

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Cross- Border Situation of English as Second Language: A Reflective Review of Policies

Yadu Prasad Gyawali¹, Assistant Professor, Mid-West University, Nepal

Research Scholar, Chandigarh University, Punjab, India

Shiksha Bala², Research Scholar, Chandigarh University, Punjab, India

Article Received: 8/4/2022,

Article Accepted: 29/04/2022,

Published online: 30/04/2022,

DOI:10.47311/IJOES.2022.4.4.39

Abstract

This paper aims to explore the situation of language planning and policy based on the scope, strategies and major issues, particularly in second language teacher education context through content analysis. Similarly, in the existing scenario, language planning and policies have not been found inclusive in the different societal, cultural, geographical and cross border levels. This paper reveals the educational possibilities based on the translanguaging theories to address the language issues such as monolingual, bilingual, multilingual, dialect, register, pidgin, creole, endangered languages and indigenous languages contextual use and cultural prosperity through status and corpus planning. Furthermore, language policy needs to intervene in the planning at different levels to preserve the originality of language and cultural ethics, referencing the global trend of language acquisition.

Keywords: translanguaging, status planning, language acquisition, educational policy, foreign influence

Introduction

Language planning and policy of a country determines how to maintain languages as per the needs and necessities. Language planning and policy have broader scope in the different fields such as education, media, business and several national and international fields. In monolingual, bilingual and multilingual language needs, the country needs to have addressed the issues through planning and policies. Language as a tool to reflect individual to societal framework is considered a part to provide the framework to the other developmental infrastructures such as communication, economy, education and health. According to Rubin (1977), language planning is introduced by Uriel Weinrich and Einar Haugen, who used the term

RESEARCH ARTICLE

language planning in the literature in 1966. Cooper and Cooper (1989) stated that language planning was introduced from France during the 15th century and expanded worldwide. Initially, it was limited to developed countries. However, it has become the global property as most countries have been adopting language planning and policies to guide the national system through language. For example, Nepal government has established an independent language commission in accordance with the constitution of Nepal to plan, prepares, and executes the country's language policy. Similarly, In India there is the Official Languages Commission that was established by the president of India in accordance with Article-344 of the Indian Constitution. The Ministry of Home Affairs, issued a notification on June 7, 1955, establishing this committee. The countries worldwide have been adopting language planning and policies based on the politicization and assigning the roles of language planning groups to direct the situation of language and their practices in and across the nation (Chen & Gottlieb, 2013). Similarly, Hornberger (2006) suggested an integrated framework of language planning and policies in which the international, national and regional standard could be addressed to ensure language access to the diverse speech communities.

Lewis and Simons (2010) emphasized the graded intergenerational disruption scales to the formation of language policy to evaluate different contexts' languages. The language planning and policy is the central guiding principle to intervene in strategies, forms, and standardization of language on the context of the country and language situations. For example, Fishman (1991) stated that eight-level categories focus on individual and societal involvement from which the endangered languages could be preserved. Therefore, language planning and policies need to have a broader scope as the standard and indigenous languages play distinctive roles in literacy acquisition, identity function and transmission of a message to the demand based categories such as education, business and information processing system.

This paper intends to explore and review the scope, importance, strategies, major issues, challenges and types of language planning and policies critically in education, particularly in the practice of second language teacher education by the documentary analysis. The language planning and policies have not been found inclusive in the different levels such as societal, cultural and geographically distributed and create cultural hegemony due to the language of the highest fame and that is culture rule over to the other national and local languages. For example, Phyak (2016) stated that the ideology of global language and social capital guides the English language policy to the social inequalities while indigenous languages are under ignorance.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Methods

The paper was based on content analysis where the literatures from the different contexts were reviewed and presented. For example the language policy of different countries such as Nepal, India, Malaysia, USA and may others were reviewed in the line of existing provisions. Based on the document analysis, the thematic ideas are discussed in the following section as result and discussions.

Major issues in Language Planning and Language Policies

This section deals with the thematic review of major issues, the scope of language planning and policy, strategies of language planning, foreign influences to the language policy through content analysis of the contemporary and related literatures.

Language planning and language policies are recognized differently based on the national standard and form of use. Kaplan and Baldauf (2003) stated that language planning and language policies as different and distinct concepts as language policy relates to the goal setting and decision making in educational processes. On the other hand, language planning is to implement the policies for the output. Supporting Hoffmann (2000) reported that language policy is prior to language planning because language planning is the act-out variety where language policy is the guideline to act-out. Similarly, Chen and Gottlieb (2013) argued language planning as a systematic action plan developed by the national agency, governmental and non- governmental organizations or individual to direct the change or preserve the functional allocation and acquisition structure of the language of a particular society or speech community whereas language policy is bounded to the governmental laws, procedures for the systematic formulation of the guidelines by the authoritative bodies. Furthermore, they recognized language policy as covert and language planning as overt in terms of the acquisition's nature. The distinctiveness features of the language policies and planning serve the function of the translanguaging policies. García and Kleyn (2016) stated that trans-language theory suggested for the multilingual and bilingual language planning strategies to ensure the translanguaging competence through several language varieties within and across the linguistic territory.

In contrast to the distinctiveness of language planning and language policy Rubin (1977) commented through the inclusiveness perspective that language policy as a part of language planning is based on the four different phases as fact-finding, policy determination, implementation and evaluation. Similarly, language policy is associated with language planning as a major part that includes policy formation, codification, elaboration and implementation of the plan.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The situation of language planning depends upon the national framework of the language status and policies as a result, the different bodies and stakeholders could develop transformative learning situation as per the global need and access of the language.

Scope of language planning and Policy

Language is the tool to communicate ideas from theory to practice the communication and relationship established in various fields such as education, health, psychology, sociology, computation, information and communication technology, teaching-learning and media. Cooper and Cooper (1989) argued that language functions to the identity, vernacularly, intergenerational representation, literary acquisition and societal profile concerning the international, national, regional, trade, educational and the language shift from one culture to another. Agreeing with the social phenomena, Daoust (2017) identified the social dynamics based on defining the role of language in the sociolinguistic concept like social status, culture, gender, speech community and roles in the different levels and the disciplines as the area of language planning. In expanding the scope, Reagan illustrated language planning involved o political, judicial, religious, commercial, interpersonal and familial domain for various uses from official today to communication and lexical modification to integrate technological, educational, economic, political and socio-developmental aspects.

Similarly, Ricento and Hornberger (1996) claimed that language planning demonstrated the multidisciplinary quality with a sense of psycho-socio and political-economic status referring to the standard and marginalized languages and multi-faceted policies of integrating all kinds of languages as the form of identity and revolution. On the other hand, Grin presented language policy with an inclusive view considering the economy; as a result, language planning could be interdisciplinary. However, it needed to be interconnected to the economic issues and limited areas could be explored while planning the language.

Baldauf (2006) asserted language planning as a large scale project of national planning where four different aspects such as society, language, acquisition and learning were encompassed to determine the areas of language planning based on the form and function with ecological realities in macro, meso and micro level of policy reformation. Therefore, the scope of language planning and policy reviews the coverage of the standard and indigenous language with the influence of cultural hegemony and the elite's language.

Strategies of Language Planning and Policies

Language planning and policy strategies are also known as types, techniques, or ways of intervening planning activities. Gramley and Kummer (2008) stated that language planning varied in terms of use of the language. For example, Cooper focused to the graphitization,

RESEARCH ARTICLE

standardization and modernizations of the language elements based on corpus planning through which vocabularies or new forms were created with the interventions. Similarly, Fishman (1991) argued on the status planning, corpus planning and acquisition planning of language, as a result, the language functions could be determined such as status planning determines the official, national and local languages. Corpus planning creates new items in the language, and acquisition planning suggests the policies to set the language strategies. With the support of status and corpus planning, Reagan (2001) associated language planning and policies to the sign language as the evolution and modification of language exist with the strategies we follow to intervene in language policy. He further argued that the strategies provide guidelines for the purification, revitalization, standardization and lexical modification of languages as corpus planning focused on the language purification based on the reformation of the language structures such as morphology, syntax and semantics. Similarly, status planning envisioned the official and national use of the languages with the help of standard language use indicators. However, the local and indigenous languages had limited provisions of strategies to preserve the originality of different forms of the languages such as dialect and registers due to the hegemonic impressions of the international and national languages as if the scholars and researchers suggested the strategies to preserve the languages for the originality of the cultures and linguistic minorities (Corker, 2000; Hatoss, 2008).

Therefore, language policy and planning strategies are found varied as per the national situation and language use. The limited research was found in developing countries like Nepal for the concern of adopting strategies in language policy and planning.

Language Planning and Educational Policy

Language planning is associated to the educational policy because language alternatives determine the educational indicators. Moreover, regarding the educational policy, language is one of the determiners as it is decided by national level with international dimensions and cultural influences. Ferguson (2006) focused on bilingual and multilingual educational practices for knowledge recognition and skill practices to ensure global citizenship. Similarly, Taylor (2010) suggested for the implementation of multilingual education to the developing countries like Nepal where are the various linguistic features and property existed. To support multilingual practices in Nepal MOEST (2019) directed to governing bodies for the implementation of multilingual curricular works from the basic-elementary schools to develop consciousness to the real world life and preserve local cultures. Moreover, NPC (2020) developed the indicators of language planning and recommended the language commission for the further planning and monitoring of connecting educational practices with language planning and policies.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The language supports the reflection of the community context where language and education function to materialize the learning process. Giri (2010) reported with the example of linguistic hegemony in the context of popular language. For example, the linguistic hegemony of the elites affects to the ethnic identity and local languages. As a result, the language policy and planning might have the transformative impressions to linguistic dominance. Toh (2020) argued that the language occurred with the assessment of policy level or it constraint to the administrative purposes in the sense that it had challenges in the implementation levels due to the level of the learners, learning situation, influence of the first language of the learners and the teachers' capacity to deal with the issues related to the second or foreign languages.

The literature shows that educational policies are affected by the linguistic phenomena as English as a medium of instruction has been in the second and the foreign language teaching context. As a result, learners need to develop native and other language skills concerning social, cultural, and educational recognition.

Foreign Influences in Language Planning

Language planning is the national level planning based on the linguistic situation, sociopolitical consideration, and literacy level of the country's people. The language varieties and geographical territories are the fundamental sources to shape the language's national policy associating to language planning. While discussing foreign influences, cultural hegemony and linguistic dominance is considered. Coulmas (1989) reported the colonial impressions and cultural hegemony of the dominant languages as foreign influences while planning the national level language. Supporting the foreign influence Hao (2018) asserted that the transition process of foreign language teachers for teaching the foreign language influenced to the planning enactment of the languages because the interest, interpretations and use of language in the classroom were found affected by the compromising situation of the dominant language and culture. Similarly, Borg et al. (2002) commented on the cultural hegemony in language planning based on Gramsci's concept where the authoritative culture affects the local cultural scenario as people are impressive to transform to the new culture created by linguistic dominance.

On the other hand, Language policy is the guideline to language planning, which determines the situation in national situations. Similarly, linguistic dominance and cultural hegemony resulted in the crisis to the national, indigenous and local languages with socio-economic and cultural gaps. Nguyen et al. (2017) presented English as a dominant global language and has been in the practice of medium of instruction to foster internationalization, bilingualism and multilingualism with socio-economic mobility could affect the national policy of language planning.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The above literature reflects the translational language policies with the more significant influence of the foreign social, political, educational, and linguistic situations on national language planning. Therefore, the dominant language's socio-cultural gap and linguistic hegemony need to consider addressing the global impact, and the national language planning commission needs to develop the policies to preserve local realities and originality of the specific languages.

Conclusion

Language policy guides the planning of languages for educational purposes, interconnecting policy and planning to the functional reality of executing the standardization and modification of language status in the existing situations. The nation's language policy determines the education system; consequently, it may suggest a concrete plan preserve linguistic importance and cultural diversity. For example, in Nepal's context, different regional, local and indigenous languages show the cultural diversity in the various linguistic landscapes.

The paper discusses several issues and debates regarding language planning and policy through documentary analysis and reveals the meaning and scope based on the distinctiveness and inclusive view. On the other hand, the potential and existing strategies as status plan and corpus planning with the purpose of language acquisition in terms of the purpose, aspects, levels, meaning and context. Similarly, language planning with education, particularly second language educationist presented, realizing the cultural hegemony and linguistic dominance while planning the language policy around the globe. The language planning facilitates the prospects of cultural and social identity regarding the local use. On the contrary, the dominant languages' cultural hegemony and linguistic ideologies may establish colonization to the local and national language policies through dogmatic perspectives. The ideology of acculturation and deconstruction might help protect the indigenous culture and dominant foresight of the languages of the importance. For instance, English as a medium of instruction can be the policy to operate language planning in Nepal and both native and second language and their culture need to have interacted for the standardization of contextual use of languages with the provision of choices while planning the language. Therefore, the national policy of language needs to guide national, provincial and local level language planning to preserve the origin of local languages and cultures. Moreover, research capacity needs to be encouraged as limited research was found in Nepal's context while exploring the relevant literature for language planning and policy.

References

RESEARCH ARTICLE

- Baldauf, R. B. (2006). Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7(2-3), 147-170. <https://doi.org/10.2167/cilp092.0>
- Borg, C., Buttigieg, J. A., & Mayo, P. (2002). *Gramsci and education*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Chen, P., & Gottlieb, N. (2013). *Language planning and language policy: East Asian perspectives*. Routledge.
- Cooper, R. L., & Cooper, R. L. C. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Corker, M. (2000). Disability politics, language planning and inclusive social policy. *Disability & society*, 15(3), 445-462.
- Coulmas, F. (1989). *Language adaptation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Daoust, D. (2017). Language planning and language reform. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 436-452). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405166256.ch27>
- Ferguson, G. (2006). *Language planning and education*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages* (Vol. 76). Multilingual matters.
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging theory in education. In T. K. Ofelia García (Ed.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students* (pp. 23-47). Routledge. <https://www.book2look.com/embed/9781317442370>
- Giri, R. A. (2010). Cultural anarchism: The consequences of privileging languages in Nepal. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 31(1), 87-100.
- Government of India. The Constitution of India. <https://www.india.gov.in/my-government/constitution-india/constitution-india-full-text.2012>.
- Gramley, S., & Kummer, W. (2008). Language planning and policy. In S. Gramley, Gramley, Vivian (Ed.), *Bielefeld introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 291-300). Aisthesis. <https://pub.uni-bielefeld.de/record/2472724>
- Grin, F. (2003). Language planning and economics. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 4(1), 1-66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200308668048>
- Hao, T. T. (2018). The transition to English teaching: Influences and considerations for foreign language education and language planning. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 34(5). <https://doi.org/10.25073/2525-2445/vnufs.4302>
- Hatoss, A. (2008). Community level approaches to language planning: A case of Hungarian in Australia. In R. B. B. Anthony Liddicoat (Ed.), *Language planning in local contexts: Agents, contexts and interactions*. Multilingual Matters.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

- Hoffmann, C. (2000). Balancing language planning and language rights: Catalonia's uneasy juggling act. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 21(5), 425-441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630008666415>
- Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Frameworks and models in language policy and planning. *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*, 24-41.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (2003). Language planning in Japan. In *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin* (pp. 17-29). Springer.
- Lewis, M. P., & Simons, G. F. (2010). Assessing endangerment: expanding Fishman's GIDS. *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, 55(2), 103-120.
- Ministry of Law and Justice. Right to Education Act. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice. http://righttoeducation.in/sites/default/files/Right%20of%20Children%20to%20Free%20and%20Compulsory%20Education%20Act%202009%20%28English%29%20%28Copiable_Searchable%29.pdf#overlay-context.2009
- MOEST. (2019). *National education policy-2076*. Kathmandu Ministry of Education, Science and Technology Retrieved from http://moe.gov.np/assets/uploads/files/Education_Policy.pdf
- NCERT (National Council of Educational Research and Training). Position Paper of the National Focus Group on Teaching of English. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training. 2006.
- Nguyen, H. T., Walkinshaw, I., & Pham, H. H. (2017). EMI programs in a Vietnamese university: Language, pedagogy and policy issues. In *English medium instruction in higher education in Asia-Pacific* (pp. 37-52). Springer.
- NPC. (2020). *Fifteenth plan(FY 2076/77-2080/81)*. Kathmandu Nepal Government, National Planning Council Retrieved from https://www.npc.gov.np/images/category/15th_Plan_Final1.pdf
- Phyak, P. (2016). Local-global tension in the ideological construction of English language education policy in Nepal. In *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 199-217). Springer.
- Reagan, T. (2001). Language planning and policy. In C. Lucas (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of sign languages* (pp. 145-180). Cambridge University Press.
- Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL quarterly*, 30(3), 401-427. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587691>
- Rubin, J. (1977). *Language planning processes*. Walter de Gruyter.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Taylor, S. K. (2010). Beyond bilingual education: Multilingual language education in Nepal [Reports - Descriptive]. 4, 138-154.

Toh, G. (2020). Challenges in English-medium instruction (EMI) at a Japanese university. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 334-347.