

CENTRAL INSTITUTE OF INDIAN LANGUAGES
CONFERENCES AND SEMINARS SERIES

8

General Editor

D.P. Pattanayak

Production

H.L.N. Bharati

LANGUAGE PLANNING

Proceedings of an Institute

Edited by

**E. Annamalai
Björn H. Jernudd
Joan Rubin**

**Central Institute of Indian Languages
Manasagangotri, Mysore 570 006, India**

**Institute of Culture and Communication
East-West Center
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848, USA**

1986

TERM PLANNING AND VOCABULARY PLANNING:

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

B.H. Jernudd and R.A. Singh

with

R. Elangaiyan, R. Gargesh, M. Maniruzzaman,

S. Mathur, and Rajyashree Subbayya

DEFINITIONS

A term names a concept characteristic of any special field of knowledge and is often presented in a glossary, which is a list of terms with their definitions. By vocabulary we mean the stock of words in a language. By term planning and vocabulary planning we mean an activity organized in a planning mode that deals with terms and words respectively.¹

TERM PLANNING

In stable speech communities and for the established domains of use in a language, the need for coordination and/or agreement on usage of terms may lead to term planning. Such planning characteristically identifies the vocabulary already in use in a specialized field and selects and elaborates a list of preferred words for those concepts that are seen to cen-

trally characterize this specialized field. This type of planning elaborates definitions, often with detailed attention to the interrelatedness and structure of concepts in the field. A typical product is a conceptually arranged glossary. The Swedish Centre of Technical Nomenclature (TNC), for example, publishes such glossaries. In the Indian situation, an example may be found in the literature of Ayurvedic medicine.

VOCABULARY PLANNING

Another type of planning is the companion and consequence of domain expansion of a language. A most common objection to introducing the use of a language into administration, education, science, etc., when that language has not been so used before, is that there are no words for the new domains in that language and the language has not been sufficiently developed. This objection is circular. Linguists say that any language has the potential of meeting any communication need, be it science, philosophy, or politics. As Pattanayak says in this volume, "No language was 'developed' before it was called upon to meet the needs of the society at any time, not even the English language." But we do not agree with the objection either because, in reality, development and dissemination of vocabulary are demanded in a systematic way, at least concurrently with the using of the language in new domains. Vocabulary planning is a vocabulary-mediated effort to implement the use of a particular language in specified domains. Subsidiary aims may be to promote a particular kind

of vocabulary and to promote a certain amount of agreement in the use of words, thus preparing for term planning in the future.

It would be interesting to explore whether premature selection of some words or kinds of words would be counter-productive, not just with reference to the individual words in the promotional "glossaries" (as wordlists in vocabulary planning in India and elsewhere are normally called) but also for the promotion effort as a whole. For example, promoting Sanskritized words in Kannada, as Mr. Sasnur said in a lecture at the Language Planning Institute, took the planners farther away from the entire enterprise. Examples of "Sanskritization mistakes" in the Kannada wordlist are abhiyantā 'engineer' and āraksi 'constable', for which the colloquial Kannada injinIyaru and polisu are perfectly good. As the main aim of the promotion is to induce lower-level officials in the state administration to use Kannada, according to him, it is better to know the words that already exist in daily usage, and the planning agency must be more interested in using the colloquial. Revision of wordlists on the basis of usage thus becomes not only feasible but desirable to smooth over any objections to domain expansion that might arise out of objectionable characteristics of the promoted vocabulary.

The desirability of revision is confirmed by Sharma (in this volume). He says that one could aspire to some amount of agreement on words in law when the usage has settled, and usage was the reason that the government of India revised the original glossary of legal terms at regular intervals. The

revision was to catch up with usage in the courts and to incorporate the new words created in the process of translation of laws after eliciting reactions to them from the legal practitioners.

The typical product of vocabulary planning then is a wordlist, often referred to as a glossary, which does not offer definitions but gives only equivalents to the words in a source language, which is normally the language of prior use in the domain for which the language of the wordlist is now promoted.

EVALUATION

Planning is a happening in a historical process. An evaluation of the success of vocabulary and term planning must be in terms of its impact, whether intended or unintended. Who is assisted or favored by it? What purposes does it serve in professional or political life? What effect does it have on educational opportunities in the community, and so on. Since vocabulary planning serves the language promotion goal, the emphasis in the evaluation of the impact of vocabulary planning must be placed in the context of domain expansion: Under what conditions is vocabulary planning seen to be necessary, how does vocabulary intervention interact with other political and social processes during the domain expansion, and so on. This is perhaps a complicated issue, but it is of considerable historical and social interest.

Another aspect of evaluation is to look at the intended effect of planning, which in the case of term planning is the effect on the relevant situations of language use in the specialized field of knowledge: How do the availability of a glossary and the use of agreed terms facilitate and organize the relevant communicative situations?

What measures are to be used for evaluation is problematical because the goals are very rarely expressed in operational details by the planners. It is an urgent research problem to establish with what expectations the glossaries are prepared and how they are used in specialized fields.

In vocabulary planning, when the major goal is domain expansion of a language, the appropriate criterion would be whether the use of the language has increased. This again is a complex issue which can be broken down, according to sociolinguistic models of communication, into participant, topic, place, channel, etc. One should assess the positive or negative contribution of vocabulary planning to the larger goal by asking whether the use or dissemination of recommended words facilitates or hinders domain expansion and how? If, ultimately, the purpose of domain expansion is to serve the public better, one should ask whether the use of the recommended vocabulary makes more people respond to administrative or public messages? This is also a complex question but is of intensely practical value and should be given priority in research.

Much more accessible to study is the evaluation of the usage of the terms and words. The question would be whether the "targeted groups" of users actually use, know, and like

the recommended terms and words. This approach needs to establish a baseline at a point of time before planning began in order to measure usage after planning. It also needs to measure usage at selected points in time after planning when an effect on usage can reasonably be expected. If the planners anticipated a certain effect at a particular time, measurement ought to be done accordingly. One would also have to consider the extent of coexistence of the recommended terms and words with other (rejected, competing, alternating) terms and words.

Another interesting possibility of evaluation is to ask whether and how much the terms and words that are used differ from the linguistic criteria laid down to guide the planning activity. The planners themselves may not have managed to approximate the often hierarchical preferences for certain kinds of linguistic structures of vocabulary. Yet, how such metalinguistic considerations enter into acceptance or rejection of terms and words is an interesting question.

Sometimes claims on motivatedness or transparency of the terms and words are made for their acceptability. Such claims can also be taken into account for evaluation.

Another aspect of evaluation in multilingual planning is the question of whether a federal (e.g., pan-Indian) set of instructions or principles is reflected across the many languages involved and, specifically, whether the terms and words of individual languages are in fact equivalent to the federal ones in the recommended list or in actual usage.

A comprehensive evaluation of term and vocabulary planning would take into account all the above aspects and construct a model reflecting different emphases in planning at different stages of the social and economic development of the community and under different sociolinguistic conditions.

CONCLUSION

Term planning normally occurs as a corrective response, on request from or in collaboration with the users in specialized disciplines. Vocabulary planning occurs in response to a systematically felt need for replacement of one language by another, i.e., to correct an inadequacy of the system. The vocabulary expansion may have an unintended effect in that it takes place not in response to any corrective need at the level of vocabulary but in response to principles (ideologies) such as nativization, internationalization, or Sanskritization. These principles are sentimentally derived, interpreted, and supported. The result will, at least in some cases, be unintelligible and unwanted terms and words by users either for sentimental reasons or for reasons of lack of need as other words are already in use.

Corrective response to inadequacies implies feedback. In the case of vocabulary planning, feedback will have to be deliberately organized in order to test reactions and to stimulate acceptance of the new words. A willingness to revise and to tolerate synonyms in common use appears to be a wise approach. This may, in fact, happen without design, as the

following examples from the Marathi glossary of recommended words illustrate:

share	bhāga, shear, hissā
share holder	bhāga dhāraka
share broker	shear dalāla
share bazaar	shear bājār
share market	shear bājār
share certificate	bhāgapatra, shearapātra
share capital	bhāga bhāndavala

After all, the emphasis in vocabulary planning is not on the acceptance of individual words but on gaining acceptance for a language.

NOTE

1. This is a group report prepared by the group whose leaders were the first two authors and whose members were the remaining authors.