

Chapter 9

Creating and maintaining linguistic dominance in pluricentric languages: Profit over languages

1. Introduction

The main objective of this chapter is to identify and reflect on the mechanisms and measures that establish linguistic dominance and keep it stable and unchallenged over long periods of time, after the division into different nations has occurred. To find this out, the practice of different PCLs is examined and compared. The other aim, which is what NDVs can possibly do to overcome the dominance of another variety and its dependence on it, is addressed in chapter (10).

As stated in previous chapters, PCLs are generally marked by an asymmetric relationship between their national varieties.² The so called “mother variety” usually enjoys the highest prestige and therefore its linguistic and pragmatic features are usually preferred throughout the whole language community – even in the non-dominant varieties (NDVs) of the language. The key question that arises from this kind of collective behaviour is how linguistic dominance is maintained when the area of a language has been split up into different nations that usually strive to act independently.

2. Linguistic dominance: A multi-level definition³

Linguistic dominance can be defined as a social act in which a particular language or variety and its characteristics are systematically favoured over other languages or varieties of the same language, resulting in a social habit that goes hand in hand with the respective language attitude of asserting superiority over other languages or varieties of the same language. The social-symbolic value of ‘other’ languages or ‘other’ varieties of the same language is devalued and their status lowered. This act of a conscious choice may be supported by pedagogical, political or even legal measures.

3. Functional levels of dominance

As mentioned above, the central question to be answered is: How is linguistic dominance of a certain variety of a PCL established and managed, so that it persists for a long period of time? The characteristics and measures for the establishment and maintenance of dominance of a single language on the language market⁴ against other (competing) varieties of the same language ap-

pear to be situated on three functional levels that ensure the dominance of a variety.

3.1 Functional level (1): Political and economical power: Non-linguistic preconditions for dominance of one specific variety of a pluricentric language

As already mentioned by Clyne (1992), a prerequisite for dominance is always political, economic and cultural (sometimes also military) power. Dominance is therefore exerted when a variety has all or at least some of the following characteristics:

- (1) The national variety has a large number of speakers (relative to the total number of speakers of that language) which represent the majority of the speakers of that language, thus generating predominant social power;
- (2) The nation using this variety has considerable economic power, providing the financial means to promote the variety through various measures, such as codifying institutions and institutions that spread the variety abroad and promote its status;
- (3) This nation also has considerable political power, which usually results in political leadership, which in turn leads to a high status and the imitation of linguistic and social behaviour by other nations that use varieties of the same PCL.

The characteristics at this level ensure dominance by the number of speakers and the role of a leading nation on the level of economics and politics providing opportunities and prestige by anyone who is a member of this nation or adapts his linguistic behaviour to it. This will lead to the preference of the specific dominant variety of this nation in international organisations (UN, EU, WTO etc.)⁵ as well as in the national and international media.

In order to find out which languages are used in international organisations, a study of the official languages of the following 77 international organisations⁶ was carried out and revealed that only 29 languages are used in these organisations. The organisations examined were:

Amnesty International; (2) Antarctic Treaty Secretariat (ATS); (3) Bank for International Settlements (BIS); (4) Commonwealth of Nations; (5) Community of Portuguese Language Countries (CPLP); (6) FIFA; (7) Holy See; (8) International Criminal Court (ICC); (9) International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol); (10) International Energy Agency (IEA); (11) International Federation of Journalists (IFJ); (12) International Labour Organization (ILO/OIT); (13) International Monetary Fund (IMF); (14) International Olympic Committee (IOC/CIO); (15) International Organization for Standardization (ISO); (16) International Telecommunication Union (ITU); (17) International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN); (18) Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU); (19) Latin Union (activities have been suspended since 2012); (20) Médecins Sans Frontières; (21) Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/OCDE); (22) Organisation internationale de la Francophonie (OIF); (23) Organization of Ibero-American States (OEI); (24) Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC/OIC);

(25) Red Cross; (26) Rotary International; (27) Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP); (28) (UNESCO); (29) United Nations (UN/ONU); (30) Universal Postal Union (UPU); (31) World Bank (WB); (32) World Customs Organization; (33) World Health Organization (WHO); (34) World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO); (35) World Trade Organization (WTO/OMC); (36) African Development Bank; (37) African Union (AU/UA); (38) Greater Arab Free Trade Area (GAFTA); (39) Arab League; (40) Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC); (41) Asian Development Bank (ADB); (42) Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB); (43) Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN); (44) Benelux; (45) Caribbean Community (CARICOM); (46) Caribbean Development Bank (CDB); (47) Central American Common Market (CACM); (48) Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA); (49) Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS); (50) Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf (GCC); (51) Council of Europe; (52) East African Community (EAC); (53) Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS/CEDEAO); (54) Economic and Monetary Community of Central Africa (CEMAC); (55) Eurasian Development Bank (EDB); (56) Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU); (57) European Space Agency (ESA); (58) European Union (EU/UE); (59) Group of Seven (G7); (60) Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC); (61) Indian Ocean Rim Association (IORA); (62) Islamic Development Bank (IDB); (63) Mercosur/Mercosul; (64) New Development Bank (NDB); (65) Nordic Investment Bank (NDB); (66) North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA); (67) Nordic Council (NC); (68) North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO/OTAN); (69) Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE); (70) Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC); (71) Organization of American States (OAS/OEA); (72) Pacific Islands Forum; (73) Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO); (74) South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC); (75) South Pacific Commission (SPC); (76) Southern African Development Community (SADC); (77) Union of South American Nations (Unasul-Unasur).

The results are:

Language	Organisation	% out of 77
1. English	63 /6	90
2. French	51	66
3. Spanish	36	47
4. Arabic	24	31
5. Portuguese	19	25
6. Russian	19	25
7. German	12	16
8. Chinese	10	16
9. Italian	7	13
10. Dutch	3	4
11. Japanese	3	4
12. Indonesian	2	3
13. Korean	2	3
14. Swahili	2	3

15. Burmese	1	1,3
16. Catalan	1	1,3
17. Danish	1	1,3
18. Filipino	1	1,3
19. Guarani	1	1,3
20. Hindi	1	1,3
21. Khmer	1	1,3
22. Lao	1	1,3
23. Latin (official)	1	1,3
24. Malay	1	1,3
25. Norwegian	1	1,3
26. Swedish	1	1,3
27. Tamil	1	1,3
28. Thai	1	1,3
29. Vietnamese	1	1,3

Table (1): Number of official languages used in 77 international organisations (list above)

Table (1) shows that 29 languages are used as official languages in the 77 international organisations. Of these 29 languages, only 14 are used in more than one international organisation.

The three most important languages are *English*, which is used in 90%, *French* in 66% and *Spanish* in 47% of all organisations.⁷ The following 15 languages are only used in one international organisation: *Burmese; Catalan; Danish;*

Filipino; Guarani; Hindi; Khmer; Lao; Latin (official); Malay; Norwegian; Swedish; Tamil; Thai; Vietnamese. Of the 47 PCLs that have been identified so far by the WGNDV, only 23 are being used as an official language in international organisations.

The status as “*language of international organisations*” clearly supports the dominant variety (DV), as it is very unlikely that norms of the NDVs are accepted in this context (except possibly in semi-official conversation).

However, if a PCL is small by the total number of its speakers (examples are *Albanian, Armenian, Basque, Catalan, Guarani, Occitan and Quechua*) the differences in economic and political power within such a PCL are of little importance, as decisions on the accepted norms are mostly decided in norm setting institutions that are backed by specific groups and interests.⁸ This also holds true for the following characteristics on level (2) as the “smaller” PCLs are usually not disseminated and spread via satellite-TV (SAT-TV).

3.2 Functional level (2): Language spread via electronic media and international language teaching organisations that promote language contact in other varieties and contribute to its dominance via predominance

Political and economical power per se is not enough to ensure that a specific variety gains particular esteem.⁹ The prestige of the supporting nation needs to be transferred to its variety. The prerequisite for this is (a) language contact, (b) language instruction and (c) language codification by well - equipped academies/publishers, as well as the availability of reliable reference books and text books for language learning. This establishes the predominance of the norm of a certain variety against the norms of other varieties in foreign language teaching, literature, tuition and in international certification of language skills.¹⁰

A particular role in achieving and enforcing dominance (indirectly) is achieved by the regular consumption of programmes broadcast via SAT-TV providing language contact with a specific (D-)variety. SAT-TV enables access to practically every speaker in the respective language community. The impact of satellite TV is massive – particularly in NDVs where language awareness for the native variety is weak and affinity of the social élites to the dominant variety is strong. The study by Muhr (2003) showed that the linguistic influence of TV programmes coming from a dominant nation on the lexicon of a NDV is particularly strong with the younger generation and may result in the stigmatisation of most traditional lexical items of the NDV, in this case Austrian German, which for that reason is gradually shifting to German German. The existence of such channels is taken as a means that supports (a) the knowledge and (b) the familiarity with the variety that is distributed via SAT-TV and exerts influence

on the linguistic repertoire of speakers who have a high level of TV-consumption.¹¹ To check the amount of language spread via SAT-TV, 41 of the 47 PCLs that have been identified so far and researched are displayed at the web site of the “Working Group on Non-dominant Varieties of Pluricentric Languages” (WGNDV)¹² research was conducted on the number of SAT-TV-stations that broadcast from the dominant nation(s) and the non-dominant nations. The PCLs were also researched in respect to institutions that are specifically dealing with language spread outside the country. These data can be found in table (2) below.¹³

Table (2): PCLS, DVs and NDVs with Satellite-TV, institutions for language regulation and international language spread

PCL	Nation where this language has an official status	Name of Satellite TV-station broadcasting for audiences outside the residual country	National institution for language regulation	National organisation for international language spread
1. Albanian	Albania	RTSH Sat, RTSH 3, RTSH 24	Academy of Sciences of Albania	None
	Kosovo	None	Academy of Sciences and Arts of Kosovo	None
	North Macedonia	TV ERA	None	None
2. Arabic	Abu Dhabi	Zayed Digital TV	None	Arabic Language International Council
	Algeria	Canal Algérie (ENTV 2)	Supreme Council of the Arabic language in Algeria	
	Egypt	Nile TV	Academy of the Arabic Language in Cairo	
	Iraq	Al-Alam	Iraqi Academy of Sciences	
	Jordan	Al-Manar	Jordan Academy of Arabi	
	Qatar	Al Jazeera	None	
	Saudi Arabia/ UAE	al-Arabiya	King Salman Global Academy for Arabic Language	
	Syria	Massaya TV, Sama TV, Syria TV	Academy of the Arabic Language in Damascus	
3. Aramaic	Irak	Ishtar TV, ANB, KBSV Suroyo TV	None	None
4. Armenian	Armenia	AMPTV/ARMTV ¹⁵	Armenian National Academy of Sciences (Armenia)	None
	US (Western Armenian)	UsArmeniaTV ARTN -Shant TV	Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (Western Armenian)	None

5. Aymara	Bolivia	None	Instituto de Lengua y Cultura de la Nación Aymara	None
	Peru	None	None	None
	Chile	None	None	None
6. Azerbaijani ¹⁶	Azerbaijan	Az TV, ITV, CBC	Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences	None
	Dagestan (Russia)	None	None	None
7. Bengali ¹⁷	Bangladesh	BTV World, Dhaka; Bangla-vision plus at least another 10 satellite TV channels	Bangla Academy	None
	India, West Bengal	ABP, Ananda, ETB Basque, ETB 1, EITB Basque	Paschimbanga Bangla Akademi (West Bengal)	None
8. Basque	Spain: Basque County, Navarra	ETB Basque (Spain)	Euskaltzaindia: Real Academia de la Lengua Vasca, Académie de la Langue Basque ¹⁸	None
	France: Pyrénées-Atlantiques, Nouvelle-Aquitaine	None		None
9. Berber/ ¹⁹ Tamazight	Morocco	TV4 Tamazight TV, 2M TV, Arrabia	Royal Institute of Amazight Culture	None
	Algeria	Berbère Télévision	Algerian Academy of Amazigh Language	None
	France	TV3CAT, TV3	None	None
10. Catalan ²⁰	Catalonia	A Punt	Institut d'Estudis Catalans (IEC)	None
	Valencia	None	Acadèmia Valenciana de la Llengua (AVL)	None
	Andorra	IB3, IB Sat	None	None
	Balearic Islands	None	None	None
	France	None	None	None
11. Chinese ²¹	People's Republic of China	China Central Television (CCTV)	State Language Commission	Cultural dissemination: Confucius institute, 433 institutes in 112 countries ²²
	Malaysia	TV2, OKEY, BERUTAR ²³	Chinese Language Standardisation Council of Malaysia	None
	Taiwan	Taiwan Television (TTV); China Television (CTV); Taiwan Broadcasting System (TBS); TVBS-NEWS; ETTV News CTi News; SET News	National Languages Committee	None
	Singapore	Channel U, Channel 8	Promote Mandarin Council	None

12. Dutch ²⁴	Netherlands	BVN, Hilversum, Co-operation of state TV-stations of Netherlands and Belgium	Dutch Language Union	130 international schools ²⁵
	Belgium	BVN, Hilversum		None
	Surinam	None		None
13. English	United Kingdom	BBC World News BBC World Service Sky TV	No regulatory body, done by dictionary offices: Oxford Dictionary	British Council, 200 offices in over 100 countries ²⁶
	US	CNBC; CNC World; CNN International; MSNBC FOX; HBO etc.	No regulatory body, done by dictionary office of Merriam-Webster Dictionary 193 overseas schools ²⁷	193 overseas schools ²⁸
	Australia	Australia Plus TV ²⁹ ABC International (Asia-Pacific TV channel) / ABC Pacific/ ABC Asia	No regulatory body, done by dictionary office of Macquarie Dictionary	None
	All other varieties	Have SAT-TV that is mainly restricted to the territory of the resp. nation	Unknown	None
14. French ³⁰	France	France24 (news); BFM TV; Canal+; TF1; France 2, France 3; France 4; Arte, TV5Monde	Academie Francaise	Alliance française: 830 offices in 135 countries; ³¹ Institut Français: 98 institutes: Cultural cooperation and action departments ³² 600 schools abroad in 139 countries ³³
	Belgium	TV5Monde: Co-operation between France, Canada, Belgium and Switzerland	Royal Academy of French Language and Literature of Belgium	
	Quebec (Canada)	TV5Monde	Québec Office of the French Language)	
	All other varieties	None	None	
15. German	Germany	DW-TV: Deutsche Welle ARD, ZDF, and about 40 other public and private TV-stations broadcast all over Europe	Indirectly regulated by dictionary office of Duden dictionary and other institutions	Goethe Institut, Munich: 160 institutes in 94 countries; 200 German schools abroad ³⁴
	Austria	ORF 2 Europe (restricted program: news and selected	Indirectly regulated by the dictionary office of the Österrei-	Österreich Institut: 10 institutes in Europe; 8 Austrian

		programs from Austria)	chische Wörterbuch	schools abroad
	Switzerland	SF1, SF2 can be received all over Europe	None	17 Swiss schools abroad ³⁵ ; Pro Helvetia (cultural institute), no language spread
	Austria, Germany, Switzerland	3sat, full program Cooperation between ARD, ZDF, ORF, SRF		
16. Greek	Greece	ERT World 1, ANT1 Greece; Star International, Alpha Sat, RIK Sat	None	Center for the Greek Language Thessaloniki (admin. by the Ministry of Education)
	Cyprus	none	None	None
17. Guarani	Paraguay	None	Guarani Language Academy	None
18. Hindi	India	45 Indian and foreign Satellite TV providers that can be received all over Asia	Central Hindi Directorate	None
		None	None	None
19. Hungarian	Hungary	MR 1, M2, Duna TV, Duna World	Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics	Balassi-Institute: 26 branches in 24 countries abroad ³⁶
	Romania	None	None	None
	Serbia	None	None	None
	Slovakia	None	None	None
	Slovenia	None	None	None
20. Irish	Ireland	TG4; Cúla (children) RTÉ International	Foras na Gaeilg (The Irish institute)	None
	Northern Ireland	BBC Two Northern Ireland		None
21. Italian	Italy	Mediaset Italia; RAI Italia; RAI 1-5	Regulated by: Accademia della Crusca	Società Dante Alighieri: 400 committees abroad ³⁷ ;
	San Marino	San Marino RTV	none	None
	Switzerland	RSI La 1, RSI La 2, TeleTicino	Research institute: Osservatorio linguistico della Svizzera italiana	none
22. Kiswahili/Swahili	Tanzania	Lyng Sat, Mambo TV Swahili	National Swahili Council; The East African Kiswahili Commission of the East African Community	None
	Kenya	Lyng Sat, TV47 Kenya	National Kiswahili Association	None
	Uganda	Lyng Sat, ST Swahili plus	None	None

23. Korean	South Korea	Arirang TV, KBS World, CGN TV, YTN World, KBS World 24	National Institute of the Korean Language	Korean Cultural Centre: 37 centres in 30 countries ³⁸
	North Korea	None	The Language Research Institute, Academy of Social Science	None
	China	None	China Korean Language Regulatory Commission	None
24. Kurdish ³⁹	Iraq	Kurdistan TV, Kurdsat, Vin TV	Kurdish Academy of Language [KAL]	None
	Turkey, Syria, Armenia, Iran, Azerbaijan	not applicable because of unclear political status		None
25. Malay	Malaysia	TV1, TV2, OKEY, Sukam RTM, Berita RM, TV6	Institute of Language and Literature	None
	Brunei	RTB Aneka, RTB Perdana	Language and Literature Bureau	None
	Singapore	Suria (TV channel)	Malay Language Council, Singapore	None
26. Mongolian	Mongolia	DDishTV LLC	Council of the official state language	None
	China (PRC)	China Central Television (CCTV)	Council for Language and Literature Work	None
27. Norwegian	Norway	not applicable	Norwegian Academy (Riksmåll), Language Council of Norway (Bokmål and Nynorsk)	None
28. Occitan	Spain	(Aranese): TV3	Institute of Aranese Studies	None
	France	ÔTele	Occitan Language Council Permanent Congress of the Occitan Language	None
	Monaco	None	None	None
29. Pashto	Afghanistan	Ariana TV; ARZU TV	Academy of Sciences of Afghanistan	
	Pakistan	Pashto TV, Sharq TV	Pashto Academy of Pakistan	None
30. Persian	Iran	6 satellite channels by IRIB, Iran International (UK), GEM TV (Dubai), VOA Persian (US), MBC Persia (UAE)	Academy of Persian Language and Literature	None
	Afghanistan (Dari)	RTA Afghanistan, Ariana Afghanistan International AATV	Academy of Sciences of Afghanistan	None
	Pakistan	AVT Khyber, Hum Pashto ⁴⁰	None	None

	Uzbekistan, Tajikistan	Khyber News, Islamabad	None	None
31. Portuguese ⁴¹	Portugal	RTP Internacional; RTP África, TVI Internacional	Lisbon Academy of Sciences	Instituto Camões ⁴² : 69 centres in 41 countries and 16 Cultural Centres;
	Brazil	TV Globo Internacional	Brazilian Academy of Letters	None
	Angola	SIC Internacional, TVI Internacional		None
	Mozambique	None	Eduardo Mondlane University	None
	East Timor	None	None	None
	Cap Verde	STV Notícias, available in Angola, Portugal	None	None
32. Punjabi	India	DD Punjabi, Zee Punjabi, PTC Punjabi	None	None
	Pakistan	Pakistan Television	None	None
33. Quechua ⁴³	Peru	TV Peru	Highest Academy of the Quechua Language, Cusco, Peru	None
	Bolivia		Language and Culture Institute of the Quechua Nation	None
	Ecuador		Academy of the Kichwa Language	None
34. Romanian	Romania	Digi 24, Pro TV International ⁴⁴	Academia Română	Institutul Cultural Român: 19 branches worldwide ⁴⁵
	Moldova	None	Academy of Sciences of Moldova	None
35. Russian ⁴⁶	Russia	RTR-Planeta, MIR, Russia Today	Russian Language Institute Russkij Mir (Russian World)	None
	Kazakhstan, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Georgia, Uzbekistan	Nationwide Russian TV stations in all countries but not on satellite	None	None
36. Sami	Norway	BO TV	None	None
	Finland regionally	Yle Ođđasa	University in Tromsø, Norway	None
	Sweden regionally	None	Giellagas-Instituutti, Oulu, Finland	None
37. Scotts	Scotland	None	Scots Language Centre	None
	Northern Ireland	None	Ulster-Scots Agency	None
38. Serbian	Serbia	DTH, SBB, Digi TV,	Board for Stan-	None

		Nova, RTV Pink	Standardization of the Serbian Language	
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	RTV Pink	None	None
	Montenegro	Nova, RTV Pink	None	None
	Kosovo	None	None	None
39. Somali	Somalia	Universal Television (London)	Regional Somali Language Academy	None
	Somaliland	Universal Television (London)	None	None
40. Spanish	Spain	TVE Internacional, 24hTVE	Association of Spanish Language Academies	Instituto Cervantes: 40 centres and 15 associated centres abroad ⁴⁷
	Regional: Aragón, Extremadura, Galicia, Andalucía	Canal Sur Andalucía, Aragón TV INT, Canal Extremadura Sat		
	Latin American countries	teleSUR		
	Guinea Ecuatorial	RTVGE Guinea Ecuatorial		None
	Cuba	Cubavisión Internacional		
41. Swedish	Sweden	SVT1, SVT1, Vision Sverige	Language Council of Sweden	
	Finland	None	Institute of the Languages of Finland	
42. Tamil	India (Tamil Nadu)	Sun News, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, DD Podhigai, Zee Tamil	Central Institute of Classical Tamil Department of Tamil Development and Information (Tamil Nadu)	
	Sri Lanka	Zee Tamil	Department of Official Languages	
	Malaysia	Zee Tamil	Malaysian Tamil Language Standardisation Council	
	Singapore	Zee Tamil	Tamil Language Council	
43. Urdu	Pakistan	PTV World, PTV Global TVOne Global, Dunya News, Samaa TV	National Language Promotion Department	
	India	Peace TV, Salaam TV	National Council for Promotion of Urdu Language	

Summary of the data about language spread via SAT-TV and language institutions in percentages:

1. 28 out of 109 (25,7%) NVs have no representation via SAT-TV:

*Bolivian Aymara, Peruvian Aymara, Chilean Aymara, Russian Azerbaijani (Dagestan), French Basque, Balearic Catalan, French Catalan, Surinamese Dutch, Cypriot Greek, Paraguayan Guarani, Romanian Hungarian, Serbian Hungarian, Slovak Hungarian, Slovenian Hungarian, North Korean Korean, *Norwegian⁴⁸, Monaco Occitan, Mozambican Portuguese, Bolivian Quechua, Ecuador Quechua, Moldavian Romanian, Swedish Sami, Scottish Scots, Northern Irish Scots, Kosovo Serbian, Finnish Swedish.*

Compared to the situation in 2015 when I researched the same data, there is a strong rise in satellite channels broadcasting the language of their home country across borders.

2. 10 (9,17%) out of 109 NVs have no representation via SAT-TV and are also not spread via language institutions: *Aymara in Bolivia, Peru and Chile, Russian Azerbaijani, Catalan on the Balearic Islands and in France, Surinam Dutch, French Catalan, Cyprus Greek, Monaco Occitan.* They are either economically weak PCLs or non-dominant varieties that are disadvantaged in respect to the number of speakers.
3. All “large” and economically powerful PCLs (e.g. their D-nations) are both on SAT-TV and in massive language export via large language institutions: *Chinese, Dutch, English, French, German, Spanish and Portuguese.*
4. 11 PCLs and 15 NDVs out of 41/109 practise language spread via specific institutions like schools, cultural organisations or international federations that seek to spread the language abroad: *Chinese, Dutch, English (US, UK), French, German, Greek, Italian, Korean, Portuguese, Romanian, Spanish.* With one exception (German), it is always the dominant variety that spreads the language abroad via specific institutions as shown in table (3) below:

NV	Language spreading Institution	Nr. of branch offices	Language spreading Institution	Nr. of branch offices
1. British English (UK)	British Council	200 offices in over 100 countries		
2. American English (US)	193 overseas schools			
3. Chinese Chinese (Confucius institute	433 institutes in 112 countries		
4. Dutch Dutch	130 international schools			
5. French French	Alliance française	830 offices in 135 countries	Institut Français	98 institutes
	Cultural co-operation and action depart-	600 schools abroad in 139 countries		

	ments			
6. German German	Goethe Institut	160 institutes in 94 countries	200 German schools abroad	
7. Austrian German	Österreich Institut	10 institutes in Europe	8 Austrian schools abroad	
8. Swiss German	Pro Helvetia (cultural institute) practises no language spread	17 Swiss schools abroad		
9. Hungarian Hungarian	Balassi-Institute	26 branches in 24 countries abroad		
10. Italian Italian	Società Dante Alighieri	400 committees abroad		
11. South Korea Korean	Korean Cultural Centre	37 centres in 30 countries		
12. Portuguese Portuguese	Instituto Camões	69 centres in 41 countries	16 Cultural Centres	
13. Romanian Romanian	Institutul Cultural Român	19 branches worldwide		
14. Spanish Spanish	Instituto Cervantes	40 centres	15 associated centres abroad	

Table 3: Institutions for language spread in PCLs and NDVs

4. Except for two Eastern European Countries (Hungary, Romania) the languages in question are backed by economically powerful home countries. However, among the 11 languages only very few national varieties are practising language dissemination.

The language with the largest number of language teaching centres is French, which is represented in a total of 1528 schools, Alliance française offices and Institut française institutes in 2025. China (People's Republic of China) with 433 Confucius Institutes comes second, and in third place Italian Italian with 400 branches of the Società Dante Alighieri. European Portuguese has 69 centres and Spanish Spanish only 40 branches of the Instituto Cervantes, which is comparatively low.

5. It should be noted that Austrian German and Swiss German are the only smaller NDVs that have schools abroad. Austria also has 10 Austrian institutes that try to represent Austrian culture, language and literature abroad. The Swiss Pro Helvetia foundation is doing the same for Swiss culture. However the Swiss institutions do not pursue language spread as it is a multilingual country.
6. All “big” and economically powerful PCLs (e.g. their D-nations) are represented both on SAT-TV and export their variety on a massive scale via large language institutions: *Chinese, Dutch, English, French, German, Spanish and Portuguese*.
7. It is interesting to note that the social symbolic power of a PCL/NDV seems

to be directly linked to the economic power of the nation and the accessibility and economic usefulness of the variety/language. A case in point is Chinese, which before the opening-up of 1978 was neither accessible nor much of general use, as mainland China was a closed country. Seen from that perspective several PCLs might become rather important in the future. Candidates for this are: *Bengali, Hindi, Urdu, Malay, Persian* and possibly *Kiswahili* which is a lingua franca in East Africa.

8. The case of Norwegian is also worth mentioning, as its pluricentricity lies within the country where three varieties of the same language are used in parallel. Language spread via satellite-TV and via schools abroad is therefore not necessary.
9. Finally, we must consider the case of Kurdish: there are several SAT-TV stations that broadcast Kurdish programmes to large areas of Europe and the Middle East. Kurdish has been a recognised official language since 2009 in Iraq but only for the Kurdish region in the north of Iraq and it is also a recognised minority language in Armenia. However, it has no official status in all other nations where also a large number of Kurdish speaker live: *Azerbaijan, Iran, Iraq, Syria and Turkey*. And there is also a large diaspora. The criteria of D/ND-variety are not applicable due to unresolved political issues and the lack of official status.

3.3 Level (3): Transnational level of centralisation: International language organisations of some PCLs that additionally promote the centralisation of the norm and its dissemination

In some large PCLs (most of them with a colonial past) a *transnational level of centralisation* has been established via international language organisations, to centralise the language after the pluricentric character of the language could not be denied any longer. This is surely the case for *Dutch, English, French, Spanish* and partly in *Portuguese* but also in some “new” PCLs like *Malay*.

Centralisation can also be found in English even though it has no central codification institution but still strong centralising ties via organisations like the Commonwealth of Nations with 53 members (and the fact that the British head of state is still head of state of 16 nations). Another strong tie is the existence of organisations such as the British Council, which is active in more than 100 countries. And there are very powerful publishing houses like Oxford University Press in Britain and the Merriam-Webster Dictionary that dominate the norm-setting for English to a large degree. Dictionaries based on single NDVs of English exist primarily for the major varieties: *American, Australian, British, Canadian, New Zealand, and South African English* and a few NDVs like *Irish, Nigerian*

and *Caribbean English*. An indirect overarching form of language unification is found via the media products of American origin (films, TV-series, popular music etc.) that are watched and listened to around the globe.

The French language is quite the opposite. Since the foundation of the Académie française in 1635, it has been a very centralised language. The Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie with 80 governments and states as members⁴⁹ ensures the centralisation on an international level. It recognises the pluricentric nature of French but tries to keep the general norm in line with the dominant French norm. One of the outcomes of the pluricentric turn for French is the “*Dictionnaire Universel Francophone*”, which was published in 1998. Another outcome is the *Dictionnaire des francophones*⁵⁰ which is only available online since 2022 and compiles 2.583.207 lexical items of around 300 national varieties and regions in France and in other French speaking areas. It also includes the 13 dictionaries of NDVs of French, published by the *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique* at the University of Nice^{51,52}. The varieties covered are those of *Belgium, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Gabon, Guinea, Ivory Coast, La Réunion, Mauritius, Mauritania, Mali, New-Caledonia, Quebec, Switzerland and Tunisia*⁵³. And it takes a new approach to the recording of lexical items according to their usage and irrespective whether they are conformant to the so called standard: “The aim is not to prescribe a particular form of French that should be used rather than another, i.e. a language standard, but to describe usage as accurately as possible so that users can choose the expression best suited to the situation.”⁵⁴ This is quite a revolutionary approach considering the fact that until recently, French was one of the languages that adhered most strictly to formal norms. Despite these new developments, French is still a highly regulated and centralised language.

A similar centralising function can be attributed to the *Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española* (Association of Spanish Language Academies), founded in 1951 and comprising 23 member academies promoting linguistic panhispanism by issuing a common dictionary. Lexical items of the “other” varieties are recorded as long they are “widespread among educated speakers in their area and do not involve a breach of the whole system and threaten its unity”.⁵⁵ To date, there are eight dictionaries of specific expressions in different Spanish speaking countries: *Argentina, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Nicaragua and Honduras*. In addition to that, the *Diccionario panhispánico de dudas* (DPD) (Dictionary of doubtful expressions) and the *Diccionario de americanismos* (DA) (Dictionary of Americanisms of Spanish) have recently been published. The *Diccionario de la lengua española* (DLE) (dictionary of the Spanish Language), issued by the Royal Academy (REA), is now taking into ac-

count the pluricentric nature of Spanish in its last editions, listing expressions from the “Spanishes” outside Spain. This is a big step forward, which at the same time is restricted by including only those items that are used by a specific social group (educated speakers) and in line with standard phonology and morphology, which in a way excludes specific linguistic developments in national varieties.

The norm-setting for the Portuguese-speaking world is done by the academies for European Portuguese (EP) at the *Academia das Ciências* situated in Lisbon and the *Academia Brasileira de Letras* (founded in 1896/97) in Rio de Janeiro. There are none in the other Portuguese-speaking countries in Africa and Asia. In 2009 the Brazilian academy published the *Vocabulário Ortográfico da Língua Portuguesa* (Spelling Dictionary of the Portuguese Language) and is working on a *Historical Dictionary of Brazilian Portuguese* (HDPB). The Academia das Ciências (Lisbon) published a full dictionary in 2006: the *Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa Contemporânea*. It includes lexis from Brazilian, African and Asian varieties of Portuguese leading to a rather symmetric relationship which seems to be an effect of the many speakers of Brazilian Portuguese and the growing economic power of this country and other Portuguese speaking countries in Africa have.

The “*Nederlandse Taalunie*” (Dutch Language Union) unifies the language codifying institutions of the Netherlands, Belgium and Suriname. It led to the recognition of Belgian Dutch as a full standard and issues a unified dictionary (Van Dale dictionary) taking the pluricentricity of Dutch into account.⁵⁶

A very close co-operation also exists for Swedish between the *Svenska Akademien* (Swedish Academy) and the *Svenska språkbyrån* (Swedish Language Department of the Research Institute for the Languages of Finland). The Finland Swedish codification institutions in Finland hold an explicit policy that aims “to prevent Finland Swedish from growing too distant from the standard variant spoken in Sweden.”⁵⁷

This seems to be the implicit policy behind the co-operation of many international and national language organisations and the norm-setting institutions of PCLs. The gradual nativisation leading to an eventual split into separate languages over a longer period of time, or the sudden split as was the case with Serbo-Croatian (*Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, Montenegrin*), and the subsequent loss of influence, symbolic and economic power seems to be the primal fear that secretly governs the language policies of many dominant varieties and their counterparts in the social elites of the NDVs.⁵⁸

The latter protect their social advantages with an exonormative language policy against the less educated citizens of their own country, denying them access to higher education by erecting a language barrier based on a non-native

norm of the written language.⁵⁹ Fortunately, there are also symmetric approaches to norm-setting, as the Dutch and Swedish examples show.

3.4 Functional level (4): Organisations that ensure the control and centralisation of norm-setting and create a centralised norm via well equipped norm setting institutions promoting exonormative principles

PCLs and their varieties can be differentiated by attempts *to control the norm-setting process and to centralise the norm of a PCL* via specialised and well funded codifying institutions. The dominant and the non-dominant varieties are marked by at least some or all of the following characteristics:

1. The dominant nation has – contrary to most NDV nations - well-equipped codifying institutions and/or large publishing houses at the level of the academies of sciences or specialised institutions which usually have the support of the government, and/or large publishing houses which issue authoritative dictionaries and text books for schools.
2. The nation of the DV operates public or private codifying institutions⁶⁰ that practise extensive codification, issuing different reference books that determine the general norm of the language and the written norm in particular.
3. The NDV nations often do not have codifying institutions and therefore do not properly codify their norm, which reduces their prestige and makes the use of DV-nation dictionaries necessary, as full dictionaries for NDVs are often missing.
4. The codifying institutions of NDVs often practise exonormative codification and by that prevent the nativisation of the variety which results in diglossia or even bilingualism.

The ability to ensure the codification and standardisation of native linguistic norms by well financed norm-setting institutions is the most important effect of economic, political and demographic power for single national varieties. NDVs often lack the financial resources to establish such centres for the codification of their native norms or do not consider them necessary. Another reason for the lack of norm-setting centres in NDVs – as mentioned earlier – could lie in the prevailing language ideology in many NDVs, where the social elites often tend to prefer more or less monocentric views on the correct standard norms and therefore do not set up centres for codification or not finance them properly.⁶¹ The immediate effect of little or no codification of the NDVs and extensive codification of DVs is the *centralisation of norm-setting* and a *centralised codified norm* by using an *exonormative approach* to norm setting, not only in the DV but also in the NDVs of the respective PCL. As shown in Muhr (2013)

this prevents the *endonormative codification* and the nativisation of the NDV, causing a split between spoken and written language that in the long term, often leads to diglossia.

Table (4) presents an overview about the norm setting institutions/situations in 41 PCLs by listing the nations where the language has official status and the institutions that practise codification and standardisation in DVs and NDVs:⁶².

PCL	Nations where the PCL has official status	Body / Organisation / Institute that regulates the norm of the language
1. Albanian	Albania, Kosovo	Academy of Sciences of Albania, Tirana
2. Arabic ⁶³	Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Morocco, Somalia, Sudan, Somalia, Syria, Tunisia, Israel	Arabic Language International Council (founded in 2008 and promoted by Saudi Arabia) 11 Academies in the countries named on the left.
3. Aramaic	Iraq	None
4. Armenian	Armenia, West-Armenian diaspora	Armenian National Academy of Sciences, Yerevan
5. Aymara	Bolivia, Peru, Chile	Instituto de Lengua y Cultura de la Nación Aymara (Bolivia)
6. Azerbaijani	Azerbaijan, Russia (Dagestan)	Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences
7. Bengali	Bangladesh, India	Two separate institutions: Bangla Academy (Dhaka) for Bangladesh and Paschimbanga Bangla Akademi (Kolkata) for West Bengal
8. Basque	Basque Country, France	Euskaltzaindia (Royal Academy of the Basque language) in Bilbao, Spain
9. Berber/Tamazight	Morocco, Algeria, France	Royal Institute of Amazight Culture (Morocco) Algerian Academy of Amazigh Language
10. Catalan	Catalonia, Andorra, France, Italy	Two institutions: Institute of Catalan Studies (Barcelona) and Acadèmia Valenciana de la Llengua in Valencia for the Valencian standard
11. Chinese	People's Republic of China, Singapore, Malaysia	4 regulatory bodies: National Commission on Language and Script Work (China); National Languages Committee (Taiwan); Promote Mandarin Council (Singapore); Chinese Language Standardisation Council of Malaysia (Malaysia)
12. Dutch	Netherlands, Belgium, Suriname	Nederlandse Taalunie (Dutch Language Union), The Hague; United dictionary (Van Dale)
13. English	United Kingdom, US and 70 other nations	No regulatory body; Norm-setting is done by publishers; Specific dict. (apart from AE and BE) exist for Australian, Canadian, Irish, New Zealand, Nigerian and South African English.
14. French	France and 79 other	Organisation internationale de la Francopho-

	countries as member states	nie, Paris; Two language academies: Académie française, Paris and Quebec Office of the French Language, Quebec; Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique at the University of Nice (issued 11 specific dictionaries of NDVs of French but is no longer active in this field)
15. German	Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg	Council for German Orthography: Regulates only the orthography. Norm setting is done by publishers via dictionaries and about 26 organisations in Germany that deal with the norm-setting and the spread of the DV abroad. Specific dict. exist for Austrian German (Österreichisches Wörterbuch), Swiss German and South Tyrolean German.
16. Greek	Greece, Cyprus	Centre for the Greek language, Thessaloniki (admin. by the Ministry of Education)
17. Guaraní	Paraguay, Bolivia, Corrientes (Argentina)	Guarani Language Academy
18. Hebrew	Israel, Turkey, South Africa	Academy of the Hebrew Language
19. Hungarian	Hungary, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Ukraine	Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest; There are no specific dictionaries of NDVs of Hungarian
20. Irish	Ireland, Northern Ireland	Foras na Gaeilg - The Irish institute as part of "The North/South Language Body" Dublin and Belfast
21. Italian	Italy, San Marino, Switzerland	Accademia della Crusca, Florence, Research institute: Osservatorio linguistico della Svizzera italiana
22. Kiswahili/Swahili	Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda	Baraza la Kiswahili la Taifa (National Swahili Council), Tanzania; National Kiswahili Association, Nairobi and The East African Kiswahili Commission of the East African Community
23. Korean	South Korea, North Korea, Peoples Republic of China	The National Institute of the Korean Language, Seoul; The Language Research Institute, Academy of Social Science, Pyongyang; China Korean Language Regulatory Commission
24. Kurdish	Iraq, Turkey, Syria, Armenia, Iran, Azerbaijan	Kurdish Academy of Language [KAL]: Electronic Non-Governmental Organisation
25. Malay	Malaysia, Brunei, Singapore	Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka (Institute of Language and Literature); Majlis Bahasa Brunei-Indonesia-Malaysia (Brunei-Indonesia-Malaysia Language Council – MABBIM)
26. Mongolian*	Mongolia, China - Inner Mongolia, Russia	Mongolia: State Language Council; China: Council for Language and Literature Work

	(Kalmyk)	
27. Norwegian	Norway	Norwegian Academy (Riksmål), Language Council of Norway (Bokmål and Nynorsk)
28. Occitan	Spain, France, Italy	Institute of Aranese Studies (Spain); Occitan Language Council Permanent Congress of the Occitan Language (France)
29. Pashto	Afghanistan, Pakistan	Academy of Sciences of Afghanistan, Kabul; Pashto Academy, Peshawar
30. Persian	Iran, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan	Academy of Persian Language and Literature, Teheran; Academy of Sciences of Afghanistan (for Dari), Kabul
31. Portuguese	Portugal, Brazil, Angola, Mozambique, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, East Timor, Cape Verde, São Tomé and Príncipe	International Portuguese Language Institute, Praia, Cape Verde; Three codifying institutions: Academia Brasileira de Letras (Brazil), Rio de Janeiro; Academia das Ciências de Lisboa, Classe de Letras (Portugal) (CPLP), Lisbon, Eduardo Mondlane University (Mozambique)
32. Punjabi	Pakistan, India	No regulatory body known
33. Quechua	Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador	Highest Academy of the Quechua Language, Cusco, (Peru); Language and Culture Institute of the Quechua Nation (Bolivia); Academy of the Kichwa Language (Ecuador)
34. Romanian	Romania, Moldova, Serbia ⁶⁴	Academia Română: Institute for Linguistics of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest; Academy of Sciences of Moldova
35. Russian	Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan	Russian Language Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
36. Sami	Norway, Finland, Sweden, Russia	University of Tromsø, (Norway), Giellagas-Instituutti, Oulu, (Finland)
37. Scots	Scotland, Northern Ireland,	Scots Language Centre (Scotland), Ulster-Scots Agency
38. Serbian	Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Kosovo	Board for Standardization of the Serbian Language
39. Somali	Somalia, Somaliland	Regional Somali Language Academy
40. Soninke*	Mali, Mauritania, Senegal	No regulatory body known
41. Sotho*	Lesotho, South Africa, Zimbabwe	Pan South African Language Board
42. Spanish	Spain and 21 other countries	Association of Spanish Language Academies, Madrid, Spain and 21 single lang. academies
43. Swazi/siSwati*	Swaziland, South Africa	No regulatory body known
44. Swedish	Sweden, Finland	Swedish Language Council (semi-official)

		Swedish Academy, Stockholm; Swedish Language Department of the Research Institute for the Languages of Finland, Helsinki
45. Swetsana*	Botswana, South Africa, Zimbabwe	No regulatory body known
46. Tamil	India (Tamil Nadu), Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Sri Lanka	Official language Commission of Government of Tamil Nadu (India), Chennai; Department of Official Languages (Sri Lanka); Malaysian Tamil Language Standardisation Council; Tamil Lan- guage Council (Singapore)
47. Urdu	Pakistan, India	National Language Authority, Islamabad National Council for Promotion of Urdu Lan- guage, Delhi
48. Venda/ Tshivenda/ Luvenda*	South Africa, Zimbabwe	No regulatory body known
49. Xhosa*	South Africa, Zimbabwe	No regulatory body known

Table (4): List of PCLs and their language regulation/norm-setting organisations

The norm-setting situation in 41 PCLs according to this list can roughly be divided into five categories:

1. PCLs where the norm-setting is highly centralised due to the existence of a *single* norm-setting centre: *Aymara, Azerbaijani, Basque, Greek, Hungarian, Kurdish, Persian (de facto), Quechua, Romanian* (unclear due to unsettled language policy issues), *Russian* (due to the novelty of the plc. situation), *Serbian, Tamil*.
2. PCLs where there are also norm-setting centres in NDV nations, but most of the codifying is still done in the DV nation or by institutions that are under the auspices of this nation:
 - *Arabic*: 11 academies but strong promotion of the Arabic Language International Council by Saudi Arabia;
 - *French*: Only one language academy outside France (Quebec). There is some codification in Belgian French and Swiss French. As already mentioned in section 3.3 a large number of dictionaries of the African varieties of French have been published by Suzanne Lafage and collaborators (CNRS – ILF - UMR 7320).
 - *German*: Most codification work done in Germany, even though there are a national Austrian Dictionary and a specific Swiss Dictionary (created by a non-institutional initiative). There is co-operation via research projects since the late 1990s (e.g. Variantenwörterbuch⁶⁵);
 - *Spanish*: 23 academies that co-operate closely via the Royal Academy of the Spanish Language in Madrid.

3. PCLs where there are separate norm-setting centres in the national varieties with little or no co-operation taking place, or where co-operation is officially existent but its real extent is unclear:
- *Bengali*: There is no co-operation between the two academies in respect to a common standard of Bengali. There may be formal exchanges or visits by representatives.⁶⁶
 - *Chinese*⁶⁷: There is co-operation only via the exchange of researchers between the countries involved.
 - *Kiswahili*:⁶⁸ There is no co-operation between the two language academies. There is also the Kiswahili Commission of the East African Community (EAC) (<https://kiswahili.eac.int/>) that is an initiative of six countries.
 - *Portuguese*: No co-operation between the two language academies of Brazil and Portugal, which both published a full dictionary. The “*Instituto Internacional da Língua Portuguesa*” (International Portuguese Language Institute) located in Praia, Cape Verde (an organ of the *Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa* (CPLP)) recently issued the *Vocabulário Ortográfico Comum* (VOC) that is a joint product of the *Instituto de Linguística Teórica e Computacional* (ILTEC) (Lisbon) and the *Universidade Federal de São Carlos* (Brazil).⁶⁹
 - *Urdu* (extent of co-operation unclear).
4. PCLs where there are separate norm-setting centres in the national varieties with a high amount of co-operation taking place, leading to a more or less symmetric codification:
- *Catalan*: Two norm-setting institutions that co-operate (Barcelona, Valencia)
 - *Dutch*: A common dictionary is issued by the two language academies of Belgium and the Netherlands with Surinam participating, leading to a quasi symmetric relation between Belgian Dutch and Netherlands Dutch;⁷⁰
 - *Irish*: Common codification via “The Irish Institute”, which is part of “The North/South Language Body” situated in Dublin and Belfast;
 - *Korean*: There is an official project for a unified dictionary called *Gyeoremal Keunsajon* (The large dictionary of the language of the Korean people)⁷¹, which has been worked on by a joint commission of linguists since 2005:⁷² How far-reaching the co-operation is in reality, however, is unclear.
 - *Kurdish*: Intense co-operation via an “Electronic Non-Governmental Organisation” that organises the description of the different varieties of

Kurdish;

- *Malay*: Intense co-operation via the Brunei-Indonesia-Malaysia Language Council – MABBIM.
- *Swedish*: High amount of co-operation between the Swedish Academy (Stockholm) and the Swedish section of the Language Institute for the Languages of Finland.

5. PCLs that have no official language regulating organisations:

- *Aramaic*: Evidently there is no norm-setting institution.
- *English*: As mentioned above, there is no common language regulation body. The norm setting in English is done by publishers via dictionaries.
- *German*: There is just one regulatory body that deals with orthography exclusively. The codification of lexis and grammar is done by large publishers of dictionaries.

The data show that symmetric, co-operative and potentially endonormative norm-setting in PCLs exists in 7 out of 41 languages and therefore is the exception rather than the rule. Another point that emerges is that in large PCLs the codification of NDVs is by and large either missing or still at a rudimentary stage. The result is structural centralisation both for native speakers of NDVs and for foreign language learners and consumers of media products (films, TV-series, books, audios, books and magazines). They will almost exclusively come into contact with the norms of the DV while the characteristics of all others are excluded or put into second place.

3.5 Functional level (5): Ensuring dominance by applying second level centralisation via applying exonormative codification rules in NDVs⁷³

Dictionaries are cornerstones of codification and standardisation. Together with grammars and style guides, they mainly decide about what in a language/variety is considered as “correct” and what is not. “Linguistic correctness” is achieved during standardisation which is a process of *norm selection* that leads to the *inclusion* and the *exclusion* of linguistic items and their subsequent description, commonly known as *codification*.⁷⁴ The codification can be organized in two ways: Taking the *endonormative* or the *exonormative* path. In the latter case lexical items are selected and described according to the model of the dominant variety. In the first case the native model of the variety is given preference. The following strategies of exonormative codification are being used.

1. Downgrading the status of NDVs and their lexis from national to regional significance

When it comes to the creation of dictionaries of NDVs, the activity is often frowned upon by exponents of the DV, who consider such a dictionary only of regional relevance and not as an equivalent to the (full) dictionaries of the DV. But if a NDV-dictionary is only considered to be of “regional” validity, its status and value are placed at a level below the dictionaries of DV-nations, which generally claim to be of universal validity for the whole language. In addition to that, such an attribution also devalues the validity of the NDV dictionary in its proper nation, as it might not be considered representative for the whole area of a nation.

2. The sole concentration on the “educated speaker” and formal written texts to uphold a dominant norm

This strategy leads to the codification of a particular linguistic variety of a socially powerful group but excludes the rest of the language community. Moreover, if codification is primarily based on formal written texts, this leads to the exclusion of a large part of the language use that takes place in everyday life and in semi-formal and informal contexts, but which is just as standard in that it is common and typical for these contexts. A representative corpus must therefore include a wide range of speakers and the language use in different formal and informal contexts.

3. The use of semantically blurred labels for marking the lexis of NDVs as restricted in usage

Carefully designed dictionaries usually provide additional information about the usage of the lexical items. This is necessary as there are also expressions that are specific for certain domains or have additional meanings or connotations. So called “neutral” expressions (e.g. standard) are usually left unmarked, while labelled lexical items are restricted in usage.

In some languages the codification uses semantically blurred labels for the description of lexical items. Taking Löffler (2005) as an example, the author distinguishes 21 terms for different varieties of German. It is simply impossible to correctly distinguish these varieties. And the sole reason for these terms is to safeguard that the "standard language" is not mixed up with items being used outside very formal contexts. (See chapter 8 for a discussion of this approach).

The examples show that exonormative codification practices have a number of negative effects on the norm of NDVs. These include the rejection of all elements that do not conform to the phonological, morphological and syntactic model of the DV. This makes the codification incomplete and inaccurate.

4. Conclusion

This chapter has used empirical data to try to show that there are means and measures at different functional levels that contribute to maintaining or even strengthening the linguistic dominance of the DV(s) in PCLs. One important factor is the status as the language of international organizations, which clearly supports the DVs.

On a second level, the DVs are much more successful and engaged in language teaching via electronic media and international language teaching organizations. SAT-TV is a powerful tool for intensive language contact, as intensive TV consumption over time influences the linguistic repertoire of speakers, especially younger ones. Few NDVs practice language dissemination through language teaching organizations, which means that most foreign language learners only come into contact with the DV.

On a third level, all “major” PCLs have established international language organizations that help to centralize the standard of the language and ensure the dissemination of the language in the form of DV norms.

A fourth level is the existence of well-resourced standard-setting institutions in DPs, compared to very few in NDVs. This ensures the creation and maintenance of reliable and authoritative dictionaries in the DVs.

The fifth and final level is the application of exonormative, inclusive and centralizing codification principles, which tend to stigmatize native NDV expressions by using restrictive labels such as “colloquial”, “vernacular”, etc., which limit their use and even distort their correct spelling, as the spelling often does not correspond to the phonology of the words, but attempts to adapt the spelling to the rules of the dominant orthography.

The core of linguistic dominance is the centralization of norm-setting, the control of the norm by international language organizations, the spread of the language and language contact through SAT-TV and well-funded language teaching institutions.

It can be concluded that linguistic dominance is a complex process composed of many intertwined levels of economic, organizational and linguistic circumstances that create a differentiated degree of power relations between the DV and the NDV in each individual pluricentric language. This requires an adapted approach for each PCL and NDV.

Footnotes:

¹ This chapter is based in parts on my publication of 2015 "Manufacturing linguistic dominance in pluricentric languages and beyond". Large parts of it have been rewritten and all empirical data has been checked and brought up to date for 2025 according to new data. The allusion of the original title to Noam

Chomsky's famous work "Manufacturing consent" was deliberate as similar processes seem to be at work when it comes to maintaining linguistic dominance. The subtitle of his book is: "Profit over people". The subtitle in our case could be "Profit over languages".

2 Clyne (1992) Epilogue

3 For this section see also Clyne (1992), Muhr (2012) and Delcourt/Muhr (2001). The characteristics mentioned there are extended and rearranged.

4 Coulmas (1992)

5 See Muhr (2009) for the treatment of pluricentric languages and their national varieties in the context of the European Union.

6 Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_official_languages_of_international_organizations [acc. 12.02.2025]. This extended list has been checked on the websites of the respective organisation, in some cases it has been corrected and updated.

7 It has to be noted that some languages (English, Arabic, French etc.) are interpreted into during conferences and sessions of the organisation, even if they are not official languages of the organisation. This means that the percentage with the most used languages is even higher.

8 As examples see Edelmann (2015) on the codifying situation in Catalan and Sumien (2012) on the situation of Occitan.

9 A good example for this is the way American English was perceived in Europe after WWII. It was considered as "unpleasant" and disapproved of, whereas British English was preferred until the late 1980s and still is preferred by some Europeans.

10 A striking example for this is the treatment of Austrian German and Swiss German norms at university level in many European countries, where both varieties, as opposed to German German, are considered non-standard. See Ransmayr (2006).

11 See Muhr (2003) as an early study on the effect of satellite TV on Austrian German.

12 See www.pluricentriclanguages.org.

13 Table (2) with the data on satellite TV-stations per language and variety, as well as data about language regulators and institutions that spread PCLs abroad can be found in the reference section at the end of this section. This very large table has been moved there to make the text of this section easier to read.

14 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_language_regulators (26.02.2025)

15 Source: <http://en.satexpat.com/tv/armenia/> (24.02.2025)

16 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Azerbaijani_language (26.02.2025)

17 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bengali_language (24.02.2025)

18 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Euskaltzaindia> (26.02.2025)

19 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berber_languages (26.02.2025)

20 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catalan_language (24.02.2025)

21 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chinese_language (24.02.2025)

22 <http://confuciusinstitute.unl.edu/institutes.shtml> (24.02.2025)

23 https://www.wikiwand.com/en/articles/List_of_television_stations_in_Malaysia

24 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dutch_language (26.02.2025)

25 <https://stichtingnob.nl/dutch-education-worldwide> (22.02.2025)

26 https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/britishcouncil_annualreport_2022-23.pdf (22.02.2025)

27 <https://www.state.gov/assisted-schools> (22.02.2025)

28 <https://www.state.gov/assisted-schools> (22.02.2025)

29 <http://www.abc.net.au/international/> and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australia_Plus (22.02.2025); Thanks to Heinz L. Kretzenbacher for this information.

30 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/French_language (24.02.2025)

31 <https://www.fondation-alliancefr.org/?cat=16> (16.02.2025)

-
- 32 <https://www.institutfrancais.com/fr> (26.02.2025)
- 33 <https://aeefe.gouv.fr/fr/reseau-scolaire-mondial/un-reseau-unique-au-monde> (26.02.2025)
- 34 <https://www.goethe.de/de/www.html> (16.03.2025)
- 35 <https://www.educationsuisse.ch/de/auslandschulen/schweizer-schulen> (21.02.2025)
- 36 <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balassi-Institute> (21.02.2025)
- 37 http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Societ%C3%A0_Dante_Alighieri (17.03.2025)
- 38 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Korean_Cultural_Centers (acc. 23.02.2025)
- 39 The status of the Kurdish territories in Iraq and elsewhere is disputed. The only semi-state entity is the Kurdistan region in Northern Iraq.
- 40 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_television_channels_in_Pakistan (accessed 23.02.2025);
- 41 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Portuguese-language_television_channels (accessed
- 42 <https://portaldiplomatico.mne.gov.pt/en/foreign-policy/portuguese-language-and-culture> (accessed 24.02.2025)
- 43 <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-latin-america-38301253> (accessed 23.02.2025)
- 44 <https://flysat.com/en/regions/country/Romania> (accessed 23.02.2025)
- 45 <https://www.icr.ro/> (accessed 23.02.2025)
- 46 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Russian-language_television_channels (26.02.2025)
- 47 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Instituto_Cervantes (16.03.2025)
- 48 Norwegian is a special case as there are three national varieties used within the country. A representation via SAT-TV outside the country is therefore not required.
- 49 See <http://www.francophonie.org/> [10.03.2025]. Despite this international approach, the web sites of the French embassies in West-Africa (e.g. Burkina Faso) until January 2025 had an item called "Protection du Français" showing that France is still the "owner" of "correct" French and willing to exert its influence. The web sites have since been redesigned and do not show this item any more.
- 50 <https://www.dictionnairedesfrancophones.org> [acc. 02.03.2025]
- 51 See Lafage, Suzanne: *Le Français en Afrique*. N° ISSN : 1157-1454 *Revue du Réseau des Observatoires du Français Contemporain en Afrique*. [<http://www.unice.fr/ILF-CNRS/ofcaf/index.html>]
- 52 See also Drescher (2009).
- 53 <http://www.unice.fr/ILF-CNRS/ofcaf/index.html> [acc. 02.03.2025]
- 54 <https://www.dictionnairedesfrancophones.org/presentation> [acc. 02.03.2025]
- 55 www.rae.es/sites/default/files/Dossier_Diccionario_Americanismos.pdf [10.03.2025]
- 56 For details see Muhr (2012)
- 57 <http://www.kotus.fi/index.phtml?l=en&s=205> (accessed 15.03.2025)
- 58 See Muhr (2012) and Lüdi (1992)
- 59 See Bacher (2008) with data from Austria.
- 60 Usually the codifying work is done by publicly financed language academies or specific language institutes or large private publishing houses.
- 61 The codification of Austrian German is a good example for this: The dictionary unit at the Austrian "Bundesverlag" which issues the national Austrian dictionary "Österreichisches Wörterbuch" is only equipped with two full time lexicographers. In Germany there are at least 5 large publishing houses with hundreds of employees doing codification. There are also large projects like the "DWDS" (www.dwds.de) well financed and situated at the Brandenburg Academy of Sciences. Switzerland has no codification centre of its own: it uses the "Duden" as book of reference.
- 62 The information in this table is partly indebted to the article "List of language regulators" on Wikipedia (en)
- 63 See Ibrahim (2009)

- ⁶⁴ The situation in Moldova is unclear because there was a movement that insisted that Moldovan Romanian was a language of its own (Muhr, 2003).
- ⁶⁵ Ammon et. al. (2004).
- ⁶⁶ Pers. communication. Thanks to Aditi Gosh (Kolkata).
- ⁶⁷ Pers. communication. Thanks to Adrian Tien (Singapore).
- ⁶⁸ Pers. communication. Thanks to Daniela Walburger (Univ. of Vienna).
- ⁶⁹ Pers. communication. Thanks to Amália Mendes (Lisbon).
- ⁷⁰ For a detailed description of this new situation, see De Caluwe (2012).
- ⁷¹ See: <http://gyeoremal.or.kr/eng/jsp/index.jsp>
- ⁷² Pers. communication. Thanks to Alena Schmutz (Vienna).
- ⁷³ This section provides only brief notes on the problem. A detailed description is given in Chapter 8 (Codification and standardisation in PCLs).
- ⁷⁴ See Haugen (1966a: 933; 1983: 275) and for NDVs Muhr (2012)