RLS, as well as the transformation of many threatened languages and their speakers. Fishman proposes that:

With increased intensities and frequencies of intergroup contacts and competition, on the one hand, and with the resulting weakening of traditional life in the face of cultural influences that are experienced as 'supra-ethnically' modern (rather than as specifically 'other-ethnic'), on the other hand, a protective and differentiating counteraction is often cultivated. Under these circumstances, the language and ethnicity link can not only become the basis of social action but it can also be transformative for those among whom it is salient. (Fishman, 1997b: 330)

According to Fishman (2001), it is precisely globalization that makes 'localization' important:

[T]he coming of globalization in certain aspects of human functioning makes 'localization' even more important in modern part-identity, equally so for state-nation, nation-state and sub-state populations. (Fishman, 2001: 455)

Language and nationalism

Joshua A. Fishman devotes an entire book to the topic of *Language and Nationalism* (1972b). In the two long essays that make up that book, Fishman distinguishes between the concepts of ethnic group, nationality and nation on the one hand, and state, polity or country on the other. Ethnic group, Fishman says 'is simpler, smaller, more particularistic, more localistic' than nationality. Nationalities are 'sociocultural units that have developed beyond primarily local self-concepts, concerns and integrative bonds' that do not necessarily have their own autonomous territory (Fishman, 1972b: 3). Nation, however, is 'any political-territorial unit which is largely or increasingly under the control of a particular nationality' (Fishman, 1972b: 5). A state, polity or country may not be independent of external control, and unlike a nation, does not always have a single predominant nationality.

Fishman also distinguishes between nationalism and nationism. He defines nationalism as 'The more inclusive organization and the elaborated beliefs, values and behaviors which nationalities develop on behalf of their avowed ethnocultural self-interest...' (Fishman, 1972b: 4). Nationism, how-

ever, is the 'cluster of behaviors-beliefs-values pertaining specifically to the acquisition, maintenance and development of politically independent territoriality' (Fishman, 1972b: 4). Fishman (1972b: 194) explains further that 'Nationalism – as distinguished from nationalism – is primarily concerned not with ethnic authenticity but with operational efficiency.'

Nationalism often uses language as the link with a glorious past and as a link with authenticity, either directly by claiming that the mother tongue is a part of the soul, or indirectly by widespread oral and written imagery. According to Fishman (1972b), nationalism is 'transformed primordial ethnicity' that leads to functioning on a larger scale. *Language Loyalty*, the title of Fishman's first major study of languages in the United States, is a component of nationalism.

Fishman has always distinguished between positive ethnolinguistic consciousness and nationalism. He defends his interest in positive ethnolinguistic consciousness by declaring, 'I draw a line ... between contributing to an understanding of positive ethnolinguistic consciousness and fostering an acceptance of nationalistic horrors' (Fishman, 1996a: 5). And to the question of whether positive ethnolinguistic consciousness, and for that matter, nationalism, can also be put to negative use, Fishman (1996a: 6) replies: '[I]t certainly can, but so can word processors, education, motherhood, cherry pies and early spring.'

Language and identity

In *Language and Nationalism*, Fishman (1972b) refers to the continued need for identity in the latter part of the 20th century:

The need for identity, for community, to make modernity sufferable, is greater than it was and will become greater yet, and woe to the elites in universities, governments and industries – who do not recognize this, or even worse, who consider it to be only a vestigial remnant of nineteenth-century thinking. (Fishman, 1972b: 83)

And facing the globalization of the 21st century, Fishman speaks against the social disorganization of post-modern and supra-ethnic societal functioning:

[R]ationality has not fully satisfied the Pandora's box of human longings, i.e., it has neither created nor corresponded to an inner reality that responds or corresponds to various other 'wave lengths' in human social motivation as well. (Fishman, 1996a: 58)

Fishman concedes that today 'ethnic identity is contextually constructed' and that 'group membership may be multiple':

The global and the specific are now more commonly found together, as

partial (rather than as exclusive) identities, because they each contribute to different social, emotional and cognitive needs that are co-present in the same individuals and societies and that are felt to require and to benefit from different languages in order to give them appropriate expression (Fishman, 1999: 450).

This conviction that multiple-group membership is possible is an early constant for Joshua A. Fishman. For example, in *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective* (1976), he points out that the human cultural experience is different from plant or animal evolution precisely because of its capacity for multiple memberships. He says: 'It [human cultural experience] not only exhibits but can be aware of and can value multiple-group membership' (Fishman, 1976: 8).

But Fishman objects to the concept introduced by Anderson (1983) of 'imagined communities.' Communities, according to Fishman, may be imagined, but they are not *imaginary*. He agrees with Richard Jenkins' (1997) position, on which he draws extensively:

Although ethnicity is imagined [in the sense that most members will never interact with each other face to face and that, therefore, the group is an abstraction which they must conceive of an identify with], it is not imaginary ... Somewhere between irresistible emotion and utter cynicism, neither blindly primordial nor completely manipulable, ethnicity and its allotropes are principles of collective identification and social organization in terms of culture and history, similarity and difference, that show little sign of withering away ... It is hard to imagine the social world in their absence. (Fishman, 1996a: 447)

Because ethnic identity is a sociopsychological variable, minorities are more conscious than majorities of their own ethnic identity, Fishman (1996a) tells us. But this doesn't mean that ethnic identity doesn't exist for all humanity.

Language and power

Fishman's work in defending minority and immigrant languages is centered on his conviction that languages have to be safeguarded to ensure a democratic climate of expression. In 1966, in an article entitled 'Planned Reinforcement of Language Maintenance in the United States,' Fishman writes:

Our political and cultural foundations are weakened when large population groupings do not feel encouraged to express, to safeguard, and to develop behavior patterns that are traditionally meaningful to them. Our national creativity and personal purposefulness are rendered more shallow when constructive channels of self-expression are blocked and when alienation from ethnic-cultural roots becomes the

necessary price of self-respect and social advancement, regardless of the merits of the cultural components of these roots. (1966, as cited in 1972a: 23).

Using languages in ways that describe the positioning of power differently, but that attest to unequal relations of power nonetheless, Fishman (1990: 113) describes his work as 'centralizing the periphery' and working on the 'cultivation of marginality' (Fishman, 1990: 115). Reflecting on his attraction for the periphery, he says:

The periphery magnifies and clarifies. Above all, it refuses to take matters for granted. It refuses to confuse peripherality with unimportance, or weakness in numbers or in power, with weakness vis-à-vis equity, justice, law and morality (Fishman, 1990: 113).

Since the 1990s, some sociolinguists have focused on the relationship between inequality and power and language and society (Fairclough, 1989; Pennycook, 1989; Tollefson, 1991, 1995). Pierre Bourdieu (1991) has posited that linguistic practices are symbolic capital that is distributed unequally in the linguistic community. Fishman's work is indeed cognizant and aware of the economic and social rewards that some languages hold. In fact, one of his most recent co-edited books (with Martin Pütz) is titled, *'Along the Routes to Power': Explorations of Empowerment through Language*. But Fishman is even more concerned with the *non-material* values that are so important in the whole sociolinguistic enterprise. Fishman warns that by focusing so much on power, a 'reductionist school of thought' is 'missing the real elephant' (Fishman, 1991b: 19). In introducing the field of Reversing Language Shift, Fishman critiques this reductionism:

The entire intellectually fashionable attempt to reduce all ethnocultural movements to problems of 'who attains power' and 'who gets money' is exactly that: reductionist. It reduces human values, emotions, loyalties and philosophies to little more than hard cash and brute force. These misguided attempts, regardless of the great names associated with them and the pseudo-intellectual fashionableness that they occasionally enjoy because of their purported 'realism,' inevitably impoverish rather than enrich our understanding of the complexity of human nature and of sociocultural reality. They cannot help us grasp the intensity of ideals and idealism of commitments and altruism, that are at the very heart of much social behavior in general and of RLS behavior in particular.

And it is not the flea but the elephant that is being overlooked by such reductionist schools of thought. (Fishman, 1991b: 19)

Fishman cautions that it is not language alone that is standing in opposi-

tion to the power potential of people who speak X languages (threatened) in interaction with those who only speak Y (non-threatened):

Xians are invariably bilingual ... and, therefore, in no way cut off from the economic rewards that are presumably inherent in Yish. ... If only knowledge of Yish stood between Xish workers and Yish-controlled rewards, the economic well-being of the former would be much better off than it usually is. Furthermore, the economic reward dimension is not the only one that defines Xish individual and social identity ... Societally weaker languages always need more than mere economic rationales. It is not labour-market access but economic power which is disproportionately in Yish hands and that is a problem that will rarely be overcome on linguistic grounds alone. As a result, even Xian bilingualism usually does not lead to any redistribution of economic power and, that being the case, the maintenance of Xish identity and cultural intactness becomes all the more important for community problem solving, health, education and cultural creativity. Vulgar materialism ... does not begin to do justice to the nuanced and completely interrelated human values, behaviours and identities that are essentially non-materialist or even anti-materialist in nature. ... Isn't it the mark of higher cultures to have other than material values, the latter being merely the most elementary expression of individual and group needs? (Fishman, 2001: 453)

Language and religion

Joshua A. Fishman's interest in language and religion is not new. 'The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and *Religious Groups*' (italics ours) was the subtitle of *Language Loyalty in the United States* (1966). Many of the chapters of that book pay attention to language use and religion. In the Preface, Fishman names language and religion as two of the important factors spurring his interest in language loyalty in the United States. He asks:

How many of us, even among professional historians or students of religion in America, know that a Polish national Catholic Church grew up on our shores, rather than in Poland proper, because so many Polish-Americans were distressed by the policy of American Catholic leaders toward language and culture maintenance? Or that a similar state of affairs almost came into being among Franco-Americans in New England? How many of us know about the language problems that convulsed several German and Norwegian Lutheran denominations for well over half a century, or of the language issues that have

influenced Jewish ethnic, religious and intellectual life in America? (Fishman, 1966: 10)

In particular, the chapter in *Language Loyalty in the United States* by John E. Hofman on 'Mother Tongue Retentiveness in Ethnic Parishes,' included a study of language use in the sermons and instruction in Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic and Eastern Orthodox ethnic parishes.

But it was only recently that Joshua A. Fishman devoted an entire volume to the topic of language and religion. Co-edited with Tope Omoniyi, *Explorations in the Sociology of Language and Religion* (2006) includes contributions from Brazil, USA, Nigeria, Singapore, Australia, Israel, England, Germany, Georgia, Scotland and South Africa. And the Sociolinguistics Symposium 16 in Limerick, Ireland will include a panel on the Sociology of Language and Religion in honor of Joshua A. Fishman's 80th birthday during the summer of 2006.

Language Planning and Language Policy

The language problems of developing nations were an early scholarly interest of Joshua A. Fishman, one pursued with his lifelong friend and colleague, Charles A. Ferguson. In 1968, Fishman, Ferguson and Das Gupta edited *Language Problems of Developing Nations*, one of the first texts in the field that became Language Planning and Policy.

Language policy

Fishman differentiates between language planning and language policies, a distinction that other scholars tend to ignore, or minimize (see, for example, Spolsky, 2004). Language planning, Fishman maintains, is the processes that come *after* language-policy decisions have been reached (1972b). Fishman identifies *three types of language policies* for three corresponding types of societies:

- (1) *Type A: Amodal.* There is consensus in these societies that there is neither an overarching sociocultural or political past and no indigenous Great Tradition (a Great Tradition being a 'widely accepted and visibly implemented belief and behavior system of indigenously validated greatness' (Fishman 1972c: 194)). Usually a Language of Wider Communication (LWC) is selected as a national or official language.
- (2) *Type B: Unimodal.* There are long-established sociocultural unities with rather well-established political boundaries. There is a single Great Tradition available. Usually a single indigenous or indigenized language is selected as the national language.
- (3) *Type C: Multimodal.* There are conflicting or competing multiplicities of Great Traditions. The nation must stand for a supra-nationalistic goal,

since nationalism is associated with traditional regional (sub-national) identities. Usually regional official languages are selected, and a LWC is selected as co-official. Bilingualism is expected.

Language planning

Fishman (1973: 24–25) defines language planning as a 'set of deliberate activities systematically designed to organize and develop the language resources of the community in an ordered schedule of time.' But like all planning, language planning also requires a justification for the movement in the specified direction. Fishman's model of language planning is based on Haugen's original conceptualization of the field (Haugen, 1966) which included four categories: (1) norm selection, (2) codification, (3) elaboration and (4) implementation. Fishman likewise speaks of code selection, codification and elaboration. He posits, however, that language planning can foster unity and authenticity via differentiation of two sources: (1) undesirable external linguistic influences and (2) internal linguistic alternatives.

Fishman studies language planning from two vantage points: (1) status planning and (2) corpus planning. He cautions that status planning is usually embroiled in conflictual inter-ethnic struggles, since it is the area of material statuses and rewards (Fishman, 1997b). Corpus planning, on the other hand, consists of tending to the 'outer vestments (nomenclature, standardized spellings, grammars and stylistic conventions) that modern pursuits and modern institutions require' (Fishman, 1997b: 337). Although Fishman posits that language policy precedes language planning, his study of First Congresses (1993) made him aware of an embryonic stage of language planning in which no authoritative policy decisions have yet been reached.

Fishman (1994) has responded to the neo-Marxist and post-structuralist critiques toward language planning (Luke & Baldauf, 1990; Tollefson, 1991), while recognizing the difficulties with the field: (1) that it is conducted by elites, (2) that it reproduces sociocultural and econotechnical inequalities, (3) that it inhibits or counteracts multiculturalism and (4) that it espouses world-wide Westernization and modernization. According to Fishman:

Authorities will continue to be motivated by self-interest. New structural inequalities will inevitably arise to replace the old ones. More powerful segments of society will be less inclined to want to change themselves than to change others. Westernisation and modernisation will continue to foster both problems and satisfactions for the bulk of humanity. Ultimately language planning will be utilised by both those who favor and those who oppose whatever the socio-political climate may be. (Fishman, 1994: 98)

Fishman's latest work is focused on the status agenda in corpus planning and the interpenetration of both – the pair of Siamese-twins, he calls them. He explains:

It is a gossamer web that they weave. It cannot be woven out of praises alone, for were there nothing but praises to be uttered for the beloved language as it is, then corpus planning itself would be unnecessary if not impossible. On the other hand, it cannot be fostered by emphasizing the current debits of the beloved language, for were that to be done it would play into the hands of its detractors and opponents. (Fishman, 1996a: 114)

Although Fishman understands that people in general do not like the prospects of social intervention in languages and their uses, he argues that it is inevitable if all languages are to be seated 'at the table':

If one seeks a place at the table of the respected and the self-respecting, if one seeks a share in the good things of the world, not least among them being respect, comfort and security, then one's beloved language too must be elevated. The language symbolizes the people, it represents them, it speaks volumes for them, and if they are to be heard and heard-out, then it must speak from a position of honor and security as well. However, the circular interconnectedness between language and people is also fully matched by a circular interconnectedness between status planning and corpus planning. One cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear and an effective elevation in status can rarely be attained or maintained without considerable change in the nature of the language itself. And so it inevitably comes about that the beloved language, whose loveliness was initially given in nature, and, indeed, is seen as part of its own ineffable nature, comes to require intervention so that it can more rapidly become visibly and audibly suitable for the new and higher functions that are pursued on its behalf. (Fishman, 1996a: 92)

Developing this concept further, Fishman (2000) has suggested that all language planning, whether corpus planning or status planning, is related to a super factor of independence/interdependence. Fishman proposes four different categories that are organized around the different poles of independence and interdependence:

- (1) *Ausbau/Einbau*. *Ausbau planning*¹⁰ is a building away process motivated by a desire to distance a language from its structurally similar big brother. This is the case of Urdu/Hindi, of Macedonian/Bulgarian, or of Landsmål/Ryksmål. Linguistic distancing is an indicator of a wish for independence and distancing – social, cultural and political.

Einbau planning, on the other hand, refers to drawing two languages closer together, emphasizing similarities and interdependence. This is the case of the current Romanian treatment of Moldavian, or of former Soviet treatment of Ukrainian and Belarusian

- (2) *Uniqueness/Internationalization*. Planning for *Uniqueness and Authenticity* requires ensuring that language is independent of others. This is why, for example, St Stephen of Perm developed a writing system for Komi based on a similarity to the traditional Komi decorative designs. Planning for *internationalization*, on the other hand, wishes for interdependence with the modern scientific and technological ways of naming. This was the case, for example, of Atatürk who Westernized Turkish based on French influences that he thought would make Turkish capable of modern use.
- (3) *Purification/Regionalization*. Planning for *Purification* is related to *Ausbau* and *Uniqueness*, but it differs from *Ausbau* in that the fears are not directed against the 'Big Brother' alone. And it differs from *Uniqueness* in that a single source of contamination is rejected. *Purification* has been a factor in planning for the independence of the revival of Hebrew, for example, from the contamination of Yiddish. Planning for *Regionalization*, on the other hand, has to do with *Sprachbund*, an entire cluster of sister languages that are acceptable sources for borrowings and influences. For example, Turkic languages are the resources for Central Asian languages; Malay and Indonesian are resources for each other; and Nordic languages are resources for one another, with the exclusion of Danish.
- (4) *Classicization/Vernacularization*. There are many examples of planning for *classicization*: Hindi (from Sanskrit), Tamil (from Old Tamil), Arabic (from Quranic Arabic). Planning for *vernacular* use, however, favors popular usage.

In the end, Fishman (2000: 114) tells us, 'all corpus planning that is oriented toward modernization and interaction with [the] community of modern peoples and nations must also settle for [an] inevitable degree of interdependence as well.' Language planning, he explains,

when engaged in under auspices of modernization and with modernization as the goal, generally results in making languages even more capable of translating American life, even when suffusing the translations with the aura and the pretense of greater or lesser degrees of indigenization.' (Fishman, 2000: 50)

Bilingual Education and Minority-Language Group Education

Scholarly interest

Bilingual education was Joshua A. Fishman's earliest area of study ('Bilingualism in a Yiddish School: Some Correlates and Non-correlates,' 1949). Almost 60 years ago, this study already contained the motivations for the development of the sociology of language. García (1991) has pointed out that the 'Bilinguality Relationship Scale' used in the study contains questions that foreshadow Fishman's now famous 'Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When.' And the independent variables of the study – play preferences, school adjustment, family adjustment, number of friends, self-identity with nationality and attitude toward Yiddish – are the same variables that Fishman later explores in studies of language, ethnicity and schooling. Fishman's familiarity with the Yiddish Workmen's Circle Schools in Philadelphia prepared him for his work on bilingual education.

Fishman's first major research project and publication, *Language Loyalty in the United States* (1966), dedicates a chapter to 'the ethnic group school and mother tongue maintenance in the United States,' a topic that he has pursued throughout his lifetime. Once the Bilingual Education Act was passed in 1968, many publications on bilingual education followed. Fishman devoted three more books to the topic of bilingual education: *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective* (1976); *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives. Social Science* (1977); and *Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the United States* (1982). And in 1979 he released his final report for the National Institute of Education on 'The Ethnic Mother Tongue School in America.' Between 1970 and 1985, Joshua A. Fishman published 15 articles on the topic; these were reprinted again and again.¹¹

Fishman devotes a great deal of effort to documenting the existence of Ethnic Mother Tongue Schools (EMT schools) because:

These schools must be included in our educational, social and intellectual bookkeeping, more for the sake of our national well-being than for their sake, since even the United States cannot afford to overlook some 6000 schools attended by as many as 600,000 children. (Fishman, 1980: 236)

Furthermore, he explains: 'Rather than reflections of foreignness, ethnic community mother tongue schools are actually reflections of dealing with both indigenesness and mainstream exposure' (Fishman, 1980: 243).

It is important to point out that Fishman was never 'led astray' by the frenzy that surrounded The Bilingual Education Act, that is, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. His work, both that of *Language Loyalty in the United States*, and also the research that later became *Bilingualism in the Barrio*, was frequently quoted in the deliberations that led to the passage of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968. And some of his termi-

nology, especially the word 'transitional' to substitute for 'compensatory,' has been adopted by governmental, scholarly and popular circles. His support for the education of language minorities, especially Spanish-speaking minorities, has been unquestionable. The 1982 volume edited with Gary Keller and dedicated to Hispanic students is precisely a reflection of this support. In addition, his concern about public bilingual education for poor Latino and Native American students has been approached through the prism of the importance of ethnic-mother-tongue schools, organized and supported by the ethnolinguistic group itself.

Education

Joshua A. Fishman has defined education broadly. As Dean at Yeshiva University, he proposed the merging of Education, Liberal Arts and Behavioral and Social Sciences saying that '[Education] is first and foremost an intellectual endeavor striving to increase knowledge about man and the process whereby he learns, grows, changes and influences others' (Congressional Record A, 3594, July 11, 1966).

Fishman has also claimed that schools cannot 'go at it alone.' In an article entitled 'Minority Mother Tongues in Education' he says:

[E]ducation is a socializing institution and must never be examined without concentrating on the social processes that it serves and the social pressures to which it responds. (as cited in Fishman, 1989: 467)

Fishman (1989: 467) goes on to say that '[S]chools alone cannot guarantee the continuity of cultures, if for no other reason than that schools are generally no more than intervening (serving) rather than independent (causal) variables with respect to such continuity.'

That schools are just intervening variables is an important idea in Fishman's early defense of public bilingual education. He cautions that:

[B]ecause there are so many other pervasive reasons why such children [poor minority children] achieve poorly, the goals of majority-oriented and -dominated schools (and societies), removing this extra burden above – and leaving all else as it was – does not usually do the trick, particularly when the teachers, curricula and materials for bilingual education are as nonoptimal as they currently usually are. (Fishman, 1976: 28)

For bilingual education to succeed, general support is needed. Fishman (1976: 111) contends that: 'not only is community consensus needed if bilingual education is to succeed, but ... help of the unmarked language community is needed every bit as much as, if not more than, that of the marked language community.' His interest in bilingual education was concerned with increasing knowledge about speech communities – both language

minority and language majority ones – as they interacted with each other and were transformed.

Early typologies and warnings

In 1970, Joshua A. Fishman and John Lovas published the now well-known 'Bilingual Education in Sociolinguistic Perspective'.¹² Two years after the implementation of the United States' Bilingual Education Act, Fishman and Lovas identified the features still lacking: (1) lack of funds, (2) lack of personnel, (3) lack of evaluated programs. This contribution provided insights into societal bilingualism that educators, psychologists and linguists involved with bilingual education programs had been missing.

Fishman pointed to three different language situations in communities that planners of bilingual education should be aware of:

- (1) a community in the process of language shift;
- (2) a community determined to maintain its own language in many or all social domains;
- (3) a community with one or more nonstandard varieties in one or more languages and their differential use from one societal domain to another and from one speech network to another.

And he warned that bilingual education (BE) programs must ascertain the sociolinguistic situation of the community before one program or the other is chosen.

Fishman (1972d: 89) proposes a typology of bilingual education based on different kinds of communities and school objectives:

- (1) *Type I. Transitional BE*, where the mother tongue is used in early grades until the dominant language is developed. This program corresponds to an objective of language shift.
- (2) *Type II. Monoliterate BE*, where both languages are used for aural-oral skills, but literacy skills in the mother tongue are not pursued.
- (3) *Type III. Biliterate BE—Partial Bilingualism*, where fluency and literacy in both languages are pursued, but literacy in the mother tongue is restricted to certain subject matter, usually that which relates to the ethnic group. Ethnic-mother-tongue day schools are generally of this type.
- (4) *Type IV. Biliterate BE—Full Bilingualism*, where both languages are used as media of instruction for all subjects, and students develop all skills in both languages in all domains.

Fishman warns that although full biliterate-bilingualism programs seem to be desirable, there are dangers in pursuing them, saying:

A fully-balanced bilingual speech community seems to be a theoretical

impossibility because balanced competence implies languages that are functionally equivalent and no society can be motivated to maintain two languages if they are really functionally redundant. Thus, this type of program does not seem to have a clearly articulated goal with respect to societal reality. (Fishman, 1976: 89)

Continuing to develop the link between types of education and types of speech communities, Fishman published 'Bilingual and Bidialectal Education' (1972) where he attempted to apply to bilingual education the model he had developed for language planning in 'National Languages and Languages of Wider Communication in the Developing Nations' (1969). Fishman (1972a: 332-337) proposes three different types of *language education policies*, advancing by a quarter-century the field that was later known by that name:

- (1) *Type A policies*: None of the mother tongue varieties are considered school-worthy because they're not tied to any great tradition and are not believed to have integrative potential. The educational authorities select for educational use a language which is not a mother tongue, and often is the standard variety of the language of wider communication (LWC). Examples of these policies are countries in West Africa such as Gambia and Sierra Leone.
- (2) *Type B policies*: There is an internally integrative great tradition, but additional traditions must also be recognized. Usually the standard is reserved for written language and education is bidialectal. Teachers and students are of the same speech community. Examples of these policies are most parts of Switzerland and Germany.
- (3) *Type C policies*: Several competing great traditions exist usually regionally. Each locality must teach a link language for communication with other localities. Students will be educated in their own mother tongue, and also in another tongue. Examples: Belgium, Switzerland or India.

Fishman not only proposes alternatives, but discusses their consequences and points out to infelicities in each of the types of policies. In Type A policies where the LWC is chosen for education, Fishman indicates that teachers must nevertheless begin by using the mother tongue of the pupils. Another consideration for this type of language education policy is whether to adopt the curriculum and standards set where the LWC is spoken or whether to develop these indigenously. An even greater problem occurs when polities have a high rate of illiteracy. It is well known that this type of policy, where the LWC used in education is not the mother tongue, presents great difficulties for adult literacy.

But the biggest concern with this type of language education policy is precisely that it is artificial and may not result in educational success.

Fishman points, however, to the reality that many indigenous groups insist on this type of education, regardless of limitations. That is, it is not simple imposition of the most powerful that results in such language education policies. Representing the powerful standard or dialect with a capital D (before Gee (1996) had suggested the D for his use of Discourse), Fishman writes:

The insistence on D and D only (for all students for all subjects) is potentially nonfunctional even though it may be a widely shared view rather than one imposed from without in many ways. It artificializes education to the extent that it identifies it with a variety that is not functional in the life of the community. (Fishman, 1972: 334)

Type B policies, in which the D is used for some subjects and a more indigenous variety is used for other subjects, also presents additional questions. For example, polities would have to decide what should be taught, in which language, and for how long.

International perspectives and advantages

In 1976, Fishman published *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective*, a book that he had been working on since 1972 when he was Visiting Professor of Sociology of Language at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. The book includes the results of an empirical study that focuses on three specific criteria across 100 of the 1000 secondary bilingual education programs:

- (1) What are the averaged grades awarded across all subjects and all years of study?
- (2) How do bilingual secondary schools compare to monolingual secondary schools in their immediate areas serving comparable populations insofar as averaged grades are concerned?
- (3) How pleased are students with respect to their bilingual secondary schooling in terms of its impact on their academic, personal and social development? (Fishman, 1976: 94–95)

The resulting published work was a significant contribution to the field of bilingual education. It communicated Fishman's (1976: ix) support for the field ("bilingual education is "good for everybody"). Part 1 of the book proposes and then defends the four principles in which Fishman bases his support of bilingual education:

- (1) bilingual education is good for the majority group;
- (2) bilingual education is good for the minority group;
- (3) bilingual education is good for education;
- (4) bilingual education is good for language teachers.

The arguments for bilingual education that Fishman presents in this

book are eerily relevant today. For example, Fishman supports bilingual education because it responds to multiple-group membership, a concept prevalent in post-modern scholarship. He writes: 'Only bilingual and bicultural education provides for multiple memberships and for multiple loyalties in an integrative fashion...' (1976: 9). He also supports the social equality aspects of bilingual education, saying:

If bilingual education does nothing else, it at least equalizes the children of marked- and unmarked-language backgrounds by providing each of them some instruction via their own mother tongue as well as some via the 'other' group's mother tongue. (Fishman, 1976: 119)

Fishman points out that yet another advantage of bilingual education is the economic possibilities that it affords bilinguals. He notes that others might see this as selfish, and clarifies:

Economic self-interest is presumably acceptable if pursued by the oil lobby, by the teachers' unions, and by our most reputable universities, but is considered meanly divisive if pursued by Hispanics, Native Americans, or other ethnics. (Fishman, 1989: 408)

Fishman's intention in writing a book on international bilingual education is clearly to provide a cross-cultural dimension that would guide and lead bilingual educators everywhere, allowing them to consider themselves a 'single community of interest, each learning from the other and correcting each other's experimental and attitudinal limitations' (Fishman, 1976: viii). He prophesied that bilingual education would continue to be important and become even more important as English spreads, saying:

We seem to be living in a period of world history in which a larger number of local languages are being given educational recognition at the very same time that a relatively few world languages (primarily English) are also gaining wider currency. Both of these trends, disparate though they may appear to be on the surface, are contributing to the overall growth of bilingual education. (Fishman, 1977: 31)

A significant contribution of this book is the chapter that argues that bilingual education is good for language teachers, a foreshadowing of what Krashen (1996, for example) advanced decades later as the advantage of bilingual education over TESOL. Fishman makes two important theoretical contributions in this regard: (1) that the increased contextualization provided by bilingual education is important for language learning, and (2) that second language teaching must target specific communicative functions.

Fishman (1976: 36) values bilingual education for 'its maximization of language learning for the communication of messages that are highly significant for senders and receivers alike.' This position is related to

Krashen's (1979) comprehensible input hypothesis and his idea of *i+1* for second language learning – representing input (*i*) plus a bit more (+1) than the student already knows). But Fishman's ideas are also related to Vygotsky's concept of scaffolding, and to what second language educators today have translated as more contextualization, relevancy and immediacy (Gibbons, 2002; Walqui, 2002).

Fishman (1976: 38–39) also points out that second language learners need languages for restricted ranges of functions, and that teachers 'ought to specify the contexts in which the student plans to use the target language.' Furthermore:

No one knows how to speak a language appropriately in all contexts in which it is used, because no one has access to all the societal roles in which the language is used and which constrain language usage. (Fishman, 1976: 39)

In the 21st century, as we saw above, the European Union has advanced the concept of plurilingualism for all its citizens. The CLIL/EMILE pedagogy that is being developed (Baetens Beardsmore, 1999) clearly specifies language functions and targets, with second languages being used to teach only certain subjects and for certain functions.

Critic of the Bilingual Education Act

Although a supporter of bilingual education, Fishman makes his antipathy towards the Bilingual Education Act clear, and he denounces its monolingual goals:

The Act was primarily an act for the Anglification of non-English speakers and not an act for Bilingualism. 'Bilingualism' has become a newspeak euphemism for non-English mother tongue. 'Bilinguals' are thus non-English mother tongue speakers; bilingual teachers are those who teach them/ bilingual programs are those that Anglify them.... The act is basically not an act for bilingualism, but rather, an act *against* bilingualism. [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1989: 405)

The bilingual education programs supported by Title VII (presently Title III of No Child Left Behind) rarely have interest either in the minority language or in the minority child. Instead in many schools the only interest is the rapid acquisition of English.

About the US government's lack of interest in developing and teaching the minority languages, Fishman (1989: 469) proposes, 'There is no or little constructive interest among the central authorities in how well they are taught in their own language, since these learnings are not considered by national authorities to be really in the national interest.' And about the lack of interest in the minority child, he explains:

[I]f there are still doubts as to the psycho-educational advantage of initial instruction via the minority child's mother tongue, it is only because of the overwhelming concern for that acquisition of the societally dominant language rather than for his or her more pervasive intellectual, emotional and self-definitional development or for the future of his or her minority community. (Fishman, 1989: 468)

Fishman is interested in the protection and development of the minority language precisely because of its advantages for the minority child and the minority community. He reveals that many of the public bilingual education programs do not have the child's best interest at heart.

Transitional vs. enrichment bilingual education

From the very beginning, Joshua A. Fishman stood against the trans-ethnifying aspects of transitional bilingual education. Much of the volume *Bilingual Education: International Perspectives* is devoted to speaking against transitional/compensatory models, as well as in favor of enrichment bilingual education. In Fishman's ironic style, he conceptualizes *transitional bilingual education* as a disease and explains how it is that using the mother tongue can lead to language shift:

If a non-English mother tongue is conceptualized as a disease of the poor, then in true vaccine style this disease is to be attacked by the disease bacillus itself. A little bit of deadened mother tongue, introduced in slow stages in the classroom environment, will ultimately enable the patient to throw off the mother tongue entirely and to embrace all-American vim, vigor and stability. (Fishman, 1976: 34)

Fishman cautions that transitional bilingual education is simply bad for the minority language:

As for the 'common garden variety' of American transitional bilingual education, there is a growing suspicion that for the marked group child, it is doing more harm to native language mastery and to native community participation than whatever good it may be doing in terms of academic achievement, English mastery or participation in unmarked role. (Fishman, 1972a: 46)

He refuses to give scholarly attention to transitional bilingual education because it is only a small part of the education of a child. Years later, he explains that mother tongue education,

should not be trivialized by evaluating merely the degree to which initial instruction via the disadvantaged language maximizes acquisition and mastery of the advantaged one. To do so is not only tantamount to

adding insult to injury; it is also to lose sight of the true relationship between language, society and culture. (Fishman, 1989: 479)

Fishman (1972a: 48) also warns that '[t]ransitional-compensatory bilingual education is scheduled to "self-destruct" in the not too distant future.' He explains this self-destruction in the following way:

If it does not succeed in improving the English mastery of those assigned to it, it would necessarily be called to task, and discontinued since such improvement is its major avowed purpose. However, should it succeed in this restricted task, then it would be discontinued purportedly as being no longer necessary. The result may well be a species of the 'double bind' so well known in the etiology of schizophrenia, with compensatory bilingual education characterized by not having enough leverage or opportunity with respect to the dominant (Anglo) society in order to successfully negotiate progress toward economic-social-political status roles for its clientele, on the one hand, and then, in addition, not having enough of an economic-social-political base within its own ethnic environments to foster real respect, mastery and attachment to the ethnic mother tongues either. [emphasis ours] (Fishman, 1977: 23)

Fishman refers to this 'double bind' ('damned if you do; damned if you don't') of the Bilingual Education Act throughout all his writings on the subject (see, for example, Fishman, 1978). And in the 21st century, the success of the anti-bilingual education referenda in California, Arizona and Massachusetts seem to be a reflection of Fishman's early vision regarding the difficulties that public bilingual education was to face in the future.

At the same time that Fishman (1976: viii) attacks transitional bilingual education, he advances his passion for '*enrichment for one and all*, rather than merely as compensation for down-and-out minorities or as a group-maintenance opportunity for reawakening ones' [emphasis ours]. In fact, he states (1976: 9): 'It is the poor little rich kids who most desperately need bilingual and bicultural education.' Advancing again by decades the coming of 'English Plus,' Fishman says: 'In the long run it means just as much mastery of *English plus* more vibrant cultural pluralism, both for the minorities and for the majority as well' (Fishman, 1976: 121).

Two-way dual language bilingual education

Joshua A. Fishman establishes that it is important for ethnolinguistic minorities to first become heard and socially equal before they can stress interdependence with majorities. Speaking of the case of the United States, Fishman proposes:

America's non-English speaking minorities may very well have to

place greater stress upon good bilingual education and other, even more effective forms of social protest and social equalization before they can afford the equanimity of stressing good intergroup relations as a goal to aim at from a position of strength. (Fishman, 1977: 42)

Nevertheless, Fishman has a vision that these goals of social equalization may be possible in a better future. He says:

There is a vision of American magnanimity involved, but more than that, a vision of American possibilities, opportunities, appreciations, sensitivities, that we all should savour. 'Brotherhood' does not mean uniformity. A shared diversity can be the true meaning of the American promise: 'to crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea.' (Fishman, 1989: 415)

But he again warns that school cannot go at it alone to impart this vision.

Fishman advances the vision of joint schooling for students with different linguistic profiles – what we today call two-way dual language education – but he warns that this goal cannot be restricted to the schools alone:

If both types of children can ultimately wind up in the same classroom, one motivated by transitional and maintenance considerations and the other by enrichment considerations, an optimal *modus vivendi* will have been attained.... However, if enrichment language policy is limited or restricted to the schools alone, it will fail as surely as either transitional or maintenance policy when similarly restricted. What is needed is an enrichment policy that views the multilingualization of American urban life as a contribution to the very quality of life itself. (Fishman, 1989: 414)

Indeed, Fishman foresees the problems that two-way dual language bilingual programs are encountering in the United States today, as their enrichment philosophy does not correspond to the view of bilingualism that most US citizens hold (García, 2006).

With regard to the participation of English-speaking students in such programs, Fishman (1989: 405) warns that the '[r]ealities of urban demography being what they are, such magnanimity does not go much beyond the co-presence of Blacks and Hispanics.' Indeed today it is mostly Latinos with different linguistic profiles who make up the student-body of two-way dual language programs. And it is students of color, African-Americans and others of African descent, but also Indians, Pakistanis and many others, who make up the English-speaking part of most two-way dual language programs.

Conclusion

Summing up the scholarly achievements of a seminal thinker like Joshua A. Fishman is a daunting task. We who have followed in his footsteps often find that it is like following a giant – we have to make a huge effort to understand what he has done, even as we recommend to our students that they read carefully, and also read between the lines. And as we compare our own meager work to his, we often find ourselves thinking that no matter what the topic is, Fishman has already taken care of it. He has already written about it, presaging later developments, laying out the groundwork. We find ourselves stumbling to make our own contributions fit, and make sense. It is this ‘Olympian overview’ that Fishman provides that makes everything else seem inconsequential – we can only provide examples from other contexts that corroborate what he has written, or at best add a detail here and there that extends his ideas into an area that was previously ignored or forgotten.

But there is another aspect of his work that makes it different from work in other disciplines or fields, and that is his tremendous humanity, his caring about languages and peoples, and the careful, avuncular mentoring he has extended to all who work in this paradigm. The atmosphere is one that encourages and fosters exploration and innovation, rather than the kind of adversarial infighting one finds in other fields and disciplines. We are grateful that we work in an area that is exemplified by this magnanimous spirit, and can encourage students to continue to read his work and learn from it.

Notes

1. In 1991, on the occasion of Joshua A. Fishman's 65th birthday, four volumes were published in his honor. John Benjamins published three *Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman* on three different sociolinguistic topics: *Bilingual Education* (Ofelia García, ed.), *Language and Ethnicity* (J.R. Dow, ed.) and *Language Planning* (David F. Marshall, ed.). In addition, Mouton de Gruyter published *The Influence of Language on Culture and Thought: Essays in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman's Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Robert L. Cooper and Bernard Spolsky, eds).
2. The bibliographic inventory compiled by Gella Schweid Fishman and included in Cooper and Spolsky (1991) contained a total of 718 items. Today, the bibliographic inventory contains a listing of more than 1200 entries.
3. This article, co-authored with Esther Lowy, Michael Gertner, Itzek Gottesman and William Milán originally appeared in 1983 in the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 4: 237–54. It was reprinted in Fishman 1989, pages 530–549.
4. Fishman's work is widely cited in the literature. A search of Google Scholar, in summer 2005, yielded 181 references. Appendix 3 lists the titles and numbers of those references attested by Google Scholar where there were two or more citations.
5. Because this volume includes (in Part 3) an exhaustive bibliography of Joshua A.

- Fishman's work, in the references section at the end of this chapter we include only the works from which we quote directly.
6. Joshua A. Fishman received his PhD in Social Psychology from Columbia University in 1953.
 7. García (1991) includes a more extensive biography of Joshua A. Fishman that readers might find helpful. Readers are also referred to Fishman, 1990.
 8. For more on the role of this seminar, see Fishman (1997a) in Paulston and Tucker (eds).
 9. The researchers on *Auslandsdeutsche* were primarily German scholars concerned with what had happened to the German language during emigration, i.e. *im Ausland*. The most important pioneer in this field was Heinz Kloss (Kloss, 1940).
 10. It should be noted that this usage differs from Kloss (1929), who first proposed it, as well as later versions of it (e.g. Kloss, 1967). The term *Einbau*, however, is Fishman's own.
 11. Fishman's articles on bilingual education include: Bilingual education in sociolinguistic perspective (1970); Bilingual and bidialectal education: An attempt at a joint model for policy description (1972); Bilingual education in sociological perspective (1972); Bilingual education: What and why? (1973, reprinted 1976, 1978, 1979); The sociology of bilingual education (1974, reprinted 1976, 1977, 1989); Bilingual education and the future of language teaching and language learning (1975; reprinted 1976); Bilingual education: Hope for Europe's migrants (1976); The international sociology of bilingual secondary education (1976); Bilingual education: A perspective (1977); Standard vs. dialect in bilingual education (1977, reprinted 1979); The Bilingual Education Act: High time for a change (1977); Bilingual education: Ethnic perspectives (1977); A model for bilingual and bidialectal education (1977); Bilingual education and the future of language teaching and language learning (1978); Philosophies of bilingual education in societal perspective (1979, reprinted 1989); The significance of the ethnic community mother tongue school (1979, reprinted 1985); Ethnic community mother tongue schools in the USA (1980, reprinted 1981, 1989); Minority language maintenance and the ethnic mother tongue school (1980); Bilingual education, language planning and English (1980); Bilingual education in the United States under ethnic community auspices (1980); Bilingual education (1982); Mother tongues as media of instruction in the United States (1982); The Americanness of the ethnic community school (1983); The use of minority mother tongues in the education of children (1983, reprinted 1989); Non-English language ethnic community schools in the USA (1985, reprinted 1989).
 12. This article was reprinted in 1972 in Bernard Spolsky's *The Language Education of Minority Children*.

Appendix 1: Joshua A. Fishman's Contributions to the *Sociology of Language (CSL) Book Series*

The following is a list of works edited by Joshua A. Fishman for the *Sociology of Language (CSL)* series. Titles are listed under year of publication and in alphabetical order by author/editor. This list was compiled with the assistance of Rebecca Walters, Mouton de Gruyter and Zeena Zakharia, Teachers College, Columbia University.

- 1972 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Advances in the Sociology of Language: Selected Studies and Applications* (Vol. 2).
Lewis, E.G. *Multilingualism in the Soviet Union: Aspects of Language Policy and its Implementation.*
- 1973 Fellman, J. *The Revival of Classical Tongue: Eliezer Ben Yehuda and the Modern Hebrew Language.*
- 1975 Dillard, J.L. (ed.) *Perspectives on Black English.*
- 1976 Alisjahbana, S.T. *Language Planning for Modernization: The Case of Indonesian and Malaysian.*
Byron, J. *Selection among Alternates in Language Standardization: The Case of Albanian.*
Dillard, J.L. *Black Names.*
- 1977 de Francis, J. *Colonialism and Language Policy in Viet Nam.*
Grayshon, M.C. *Towards a Social Grammar of Language.*
Greenbaum, S. *Acceptability in Language.*
Luelsdorff, P.A. (ed.) *Soviet Contributions to the Sociology of Language.*
Rubin, J., Jernudd, B.H., DasGupta, J., Fishman, J.A. and Ferguson, C.A. (eds) *Language Planning Processes.*
Uribe-Villegas, O. *Issues in Sociolinguistics.*
- 1978 Gordon, D.C. *The French Language and National Identity (1930–1975).*
Jessel, L. *The Ethnic Process: An Evolutionary Concept of Languages and Peoples.*
- 1979 Billigmeier, R.H. *A Crisis in Swiss Pluralism. The Romansh and Their Relations with the German- and Italian-Swiss in the Perspective of a Millennium.*
Saulson, S.B. *Institutionalized Planning: Documents and Analysis of Revival of Hebrew.*
Wurm, S.A. (ed.) *New Guinea and Neighboring Areas: A Sociolinguistic Laboratory.*
- 1980 Dillard, J.L. (ed.) *Perspectives on American English.*
Khleif, B.B. *Language, Ethnicity, and Education in Wales.*
- 1981 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Never Say Die! A Thousand Years of Yiddish in Jewish Life and Letters.*
Key, M.R. *The Relationship of Verbal and Nonverbal Communication.* Second printing.
- 1982 Cobarrubias, J. and Fishman, J.A. (eds) *Progress in Language Planning. International Perspectives.*
Forster, P.G. *The Esperanto Movement.*
- 1983 Veltman, C. *Language Shift in the United States.*
- 1985 Dillard, J.L. *Toward a Social History of American English.*

- Fishman, J.A., Gertner, M.H., Lowy, E.G. and Milán, W.G. *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity.*
- Kreindler, I.T. (ed.) *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Soviet National Languages: Their Past, Present and Future.*
- Mehrotra, R.R. *Sociolinguistics in Hindi Contexts.*
- Parkinson, D.B. *Constructing the Social Context of Communication: Terms of Address in Egyptian Arabic.*
- Wolfson, N. and Manes, J. *Language of Inequality.*
- 1986** Evans, A.D. and Falk, W.W. *Learning to be Deaf.*
- Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *The Fergusonian Impact. In Honor of Charles A. Ferguson on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday (Vol. 1: From Phonology to Society; Vol. 2: Sociolinguistics and the Sociology of Language).*
- Haarmann, H. *Language in Ethnicity: A View of Basic Ecological Relations.*
- Preisler, B. *Linguistic Sex Roles in Conversation: Social Variation in the Expression of Tentativeness in English.*
- 1987** Haugen, E. *Blessings of Babel: Bilingualism and Language Planning. Problems and Pleasures.*
- 1988** Braun, F. *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures.*
- Flaitz, J. *The Ideology of English: French Perceptions of English as a World Language.*
- Harman, L.D. *The Modern Stranger. On Language and Membership.*
- Heller, M. (ed.) *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives.*
- 1989** Coleman, H. (ed.) *Working with Language: A Multidisciplinary Consideration of Language Use in Work Contexts.*
- García, O. and Otheguy, R. (eds) *English Across Cultures. Cultures Across English. A Reader in Cross-Cultural Communication.*
- Haarmann, H. *Symbolic Values of Foreign Language Use. From the Japanese Case to a General Sociolinguistic Perspective.*
- Jernudd, B.H. and Shapiro, M.J. (eds) *The Politics of Language Purism.*
- Key, M.R. and Hoenigswald, H.M. (eds) *General and Amerindian Ethnolinguistics. In Remembrance of Stanley Newman.*
- 1990** Adams, K.L. and Brink, D.T. *Perspectives on Official English. The Campaign for English as the Official Language of the USA.*
- Janicki, K. *Toward Non-Essentialist Sociolinguistics.*
- 1991** Clyne, M. (ed.) *Pluricentric Languages. Differing Norms in Different Nations.*
- Coulmas, F. (ed.) *A Language Policy for the European Community. Prospects and Quandaries.*
- Fierman, W. *Language Planning and National Development: The Uzbek Experience.*
- Haarmann, H. *Basic Aspects of Language in Human Relations. Toward a General Theoretical Framework.*
- McGroarty, M.E. and Faltis, C.J. (eds) *Languages in School and Society: Policy and Pedagogy.*
- Watts, R.J. *Power in Family Discourse.*
- 1992** Brenzinger, M. (ed.) (1992) *Language Death: Factual and Theoretical Explorations with Special Reference to East Africa.*

- 1993 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *The Earliest Stage of Language Planning. 'The First Congress' Phenomenon.*
- 1995 Harlig, J. and Pléh, C. (ed.) *When East Met West: Sociolinguistics in the Former Socialist Bloc.*
Pütz, M. (ed.) *Discrimination Through Language in Africa? Perspectives on the Namibian Experience.*
- 1996 Fishman, J.A., Conrad, A.W. and Rubal-Lopez, A. (eds) *Post-Imperial English. Status Change in Former British and American Colonies, 1940–1990.*
Hellinger, M. and Ammon, U. *Contrastive Sociolinguistics.*
Dalls, K.K. *Language Loss and the Crisis of Cognition. Between Socio- and Psycholinguistics.*
Robinson, C.D. *Language Use in Rural Development: An African Perspective.*
- 1997 Clyne, M. (ed.) *Undoing and Redoing Corpus Planning.*
Fishman, J.A. *In Praise of the Beloved Language: A Comparative View of Positive Ethnolinguistic Consciousness.*
García, O. and Fishman, J.A. (eds) *The Multilingual Apple: Languages in New York City.*
Goldstein, T. *Two Languages at Work: Bilingual Life on the Production Floor.*
Hornberger, N.H. *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom up.*
- 1998 PuruShotam, N.S. *Negotiating Language, Constructing Race: Disciplining Difference in Singapore.*
Smith, M.G. *Language and Power in the Creation of the USSR, 1917–1953.*
- 1999 Clyne, M. and Kipp, S. *Pluricentric Languages in an Immigrant Context: Spanish, Arabic and Chinese.*
Kunihiro, T., Inoue, F. and Long, D. (eds) *Sociolinguistics in Japanese Contexts/ Takesi Sibata.*
- 2000 Owens, J. *Arabic as a Minority Language.*
- 2001 Ammon, U. (ed.) *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science. Effects on Other Languages and Language Communities.*
Wolf, H.G. *English in Cameroon.*
- 2002 García, O. and Fishman, J.A. (eds) *The Multilingual Apple: Languages in New York City* (2nd edn).
Jones, M.C. and Esch, E. (eds) *Language Change: The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-Linguistic Factors.*
Wei, L., Dewaele, J.M. and Housen, A. (eds) *Opportunities and Challenges of Bilingualism.*
- 2003 Tuten, D.N. *Koineization in Medieval Spanish.*
Zhou, M. *Multilingualism in China: The Politics of Writing Reforms for Minority Languages 1949–2002.*
- 2004 Leitner, G. *Australia's Many Voices: Australian English: The National Language* (Vol. 1).
Leitner, G. *Australia's Many Voices. Ethnic Englishes, Indigenous and Migrant Languages. Policy and Education* (Vol. 2).
- 2005 Hidalgo, M. (ed.) *Mexican Indigenous Languages at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century.*

Pütz, M., Fishman, J.A. and Neff-van Aertselaer, J. (eds) *'Along the Routes to Power': Explorations of Empowerment Through Language.*

Appendix 2: Joshua A. Fishman's Contributions to the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language (IJSL)*

The following is a list of works published in the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language (IJSL)* series, for which Joshua A. Fishman served as General Editor. Titles are listed under year of publication and by issue number. This list was compiled with the assistance of Rebecca Walters, Mouton de Gruyter and Zeena Zakharia, Teachers College, Columbia University.

- 1974 1 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *The Sociology of Language in Israel.*
 2 Spolsky, B. and Bills, G.D. (eds) *The American Southwest.*
 3 Cooper, R.L. (ed.) *Language Attitudes I.*
- 1975 4 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *'Singles' Issue.*
 5 Rubin, J. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics in Southeast Asia.*
 6 Cooper, R.L. (ed.) *Language Attitudes II.*
- 1976 7 Dillard, J.L. (ed.) *Socio-Historical Factors in the Formation of the Creoles.*
 8 Berry, J. (ed.) *Language and Education in the Third World.*
 9 Rona, J.P. and Wölck, W. (eds) *The Social Dimension of Dialectology.*
 10 Nordberg, B. (ed.) *Sociolinguistic Research in Sweden and Finland.*
 11 Rubin, J. (ed.) *Language Planning in the United States.*
- 1977 12 Dressler W. and Wodak-Leodolter, R. (eds) *Language Death.*
 13 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *'Singles' Issue.*
 14 Lewis, E.G. (ed.) *Bilingual Education.*
- 1978 15 Verdoodt, A. (ed.) *Belgium.*
 18 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *'Singles' Issue.*
- 1979 19 Hancock, I.F. (ed.) *Romani Sociolinguistics.*
 20 Lamy, P. (ed.) *Language Planning and Identity Planning.*
 21 Ammon, U. (ed.) *Dialect and Standard in Highly Industrialized Societies.*
 22 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *'Singles' Issue.*
- 1980 23 Sager, J.C. (ed.) *Standardization of Nomenclature.*
 24 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Sociology of Yiddish.*
 25 Williamson, R.C. and van Eerde, J.A. (eds) *Language Maintenance and Language Shift.*
 26 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Variance and Invariance in Language Form and Context.*
- 1981 27 Walters, J. (ed.) *The Sociolinguistics of Deference and Politeness.*
 28 Clyne, M.G. (ed.) *Foreigner Talk.*
 29 Tabouret-Keller, A. (ed.) *Regional Languages in France.*
 30 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *The Sociology of Jewish Languages.*
 31 Currie, H.C. (ed.) *Sociolinguistic Theory.*
 32 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Unguarded and Monitored Language Behavior.*
- 1982 33 Kreindler, I. (ed.) *The Changing Status of Russian in the Soviet Union.*
 34 Polomé, E.C. (ed.) *Rural and Urban Multilingualism.*
 35 Ellis, J. and Ure, J. (eds) *Register Range and Change.*

- 36 McKay, G.R. (ed.) *Australian Aborigines: Sociolinguistic Studies*.
- 37 Harris, T.K. (ed.) *Sociology of Judezmo: The Language of the Eastern Sephardim*.
- 38 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *From Conceptualization and Performance to Planning and Maintenance*.
- 1983 40 Leitner, G. (ed.) *Language and Mass Media*.
- 41 Cooper, R.L. (ed.) *Sociolinguistic Perspective on Israeli Hebrew*.
- 43 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Face-to-Face Interaction*.
- 1984 45 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *The Decade Past, the Decade to Come* (10th anniversary issue).
- 46 Giles, H. (ed.) *The Dynamics of Speech Accommodation*.
- 47 Ros i Garcia, M. and Strubell i Trueta, M. (eds) *Catalan Sociolinguistics*.
- 49 Coleman, H. (ed.) *Language and Work 1: Law, Industry, Education*.
- 50 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *International Sociolinguistic Perspectives*.
- 1985 52 Magner, T.F. (ed.) *Yugoslavia in Sociolinguistic Perspective*.
- 53 Aguirre, Jr, A. (ed.) *Language in the Chicano Speech Community*.
- 54 Tabouret-Keller, A. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics in France: Current Research in Urban Settings*.
- 55 Mehrotra, R.R. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics Surveys in South, East and Southeast Asia*.
- 56 Cooper, R.L. (ed.) *Sociolinguistic Perspective on Theoretical and Applied Issues*.
- 1986 57 Preston, D.R. (ed.) *Sociolinguistic Taxonomics*.
- 59 Jernudd, B.H. *Chinese Language Planning: Perspectives from China and Abroad*.
- 61 Jernudd, B.H. and Ibrahim, M.H. (eds) *Aspects of Arabic Sociolinguistics*.
- 1987 63 Cooper, R.L. (ed.) *Language in Home, Community, Region and Nation*.
- 64 Gorter, D. (ed.) *The Sociology of Frisian*.
- 65 Apte, M.L. (ed.) *Language and Humor*.
- 66 Williams, G. (ed.) *The Sociology of Welsh*.
- 67 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *The Sociology of Jewish Languages*.
- 68 Dow, J.R. (ed.) *New Perspectives on Language Maintenance and Language Shift I*.
- 1988 69 Dow, J.R. (ed.) *New Perspectives on Language Maintenance and Language Shift II*.
- 70 ó Riagáin, P. (ed.) *Language Planning in Ireland*.
- 71 Rickford, J.R. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics and Pidgin-Creole Studies*.
- 72 Pauwels, A. (ed.) *The Future of Ethnic Languages in Australia*.
- 73 Stalpers, J. and Coulmas, F. (eds) *The Sociolinguistics of Dutch*.
- 74 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Language Planning and Attitudes*.
- 1989 75 Mehrotra, R.R. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics in India*.
- 76 Zuanelli Sonino, E. (ed.) *Italian Sociolinguistics: Trends and Issues*.
- 77 Hornberger, N.H. (ed.) *Bilingual Education and Language Planning in Indigenous Latin America*.
- 78 Janicki, K. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics in Poland*.
- 79 Wherritt, I. and García, O. (eds) *US Spanish: The Language of Latinos*.
- 80 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Current Issues in Language Planning and Language Education*.

- 1990 81 Yuan, C. and Marshall, D.F. (eds) *Sociolinguistics in the People's Republic of China*.
 82 Haarmann, H. and Hwang, J.R. (eds) *Aspects of Korean Sociolinguistics*.
 83 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Zur Soziolinguistik des Deutschen / Varieties of German*.
 84 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Spanish in the USA: New Quandaries and Prospects*.
 85 Pollard, V. (ed.) *Caribbean Languages: Lesser-known Varieties*.
 86 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Perspectives on Language Contact and Language Policy*.
- 1991 87 Ennaji, M. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics of the Maghreb*.
 88 Sibayan, B.P. and Gonzalez, A.B. (eds) *Sociolinguistic Studies in the Philippines*.
 89 Gomes de Matos, F. and Bortoni, S.M. (eds) *Sociolinguistics in Brazil*.
 90 de Bot, K. and Fase, W. (eds) *Migrant Languages in Western Europe*.
 91 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Yiddish: The Fifteenth Slavic Language*.
 92 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *New Perspectives on Linguistic Etiquette*.
- 1992 93 Taylor, A.R. (ed.) *Language Obsolescence, Shift and Death in Several Native American Communities*.
 94 Bull, T. and Swan, T. (eds) *Language, Sex and Society*.
 95 Ammon, U. and Kleineidam, H. (eds) *Language-Spread Policy I: Languages of Former Colonial Powers*.
 96 Lastra, Y. (ed.) with the assistance of de la Mora, A. *Sociolinguistics in Mexico*.
 97 Hongkai, S. and Coulmas, F. (eds) *News from China: Minority Languages in Perspective*.
 98 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Attitudes and Accommodation in Multilingual Societies*.
- 1993 99 Siegel, J. (ed.) *Koines and Koineization*.
 100/1 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Anniversary Issue: Preparing for the 21st Century*.
 102 Schnepel, E.M. and Prudent, L.F. (eds) *Creole Movements in the Francophone Orbit*.
 103 Eastman, C.M. (ed.) (1993) *Language in Power*.
 104 Verdoodt, A.F. and Sonntag, S.K. (eds) (1993) *Sociology of Language in Belgium (Revisited)*.
- 1994 105/6 Bourhis, R.Y. (ed.) *French-English Language Issues in Canada*.
 107 Ammon, U. (ed.) *Language Spread Policy II: Languages of Former Colonial Powers and Former Colonies*.
 108 Landry, R. and Allard, R. (eds) *Ethnolinguistic Vitality*.
 109 Varro, G. (ed.) *Language, the Subject, the Social Link: Essays offered to Andrée Tabouret-Keller by the members of LADIDIS*.
 110 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Ethnolinguistic Pluralism and Its Discontents: A Canadian Study, and Some General Observations*.
- 1995 111 Kontra, M. and Pléh, C. (eds) *Hungarian Sociolinguistics*.
 112 Ennaji, M. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics in Morocco*.
 113 Devlin, B., Harris, S., Black, P. and Guruluwini Enemburus, I. (eds) *Australian Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders: Sociolinguistic and Educational Perspectives*.
 114 Hidalgo, M. (ed.) *Sociolinguistic Trends on the US-Mexican Border*.
 115 Jahr, E.H. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics in Norway*.
 116 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *'Singles' Issue: Language Politics and Accommodation*.
- 1996 117 Elizaincín, A. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics in Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay*.

- 118 Dua, H.R. (ed.) *Language Planning and Political Theory*.
- 119 Verhoeven, L. (ed.) *Vernacular Literacy in Non-Mainstream Communities*.
- 120 Gustavsson, S. and Starý, Z. (eds) *Minority Languages in Central Europe*.
- 121 Grin, F. (ed.) *Economic Approaches to Language and Language Planning*.
- 122 Coulmas, F. (ed.) 'Singles' Issue: *Concepts of Language in Asia and Other Non-Western Societies*.
- 1997** 123 Ennaji, M. (ed.) *Berber Sociolinguistics*.
- 124 Greenberg, M.L. (ed.) *The Sociolinguistics of Slovene*.
- 125 Abdulaziz, M.H. (ed.) *Sociolinguistic Issues in Sub-Saharan Africa*.
- 126 Alatis, J.E., Straehle, C.A. and Ronkin, M. (eds) *Aspects of Sociolinguistics in Greece*.
- 127 Hamel, R.E. (ed.) *Linguistic Human Rights in a Sociolinguistic Perspective*.
- 128 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Issues in Language Contact and Social Power Relations*.
- 1998** 129 Ide, S. and Hill, B. (eds) *Women's Languages in Various Parts of the World*.
- 130 Omar, A.H. (ed.) *Linguistic Issues in Southeast Asia*.
- 131 Topolinjska, A. (ed.) *The Sociolinguistic Situation of the Macedonian Language*.
- 132 McCarty, T.L. and Zepeda, O. (eds) *Indigenous Language Use and Change in the Americas*.
- 133 Varro, G. and Boyd, S. (eds) *Americans in Europe: A Sociolinguistic Perspective. Probes in Northern and Western Europe*.
- 134 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Language Choice Issues*.
- 1999** 135 Videnov, M. and Angelov, A. (eds) *Sociolinguistics in Bulgaria*.
- 136 McCormick, K. and Mesthrie, R. (eds) *Post-Apartheid South Africa*.
- 137 Landau, J.M. (ed.) *Language and Politics: Theory and Cases*.
- 138 Isaacs, M. and Glinert, L. (eds) *Pious Voices: Languages Among Ultra-Orthodox Jews*.
- 139 Hennoste, T. (ed.) *Estonian Sociolinguistics*.
- 140 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Linguistic Symbolism, Political and Individual*.
- 2000** 141 Bamgbose, A. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics in West Africa*.
- 142 Ramírez González, C.M. and Torres, R. (eds) *Language Spread Policy III: Languages of Former Colonial Powers and Former Colonies: The Case of Puerto Rico*.
- 143 Omoniyi, T. (ed.) *Islands and Identity in Sociolinguistics: Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan*.
- 144 Kamwangamalu, N.M. (ed.) *Language and Ethnicity in the New South Africa*.
- 145 Kallen, J.L., Hinskens, F. and Tældeman, J. (eds) *Dialect Convergence and Divergence Across European Borders*.
- 146 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Problems of Multilingualism and Social Change in Asian and African Contexts*.
- 2001** 147 Filipovic, R. and Kalogjera, D. (eds) *Sociolinguistics in Croatia*.
- 148 Modarresi, Y. (ed.) *Aspects of Sociolinguistics in Iran*.
- 149 Hidalgo, M. (ed.) *Between Koineization and Standardization: New World Spanish Revisited*.
- 150 Grivelet, S. (ed.) *Diagraphia: Writing Systems and Society*.
- 151 Radovanovic, M. and Major, R.A. (eds) *Serbian Sociolinguistics*.
- 152 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Language Contact Issues*.
- 2002** 153 de Bot, K. and Stoessel, S. (eds) *Language Change and Social Networks*.

- 154 Ricento, T. and Wiley, T.G. (eds) *Revisiting the Mother-Tongue Question in Language Policy, Planning and Politics*.
- 155/6 Garcia, E.E. (ed.) *Bilingualism and Schooling in the United States*.
- 157 Fishman, J.A. (ed.) *Focus on Diglossia*.
- 158 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Linguistic Choices by Individuals, Organizations, and Speech Communities*.
- 2003** 159 Kirstiansen, T. and Jørgensen, J.N. (eds) *The Sociolinguistics of Danish*.
- 160 Tabouret-Keller, A. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics in France: Theoretical Trends at the Turn of the Century*.
- 161 David, M.K. (ed.) *Language Maintenance or Language Shift: Focus on Malaysia*.
- 162 Nekvapil, J. and Cmejrková, S. (eds) *Language and Language Communities in the Czech Republic*.
- 163 Belnap, R.K. (ed.) *Arabic Sociolinguistics as Viewed by Western Arabists*.
- 164 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Language Expansion and Linguistic World*.
- 2004** 165 König, G. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics in Turkey*.
- 166 Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (ed.) *Organizational Discourse*.
- 167 King, K.A. and Hornberger, N.H. (eds) *Quechua Sociolinguistics*.
- 168 Goutsos, D. (ed.) *The Sociolinguistics of Cyprus I (Studies from the Greek Sphere)*.
- 169 Blanchet, P. and Schiffman, H. (eds) *Revisiting the Sociolinguistics of Occitan: A Presentation*.
- 170 Coulmas, F. (ed.) *Focus on Africa: Sociolinguistic Changes in a Changing World*.
- 2005** 171 Cenoz, J. and Gorter, D. (eds) *Trilingual Education in Europe*.
- 172 Lotherington, H. and Benton, R. (eds) *Pacific Sociolinguistics*.
- 173 Bradley, D. (ed.) *Language Policy and Language Endangerment in China*.
- 174 Azurmendi, M.J. and Martínez de Luna, I. (eds) *Presenting the Basque Case*.
- 175/6 Coulmas, F. and Heinrich, P. (eds) *Changing Language Regimes in Globalizing Environments: Japan and Europe*.

Appendix 3: Google Scholar Citations of Joshua A. Fishman's Work

This table is correct as of August 2005. Only citations of more than one are included. Books are rendered in italics, chapters and articles appear in regular font. Where two entries appear to be the same, the first is usually the title of an article or chapter, the second the title of a book (often the one in which the article or chapter appears).

<i>Number of citations</i>	<i>Publication date</i>	<i>Title of publication</i>
123	1991	Reversing language shift
96	1991	<i>Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages</i>
75	1989	<i>Language & Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective</i>
44	2001	<i>Can Threatened Languages be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective</i>
46	1967	Bilingualism with and without diglossia: Diglossia with and without bilingualism
37	1972	The sociology of language
34	1978	<i>Language Loyalty in the United States</i>
24	1977	<i>Language and Ethnicity</i>
23	1973	<i>Language and Nationalism: Two Integrative Essays</i>
22	1964	Language maintenance and language shift as fields of inquiry
22	1970	<i>Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction</i>
21	1996	<i>Post-Imperial English: Status change in former British and American colonies</i> (with A.W Conrad and A. Rubal-Lopez)
19	1972	<i>The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society</i>
19	1971	<i>Bilingualism in the Barrio</i>
19	1991	<i>Bilingual Education: Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman</i> (edited by O. García)
17	1990	What is reversing language shift (RLS) and how can it succeed
17	1980	Bilingualism and biculturalism as individual and societal phenomena
17	1999	<i>Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity</i>
17	1972	Language and nationalism
16	1976	<i>Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective</i>
17	1965	Who speaks what language to whom and when
15	1968	<i>Readings in the Sociology of Language</i>
13	1968	Nationality-nationalism and nation-nationism
12	1968	Language problems of developing nations
12	1970	Language attitude studies: A brief survey of methodological approaches

11	1964	Language loyalty in the United States: The maintenance and perpetuation of non-English mother tongues
11	1985	<i>The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity</i> (with M.H. Gertner, E.G. Lowy, W.G. Milan)
10	1985	The rise and fall of the ethnic revival
9	1972	<i>Language in Sociocultural Change</i>
9	1974	The study of language attitudes
9	1976	Advances in the sociology of language
9	1998	The new linguistic order
9	1996	What do you lose when you lose your language
8	1972	Domains and the relationship between micro-and macro-sociolinguistics
8	1999	Sociolinguistics
8	1982	Whorfianism of the third kind: Ethnolinguistic diversity as a worldwide societal asset
8	1997	Maintaining languages, what works, what doesn't
7	1976	Advances in language planning
7	1977	<i>The Spread of English: The Sociology of English as an Additional Language</i>
7	1977	The spread of English
7	1997	<i>The Multilingual Apple: Languages in New York City</i> (with O. García)
7	1970	Bilingual Education in sociolinguistic perspective
7	1994	On the limits of ethnolinguistic democracy
7	1983	Sociology of English as an additional language
6	1971	National languages and languages of wider communication in the developing nations
6	1968	Sociolinguistics and the language problems of the developing countries
6	1956	An examination of the process and function of social stereotyping
6	1997	<i>In Praise of the Beloved Language: A Comparative View of Positive Ethnolinguistic Consciousness</i>
5	1985	Language maintenance and ethnicity
5	1996	Introduction: Some empirical and theoretical issues
5	1997	Linguistic human rights from a sociolinguistic perspective (with R.E. Hamel)
5	1973	Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization
5	1977	Bilingual education: Current perspectives. The social science perspective
5	1994	Critiques of language planning: A minority languages perspective
5	1994	English only
5	1978	<i>Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism</i>

<i>Number of citations</i>	<i>Publication date</i>	<i>Title of publication</i>
4	1983	<i>Progress in Language Planning: International perspectives</i>
4	1968	Some contrasts between linguistically homogeneous and linguistically heterogeneous polities
4	1968	A sociology of bilingual education
4	1996	Summary and interpretation: Post-imperial English 1940–1990
4	1974	Language planning and language planning research: The state of the art
4	1979	Bilingual education, language planning and English
4	1981	Societal bilingualism: Stable and transitional
4	1980	Minority language maintenance and the ethnic mother tongue school
4	2001	300-plus years of heritage language education in the United States
3	1974	Yiddish in Israel: A case-study of efforts to revise a monocentric language policy (with D.E. Fishman)
3	2001	From theory to practice (and vice versa): Review, reconsideration and reiteration
3	1968	Sociolinguistic perspectives on the study of bilingualism
3	1987	Language spread and language policy for endangered languages
3	1997	In praise of the beloved language
3	1993	<i>The Earliest Stage of Language Planning: The 'First Congress' Phenomenon</i>
3	1991	<i>Yiddish: Turning to Life</i>
3	1993	Ethnolinguistic democracy: Varieties, degrees and limits
3	1988	Ethnocultural issues in the creation, substitution and revision of writing systems
2	1985	Language, ethnicity and racism
2	2001	Digraphia maintenance and loss among Eastern European Jews: Intertextual and interlingual print
2	1989	Bilingual education and language planning in indigenous Latin America
2	1985	<i>Readings in the Sociology of Jewish Languages</i>
2	1971	Sociolinguistique
2	1980	Social Theory and ethnography: Language and ethnicity in Eastern Europe
2	1977	<i>Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems</i>
2	1985	<i>Ethnicity in Action: The Community Resources of Ethnic Languages in the United States</i>
2	1982	Sociolinguistic Foundations of Bilingual Education
2	1991	<i>Language and Ethnicity: Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday</i> (edited by J.R. Dow)

References:**Joshua A. Fishman works cited**

We include here (in date order) only those works – often a collection of work – from which we quote verbatim. For a more complete list of Fishman's works referred to in this chapter, please consult the bibliographical inventory compiled by Gella Schweid Fishman, which forms Part 3 of this volume.

- Fishman, J.A. and Passanella, A. (1960) College admission-selection studies. *Review of Educational Research* 30, 298–310.
- Fishman, J.A. (1964) Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry. *Linguistics* 9, 32–70.
- Fishman, J.A. (1965) Who speaks what language to whom and when? *La Linguistique* 2, 67–88.
- Fishman, J.A. (1966) *Language Loyalty in the United States. The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J.A. (1967) The description of societal bilingualism. In L.G. Kelly (ed.) *The Description and Measurement of Bilingualism* (pp. 275–284). Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Fishman, J.A. (ed.) (1968) *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J.A., Cooper, R.L., Ma, R. et al. (1971) *Bilingualism in the Barrio: Language Science Monographs* 7. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Fishman, J.A. (1972a) *Language in Sociocultural Change. Essays by Joshua A. Fishman*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Fishman, J.A. (1972b) *Language and Nationalism. Two Integrative Essays*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Fishman, J.A. (ed.) (1972c) *Advances in the Sociology of Language* II. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J.A. and Lovas, J. (1972d) Bilingual education in sociolinguistic perspective. In B. Spolsky (ed.) *The Language Education of Minority Children* (pp. 83–93). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Fishman, J.A. (1973) Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization and planning. *Language in Society* 2, 23–44.
- Cooper, R.L. and Fishman, J.A. 1974. The study of language attitudes. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 3: 5–20.
- Fishman, J.A. (1976) *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Fishman, J.A. (1977) *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives. Social Science*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Fishman, J.A., Cooper, R.L. and Conrad, A. (1977) *The Spread of English: The Sociology of Language as an Additional Language*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Fishman, J.A. (1978) A gathering of vultures, the 'legion of decency' and bilingual education in the USA. *NABE Journal* 21, 13–16.
- Fishman, J.A. (1980) Ethnic community mother tongue schools in the USA: Dynamics and distributions. *International Migration Review* 14, 235–247.
- Fishman, J.A. (1982) Whorfianism of the third kind: Ethnolinguistic diversity as a worldwide asset. *Language in Society* 11: 1–14.
- Fishman, J.A. (1983) The rise and fall of the 'ethnic revival' in the USA. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 4 (3), 5–46.

- Fishman, J.A., Gertner, M.H., Lowy, E.G. and Milan, W.G. (1985a) *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fishman, J.A. (1985) The societal basis of the intergenerational continuity of additional languages. In K.R. Jankowsky (ed.) *Scientific and Humanistic Dimensions of Language. Festschrift for Robert Lado* (pp. 551–558). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fishman, J.A. (1987) *Ideology, Society and Language: The Odyssey of Nathan Birnbaum*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma.
- Fishman, J.A. (1989) *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J.A. (1990) My life through my work: My work through my life (autobiography). In K. Koerner (ed.) *First Person Singular* (Vol. 2; pp. 105–124). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fishman, J.A. (1991a) Putting the 'socio' back into the sociolinguistic enterprise. *The International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 92, 127–138.
- Fishman, J.A. (1991b) *Reversing Language Shift: Theory and Practice of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J.A. (1991c) *Yiddish: Turning to Life: Sociolinguistic Studies and Interpretations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fishman, J.A. (1994) Critiques of language planning: A minority languages perspective. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 15 (2 and 3), 91–99.
- Fishman, J.A. (1996a) *In Praise of the Beloved Language: A Comparative View of Positive Ethnolinguistic Consciousness*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fishman, J.A., Conrad, A.W. and Rubal-López, A. (eds) (1996b) *Post-Imperial English. Status Change in Former British and American Colonies, 1940–1990*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fishman, J.A. (1997a) Bloomington, summer of 1964: The birth of American sociolinguistics. In C.B. Paulston and G.R. Tucker (eds) *The Early Days of Sociolinguistics: Memories and Reflections* (pp. 87–95). Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications.
- Fishman, J.A. (1997b) Language and ethnicity: The view from within. In F. Coulmas (ed.) *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 327–343). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Fishman, J.A. (1997c) Reflections about (or prompted by) *International Journal of the Sociology of Language (IJSL)*. In C.B. Paulston and G.R. Tucker (eds) *The Early Days of Sociolinguistics: Memories and Reflections* (pp. 237–241). Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications.
- Fishman, J.A. (ed.) (1999) *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fishman, J.A. (2000) The status agenda in corpus planning. In R.D. Lambert and E. Shohamy (eds) *Language Policy and Pedagogy: Essays in Honor of A. Ronald Walton* (pp. 43–51). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fishman, J.A. (ed.) (2001) *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J.A. (2002) Introduction. *MOST Journal on Multicultural Societies* 4 (2), i–x.

Other works cited

- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1997) *Borderlands/La frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

- Baetens-Beardsmore, H. (1999) La consolidation des expériences en éducation plurilingue. In D. Marsh and B. Marland (eds) *CLIL Initiatives for the Millenium*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. (M. Holquist, ed., M. Holquist and C. Emerson, trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bhabha, H.K. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. (2004) *World English: A Study of its Development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Calvet, L.J. (1999) *Pour une écologie des langues du monde*. Paris: Plon.
- Canagarajah, S. (ed.) (2005) *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2002) Online document: http://www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/education/Languages/Language_Policy/Common_Framework_of_Reference/
- Coste, D. (2001) La notion de compétence plurilingue. In *Actes du Séminaire: l'Enseignement des Langues Vivantes, Perspectives*. Paris: Ministère de la Jeunesse de l'Education et de la Recherche, DES. On WWW at <http://www.eduscol.education.fr>
- Coulmas, F. (2005) *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Speakers' Choices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fasold, R. (1984) *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Ferguson, C.A. (1959) Diglossia. *Word* 15 (2), 325–340.
- García, O. (ed.) (1991) *Bilingual Education. Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Vol. 1). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- García, O. (2006) Lost in transculturation: The case of bilingual education in New York City. In M. Pütz, J.A. Fishman and J. Neff-van Aertselaer (eds) *'Along the Routes to Power': Explorations of the Empowerment through Language*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gee, J.P. (1996) *Social Linguistics and Literacies. Ideology in Discourses*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Gibbons, P. (2002) *Scaffolding Language: Scaffolding Learning. Teaching Second Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-López, P. and Tejada, C. (1999) Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture and Activity* 6 (4), 286–303.
- Haugen, E. 1996. *Language Planning and Language Conflict. The Case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1972) Foreword. In J.A. Fishman, *The Sociology of Language. An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society* (pp. v–viii). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Irvine, J. and Gal, S. (2000) Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. Kroskrity (ed.) *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics and Identities* (pp. 35–84). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Jenkins, R. (1997) *Rethinking Ethnicity*. London: Sage.
- Jewett, C. and Kress, G. (2003) *Multimodal Literacy*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Kloss, H. (1929). *Nebensprachen: Eine sprachpolitische Studie über die Beziehungen eng Verwandter Sprachgemeinschaften*. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller, Universitäts-Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Kloss, H. (1940) *Das Volksgruppenrecht in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika* (Vol. 1). Essener Verlagsanstalt: Essen.
- Kloss, H. (1967) *Abstand languages and Ausbau languages*. *Anthropological Linguistics* 9 (7), 29–41.
- Krashen, S.D. (1979) Language acquisition and language learning in the late-entry bilingual education program. *Language Development in a Bilingual Setting* (pp. 100–112). Pomona, CA: National Multilingual Multicultural Materials Development Center.
- Krashen, S.D. (1996) *Under Attack: The Case Against Bilingual Education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.
- Kress, G. (2003) *Literacy in the New Media Age*. New York: Routledge.
- Luke, A. and Baldauf, Jr, R.B. (1990) Language planning and education: A critical rereading. In R.B. Baldauf, Jr and A. Luke (eds) *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (pp. 349–356). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Maurais, J. and Morris, M. (eds) (2004) *Languages in a Globalising World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pavlenko, A. and Blackledge, A. (eds) (2004) *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Peñalosa, F. (1981) *Introduction to the Sociology of Language*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Pennycook, A. (1989) The concept of method, interested knowledge and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 23 (4), 589–618.
- Ruiz, R. (1984) Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal* 8 (2), 15–34.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988) Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas and J. Cummins (eds) *Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle* (pp. 9–44). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Spolsky, B. (2004) *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tollefson, J. (1991) *Planning Language, Planning Inequality: Language Policy in the Community*. London: Longman.
- Tollefson, J. (ed.) (1995) *Power and Inequality in Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walqui, A. (2002) Conceptual framework. Scaffolding instruction for English learners. Unpublished manuscript. WestEd, San Francisco.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Williams, G. (1992) *Sociolinguistics. A Sociological Critique*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Woolard, K. (1998) Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. Wollard and P. Kroskrity (eds) *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 3–47). New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, S. (2004) *Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalism to Globalisation*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.