

Contents

Foreword ix

Part 1 Initial Concepts for Language Planning

1 A Contextual and Terminological Basis for Planning	3
Introduction	3
A Definition	3
The Context of Language Planning	4
Terminological Difficulties	14
Summary	26
2 A Framework for Planning: Who Does What to Whom?	28
An Overview of Language Planning as a Process	28
Status Planning	30
Corpus Planning	38
Levels of Language Planning	49
An Accounting Scheme for Language Planning	52
Summary	57
3 Language Planning Goals	59
Goals of Language Planning	59
Meso Level Planning Goals	80
Critiques of Classical Language Planning	80
Summary	82

Part 2 Key Issues in Language Planning

4 Language Planning Process	87
Approaches to Data Collection	88
Sociolinguistic Surveys	102
Importance of Methodology	118
Summary	120

v

COLLEGE OF LIBRARY STUDIES
LIBRARY
TRINITY COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE

401.
99
Kap

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Kaplan, Robert B.
Language Planning From Practice to Theory
Robert B. Kaplan and Richard B. Baldauf
Multilingual Matters: 108

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Language planning.
I. Baldauf, Richard B. II. Title. III. Series: Multilingual Matters (Series): 108.
P40.5.L35K36 1997
306.44'9-dc21 97-2118

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 1-85359-372-9 (hbk)
ISBN 1-85359-371-0 (pbk)

Multilingual Matters Ltd

UK: Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall, Victoria Road, Clevedon BS21 7TH.
USA: 1901 Frost Road, Suite 101, Bristol, PA 19007, USA.
Canada: OISE, 712 Gordon Baker Road, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M2H 3R7.
Australia: P.O. Box 586, Artamon, NSW, Australia.
South Africa: PO Box 1080, Northcliffe 2115, Johannesburg, South Africa.

Copyright © 1997 Robert B. Kaplan and Richard B. Baldauf, Jr

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publisher.

Typeset by Archetype: <http://www.archetype-it.com>
Printed and bound in Great Britain by WBC Book Manufacturers Ltd.

2 A Framework for Planning: Who Does What to Whom?

An Overview of Language Planning as a Process

Having examined the context for language planning and the complex problems of terminology usage in Chapter 1, it is useful to turn our attention to some frameworks for language policy and planning and to look at some of the key defining variables found therein. These frameworks will provide some initial overall perspectives on the discipline which will help to inform our understanding of the specific examples found in subsequent chapters. Three complementary frameworks are initially examined, those proposed by Haugen (1983), Haarmann (1990) and Cooper (1989) along with some other critical variables necessary to provide an overall framework for understanding language policy and planning. For those interested in other approaches, Jernudd (1982) and Neustupný (1978, 1987) have suggested a correction focus as a paradigm for language planning and more recently have argued for a language management approach (see Chapter 7).

First we turn to a structural framework for language planning which looks at the various stages and activities which can be said to occur as part of the planning process. Researchers in language planning have attempted to differentiate two distinct kinds of activities – those that are concerned specifically with attempts to modify language itself, and those that are concerned with attempts to modify the environment in which a language is used. These have come to be designated 'corpus planning' and 'status planning', respectively. Such a separation constitutes something of an oversimplification; it is, in fact, virtually impossible, in practice, to separate the two activities. The fact is that any change in the character of a language is likely to result in a change in the use environment, and any change in the use environment is likely to induce a change in the character of the language.

Over the years there have been a number of attempts to define the

activities which make up the language planning process and to provide a descriptive model of those processes. Haugen (1983: 275) has incorporated much of this thinking into an overall model of the language planning process (Table 2.1), to which '4.c. internationalisation' can be added.

The model indicates that the activities which make up the language planning process can be viewed from either a societal or a language focus. The societal focus is called 'status planning' and consists of those decisions a society must make about language selection and the implementation to choose and disseminate the language or languages selected. The language focus is called 'corpus planning' and consists of linguistic decisions which need to be made to codify and elaborate a language or languages. These two foci form the basis for an overview of all the activities which make up the language planning process. The model can also be examined in terms of form or policy planning, with its emphasis on basic language and policy decisions and their implementation, or on function or language cultivation, with its emphasis on language teaching and extended language development and use.

While these activities can be said to describe the overall language planning process, in any particular situation it may be possible or even necessary to omit some of the steps outlined in the process. In part this is so because the activities which are important in a specific language planning situation can be determined by the particular goals for which language plans are being developed (see Chapter 3). In part the model may not be followed because, although such models are conceptually useful in understanding the language planning process, individuals involved in language planning do not necessarily know about or follow this or any other model.

Table 2.1 Haugen's (1983: 275) revised language planning model with additions

	Form (policy planning)	Function (language cultivation)
Society (status planning)	1. Selection (decision procedures) a. problem identification b. allocation of norms	3. Implementation (educational spread) a. correction procedures b. evaluation
Language (corpus planning)	2. Codification (standardisation procedures) a. graphisation b. grammatication c. lexicon	4. Elaboration (functional development) a. terminological modernisation b. stylistic development c. internationalisation

environment must be created through 'revalorizing' them where there is an appreciation of the contribution they make to social and cultural life.

Identification of the problem

The choice of a national language(s) is not as simple as it seems on the surface since such selection normally implies a choice among competing languages. Vernacular languages provide the opportunity to establish a common heritage, a common history, and to facilitate unity; on the other hand, exogenous languages often provide access to the external world. The choice of a language(s) ideally should result in the smallest possible disruption to the social structure, yet at the same time the decision should not isolate the polity from the outside world.

Various criteria for selecting a language have been proposed and include such things as political neutrality, dominance, prestige, a great tradition and areal affinity (Kale, 1990: 185-6). However, one must be aware that such criteria are themselves value laden, and cannot all be weighted equally. For example, if a polity is at the point of making a language-choice decision and is also concerned about modernisation, an exogenous language may be a feasible alternative. Language modernisation is a time-consuming and resource-intensive process, as is the translation of key materials into a new language. The fact is that most scientific and technical information available in the major global storage and retrieval networks occurs in one of a very few languages (i.e. English, French, German and Russian). For complex historical reasons, it is currently the case that the vast majority of scientific and technical texts are either published in, or abstracted in, English, and most databases are organised using an English sociology of knowledge. These facts make English and other so-called 'world languages' important competitors for the position as national language, or as a language with some official status.

Politics of necessity then must choose among the available alternatives. The choice is not always an easy one. The former colonial language, spoken by an elite and probably providing access to the larger modern world, may not be a good choice if an objective of the choice is to facilitate national unity, since the colonial language may be regarded as a symbol of oppression by some segments of the population, but also may not be spoken by any significant segment of the population. If not a foreign language, then which of the indigenous languages? The criteria of dominance – that is, a language spoken by a clear numerical majority – may be chosen, provided that the choice is not opposed by other significant segments of the population. It is, however, relatively rare, in genuinely polyglot communities, that any single language is in fact spoken by a clear numerical majority (see the data for South Africa in Table 8.1). Other types of dominance include: the language of the capital city, the language of the wealthiest group, the language of the most powerful group (usually the

According to Haugen's model, the planning process always begins with a status planning decision. In fact, that is not necessarily the case, but for the sake of discussion and because the model provides a good overview of the planning process in an idealised sense, the sequence in the model will be followed, and each cell will be explored in some depth. Assuming, then, that the process is initiated with a status decision, it is possible to examine a typical case. The Sub-Saharan African states might serve as illustrations of this process (see e.g. Tanzania and Uganda in the Appendix).

Status Planning

Status planning can be defined as those aspects of language planning which reflect primarily social issues and concerns and hence are external to the language(s) being planned. The two status issues which make up the model are *language selection* and *language implementation* (see, e.g. Ridge, 1996).

Language selection

Selection of a language(s) focuses on the development of language policy. Selection involves the choice of a language(s) by/for a society through its political leaders. Such decisions are usually made from among competing languages and/or dialects. The language or language items selected establish the particular linguistic form which is to be the norm and which is to have status within society.

In the context of our illustration, when a geographic region becomes a polity – an independent state – as many former colonial territories in Sub-Saharan Africa did in the early 1960s, there are some immediately identifiable problems that require political solutions. A state must have a language(s) in which it can communicate with its citizens. As has already been observed earlier in this volume, most of the newly emerging states in Sub-Saharan Africa were polyglot communities containing populations speaking anywhere from two to three or several hundred languages. In political terms, the state must recognise its need for a language (or languages) of communication, and subsequently it must select one or more languages for official purposes.

After the independence of Namibia in 1990, English became the official language of the country, while German, Afrikaans and African languages indigenous to Namibia are recognised on a par for purposes of education and other communication (Haacke, 1994). The post-apartheid situation in South Africa has led to that country reassessing which of its 11 official languages will be used for what purposes (Webb, 1994a; Ridge, 1996). Webb (1994b: 197) has argued that if Africa's autochthonous languages (i.e. non-European African languages) are to contribute to this process, then an

military, e.g. the linguistic history of Uganda under Idi Amin), or the language of the political elite (namely, the language spoken by or favoured by a charismatic national President – e.g. Malawi's former President favoured Latin). This issue of prestige is examined more specifically in the next framework, Haarmann (1990), which effectively suggests prestige as a third dimension to status and corpus planning (see Table 2.2).

The choice of a national language(s) is normally calculated to create the least possible disruption in the polity. If, for example, French was the former colonial language, French is recognised as a world language, and virtually no one in the polity speaks another world language such as English; if the resources for teaching English do not exist, and if there is among the population no particular emotional attraction to English, then it makes little sense to choose English as a national language because choosing it will create a powerful disturbance in the social structure. On the other hand, if Japanese were a serious contender in a new polity which had formerly been occupied by the Japanese military, and if the population had a strong antipathy toward the Japanese on the basis of that earlier military occupation (e.g. Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Hong Kong, Taiwan, the Philippines), Japanese would probably be a poor choice for a national language and that it is rapidly becoming an important language in other contexts. These illustrations suggest that leaders of a polity should have basic social and linguistic information about the language situation in the polity to make language selection decisions. Such information subsumes an understanding of what segments of the population speak what languages, of the registers in which each language may be used, of the purposes served by the available languages, and of the resources available for each of the competing languages. It also subsumes an understanding of the emotional attitudes of the population with respect to the primary candidate languages.

There are a number of ways which can be used to collect the information (see Language Planning Process, Chapter 4) needed to provide a detailed description of the actual language situation (who speaks what to whom under what circumstances to what end) including sociolinguistic surveys, with their focus on the collection of attitude toward language(s) data. While it is of course possible to change attitudes toward a particular language, such population-wide attitude modification takes a long time and is extremely expensive. For example, Malaysia's national language programme which was begun in 1967 has put a lot of effort not only into language teaching using a variety of techniques, but also into a media campaign to convince the large numbers of non-Malay speakers in the population of the efficacy of learning 'Bahasa Malaysia'. Language choice cannot be made in a vacuum, but rather needs to be made in light of linguistic information, which in most cases does not readily exist.

To illustrate this point, Tagalog was chosen in the Philippines because

it was claimed that it was the language of a numerical majority, because it was the language of the Capital city, and because it was the language of the early political elite; but despite all these excellent reasons, the choice was, and continues to be, resisted by the other numerically significant populations – the Cebuanos, the Ilocanos, etc. Rejection is frequently based on democratic considerations; native speakers of the official/national language have a clear advantage – they don't have to learn that language, they have native facility in the language, and they have easy access to the best jobs. All other groups, then, are, by definition, disadvantaged and will oppose the choice.

By contrast, Bahasa Indonesia, which is a variant of the pan-Malay language used by traders, was selected by nationalists to be the national language of Indonesia in 1928, almost 20 years before independence from the Dutch, because it was more politically and socially neutral than Javanese, the language of the largest and most powerful ethnic group. In a country as culturally diverse as Indonesia, the choice of 'Malay' as the language of resistance against Dutch colonialism and later as the national language was a statement about the need to build unity through diversity. To have chosen Javanese would have been a statement of a new colonialism, and it is unlikely that Indonesia as we know it would have emerged.

Because language is an emotional matter, opposition to a language can become violent. If the language differentiation is echoed in religious, social, or economic differences, the opposition may be all the more instant and violent. For example, Hindi and Urdu are linguistically essentially the same language differentiated primarily by the use of different writing systems, and in their sources for abstract vocabulary – Sanskrit for Hindi, and Arabic for Urdu. But the language differentiation is reflected in a religious difference as well, Urdu being spoken by Moslems and Hindi by Hindus. Some leaders from both groups used these differences for their own political purposes to differentiate the communities (Das Gupta, 1971). Thus linguistic difference was, in part, responsible for the initial violent break-up of imperial India at independence into Pakistan and India. Pakistan in turn had the eastern portion break away and become Bangladesh, although both are Islamic polities, in part over linguistic (Urdu and Bengali) and cultural differences.

While the choice of a language constitutes a difficult problem, polities do, at some point, make a choice. Once a choice has been made, there are a number of other problems to be dealt with. If the choice falls on a foreign language, that language is likely already to have a standard form, and a set of dictionaries, grammars, etc., are likely to exist. But it is often the case that the variety of the colonial language most widely spoken in the new polity is not the same variety that is spoken in the former colonial power. In such cases, there is the problem of which variety to accept. The metropolitan

variety has a number of advantages, but it may not be spoken by many people; the local variety may be spoken by many people but may to some extent preclude the wider communication for which it was chosen in the first place. The choice of a local language also raises the question of variety. Modern English and French are the varieties which were dominant around London and Paris about 500 years ago and which have now become accepted as national languages.

Allocation of norms is no less complex than the initial identification of the language to be selected. If one can assume that the choice of a language for a specific purpose (i.e. a national language, a foreign language, a regional variety, etc.) has already been accomplished, the next series of problems deals with the establishment of norms. Let us say that English has been chosen as one of the national languages; the question then becomes 'which English?' Take Hong Kong as an example: there are at least five Englishes spoken in Hong Kong: British English (BE), Australian English (AuE), American English (AmE), Indian English (IE), and Hong Kong Chinese English (CE). BE is probably the most prestigious of the available varieties, but it is spoken by a relative small segment of the population – a segment which is likely to diminish rapidly as integration with China in 1997 approaches. CE (a nativised variety, to use Kachru's term) is the least prestigious of the available varieties but it is spoken by the largest segment of the population. AmE is probably the second most prestigious variety – one which is rapidly growing in number of speakers. As BE is declining with the departure of large segments of the British professional civil service, the number of speakers of AmE is increasing. As early as 1986, the number of speakers of AmE in Hong Kong exceeded the number of speakers of BE. AuE is also of growing importance as a variety not identified with colonialism or imperialism. All three of these varieties (BE, AmE, AuE) provide relatively equal access to an extensive literature and to science and technology. IE is relatively unimportant both in the numerical sense and in terms of access that it provides to the larger world, but it is a variety spoken in a demographically large regional area.

A further consideration has to do with the direction in which China (PRC) will move. At the moment, the PRC seems to be moving in the direction of AmE, but the situation is fluid, and it is difficult to predict what will ultimately happen. The aftermath of the unsuccessful pro-democracy movement and other perceived human rights violations within the PRC could cause a rupture of relations with the United States which might move the PRC in the direction of BE or AuE. A second non-trivial consideration has to do with commerce. Hong Kong has become one of the banking centres of the world, and it is important both to Hong Kong and to the PRC that that situation continue. Whichever variety of English promises the greatest access to the world of commerce is likely to be chosen, if not by government fiat, then by the people's action. While it is possible to devise

a variety of English which falls in the centre of a circle of these Englishes, the artificial development of such standard forms has not been very successful (i.e. the attempts in the 1950s and 1960s to develop a 'mid-Atlantic English' between BE and AmE).

The problem of allocation of norms also applies to Chinese in Hong Kong. Hong Kong is traditionally a Cantonese speaking community, but because it has, for a century or more, been the recipient of Chinese migration from all over China, but primarily from South China, a variety of other southern dialects (e.g. Hakka) are also spoken in Hong Kong. The PRC has Mandarin as its official language, and has already urged Hong Kong to disseminate Mandarin in the run-up to 1997. Thus, the allocation of norms among the competing Chinese varieties constitutes an extraordinarily thorny problem. The current tendency is to evolve a high and a low variety in parallel with the situation of English (diglossic situation); that is, BE is the high (H) variety and CE is the low (L) variety, without reference to the proportion of the population which speaks each. It is possible that Mandarin will evolve into a Chinese high (H) variety and Cantonese into a low (L) variety. The planner must decide whether this tendency constitutes an acceptable alternative, and, if not, what strategies can be devised to modify the tendency.

On the other hand, if a local vernacular is chosen, that vernacular may not be standardised. Decisions must be made regarding the variety of the local vernacular that will be 'officialised'. It is further possible that the local vernacular will not have a standardised lexicon and/or a standardised grammar. Indeed, it is possible that the local variety may not have a standardised orthography. It is also possible that the lexicon of the local vernacular may not be particularly well suited to the needs of a modernising society; new lexical items may need to be created to facilitate the language's ability to deal with modern concepts, particularly in education. For example, in the Philippines, Filipino (since 1987 known as Pilipino) – a 'nationalised' form of Tagalog – is mandated throughout the educational system, except in the teaching of science and mathematics where English remains the language of instruction, largely as an outcome of the relative lack of technical terminology in Pilipino.

However, similar problems can arise even with well-established languages. In the United States, in the last decade, there has been a powerful movement to amend the Federal Constitution in order to designate English as the official language of that country. Indeed, a number of states, 22 out of 50 by 1996, have already adopted so-called 'English only' legislation. There are, of course, political issues underlying these actions, but there is also an important linguistic question; if 'English' is designated as the official language of the United States, which 'English' shall it be? In order to instantiate an official language, it is necessary to define which variety of the language will constitute the official standard. The English of the United

States is marked by the existence of a number of regional and socio-economic varieties. While these varieties are most clearly distinguished by differences in pronunciation, there are substantial lexical differences among the several varieties, and there are even syntactic differences. Logically, if the United States wishes to adopt English as its official language, it will probably be necessary to create a national language academy to define the 'standard' variety and to maintain the standards of that variety over time.

Language implementation

Having taken the decision about what language(s) and what variety(ies) or norms are to be adopted, these policies need to be put in place. The implementation of a language plan focuses on the adoption and spread of the language form that has been selected and codified. This is often done through the educational system and through other laws or regulations which encourage and/or require the use of the standard and perhaps discourage the use of other languages or dialects. While education was the preserve of the few, it was relatively easy to spread the standard. For example, 'Oxbridge' English, disseminated through the English 'public school' system became the 'standard' in the nineteenth century (see G.B. Shaw's *Pigmalion* and the musical version *Milk Fair Lady*). However, the coming of mass education has made language implementation a major issue. Very few nation-states are linguistically homogeneous, and the choice of any standard will certainly disadvantage some members of that heterogeneous community.

'Correction' is the term used by language planners to describe the specific measures taken to implement the social aspects of a language plan. Strategies need to be devised to promote language spread and to prevent the development of a linguistic underclass which has no access to the language change. While the formal educational system often plays a major role in the implementation of correction procedures (see Language-in-Education Planning, Chapter 5), it is clear that the education sector alone is not capable of providing for language correction, partly because dissemination through the education system requires several generations, and partly because the education sector lacks the authority to impact on other segments of society.

Some of the complex range of concerns of the Ministry of Education are that the education sector has to disseminate and store the teaching materials prepared - dictionaries, grammar books, etc.: it has to decide what segment of the school day will be allocated to language education at what levels of the educational structure. It has to decide what the objectives of instruction are at each level. It has to decide what other segment of the population will provide the teachers, what training the teachers shall receive over what period of time. It has to decide how to induce students

to undertake study seriously and how to convince their parents that language study is a good idea. In the process of making these decisions, it is likely to uncover the fact that the materials prepared in the preceding corpus planning endeavour are not entirely satisfactory, and it has to bring these into line with the classroom reality (see Chapter 5).

Other agencies of government may, for example, need to instigate tax incentives that will promote the use of a particular variety (e.g. the situation of French in Quebec, Canada). In addition, other agencies of government are able to require bilingualism as a condition of employment in the civil service (e.g. Malaysia beginning in the 1960s). Such a strategy can be a powerful incentive to the acquisition of a particular language or variety. Only the government has the resources to mount a major campaign to modify attitudes in the population at large. A number of years ago the Australian government endorsed a media campaign to reduce the tendencies toward alcoholism and sedentary living in the Australian population, the 'Life be in it' campaign. It is obviously possible to devise and implement comparable campaigns in favour of one or another language variety but, more importantly, in favour of language tolerance in the population.

Evaluation

It is not enough to devise and implement strategies to modify a particular language situation; it is equally important to monitor and evaluate the success of the strategies and progress shown toward implementation. Such evaluation should constitute an ongoing process, and must be designed in such a manner as to provide constant feedback for the implementation strategy, so that the implementation strategy can be corrected in the light of the information flowing from the evaluation phase. Such evaluation must occur simultaneously at two levels: i.e. at the level of the plan itself and as an evaluation of the effect of the plan on various sectors of the population. As we have seen, language plans and their consequences involve complex social change. It is imperative to monitor that change both at the level of the plan and its societal outcomes so that appropriate modifications can be made, where necessary, to the plan itself and/or to the dissemination mechanisms so that implementation leads to appropriate societal goals. Aspects of evaluation are examined in Chapter 4, but it is generally the case that evaluation is a neglected area of language planning.

Status planning summary

Status planning represents the social concerns and social implementation of language planning. Through the process of language selection, the languages to be taught, to be learned, to be made standard are identified. While language planning may play a part in this process, as Luke, *et al.*, (1990) have indicated, language choice is often made on other grounds (race, class, socioeconomic status) and as Sommer (1991) has shown, even

and Woods (1985), have taken case histories of the standardisation of different languages as their primary focus. By contrast, the five volumes edited by Fodor and Hagège (1983–1984, 1989–1990) focus predominantly on current examples of corpus planning for 'major' languages from Europe, Africa, Asia and the Pacific region and endangered languages from around the world. *Sociolinguistica* 2 (Ammon, Mattheier & Nelde, 1988) includes eight articles on the theme of standardisation of Romance and Germanic European national languages while *Sociolinguistica* 6 (Mattheier & Panzer, 1992) includes 10 articles on the theme of standardisation of languages in Eastern Europe. Taken together these 10 volumes provide a descriptive account of attempts at corpus planning in more than 85 countries.

Codification

Codification of a language focuses on the standardisation procedures needed to develop and formalise a linguistic and usually literate set of language norms. Codification is usually performed by individuals with linguistic training who decide explicitly the linguistic form the language is to take. Joseph (1987) has explored the question of 'what is a standard language', and the Eurocentric nature of this question; he cites as examples French, Greenlandic and Inupiaq. LePage (1988) sees standardisation as stereotypical behaviour by users of a language. Ferguson (1988) offers a contrasting position arguing that standardisation implicates a supradialectal norm that leads to language spread.

For many languages the codification process has become so extensive that language agencies (see Rubin, 1979; Domínguez & López, 1995) have been created to do the necessary corpus planning work. For example, Chaklader (1987) describes the work of the Panshimbanga Bangala Akademy for Bengali in India, while Tovey (1988) discusses the role of the Bord na Gaeilge in the development of the Irish language. Of course, language agencies need not be formal language planning bodies. Pointon (1988) relates how the BBC has dealt with pronunciation standards over the last six decades and Sinclair *et al.* (1992) provides a dictionary basis for that usage.

Yet, there is a growing realisation among those involved in corpus planning that standardisation has its social, cultural and political consequences—for language planners themselves, for individual language users, and for minority language communities (Luke *et al.*, 1990). Corpus planning takes place amidst conflicting interests prevalent in the social context (Jernudd & Neustupný, 1987). As Fishman (1988b) points out, the need to standardise a language at a national level to meet economic and political goals should not be used as an argument to eliminate community languages which serve as the social and interpersonal fabric for many linguistic minorities.

that choice may be thwarted by bureaucracy or other conservative forces in the society. Language implementation has as a major component language-in-education planning, but as we will see subsequently, all too often this aspect is allowed to dominate the language plan with problematic consequences, these in general being that formal education represents only one part of language use. Evaluation, when it is carried out, is often done as part of government reports which are not easily accessible to the wider community.

Corpus Planning¹

Corpus planning can be defined as those aspects of language planning which are primarily linguistic and hence internal to language. Some of these aspects related to language are: (1) orthographic innovation, including design, harmonisation, change of script and spelling reform; (2) pronunciation; (3) changes in language structure; (4) vocabulary expansion; (5) simplification of registers; (6) style; and (7) the preparation of language material (Bamgbose, 1989). Jernudd (1988) provides a more detailed discussion of these linguistic aspects of language planning. Haugen divides these processes into two categories: those related to the establishment of *norms*, and those related to the extension of the linguistic functions of language. In his model Haugen labels the former category 'Codification' (or standardisation) procedures, and the latter, 'Elaboration' (or the functional development of language).

Vikor (1988, 1993) has enumerated a set of underlying corpus planning principles which shape the way a corpus is planned. He illustrates these with examples from the Indonesian/Malaysian spelling reforms. The principles show that language planners involved in the corpus planning process are not just applying technical linguistic knowledge, but are involved in choices or alternatives which have a social aspect and which must be resolved for such planning to be successful. These principles can be grouped into four major categories:

- *Internal linguistic principles* (phonemicity, morphophonemicity, simplicity, etymology, invariance and stability);
- *Principles related to attitudes toward other languages* (*rapprochement* or adaptation, reaction [purism]);
- *Principles concerning the relationship between the language and its users* (majority, liberality, prestige, counter-prestige, usage, aestheticism, rationalism); and
- *Principles derived from societal ideologies* (nationalism, liberalism, traditionalism, democracy/egalitarianism, modernity, authority).

Corpus planning has generated a lot of interest in the literature. Four collections of papers, edited by Haas (1982), Lüdi (1994), Scaglione (1984)

Haugen (1983) suggests that codification consists of three areas: *graphisation*, *grammatication* and *lexication*, thereby virtually ignoring aspects of spoken language (although see Thomas, 1987). The typical results of codification work are a prescriptive orthography, grammar, and dictionary. There are a few studies (i.e. O'Boyle, 1988, for Irish) which provide specific details across each of these three areas; most studies, however, relate only to one of them, and thus can be considered separately. *Graphisation* has been considered the first step in the standardisation of a language. Writing systems – whether employing an alphabet, a syllabary or a system of ideograms – provide the basis on which literacy materials can be established and have the potential to reduce the linguistic variation in a language community (see e.g. Wurm 1994a). A great deal of graphisation has been accomplished through the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics [SIL] (Wycliffe Bible Translators); the SIL has provided orthographies for more previously unwritten languages than any other single source. This work, however, has not been without controversy. In some instances, for example, dialect variation has been sacrificed in the interests of 'normative' graphisation (i.e. in Quechua). For a discussion of the role of the SIL with reference to indigenous languages in Mexico, see Pathway-Chavez (1994); for a discussion of the problems of graphisation in the Andean languages, see Hornberger (1992, 1993, 1994, 1995b).

While graphisation activities are often associated with the transformation of oral languages to literate ones, aspects of this type of standardisation apply equally to 'modernised' written languages (e.g. Coulmas, 1989b). Script reform is a matter being considered for a number of languages including Tamil (James, 1985). The choice of alphabetic or character scripts is part of a continuing debate for many East Asian languages (e.g. Chinese [International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 1986, 59], Korean [Hanna, 1995]) while issues related to spelling reform – e.g. Kana in Japan (Neustupný, 1986), Tok Pisin and Australian Kriol (Yule, 1988), Dutch (de Rooij & Verhoeven, 1988 and more recently in 1994), German (Augst & Ammon, 1993) and the more recent pluricentric changes in 1996), Portuguese (de Silva & Gunnewick, 1992), and spelling foreign words in English (Abbott, 1988), for example, are continuing issues.² However, it can be argued that standardisation of spelling may not be appropriate in all situations, for example, where a language is still developing as a communicative medium as with Australian Kriol (Black, 1990).

In the case of a local vernacular which has not developed a standard orthography or which simply does not have a written history, for literacy to occur graphisation becomes necessary. It is necessary to devise an orthographic system that reflects the phonology of the language. When, for example, Native American (e.g. Navajo), Australian Aboriginal languages (e.g. Guugu Yimithirr) or Asian languages like Vietnamese and Kampuchean acquired orthographies, those orthographies were often devised

by missionaries who did not have any very clear concept of the linguistic differences between phonological systems. Hornberger (1992: 192) writes: 'It was the missionary friars and priests who first wrote down many of the indigenous languages, each adopting Spanish or Portuguese orthography according to his own conventions.' Orthographic systems devised for tonal languages by missionaries speaking Spanish or English (in the historical past) often failed to represent the tonal system in any way, and those orthographies have had to be modified over time to reflect the tonal character of the language. In the process of graphisation, local dialect differences must be resolved as well in order to arrive at a standardised representation of the language.

Grammatication involves the extraction and formulation of rules that describe how a language is structured. Most of the grammars developed have been prescriptive and based on the standardised variety of the language, especially those used in schooling or for literacy development. Singh (1987) argues, however, that English grammars used in India during the last 100 years have varied in their sensitivity and appropriateness to Indian conditions thereby creating the feeling that English is either a colonial/imposed language or a national self-expressive one. Soh (1985) illustrates the need to think beyond Eurocentric categories of grammatication. In Korea industrialisation and the resultant social change have altered the use of honorifics and the related pronominal system, making the language less polite but more democratic (cf. Masagara, 1991 for similar changes resulting from urbanisation and Christianisation in Kirundi).

In addition, it must be recognised that the grammar of any language is probably too complex to be represented in a simple way – or for that matter captured in a single book. Besides, a living language is protean, constantly changing its shape to meet its communicative needs, so the best grammar book is, at the moment of its publication, a historical document reflective of the past. For pedagogical purposes, additional choices have to be made; what grammar (or really what segment of the grammar) will be taught? How can it be taught most effectively? How can it be taught to speakers of other local vernaculars whose grammars may be readily compatible with, or may vary substantially from, the target language?

While the grammar of a language is, admittedly, too complex to be simply represented, the pragmatics of a language are almost impossible to capture. Youmans (1995) has explored the use of epistemic modals in standard academic American English and in the speech of Mexican American youngsters; she found significant differences in the conditions under which certain modals were invoked. There is ample evidence in research in German (Heidelberg Project, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1979) and in other languages that, while the grammar remains fairly constant, the frequency and distribution of grammatical features changes with the circumstances under which a given speech act occurs, with the interlocutors, and with

such sociolinguistic factors as relative power status, socioeconomic class, and relative degree of education. Such changes occur in the linguistic production of a given individual, in the production of identifiable sub-populations, and certainly across populations (e.g. when a native speaker of English interacts with a non-native speaker, and certainly when two non-native speakers interact). Pragmatic issues are virtually never discussed in even the most sophisticated grammars of a given language (but see the Collins *CoBuild English Usage* (1992) London: HarperCollins).

Once pedagogical grammars exist, the polity is faced with three additional non-linguistic problems: (1) how to produce and distribute the grammars to the population; (2) how to train teachers to use the grammar books; and (3) how to update and republish and redistribute the grammar books on a continuing basis. At least two of these questions have significant economic implications: book production and distribution is expensive, and among the poorer states the capability to produce and distribute books over a vast geographic area may simply be beyond the means of the exchequer. Even if the fiscal resources exist to publish and disseminate books once, it may be quite impossible to continue to do so over time.

Lexicography refers to the selection and development of an appropriate lexicon. As Haugen notes 'in principle this also involves the assignment of styles and spheres of usage for the words of the language' (1983: 271). In its initial stages, lexication may involve specifying how words are used in particular domains – e.g. in Telugu native occupations (Krishnamurti, 1985). Baldauf and Egginton (1990), in an examination of Australian Aboriginal languages, demonstrate that lexication is an ongoing procedure both in predominately oral as well as literate cultures. Studies in this area not only examine issues related to lexical development, but also those related to usage. Nichols (1988), for example, shows how many American dictionary definitions and handbooks are anchored in the cultural world of the Eurocentric-American male and urges language planners to treat fully and seriously gender and ethnic language related issues.

While dictionary development has traditionally been the domain of lexicographers who selected lexical items and wrote many of the definitions, with the aid of computers it is now possible to create computer generated dictionaries from large corpora of a language – e.g. the *Dictionary of American Regional English* (Cassidy, 1987), the *CoBuild Dictionary* (Collins CoBuild, 1987) – or to computerise dictionaries for CD ROM computer access – e.g. *New Oxford English Dictionary* (Weiner, 1987). The *BBC English Dictionary* is another electronic database dictionary developed from a seven million word corpus of broadcast output of news, current affairs and sports broadcasts taken from the BBC in London and National Public Radio in Washington (Sinclair *et al.*, 1992). Specialist dictionaries in electronic form are now becoming available (Heather & Rossiter, 1988).

The lexicon of a local vernacular, now the national language, will inevitably be rich in resources to deal with all the traditional areas of communication, but it may not be sufficiently rich in the kind of technical terms necessary to permit modernisation. New lexicon may need to be devised. A number of different principles may be employed: (1) foreign words may be borrowed directly from other languages and either modified phonologically or not (see for example Heah Lee Hsia (1989) for the influence of English on Bahasa Malaysia); (2) words may be invented from borrowed roots – a process common enough in English naming where Latin and Greek roots have been employed to coin new words like *plastic*, *solar*, etc.; (3) words no longer in use in the language can be revived (e.g. *broadcast* in English, once restricted to the agricultural sector as descriptive of a way of sowing seed, but now totally taken over by the radio/television industries); or (4) new combinations of existing words can be employed to reflect new concepts (e.g. periphrasal, morpho-syntactic or calquing approaches). Certainly these are processes that have been used in Pilipino and in many other languages with varying degrees of planning.

The processes of graphisation, grammatication and lexication are all corpus planning matters. While the status decisions described above were noted as primarily political matters, the corpus planning issues discussed here are essentially linguistic issues; and whereas status planning is often accomplished by bureaucrats and politicians, corpus planning activity must be undertaken by linguists.

Elaboration

Elaboration of a language focuses on the functional development of that language. That is, once a language has been codified there is a need to continue 'the implementation of the norm to meet the functions of a modern world' (Haugen, 1983: 373). Such a modernised language must meet the wide range of cultural demands put upon it in terms of both terminology and style, from those set by the technological, intellectual, and humanistic disciplines to those associated with the everyday and popular aspects of a culture (Haugen, 1983). Haugen has defined elaboration in terms of *terminological modernisation* and *stylistic development*, but a final and emerging category needs to be added to these established aspects of functional development, that of *internationalisation*.

Elaboration is not merely a matter of increasing the richness of the vocabulary – a matter already touched upon under the topic of lexication; much more is required. For example, literacy in a language is difficult or impossible to maintain if there is nothing to read beyond the literacy materials. Government must actively encourage the publication of newspapers and magazines, of comic books and agricultural pamphlets, in the language that has been chosen. The government must encourage the establishment of radio and television broadcasting in the language. It must

archaic terms which have dropped from use. Some languages, like Khmer (Jacob, 1986), seem to borrow foreign terminology quite readily. However, as Anderson (1987) notes in the case of Indonesian, the basis for the development of new terminology, especially the issue of indigenous roots versus international borrowing, can be an emotive and contentious one (also see Daoust, 1991 for French-English choice in Québec).

Stylistic development implies that a language is more than the sum of its lexical, grammatical and syntactic parts (Cee, 1992). Each language has its own discourses appropriate for each of the domains in which it is used. Stylistic development signals a recognition that, without appropriate development of linguistic style in those domains important to a language, it is not fully able to meet all the demands placed upon it. Arguing for the importance of 'bottom-up' activities in developing style, Nik Saffiah (1987: 68) has proposed that 'the cultivation process of Bahasa Malaysia needs to be accelerated and enhanced within the school environment'. By contrast, Gonzalez's (1990: 330) analysis of Filipino-English bilingual programmes in the Philippines, shows that 'the utility of a language as a tool for learning depends on the state of its cultivation'. He concludes that educational expansion and the cultivation and expansion of a developing language must occur in tandem. Nelde (1988) argues that even in modernised languages such as Dutch there is a need to maintain and use styles in domains like science where the unnecessary use of English could undermine the vigour of the language. Razinkina (personal communication) reports a similar phenomenon in Russian, e.g. a tendency to use English technical terms even when appropriate Russian terms exist.

An area of stylistic development that is rarely discussed in the literature is the need to develop new genres as a language acquires a written form. Egginton (1992; Table 5.1, this volume), for example, argues how, among Australian Aboriginal people, a lack of awareness of what Martin (1990) has called 'power language' significantly inhibits the ability of Aboriginal people to control their own destiny. Oral language has a different set of characteristics for certain functions – characteristics which change as literacy becomes increasingly important in a given society. It is important to keep in mind that written language is not merely transcribed oral language – written language has functions that oral language does not have. This issue, which is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5, *Literacy Planning in Language-in-Education Planning* (p. 146), suggests that some genres (e.g. here, those involved in decision making, negotiation, and contract making) may differ from oral language situations to written language situations. Stylistic development must take into consideration the development of appropriate rhetorical structures to deal with such changes as well as with grammatical and lexical matters.

A critical aspect of stylistic development is the use of the language for media and cultural expression. While such development is often thought

encourage the use of the language in the civil service, in the religious sector, indeed in every walk of life. It must encourage literary artists to produce poetry and fiction in the language. It must encourage the publication of books – a flood of books – so that those who are literate have something to read. In a cyclical manner, it must continue the work of terminological modernisation. It must encourage, through the inception of a whole range of published resources, stylistic development of the language, and it must encourage the use of the language in every possible sector so that internalisation of the language occurs throughout the population at a rate much greater than dissemination through the education sector would allow. The national language efforts in Taiwan (Republic of China) from the late 1940s to the late 1980s may serve as an example (Tse, 1986).

Elaboration is a complex and ongoing process. All languages have some mechanism for elaboration. Languages change; they take on new functions as new technologies emerge; they lose functions as older technologies are abandoned; they develop contact with new groups of speakers of other languages through immigration or through the expansion of commercial activities, and any of these changes require further elaboration of the official language. In the world in which we live language change and development is both rapid and continuing. Language communities need, therefore, to have mechanisms to modernise their language so that it continues to meet their needs. This is not, of course, a new problem. Jernudd (1971) has hypothesised that one of the functions of ceremonial meetings in Australian Aboriginal society was to discuss language and its use. The difference now, of course, is that technological change is occurring very rapidly and language must also change to meet these societal demands.

Terminological modernisation, which involves the development of new lexical items or terminology for a language, is undoubtedly one of the areas which has generated the most discussion within corpus planning. In culturally, technologically and economically changing conditions, thousands of new terms must be generated each year in a language if that language is to be fully expressive in every domain. Terminological development is a major preoccupation of language agencies/academies and specialised international organisations. For each language it must be decided how new terms will be developed. Some general strategies include borrowing a term from other contact or international languages (e.g. Cannon, 1990 [Chinese], De Vries, 1988 [Indonesian], Ermaji, 1988 [Arabic], Fisherman, 1990 [Hebrew], Kay, 1986 [Japanese], Malischewski, 1987 [Chinese], Morrow, 1987 [Japanese] and Stanlaw, 1987 [Japanese]), Takashi, 1992 [Japanese]), often involving transliteration so that the term suits the host language (see the near universal use of the English term *TV*); translating the borrowed term into the host language; and innovative word building, often involving going back to indigenous root words, or reusing

of as the end product of the language planning process, Gonzalez (1990: 328) argues that:

In developing a post-colonial indigenous language as the national language and as the language of scholarly discourse to develop special registers for classroom use, implementation should not start at the bottom, in the primary school, but at the tertiary level, at the university, where a creative minority of scholars who are both linguistically versatile and knowledgeable in their fields can do the necessary pioneering work in translation and production of research in Filipino so as to be able to create an intellectual variety of the language.

In this context it can be argued that the systematic building up of language skills through a planned programme of language development will not be successful unless there are strong and vigorous models of language use in 'high' status language domains such as politics, technology and culture. Thus, one of the questions that may be asked is, 'In what language is the poetry or the prose fiction of the nation being written: the national or local language or the ex-colonial or world language?' As an example of the issues being raised Cruz (1986) summarises aspects of this debate for the Philippines where there has been considerable discussion about writing in a vernacular language or Tagalog or in English. While many would argue that the choice of language is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the nationalist movement in Philippine literature and is a manifestation of the writer's social consciousness, the use of English can be seen in other contexts, besides one that alienates the writer from the people. Cruz (1986: 167) argues that bilingual Filipino writers of poetry use English 'for two main reasons: to capture certain realities not within the lexical (taken as poetic diction) capabilities of Tagalog, and to exploit the musical qualities of the foreign language'. Tagalog, on the other hand, better expresses the social and political realities of the Filipino world (cf. Timio, 1990; also see Kaplan, 1993b). However, the struggle to build a continuing literary tradition in 'modernising' languages, where all realities need to be able to be expressed, is an ongoing one.

Internationalisation can be seen as a particular type of language spread which affects the corpus of a language. As a language becomes a medium of international communication, rather than just a national or intranational standard, standardisation problems arise which parallel each of the categories previously discussed. These problems of standardisation are somewhat different in regional or international contexts – e.g. in Scandinavia via (Loman, 1988) or for Arabic (Mitchell, 1985). Furthermore, as discourse and pragmatic strategies do not carry over entirely across cultures, despite the use of a shared linguistic medium, communication problems may arise (Smith, 1987). The issue has been summarised by Mänttinen in a contractive textlinguistic study of Finnish and English:

... [writers] differ in some of their culturally determined rhetorical practices, and these differences manifest themselves in typical textual features. *The writers seem not to be aware of these textual features, or underlying rhetorical practices.* This lack of awareness is in part due to the fact that textlinguistic features have not been the concern of traditional language teaching in schools. Sometimes text strategies are taught for the mother tongue, but rarely if ever for foreign languages separately. Such phenomena have therefore not been brought to the attention of writers struggling with writing. ... Nevertheless, these sometimes subtle differences between writing cultures, often precisely because they are subtle and not commonly observable to the non-linguist, tend to put ... [various] native language [writers] at a rhetorical disadvantage in the eyes of [other language] readers. ... This disadvantage is more than a difference in cultural tastes, since it may not only strike readers as lack of rhetorical elegance, but as lack of coherent writing or even thinking, which can seriously affect the credibility of non-native writers. (1993: 1–2; emphasis added)

In this regard the role of English as an international language (Görlich, 1988) and the related development of varieties of Englishes (Kachru, 1988, 1996) has generated a lot of corpus planning interest. Some of the specific issues raised, and related topics previously discussed, include: grammaticisation (Greenbaum, 1986, 1988), lexicisation (Lowenberg, 1986; Goke-Pariola, 1987; Pemaghi, 1989), terminology (Starlaw, 1987; Zhou & Feng, 1987), and stylistic development (Widdowson, 1988).

There is also a growing literature in English which reflects both the internationalisation of English and at the same time its localisation. Indigenous authors in the Pacific, in South Asia and Africa are writing in English, but with the view that:

the English language will be able to carry the weight of my African experience. But it will have to be a new English, still in full communication with its ancestral home but altered to suit its new African surroundings. (Achebe, 1965, cited in Thumboo, 1986: 253)

As Thumboo (1986: 252) says, the question of which language to create in, when there are a number available, has several aspects. However, for most individuals 'languages choose their writers, not writers their languages' as 'a decision to write creatively generally forms after one has acquired an inwardness in a language.' Thus, it is how a language like English, or any other international language, is used and shaped by the author to reflect the native language and culture that is important. As an example, Thumboo (1986: 263), through a detailed analysis of Okara's *The Voice*, 'demonstrates the virtually limitless possibilities offered by English,

thus suggesting to writers of new literatures that it can be reshaped and given a local habitation and a name.

Increasingly, issues of stylistic development and internationalisation are coming together in many polities (i.e. the practical need to learn English, but in a culturally suitable manner). This mixing of issues raises questions of 'What is the relationship of literature to language and culture?' (e.g. Hasan, 1996), and 'What are the implications for what English literature will be taught in schools?' In Malaysia, for example, Zawiah Yahaya (1996) argues that there is a need for a change in methodology and perspectives so as to reinterpret the English canon based on the Malaysian nation building context. Koh Tai Ann suggests that the role of English literature teaching in Singaporean schools needs to be re-evaluated as 'a critical disjunction exists between national language policies and the teaching profession's own stated aims for the teaching of literature' (1996: 27). Thus, while English is being internationalised, there is increasing pressure in schools for it to contribute to local cultural and national development.

Finally, despite (or perhaps because of) this internationalisation of English (and Arabic, French, German, Mandarin, Portuguese, Spanish), there are those who believe the continued development of constructed or planned languages is an important and more culturally neutral way to meet the growing international communication needs that have been discussed (Dasgupta, 1987; also Ashby, 1985; Large, 1988; Harry, 1989; Tonkin, 1987).

Corpus planning summary

A number of trends have emerged from this review of the corpus planning literature. First, the linguistic tension between traditional usage and modernisation of language referenced by Fishman (1983) continues as does the necessity for corpus planners to keep attuned to their public yet provide sound language models. However, there does seem to be a growing awareness that corpus planning does not deal solely with linguistic issues. This is reflected by the fact that in many instances it is difficult to separate corpus from status planning issues in a particular language so as to fit them neatly into Haugen's model. Ultimately, corpus planning operates in real-world contexts in conjunction with social, historical, cultural and political forces. Second, while terminology remains a major focus of interest, the spread of 'Englishes', 'Spanishes' and 'Frenches' is a growing area of concern for corpus planning. Developments in both of these areas are central to information access and dissemination which is necessary to the functioning of modern societies. Third, computers are beginning to make their mark on corpus planning, especially in the development of dictionaries. Each of these trends suggests that a narrow preoccupation with linguistic skills is not, in and of itself, a sufficient basis

for corpus planning, and that a critical re-evaluation of the modernist assumptions of language planning is beginning to occur.

What should be clear from this discussion, however, is that corpus and status planning changes cannot be carried out in isolation; the two systems are completely interdependent. It should also be clear that a planning activity does not necessarily start conveniently at the beginning; on the contrary, states at various stages of development – both linguistic and economic – can enter into the planning paradigm at any point. The point at which a state enters into a planning mode will determine which are the first stages.

New Zealand, for example, only recently entered into a planning mode. The country has only two official languages: English and Maori. English is well along in development; Maori less so. Nevertheless, New Zealand had to be concerned about the allocation of norms. Both English and Maori have established orthographic systems, so graphisation has not been a problem, but the languages are uneven in terms of grammatical structure and lexicification. The dissemination of English through the educational structure is well developed, but the dissemination of Maori is still at a relatively primitive stage. English, of course, enjoys broad elaboration across the English-speaking world, but Maori is less elaborated than English; while Maori has a rich oral tradition, the development of a written literature in Maori is still in need of strong support and encouragement. Thus, New Zealand entered into the planning process with its two primary languages at different states of development. But in addition to the two primary languages, there are a number of other languages spoken by segments of the New Zealand population which must be accounted for in the planning process (Kaplan, 1993a, 1993b; Peddie, 1991a, 1991b, 1996; Waite, 1992).

It should be clear from Haugen's model and from the New Zealand example that although for discussion purposes the 2×2 matrix suggested by Haugen (Figure 2.1) is conceptually very useful, in reality all the stages suggested in the model may occur simultaneously in a complex reticulated structure. Planning involves both the language itself and the situation in which the language will be/is being used, and the two segments of the planning paradigm in practice cannot be separated; it is inevitably the case that changes in the language affect the sectors/register in which the language is being/can be used, and these changes in turn define in a new way the language situation. It should also be clear that planning cannot occur in some cleverly isolated segment of the polity; it must occur across all sectors of the state, but this point will be discussed in greater detail in a later section of this volume.

Levels of Language Planning

As indicated in Chapter 1, language planning occurs in a number of contexts and at a number of levels. The impact of any particular language

illustrate the impact of promotional activity on status and corpus planning:

- 1.1 the effort made by the Protestant bishop Mikael Agricola in the sixteenth century to promote the Finnish language as a medium of instruction at school (see Haarmann, 1974: 40 ff.); the effort by Senator S.I. Hayakawa to make English the official language of the US;
- 1.2 the efforts made by J.H. Campe, J.G. Fichte, E.M. Arndt and others in connection with language purism (German Sprachreinigung) in Germany (see Kirkness, 1975); the efforts by G.B. Shaw to reform English spelling (see endnote 2);
- 2.1 the activities of the Gaelic League since 1893 to promote the maintenance of Irish as a mother tongue and colloquial variety (see Ó hAilín 1969: 91 ff.); the activities of the Federation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Languages to promote language revival, maintenance and survival of aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Languages in Australia (Baldauf, 1995a; McKay, 1996);
- 2.2 the attempts to elaborate a written standard for modern Occitan, made by writers and philologists in the movement of the *Félibrige* since its foundation in 1854 (see Kremnitz, 1974: 178 ff.); the efforts of the Maori Language Commission to publish a 'standard' Maori dictionary;
- 3.1 the activities to stabilise the functions of the two language varieties *nynorsk* and *bokmål* in Norway (see Haugen, 1966); the efforts of the 'loi Toubon' to purify French (see Chapter 10, Introduction);
- 3.2 the efforts to provide norms for the terminological modernisation of national languages in Nordic countries (see Språk i Norden, 1986); the creation of new lexical items in Indonesian (Alisjahbana, 1984; Vikør, 1993) and Malay (Omar, 1984);
- 4.1 governmental legislation concerning the status of French, Dutch, and German in Belgium (see Falch, 1973: 9 ff., 125 ff.); the constitution of Vanuatu stating the national language is Bislama (Thomas, 1990);
- 4.2 the elaboration of writing systems (alphabets) for new standard languages in the Soviet Union since the 1920s (see Iaeav, 1979), or more recently for *minority minzu* in China (Harrell, 1993).

While these examples for each of the eight individual types (status planning by corpus planning by four prestige levels) are useful illustrations, in many language planning situations, the success of the plan and its implementation may depend on multiple impacts, and the boundaries between language prestige levels is often not clear.

plan depends on the level or context in which the plan is developed and implemented. In the two following sections we examine two ways of looking at this issue as part of an overall framework.

An ideal typology of language planning

Haarmann (1990) has suggested a third range of language planning activities to complement the status planning and corpus planning introduced in Haugen's model. He argues that *prestige planning* represents a separate range of activities. Whereas corpus and status planning are productive activities, prestige planning is a receptive or value function which influences how corpus and status planning activities are acted upon by actors and received by people (to use Cooper's terms, following section). As Table 2.2 suggests, prestige planning is very much related to the four language planning contexts examined in Chapter 1 (Table 1.1).

Haarmann's typology is useful in that it reinforces the notion that planning occurs at different levels and for a variety of purposes. He argues that these levels (i.e. governmental activities, activities of agencies, group activities and activities of individuals) represent a differential prestige or efficiency of organisational impact levels and that this may affect the success of the language plan. The following examples of ranges of language planning and language cultivation are taken from Haarmann (1990: 120-1, with some added examples) and provide some concrete settings which

Table 2.2 An ideal typology of language cultivation and language planning (Haarmann, 1990: 120-1)

	Ranges of language planning				Ranges of language cultivation			
	Activities of government	Activities of agencies	Activities of groups	Activities of individuals	Activities of government	Activities of agencies	Activities of groups	Activities of individuals
Status planning	4.1	3.1	2.1	1.1				
Prestige planning	↑ official promotion ↓ 4.2	↑ institutional promotion ↓ 3.2	↑ pressure group promotion ↓ 2.2	↑ individual promotion ↓ 1.2				
Corpus planning								
	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1				
Maximum	Efficiency in terms of the organisational impact				Minimum			

1. The table has been reoriented and slightly reworded to be consistent with the terminology used in this book.

Macro vs. micro language planning

Another way of looking at the problem of context or levels is not to examine language problems in terms of the scale of the activity and its intended impact. Both large- and small-scale activities may be prestigious (or not) and may have (or fail to have) the desired impact on their particular language planning situation. However, most general frameworks (i.e. Haugen's corpus vs. status planning model and Cooper's accounting scheme) and much of the exemplary literature cited to support them, suggest that language planning is a large-scale activity, i.e. it occurs mainly at the macro level. However, language planning actually occurs at many different levels, although the micro levels are not well documented in the literature, perhaps because they are not seen to be as prestigious. For large-scale planning to meet popular needs, and indeed for it to succeed at all, it must have effect across all levels of language and society. Williams (1994: 102) illustrates this clearly in his listing of factors which promote the anglicisation of Wales in the modern period (Table 2.3), examining as he does the macro, meso and micro levels of planning impact.

On the other hand, some language policies have much more limited goals and may affect only micro policy and planning, perhaps in a single company or institution. Students of language planning often remark after reading the language planning literature that this is all very interesting, but they can't really see themselves planning for language change in China, Russia, Namibia or Brazil. However, as many people are beginning to realise, although societal language planning is very interesting, micro examples of language planning occur around us every day and for these to be successful many of the same ideas and skills need to be utilised to make them work effectively (see, e.g. Kuo & Jernudd, 1993 for Singapore; Applying the macro to the micro situations on pp. 117–118, and economic examples on pp. 187–189, both this volume).

An Accounting Scheme for Language Planning

Another approach to the development of an overall framework for language planning is that taken by Cooper (1989). He evaluated four frameworks from other disciplines as the basis for developing a process framework for language planning. To develop this framework (Table 2.4), he considered:

- (1) the management of innovation;
- (2) an instance of marketing;
- (3) a tool in the acquisition and maintenance of power; and
- (4) an instance of decision making. (1989: 58)

From this emerges an accounting scheme with eight components:

- (i) What actors, (ii) attempt to influence what behaviors, (iii) of which

Table 2.3 Factors promoting the anglicisation of Wales in the modern period (Williams, 1994: 102)

Policy	Economy	Culture/society
<i>Macro</i>		
The Edwardian conquest.	Land transfer.	Alien nobility.
State integration via the Acts of Union 1536 and 1542.	Early urbanisation. Agricultural depression. Promotion of urban bourgeoisie.	Outlawing Welsh language.
Establishment of state church.	Urbanisation and industrialisation.	Estrangement of the gentry.
Parliamentary representation after the Reform Act 1867.	Integration into the world economy.	Translation of Bible, 1588.
Expansion of suffrage.	Welsh out-migration and regional change.	Educational reform and value reorientation.
Education Act 1870.	Non-Welsh immigration to selected areas.	Inter-generational language loss.
Warfare and conscription.		
<i>Meso</i>		
Local government reforms.	Developing bureaucracy and economic	Denominational religious diversity.
Political radicalism.		Popular mass entertainment.
Chartism, party political electoral representation.	Trade unionism.	Social movements.
	Transport and communication.	Adult education.
	Infrastructure improvements.	
	Print capitalism.	
<i>Micro</i>		
Voter participation.	Entering wage economy.	Inter-ethnic marriage patterns.
Political party membership.	Residential mobility.	Language switching and language loss.
British identification.	Socioeconomic and class consciousness.	Increased bilingualism.
State support in wartime.	Individual material advances.	Secularisation and reorientation of value system.
Dependency upon state agencies.	Benefits of welfare state policies.	Passive receptive entertainment.
Educational opportunities through the medium of English.		

Figure 2.4 An accounting scheme for the study of language planning (Cooper, 1989: 98)

- I What *actors* (e.g. formal elites, influentials, counterelites, non-elite policy implementers)
 - II attempt to influence what *behaviors*
 - A. structural (linguistic) properties of planned behavior (e.g. homogeneity, similarity)
 - B. purposes/functions for which planned behavior is to be used
 - C. desired level of adoption (awareness, evaluation, proficiency, usage)
- III of which *people*
 - A. type of target (e.g. individuals v. organisations, primary v. intermediary)
 - B. opportunity of target to learn planned behavior
 - C. incentives of target to learn/use planned behavior
 - D. incentives of target to reject planned behavior
- IV for what *ends*
 - A. overt (language related behaviors)
 - B. latent (non-language related behaviors, the satisfaction of interests)
- V under what *conditions*
 - A. situational (events, transient conditions)
 - B. structural
 1. political
 2. economic
 3. social/demographic/ecological
 - C. cultural
 1. regime norms
 2. cultural norms
 3. socialisation of authorities
 - D. environmental (influences from outside the system)
 - E. informational (data required for a good decision)
- VI by what *means* (e.g. authority, force, promotion, persuasion)
- VII through what *decision making process* (decision rules)
 - A. formulation of problem/goal
 - B. formulation of means
- VIII with what *effect*

people, (iv) for what *ends*, (v) under what *conditions*, (vi) by what *means*, (vii) through what *decision making process*, (viii) with what *effect*. (1989: 98)

Each of these components of the framework is now briefly examined.

- (i) The *actors* or traditional participants in language policy and planning have come from what Kaplan (1989) refers to as 'top-down' language planning situations. These are people with power and authority who make language related decisions for groups, often with little or no consultation with the ultimate language learners and users. Exactly who these planners are is often left in general terms. In their introduction to the classic volume on language planning, Rubin and Jernudd (1971: xvi) put it this way:

As a discipline, language planning requires the mobilization of a great variety of disciplines because it implies the channeling of problems and values to and through some decision-making administrative structure.

In general language planning has been portrayed as being done (note that the use of the passive here leaves ambiguous who is doing) from within an objective, ideologically neutral and technological perspective in which planners matter little—as long as they have the technical expertise required. Baldauf (1982) was one of the first to point out explicitly that 'who the planners were was potentially an important variable in the language policy and planning situation.'

A number of authors (Luke *et al.*, 1990; Mey, 1989; Watson-Gogoo & Gegoo, 1995) have questioned the role of traditional language planners or *actors* and have argued for the inclusion of a broader participation base, i.e. those *people* for whom language is being planned should have a say in its actual planning and implementation. Kaplan (1989) has described this as 'bottom-up' language planning. The use of sociolinguistic survey techniques (see Chapter 4) or other such methods means that traditional planners have the means to collect information about the impact of potential planned language changes at the macro level. Whether there is the political and social will to do so, is another matter.

(ii) Language policy and planning is meant to influence language *behaviors* in a number of ways including the structural, the purpose or functional and the desired level of adoption. For example, the issue of sexist language usage in English has brought about structural changes in the linguistic nature of English. Over the last 20 years, it has become inappropriate to use gendered pronouns (she, he) or nouns (actress, chairman) and non-gendered substitutes have entered the language instead (i.e. they for he/she; actor regardless of gender; chair or chairperson instead of chairman). Initially, the purpose or function of this usage came from feminist writings which argued English constructed a male gender-biased world and the changed usage first appeared in professional speech and writing. The desired level of adoption was, however, universal and the

change is gradually becoming the norm in all written English and increasingly in speech (see Pauwels, in press).

(iii) Which people are to be the targets of planned language change and what are their opportunities, incentives or disincentives for making the required language changes? Unfortunately, the incentives for making the required language change are often negative. In Wales, during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (following the Education Act of 1870), Welsh children were not only required to learn English in school, but were prohibited from speaking Welsh at school. Children who, for whatever reason used Welsh, were punished with the 'Welsh Not'. Offending children were required to wear a board suspended on a thong around their necks. The message on the board was 'Welsh Not'. The child wore the board until another offender relieved him/her of the burden. Thus, the objective was not to speak Welsh; the incentive was a rather humiliating punishment. The disincentive might have been Welsh ethnic pride, but it was more likely to be childish unconsciousness, carelessness or even peer pressure. Indeed, the use of Welsh might have been an attempt to circumvent ignorance of the appropriate English structure. Similar practices occurred in the US in the education of Native American children, in Australia in the education of Aboriginal children, and in New Zealand in the education of Maori children.

(iv) The ends or goals for which language planning is undertaken can be quite varied. These goals are the focus of the next chapter and include language purification, language regeneration, language reform, language standardisation, language spread, lexical development, terminological unification, stylistic simplification, interlingual communication, language maintenance and auxiliary-code standardisation. Cooper points out that such ends can be overt, to change language related behaviours, or latent, to change non-language related behaviour. The requirement to use 'Bahasa Melayu' in Malaysia, while being about having a common language for communication also has the purpose of building common understandings so as to defuse racial and other tensions within the society.

(v) The conditions under which language change is to occur are quite varied. Cooper suggests that situational, structural (political, economic and social/demographic/ecological), cultural, environmental and informational conditions may impact on any particular language plan. The nature and effect of such conditions will become more evident when we look at some case studies in Part 3 of this volume.

(vi) The means (e.g. authority, force, promotion, persuasion) by which language planning decisions are introduced vary from situation to situation. As Haarmann's (1990) prestige planning concept suggests, there is always some authority behind any language planning decision, and such authority may be at different levels (also see Chapter 7 of this volume).

(vii) The decision-making process refers to the decision rules for the

proposed language plan, including both the formulation of the problem/goal and the formulation of the means to reach that goal. As the incentives to achieve target behaviour were often negative, the decision-making processes were often removed from the control of those who were most affected. In New Zealand, for example, decisions regarding which languages would be taught in schools and when and for how long they would be taught, who would teach them to whom, how they would be taught, and how appropriate levels of achievement would be assessed are, at the present time, almost exclusively in the hands of the Minister of Education. Although in some instances the Minister may consult with teachers, teachers are substantially removed from the process. Students are entirely excluded from the decision-making process. The grounds on which decisions are made by the Minister are undoubtedly in part political; additionally, they may be based on theoretical notions of what may be expected to work. The Minister is, in fact, distantly removed from the environment in which the decisions will be implemented.

The New Zealand case is not exceptional. In Mexico, for example, decisions regarding issues pertaining to indigenous language education are made in the capital city. Implementation of the decisions is distantly removed from the decision-making site; instructions for implementation pass through many hands before they arrive in the actual schools in geographically distant provinces, and many layers of bureaucrats interpret those instructions along the way. Any bureaucrat opposed to the decision can delay implementation indefinitely simply by failing to act (Pattey-Chavez, 1989, 1994).

(viii) The effects of any particular language planning project as discussed in the previous chapter are not always easy to determine, because it is hard to know what would have happened if language planning had not occurred. In Part 3 of this volume, we look at some specific issues and case studies and in that context the effects of planning.

Summary

In this chapter we have examined Haugen's model for language planning as one way of visualising the scope and sequence of the language planning process. We have done this by examining corpus planning and status planning with their respective focus on language and society. We have then examined the issue of micro and macro planning, noting that much more attention has been paid to the latter than the former. Finally, we have looked at who traditionally is included in and excluded from language planning, although this will become more evident as instances of language planning are examined throughout the book. These first two chapters, then, provide an overview of the field and the major issues facing

the discipline. They also provide some terminology and an initial framework with which we can examine language planning in practice.

Notes

1. Some of the material in this section first appeared in Baldauf (1990b).
2. ... English has some impossible characteristics. The *th* is famously difficult for foreigners who find sentences like 'What's this?' hard to pronounce. There are some very rare and difficult vowels: The vowel sound in *bird* and *nurse* occurs in virtually no other language. There are no fewer than 13 spellings for *sch*: *sch, sugar, issue, nungion, nation, suspicion, again, conscious, dajeron, schist, fiddia* and *pslaw*. An old bit of doggerel for foreign students advises:
Beware of *heard*, a dreadful word
That looks like *beard* and sounds like *bird*,
And *dead*: It's said like *bed*, not *head* –
For goodness sake, don't call it *dead*!
Various English seemed standardised on the air, the greater seemed the need for a simplified spelling system. Such proposals were often heard during the inter-war years. In 1930, a Swedish philologist, R.E. Zachrisson, proposed an international language, essentially English to be called *Anglic*. For all its logic, its drawbacks can be easily demonstrated in the Anglic version of a famous sentence: *Fanscor and seven yertz ago our fudherz braut forth on this continent a nuu neshion, kinsceded in liberti*. ... In 1940 the **British Simplified Spelling Society** mounted a campaign for New Spelling and lobbied hard for government approval. Perhaps the most famous champion of the simplified spelling was **George Bernard Shaw** who bequeathed a part of his large fortune to the cause of a more regular English spelling ... (Emphasis added. McCrum *et al.*, 1986: 46–47)

3 Language Planning Goals

In Chapter 2 three frameworks were examined which provided an overview of the language planning process. Having developed an understanding of the process within which language planners work, it is now appropriate to examine the goals or *ends* to which language planning is put. Language planning can be engaged in for a wide variety of objectives or general goals, and language planners (*actors*) develop plans to work toward those goals. In this chapter we examine some of these macro level goals and briefly provide some examples of each. However, it needs to be recognised that language planning is seldom done with a single goal in mind (e.g. the major goal of language planners in Québec may have been French language maintenance, but purification and language spread were minor goals). It may be based on contradictory goals – e.g. the development and promotion of Bahasa Indonesia as a national language (language spread) while at the same time supporting local language rights (language maintenance). As Haarmann (1990: 123) has pointed out:

In practical work it is hardly possible to reach a level where all of the relations would be in balance. Most inconsistencies in practical language planning result from conflicts of interest. It is a well-known fact that the objectives of language planning are often incompatible.

Furthermore, many of these goals are carried out to reach rather abstract purposes, which are related to national policy goals in a more general sense. In Chapters 5 and 6 three of these major language planning goals are examined: (1) language-in-education planning; (2) language-in-education literacy planning; and (3) the economics of language. These are general goals with language foci that modern and modernising societies seek to attain and which have a direct impact on individuals within those societies.

Goals of Language Planning

A number of authors (Annamalai & Rubin, 1980; Bentahila & Davies, 1993; Eastman, 1983; Jahr, 1993; Kaplan, 1990a; Karam, 1974; Nahir, 1984; Paulston, Pow & Connerty, 1993) have discussed the types of the goals involved in language planning. While the language planning processes can be characterised by the four cells in Haugen's model (i.e. selection,