© 1999 – R. Stuart DeLorme

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Problem and Research Questions

The process of officialization of one language that has historically been superseded by another language is tedious and seldom successful in the eyes of its promoters. One has only to think, for example, of the mixed results of attempts to officialize Quechua in Peru, Gaelic in Ireland, and Maori in New Zealand. The successes of the officialization of Hebrew in Israel, Malay (Bahasa Malaysia in Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia in Indonesia), Kiswahili in Tanzania,[1] and, on the provincial level, of French in Quebec and Catalan in Catalonia,[2] seem to be exceptions to the general failure of such attempts (which nevertheless include many notable small success stories in the case of individual schools and communities). As is typical of many efforts worldwide to officialize an indigenous language, policy makers and educators in the Republic of Kazakhstan (formerly the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic until independence in 1991) are confronted with the dilemma of how to promote the spread of the Kazakh language in the face of widespread indifference toward it by the majority of the population who speak Russian, the former Soviet Union's language-of-wider communication.[3] Kazakhstan's severe economic crisis has drastically limited the allocation of the funds for corpus and language acquisition planning that are essential for the "successful" officialization of Kazakh.

In 1989, Kazakh was legislated as Kazakhstan's sole "state" language and Russian the "language of inter-ethnic nationality communication." Since then, however, despite the reconfirmation of its sole state language by both the Constitution of 1995 and the Language Law of 1997, Kazakh has made only slight gains in terms of the number of Kazakhs (re)acquiring it and reported losses in the number of non-Kazakhs learning it as a second language.[4]

A brief survey of the demographic and sociolinguistic situation in Kazakhstan reveals several significant factors which have hindered the spread of the Kazakh language. In 1996, the Kazakhs made up barely 51 % of the total population (Kazakstan, 1998: 289). Among these, a full one-quarter had no communicative competence in their own language.[5] The majority of Kazakhs spoke, read, and wrote Russian fluently. Significant Kazakh-speaking pockets existed in large areas of the country where the Kazakh population was highly concentrated--especially in the south--but language shift to Russian was so advanced in the late Soviet period (the late 1980's) that concerns over the marginalization of the language were legitimate. The State

---

[1] See Fasold, 1984: 266-277. A common reason for the success of Kiswahili and Malay in the countries cited is that they were widely used as regional trade languages before officialization.

[2] Fishman (1991: ix) gives Modern Hebrew, French in Quebec, and Catalan in Catalonia as "success stories (more or less)."

[3] I am indebted to William Fierman (personal communication, November 17, 1996) for helping me to identify this key problem driving my research: how to promote a language spoken by a minority of people within a state in becoming the language spoken by the majority of its citizens. This problem opens up a multitude of questions concerning the feasibility, necessity, advisability of such a language promotion goal (Fishman, 1991: 2-5).

[4] As reported by two comparative sociolinguistic surveys taken in 1994 and 1996 (Arenov & Kalmykov, 1996). According to Arenov & Kalmykov, of the total Kazakh population in the Republic in 1996, "those who speak, read, and write fluently amount to 74.7 percent (71 percent in 1994)." As for the percentage of the total Russian population in Kazakhstan who are "fluent" in Kazakh, Arenov & Kalmykov report a decrease from 1996 to 1994 from 1.7 percent to 1.4 percent.

[5] Tatimov, 1992: 98.

Program on Languages of 1990 states that, out of "the fifty social functions which are necessary for the normal functioning of any language, the Kazakh language maintains only about ten."

It is not surprising that few Russians, who made up 32 % (Kazakstan, 1998: 289) of the population in 1996, knew Kazakh. It seems, from the statistics mentioned earlier which indicate a decrease of non-Kazakh speakers of Kazakh from 1994-1996, that factors such as the vociferous demands of Kazakh nationalists for all citizens of Kazakhstan to learn Kazakh and the widespread practice of Kazakhization, i.e. of replacing non-Kazakhs with Kazakhs in leadership positions, have made Russians and other non-Kazakhs even less willing to learn the state language. The non-Kazakh, non-Russian ethnic nationalities who constituted 17 % of Kazakhstan's total population in 1996,[6] tended to be more fluent in Russian than in Kazakh. During the Soviet period until the present, Russian has remained the main language used in the domains of government, education, work, and mass communication. Despite a number of factors that have favored the spread of Kazakh--the above-mentioned officialization of Kazakh in 1989, the emigration of Russians [7] and immigration of the Diaspora,[8] the relatively high birth-rate of Kazakhs compared to Russians, and the increased use of the state language in education and the media--Russian continues to be used as the main language in many domains of Kazakhstan's daily life.

Important historical[9] and geographic factors have contributed to the dominance of the Russian language on the Kazakh steppe. Tsarist Russian influence over Kazakh affairs was already considerable by the 18th century. By the 19th century, St. Petersburg had completely incorporated the steppe into its empire through treaties and force of arms. Seven decades of Soviet rule (1917-1991) resulted in nearly universal literacy, often at the price of language shift and negative stereotyping of those not literate in Russian. Tight political control and government monopoly of education and the media and literature considerably weakened the use by the general population of other non-Russian languages, whether international languages-of-wider communication or indigenous languages such as Kazakh. In the heyday of Soviet achievements in universal education, space exploration, and international sports competition, Kazakh seemed to have been relegated more and more to the village, to the specialized study of academicians, and show-case performances of Kazakh drama and opera in the capital. Kazakhs were reportedly reticent to speak Kazakh among themselves on buses in Almaty in fear of being reprimanded by Russians for doing so. I was told several times that, during the Soviet period, one was not considered *adam boluw,* 'to be a person/to be somebody' unless he or she was literate in Russian. My language tutor, an honors graduate of the Oral Pedagogical Institute, told me that Russian students referred to students in her department for training teachers for Kazakh-medium schools as *baran*, 'sheep,' a Russian epithet expressing the stereotype of Kazakhs as uncouth animal herders.

---

[6] Principally, Ukrainians, Germans (300,000 in 1996 see Kazakstan, 1998: 289), Uzbeks, Uygurs, Tatars, and Koreans. It is striking that during the Soviet period, the Turkic-speaking peoples (Uzbeks, Uygurs, and Tatars) living in Kazakhstan tended to speak and read Russian, which belongs to a completely different language family (Slavic), better than Kazakh which is so closely related to their own languages. A principal reason for this, as well as for the widespread language shift among the Kazakhs, is the dominance of the Russian language in so many domains of life (education, media, work, and scholarly/artistic literature).

[7] 850,000 Russians left Kazakhstan during 1991-1997 (Dzhumaliyeva, 1998).

[8] 170, 000 Kazakhs of the Diaspora returned to Kazakhstan during 1991-1997 (Dzhumaliyeva, 1998).

[9] See pages 70-74 for a summary of troubling events in the history of the Russian presence in Kazakhstan which constitute part of the "cultural baggage" of contemporary Kazakhs.

Russia and Kazakhstan share the longest continuous land border in the world.[10] This border has few natural barriers and trade across it is brisk. Kazakhs living on either side of the boundary (there are many Kazakhs living in Russia[11]) tend to speak Russian rather than Kazakh. Ethnic Slavs make up the majority of the population in the industrialized *oblys,* 'oblasts'[12] of northern Kazakhstan. The general Kazakh population is largely rural[13] and concentrated in the generally less industrialized south. Even in the south, Russian is the main language of communication in important urban centers such as the cities of Almaty (the former capital and largest city in Kazakhstan), Shymkent, and Taraz (formerly Zhambyl).

Kazakh shares a linguistic ecological system not only with Russian but with a number of other Turkic languages. Kazakh is spoken as the first language of roughly nine million speakers.[14] Uzbek, a related Turkic language, is spoken by nearly 20 million. Uzbeks live mainly in their titular republic which borders Kazakhstan to the south. Uzbek and other major Turkic languages such as Turkish (as used in the Republic of Turkey), Uygur, Tatar, and Azeri enjoy a prestige associated with sedentary Islamic culture not shared by the Kazakh language despite its rich tradition of oral literature and modern written genres beginning in the late 19th century. Because Kazakhstan is a geographical buffer between Russia to the north and the rest of Central Asia to the south, it is understandable that there has been a greater degree of language shift of speakers to Russian there than in Uzbekistan.

In this dissertation, I examine attempts to officialize Kazakh in Kazakhstan in the light of central government language policy and implementation attempts in one particular school. I compare and contrast government documents and field data from a secondary school in a village near Almaty City collected during my residence there from August, 1994 to April, 1996. I attempt to show that an understanding of language officialization and other language planning goals such as nationalization, language spread and maintenance (all of which are covered in the subsequent discussion) involve consideration of language attitudes (or language orientations) and issues of social identity. The "success" of an officialization movement requires not only the status and corpus efforts traditionally associated with language planning but also an often painful and fitful metamorphosis of attitudes toward the official language and the people who speak it.

It seems that this difficult process of change usually begins with new attitudes of the primary group toward themselves and to their "mother tongue" before the attitudes and linguistic behavior of non-group members is appreciably altered. In "successful" officialization attempts such as Bahasa Malay and Bahasa Indonesia, other non-native speakers of the vernacular begin acquiring and using it for at least some functions and adopt a more or less conscious and clearly articulated positive attitude toward native speakers of the officialized language. The adoption of a positive attitude toward Kazakhs and Kazakh and actual acquisition of Kazakh as a second

---

[10] Longer than the United States-Canadian border (minus Alaska), than the Sino-Russian border which is interrupted by Mongolia, and the border between Chile and Argentina.
[11] A sample statistical analysis of 5% of the population of the Russian Federation yielded an estimated 567,980 Kazakhs living there (Russia, 1998: 40). Fierman (1998: 173) states that there are "about two-thirds of a million Kazakhs" in Russia. Most of these are Kazakhs living in southwest Siberia and Astrakan, adjacent to Kazakhstan.
[12] An *oblys,* 'oblast,' is the largest administrative unit in Kazakhstan, comparable to a state in the U. S. A.
[13] The general population of Kazakhstan was 55 % urban in 1997 (Kazakstan, 1998: 289) but percent of the ethnic Kazakh urban population was considerably lower than that.
[14] An approximate figure arrived at by adding the total of native Kazakh speakers in Kazakhstan (the number of ethnic Kazakhs minus the 25% who no longer speak their mother tongue) plus the roughly two million Kazakhs in the Diaspora who still maintain their mother tongue (mainly those in China).

language by the Russians and other ethnic nationalities living in Kazakhstan is problematic given the contextual factors cited earlier. This study analyzes efforts at both the government policy and school implementation levels to reverse negative stereotypes toward the Kazakh ethnic nationality and toward their language and to facilitate the acquisition/reacquisition of Kazakh in schools.

I have chosen the study of metaphors (Lakoff, 1993) of identity and language found in government documents and school discourse as a method of unifying my analysis of language and identity issues. I examine how Kazakhs at both the central government and local school levels represent themselves and their language, both positively and negatively, with particular attention to tropes which have potential for use in identity and language planning. My analysis of metaphors is framed within an identity planning-language planning framework which is an extension of Hornberger's integrative framework of language planning goals (1994). The specific research questions I seek to answer are:

1) What metaphors of identity and language are expressed in government documents at the national policy level and in school discourse at the local, implementational level?

2) How do these metaphors and actual government language status planning and school language acquisition implementation efforts inform each other?

3) Which of these metaphors have potential for further development in identity and language planning and how can they be more clearly enunciated, elaborated, and promoted in policy at the national level and implemented in schools at the local level to facilitate the government's goals?

Identity planning and language orientation planning are the main foci of this dissertation. Although both concepts address important matters of identity and ideology which profoundly shape the direction of language planning efforts, they are, however, only the starting points of any effective language officialization movement. As Fishman (1991: 396) writes, "consciousness and ideology are not enough. They are merely the first of many concerns, all of which, taken together, constitute a theory and a model of the intergenerational transmission of language, culture, society, and identity." Among these "many concerns," I will address issues of government status policy planning and school language acquisition as they relate to identity and language orientation planning. At the level of government policy, I discuss "symbolic" and "working" language officialization and the functional allocation of Kazakh and Russian in various domains of daily use. At the school level, I explore multilingual education models which reflect particular language orientations and program types which implement government status decisions concerning functional allocation. My analysis of specific government status language policy measures and school implementation efforts are meant to shed light on the reiterative process of ideology and language orientation construction in the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Empirical data is primarily from one school[15] and can not claim to be representative of all schools in such a vast country, the ninth largest in the world in terms of land area.[16] There exists, however, a dearth of ethnographic studies of indigenous language reacquisition efforts now taking place in many schools throughout the former Soviet Union. An in-depth look at one school and its community and an examination of important government

[15] The main focus is on the village of Aspan's Kazakh School but I refer as well to the village's Russian School. I have also made visits to several other schools in the area.

[16] After India (7th) and Argentina (8th).

language policy documents should provide insights which may contribute to a better understanding of the role of government language planning and school practice in the officialization and nationalization of the Kazakh language and the maintenance of Russian in the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Theoretical Framework

The manner in which the above research questions are posed reflects the academic literature which shaped them. Language planning is the research literature from which I draw most heavily. Below I will present my language planning-identity planning framework which discusses the concept of identity planning as developed by scholars of language planning. I begin here with a brief perspective on the study of metaphor, so central to the approach I take, drawing from work in semantics and the philosophy of language.

Metaphor

My analysis of the discourse of the written and spoken texts which constitute my empirical data focuses upon metaphors (Lakoff, 1993) of self, other, and language. I place metaphors of self and other under the rubric of identity planning. Metaphors of language are considered under what I term "language orientation planning" because language orientations (Ruiz, 1984) are essentially metaphors of language.

I follow Lakoff in interpreting metaphors as the mapping of concepts, not words. Lakoff credits Reddy (Lakoff, 1993: 204) for the view that "the locus of metaphor is thought, not language." Using the metaphor of "love is a journey" he explains:

> Metaphor involves understanding one domain of experience, love, in terms of a very different domain of experience, journeys. More technically, the metaphor can be understood as a mapping (in the mathematical sense) from a source domain (in this case, journeys) to a target domain (in this case, love). The mapping is tightly structured. There are ontological correspondences, according to which entities in the domain of love (e. g., the lovers, their common goals, their difficulties, the love relationship, etc.) correspond systematically to entities in the domain of a journey (the travelers, the vehicle, destinations, etc.).

Let me illustrate source and target domains and their ontological correspondences by a metaphorical example to be found in Kazakhstan's State Anthem which will be discussed in Chapter Two. In the State Anthem, the Kazakh nation is described in terms of compassionate motherhood. The diagram on page 80 of Chapter Two gives several ontological correspondences in this mapping of the Kazakh state as a merciful mother. The Kazakh words for "mother" and "all ethnic nationalities" are in brackets because they are clearly implied but not actually stated in the imagery of the anthem. In both the source domain and target domain panels, I use the exact words of the State Anthem (see pages 64-65 of Chapter Two for the full text of the Anthem).

I argue that an integral part of the task of policy-makers and language planners is to analyze the metaphors, such as the above found in the State Anthem; that is, to map and analyze the ontological correspondences, whether implied or explicitly stated. I will provide examples of mapping between source and target domains in the following chapters and the implications these correspondences have for policy.

Recently, two works have appeared which apply Lakoff's understanding of metaphor to the contexts of education and ethnic relations. Wincek (1995) studies how metaphors influence action in the context of school reform. Buckley and Kinney (1995) examine the metaphors constructed amidst the inter-group strife of Northern Ireland.

Wincek quotes Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 145-146): "Words alone don't change reality. But changes in our conceptual system do change what is real for us and affect how we perceive the world and act upon those perceptions." Her assumption, and mine, is that metaphors both express and influence conceptual systems. As I do in this study, Wincek sifted through large amounts of field data from her school site looking for metaphors, classifying them according to themes, and inductively arriving at a small number of metaphorical arguments most salient to her topic. "Metaphor provides a powerful tool that 'might be invoked profitably by teachers and administrators as a way of reflecting on and possibly improving their own practice' (Mumby & Russell in Wincek, 1995: 28). Her remark can apply not only to teachers and school administrators but also to government policy and language planners.

Buckley and Kenney study the relationship between the use of metaphors and the construction of identity. They claim (1995: 36) that the various "frameworks used to define identity...are often structured by the same few metaphors." They cite Piellon, 1984 who illustrates how quite different forms of Irish discourse (short stories, pastoral letters from bishops, and speeches by Irish trade unionists) manifest similar ideological patterns for they employ similar metaphors. To illustrate, let me take the identity metaphor of Kazakhs as combatants on a "demographic battlefield" found in my own data. "Demographic" refers to the relative size of the ethnic Kazakh population in relation to the ethnic Russian population in the Republic of Kazakhstan. The mapping here is between the relative size of Kazakhs to Russians and "battlefield," referring to the attempts of Kazakh nationalists to promote an increase in the ethnic Kazakh population at the expense of ethnic Russian population. The phrase "demographic battlefield" is used by the demographer Tatimov in an article in the national newspaper, *Ana Tili* [*Mother Tongue*] where he exhorts the Kazakhs to stop the practice of abortion and to bear more children. One of his reasons for promoting population growth is to validate and facilitate the implementation of Kazakh as the official language of the Republic. In my school data, there is also a clear instance of an argument on demographic grounds by Nurijla, one of the Kazakh School teachers. At the parents-teachers' meeting discussed in Chapter Seven, she encouraged parents to speak out for moving the Kazakh School into the Russian School's larger and superior facilities. Nurijla's argument is similar to that of Tatimov's: the Kazakhs should be given privilege based on demographic superiority despite Russian opposition to the exercise of that privilege. The logic of the demographic battlefield metaphor works then in different frameworks, the national on one hand, and the community on the other.

I will now present my language planning-identity planning framework which theoretically situates metaphors of identity and metaphors of language in relationship to one another. I see identity planning and language orientation planning, both to be described below, as the national and local elite's construction, elaboration, and implementation of interconnected metaphors of identity and language which influence public opinion, shape social and language policy, and guide implementation of political and language planning initiatives at both the national and local levels. I proceed chronologically beginning in the late 1970's, with a rapid overview of the development of language planning as an academic discipline and of the concept of identity planning developed within language planning studies. I hope to develop the concept of identity

planning a bit further within my overall framework of language planning-identity planning. Finally, at the end of the chapter, I cover the methodology and the organization of this dissertation's chapters.

Components of Hornberger's Language Planning Framework

The organizing framework for my own work is that of Hornberger who introduced her own integrative framework of language planning goals into the academic literature in 1994 (see Appendix One for Hornberger's framework). Her work presents, I believe, a major step forward in language planning research in that it integrates the work of major scholars of language planning (Ferguson, Kloss, Stewart, Neustupny, Haugen, Nahir, and Cooper) and also takes into account the landmark study of Richard Ruiz (1984) on language orientations which I incorporate into my own extended version of Hornberger's framework (see Appendix Two for my framework). After presenting and explaining my extended framework of language planning goals which, again, is little more than an amplification of Hornberger's work, I will move on to a discussion of identity planning. In Appendix Two, the reader can see how I relate language planning and identity planning as a conceptual whole.

Weinreich and Haugen's Term of "Language Planning"

Uriel Weinreich (Cooper, 1989: 29) is attributed with the first use of the phrase "language planning" in a Columbia University seminar in 1957 (Cooper, 1989: 29) and Einar Haugen with introducing the term into academic literature in 1959. Miller (1950: 720-725) had proposed the term "language engineering" as early as 1950, but it was Weinreich and Haugen's term which has prevailed over various others. I modify (*in italics*) Cooper's (1989: 45) definition of language planning by defining it as "deliberate efforts to influence *the orientations of one's own group and others toward language(s) and* the behavior of *one's own group and* others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes." This definition includes the four main types of language planning discussed below: corpus, status, acquisition, and language orientation planning. Metaphors appearing in Kazakh government documents and in the field data which are associated with each type of planning, except corpus planning, are discussed in their proper chapters.

Kloss' Distinction Between "Corpus" and "Status" Language Planning

Kloss (1969) provided the foundational distinction between status and corpus language planning. Corpus planning "refers to activities such as coining new terms, reforming spelling, and adopting a new script" (Cooper, 1989: 31). In other words, corpus planning involves changes in language itself. It is not within the scope of this dissertation to deal with corpus planning since my focus is on identity issues and orientations toward languages, but it warrants saying, if only in passing, that corpus planning and identity planning issues are inextricably intertwined in a number of ways such as, for example, the choice of a script. The selection of one script over another (the choices in the Kazakh case having historically been between the Arabic, Cyrillic, and Latin scripts) often identifies its users with the cultural traditions historically associated with the other users of that script.

Status planning refers, not to actual structural changes in a language but, as its title implies, to changes in the status of a language in relation to other languages. It is the "recognition by a national government of the importance or position of one language in relation to others (Cooper, 1989: 32)." Under status planning, Hornberger places four major language

planning goals: status standardization, officialization, nationalization, and, proscription. I discuss each in turn.

Status Standardization.

Hornberger (1994: 81) defines status standardization as "language planning activities that accept or impose a language as the standard." I take this to mean the selection of a particular language as the societal norm, whether or not that language is also made the official and national language (see officialization and nationalization below). An example of standardization without officialization and nationalization is the selection in the 19th century of the language of northern Kazakhstan as the literary standard for the Kazakhs. Although made the norm of the written language, the northern Kazakhstan "dialect" was not made the official or national language of the Kazakhs who lived under Russian colonial rule.

Officialization.

Officialization refers to a government's making a language or languages the official language of the country. Cooper (1989: 100) distinguishes between three senses of the term officialization: *statutory,* a language declared official by law; *working,* a language which a government uses for its everyday activities; and *symbolic,* a language which is designated a symbol of the state. A language can be official in one, two, or all three senses.

Nationalization.

Nationalization is a term which can be used in two senses (Garvin, 1974: 71). First, in the "emotionally more neutral" one that a given language "serves the entire territory of a nation rather than just some regional or ethnic subdivision" (Garvin, 1974: 71). Second, in the "emotionally more powerful" sense that a language serves as a national symbol. This is the sense in which the term is commonly used in emergent countries; it is then often contrasted with the language of the former colonial overlord. Thus the term nationalization can have a *territorial* and a *symbolic* connotation. I am tempted to combine Cooper's symbolic officialization with Garvin's symbolic nationalization but at least one salient example comes to mind of a language being a symbolic national language without being officially symbolic such as Guarani in Paraguay or the Kazakh language in Kazakhstan during the Soviet period.

Proscription.

Proscription is banning the use of a given language. In Kazakhstan, proscription is noticeably absent at the government policy level. However, I have observed Kazakh teachers forbidding pupils to speak Russian at the school level.

Cooper's "Acquisition Planning"

In 1989, Cooper argued for the inclusion of "acquisition planning" as a category distinct from status planning (Cooper, 1989: 33-34,157-163). "When planning is directed toward increasing a language's uses, it falls within the rubric of status planning. But when it is directed toward increasing the number of users-- speakers, writers, listeners, or readers-- then a separate analytic category for the focus of language planning seems to me justified" (Cooper, 1989: 33). He neatly summarizes (1989: 120) the difference between status and acquisition planning: "status

planning is an effort to regulate the *demand* for given verbal resources whereas acquisition planning is an effort to regulate the *distribution* of those resources."

Kaplan & Baldauf (1997), the first major language planning textbook in English to appear since Cooper, 1989, does not adopt Cooper's perfectly adequate term of "acquisition planning." They use instead "language-in-education planning" which I find needlessly cumbersome and too narrow in its focus, for much language acquisition takes place outside of what one normally associates with "education." Hornberger has opted to maintain Cooper's term of acquisition planning.

Hornberger (1994: 82) also draws upon Cooper (1989: 99-119)[17] to identify six major acquisition planning goals "in terms of the domains in which users are targeted to receive opportunity and/or incentive to learn the given language/literacy: *group, education/school, literature, religion, mass media*, and *work*" [italics added]. Hornberger combines two domains which Stewart and Cooper refer to as "educational" and "school subject" respectively. By "educational" Stewart (1968: 540) had in mind "the function of a language (other than one which already has an o [official] or p [provincial] function) as *a medium of primary or secondary education*, either regionally or nationally" [emphasis added]. By "school subject," Stewart (1968: 541) had in mind that the "language...is *commonly taught as a subject in secondary and/or higher education*." Hornberger's combined rubric of "education/school" covers both these functions.

Hornberger's combination of the education and school subject functions is not meant to blur an important distinction in bilingual education studies between the teaching of a language as a *medium* of instruction and as a *subject* of instruction. In both the Kazakh and Russian Schools in Aspan, for example, Russian and Kazakh were taught as second languages; but there were enormous differences in the classes I observed. In the Russian School, Kazakh was taught strictly as a subject through the medium of the Russian language; the use of Kazakh was restricted to reading and answering questions in the book, with only the best pupils venturing to make spontaneous remarks beyond the immediate text. By stark contrast, in Russian language and literature classes at the Kazakh School, both teacher and most pupils interacted briskly in native-like Russian with only occasional recourse to Kazakh; other subjects were taught there in the medium of Kazakh.

The meaning of the domains of "religion," "mass media," and "work" (the latter two added to Stewart's typology by Cooper, 1989: 118-119) are more or less transparent but the terms "literature" ("literary" in Stewart's typology) and "group" need some explanation. By "literature," Hornberger follows Stewart's (1968: 541) definition of "the use of a language primarily for literary or scholarly purposes." By "group," Hornberger adopts Stewart's meaning (1968: 540) of "the function of a linguistic system primarily as the normal medium of communication among the members of a single cultural or ethnic group."

Haugen's Distinction Between "Policy" and "Cultivation" Language Planning

The four goals of status planning and the six goals of acquisition mentioned above refer to "policy" language planning (Haugen, 1983; Hornberger, 1994). By "policy," Haugen refers to form, that is, the selection of norms. To visualize what has been said above about policy (form) status and acquisition planning which deal with matters of norm selection, I present a slightly

[17] Cooper elaborates on Stewart's (1968: 540-541) work

modified version of the status and acquisition policy planning panels of Hornberger’s integrative framework:

LANGUAGE STATUS AND ACQUISITION POLICY PLANNING GOALS (SELECTION)	
Approaches ⊳ ***Types*** ß	***Policy (Form)*** ***(Selection)***
Status Planning (SP)	**Status Standardization** **Officialization** **Nationalization** **Proscription**
Acquisition Planning (AP)	**Group** **Education/School** **Literature** **Religion** **Mass Media** **Work**

As Haugen adopts the word "policy" to refer to matters of form or the selection of norms, so he borrows the word "cultivation" from Neustupny (1970) to refer to function, that is, the implementation of norms. On the next page, I present the status and acquisition *cultivation* panels of Hornberger's integrative framework (please refer to the appendix for her entire framework):

LANGUAGE STATUS AND ACQUISITION CULTIVATION PLANNING GOALS (IMPLEMENTATION)	
Approaches Þ ***Types*** ß	***Cultivation (Function)*** ***(Implementation)***
Status Planning (SP)	**(1) Revival** **(2) Maintenance** **(3) Spread** **(4) Interlingual Communication:** **(4a) Intranational** **(4b) International**
Acquisition Planning (AP)	**(1) Reacquisition** **(2) Maintenance** **(3) Shift** **(4a) Second Language and Literacy** **(4b) Foreign Language and Literacy**

In these two panels, Hornberger matches Nahir's (1984) four status language planning goals of revival, maintenance, spread, and interlingual communication with their equivalent acquisition planning goals (Cooper's 1989: 159), to which she adds the goal of "shift," yielding four matching pairs of (1) revival/reacquisition (2) status maintenance/ acquisition maintenance (3) spread/shift and (4) intranational-international communication/second-foreign language-literacy. Each pair will be explained in turn.

Language Revival and Language Reacquisition.

Language "revival" refers to "the effort to restore a language with few or no speakers *or a literacy with few or no users* to use as a normal means of communication in a community" (Hornberger, 1994: 80. See also Nahir, 1977: 110-114; Nahir, 1984: 301-302). "Few" is a comparative term. I feel that it can safely be applied to Kazakh literacy which, though used by many native Kazakhs, is still employed by relatively "few" Kazakhs if compared with the number of Kazakhs literate in Russian. Cooper describes language *reacquisition* as "reacquisition of the language by populations for whom it was once either a vernacular--as in the renativisation of Hebrew, the attempts to renativise Irish, and the renativisation of Maori--or a language of

specialized function, as in the return of written Chinese to Taiwan" (1989: 159). Successful language reacquisition planning includes, argues Cooper (1989: 159-160) giving people both the opportunity and the incentive to reacquire their language.

Language Status Maintenance and Language Acquisition Maintenance.

I use the two terms "language status maintenance" and "language acquisition maintenance" to distinguish between the two uses of "language maintenance" listed in the status and acquisition panels of Hornberger's integrative framework. Hornberger (1994: 80) cites Nahir in describing language status maintenance as "the effort to preserve the use of the native language, *or native literacy*, in situations where the status of the language*/literacy* as a means of communication, a cultural medium, or a symbol of group or national identity is (or is perceived to be) under threat due to political, social, economic, educational or other pressures." Language acquisition maintenance refers to the learners themselves: those actually targeted to learn or maintain the language under threat.

Language Spread (of Uses) and Language Shift (of Users).

The table of Hornberger's integrative framework (1994: 78) indicates that *language spread* belongs to status planning and concerns the spread of *uses* of a language into new domains, whereas *language shift* belongs to acquisition planning and concerns the shift in learners or *users* from one language to another

Language spread results in language shift. For example, there has been a modest increase in the uses of Kazakh in the government administration, mass media, and education domains which has provided some incentive for a number of people (Kazakhs and non-Kazakhs) to acquire it as a second language. Language shift also precipitates language spread: if more people are learners and users of a second language, they will demand more domains in which to use it.

Interlingual Communication and Second-Foreign Language-Literacy.

Interlingual communication refers to "efforts toward facilitating communication between members of different speech communities...by...a language/*literacy* of wider communication" (Hornberger, 1994: 80) whether internationally (such as Spanish among the various countries in Latin America) or intranationally (such as English in India).

Second and foreign language/literacy refer to the acquisition of competence in intranational and/or international languages by a targeted group of learners. Although second and foreign language/literacy acquisition take place in all six of the domains listed under acquisition policy planning (group, education/school, literature, religion, mass media, work), the vast bulk of language/literacy acquisition takes place in formal institutions of learning at the primary, secondary, and tertiary levels. Under acquisition cultivation, I include a discussion of bilingual education program types. Bilingual education program types (Hornberger, 1991: 224) deal with contextual issues of student population and teachers and structural issues of type of program in school (school-wide vs. targeted, one-way vs. two-way), languages in the curriculum (sequencing, oral and literate development, subject allocation), and classroom language use (alternate and mixed patterns; functions). Although research concerning bilingual education program types belongs to the research area of bilingual education, it must be kept in mind that all

the contextual and structural issues mentioned above directly influence effective language planning implementation and are therefore included here.

Below I include the language status planning and language acquisition panels of my extension of Hornberger's (1994) integrative language planning goals:

LANGUAGE STATUS PLANNING GOALS		
Approaches ⊳ ***Types*** ß	***Policy Planning (Form)***	***Cultivation Planning (Function)***
Status Planning **(*Sources:* Cooper, 1989 Garvin, 1974 Haugen, 1983 Hornberger, 1994 Kloss, 1969 Nahir, 1977, 1984 Neustupny, 1974)**	***Selection of uses of languages in areas of:*** **(1)** ***Status Standardisation*** **(2)** ***Officialisation (symbolic, statutory, working)*** **(3)** ***Nationalization (territorial, symbolic)*** **(4)** ***Proscription***	***Implementation of uses of languages in areas of:*** **(Matches four goals in acquisition panel below)** **(1)** ***Revival of vernacular*** **(2)** ***Spread of domains of use of vernacular*** **(3)** ***Maintenance of uses of LWC*** ***Intralingual Communication uses of LWC, vernacular, foreign languages in areas of:*** **(4a)** ***Intranational-*** **between ethnic nationalities** **(4b)** ***International-*** **between nations**

LANGUAGE ACQUISITION PLANNING GOALS		
Approaches ⊳ *Types* ß	*Policy Planning* *(Form)*	*Cultivation Planning* *(Function)*
Acquisition Planning **(*Sources:*** **Cooper, 1989** **Hornberger, 1991, 1994** **Stewart, 1968)**	***Selection of users of language: Policy decisions about who gets what opportunities and/or incentives to acquire and improve their language competence in domains of:*** **(1) *Work*** **(Including government's executive, legislative, judiciary branches and national/local administration, courts, law enforcement, military)** **(2) *Group*** **(3) *Mass Media*** **(4) *Education/School:*** **(Matches with goals 4a, 4b in cultivation panel to right)** **State's School Language Requirements for:** **Vernacular** **LWC** **Dual Medium** **Foreign Languages** **(5) *Literature*** **Creative Literature** **Academic Literature** **(6) *Religion***	***Implementation of opportunities and/or incentives to acquire languages in areas of:*** **(Matches four items in status panel above)** **(1) *Reacquisition of vernacular*** **(2) *Maintenance of LWC*** **(3) *Shift from LWC to vernacular*** **(4a) *Second language/literacy*** **Multilingual education program types & sequencing of language media of:** **Vernacular** **LWC** **Dual Medium** **(4b) *Foreign language/literacy in:*** **Regional languages: Chinese, Farsi** **World languages: Arabic, English**

Ruiz's "Language Orientations"

In Hornberger's 1994 article cited above, she refers to Ruiz' (1984) influential concept of "language orientations." For Ruiz, a language orientation is "complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society...Orientations are related to *language attitudes* in that they constitute the framework in which attitudes are formed: they help to delimit the range of acceptable attitudes toward language, and to make certain attitudes legitimate. In short, orientations determine what is thinkable about language in society"(1984: 16).

Schiffman (1996: 5) introduces the term "linguistic culture" which is similar to Ruiz's concept of language orientations. By linguistic culture, he refers to the aggregate of "ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices, religious strictures, and all other cultural 'baggage' that speakers bring to their dealings with language from their background" (1996: 276). I use Schiffman's term, with its inclusion of the element of the highly emotive cultural 'baggage' associated with language attitudes, in my analysis of a speech event in Chapter Seven. I prefer Ruiz's concept, however, for use in my language planning framework because he categorizes language orientations in terms of metaphors.

Ruiz identifies three orientations--which he categorizes with three metaphors--in the discourse of language debates in the United States about bilingual education and the officialization of English. These orientations are: language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource. He suggests that scholars should research orientations latent in debates about the roles of various languages in society and make them explicit to those embroiled in the debates. He also suggests that scholars go a step further and construct positive language orientations.

In many ways, Ruiz's paper is a foundation for my own work. First, the three language orientations he discusses are actually metaphors of language, for he maps different things (language with problem, right, and resource respectively) and draws out their ontological correspondences. Second, he makes explicit the implied metaphors of language which drive language planning debates. Third, he advocates constructing metaphors, such as resource, which will provide conceptual frameworks which will promote inter-group cooperation and respect for one anothers' languages (linguistic pluralism).

I argue that the research and proposal of language orientations are integral components of language planning and suggest that they be incorporated as "language orientation planning" (OP) into Hornberger's 1994 model. Language orientation planning should not be dismissed as a useful but dispensable pre-language planning exercise, but be counted as one of the essential processes of language planning.[18] Contending metaphors of language(s) need to be elucidated and debated by the various political interest groups in terms of their usefulness in formulating language policy guidelines to address the state's twin concerns for operational efficiency and sociocultural integration (Fishman, 1969: 111, 113, 125 footnote).

In adopting "language orientation planning," I am rejecting the similar term of *prestige planning* proposed in an important work by Harald Haarmann (1986). By prestige planning,

---

[18] R. D. Freeman (personal communication, November, 1998) questioned whether language orientation issues should not be subsumed under status planning since effective status policy planning requires a corresponding orientational shift. While agreeing with her latter point about the prerequisite of orientational shifts for successful status efforts, I prefer to keep language orientation and status issues separate in order to focus more clearly on language attitudes on the one hand (language orientations) and the specifics of functional allocation on the other (status planning).

Haarmann (1986: 87) means "a cluster of individual ecological variables which imply evaluations of language planning activities in the speech community."[19] Under prestige planning, Haarmann (1986: 12) enumerates five ecological, ethnopsychological variables (1) the relevance of enculturation for ethnic identification (2) the relevance of self-categorization (self-identification) among members of a community (3) the relevance of and ways of categorizing other ethnic groups among members of a community (4) language maintenance as a measure of ethnic identity (5) the attitude of community members toward interaction with members of contacting ethnic groups (inclination towards interethnic communication versus rejection of contact). I find Haarmann's overlapping of identity and language confusing and prefer to separate language orientation planning and identity planning into two separate categories. The term "prestige," by Haarmann's own admission, is vague and he cites (1986: 88) Fishman's objections to it. Since Ruiz' concept of "language orientation" has already gained some acceptance in western language planning literature, I feel "language orientation planning" is the best term available at the present time.

Although Ruiz advocates the language-as-resource orientation as a "potentially important redirection for language planning," he suggests that all three, "though competing" are "not incompatible approaches" with one orientation perhaps being "more desirable than another in any particular context." In fact, he suggests that it is probably best to have "a repertoire of orientations from which to draw" (1984: 18). I believe his flexible approach is wise, for the formulation of policy is a give-and-take, dialogical process. One can rarely foresee what orientation or set of orientations will provide the most dynamic language metaphors to frame and motivate language planning in a given context.

Language-as-Problem.

Of the *language-as-problem,* Ruiz (1984: 21) writes: "The orientation that language is a social problem to be identified operationally and resolved through treatments like transitional bilingual education may be more pervasive than we think. Whether the orientation is represented by malicious attitudes resolving to eradicate, invalidate, quarantine, or inoculate, or comparatively benign ones concerned with remediation and 'improvement,' the central activity remains that of problem-solving." Even though Ruiz believes that fruitful, early studies dealt with language planning mainly in terms of problem solving, he notes that the "language-as-problem" orientation has several inherently negative connotations. Not the least of these is the common majority association of a particular minority language with the problems of poverty, provincialism, and general low level of education which that minority group experiences. Even today, majority Americans equate Spanish-English bilingual programs with impoverished Spanish-speaking communities. They look upon the variety of Spanish spoken by Hispanics in the United States as a social problem which, along with ignorance, poverty, and drugs, must be solved in order for minority children to succeed in school and in the job market. According to the logic of this orientation, the "solution" too often means absorbing minorities as quickly and efficiently as possible into dominant language medium education. Up to the present day, Russians have associated the Kazakh language with illiterate nomads. During the late Soviet period, when Russians were still the majority in the Union, the main emphasis of language education was not upon indigenous languages (of which there were over one hundred) but on

[19] See my qualification of the sociolinguistic term *speech community* in this chapter under data analysis.

Russian, the language-of-wider-communication, which was used extensively for reading, writing, and speaking functions in school.

Language-as-Right.

A *language-as-right* orientation considers “language as basic human right” (Ruiz, 1984: 22). Williams (Ruiz, 1984: 25) quite validly suggests that “before detailed language policies are formulated, it behooves us to question the relationship between language planning and language rights and to suggest the manner in which planning can realize the fulfillment of individual and group based rights.” The problem with this orientation, as Ruiz explains (1984: 24) is that a person or group’s “claim to” the use of a certain language is also a “claim against” someone who is hindering that right. “Confrontation, of course, is what the legal process is all about,”(p. 24) writes Ruiz but he is bothered with the “hostility and divisiveness” inherent in a rights (as well as problem) orientation and he documents (p. 24) how laws affecting which languages are used as teaching media in schools, even when successfully passed, face non-compliance by those (often majority groups) who are against them.

Language-as-Resource.

While not eliminating the language-as-problem and language-as-right orientations as options in a language orientation repertoire, he clearly favors a *language-as-resource* orientation both because of the disadvantages of the problem and right orientations mentioned above and because of the clear advantages of the language-as-resource orientation itself. Ruiz lists the advantages of the resource metaphor: its potential for enhancing the status of the subordinate speech community, its provision of a more consistent way of understanding the possible wider societal functions of a subordinate language, and its help in reducing tensions and promoting cooperation between dominant and subordinate speech communities (1984: 25-26).

Society should think of languages as resources for military preparedness, national security, diplomacy, international business and communications, improved conceptual skills in science, general concept learning, and skill development (Ruiz, 1984: 27-28). If society views languages in this light, it will tend to elevate the status of non-dominant languages and be open to exploring more consistent ways of using those languages in the mentioned areas. If a society uses resource as a metaphor to frame its dialogue on the status and functions of various languages, then it can perhaps avoid the divisive and hostile implications of the problem and rights orientations and encourage what Ruiz (1984: 26) calls “cooperative language planning.” Cooperative language planning implies that language planners and groups recognize, respect, and encourage the acquisition and use of various languages for various domains. Ruiz’ idea of cooperative language planning is similar to the aim Haarmann (1986: 89) envisions for prestige planning:

> The general aim of prestige planning must be to overcome stereotyping categorizations which often include intolerance, mistrust, or even elements of hostility. This means that prestige planning should function as a kind of control to corpus and status planning activities in order to keep up a balanced planning level (thus neither unilaterally promoting a minority language nor unilaterally fixing the status of a dominant language in terms of prestige). Ideally, prestige planning in a setting of contact between a minority and a dominant language is balanced so that

the potential circumstances of ethnic friction and conflict can be reduced to a minimum.

Ruiz's 1984 paper drew upon a related article by Cobarrubias which discusses *language ideology,* a concept that parallels Ruiz' language orientations. Cobarrubias maintains (1983: 63) that "language ideologies" "reflect a mode of treatment of one language group with respect to another and ordinarily involve judgments as to what is right and wrong. Also, ideologies involve frames of reference pertaining to an ideal social group that will evolve, at some future time, from the segment of reality to which the ideology is being applied." I will describe below four "typical" ideologies outlined by Cobarrubias: linguistic assimilation, linguistic pluralism, vernacularization, and internationalization .

An ideology of *linguistic assimilation* is that "all speakers of languages other than the dominant language should be able to speak and function in the dominant language...it attaches linguistic superiority to the dominant language and does not grant, in principle, equal rights to linguistic minorities" (pp. 62-63). Proscription is one of the most common language status policy planning goals associated with an ideology of linguistic assimilation. Cobarrubias cites numerous cases (1983: 64-65) of the prohibition of local languages from school and/or local government use in U. S. history. *Linguistic pluralism* involves "coexistence of different language groups and their right to maintain and cultivate their own languages on an equitable basis" (p. 65).[20] *Vernacularization* is the "restoration and/or elaboration of an indigenous language and its adoption as an official language" (p. 66). Finally, *internationalization* means the "adoption of a nonindigenous language of wider communication either as an official language or as a language of instruction at some level of the educational process" (p. 66).

I see possible linkages between Ruiz's three language orientations and Cobarrubias' four language ideologies as follows. A language ideology of linguistic assimilation, as Cobarrubias defines it, would tend to see other languages as a problem, that is, a competition to the dominant one. Linguistic pluralism would advocate the various languages as rights. Finally, vernacularization and linguistic internationalism would perceive languages as resources, vernacularization[21] as a resource for what Fishman (1969: 113) calls *ethnic authenticity* and linguistic internationalization as a resource for Fishman's (1969: 113) *operational efficiency*, which I extend to include both more efficient intranational as well as international communication. Fishman writes (1969:113) that ethnic authenticity is a main preoccupation of *nationalism* and operational efficiency, a main concern of *nationism.*[22]

By "ethnic authenticity" Fishman (1969: 113, 125) means sociocultural integration, that is, "the never fully completed process of shaping and reshaping broader cognitive-emotional identifications and broader behavioral expressions of communality than are expressed via the narrow kinship, neighborhood and ethnic traditions that individuals recognize as a result of their

[20] Einar Haugen (1987: 53) writes that "language pluralism is not precisely the same as language diversity. The latter is an objective fact of life to be measured by census takers and sociologists...When we speak of "pluralism," we imply not a state of affairs, but a goal that may make it possible for diverse language groups to live together. It is a more subjective term, implying a policy of deliberate planning and official action. The very suffix of the word, "-ism," implies that it is a doctrine, a theory, in short a goal that some desire and others deplore (Berry, 1974)."

[21] Vernacularization can also be for operational efficiency but I am striving to keep the use of my terms as discreet and mutually exclusive as possible for theoretical effectiveness.

[22] Fishman's "nationalism" and "nationism" (see also Fishman, 1968 and 1989) are the equivalents of Raymond Breton's (1996: 348) "ethnic nationalism" and "civic nationalism."

early socialization experiences among family and friends." It is important to realize that ethnic authenticity does not only involve the principal ethnic nationality in a state but involves the others as well. In other words, the titular ethnic nationality often calls upon the other ethnic nationalities to express their solidarity with it by means of acquiring its language (with a language ideology of either linguistic assimilation or vernacularization) and at least a certain degree of cultural assimilation such as adopting its customs of politeness which come with the acquisition of the pragmatics of the titular ethnic nationality's language. All ethnic nationalities are thus to acknowledge and promote the authenticity of the titular ethnic nationality's language and culture.

By "operational efficiency" or "operational self-management," Fishman (1969: 111) means "effectiveness in the realms of public order and public service, as well as industrially, commercially, educationally, diplomatically and militarily." Elsewhere (1969: 125) he defines it as "political integration or consolidation to cover all these operational processes that are to such a large extent governmentally influenced or controlled and technological rather than ethnic in nature."

Ruiz (1984) and Hornberger (1991, 1994) imply natural links between the three language orientations and three *bilingual education model types*: the language-as-problem orientation is related to *transitional bilingual education*. In other words, if society-at-large holds to assimilationist attitudes and perceives of non-dominant languages as problems and obstacles to assimilation, it will favor a model type of bilingual education in which pupils mainstream as quickly as possible into dominant language medium education. The language-as-right orientation is consistent with the *maintenance bilingual education* model type. Minority language activists often insist upon the preservation of their mother tongue as a political right. They agitate for school language programs to save their children from the threat of irrevocably shifting to the dominant language. Finally, the language-as-resource orientation is conducive to *enrichment bilingual education*, for this model type regards both minority and majority languages as valuable resources[23] and promotes the complex process of their simultaneous acquisition as a demanding but mutually enriching[24] synergism.

Although Gardner and Lambert's (1972: 11-16) influential discussion of *instrumental* and *integrative motives* for language acquisition is pertinent to all three orientations,[25] I focus on its application to the language-as-resource orientation and enrichment bilingual education model type. They write that "language is a means to an end rather than an end in itself, in the sense that languages are typically learned in the process of becoming a member of a particular group, and the sustaining motivation appears to be one of group membership" (1972: 12). Therefore, they define the integrative motive as "a willingness to become a member of another ethnolinguistic group" (1972: 12). "The notion of an integrative motive implies that success in mastering a second language depends on a particular *orientation* [emphasis mine] on the part of the learner, reflecting a willingness or a desire to be like representative members of the "other" language community, and to become associated, at least vicariously, with that other community" (1972:

[23] W. Fierman (personal communication, October, 1998) asks whether peoples' language orientations could not, in fact, be "mixed," viewing "some languages as resource and others as problem."
[24] However, the Soviet slogan of "mutual enrichment" of languages (Baskakov, 1969) often meant the heavy influence of Russian loan words and grammar on indigenous languages with little corresponding effect of those languages on Russian.
[25] R. Freeman, personal communication, November, 1998).

14). By contrast, the instrumental motive of second language acquisition is characterized by "a desire to gain social recognition[26] or economic advantages through knowledge of a foreign language. The perspective...is more self-oriented [than the integrative motive] in the sense that a person prepares to learn a new code in order to derive benefits of a non-interpersonal sort" (1972: 14).

I consider the language-as-resource orientation in light of both the integrative and instrumental motives. First, the integrative motive: the vernacular (in this case, Kazakh) is a resource for ethnic authenticity and the acquisition of Kazakh by Russified Kazakhs, Russians, and others is motivated by a desire to identify with a positive, attractive Kazakh ethnic identity. Second, the instrumental motive: the LWC (in this case, Russian) functions as a resource for operational efficiency and the acquisition of Russian by Kazakhs is motivated by a desire to develop the economy of their country, a task which is impossible without the use of the Russian language and without the cooperation of the huge Russian minority and the many other ethnic nationalities living in Kazakhstan.

I now include the "Language Orientation Planning" panel from my extension of Hornberger's (1994) integrative framework of language planning goals (see appendix for all the panels of my framework) which attempts to integrate the various strands of research discussed above:

[26] Social recognition, not in the sense of warm acceptance by the other group whose language the learner is acquiring, but in the sense of the socio-economic status accrued by learning that language.

LANGUAGE ORIENTATION PLANNING GOALS		
Approaches ⊳ ***Types*** ß	***Policy Planning (Form)***	***Cultivation Planning (Function)***
Language Orientation Planning (***Sources:*** **Cobarrubias, 1983 Fishman, 1969 Gardner & Lambert, 1972 Haarman, 1986 Hornberger, 1991, 1994 Ruiz, 1984, Schiffman, 1996)**	***Selection of Language Orientations: Guiding metaphors of language in domains of work, group, mass media, literature, religion, education/school:*** **(Matches four goals in cultivation panel to right)**	***Implementation of Language Orientations: Enactment of metaphors of language in multilingual model types in domains of work, group, mass media, literature, religion, education/school:***
	(1) ***Language-as-Problem (Linguistic Assimilation)***	**(1)** ***Transitional***
	(2) ***Language-as-Right (Linguistic Pluralism)***	**(2)** ***Maintenance***
	(3) ***Language-as-Resource for Ethnic Authenticity (Vernacularization)***	**(3)** ***Identity Enrichment (integrative motivation)***
	(4) ***Language-as-Resource for Operational Efficiency (Linguistic Internationalization)***	**(4)** ***Skills Enrichment (instrumental motivation)***

Concept of "Identity Planning"

The concept of identity planning, introduced into the language planning literature by Pool in 1979, is closely related to language orientation planning and the theory of "identity" which Muller (Haarmann, 1991: 40), perhaps overstates as, "the basic theory of all the humanities, on which the more specialized ethnological and other anthropological disciplines...would have to be

based and elaborated." In this section, I will explore *identity planning* as developed principally by Pool, 1979, Eastman, 1981, Fasold, 1984, Haarmann, 1986, and Freeman, 1993. First, I will begin with the term "identity" as used in earlier academic literature in the sense of "personal identity." Then I will treat the concept of "group identity" as it is treated in more recent literature and develop it in terms of "ethnic nationality identity" and "state identity." Finally, I will discuss Pools' concept of "identity planning" itself and its relationship to language planning.

Personal Identity

It is helpful to be reminded of the etymology and meaning of the word "identity" itself. The English word is from the Latin adjective *idem* which means "same." Identity as a noun, therefore, means "sameness." Because of the extraordinarily broad usage of this term in so many disciplines in western[27] social scientific literature, it is not redundant to begin with several major definitions of it. I give them in chronological order, showing a remarkable continuity of definition from the 1930's to the 1980's. The definitions I give here deal mainly with *personal identity*. Later, I will deal with more recent notions of identity.

The Oxford English Dictionary (*OED*) of 1933 defines "identity" as: "The sameness of a person or thing at all times or in all circumstances; the condition or fact that a person or thing is itself and not something else; individuality, personality. The *OED* defines "personal identity," as used in psychology, as "the condition or fact of remaining the same person throughout the various phases of existence; continuity of the personality" (Volume 4: 19). Erik Eriksen (1968, Volume 7: 61) defines personal identity as including a "subjective sense of continuous existence and a coherent memory." Keyes (1984: 5) writes that personal identity refers to a "self-sameness, internal cohesion, and self-respect." Reber (1985, 341) defines it as "a person's essential, continuous self, the internal, subjective concept of oneself as an individual." These definitions all share in common the concept of an individual's awareness of oneself as a continuous being despite the constant changes taking place outside and inside the person. Two key semantic elements, therefore, are common to the above definitions of identity: (1) *self-awareness* and (2) *continuity despite change.*

Group Identity

I prefer to use "group identity" (in juxtaposition to "individual identity, " see Harre, 1993: 2) as an umbrella term for a great number of collective identity terms used widely in the academic literatures, such as "social identity" and "nationality identity." Social and nationality identities are forms of group identity which refer to an individual's awareness of his or her sameness to other members of the group in aspects made salient and elaborated by group members in the context of their interactions with other groups.[28] The internal *sameness* of one group is what makes it *different* from others. Explanations of one group's identity always imply that *other* groups maintain *their* identities as well. By definition, identity is a relative term. Thomas Eriksen (1993: 60) defines it as "*being the same as oneself* [and one's own group]as well

[27] I do not explore here the prevalence of the concept of identity outside the sphere of western sciences. Kazakh intellectuals are familiar with the Russian form of the term as *identichnost'*. Ahmetova *et al. English-Kazakh Dictionary* (1974: 285) gives *birdejlik*, *barabarlyk* [sameness], *uksastyk* [similarity] under its entry for "identity."

[28] My definition of group identity is consistent with Fredrik Barth's (1969: 10) discussion of ethnic groups "as categories of ascription and identification by the actors themselves." He writes (1969: 15) that "if a group maintains its identity when members interact with others, this entails criteria for determining membership and ways of signaling membership [sameness with one's in group] and exclusion [difference from the out group]."

as *being different*." In a similar vein, Tabouret-Keller (1997: 316) writes that "identifying...implies both that *they* are different from *us* and that *we* are different from *them*, and also, even if not explicitly, that they too are supposed to apply the same logic *vis-a-vis* ourselves. The Latin *alter* [other] (or, at a later time, *alter alter*) expresses this complex process in a very condensed and apt way, stressing its mirror quality." The term "in group" (Sumner, 1906 in Harre & Lamb, 1988: 192) refers to one's own group, the group with which one identifies, and the term "out group" refers to groups with which one does *not* identify, that is, groups with which *others* identify as *their* own.

Tabouret-Keller (1997: 324) defines the psychological process of *identification* as "the operation of bringing together identities as social constructs [group identity] and identities as subjective constructs [personal identity]." In other words, individuals tend to identify or associate themselves with various groups of individuals. Individuals tend to *identify* with groups they perceive as having positive attributes[29] benefiting those who belong to them. One aspect of an individual's identification with a group that he or she perceives as beneficial is referred to in psychological literature as *affiliation*, that is, "bringing into close contact or association; affiliation is association with cooperation, companionship, even love" (Reber, 1985: 15).

More recent notions of identity emphasize the malleability of identities as "strong" or "weak." One or more of our multiple and inter-related identities may be re-enforced or weakened during daily transactions and the peaks and troughs of life. For example, a person's religious identity within a particular faith community tends to be weakened by prolonged absence of contact with other members of that community and by long lapses of exposure to its scriptures and teachings, while constant interaction with other faith community members, scripture reading, and prayer strengthen that identity. Tabouret-Keller (1997: 326) eloquently expresses the tenuous nature of identity: "we suspect that [identities] provide just a very fragile and uncertain bridge between a person and her society, for example, when it comes to dealing with serious social problems such as unemployment." How can an unemployed woman, Tabouret-Keller muses, identify with her society's "ideals of discourse celebrating employment, work, and affluence" (1997: 326) when she is without a job and a work-place in that society? The fluctuating strength or weakness of group identities (see ethnic nationality identity and state identity below), as influenced by macro-level government policy and micro-level school discourse, is of central concern to this study.

Ethnic Nationality Identity and State Identity

In this study I am interested in the development of two phenomena which Fierman (1997: 1) calls "ethnic identity" and "republic identity:" an individual's identification with an ethnic group and/or a state. Instead of "republic identity," I use "state identity" for not all states are republics and I want to use as general a term as possible. Instead of "ethnic identity," I use "ethnic nationality" identity. In the copious literature on the peoples of the Soviet Union and former-Soviet Union, the term *natsionalnost*, 'nationality' is used for peoples with their own titular republics such as the Kazakhs, most of whom live in Kazakhstan, and for groups such as the Germans, Poles, and Dungans (W. Fierman, personal communication, November, 1998) who do not have their own administrative units. I modify "nationality" with "ethnic" to avoid a

---

[29] "Not always," says R. Freeman (personal communication, November, 1998), "often people identify or are identified with negative attributes." Her work (1993) demonstrates how a bilingual school seeks to help its pupils learn how to negotiate positive identities in the dominant society which often identifies them with negative attributes.

common semantic confusion, that is, the American usage of "nationality" to refer to a person's country of citizenship[30] and I consistently use the term "ethnic nationality" for the Kazakh word *ult* [31] and the Russian word *natsionalnost*.

I mentioned earlier that nationism (or civic nationalism) is mainly interested in language as a resource for operational efficiency and that nationalism (or ethnic nationalism) is primarily interested in language as a resource for ethnic authenticity. In this section, I link the concerns of nationism with the construction of a "state identity" and the concerns of nationalism with the construction "ethnic nationality" identity.

The distinction between ethnic nationalism/ethnic authenticity and identity on the one hand and nationism or civic nationalism /operational efficiency and state identity on the other hand are theoretically helpful (Breton, 1996: 349), forming two clearly distinguishable ends in the government policy continuum. Breton (1996: 348) defines the two types of nationalism as follows.

> In one type of nationalism...the basis of inclusion and exclusion is ethnic (e.g. ancestry, language, religion, 'cultural distinctiveness'). The attachment of individuals to the collective entity is primarily symbolic and socio-emotional rather than pragmatic or utilitarian. Hence, they are mobilizable for the pursuit of collective goals on the basis of loyalty to the collectivity rather than of personal benefits they can derive from membership in it...although the impact of other groups on one's material well being is important, the main threats that the group and its elite focus upon are those that pertain to its cultural and linguistic integrity and maintenance.

The other type of nationalism, "emphasizes the instrumental dimension of societal institutions:"

> Societies are constructed in order to acquire control over resources; to solve problems; and to defend members against enemies. Societies are seen as rational-legal entities...The basis of inclusion or exclusion is civic: it is by birth or on the basis of legally established criteria....The criteria tend to pertain to economic well-being or development of society--not its cultural character. In this nationalism, the cultural is dissociated from the political.

Kazakhstan struggles to find a balance between these poles. Since Independence in 1991, the government of Kazakhstan has projected itself as attempting to nurture (while curbing the excesses of) "two loyalties:" each citizen's own ethnic nationality identity, whatever it may be, and his or her state identity.[32] This policy of two loyalties is spelled out most explicitly in the presidential decree of July 15, 1996 entitled *Concept of Ethnocultural Education* which will be

---

[30] *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*'s (1988: 788) entry under "nationality," definition 3 a, b.

[31] Musabaev, 1978: 469 gives *ulttylyk* as the equivalent of the *national'nost'*. However, *ulttylyk* does not appear in Kengesbaev (1961), nor in the two Kazakh-Russian dictionaries (Mahmudov & Musabaev, 1989 and Bektaev, *et al*. 1992), nor in Merzabekova's (1992) Kazakh-German, nor in Krippe's (1994) Kazakh-English dictionary. Ahmetova, *et al.*'s English-Kazakh dictionary (1974: 217) gives *ult* for nationality.

[32] Walker Connor (1994: 196) uses the same term of "two loyalties," referring to the two distinct phenomena of "nationalism" (which I equate with "ethnic nationality identity") and "patriotism" (equated with "state identity").

analyzed in Chapter Two. It was designed to provide a much-needed balance between ethnic nationalism and civic nationalism, the latter of the two Akiner terms "internationalism...in the Soviet sense of harmonious inter-ethnic relations" (1995: 80-81). Akiner writes that "in both the public and private spheres, at government level and at the level of the individual, there is an almost schizophrenic oscillation between these positions" (1995: 80). Is the nation of Kazakhstan, or any nation, able to cultivate the loyalty of its citizens while condoning or even encouraging loyalty to the respective ethnic nationalities with which its citizens identify?

To try to answer this question for Kazakhstan, it is important to qualify a working definition of "nation." Stalin defined a nation as "a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture (Hutchinson & Smith, 1994: 20)."[33] He excluded race or tribe (i.e. kinship) as an essential element of nationhood.[34] I will use his definition (unless otherwise specified) since it constitutes an integral part of the ideological background of both the policy documents and school discourse concerning issues of state, ethnic nationality identity, and language.

I return, now, to the definition of "ethnic nationality" and it differs from "nation." Carlton Hayes' (Snyder, 1990: 256-257) defines nationality as "a cultural group of people who speak a common language (or closely related dialects) and who possess a community of historical traditions (religious, territorial, political, military, economic, artistic, and intellectual)." Unlike nation, "ethnic nationality" does not imply the present possession of politically organized territory[35], although, according to Hayes, a nationality may possess a tradition that includes its past occupation of a territory.

Although, Snyder writes (1990: 254), it is "impossible to argue *a priori* for the presence of any one of these factors [mentioned by Hayes] in the existence of a nationality," they are often present in academic discussions of the concept of nationality and feature prominently in both macro-level government and micro-level school discourse on ethnic nationality in my field data. An important example of the construction of ethnic nationality (analyzed in Chapter Seven of this work) is found in Mukhtar Shakhanov's poem, *Toert ana*, 'four mothers.' In his poem, Shakhanov specifies four attachments which belong to ethnic nationality consciousness: the individual's identification with *tugan zheri*, 'native land,' *tugan tili,* 'native tongue, *tugan daestur*, 'native tradition,' and *tugan tarijhy*, 'native history.' Although only representing one individual's views, Shakhanov's four themes of language, land, tradition, and history echo repeatedly in government documents and school discourse.

During the Soviet period, ethnic nationality was formalized not only by the establishment of titular territories but also with the inclusion of one's ethnic identity in passports. The passport of a Soviet Kazakh, for instance, had the Soviet Union for citizenship and Kazakh for ethnic nationality. Those residing in the former Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic were considered citizens of that Republic as well as of the Soviet Union (Akiner, 1983: 19). Nevertheless the

---

[33] I adhere to the notion of culture as "what is learned...the things one needs to know in order to meet the standards of others" (Goodenough, 1971: 19). I treat *tradition* in this dissertation as synonymous with culture.

[34] A "historically constituted, stable community...sharing a common psychological make-up manifested in a common culture" seems to imply, however, a fictive kinship constructed by those races and tribes who identify themselves as coherent groups. This element of fictive or perceived kinship and common ancestry figures prominently in other important definitions of nation (Weber, 1994: 22; Geertz, 1994: 33; Connor, 1994: 202).

[35] "Politically organized territory" is admittedly ambiguous because it could mean *de facto* political control or nominal affiliation in legal documents (W. Fierman, personal observation, October, 1998).

latter identity was more heavily stressed (Fierman, 1997: 2) in government ideology and propaganda and in the formal socialization of children and youth in schools and the many extra-curricular groups which flourished under the Party's leadership during the Soviet period. The long-standing Soviet emphasis upon an all-Union Soviet citizenship instead of a specific republican allegiance-- "simultaneous with processes which emphasized [ethnic] nationality"[36]-- are reasons why it is so hard for the present government to construct a Kazakhstan state identity amongst its citizens.

Pool's "Identity Planning"

I define the term "identity planning" as the selection, elaboration, implementation, and evaluation of metaphors of ethnic authenticity and operational efficiency. I will use it in this dissertation to refer both to macro-level government policy formulations concerning identity as well as micro-level faculty/pupil constructions of identity in discourse and written documents.

Pool (1979), a political scientist who was one of the first western scholars to use the term, analyzes its relationship to language planning without precisely defining it. His 1979 article implies that it means efforts to use language planning (among other forms of government policy planning) to change peoples' ethnic identity from one group to another and/or to promote "the growth of a united identity" (1979: 20). By "united identity" Pool seems to mean a state identity shared in common within a country by both majority and minority groups.

Pool maintains a fairly strong Whorfian view in assuming that language does affect thought so that language shift will possibly result in a change in identity. His main hypothesis, based on data about majority and minority language speakers in Wales and Quebec (majority language in either case being English, and the minority languages Welsh and French respectively), is that majority language speakers[37] who learn the minority language are more likely to identify with the minority group than minority language speakers who learn the majority language will identify with the majority group. In other words, English speakers who learn Welsh or French are more likely to identify themselves with the Welsh and the Quebecois than are Welsh and French speakers to identify with the majority British or English-speaking Canadians. Provided this hypothesis is true, Pool reasons, then the most effective means to create a state identity, regardless of the acquisition planning challenges, would be for the majority to learn the minority language rather than for the minority to learn the majority language:

> It may in principle be more difficult to teach a language of a few to many than to teach the language of the many to the few, but the effect of the former on identity would be greater. Furthermore...the growth of a united identity might be promoted if the majority's natural advantage were compensated for by a policy under which the majority had to learn the minority's language instead of vice versa.

---

[36] W. Fierman, personal communication, October, 1998.

[37] A major problem with both the Welsh and Canadian data, I find, is that the ethnicity of the parents is unclear--all the data gives is the main language spoken by both parents at home. In other words, we can not assume the parents' ethnicity, as Pool seems to do with his data from Wales and Quebec, by the main language they speak at home. For example, parents may speak English at home but both/either be ethnically Welsh or French Canadian or may speak French or Welsh at home and both/either be ethnically non-French-Canadian or non-Welsh.

A second major hypothesis of Pool's is that a person's change of identity from group A to B depends (in various degrees of strength depending upon the context) upon the level of competence that person has in language B. According to the data from both Wales and Quebec, Pool found that identity is not only related to a person's primary language (i.e. first language or mother tongue) but also to the degree of competence a person achieves in a second language (1979: 15-16).

Eastman (1981), however, challenges the validity of Pool's Whorfian assumptions as applied to the context of language planning and identity planning. In the contexts of language and identity planning, she suggests that language should not be considered in the Whorfian sense of a powerful medium of socialization that determines *thought*, but as "the communication of culture by means of *speech used* " (Eastman, 1981: 50, emphasis added). If policy makers and language planners, she argues, concentrate upon influencing the language people actually use rather than upon trying to change their thought, they will be able to plan more concretely and to evaluate the results of their efforts more accurately.

Eastman also suggests (1981: 46) that a language may be an important factor in a person's ethnic identity regardless of his/her level of competence because language has not only a communicative function but also an emblematic or symbolic function. She stresses that, more than actual general competence in a language, the aspect of a person's knowledge of a language most salient to identity and language planning issues is his or her command of that language's 'culture-loaded' (as opposed to 'culture-free') vocabulary (1981: 52).

Fasold (1984: 262) refers to identity planning as "consciously taken steps to influence a person's self-identification." "The conduct of identity *planning* would seem to involve using available resources to make it attractive to identify with the speakers of a particular language or variety (1984: 260)." Fasold does not give a more detailed account of what is involved in language planning in terms of macro-level policy or micro-level implementation.

Freeman (1993: 106-107) cites Fasold's definition of identity planning as involving active efforts to develop an attractive or desirable identity for the speakers of a particular language and links this with Harre's concept of a "social identity project" (Harre, 1984: 273-275). A social identity project entails first knowing "what the attributes of the desired social identity might be" (Harre, 1984: 274). In her ethnographic study of a bilingual school in the United States, Freeman (1993: 472) concentrates on "how an institution [the school] can collectively organize itself to...identify the attributes that a positive minority social identity would have." She interprets this positive minority social identity constructed by members of the school as the development of "the ability and the right to participate as an equal in whatever discourse the individual chooses to participate in [*sic*] without being forced to assimilate to standard English speaking white middle class norms of interaction and interpretation"(1993: 472). "The notion of identity planning," she writes (1993: 480), "is one that focuses on individual choice, with the individual constructing his/her positive minority social identity in his/her own image. In this way, identity planning allows for social change from the bottom up."

Like Freeman, I am also interested in identity planning and language planning and the linkage between school and society, but I approach these issues using a somewhat different set of theoretical and discourse analytical tools. Freeman's powerful methodology, which she calls an "ethnographic/discourse analytic approach," studies how pupils develop strategies to contest prevalent societal discourse and to take more control of their lives. My approach is to examine

macro-level government documents and micro-level school documents and oral discourse, searching for metaphorical constructions of identity (identity planning) and language (language orientation planning) within the context of the IP-LP typology diagrammed above. The purpose of these constantly evolving metaphorical constructions is to strive continually for "balanced" allocations of language functions (Haarmann, 1986: 89) that will authenticate and promote the multiple identities (ethnic, social, political, professional, sexual, etc.) that constitute the everyday realities of life in multilingual, industrialized societies (Haarmann, 1986: 90). Haarmann (1986: 91) cites Allardt:

> It seems reasonable to assert that patterns of multiple identities will stimulate the maintenance of ethnic loyalties on one hand, but also weaken conflicts on the other.

The ideal is to affirm one's roots while strengthening wider allegiances that benefit all, not just the members of one's own group. This is the balance between identities and language functions which Haarmann advocates and the fulfillment of the nationalistic goals of ethnic authenticity and nationist aims of operational efficiency about which Fishman writes (1969).

The identity planning panel of my extended framework is presented here:

IDENTITY PLANNING GOALS		
Approaches ⊳ ***Types*** ß	***Policy Planning (Form)***	***Cultivation Planning (Function)***
Identity Planning ***(Sources:*** **Eastman, 1981** **Fasold, 1984** **Fishman, 1969, 1997** **Freeman, 1993** **Haarman, 1986** **Lakoff, 1993** **Pool, 1979)**	***Selection of positive symbols & metaphors in areas of:*** **(1)** ***State identity (for operational efficiency)*** **(2)** ***Ethnic nationality identity (for ethnic authenticity)*** **Selection of visual symbols, metaphors, and stock of "culture-loaded" vocabulary (Eastman)**	***Implementation of positive symbols & metaphors in areas of:*** **(1)** ***State identity (for operational efficiency)*** **(2)** ***Ethnic nationality identity (for ethnic authenticity)*** **Dissemination of visual symbols, metaphors, and culture-loaded vocabulary via mass media, creative and academic literature, government, cultural, and educational institutions**

Method

My methodology is ethnographic. Ethnography "seeks to describe and interpret systematically and thoroughly a particular culture, or cultural situation, in terms generated by the culture itself, and not in terms of an *a priori* hypothesized generalization to be tested" (Hornberger, 1988: 4). The ethnographic method of describing a group in its own terms is applied here. I study government and school constructions of identity and language metaphors in terms of their own conceptual systems. However, I have emphasized certain components of these systems guided by the assumption that each ethnic nationality possesses a "positive" identity, that is, the ability to construct metaphors about the strengths of their own group and of concern for those outside the group.

My data collection was conducted from September, 1995 to March, 1996 in the village of "Aspan" (pseudonym). I lived in the village for a year prior to that in order to learn Kazakh and to prepare for a proper entrance into the Kazakh School. Abzal, the School Director and the teachers were extraordinarily gracious and patient putting up with my daily incursions into the halls and classrooms of the school. Special thanks goes to Nurijla, the School's Dean of Studies and Eleventh Grade Homeroom teacher in whose classes (history, social studies, ethnic philosophy, and rhetoric) I spent most of my observation time. When I went to classes, I sat in the empty seat of a pupil's desk (all desks are made to seat two pupils) with my notebook and often with a portable tape-recorder. At the beginning of class, I would ask the teacher for permission to tape-record it. Most of the time, with a few exceptions, the teacher granted me the permission to do so.

My original purpose was to study the impact of the government's extensive language planning efforts on the attitudes and actions of teachers in a Kazakh language medium school. My initial interest in Kazakhstan's language planning endeavors was sparked providentially: during the 1990-1991 academic year, my eye happened to catch a caption in a *Kazakhstanskaja Pravda* laying on top of a stack of newspapers unceremoniously stacked under a table in the basement library of the Russian Research Institute in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The caption of the July 1, 1990 issue was announcing Kazakhstan's new State Program on Languages. An analysis of that document inaugurated my study of this fascinating area of research. Soon after, I enrolled in a graduate school of education and began pursuing the educational implications of Kazakhstan's language planning efforts which eventually led to my desire to observe firsthand the implementation of these efforts in actual schools. ACTR/ACCELS (American Council of Teachers of Russian/American Council for Collaboration in Education and Language Study), under the able leadership of Dr. Dan Davidson, supported me financially during the summer language study in Almaty in 1992 and for the first year in Aspan, 1994-1995, and also provided essential visa and advisory support for my field research in Almaty in the summer of 1993 and in Aspan, 1995-1996.

Data Collection

Government Documents

My data is divided into two main groups: government documents and school discourse, both written and spoken.

I collected the corpus of government documents used in this dissertation in a gradual, ethnographic manner. During the summers of 1992 and 1993 and after my family began residence in Kazakhstan in July, 1994, I visited bookstores and newspaper kiosks of Almaty City and the neighboring *awdan* center, Kaskeleng City keeping my eye open for significant new publications in Kazakh and in Russian. In this way, I came upon most of the government documents used in this study. I found several others either in the library of Aspan's Kazakh School or in the school director's office. This gradual approach of gathering documents on the field turned out to be quite effective. Upon returning to the United States, I found that I already possessed the original Russian and Kazakh language versions of important government documents which had been summarized or translated in full into English by American news services such as Radio Liberty and the Foreign Broadcast Information Service. My success in collecting government documents on the field is partly due to the highly centralized nature of the present government and President Nazarbaev's effectiveness in making major policy pamphlets available to the public through the country's retail stores.

In addition to checking bookstores, I subscribed to a number of newspapers which also carried draft and final versions of the Constitution of 1995 in both Kazakh and Russian. The newspapers were filled with editorials and articles about issues directly related to identity planning and language planning but I have limited my focus to official documents themselves which have legal force and/or the authority of the government's endorsement. However, with my language tutor I read various articles in newspapers which provided many valuable insights for this study.

Besides buying documents from bookstores or photocopying ones I found at the Kazakh School, I also went to the Ministry of Education building in Almaty City to collect information on the State's language requirements for secondary schools in the country. I was well received there and given a set of booklets (one in Kazakh, one in Russian) which described the state-endorsed curricula. Later, I was able to get an official, published update of these same curricula from an employee of the local Awdan Educational Administration.

School Written and Spoken Discourse

I collected school documents as I encountered them and made photocopies of them on a portable photocopier I was able to purchase in Almaty City. The Kazakh School director, librarian, teachers and pupils generously let me take both published and hand-written documents home to photocopy and later return to them. I copied into my fieldnotes the extensive writings, both permanent and temporary, on the walls and bulletin boards of the school. I photographed some of the wall texts as well as the pictorial plaques and murals adorning the hallways and classrooms.

I collected spoken discourse at the school with a portable tape-recorder. For a brief period during the fall of 1994 and extensively during the fall of 1995, I observed many classes and meetings at the Kazakh School, took fieldnotes in all, and tape-recorded many. I also interviewed teachers and students both informally during the course of field observations or

formally by preparing questions ahead of time. Interviews were in Kazakh except for the informal one conducted after English Club which began in English and eventually switched over to Kazakh and Russian (the specifics of which are detailed in Chapter Eight).

My method of processing meetings and the interviews was to first ask (and pay) a local person to transcribe the tapes in long hand. For particularly important meetings, such as the September 6, 1995 parents-teachers' meeting analyzed in detail in Chapter Seven, I typed the hand-written transcripts onto the computer in Cyrillic font (the official script used for Kazakh in Kazakhstan) and then checked a print-out of the text with my language teacher both for accuracy of transcription and for clarification of meanings. For the interviews and other meetings, I typed up summaries with transcriptions of important sections.

I have many fieldnotes and tapes of classes but have not used them extensively in this study. My practice was to take fieldnotes and tape-recordings in class (again with the generous assent of the classroom teachers) and then encode the fieldnotes on computer as soon after class as possible.

Transliterations in the Body of the Dissertation

Within the body of the dissertation, I give English translations and transliterations of the Kazakh or Russian texts for written government and school site documents and only the English translation of school site spoken discourse. Transliteration tables, with explanations, can be found in the appendices. For instances of the use of Kazakh and Russian phrases embedded within the text of my discussion, I follow the stylistic guidelines of the LSA (Linguistic Society of America); for examples: *ana tili*, 'mother tongue' and *ulttyk sana-sezim,* 'ethnic nationality consciousness.'

Data Analysis

Preliminary Data Analysis

Back in the United States, faced with a pile of the print-outs of the transcripts, fieldnotes, and summaries I had encoded on the computer in Kazakhstan, I began to look for repetitive themes among the data. Initially, I went through the data and recorded language orientations and organized them under emerging headings of related items. Hornberger urged me to isolate major arguments and lesser but nevertheless persistent themes which I saw emerging from my analysis of the field data. To accomplish this, I used the File-Maker Pro data base software program to record salient themes and labeled them with the date and place of their collection. I kept themes in one large database file and recorded a smaller set of emerging arguments in another file. I also produced another comprehensive file of metaphors for language used in government documents and school discourse and texts.

Discourse Analysis

Metaphor analysis, as introduced earlier, is my principal discourse analytic method. I will also briefly mention in this section my use of the work of Tannen (1979) and Hymes (1974). I note in Chapter Five the use of inexact statements and generalization (Tannen, 1979: 171-172) in a teacher's narrative. Tannen argues that these are evidence of the speaker's culturally-informed expectations within certain speech situations. These expectations constitute an important element in Hymes' norms of interpretation mentioned below.

Hymes' "Ethnography of Speaking."

My main methodological tool is metaphor analysis but I do make limited use of elements of Hymes' ethnography of speaking. My choice to focus on one speech event, Nurijla's speech during the September sixth parents-teachers' meeting, was largely due to his emphasis on isolating speech situations which can further be broken down for analysis into speech events and speech acts (Saville-Troike, 1989: 26-27). I will mention elements of his taxonomy for the analysis of speech (one or more of sixteen elements represented by one letter in the eight letters of the acrostic SPEAKING) when they are helpful in explaining the discourse excerpts which I have chosen. These elements (based on Wolfson's exposition of them, 1989: 7-9) are as follows.

S: ***Setting***. (1) *Setting*: the time, place, and physical setting. (2) *Scene*: the psychological ambiance or cultural definition of the occasion.

P: ***Participants*****.** (3) *Speakers*. (4) *Addressors*: speakers who are relaying the messages of others. (5) *Hearers*. (6) *Addressees*: objects or animals which are addressed by a speaker.

E: ***Ends*****.** (7) *Purposes*: "conventionally recognized and expected outcomes" (Hymes, 1974: 56). (8) *Goals*: the personal aims[38] of individuals (Hymes, 1974: 57).

A: ***Act Sequence*** (what is said, in what order)**.** (9) *Message Form*: how something is said. (10) *Message Content*: topics being discussed.

K: ***Keys*****.** (11) *Keys:* manner or spirit in which utterances are made, i.e. serious, joking, sarcastic. Key overrides form and content when they are in conflict.

I: ***Instrumentalities*****.** (12) *Channels*: written or spoken. (13) *Forms of Speech*: languages, language varieties, registers.

N: ***Norms*****.** (14) *Norms of Interaction*: specific behaviors considered appropriate for different kinds of speaking in different societies and involving analysis of social structure and social relationships of community roles. (15) *Norms of Interpretation*: the way different kinds of speech are regarded and understood by members of a given group which involve analysis of the belief system of the community.

G: ***Genres*****.** (16) *Genres*: poems, prayers, proverbs, myths, greetings, blessings, curses, etc. which can be on the levels of speech situation (i.e., a play), speech event (i.e., recitation of a poem), or speech act (i.e., a blessing).

In addition to informing my analysis of specific discourses, Hymes' ethnography of speaking has influenced the overall organization of my dissertation. Chapters Two through Five provide the political and social psychological *scene* and Chapters Four and Six provide the physical *setting* of the community of Aspan and of the Kazakh School for the speech event of Nurijla's speech analyzed in Chapter Seven. These chapters, in turn, provide the scene and setting for my interviews with pupils in Chapter Eight. The layers of description piled up in Chapters Two through Eight are meant to maximize the reader's understanding and appreciation of the final bits of data embedded in the conclusions drawn in Chapter Nine.

Analysis of "Speech Communities"

In Chapter Four, I describe the Kazakh School and the Russian School in the village of Aspan in terms of two distinct speech communities. The concept of *speech community* has a long history in the sociolinguistic literature. I use two criteria to qualify my use of the term. The first criterion is extra-linguistic, dealing with group identification and acceptance: a speech

---

[38] Attempting to discover the ways in which a person expresses his/her aim in a narrative is the equivalent of exploring "the means used by the narrative to indicate the point of the narrative, its raison d'être: why it was told, and what the narrator is getting at," i.e., what Labov (1972: 366) calls "evaluation."

community is "a group of people who regard themselves as using the same language"(Halliday, 1968: 140) and who are accepted by other members of the group. The second criterion is linguistic, dealing with language use: a speech community is a group of people who share at least one language variety and know its norms of use (Fishman, 1971: 28; Gumperz, 1972: 219-221; Hymes, 1974: 51; Labov, 1972b: 120-121). In terms of this study, I attempt to show that the members of either speech community identify with and are accepted by it and have chosen the use of one or the other language as the main medium of school instruction.

Organization

As it contains a strong ethnographic element, this study is organized not only by the main points of the above language planning model but also by consideration of how best to incorporate the emic themes which emerged from the ethnographic fieldwork. Fortunately, I believe that can be done: after an analysis of the data, I have arrived at the following central organizational categories which, I believe, incorporate many of the important themes I read in the documents or recorded in the field:

Processes of Becoming
Becoming a Multi-ethnic Nation ***(koep ulttyk el boluwda)***
Becoming a State Language **(*memleket til boluwda*)**
Becoming a Multi-track Kazakh Gimnasia ***(koep salaly Kazakh Gimnasiasy boluwda)***
Becoming a Multilingual Citizen (*koep til soelej alatyn azamat boluwda)*

Please see the Table of Contents for a complete presentation of the dissertation's organization which integrates the language planning typology and these four categories as follows: becoming a multi-ethnic nation/identity planning; becoming a state language/orientation and status planning; and becoming a multi-track Kazakh gimnasia/acquisition planning. "Becoming" is used to emphasize the rapidly changing and uncertain situation in Kazakhstan both at the national and the school levels.

In the conclusion, based upon my findings concerning identity and language planning, I propose the imagery in the State Anthem of the kind mother as a suitable comprehensive metaphor of identity for both *memleket* (the state) and *mektep* (the school) that is compatible with the Kazakh mother tongue revival movement (vernacularization) and the push toward nation-

wide operational efficiency via the use of a non-native language-of-wider-communication (internationalization).

In terms of chapter content, the dissertation's organization is as follows. Chapter Two provides regime policy and perspectives on Kazakh ethnic nationality identity and an emerging multi-ethnic or trans-ethnic state identity. Chapter Three analyzes written government attitudes toward language and toward the two languages most widely used in the Republic, Kazakh and Russian.

Chapter Four describes the community of Aspan in which are located the Kazakh School and its counterpart, the Russian School. It also chronicles the advent of Kazakh-medium education in the community from its inception in the fall of 1989 through the spring of 1996 when my fieldwork there came to an end. Chapter Five records the responses of teachers at Aspan's Kazakh School to open-ended interview questions. These narratives represent the teachers' own reconstructions of what they thought, felt, said, and did during the turbulent first days of Kazakh-medium education in the community of Aspan.

Chapter Six describes visual and textual artifacts at Aspan's Kazakh School which reveal the school's own efforts to construct identity and language orientations. It compares the Kazakh School's symbols (its school emblem and school anthem) with the State symbols and State Anthem and provides the physical setting for Nurijla's speech in Chapter Seven. In Chapter Seven, Nurijla, Dean of Studies at Aspan's Kazakh School, addresses a meeting of bewildered parents who were wavering in their commitment to Kazakh language medium education in the wake of the new Constitution's elevation of the status of the Russian language.

Chapter Eight airs the voices of eleventh grade pupils at Aspan's Kazakh School concerning their views on identity and language. Finally, Chapter Nine summarizes my findings in the areas of language and identity planning in Kazakhstan at the government and school levels.