LANGUAGE PLANNING AS DISCIPLINE[1]

Björn H. Jernudd

Department of Humanities, Footscray Institute, Victoria University of Technology, Footscray, Australia 3011

Abstract. A social science approach to language planning is contrasted with a language management approach to language planning. The language management approach connects language planning to discourse and requires a separation of linguistic and non-linguistic motivations for language planning actions. Language planning is the kind of language management that social and political scientists are the most interested in because it is typically motivated by non-linguistic interests.

Social Science Approaches to Language Planning

In the concluding paragraph to his very recent book on *Language Planning and Social Change*, Cooper (1989: 182) answers the question whether a theory of language planning is possible by first quoting and thereby supporting Weston (1977) in favour of a 'single general theory of social change', then stating what a theory would enable us to explain. It would explain:

the motivation for setting particular status, corpus, and acquisition goals and for choosing particular means and the reasons that the means do or do not effect the goals within a given social context.

Such a theory is unattainable, writes Cooper, because the language planning goals serve a diversity of

latent goals such as economic modernization, national integration, national liberation, imperial hegemony, racial, sexual, and economic equality, the maintenance of elites, and their replacement by new elites.

What's needed, resolves Cooper, is a theory of social change. Thus, we observe, his interest is focused on the social and not on the linguistic. Because acquisition of social knowledge is such a vast enterprise, he temporarily suspends theorising in favour of description[2] (1989: 97–98). He develops an accounting scheme to gather at least some of the information one would need to understand language planning. His accounting scheme is hinged on first identifying the actors in a decision-making process. What

127

© 1991 B.H. Jernudd
Vol. 12, Nos 1&2, 1991

language problems are involved in the process are accounted for in terms of those behaviours that these actors' have chosen to attempt to influence. Thus, Cooper's approach to language planning is sociological.

So is Joshua Fishman's, to whom Cooper pays tribute in his introduction. Fishman (1987) assesses the state of the art in language planning study and in so doing presents the social science approach to language planning. One of his definitions even opposes a societal direction of study to a linguistic one:

For me, language planning remains the authoritative allocation of resources to the attainment of language status and language corpus goals, whether in connection with new functions that are aspired to, or in connection with old functions that need to be discharged more adequately. This definition [...] leads in societal directions more than it does in linguistic ones. (Fishman, 1987: 409)

Fishman (1987: 423) subordinates corpus planning to status planning:

status planning is the real engine of the language planning train. Only when status planning is seriously enforced does corpus planning really take root [...] the products of corpus planning [...] have no dynamic of their own. Many languages will never get much corpus planning codification or elaboration, and even less implementation [...]

Fishman (1987: 411) compassionately constructs language planning around such issues as ethnic identity, nationalism and nationalism, functional inequality and undercut pluralism:

it [language planning] is primarily the means whereby less fortunate language communities (i.e. those less powerful in their particular confrontation with another ethno-linguistic aggregate) organize their self-defense, as well as their inter-translatability-at-least-to-some-extent-and-in-some-functions vis-à-vis one or another 'international language'.

[Thus]

They [language planners] are (or should be) issue definers and consciousness raisers vis-à-vis the goal of ethno-cultural pluralism and ethnocultural democracy. (p. 413)

He regards the study of language planning as one area of study to contribute to theory of social change, social planning, and at its best, sociological theory in general.

People claim allegiance to languages as symbols of the nation, they may fear the loss of income or (is it worse?) suffer alienation from their true origins, indeed face dissolution as a separate and distinct community because of loss of their language. These very real claims are typically produced by and evaluated in terms of goals and ideologies that are not rooted in problems of communication although the use of the language is trivially necessary for the goals and ideologies to apply. Rather, group interests for reasons of

control of institutions, and management of identity, prescribe the endorsement of a particular language. There is no question but that processes and problems of this kind are best studied according to the rules of disciplines that are equipped to dissect relationships of ideology, power, and identity. Works in history, political science, ethnography, literacy, geography, literature, linguistics, social psychology, and so on, hold crucial insights into these aspects of language planning processes and offer methods. If political science accommodates institutional and rhetorical approaches, then the study of the politics of language should accordingly be informed by these institutional and rhetorical approaches (cf. Jernudd & Shapiro, 1989). When theories of development replace each other, so could their projections on language behaviour be re-evaluated on the basis of appropriately enriched and enlarged data bases that correspond to the analytical requirements of the adopted theoretical perspective.

In commenting on the status of particularly 'status planning' in his state of the art paper, Joshua Fishman says that

[those interested in language planning] have been making up social science theory far too long and, as a result, have benefited far too little from the theory that has been elaborated by specialists working in other areas of social change and social planning.

But sociolinguistics is also concerned with the exhaustive, multidimensional depiction of the present, with attitude studies, with usage studies, with criterion evaluation studies, in short, with quantitative studies of various kinds. We ultimately want to know more about what kinds of populations are more likely, and what kinds are less likely, to adopt the status planning and corpus planning products of language planning authorities and why these differentials exist. (1987: 410)

For an example of this kind of work, Fishman refers to the International Research Project on Language Planning Processes (1987: 426)[3]. Led by Fishman, the project's research team formulated their questions in 1968–69. The questions then, as Fishman's questions also now, focused on the authorisation, policy-processes, agency operations, and products of language planning agencies and associations, and on responses among the 'target populations'[4]. These were the kinds of questions that interested the research group, and these are the kinds of concerns that accompany language planning processes which implement policies that are driven by élite, nationalistic, partisan ethnic, developmentally ideological, or such-like motivations. The project did not connect with individual management of language in discourse because impact of agency work on discourse was the main issue. It gathered language data relevant to evaluating agency influence on language use.

A Language Management Approach to Language Planning

In the 1990s, language planning is also motivated by migrations and ethnic relations, by new nationalisms, by the maintenance of state power by the one interest group (even self-identified by 'race' in some corners of our world), by consequences of economic globalisation of the economy, by the growth and increased intensity in use of global, regional, and local networks of communications. Naturally therefore, researchers engage with language planning and from just as many different perspectives of study. However, there is one perspective that can be regarded as language planning's own perspective. This perspective arises out of a theory of language problems (Neustupný, 1968, 1978: 243–57). A theory of language problems is explicit about relationships between discourse (communication) and peoples' behaviour towards language in that it must reveal whether and how language problems occur in communicative acts, i.e. in discourse. If participants in language planning processes claim that certain user groups' language use, in terms of specific features of language, or in terms of repertoire and distribution in use by domain or network, are inadequate, how do these claims arise? Do they arise out of *linguistic interest* or out of *non-linguistic interest*? With what differential consequences? Language problems that arise out of linguistic interest form a direct part of the communication process, while the latter have to be introduced into discourse in order to become problems of language (Jernudd & Neustupný, 1987: 77). Scientifically minded linguists, if they were to pay attention to language management processes, would most likely opt to inspect the sources in discourse for language planners' and managers' claims about problems in need of correction, and solution in need of implementation, just as political scientists and sociologists now opt to inspect sources in ideologies, power conflicts, migrations, nationalisms, ethnic aspirations, etc. for the authorisation and operation and implementation processes in language planning.

A discipline of language management which includes language planning as one type of language management activity organises its work with focus on language. Relative to Cooper's and Fishman's approaches to language planning processes, three questions articulate the linguistic interest in the language management approach quite clearly:

where is the language problem?
whose is the problem?
is there a problem in discourse?

In seeking answers to these questions, language planning researchers give themselves the opportunity to relate individuals' management of language in discourse, on the one hand, to institutional, ideological, attitudinal and survey-of-language-use findings, on the other.

The model for language management in discourse (Jernudd & Neustupný, 1987: 75–76) holds that a person

(1) produces messages
(2) monitors the language that constitutes these messages, and notes (or not) a difference from norm by monitoring language production, thus identifying a product-item;
(3) evaluates (or not) the kind and degree of inadequacy of the product-item;
(4) selects (or not) an adjustment strategy or at least *ad hoc* means of adjustment for the inadequacy;
(5) acts (or not) to pre-, in-, or post-correct self or to react to the other's speech, to implement adjustment.

It is difficult to recover notings, evaluations, and adjustment strategies from recordings, even when there is reason to think that a participant took overt action to implement adjustment. Conversation analysis assumes that participants' communicative actions are both context shaped and context renewing. It shares with language management an interest in trouble and repair in conversation; and trouble and repair are as central to ethnomethodologists' reconstruction of language processes as they are to the language managers' search for solutions. Conversation analysts' untiring attention to details constitute their (ethno)methodology; language managers make accessible evaluation, adjustment, and implementation processes in discourse and situate these in institutional context. Tapping participants' reports on their own behaviours also offers a promising methodology (Ericsson & Simon, 1984). Since individual discourse stands at the centre of the language management discipline, application of methods that rely on participant reports is obviously extremely important. Language management is not alone in sharing this methodological interest. Students of language teaching are returning to self-report and even stream-of-consciousness methods to explore the language acquisition process (see Faerch & Kasper, 1987; Cohen, 1987a, b). Neustupný (1986a, b) discusses the application and interpretation of interaction and follow-up interviews in language management (cf. also Clyne, 1975).

For written language, while principles guide editing and evaluation of congruent parameters of a style, of document formulation and so on, language management also needs data from the writing process itself. A researcher can arrange to register all input a writer makes at a computer keyboard and build up a detailed record of rewrite which can be analysed, and then, with questions guided by the analysis, presented to the writer for recollected comment and for re-evaluation (Severinson Eklundh, 1988).

There are communications about language inadequacies that can be studied directly. In language learning, the researcher may experience overt, consultative management as a participant either in the role of teacher or learner (Schmidt & Frota, 1986). In language cultivation, the researcher may take note of queries directed over the telephone or by mail to language cultivation agencies to help solve language problems, or collect problems in

any situation of another seeking help with adjustment of inadequacies (cf. Nordisk Språksekretariat, 1988).

The study of language management critically depends on an explicit understanding of some discourse events. An interest in discourse is very much a matter of the climate of times. The discursive interest in anthropology[5], practical philosophy[6], literary criticism[7], political science[8], and history[9], now percolating in all the human and social sciences, and interest in discourse in branches of language study, are not accidental and not accidentally related. One motivating factor for the shared foregrounding of the discursive in the human and social sciences is an interest in the individual, and perhaps also therefore interest in the ordinary, us-all-encompassing, in contemporary endeavours of any kind.

The study of language management focuses on trouble in discourse because processes of overcoming trouble validate practices of language cultivation and language planning. But Fishman's assertion is also true, that

basic issues impinging upon language planning not only go beyond language planning (substantially involving, as they do, culture planning and identity planning, i.e., some of the most sensitive and value-encumbered aspects of human society), but go beyond the social sciences themselves. (1987: 411)

Indeed, students of language planning need to go beyond both discourse management and the social sciences if our task is to explain, as ends Cooper his book and I with him this paper, that

Language is the fundamental institution of society [therefore] To plan language is to plan society. (1989: 182)

Notes

1. This conference presentation borrows from a paper just written together with Professor J. V. Neustupný (Jernudd & Neustupný, forthcoming), because this content is what is on my mind.
2. 'I offer the [descriptively-adequate] framework as a guide to future investigators in the hope that it will improve our ability to describe, predict, and explain language planning.' Rubin et al. (1977) report on this project; and for its comparative methodology, note especially Fishman (1977) in the report.
3. Rubin et al. (1977) report on this project; and for its comparative methodology, note especially Fishman (1977) in the report.
4. The questions are published in an appendix to the book Can Language Be Planned? (Rubin & Jernudd, 1971: 293–305). The team relied mainly on questionnaires, and intensive interviewing of well-informed participants in policy and work processes.
5. Cf. Geertz, 1988.
6. Heidegger displaces the ego subject, the subject of consciousness from the centre of knowledge and puts in its place an historical, changing subject constituted as a set of skills and/or practices, including (and especially) linguistic practices which "house" human existence.' (Shapiro, 1984: 216)
7. In the same article, Shapiro lets Beckett speak for the literarily discursive (1984: 239): 'Beckett places the "I" in a place where it receives the action. It is in a head, but the kind where it gets pissed on.'
8. For applications, see Shapiro and Henningsen on language purism in Jernudd & Shapiro,

1989. For an overview, see Shapiro (1987) with an annotated bibliography or his edited collection (1984). Philosophers and political theorists who work in this mode grapple with the problem of our free will in context of peoples' production of relationships of power and authority.

9. Muecke (1983: 71): 'Events in history exist only insofar as they exist in discourse.'

References

Clyne, M. (1975) A non-verbal check on acceptability of transference among bilinguals. ITL 30, 55–64.

Cohen, A. D. (1987a) Studying learner strategies: how we get the information. In Wenden & Rubin (1987b), 31–40.

—— (1987b) Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In Wenden & Rubin (1987), 57–69.

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

Ericsson, K. A. and Simon, H. A. (1984) Protocol Analysis: Verbal Reports as Data. Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press.

Faerch, C. and Kasper, G. (eds) (1987) Introspection in Second Language Research. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Fishman, J. A. (1977) Selected dimensions of language planning: a comparative analysis. In Rubin et al. (1977), 195–214.

—— (1987) Conference comments: reflections on the current state of language planning. In Laforge (1987), 405–28.

Geertz, C. (1988) Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Henningsen, M. (1989) The politics of purity and exclusion: literary and linguistic movements of political empowerment in America, Africa, the South Pacific, and Europe. In Jernudd & Shapiro (1989), 31–52.

Jernudd, B. H. and Neustupný, J. V. (1987) Language planning: for whom? In Laforge (1987), 69–84.

—— (forthcoming) Multi-disciplined language planning. In D. F. Marshall (ed.), in the volume on language planning in a series of three focusschriften. John Benjamins.

Jernudd, B. H. and Shapiro, M. J. (eds) (1989) The Politics of Language Purism (=Contributions to the Sociology of Language, 54). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Laforge, L. (ed.) (1987) Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning, May 25–29, 1986, Ottawa (=Publications of the International Center for Research on Bilingualism, A-21). Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Muecke, S. (1983) Discourse, history, fiction: language and Aboriginal history. Australian Journal of Cultural Studies 1, 71–80.

Neustupný, J. V. (1968) Some general aspects of 'language problems' and 'language' policy in developing societies. In J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson & J. Das Gupta (eds) Language Problems of Developing Nations, 285–94. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

—— (1978) Post-Structural Approaches to Language. Language Theory in a Japanese Context. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

—— (1986a) Inquiry for language management. Conference on Language Policy and Language Planning in Hong Kong, City Polytechnic of Hong Kong, December 19–21, 1986.

—— (1986b) The follow-up interview. Ms. (Originally written as an appendix for the author's paper 'Language norms in Australian-Japanese contact situations'. In M. Clyne (ed.) (1985) Australia. Meeting Place of Languages (pp. 161–70). Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Nordisk Språksekretariat (1988) Språknemndenes telefon-rådgivning (=Nordisk språksekretariats rapporter, 9). Oslo.

Rubin, J. and Jernudd, B. H. (eds) (1971) Can Language be Planned? Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

Rubin, J.; Jernudd, B. H. *et al.* (eds) (1977) *Language Planning Processes* (=*Contributions to the Sociology of Language*, 21). The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Schmidt, R. W. and Frota, S. N. (1986) Developing basic conversational ability in a second language. In R. R. Day (ed.) *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Severinson Eklundh, K. (1988) Datorloggning som metod at studera skrivprocessen. ASLA's *Symposium on the Writing Process, November* (=*ILPLab*, 16). Stockholm: Royal Institute of Technology.

Shapiro, M. J. (ed.) (1984) *Language and Politics*. New York: New York University Press.

—— (1987) Language and politics. In Robert B. Kaplan (ed.) *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* Vol. 7 (1986). Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, pp. 74-85.

—— (1989) A political approach to language purism. In Jernudd and Shapiro (1989), 21-29.

Weston, L. (1977) *The Study of Society*. Second edition. Guilford: The Dushkin Publishing Group.

Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (eds) (1987) *Learner Strategies in Language Learning: Process and Approaches for Foreign Language, English as a Second Language, and Bilingual Educators.* Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice Hall International.