1 Introduction: What is Educational Linguistics?

BERNARD SPOLSKY

First named as a field 30 years ago (Spolsky, 1974b) and defined in two introductory books (Spolsky, 1978; Stubbs, 1986), educational linguistics has rapidly expanded and has become widely recognized in reference texts (Corson, 1997; Spolsky, 1999) and in university programs and courses. With the growing significance of language education as a result of decolonization and globalization, more and more educational systems are appreciating the need to train teachers and administrators in those aspects of linguistics that are relevant to education and in the various subfields that have grown up within educational linguistics itself.

I first proposed the term "educational linguistics" because of my dissatisfaction with efforts to define the field of applied linguistics. In the narrowest definition, courses and textbooks on applied linguistics in the 1960s dealt with the teaching of foreign languages; in the widest definition (for example, in the scope of subjects covered in the international congresses starting to be organized by AILA) it came to include all of what Charles Voegelin had called "hyphenated linguistics," that is to say, everything but language theory, history, and description. One of the central issues of debate was the relationship between theoretical or mainstream linguistics and the applied field. It was becoming clear, particularly with the failure of the audio-lingual method on the one hand and the refusal of transformational linguistics to accept responsibility for practical issues on the other, that the simplistic notion that applied linguistics was simply linguistics applied to some practical question was misleading.

Applied linguistics as it had developed seemed to me to be a fairly soulless attempt to apply largely irrelevant models to a quite narrow range of problems, especially in teaching foreign languages. It produced a couple of potential monsters in language teaching: the deadening drills of the order of the audio-lingual method, and the ungoverned chaos of the early natural approach. I saw the challenge in this way:

> Many linguists believe that their field should not be corrupted by any suggestion of relevance to practical matters; for them, linguistics is a pure science and its study is motivated only by the desire to increase human knowledge. Others, however, claimed that linguistics offers a panacea for any educational problem that arises and quickly offer their services to handle any difficulties in language planning or teaching. Each of these extreme positions is, I believe, quite wrong, for while it is evident that linguistics is often relevant to education, the relation is seldom direct. (Spolsky, 1978: 1)

In a review of a recent Festschrift dealing with applied linguistics, Davies (2006) suggested a distinction between those like Henry Widdowson who argued for a dictionary definition of the field, maintaining that there is "an applied linguistics core which should be required of all those attempting the *rite de passage*" and those who prefer the approach by ostensive definition, "if you want to know about applied linguistics, look around you." He correctly places me somewhere in this latter camp, although in the case of educational linguistics, which I argue is more focused, I think I have less trouble in finding a core, in the interactions between language and education. It was the very lack of a core in applied linguistics that led me to propose educational linguistics. On the analogy of educational psychology, I hoped it would be possible to define a field relevant to education but based on linguistics.

It soon became clear that the term is necessarily ambiguous: it includes those parts of linguistics directly relevant to educational matters as well as those parts of education concerned with language. This turns out to be a pretty wide scope, as most parts of education do involve language: we found for instance the measured competence in mathematics of new immigrant students in Israel was lowered by their limited Hebrew proficiency. But more recent thought, following at least a decade of research and publication in the area of language policy, has given me a clearer view of how to locate educational linguistics, which I now see as providing the essential instruments for designing language education policy and for implementing language education management. Language policy, I argue, exists within all speech communities (and within each domain inside that community), consisting of three distinct but interrelated components: the regular language practices of the community (such as choice of varieties); the language beliefs or ideology of the community (such as the values assigned to each variety by various members of the community); and any language management activities, namely attempts by any individual or institution with or claiming authority to modify the language practices and language beliefs of other members of the community.

Tracing the history of language management, the earliest activities were those aiming to preserve sacred texts (the work of the Sanskrit, Arabic, and Hebrew grammarians, for instance) or to translate them into new languages. Later, with the establishment of the Spanish and French academies, the emphasis moved to preserving the purity of standard varieties. To this, the French Revolution added, and the German Romantics confirmed, the emphasis on defining

a centralized standard language variety in order to assert national identity. This task, concentrating on language status and supported by puristic language cultivation (or corpus planning), was the central management activity in newly developed independent nations in the nineteenth century and again with the end of colonialism after World War II. While this had obvious effects on education (especially on the choice of language of instruction), the recognition that language acquisition policy was a key component of language management had to wait until it was suggested by Cooper (1989). While it is true that most students of language policy continue to focus on decisions concerning status at the level of the nation-state, it is starting to be recognized that the major changes in language practices and beliefs are the results of management activities concerning education.

An obvious example is the way that decisions concerning language of instruction have been the major cause in Africa and other former colonies of the downgrading and extinction of minority languages. Similarly, pressures are now developing in Asia and elsewhere to introduce English into primary schools, either alongside the local language or replacing it as medium of instruction especially for science subjects. In South America, the destruction of indigenous languages was virtually guaranteed by Spanish refusal to admit them into the educational system. In the Soviet Union, the better facilities provided to Russian-medium schools raised the status and importance of the language and threatened the territorial languages. In New Zealand, the change from Maori to English in the 1870s in the Native Schools was the beginning of the suppression of language, and the movement for Maori language regeneration of the last two decades has been focused on the schools. It is reasonable to claim then that the most important language management activities are now those taking place within the school system.

A parenthetical word of concern may, however, not be out of place. Recently, especially in the field of language assessment, there has been a growing recognition of the issue of ethical responsibility for the use of language tests. Whereas at one stage language testers spent most of their time studying and talking about the reliability and validity of a test, they are now more likely to be concerned with test use and misuse. Strong alarm has been expressed, for example, about the use of language tests to exclude asylum seekers or to control immigration. Similarly, the growing employment of national standardized tests to ensure accountability of education systems is interfering with efforts to provide education suitable for minorities and new immigrants.

This sense of responsibility and ethical disquiet has also moved to language management, in part as a result of the criticism of the contribution of imperialist and colonialist policies to language endangerment and also as a result of widespread recognition of the need to apply principles of human rights to language policy. It is clear that language management can be directed toward socially and morally inappropriate goals, such as the homogenization and suppression of minority languages. Many scholars hold that the contrary pressure, toward the revival of fading languages or toward giving power to

minority languages, is necessarily good and to be encouraged – a common argument makes an analogy between biological and linguistic diversity that remains debatable.

By definition, however, any language management is the application of power coming from authority, and has totalitarian overtones. It assumes that the language manager (government or activist or scholar) knows best and it is thus in essence patriarchal. Taking a liberal or pluralistic point of view, one would argue that people should be allowed free choice of language, as of religion, provided only that they do not interfere with or harm others. On this principle, individuals should also be offered an opportunity to acquire the language in which national and civic activities are undertaken, and the language or languages which will provide them with access to economic success. A language education policy which denies such access (such as the ban on English in the Maori *Kura kaupapa*) needs very strong justification.

At the same time, one may question the demands made by ethnic language revival movements that all members of the ethnic group must use only the ethnic language, granting rights to the group, or even worse, to a specific language as an object, at the cost of individual freedom to choose. This is an example of conflict of values: identity with a large group (family, ethnic group, religion, or nation) is valuable, but so is the right to choose one's own language. From a pluralist point of view, there is no obvious way to apply a higher value to one or the other, leaving a free choice accompanied of course by a price. But what gives me (the putative language manager) the authority to make decisions for others? Can I point to some ideal society in which utopian pluralism has been achieved, or simply to the many failures of efforts to manage languages? I can be comfortable with what I might call language accommodation: providing all citizens with linguistic access to civic life but defending their freedom to choose also which language best represents their social, cultural, and religious identity.

Questioning language management like this may seem to move us beyond the spheres of language policy and educational linguistics into fundamental questions of identity and philosophy, but it is a reasonable step in a study of both fields. At the same time, it is only fair to note that most scholars in the field tend toward activist positions, assuming that their expertise in various aspects of educational linguistics gives them responsibility as well as ability to attempt to manage language education. In editing this handbook, we too accept this responsibility, if with a continuing modicum of skepticism and modest doubt.

In planning the book, we selected what we considered the more central areas of educational linguistics and added other fields in which there has been relevant research and publication over the last few decades. We divided the 44 commissioned chapters into three clusters. For each chapter, we invited the scholar we believed could give the best description of the development, current state, and future prospect of the topic. We also encouraged contributors to choose a colleague to add a wider perspective. This reflected our decision

on joint editorship, and the fact that Francis M. Hult has written the second chapter recounting and analyzing the history of the field, which I personally found very revealing.

The first cluster of chapters presents the foundational background, setting out the knowledge derived from neurobiology, the linguistic theory, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and politics relevant to educational linguistics and the educational systems in which it operates. Language, it has come to be realized especially since the work of Chomsky, is embodied in the brain, and growing knowledge of the brain is therefore relevant if not yet directly applicable (Schumann, 2006). Thus the section opens with a chapter on neurobiology by Laura Sabourin and Laurie A. Stowe, further developed in the chapter on psycholinguistics by Tej K. Bhatia and William C. Ritchie. Basically, a central principle of all the chapters in this section is the realization that the core fields do not have direct application but rather set possibilities and have implications for activity. Applied linguists, I suggested earlier (Spolsky, 1970), are somewhat like little boys with hammers looking for something to hit; one notes the ease with which some of them moved from structurally based language textbooks to transformational exercises. A much more reasonable discussion of the relevance of linguistic theory to education is presented in the chapter by Richard Hudson. At the same time, as the work of Labov and other sociolinguists has shown us, all varieties of language and their uses are contextualized in social settings, depending on common co-construction and the interplay of social and linguistic structures and patterns. That gives importance to the fields of sociolinguistics and sociology of language presented by Rajend Mesthrie. Much of the understanding of social contextualization was also a result of work in the foundation field of linguistic anthropology, discussed in the chapter by Stanton Wortham. The inevitable effect of code choice on power relationships, the realization that choice of language for school and other functions has major power to include or exclude individuals, has taught many people to take what is often called a "critical" approach and ask who benefits from decisions about choice. Thus, while educational linguistics tries like most other disciplines to achieve a measure of scientific objectivity, it is often committed and regularly interpreted as being on one side or the other in the politics of education. These aspects are discussed in a chapter on the political matrix of linguistic ideologies by Mary McGroarty. It is finally important to note that linguistics is not the sole core area, but educational linguistics draws equally on such other relevant fields as anthropology, sociology, politics, psychology, and education itself. This opening section is tied together by an essay by Joseph Lo Bianco on educational linguistics and education systems.

In the centre of the volume, we include 25 chapters dealing with specific themes or sub-areas of educational linguistics that show the synthesis of the knowledge from the theoretical foundations in Part I. The first group of papers in this part picks up my original question about the nature of the language barrier between home and school (Spolsky, 1971, 1974a). A chapter by Stephen L. Walter reviews the evidence concerning the choice of language of

instruction in schools: all major empirical studies support the UNESCO-proclaimed belief in the value of initial instruction in the language that children bring with them from home, and suggest that it takes at least five or six years of careful preparation in some model of bilingual education before most pupils are ready to benefit fully from instruction in the national official school language. Unfortunately, the reality is far different, with the majority of governments and education departments satisfying themselves with at most one year of preparation before launching into teaching in a standard language.

Other chapters look at the home–school gap. Iliana Reyes and Luis C. Moll focus on cultural as well as linguistic differences between home and school. Jeffrey Reaser and Carolyn Temple Adger tackle the difficult situation that arises when the home language is stigmatized as a dialect or nonstandard. In the next chapter, Samuel J. Supalla and Jody H. Cripps consider the relevance of the language barrier to the education of the Deaf, a group now increasingly recognized by some as analogous to a linguistic or ethnic minority. In a chapter by Carolyn McKinney and Bonny Norton, new definitions of literacy are shown to be related to developments of multiple identities in modern societies. In the final chapter in this group, dealing with postcolonialism and globalization in language education, Hyunjung Shin and Ryuko Kubota attempt to analyze causes, looking at the effects of colonization and its aftermaths and the growing pressure of globalization.

The second group of chapters in this part deals specifically with language education policy and management. The chapter by Brian North describes work in Europe to define common goals for foreign language teaching, the major effort to revise language teaching in Europe in response to the development of the European Community. The second chapter in the section, by Richard B. Baldauf, Jr., Minglin Li, and Shouhui Zhao, considers language teaching inside and outside schools. The third chapter, on language cultivation in developed contexts by Jiří Nekvapil, presents the theories and practices of language management cultivation initially developed by the Prague School of linguists who were interested in the elaboration of developed literary languages at a time when the American school of language planning was tending to concentrate on the issues faced by previously underdeveloped languages. M. Paul Lewis and Barbara Trudell next describe the work continuing with language cultivation in underdeveloped contexts, such as the development of writing systems, the choices involved in adapting vernacular languages to school and other uses, and the sharing of functions with standard languages. In a chapter on ecological language education policy, Nancy H. Hornberger and Francis M. Hult explore specific directions for the application of the ecology of language approach to the study of language policy and planning in education. Writing about education for speakers of endangered languages, Teresa L. McCarty, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, and Ole Henrik Magga look at the extreme cases, presenting arguments for the involvement of education systems in the preservation of endangered languages. The final chapter in this section by Yun-Kyung Cha and Seung-Hwan Ham adds a note of realism or sounds the tocsin,

presenting evidence of the rapid invasion of primary education throughout the world by the spread of English and its impact.

In the third group of articles in this part, the central theme is literacy. Thirty years ago, one might have been satisfied with a chapter on the teaching of reading, but now there is separate treatment of literacy in general by Glynda A. Hull and Gregorio Hernandez, vernacular and indigenous literacies by Kendall A. King and Carol Benson, religious and sacred literacies by Jonathan M. Watt and Sarah L. Fairfield, and the particular approaches to multiliteracies that have developed out of M. A. K. Halliday's alternative view of linguistic theory in a chapter on genre and register in multiliteracies by Mary Macken-Horarik and Misty Adoniou. Literacy is much more than reading, as studies of the various functions and varied literacy environments is starting to show.

The fourth group of papers in Part II picks up major themes in second language acquisition, a term, coined after the transformational revolution, that is perhaps crying out for a new name as it adds social context to psycholinguistic models. Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig and Llorenç Comajoan tackle the problem of the order of acquisition that started to be studied in the light of Chomsky's claim that language was innate rather than learned. Kathleen C. Riley takes a different perspective, looking at research encouraged by anthropology into the process of language socialization. The next three chapters cover what have become traditional second language acquisition themes: the nature of interlanguage and the influences one language has on learning another language (Peter Skehan); the extent to which the language learner is able to reach the proficiency or competence level of the native speaker and whether this is biologically or otherwise determined (David Birdsong and Jee Paik); and the continuing debate as to whether natural exposure to a new language must be supplemented by explicit teaching and focus on forms (Rod Ellis).

The last five chapters in this part deal with language assessment, not just as 20 years ago they might have done by simply describing various kinds of language testing, but now starting with a sociologically anchored and ethically informed discussions of language assessment for inclusion or exclusion (immigrants, asylum seekers, minorities) with Lyle F. Bachman and James E. Purpura asking whether language assessment acts as Gate-Keeper or Door Opener. The chapter by Ari Huhta describes recent work in diagnostic and formative assessment, the difficulty of which is slowly being made clear. In the next chapter, Alan Davies discusses ethical approaches to accountability and standards, recognizing the tensions that remain unresolved. Next, the potential of scales and frameworks, increasingly used but still challenged, is discussed by Neil Jones and Nick Saville. Finally, the effects of attempts at national standardization particularly in the United States, are analyzed by Micheline Chalhoub-Deville and Craig Deville. The recurring interest in language use and policy relevance is evident.

The third part of the book has a number of chapters exploring the relationship between research and practice. Teresa Pica summarizes recent work on task-based learning, moving emphasis from form to use. Susan M. Conrad and

Kimberly R. LeVelle outline developments in instructional approaches that take advantage of current work in corpus linguistics: taking advantage of the computer, we now have access to information about language use that would once have taken decades of painstaking work to obtain. Interaction, output, and communicative language learning are described in a chapter by Merrill Swain and Watara Suzuki. Lesley Rex and Judith Green look at actual language use inside the classroom. Carol Chapelle describes current trends in computer-assisted language learning, a field I was working on 40 years ago in Bloomington but that has grown with the greater power of computers. The final chapters open wider perspectives. Leo van Lier presents an ecological perspective on educational linguistics within the context of semiotics. There are two concluding and summarizing chapters. Frances Bailey, Beverley Burkett, and Donald Freeman present a classroom agenda in which they tackle the complex question of what educational linguistics the language teacher should know. In the final chapter, Paola Uccelli and Catherine Snow propose a research agenda for the field, identifying gaps that remain untackled.

This is an appropriate place to express thanks and appreciation to the people (Ada Brunstein, Sarah Coleman, Danielle Descoteaux, and Haze Humbert) at Blackwell Publishing, now incorporated in John Wiley & Sons, for the idea of this series and this volume, and for all their help in producing it. Especial thanks to my co-editor, Francis Hult, who took a full share of planning the volume and a larger measure of the detailed tasks of seeing it through to press. Of course, our greatest debt of gratitude is to the contributors: presented with a title and a suggestion of scope, they have written fascinating chapters which do not merely describe but also advance significantly their piece of the field.

This handbook describes and celebrates 30 years of research and publication in the field of educational linguistics relevant to language education management. The individual chapters trace the breadth of interest and offer innovative views of past developments and possible future trends. While there are probably good pragmatic reasons why the field will never be fully institutionalized (there are programs in educational linguistics at only a few pioneering universities), the book will provide guidance for those working in a variety of academic departments and especially for those training others to participate.

Looking at the history of the last century, it is encouraging to note that there has been improvement in the number of people with access to education, especially in less developed parts of the world and in particular for women. But it is regrettable that this increase in quantity has not been reflected in any dramatic improvement in quality. A good deal of the blame falls, we argue, on the failure to deal with the language barrier to education and the matching failure to remedy the effects of hegemonic monolingual education in a language not well enough known by the richly pluralistic pupils in schools. The field of educational linguistics offers a way to tackle this issue, and the increasing professionalization of the field signaled among other things by the publication of this handbook is an important step in this process.

REFERENCES

Cooper, Robert L. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corson, David (ed.) (1997). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (8 vols.). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Davies, Alan. (2006). Review of directions in applied linguistics: Essays in honour of Robert B. Kaplan. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(3), 534–537.

Schumann, John H. (2006). Summing up: Some themes in the cognitive neuroscience of second language acquisition. *Language Learning Journal*, 56(s1), 313–319.

Spolsky, Bernard (1970). Linguistics and language pedagogy: Applications or implications? In James E. Alatis (ed.), *Twentieth Annual Round Table on Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 143–155). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Spolsky, Bernard (1971). The language barrier to education. In George E. Perren (ed.), *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language* (pp. 8–17). London: CILT.

Spolsky, Bernard (1974a). Linguistics and the language barrier to education. In Thomas A. Sebeok, Arthur S. Abramson, Dell Hymes, Herbert Rubenstein, Edward Stankiewicz, & Bernard Spolsky (eds.), *Current Trends in Linguistics: Linguistics and adjacent Arts and Sciences* (vol. 12, pp. 2027–2038). The Hague: Mouton.

Spolsky, Bernard (1974b). The Navajo Reading Study: an illustration of the scope and nature of educational linguistics. In J. Quistgaard, H. Schwarz, & H. Spong-Hanssen (eds.), *Applied Linguistics: Problems and Solutions: Proceedings of the Third Congress on Applied Linguistics, Copenhagen, 1972* (vol. 3, pp. 553–565). Heidelberg: Julius Gros Verlag.

Spolsky, Bernard. (1978). *Educational Linguistics: An Introduction*. Rowley, MA: New bury House.

Spolsky, Bernard (ed.) (1999). *Concise Encyclopedia of Educational Linguistics*. Amsterdam/New York: Elsevier.

Stubbs, Michael (1986). *Educational Linguistics*. Oxford/New York: Basil Blackwell.