Diglossia and Language Legitimacy:
Examining how divergences in languages function as discourses of power.

Neil Matthew Addison

Abstract: *It is the intention of this paper to pursue the argument that diglossia exists as a tool of control which can restrict the access of lower language status speakers to global discourse. Starting with Bakhtin's definition of language as heteroglot, this paper will proceed with an analysis of Fergusson's diglossia, and attempts will be made to analyze what diglossia is, and how it leads to conflict between high status and dialectical language users. English's role as a high status language is also examined, and it is argued that English, whilst offering opportunity and emancipation for some language learners, can also operate as a barrier to progress for others. This paper will then pursue the argument that, due to the relationship between English and economic market forces, English ultimately bestows the most advantages and power upon language users from native speaker countries, and in doing so threatens to marginalize the position of other languages. Finally this discussion will conclude by looking at what can be done to avoid the exclusion of other languages and language users from access to global voice.*

1. Language Divergences.

Language use can be examined in terms of gender, age, occupation, formality, education and geography. Brown and Hatch argue that "one area of dialect geography that is especially important...(is) the difference in word use between Australian, Canadian, American and British dialects" (Hatch, 1995: 302), whilst also noting that men and women often select different word choices from the same semiotic system. For example they argue that "women are much more likely than men to use specific colour terms like 'ecru', 'lavender' and 'beige'" (307). However, language use, language definition, and knowledge about language, can also be defined in terms of commodity use value, and this in turn has a discrete but specifiable relationship to power. Mikhail M. Bakhtin referred to this struggle for

language ownership as heteroglossia, and maintained that contained within a language there were several ever present voices and meanings which "operate in the midst of heteroglossia" (Morris, 1994: 75).   These voices competing for power within languages included genres, social dialects, regional dialects and standardised, unified national varieties.   Furthermore, Bakhtin defined language as embedded in ideology, having been "completely taken over, shot through with intentions and accents...it has lived a socially charged life" (Danow, 1991: 25).   Read in terms defined by Bakhtin, the linguistic sign can be seen as a socially and culturally signified matrix which operates in constant flux, and which is "at any given moment of its historical existence...heteroglot from top to bottom" (Bakhtin, 1981: 296).

The meaning of the sign is opposed by the weaker classes and legitimized by the dominant classes in an ongoing struggle.   This struggle, which sees language imbued with positive and negative signification, ultimately reflects status and power.   For example, the Japanese word for you, anata, can have a marked use, depending on the age, gender or status of the user; being in certain cases employed vocatively by wives addressing husbands, or patronisingly by offspring addressing aged parents or grandparents (Muhlhauser et al, 1990: 8).   English words can be subtly wielded by men to connote themselves in positive terms, and women in pejorative terms, through the employment of terms such as bachelor vs. old maid, or tailor vs. seamstress (Hatch, 1995: 307).   Language use also reflects geopolitical and culturally hegemonic realities; words from one variety of English can overlap and encroach upon another, such as American terms like movie, apartment, semester and guys becoming more prevalent in British English (Redman, 1997).   Therefore, whilst language can change and switch semantically over time, it is common in heterogeneous communities that the language of the most socially powerful group or entity is considered the official language.   Schjerve argues that in this situation "it is used in all domains of communication, whereas the language of the subordinate group is reduced to the status of a dialect" (Schjerve, 2003: 46) whilst McArthur observes that "a dialect is a language variety that has everything going for it except the schools, middle class, the law and the armed forces" (Swann, 2005: 63).

2.   Diglossia and Language Hierarchies.

Ferguson (1959) argued that language slowly but inevitably diverged into two manifest forms: a standardised national variety and a vernacular

dialect.   Bakhtin (1981) had referred to social dialects from a literary theory perspective, but Fergusson defined them through empirical observation, denoting how they function within language.   Ferguson employed the term diglosia, to represent a "relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language...there is a very divergent, highly codified...superimposed variety" (Ferguson, 1959: 435).   Fergusson, therefore, saw a diglossic situation as one which occurred in a society with two distinct codes which manifest distinct separation of function. Furthermore, he made a distinction between these two sets of codes as being employed in either high circumstances or low circumstances (see Figure 1 below).

Figure 1.   High and Low Varieties of Language (Ferguson, 1959: 431)

	H	L
Sermon in church or mosque	x	
Instruction to servants, waiters, workmen, clerks		x
Personal letter	x	
Speech in parliament, political speech	x	
University lecture	x	
Conversation with family, friends, colleagues		x
News broadcast	x	
Radio "soap opera"		x
Newspaper editorial, news story, caption on picture	x	
Caption on political cartoon		x
Poetry	x	
Folk literature	x	

For Ferguson, the high code would increasingly dominate, eventually resolving into a single standardized language, and he notes that this occurs when "leaders of the community begin to call for unification of the language...actual trends towards unification take place" (Fergusson, 1959: 436). Similarly, Del Hymes claimed that within a heterogeneous speech community "there will be language hierarchies, whereby one's language may have power over, and affect the other" (Brumfit, 1987: 19).   This split will inevitably occur within language communities because, as Orwell maintains, "the educated classes lose touch with the manual workers" (Orwell, 1948: 35), whilst successfully bridging this schism would entail language being "the joint creation of poets and manual workers" (39).   This concept of a high and low dialectical schism in language was supported by

Brown and Gilman (1960), who argued that diglossia gifted specific individuals the ability to control the behaviour of others.   They provided evidence that the use of certain pronouns in language could be used as an expression of solidarity or, conversely, power (Brown and Gilman, 1960: 253), whilst Rubin's (1962) studies in bilingualism in Paraguay explored dialectical relations of power between socially unequal speech agents. These studies illustrated how a socially superior giver of the code placed himself/herself in a position of power whilst placing the onus on the receiver to respond with honorific forms (Rubin, 1962: 52).

Fishman (1967: 29) hypothesized that diglossia could be extended to societies where two forms of distant or unrelated languages occupy the high and low stations, such as Sanskrit and Kannada in India, and pursued the argument that the high language was used for prestige situations, such as the religious, educational, and literary domain, whilst the low status language was used in primary, spoken domains.   Those who fall into the subordinate group may not possess the same opportunities to acquire reading and writing skills as the more powerful group.   The standardization of Indian Hindustani, which was completed after the departure of the British, was achieved by borrowings and adaptations from classical Sanskrit (Coulmas 1989: 11).   With no mass education program, those Indians with no knowledge of Sanskrit would fall into a linguistically subordinate position, and Spear noted that "seventeen years after independence seventy five percent of Indians are still illiterate" (Spear, 1970: 248).   However, Memmi blamed European colonial powers for enforcing diglossia, accusing them of convincing native and indigenous peoples that their language was inadequate and that European speech was the higher language (Burke et al, 1991: 207).   For example, the Castillian language was employed by Spain from 1492 as an ideological "tool for conquest abroad and a weapon to suppress untutored speech at home" (Philipson, 1992: 47), whilst during the 19th century, the native population of Lombardy were controlled by their Haspburg masters through the hidden diglossia of cultural production and propaganda (Schjerve, 2003: 229).   Before Sanskrit, English was employed by the British in India as a barometer for determining how far one could progress.   The British Empire imposed English on its Indian subjects whilst also employing the language as a means of measuring ability within the Imperial system (James, 1999: 346).   Access to an English language education which could enable Indians to rise within the system depended on wealth and standing.   For example, James observed that the government "transferred available funds to urban secondary schools where places were taken by boys whose parents were rich...India's peasantry remained un-

touched by the new learning" (1999: 346).   A hierarchal order of language learning and use based on wealth and status was maintained, which was in turn a recreation of the educational class divide that existed in Britain (Thompson, 1968).

3.   Diglossia and Restricted Codes.

Bernstein (1973) claimed that a form of dialectical diglossia prevented working class children from developing their full intelligence potential, due to them speaking a restricted code of language, whilst middle class public school children employed an elaborated kind.   Bernstein's model was based on a study of British middle class and working class mothers' orientation towards specific forms of language, and hence the effect this had upon their children.   The results of this study by the Sociological Research Unit of the University of London led Bernstein to proclaim that "linguistic codes are realizations of social structure and both shape the contents of social roles and the process by which they are learned" (Bernstein, 1973: 40). Comparisons can be drawn between Bernstein's categories and Orwell's fictional Newspeak, which was wielded by the totalitarian 'Big Brother' in his novel 1984.   Fowler and Hodge observe that "Orwell seems to have anticipated Bernstein's categories" (Fowler, et al, 1979: 10).   In the novel, Syme describes the process of 'Newspeak' as "cutting the language down to the bone" (Orwell, 1984: 48), whilst in the appendix Orwell elaborated further on this concept, explaining that Newspeak was designed "not to extend but to diminish the range of thought and this purpose was indirectly assisted by cutting the choice of words down to a minimum" (1984: 258). Fowler and Hodge point out that "Newspeak turns out to be a particular kind of restricted code, one specifically designed for the ruling class" (Fowler et al, 1979: 10).

This deterministic view of language can be traced to the work of both Edward Sapir and Benjamin Whorf (1970), who separately argued that people with different languages have differing thoughts, views and perceptions.   Sapir claimed that "Languages are more to us than systems of thought transference" (Sapir, 1970: 221), instead maintaining that "they are invisible garments that drape themselves about our spirit and give a predetermined form to all its symbolic expression" (221).   Therefore, for Sapir, language can restrict and determine thought, and he argued that "the word, as we know it, is not only a key; it may also be a fetter" (Fowler, 1991: 28).   Similarly, Bernstein held that elaborated or restricted codes affected cognitive forms of expression, arguing that this was because the later

group's instruction is didactic, in which his restricted code "emphasizes operations rather than principles" (Bernstein, 1973: 40). He claimed that middle class mothers employed an "elaborated code, (which renders the implicit explicit)" whereas working class mothers employed "a restricted code (which reduces the possibility of such explicitness)" (1973: 40).

In relation to Bernstein's research, critics of English's role as a global language have argued that the paradigm of elaborated and restrictive codes can be employed as a method of evaluating its specifiable role to power. Said argued that English subjugated those Arab students who were forced to learn it, and cited the example of a particular English teaching program employed in one of the Gulf States, maintaining that these students "learned English to use computers, respond to orders, transmit telexes, decipher manifests and so forth. That was all" (Said, 1993: 368-69). However, whilst some scholars maintain that diglossia creates a division between elaborated and restricted codes, denying the subordinate group access to expression, other researchers point out the lack of empirical evidence for this. Whilst Whorf held that thought is structured by the availability of signs in the operational lexicon, arguing that "the objects of our perceptions can be strongly influenced by the availability of and customs in the use of a lexicon" (Muhlhauser et al, 1990: 6) Muhlhauser and Harre argue that the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis possesses a crude depth of variation. Instead they maintain that too much attention is paid to the relativity of language and its specialist vocabulary, claiming that "the proliferation of a specialist vocabulary is a common intralanguage phenomenon, susceptible of common sense explanation" (1990: 6). Furthermore, Brumfit observes that "Bernstein's 'elaborated/restricted codes' were based on abstract model construction and hypothesizing" which was "only slightly put to any kind of empirical test" (Brumfit, 2001: 38).

4. Diglossia and Linguistic Resistance.

Whilst linguistic diglossia can be employed by dominant groups as a tool for exploitation and control, high status languages can also be employed by those learning them as a tool for protest and creativity. A language can escape the hold of those who control it, and can be modified and recreated by a learner's employment of it, therefore making it, as Brumfit argues, "open ended and unrepressive in effect" (Brumfit, 2006: 41). Language is not, as Brumfit notes "fixed 'out there' and we do not possess it once we acquire it; more accurately, we perform with it in order to make it" (Brumfit, 2006: 29). Similarly, Halliday argues that it is possible for us to transcend

our particular semiotic code, arguing that the speaker can "see through and around the settings of his semantic system...in doing so, he is seeing reality in a new light, like Alice in looking-glass house" (Halliday, 1978: 31).   Therefore, critics of the restricted code model argue that learners of languages such as English often engage with what they are learning actively and creatively, extending their repertoire whilst doing so.   Crystal maintains that English is open ended, claiming "nobody owns it anymore" (Crystal, 2004: 2), whilst Coulmas disagrees with a model of language as conditioned by the social organization of the participants involved, and argues that language "is quasi-latent because it is the common property of all" (Coulmas, 1992: 66).   If language can be commercially acquired and learnt then it becomes a malleable tool to be employed by the individual for his or her own purposes, and the concept of diaspora, which analyses the cultural impact of population dispersion and travel across borders, can be extended to an analysis of language use (Osgerby 2004: 172).   The diaspora model argues that local communities actively engage with commodities such as language, creatively re-embedding them and their meaning within local cultures and contexts.

Groups of people can display their oppositional status to a dominant society through relexicalisation; the process of replacing old words for new, such as in the speech practices of teenagers (Halliday, 1978: 31).   Halliday claims that the "simplest form taken by an anti-language is that of new words for old; it is a language relexicalized" (1978: 165).   Another determining factor in how far the subordinate group can successfully subvert power is how they employ their own low code or dialect.   Scott argues that the power elite's "victims retain considerable autonomy to construct a life and culture not entirely controlled by the dominant class" (Scott, 1985: 328).   He claims that "when the workers gather together with the other labourers and smallholders their discourse is different from what one would hear if the bosses were present" (1985: 329).   Scott argues that this on-stage and off-stage linguistic behavior is "a necessary condition for the development of symbolic resistance" (1985: 329).   In specific relation to English, Searle raised a challenge to language learners and users to re-invent the language, arguing that "we seek to grasp that same language and give it a new context, to decolonise its words...making it a vehicle of liberation" (Pennycook, 1998: 68).

More recently, there has been a shift from high to low language use in the differing media outlets of many societies, as this symbolic resistance reaches increasingly into the inner circle (Osgerby, 2004: 172).   This has been seen

through the development of television which is almost totally of the low variety, such as reality TV, make over programs and talk shows.   The use of high value language on these popular formats would seem unnatural or stilted, and those appearing on them have been seen to adopt low value language, which would historically have been perceived as highly vulgar. In some cases, powerful or socially prominent figures have even been observed to adopt the low status language familiar to these programs when appearing on them.   Whilst during the 19th century Dickens portrayed the villainous Uriah Heep as "a man who drops his aitches" (Orwell, 1970: 113) by the late 1990s the U.K Independent reported that Prime Minister Tony Blair had dropped his aitches when appearing on a popular talk show (Wheatcroft, 1998: 1).

However, whilst Blair could be seen to employ the dialectical English of the lower variety, this did not necessarily mean that linguistic power had shifted to the subordinate group.   In the wake of a conservative government, and changing social trends, more recent performers on U.K television have been reported by the U.K Guardian to have employed upper class accents, as refined language has arguably become more socially acceptable (Becket, 2009: 1).   Furthermore, new trends, styles and dialectical words created by the subordinate group can be quickly assimilated into the media mainstream, stripping them of their subordinate power.   Grenfell notes that "the paradox seemed to be that...as soon as it gets recognized it gets absorbed into the establishment" (Grenfell, 2004: 103).   Whilst Crystal contends that it is "perfectly possible (as the example of rapping suggests) for a linguistic fashion to be started by a group of second – or foreign language learners" (Crystal, 2004: 173) Gorman observes that "not long after rap's appearance as a powerful music of resistance, it was incorporated into corporate advertising strategies" (Gorman et al, 2003: 257).   Therefore, virtually any form of expression, including language, can be co-opted, re-branded and legitimized as the language of the dominant linguistic group. Language can be contested and subverted by agents on the periphery, but it can also be incorporated and re-designated in meaning by whichever dominant language group controls the media.

5.   Diglossia and Legitimacy of Meaning.

Within a language, words are at the centre of a diglossic class struggle for the right to make things mean, and, whilst symbolic language resistance can enter the linguistic mainstream, in the age of a global news media the English language can be co-opted and re-branded in meaning by powerful

interests.   Huxley argues that the press "are among the most powerful weapons in the dictator's armory" (Huxley, 1983: 59), whilst Said holds that news broadcasting attempts to "signify moral power and approval for whomever they designate" (Said, 1993: 374).   The modern news media operates as a diglossic force, bestowing legitimacy or inferiority on specific groups through the use of specific language, and Fowler notes how the U.K news media employed pejorative language and bestial terms such as "mad dog", and "rat" (Fowler, 1991: 117/8) during air attacks on Libya by British troops.   Fowler argues that "this makes it quite clear the perceptions of Arabs as non-human, bestial" (Fowler, 1991: 117/8).   Furthermore, the pejorative word terrorism, which describes an agent "who uses or favors violent and intimidating methods of coercing a government or community" (Thompson, 1995: 440), has been frequently employed by the United States and its news media towards those threatening its interests.   Chomsky notes the irony inherent within this context, observing that "the current leader of the 'War on Terror' is the only state in the world that's been condemned by the World Court for international terrorism" (Chomsky, 2003: 50).   The news media and powerful political interests can switch and change the previous meanings and connotations of words, giving legitimacy to the updated definition.   Chomsky highlights the re-branding of the term ground zero, which was previously used to designate the central detonation point of an atomic bomb, observing how the term has been employed by U.S administrations and news media outlets since 2011 to describe the square beneath the former World Trade Centre.   Chomsky argues that the deployment of this term rhetorically accentuates the already dramatic and destructive nature of the event, whilst also noting how the rebranding of this word "doesn't exist in people's consciousness.   Almost nobody thinks of it" (2003: 16).

Whilst the U.S news media selects and employs powerful language to describe injustices suffered by the United States, euphemistic terms are often employed when the U.S is the aggressor.   Fowler examines how language is employed in war, highlighting the euphemistic employment of terms such as "protective reactions" and "pacification, defoliation" (Fowler et al, 1979: 23) by the media whilst reporting on U.S bombing missions in Vietnam. Fowler claims that the U.S B52 pilots who, during bombing runs, referred to the exercise as a series of protective reactions were "not necessarily conspiring to falsify reality through the misuse of language.   The phrase was routine" Fowler, et al, 1979: 23).   People can therefore be seen to implicitly fall into the use of such language, because of its perceived legitimacy. Grenfell argues that this top down re-appropriation of language serves to

"enter into the human consciousness and unconscious as a kind of mental colonization of thinking" (Grenfell, 2004: 167), whilst Bourdieu refers to this re-designation of language by powerful groups as "symbolic power" (Bourdieu, 1991: 170), which creates a belief in "the legitimacy of words and those who use them" (1991: 170).

Political leaders and those from the dominant class with access to the news media are able to place emphasis upon specific words, give them specific connotations and hence bestow legitimacy upon them.   For example, in economic language, the financial markets are often described by those at the centre of power as dynamic and progressive, whilst the state, with its Keynesian history, is described as backward (Grenfell, 2004: 129).   In a 2006 speech, Tony Blair equated "victory" with "globalization", and claimed that "the way for us to handle the challenge of globalization is to compete better...more flexibly" (Blair, 2006: 1).   However the term globalization, whilst connoting a liberal, inclusive meaning, is argued by others to represent an exclusive process concerned with the concentration of power and the maximization of wealth.   Chomsky argues that globalization is "geared to the interests of private power, manufacturing corporations and financial institutions, closely linked to powerful states" (Chomsky, 2000: 1).   Whilst Blair equates globalization with victory, the inequality resulting from these global processes has led to many third world countries falling heavily into debt, and in turn having their public sectors exposed to aggressive Western enforced privatization (Mander, 2001: 82).   People from the weaker classes, however, can implicitly fall into using language such as globalization, flexibility, and liberalization of trade which may not serve their interests, whilst paradoxically defending things that in other times they would wish to change (Grenfell, 2004: 129).   This is due to the legitimacy which such language connotes, especially when it is wielded in the media by the dominant classes, meaning that the terms of any debate are already constructed in ways which connote and establish positive and negative values to respective concepts within it.   Bourdieu refers to this phenomenon as linguistic "misrecognition of arbitrariness" (Bourdieu 1991: 79), in which people are convinced to believe in the value, or lack of value, of an ideological discourse through the way language is employed by the dominant group.

6. Diglossia and English.

English is used and employed by more people globally than any other language, and by 2004 Crystal observed that around 1.5 billion people were

competent in it (Crystal, 2004: 68).   However, whilst English offers opportunities for emancipation, Cystal also acknowledges that there is "the closet of links between language and power" (2004: 128).   Moreover, Howatt and Widdowson argue that English is used by powerful countries like the United States and the United Kingdom to exercise "hegemonic dominion...through control of the media, and of economic, cultural and commercial globalization" (Howatt et al, 2004: 359).   One who now wishes to obtain global recognition as a writer, scientist or politician must engage with English either directly or through translation.   This situation is historically analogous to Medieval Latin, which was practically the only subject of instruction in the schools from the era of Alcuin to the time of Bacon and Hook (Balcon, et al, 1948: 18).   From Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum (1948) to Leeuwenhoek's groundbreaking work in microbiology (Bernal, 1969: 467) and Newton's Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica, (Bixby, 1964: 134) all important political, scientific, historical and artistic literature had to be written and submitted in Latin, and those without a command of the language were excluded from entering scholastic and academic circles (Balcon, et al, 1948: 18).   Today English has become a similarly necessary language commodity to acquire, due to its position as a "gatekeeper to positions of prestige in society" (Pennycook, 1998: 14) affording access to international disciplines such as science, technology and culture.   English has also been employed as a powerful educational barometer, such as in Kenya where it became the main determinant of a child's progress (1998: 14), whilst also being employed as a means of stemming dissent, as in the case of Sri Lanka, where, at the end of 1989, the government attempted to disarm its poorest classes from violent protest by making English a compulsory school subject for all (Burke et al, 1991: 208).   Due to the political and economic power of English speaking countries such as the United States and Britain, twinned with the growth of disciplines such as applied linguistics and ELT, some scholars, such as Pennycook, argue that English has become imbued with an authoritative, disciplinary effect (Pennycook, 1998: 97), whilst Phillipson (1999) links English's status as a diglossic language directly to the poverty of those in post-colonial countries who speak only low status languages.   He argues that "the majority of the populations in post colonial states are governed in a language they do not understand, and live in abject conditions" (Phillipson, 1999: 268).

Whilst diglossic divisions between high and dialectical languages may become established for a variety of complex historical and geopolitical reasons, these divisions can be actively enforced and encouraged at a

governmental level.   For example, Central Peninsula Spanish is promoted by the Instituto Cervantes as a high status form of Spanish, whilst the Instituto refers to other versions of Spanish as secondary varieties (Mar-Molinero, 2006: 86).   However, whilst Mar-Molinero argues that this "denotes a position of inferiority" (2006: 86) she maintains that this may be performed "consciously or unconsciously by the Instituto Cervantes" (2006: 86).   In contrast, Phillipson claims that English's position as a diaglossic language is not unconsciously or accidently enforced, arguing that "it has been British and American government policy since the mid 1950s to establish English as a universal 'second language', so as to protect and promote capitalist interests" (Pennycook, 1998: 22).   This policy is specifically identifiable with a historical sea change which took place in macroeconomics; the collapse of the Bretton Woods economic system and the subsequent Western rejection of Keynesian economics during the OPEC oil crisis of 1973 (Hertz, 2001: 23).   The rise to prominence of laissez faire economics also precipitated a shift in language policy and language teaching towards the newer oil based economic system (Brumfit, 2001: 118), and this is reflected in the British Council's 1987/88 report, which identifies that "Britain's real black gold is not North Sea Oil but the English language" (Phillipson, 1992: 48).

This policy was specifically illustrated at a governmental level in 1988 when Chris Patten, the U.K minister for overseas development, announced the textbooks for Africa project, designed to get surplus textbooks into African schools to aid the U.K economy (Phillipson, 1992: 48).   In addition, whilst the British Council has claimed on its website that "our purpose is to build mutually beneficial relationships between people in the UK and other countries" (British Council, 2006: 1), the Council has opened offices in lucrative markets such as China and the Gulf, whilst closing a number of offices in countries judged of little strategic or economic importance. Despite expressing a "strong belief in internationalism" (2006: 1), the Council's decision to proceed with the closure of the Belarus office prompted Parliamentary criticism.   In response, the former Minister for Europe, Peter Hain, told the House of Commons that "the decision to close the British Council operation in Minsk followed a strategic review by the Council designed to maximize effectiveness world wide" (House of Commons, 2001: 1).   This statement underlines the primary interest of the Council, which involves the pursuit of economic gain through exploiting the commodity value of English.   More recently, U.S based ETS, the administrator of TOEIC and TOEFL, which administers English tests in more than 180 countries worldwide (ETS, 2012: 1) has been accused of failing to pay

taxes in Korea on tests which cost 25 billion won in annual fees (Young-jin, 2009: 1).   This is despite the findings of a 2008 Korean policy paper, which found that "the high dependency on foreign English proficiency tests means 23 billion won...flowing out of Korea each year" (Da-ye, 2012: 1).   In light of these findings, Korean Minister for Education Ahn Byong-man is pushing for the implementation of a state developed English test (Young-jin, 2009: 1), affirming that "I am sure that it is just a matter of time before all schools start to use it" (2009: 1).

English can therefore be seen to occupy the centre ground in an economic battle between nations and language hierarchies.   There is a strong correlation between diglossia and economic power, and Coulmas notes that "money and language are among the most important social institutions" (Coulmas, 1992: 5).   This is most strikingly expressed by the British Council's 1987/88 Annual report, where it observed that its challenge regarding English was to "exploit it to the full" (Phillipson, 1992: 48). Whilst exploiting English, however, it has not been British policy to encourage the growth and learning of other languages within the European community which could challenge English's status.   The former U.K Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher actively opposed the LINGUA program of the European Community, which sought to mandate a foreign language education policy for the member states.   Coulmas observed that from Thatcher's point of view "Britain was asked to pay for a program which... benefited her country least" (Coulmas, 1992: 87).

7.   Diglossia and Language Death.

Due to the power and spread of English as a high status diglossic language, Gerhard Stickel, President of the European Federation of National Institutions for Language, fears that in 50 years from now most European Languages, such as Italian, German and Dutch will be reduced to the status of a dialect due to the supremacy of English.   He argues that (Stickel, 2006: 1):

> As a single language of common use in the EU, English would be bound up with the danger of diglossia...Eventually all important matters in economics, science and politics would be treated only in English.   One dark day in the future, the only remaining domains for all the other languages would be those of the family, friends and folklore.

Stickel's pessimistic scenario is that in the future the world will largely

communicate in creolized English, whilst Krauss predicts that "the next century will see the death or the doom of 90% of the world's languages" (1992: 7).   Knight argues that half of all the world's languages face extinction this century (2004: 1), whilst Anderson observes that "what is lost when a language is lost is another world...valuable ethnographic and cultural information disappears when a language is lost" (Knight, 2004: 1).   Furthermore, Harrison notes how this effects, and will continue to effect cognitive research, observing that "each language lost leaves a gap in our understanding of the variable cognitive structures of which the human brain is capable" (2004: 1).   However, whilst Crystal notes that language death is "an intellectual and social tragedy" (Crystal: 2000: 20), he also observes that "big languages have been killing off little languages through-out history" (Crystal: 2000: 20).   Therefore, whilst the prospect of a creolized English world is depressing, it is somewhat problematic to affix a preservation order on specific languages when all languages are continually in flux.   Brumfit argues that "we have to protect the individual's right to practice their language if they wish to, but the right has to be permissive, not compulsive in effect" (Brumfit, 2001: 136), whilst Stickel also affirms the importance of this position, claiming "let me say that no law should be passed for the protection of the German language" (Stickel, 2006: 3).

Other scholars have therefore proposed different models and paradigms to attempt to more subtly reverse diglossia, and to prevent domination of low status languages by high status languages.   Fishman's (1991) proposed Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) emphasized the importance of teaching lower status languages in schools, and employing them in the sphere of work, the media, and at political levels if language shift was to be reversed (Fishman, 1991: 395).   This approach therefore involved employing specific activities at each point of the GIDS scale to ensure continuous intergenerational communication of low status languages.   Similarly, Stickel argues that in order to avoid the danger of diglossia and subordination there should be "more commentaries on language in newspapers, on television and radio" (Stickel, 2006: 3). However, his model for avoiding diglossia in Europe advocates that "EU institutions should insist upon the use of more than one working language" (2006: 4).   Therefore, the educational goal for each European country should be the study and use of two foreign languages, or, as Stickel describes it, "the goal of M plus 2" (2006: 4).   Kachru stresses that this approach should be complimented and compounded by English teachers working in the field, arguing that it is important for such native speakers of English to achieve competence in the learner's language (Hedge, 1997: 40),

whilst Hedge maintains that "all native English speaking teachers should take great pains to learn foreign languages" (1997: 40).   This would immediately precipitate a more egalitarian relationship between English native speakers and learners, as the learners would on occasion become the teachers, and the teachers would on occasion become the learners, with the roles reversing and alternating, removing the implicit hierarchies involved in learning English.

8.   Conclusion.

Whilst some scholars correctly connect language with opportunity as well as restriction, it is clear that agents from a low status language group are at a disadvantage compared to those from a high status group.   Those from the former group will have to undergo the labor of learning a second language before they can gain access to a wider global voice, whilst agents from the high status group need not bother.   Stickel notes the inequality of this situation, observing that English native speakers have "become used to nearly everybody else being able to speak more or less good English" (Stickel, 2006: 4).   In this sense, diglossia is a tool of power, as whilst language may be open-ended and unrepressive in effect, it is less immediately accessible for those that acquire the low status language from birth than for those who have been brought up speaking a language which enjoys high currency on the world market.   As Schjerve argues "The burden of having to become bilingual is imposed on the subordinate group, which, in order to gain access to public communication, must learn the dominant language" (Schjerve, 2003: 47).

Therefore, in conclusion, this paper maintains that diglossia can be seen as a key and as a fetter; it maintains a hegemonic relationship between high and low language groups, whilst also affording agents from low status groups the chance for advancement and opportunity.   However, in the modern globalized world, opportunities are increasingly specifiable to language ability.   In order that these opportunities be more evenly distributed, the problem of diglossia needs to be fundamentally addressed, and it will be necessary to embark on developing and maintaining a more egalitarian world language policy, such as Stickel's M plus 2 paradigm.   If higher status code users can rely on using their own language in any given situation, and do not have to bother learning a foreign language, then the relationship between languages and language users cannot be said to be equal.

Bibliography.

Balcon, M, Blyton, W. J, Church, R, Ervine, J, Lord Gorell, Lehmann, J, Marriott, J. W, Pattison, B, Strong, L. A. G, Swinnerton, F, Thurburn, G, Weekley, E, 1948, *English Language and Literature: A Comprehensive Guide to the Study of English Literature, Language and Self Expression,* Odhams Press Ltd: London

Bakhtin, M. M, 1981, 'Discourse in the Novel', in *The Dialogic Imagination,* Ed. M. Holquist, University of Texas Press, (1935) 259-422

Beckett, A, 2009, Tory chic: the return of poshness, in *The Guardian,* retrieved 31/08/2012 from: http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2009/dec/16/the-return-of-poshness

Bernal, J. D, 1969, *Science in History Volume 2: The Scientific and Industrial Revolutions*, Penguin Books

Bernstein, B (ed.) 1973, Class, *Codes and Control: Volume 2: Applied Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*, Routledge & Kegan Paul: London

Bixby, W, 1964, *The Universe of Galileo and Newton*, Cassell: London

Blair, T, 2006, *Speech to the Los Angeles World Affairs Council*, Retrieved 03/09/2012 from: http://www.number10gov.uk/output/page9948.asp

Bourdieu, P, 1991, *Language and Symbolic Power*, Polity Press

British Council, 2006, 'British Council Home', Retrieved 01/09/2012 from: http://www.britishcouncil.org/home-about-us-facts-figures.htm

Brown, R. and A. Gilman (1960), 'The pronouns of power and solidarity', in T. A. Sebeok (ed.) *Style in Language*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 253-76

Brumfit, C. J, Johnson, K (eds.) 1987, Sixth impression, *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*, Oxford University Press

Brumfit, 2001, *Individual Freedom in Language Teaching*, Oxford University Press

Brumfit, C. J, 2006, 'A European Perspective on Language as Liminality.' In Mar-Molinero, 2005: 28-43

Burke, P, Porter, R (eds.) 1991, *Language, Self and Society: A Social History of Language*, Polity Press

Chomsky, N, 2003a, *Confronting the Empire*, Retrieved 26/09/2012 from: http://www.chomsky.info/talks/20030201.htm

Chomsky, N, 2003b, *Power and Terror: Post 9-11 Talks and Interviews*, Littlemore: Seven Stories Press

Coulmas, F, 1989, Language adaptation, in *Language Adaptation*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-25

Coulmas, F, 1992, *Language and Economy*, Blackwell Publishers

Crystal, D, 2000, 'On Trying to be Crystal-Clear: A Response to Phillipson', *Applied Linguistics*, 21/3, 415-423

Crystal, D, 2004, *English as a Global language*, Second Edition, Cambridge University Press

Danow, D. K, 1991, *The Thought of Mikhail Bakhtin: From Word to Culture*, MacMillan

Da-ye, K, 2012, Tests that make money, in *The Korea Times*, retrieved 31/09/2012 from: http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/biz/2012/10/328_109920.html

ETS, 2012, *ETS — Who We Are*, retrieved 31/09/2012 from: https://www.ets.org/about/who

Ferguson, C. F, 1959, 'Diglossia' *Word* 15: 429-439

Fishman, J. A. (1967) 'Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism', *Journal of Social Issues* 23 (2), 29-38

Fishman, J. A. (1991) *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Fowler, R, Hodge, B, Kress, G, Trew, T, 1979, *Language and Control*, Routledge & Kegan Paul: London

Fowler, R, 1991, *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*, Routledge

Goldsmith, E, Mander, J (eds.) 2001, *The Case Against the Global Economy & For a Turn Towards Localization*, Earthscan Publications

Gorman, L, MacLean, D (eds.) 2003, *Media and Society in the Twentieth Century: A Historical Introduction*, Blackwell Publishers

Grenfell, M, 2004, *Pierre Bourdieu: Agent Provocateur*, Continuum

Halliday, M. A. K, 1978, *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*, Edward Arnold

Hatch, E. and Brown, C. (1995) *Vocabulary, Semantics, and language Education*, Cambridge University Press

Hedge, T, Whitney, N (eds.) 1997, *Power, Pedagogy and Practice*, Oxford University Press

Hertz, N, 2001, *The Silent Takeover*, Arrow

Howatt, A. P. R, Widdowson, H, 2004, *A History of English Language Teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

House of Commons, 09/07/2001, *Hansard Debates*, Retrieved 05/09/2012 from: http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200102/cmhansrd

Huxley, A, 1983, *Brave New World Revisited*, Triad Grafton Books

James, L, 1999, Raj: *The Making and Unmaking of British India*, Abacus Books

Knight, W, 2004, 'Half of all languages face extinction this century', in *New Scientist*, retrieved 28/08/2012 from: http://www.newscientist.com/article.ns?Id=dn4685

Krauss, M, 1992, 'The world's languages in crisis', in *Language* 68, 4-10

Mander, J, 2001, 'The rules of corporate behaviour.' In Goldsmith et al 2001: 81-92

Mar-Molinero, C, 2006, 'The European linguistic legacy in a global era: Linguistic imperialism, Spanish and the Instituto Cervantes. ' In Mar-Molinero 2006: 76-88

Mar-Molinero, C, and Stevenson, P (eds.) 2006, *Language Ideologies, Politics and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, Macmillan

Morris, P, 1994, *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Volosinov*, Edward Arnold Publishers

Muhlhauser, P, Harre, R, 1990, *Pronouns and People: The Linguistic Construction of Social and Personal Identity*, Basil Blackwell

Osgerby, B, 2004, *Youth Media*, Routledge

Orwell, G, 1948, *The English People*, Collins, London

Orwell, G, 1970, *Decline of the English Murder and Other Essays*, Penguin Books

Orwell, G, 1984, *Nineteen Eighty Four*, Penguin Books

Pennycook, A, 1998, *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*, Addison Wesley Longman Limited

Phillipson, R, 1992, *Linguistic Imperialism*, Oxford University Press

Phillipson, R, 1999, 'Voice in Global English: Unheard Chords in Crystal loud and Clear', *Applied Linguistics*, 20/2: 265-67

Redman, S, (1997) *English Vocabulary in Use*, Cambridge University Press

Rubin, J, 1962, Bilingualism in Paraguay, in *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. IV, No. 1, pp 52-58

Said, E, 1993, *Culture and Imperialism*, Chatto and Windus Ltd

Sapir, E, 1970, *Language: An Introduction To The Study of Speech*, Rupert-Hart Davis: London

Scott, J, 1985, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, Yale University Press: Newhaven and London

Schjerve, R (ed.) 2003, *Diglossia and Power: Language Policies and Practice in the 19th Century Habsburg Empire*, Mouton de Gruyter

Spear, P, 1970, A History of India: Volume 2, Pelican Books

Stickel, G, 2006, 'Cultural Diversity', in *Goethe-Institut Die Macht Der Sprache*, retrieved 31/08/2012 from: http://www.goethe.de/lhr/prj/mac/kvi/en1399909.htm

Swann, M, 2005, *Grammar*, Oxford University Press

Thompson, D (ed.) 1995, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, Ninth Edition, Clarendon Press, Oxford

Thompson, E. P, 1968, *The Making of the English Working Class*, Pelican Books.

Wheatcroft, G, 1998, It's the way Tony tells 'em, in *The Independent*, 07/06/1998, Retrieved 31/08/2012 from:http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/its-the-way-tony-tells-em-1163337.html

Young-jin, O, 2009, Korea to replace TOEFL with state tests, *The Korea Times*, retrieved 31/09/2012 from http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2011/04/117_54652.html

＊ Neil Addison, M.A is a lecturer at Reitaku University, Meiji Gakuin and Bunkyo Gakuin.   His research interests include Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) blended learning, and English literature teaching evaluation and materials development.