DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 562 FL 013 652

AUTHOR Kennedy, Chris
TITLE Language Planning.
PUB DATE Oct 82
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Language Teaching; v15 n4 p264-84 Oct 1982

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; Bilingual Education; Educational Policy; *Language Planning; Sociolinguistics; Surveys

ABSTRACT

An overview of the field of language planning and an updated bibliography are presented. Language planning is defined as the planning of deliberate changes in the form or use of a language or language variety and viewed as a subdiscipline of sociolinguistics. Among the topics discussed are the scope of language planning, an ideal language planning program, aims of language planning, types and levels of language planning, the role of the linguist in language planning, language planning surveys, implementation and evaluation of language planning, bilingual education, and educational policy. (RW)

State of the art article

LANGUAGE PLANNING

Chris Kennedy
University of Birmingham

1. Introduction

This article aims to provide both an introduction to the field of language planning (LP) and a current review. It updates the major bibliography on LP by Rubin and Jernudd (1979), and extends the scope of that work to include aspects of LP and language education.

Sections 2–11 deal with various theoretical aspects of LP, sections 12–14 with fact-finding, implementation and evaluation in LP programmes, and sections 15–16 with the relationships between LP and education. The bibliography, in addition to the normal list of references, has a short guide to resources, journals, and major collections concerned with LP.

2. Language planning and sociolinguistics

Let us accept for the moment a preliminary definition of LP (see section 4 below for further discussion) as the planning of deliberate changes in the form or use of a language (or a variety), or languages (or varieties). Both planning and language use are socially-based activities and LP is generally regarded as a sub-discipline of sociolinguistics. There are however strong relationships between LP and other types of planning, for example in the economic and cultural spheres (see section 11 below), which give LP a strong multi-disciplinary flavour. Language and politics are never far apart (Mazrui, 1975; O'Barr, W. & O'Barr, J., 1976) and in LP are, arguably, inextricably connected, adding to the complexity of LP studies. If one accepts that LP is concerned rather more with social than linguistic systems, then it can be regarded as belonging to the 'macro' end of sociolinguistics or the sociology of language (the study of society in relation to language) rather than 'micro' sociolinguistics (the study of language in relation to society) (see Hudson, 1980: 4–5 for discussion of the differences). LP could certainly be included within Fishman's definition of the sociology of language (Fishman (ed.) 1971: 9): 'the sociology of language is concerned with language varieties as targets, as obstacles, and as facilitators, and with users and uses of language varieties as aspects of more encompassing social patterns and processes'. The 'macro' and 'micro' distinction, however, is not clear cut: 'there (are) no large-scale relationships between language and society that do not depend on individual interaction for their realisation' (Fishman, 1971*b*: 31).

Macro- and micro-sociolinguistics form two ends of a cline, the former stressing

in Language Teaching, Vol. 15, No. 4 Oct. 1982, pp 264-84

social, the latter linguistic, systems. LP will need to engage at different points along this cline at various stages in the LP process (see section 5 below), with Fishman's notion of domain (1971*b*) providing a useful mid-way point.

3. Scope of language planning

Annamalai and Rubin (1980) have listed a number of domains in which LP operates. These include administration, the law, mass communication and education. Most of the illustrations of LP in this review will be drawn from the educational domain, and will be specifically concerned with the role of English and its relationship to other languages in a given society or nation. Issues that arise in this context include mother-tongue teaching, choice of medium of instruction at different educational levels (and of variety to be taught), and the use of different languages for intranational or international purposes. A useful introduction to these issues, though not directly pertaining to LP, is provided by Spolsky (1978).

4. What is language planning?

LP is a relatively new academic discipline, though by no means a new activity (see, for example, Fishman, 1971*c*), and at this stage in its development is much concerned with model building and theory construction. Those unfamiliar with LP may therefore be initially confused at the number of different definitions and terms in the literature which I shall attempt to clarify.

Weinstein's definition provides a useful starting-point: 'Language planning is a government-authorised, long-term, sustained and conscious effort to alter a language's function in a society for the purpose of solving communication problems' (Weinstein, 1980: 56).

Jernudd and Das Gupta's definition (1971) similarly stresses the political, problem-solving nature of LP, and Das Gupta and Ferguson (1977) see LP as a process of assessing language resources, assigning preferences and functions to one or more languages, and developing their use according to previously determined objectives. Rubin (1973) emphasises the future-oriented problem-solving nature of the enterprise with goals being set and alternatives considered at each stage in the process. She highlights the social nature of LP and the necessity for planners to consider the needs and wants of those at whom the planning is directed. Policy making is not planning. Many so-called LP 'failures' may have been no more than policy statements with no planning having taken place (see section 13, *Implementation*, below).

5. The language planning programme

Rubin (1977) provides a clear description of the stages in an ideal LP programme. Stage 1 involves the gathering of facts about the situation, identifying problems and isolating potential constraints. Stage 2 is the planning stage, when goals are set, strategies conceived, and outcomes predicted. The plan is then implemented in stage 3 and feedback on the success or failure of the plan takes place in stage 4. As a result of feedback, changes may be made to the programme at any of the stages, the planning thus being a continuous process. Although an ideal sequence, it is one which provides

a useful model for planning and comparisons with actual planning processes. Weinstein (1980), attempting a synthesis of other models, describes a similar process but in greater detail with 11 steps in the programme. He adds to Rubin's model examples of the implementation process (e.g. creation of a bureaucracy), planning results (acceptance or rejection by language users), and the interaction between policy makers (government), policy reporters (the bureaucracy) and planners. The attempt to identify some of the participants in the LP process is a particularly useful aspect of his description.

6. Aims of language planning

Rabin (1971) distinguishes three aims associated with LP: extra-linguistic aims refer to changes in the use of language or languages; semi-linguistic aims concern changes in writing systems, spelling and pronunciation; linguistic aims are directed at changes in vocabulary, including its expansion or standardisation. These terms reflect a narrow definition of linguistics and imply a restricted applicability of linguistics to LP. The linguist can, for example, make a contribution to LP even when the aims are 'extra-linguistic' (see section 10 below on the role of the linguist in LP). The same terms, with slightly different meanings, are also used by Rubin (1977) to classify aims. Extra-linguistic aims include situations where a non-linguistic goal is aided by planning for a possibly non-existent but deliberately created language problem. Semi-linguistic aims serve both linguistic and social or political aims, and linguistic aims attempt to solve communication problems. Rabin and Rubin appear to be referring to different classes of aims. Rabin's are close to Kloss's division between status planning (planning for particular functions or uses of a language) and corpus planning (changes to the linguistic code and the creation of grammars and dictionaries) (Kloss, 1969). Rubin is describing the extent to which such aims serve communication, socio-politico-linguistic, or entirely non-linguistic, political purposes. The aims/purposes (or means/ends) division might be preserved using the matrix below:

	Purposes (Ends) (Rubin)		
Aims (Means) (Rabin/Kloss)	(*a*) Communication	(*b*) Socio-politico-linguistic	(*c*) Political
(i) Status	×	×	×
(ii) Corpus-orthography/ phonology	×	×	×
(iii) Corpus-vocabulary	×	×	×

We can see clearly from this matrix the sorts of changes planned and their purposes. Thus the planned introduction of a mother tongue as a means of education during the initial stages of schooling ('status' aims) may be for purpose (*a*), e.g. more efficient classroom learning, (*b*) e.g. upholding of minority rights, or (*c*) e.g. preservation of political power. More than one purpose may be operating at any one time, of course, and different groups may support (or oppose) a plan for different reasons. Similarly,

purposes may be overt or covert, the planning authorities presenting a particular purpose to gain public support, while at the same time planning for other unpublicised ends.

7. Language planning as product planning

We have seen how an LP programme might operate and what particular aims and purposes might motivate planning. We now need to consider the sorts of changes that a language (the product) might undergo as part of an LP programme. Following Neustupny (1970), we distinguish four aspects of product planning: selection, codification, elaboration and cultivation. Selection is the process of choosing a language for a particular role and differs somewhat from the remaining three aspects in that it is very much a result of policy decisions. The meaning seems to be close to Gorman's (1973) notion of allocation which he would regard as distinct from planning. Codification is required when a language is being standardised and needs a reference system of dictionaries and grammars. If a language assumes a number of different fuctions, more terms will be needed to enable the language to deal with new concepts (elaboration). Finally, as different varieties of a language are stabilised, notions of appropriacy may need to be expressed in linguistic terms. These last three aspects, codification, elaboration and cultivation, can represent a stage of planning resulting from status planning and may themselves be regarded as different kinds of corpus planning (see section 6 above). They can also represent a temporal sequence of language development. Neustupny, for instance, argues that developing nations are in general at the selection stage ('policy' approach), choosing for inter- and intranational communication, while the developed nations whose language functions are more stable can afford 'cultivation' approaches. (Evidence of the latter approach can clearly be seen in the publications of the Design Document Centre and its newsletter *Simply Stated*.) Haugen (1966*a*) presents a similar model of planning, and Fishman (1975) proposes an integration of the two.

8. Types of language planning

Kloss (1977) presents a useful typology of LP which clarifies and simplifies a number of conflicting and overlapping definitions provided by other writers on the subject:

Category	Language planning	
(1) Scale	National	Other-than-national
(2) Methods	Innovative	Conservative
(3) Goals	Maintenance-oriented	Transition-oriented
(4) Dimensions	Corpus	Status
(5) Scope	One target tongue	More than one target tongue

(Kloss, 1977: 52)

Category 1 refers to the fact that LP may be carried out not only by governments but also by private institutions and pressure groups. 'Innovative' and 'conservative' are

roughly equivalent to Neustupny's policy and cultivation approaches mentioned above (section 7). Corpus and status planning have already been discussed (see section 6 above). Category 3 is relevant to bilingual programmes (see section 15 below), where the intention may be the continued maintenance of a culture and its associated language or 'temporary' maintenance where it is assumed that maintenance is a transitional stage towards eventual cultural assimilation and loss of the first language. Scope refers to the situation where planning is aimed either at one or more than one language. Even when the target is one language, planning may result in other languages being affected, but this is an essentially different situation from that in which two or more languages are part of the planning process from the outset.

9. Levels of language planning

Most writers regard LP as a government activity conducted at national level (Jernudd & Das Gupta, 1971) with lower-level organisations relating to implementation or being in some way affected by LP rather than undertaking LP programmes themselves. Jernudd (1973) and Fishman (1973), however, have commented on the possibility of other levels of LP. This is an important extension of the concept of LP since it avoids unnecessary compartmentalisation and has the added advantage of revealing the links between LP at different levels and their influence on one another. The notion of levels is especially valuable as applied to English language teaching (ELT) since by identifying the planning process at different points in the chain, we should be able to establish the origins of problems and reasons for success/failure of particular projects. A crude system of levels on an organisational basis would look something like this:

	Level	
Macro-LP	1	Government
↑	↓	
	2	Ministry
	↓	
	3	Regional authority
	↓	
	4	Institution
	↓	
	5	Department
↓	↓	
Micro-LP	6	Classroom

At all levels, some sort of LP is taking place, involving different processes, participants and circumstances but essentially following the same 4-stage programme outlined by Rubin (see section 5 above). The link between levels is maintained (or should be), since planners on each level, while planning a programme themselves, are part of the implementation phase of the programme at the level above. Such a model, suitably refined, might be used to explain why, for example, LP at level 2, regarding,

say, the introduction of a new ELT syllabus, failed/succeeded when implemented as materials at level 6.

Syllabus planning as an example of LP at the micro-level has tended to disregard the higher levels of planning but there are signs of a growing awareness of the relationships. Oshtain (1979) has developed a multi-level model for planning a language of wider communication. Bell (1981: 25) identifies the agencies, issues and output at different 'levels' of planning, on a most to least powerful basis, though his criteria for selection of 'levels' are not made explicit. It is not clear, for example, why the linguistic level should necessarily be more powerful than the psychological level. Roe (1977: 85), in the context of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), refers to the 'total curriculum setting' and believes that by the time the planning chain has reached the ESP specialist, most of the crucial decisions have already been taken. This raises the interesting question of the degree to which lower levels can influence higher levels. Judd (1981) and Stern (1981) relate national policy and the use of English in different communities to varieties of English and ultimately to issues such as amount of time spent on English teaching and forms to be taught, thus implicitly recognising the existence of levels. Tollefson (1981*a*), in discussing the relationships between LP and second-language acquisition (see also Tollefson, 1980), also maps the relationship between macro-policy and its objectives (my level 1) with its implementation in the form of teacher training, textbooks and curriculum innovations. He lists a number of variables, such as curriculum approaches, attitudes and motivation, which he believes can be determined by a conscious, deliberate LP process.

Tollefson's description of centralised and de-centralised LP (Tollefson, 1981*b*) could serve as a useful means of investigating the links between macro- and micro-planning. Successes/failures in LP may be accounted for by the degree of 'coupling' within the planning system; the degree of plan adaptation possible in formulation and implementation; and the degree to which macro- and micro-implementation procedures influence each other. Coupling refers to the extent to which planners exercise authority over implementation bodies, determine their organisation or control their aims. Such considerations might be applied in the evaluation of ELT programmes and might help to explain the far greater difficulties encountered in developing secondary-level ELT as compared with curriculum innovation at tertiary-level ELT, especially in the area of ESP (see *ELT Documents*, **108**, 1980).

10. Role of the linguist in language planning

The determination of language policy is a political activity and policy decisions will be made by politicians, not linguists. Planning resulting from policy will be delegated to planners and it is at this stage that the question arises of the role of the linguist in planning and his influence on policy making. A division between the politician and the linguist is necessary if the latter is to remain objective. This is often not the case. Work on bilingualism, for example, is often presented in far from objective terms, clearly influenced by the particular socio-political viewpoint of the writer.

Rabin (1971) associates the linguist primarily with corpus planning. Haugen (1966*b*) has a broader view of the linguist's role and sees him as historian (able to establish

the development of a language); as descriptivist (able to describe use of the language in the community); and as theoretician (able to analyse the language – this seems to parallel Rabin's view); and as teacher (able to deal with pedagogic problems). Haugen thus expands his definition to include sociolinguists and applied linguists, but he is careful to point out that although linguistics may be necessary for planning it is not sufficient and stresses the need for political, sociological and psychological expertise. (Haugen's article also provides an excellent introduction to LP.)

As to what stage in the planning process a linguist (using the term to cover both the 'pure' and the 'applied' linguist) may operate, Rubin (1971) implies he can play an important role as an evaluator at each step in the planning programme (see section 14 below on *Evaluation*). Paulston (1974) distinguishes between language cultivation and language policy (not to be confused with Neustupny's (1970) terms – see section 7 above). Language cultivation deals with language matters, language policy with socio-political issues. Using Jernudd's three-stage programme of determination, development and implementation (Jernudd, 1973), she demonstrates the links between cultivation and policy, concluding, however, that the linguist can only operate in the cultivation, not the policy, category. She also believes the language specialist may provide input to policy decisions. Whiteley (1973) is sceptical of such influence, believing that linguists will have to accept that linguistic information will only be used for policy decisions if the information happens to support the ideology of the day (see section 12(*c*) below for further discussion).

11. Language planning and other types of planning

A number of writers (Rubin, 1973; Cooper, 1979) consider language as a resource, and the question arises whether it can be planned in the same way as other resources. Cooper (*op. cit.*) argues for an analogy with product planning in other fields, suggesting that marketing research and strategies can be applied to LP. Fishman (1973) seeks to find parallels between LP and other planning. He points to the difficulty of treating language as a resource that can be quantitively analysed but concludes that language planners can at least benefit from a study of other planning theories and processes. The notion of 'unexpected system linkages' (Fishman, 1973:93), for example, would appear a valuable addition to LP theory. An instance might be the introduction of English as a medium of education at primary level leading to higher aspirations and an unsatisfied demand for jobs by an educated but unemployed élite. Thorburn (1971) seeks to identify those areas of LP which may be susceptible to cost-benefit analysis and suggests that in the case of the choice of a language of wider communication (LWC), factors such as the cost of teaching the language, effect of knowledge of the LWC on central administration, influence on trade, and development of a higher standard of living, may be measured, though in most cases not accurately. The latter examples reveal the difficulty of isolating distinct cause–effect relationships and the uncertainty as to whether one is observing the results of LP or of other social and economic planning, especially since many LP benefits are intangible and there may be considerable time lag between cause and effect (Jernudd, 1971). A dissenting voice on the presuppositions underlying investigation in this area is heard from Khubchandani (1977), who argues that LP is concerned with changes in human behaviour and that this is not the same as planning resources or

technology. Whether one accepts this or not (and there is a strong argument that all planning is in fact concerned with human behaviour modification at some stage), one can make a case for links between LP and product planning, which is aimed at persuading people to use a product for the first time, use it more or less, or change from one product to another. However, Khubchandani's argument quite rightly brings a humanistic elem .. into LP, which is important since a language belongs to the people who use it and is part of their identity (Eastman, 1981) to a much greater extent than a normal marketable product. LP is therefore heavily value laden and as much concerned with sentimental (at a high level, nationalistic) systems as instrumental. Such sentimental attachments add a complexity to LP that may not be so evident in other planning, so complex in fact that Kelman (1971) proposes that LP should plan for instrumental rather than sentimental needs and interests.

Such arguments, however, do not imply that we should abandon attempts to learn from planning in other areas. The micro-levels of language planning for ELT curriculum and syllabus development have, for instance, shown an almost total lack of knowledge of planning theory and focused on a necessary but not sufficient linguistic level, though more awareness is now being shown of the relevance of activity in other areas (see for example, Bachman & Strick, 1981). Those interested in other-than-language planning are referred to Bennis, Benne and Chin (1970); Rogers and Shoemaker (1971); and the references in Jernudd (1971); Fishman (1973); Cooper (1979); and Tollefson (1981*b*).

12. Language planning surveys

(*a*) *Purpose and type*

Surveys can be used as fact-finding instruments intended to assist in policy making, in evaluation studies measuring the success of policy implementation or as aids to programme design. Cooper (1980) distinguishes between surveys intended to investigate either language behaviour or behaviour towards language, both of which can be operated on a number of levels.

Behaviour	Level of observation	
	Micro	Macro
Language behaviour		
Proficiency	×	×
Acquisition	×	×
Usage	×	×
Behaviour toward language		
Attitudinal	×	×
Implementational	×	×

Major survey reports and papers can be found in Ohannessian, Ferguson and Polomé (eds.) (1975); Harrison, Prator and Tucker (1975) with respect to Jordan; Rubin, Jernudd, Das Gupta, Fishman and Ferguson (eds.) (1977), which is a comparative

survey of implementation processes in India, Indonesia and Israel; 'the survey of language use and language teaching in Eastern Africa' series (1972–80), which covers Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda; and reports from the Linguistic Minorities Project (1980, 1981, 1982), the first major survey of ethnic minority language use in Britain.

(*b*) *Problems of language surveys*

Surveys need a system for describing the language situation in a country to produce profiles of language use. Ferguson (1966), Kloss (1968) and Stewart (1968) provide different ways of classifying data based on language types, their status, number of speakers, and functions in the community. Whiteley (1973) illustrates some of the problems in trying to achieve a national sociolinguistic profile, doubting the value that such a generalisation about language use might have, if, for example, demographic, socio-economic, and age, sex, urban/rural differentials are not taken into account. Similar points are made by Lieberson (1980) who draws attention to the difficulties of comparing samples from different areas and stages of economic growth. Much LP data is taken from census reports which need to be treated with caution. Census definitions of socio-economic terms or the urban–rural distinction may differ from those of the researcher. Much information on language use may be based on self-report which may be unreliable (Mobbs, 1981). It is remarkable in this respect how many sociolinguistic surveys collect data through self-report. Surveys are of course limited by time, money and manpower, but perhaps less reliance should be put on self-report, especially in the case of claimed language competence, or at least some cross-checking language tests should be given. Problems of sampling are mentioned by Romaine (1980), who argues for more rigour in collection, analysis and interpretation of data, or at least some recognition of weaknesses when drawing conclusions. Scotton (1978) makes the same points about flaws in basic methodology, blaming the lack of training sociolinguists receive in this area.

(*c*) *Influence of surveys*

It is perhaps presumptuous of linguists to think that surveys may change or initiate policy (unless the results happen to fit in with prevailing policy). Pool, in his introduction to the Proceedings of the Montreal conference on sociolinguistic surveys (1975), acknowledges that few surveys ever get implemented. All those involved in a survey should know from the outset whether it is intended solely as a programme of academic research or for potential use at a political level. If the latter, it is reasonable to suggest that there need to be close contacts throughout the programme between researchers and government; that rapid dissemination should occur and that the results should not be presented in an unnecessarily technical form; that alternative solutions to the problems should be presented and that they should be realistic in terms of resources available and not at odds with the culture of the community in which the planning may take place. The last point implies a close involvement of local staff with the project, and it may be that the degree of such involvement is the key to survey influence with the policy decision makers. Opinion as to whether to work within the framework of an existing political situation is divided in the literature. Some would

say that foreign specialists in particular should not give advice on language policy but remain disinterested descriptivists. That 'disinterest' can ever exist among those involved in LP is challenged by Weinstein (1980), who believes that a political motivation underlies most groups' work in LP.

There is a strong case for more limited small-scale surveys done on a local basis. The survey of pupils' languages and dialects (Rosen & Burgess, 1980) is an example of such a survey, which besides being an instrument of change for those involved in the survey, may prove also to be influential at higher levels in the system.

13. Implementation of language planning

As we noted above (see section 4), statements of policy alone will not be sufficient to achieve successful goals in LP. Harries (1976) reports the late President Kenyatta's statements that Swahili should be the national language but doubts whether this will ever become reality without plans for implementation. Scotton (1978) predicts failure in Kenyan policy for different reasons, believing the choice of Swahili was based on the interests of an élite, and that a policy not taking into account the needs and wants of all groups in the society in which change is planned will fail in the long term, an opinion endorsed by Pool (1973) and Khubchandani (1979). The latter clearly believes that present LP implementation processes (in the context of India) are élite-inspired, based on biased notions of Westernisation and modernisation, and that this may promote certain languages inappropriately. Language change should be phased (see also Spencer, 1980), move at a speed commensurate with social acceptance, and be made in line with social trends, not by decree, otherwise community antagonism will prevent implementation. He proposes situation-bound LP based on the use of languages and varieties in different areas, rather than global national solutions.

Successful implementation is often measured by degree of adoption and spread of the language concerned. Cooper (forthcoming) provides a possible model for such measurement, pointing to the motivational variables amongst others. With regard to English, the findings of Fishman *et al.* (eds.) (1977) that English world-wide is more learnt than used and more used than liked, indicate that instrumental needs to learn English should be taken account of in LP implementation, in contrast to sentimental needs of nationalism expressed through a mother tongue.

A number of different agencies are involved in implementation (Noss, 1967) including ministries, the media, planning boards, development agencies and research organisations. Teachers and schools, trainers and teacher-training institutions are particularly crucial agents of implementation (Gopinatham, 1980; St Clair & Eiseman, 1981). Ladefoged, Glick and Criper (1972) emphasise the point: '...the success of the present policy to teach English in Uganda is dependent on the availability of teachers who can implement that policy...New materials in the hands of the same teachers will not necessarily improve the language teaching' (p. 140). It is ironic that the teacher is placed at the lowest level of planning (see section 9 above) and yet is such an important participant in LP. The teacher's role has been neglected at higher levels of planning, and more work needs to be done to ensure that teachers' needs are taken into account so that links are maintained with teachers at all stages of the planning process.

14. Evaluation of language planning

Evaluation is a term used with three different meanings in the literature, in the sense of: (*a*) feedback as the final stage in an LP programme; (*b*) information presented to planners at all stages of a programme to enable them to make choices between alternative strategies; (*c*) judging the effectiveness and nature of processes in complete LP programmes. All three types of evaluation are under-researched. Models of evaluation at the level of curriculum planning might be more widely applied for type (*a*) evaluation (e.g. Stenhouse, 1977; Galton, 1980). Both Cooper's model (1979) and cost-benefit evaluation techiques already mentioned (see section 11 above) also provide insights and ideas. Fishman (1980*b*) lists a number of findings in the evaluation of corpus planning, including the fact that ideological rather than linguistic factors determine public acceptance of corpus innovations. Evaluation of teacher adoption of LP implementation in the form of materials is needed. Harding and Kelly (1977) found, in the case of a particular Schools Council science project, that adoption by teachers was only likely if the materials were assessed favourably in terms of feasibility, acceptability and relevance. It would be interesting to see whether the same factors might operate in a language-teaching context with non-native teachers of English.

Type (*b*) evaluation is described extensively by Rubin (1971), who sees evaluation playing a role at the fact-finding stage (when the task of the evaluator is to formulate criteria for needs analysis); at the planning stage (drawing up alternative goals and strategies); and at the feedback stage (when the evaluator helps formulate assessment procedures). This is a much broader notion of evaluation than type (*a*), with the evaluator acting as a consultant or adviser throughout the programme. For type (*c*) evaluation, evaluating and comparing LP processes, we need models of LP such as that suggested by Tollefson (1981*b*) against which different LP in various contexts may be measured and compared. Rubin *et al.* (eds.) (1977) provide detailed evaluations of implementation processes in corpus planning in India, Indonesia and Israel. Neustupny (1970) has suggested four aspects of LP treatment which might be used for comparative evaluation. They refer to the degree to which a language problem is systematically treated, the degree to which treatment is related to linguistic or sociological theory, the 'depth' of treatment, that is whether problems are accepted at face value or whether they are related to 'deeper' more complex issues, and finally how rationally the problem is treated, that is to what extent goals are set, strategies planned, and solutions evaluated.

15. Language planning and bilingual education

Bilingual education is a vast field in itself and readers are referred to Lewis (1981) and Beardsmore (1982) for comprehensive introductions. Fishman (1980*b*) claims that bilingual education is an example of language planning and shows how the process of status and corpus planning can be applied to bilingual education programmes. Rubin (1977) takes a similar approach, arguing that a number of failures in bilingual education may have been due to a lack of planning. Certainly much writing on bilingual education is characterised by an absence of features we would recognise as

inherent in effective planning – clear statements of aims and objectives, of alternative solutions, and of evaluation procedures. This is nowhere more apparent than in the field of mother-tongue (MT) education where political and emotional arguments tend to distort academic objectivity. Good statements on mother-tongue issues are found in Tosi (1979; forthcoming, 1983) and Khan (1980), writing principally in the context of mother-tongue teaching for ethnic minorities in Britain. Bamgbose (1976) presents a useful collection of articles on the West African situation. Much of the debate on mother-tongue education has been influenced by the 1953 UNESCO Report on the Use of Vernacular Languages in Education. This established the benefits of mother-tongue education, particularly at the early stages of schooling, but it is worth noting that the writers of the report did foresee circumstances in which mother-tongue teaching might not be advisable, and Engle (1975), after reviewing a number of research projects, concludes that the theoretical evidence for or against mother-tongue teaching is still lacking. Ure (1981) states a number of advantages for mother-tongue education (preservation of cultural traditions, promotion of cognitive thought, and provision of a link between school and community). Since objections to MT education are often raised on the grounds of cost, Ure suggests the production of cheap, 'language-neutral' materials that could be used to develop oral skills for a variety of languages spoken in a particular area. Such an idea cannot overcome the problems of writing skills, however. The problem of maintenance *v.* transition-oriented programmes is discussed by Otheguy and Otto (1980). Edwards (1981) questions the value of maintenance programmes, and Quinn (1980*a*, *b*) provides a cogent evaluation of MT programmes, their aims and their objectives.

16. Language planning and educational policy

Language allocation is often part of the process towards the creation of, firstly, a unified nation and, secondly, an efficiently run one. A national language will be chosen to help achieve the former goal of nationalism; an official language the latter goal of nationism (Fishman, 1968); a language will be designated the national official language (NOL) where the twin goals of nationalism/nationism are set. Different policies may be adopted to achieve these ends – three types of policy have been suggested (Fishman, 1971*a*). Type A policy may be adopted where there is no suitable local language available for the role of NOL, a non-indigenous language, usually a former colonial language, being chosen for that role. This is an exoglossic solution (Kloss, 1968). Type B policy is implemented where there is a suitable indigenous language or where government policy deems it suitable. Type C policy is the most complex as it attempts to satisfy competing traditions. The solution is often to choose a non-indigenous language, typically English, as the NOL, on an 'unfair-to-all' basis, and select major indigenous languages as regional official languages.

Once decisions have been taken concerning the role and purpose of various languages including English within a state, policy has to be implemented within the educational system. The crucial initial choice is whether English will function as a subject or as a medium at the various educational levels. LP in Africa presents a picture of different outcomes in this respect. Thus Zambia has opted for English-medium throughout formal education; Tanzania for Swahili-medium at primary level, English-medium

thereafter; Kenya may be in a transitional stage with English-medium for most years of schooling but with Swahili increasing its potential for wider use as a medium. (See Gorman, 1971, for discussion of language and education in Eastern Africa.) Type C policies can result in an educational system which involves learning at least three languages in school, which obviously puts heavy demands on pupils, teachers and resources (Tadadjeu, 1980). A number of countries have moved or are moving from A to B policies. Malaysia, for example, has switched from English-medium to Malay-medium (Asmah, 1979; Watson, 1980). This move, often more influenced by nationalism than nationism, can result in relatively rapid loss of secondary-level proficiency in English and may lead to governments being forced to 'soften' their English-language policy, allocating more resources to ELT or partially 'rehabilitating' English to increase motivation for learning the language. (Miller, 1981, describes this aspect with regard to the situation in the Philippines.) There is also a carry-on effect at tertiary level, where, as in other EFL situations, English is still required for academic purposes, since so much specialist knowledge is only available through English-language books and journals. The recognition of problems at this level has of course led to the expansion of ESP programmes, although with a more closely defined role for English in many ESL situations, we may expect to see ESP-type programmes filtering back through secondary level. It has even been suggested (Wigzell, forthcoming 1982/3) that English as a subject may need to be taught entirely through the context of another content subject, an idea suggested by Widdowson some time ago (Widdowson, 1968).

Where English is used intranationally as a second or third language, indigenous varieties of English arise which may conflict with traditional norms established with reference to an external standard form of the language. The conflict expresses itself in educational terms over the question of which variety of English to teach. Formerly, British/American standard varieties were the only ones available and were supported by expatriate teachers with access to the external standard. Now, with the growth of 'local' standard varieties and the employment of local teachers, choice of variety is a matter of much debate, with linguistic, political and nationalistic issues intertwined (see, for example, Prator, 1968, and Kachru, 1981, for two opposing views). In extreme cases, the variety proposed may be a pidgin form (Litteral, 1975) which has been or will need to be promoted to official language status, codified and standardised (Wurm, 1977). More often, the model chosen will be an emerging national standard spoken or written by the country's educated élite. Many may not reach this target, however, and may be expected to perform at points on a continuum ranging from 'low', non-standard to 'high', standard forms. Platt (1977) has isolated three points along such a continuum moving from high to low, naming them acrolect ('high'), mesolect ('mid'), and basilect ('low'). Further discussions on emergent standard varieties can be found, *inter alia*, in Angogo and Hancock (1980); Platt (1980); Parasher (1981). The worry is that these indigenous varieties, even the standard forms, may in time not be comprehensible internationally. This problem, coupled with problems in EFL situations of conformity to external norms, has led to the concept of English as an International Language (EIL) (see *ELT Documents*, **102**, 1978). Quirk (1981) has suggested guidelines for an international mutually comprehensible variety called 'Nuclear English' which could act as a model for EIL. The concept is attractive at

first sight but presents a number of difficulties, discussed by Wong (1982). Lack of space precludes further discussion of these issues but readers are referred to Bailey and Robinson (1973), Richards (1979), Smith (1981) and Pride (1982) for further information.

17. Language planning in particular geographical areas

In addition to references mentioned in this review, the following selective list is provided for those wishing to gain more information about particular areas: Australia and New Zealand (Clyne, 1976; Kaplan, 1980, 1981; *ITL*, 1980); Israel (Cooper & Danet, 1980; Gold, 1981); Jamaica (Christie, 1980); Namibia (UN Institute for Namibia, studies series 4, 1981); Nigeria (Nwoye, 1978; Brann, 1979; Okoh, 1979; Grant, forthcoming 1982/3); Nepal (Sonntag, 1980); Papua New Guinea (Taylor, 1981); Philippines (Gonzalez, 1980; Kelz, 1981); Singapore (Crewe (ed.), 1977; Afendras & Kuo (eds.), 1980; Platt & Weber, 1980).

18. Conclusion

Many people, when LP is mentioned, ask 'What's that?' I hope I have answered that question reasonably satisfactorily and also passed on some helpful information to those already specialising in LP. I have deliberately broadened what some may regard as the traditional scope of LP to include its influences on language education and language teaching in the classroom, as I believe it is essential for all those at different levels of LP, not least the teacher, to be aware of planning activities at other levels in the system and the consequences for their own work. Fishman *et al.* (1977) have documented the spread of English as an additional language. Assuming this process continues, and English remains a major language of modern technology, education, upward mobility and unification, LP will become an increasingly important aspect of national planning, especially with governments concerned to adopt a more cost-conscious, utilitarian approach to English-language training. We can already see the initial results of such an approach in the expansion of tertiary-level ESP programmes world-wide. There are likely to be similar radical changes in other parts of the educational system with consequent heavy demands placed on teachers and course designers. These pressures may be eased, or at least understood, if all those involved in education are made more aware of LP processes, and if, for example, LP as a subject were to figure more prominently in teacher-training curricula.

References

1. Resources

Directory of Language Planning Organisations (1979). Ed. J. Rubin. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Guide to Information Resources in Language Planning (1979). Eds. T. Reese & J. Pool, *Language Planning Newsletter*, 5, 2.

References for Students of Language Planning (1979). Eds. J. Rubin & B. Jernudd. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

2. Journals and newsletters

(i) Concerned with Language Planning

International Journal of the Sociology of Language (IJSL). General editor, J. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton.

Language Planning Newsletter. Ed. J. Rubin, Hawaii: East–West Culture Learning Institute, Honolulu.
Language Problems and Language Planning (LPLP). Ed. R. Wood. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

(ii) Often concerned with Language Planning and Related Issues

ALSED Newsletter. Paris: UNESCO, Division of Structures, Content, Methods and Techniques of Education.
Discussion Papers in Geolinguistics. Ed. C. Williams. Department of Geography and Sociology, North Staffs. Polytechnic, Stafford, U.K.
English Around the World. Ed. J. B. McCulloch. New York.
English World-Wide (EWW). Ed. M. Görlach. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.
ITL: A Review of Applied Linguistics. University of Louvain, Belgium.
Journal of Intercultural Studies. Eds. M. Clyne & J. McKay. Carleton, Australia: River Seine Publications.
Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development (JMMD). Ed. D. Sharp. Wales: Department of Education, University College, Swansea.
Language in Society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Language and Development. Ed. B. Kachru. Illinois: Division of Applied Linguistics, University of Illinois.
Linguistic Reporter. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Polyglot. Language Centre, Birkbeck College, University of London.

3. SERIES WITH REGULAR ISSUES ON LANGUAGE PLANNING

Contributions to the Sociology of Language (1974–?). The Hague: Mouton.
Current Trends in Linguistics (1970–1976). Ed. T. Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton.
Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics (GURT) (1967–?). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

4. MAJOR COLLECTIONS ON LANGUAGE PLANNING

Bright, W. (ed.) (1966). *Sociolinguistics*. The Hague: Mouton.
Cobarrubias, J. & Fishman, J. A. (eds.) (forthcoming). *Progress in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton.
Dil, A. S. (ed.) (1972). *Language in sociolinguistic change: essays by J. A. Fishman*. Stanford: University Press.
Fishman, J. A. (ed.) (1968). *Readings in the sociology of language*. The Hague: Mouton.
Fishman, J. A. (ed.) (1971/72). *Advances in the sociology of language*. Vols. 1 and 2. The Hague: Mouton.
Fishman, J. A. (ed.) (1974). *Advances in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton.
Fishman, J. A. (ed.) (1977). *Advances in the creation and revision of writing systems*. The Hague: Mouton.
Fishman, J. A. (ed.) (1978). *Advances in the study of societal multilingualism*. The Hague: Mouton.
Fishman, J. A., Cooper, R. & Conrad, A. (eds.) (1977). *The spread of English*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
Fishman, J. A., Ferguson, C. & Das Gupta, J. (eds.) (1968). *Language problems of developing nations*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
Mackey, W. F. & Ornstein, J. (eds.) (1979). *Sociolinguistic studies in language contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
Ohannessian, S., Ferguson, C. & Polomé, E. (eds.) (1975). *Language surveys in developing nations*. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B. H. (eds.) (1971). *Can language be planned?* Honolulu: University of Hawaii, East West Center.
Rubin, J., Jernudd, B. H., Das Gupta, J., Fishman, J. A. & Ferguson, C. (eds.) (1977). *Language planning processes*. The Hague: Mouton.
Rubin, J. & Shuy, R. (eds.) (1973). *Language planning: current issues and research*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
Whiteley, W. H. (ed.) (1971). *Language use and social change*. London: Oxford University Press.

5. Books, Articles and Reports

Adekunle, M. (1972). Sociolinguistic problems in English language instruction in Nigeria. In D. M. Smith & R. W. Shuy, (eds.), *Sociolinguistics in cross-cultural analysis* (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press), 83–101.

Alendras, E. A. & Kuo, E. (eds.) (1980). *Language and society in Singapore*. Singapore: University Press.

Alatis, J. E. (ed.) (1978). *International dimensions of bilingual education*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Alatis, J. E. (ed.) (1980). *Current issues in bilingual education*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Alatis, J. E. & Tucker, G. R. (eds.) (1979). *Language and public life*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Angogo, R. & Hancock, I. (1980). English in Africa: emerging standards or diverging regionalisms? *EWW*, **1**, 1, 67–96.

Annamalai, E. & Rubin, J. (1980). Planning for language code and language use: some considerations in policy-formation and implementation. *Language Planning Newsletter*, **6**, 3, 1–4.

Asmah, H. O. (1979). *Language planning for unity and efficiency*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.

Bachman, L. & Strick, A. (1981). An analytic approach to language program design. In R. Mackay & J. Palmer (eds.), *Languages for specific purposes* (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House), 45–63.

Bailey, R. W. & Robinson, J. L. (1973). *Varieties of present day English*. London: Macmillan.

Bamgbose, A. (ed.) (1976). *Mother tongue education – the West African experience*. Paris: UNESCO.

Basso, K. (1974). The ethnography of writing. In R. Baumann & J. Sherzer (eds.). *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (Cambridge University Press), 432–52.

Beardsmore, H. B. (1982). *Bilingualism: basic principles*. Clevedon, Avon: Tieto Ltd.

Bell, R. T. (1976). *Sociolinguistics*. London: Batsford.

Bell, R. T. (ed.) (1978). *The European Community: a language planning simulation*. Singapore: Civil Service Institute.

Bell, R. T. (1981). *An introduction to applied linguistics*. London: Batsford.

Bennis, W., Benne, K. & Chin, R. (eds.) (1970). *The planning of change*. London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Berman, P. (1978). *The study of macro- and micro-implementation of social policy*. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation.

Bickerton, D. (1975). Can English and Pidgin be kept apart? In *Tok Pisin I Go We*, special publication no. 1 of *Kivung Journal of Linguistic Society of Papua New Guinea*, 21–27.

Bowen, J. D., Cooper, R. L. & Ferguson, C. (1976). *Language in Ethiopia*. London: Oxford University Press.

Brann, C. M. B. (1979). Multilingualism in Nigerian education. In Mackey & Ornstein (eds.), 379–92.

Brann, C. M. B. (1981). *Trilingualism in language – planning for education in sub-saharan Africa*. Paris: UNESCO.

Chai, H. C. (1971). *Planning education for a plural society*. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Christie, P. (1980). The language situation in Jamaica. *Polyglot*, **2**, 2, A3–B3.

Clyne, M. (ed.) (1976). *Australia talks: essays on the sociology of Australian, immigrant, and aboriginal languages*. Canberra Pacific Linguistics. Series D, No. 23.

Cooper, R. L. (1979). Language planning, language spread and language change. In Alatis & Tucker (eds.), 23–50.

Cooper, R. L. (1980). Sociolinguistic surveys: the state of the art. *Applied Linguistics*, **1**, 2, 113–28.

Cooper, R. L. (1981). Language spread as a perspective for the study of second-language acquisition. In R. W. Andersen (ed.), *New dimensions in second language acquisition research* (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House), 130–45.

Cooper, R. L. (forthcoming). A framework for the study of language spread. In R. L. Cooper (ed.) (forthcoming).

Cooper, R. L. (ed.) (forthcoming). *Language spread : studies in diffusion and social change*. Arlington, Va.: Centre for Applied Linguistics and Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press.
Cooper, R. L. & Danet, B. (1980). Language in the melting pot: the sociolinguistic context for language planning in Israel. *LPLP*, **4**, 1, 1–28.
Crewe, W. (ed.) (1977). *The English language in Singapore*. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.
Das Gupta, J. (1970). *Language conflict and national development : group politics and national language policy in India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Das Gupta, J. & Ferguson, C. A. (1977). Problems of language planning. In J. Rubin *et al.* (eds.), 3–7.
De Silva, M. (1976). *Diglossia and literacy*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.
Dil, A. S. (ed.) (1981). *Language diversity and language contact : essays by S. Lieberson*. Stanford, California: University Press.
Eastman, C. M. (1981). *Language planning, identity planning and world view*. *IJSL*, **32**, 45–53.
Edwards, J. R. (1981). The context of bilingual education. *JMMD*, **2**, 1, 25–44.
ELT Documents, **102** (1978). *English as an international language*. London: British Council.
ELT Documents, **108** (1980). *National syllabuses*. London: British Council.
ELT Documents, **109** (1980). *Study modes and academic development of overseas students*. London: British Council.
ELT Documents, **115** (1982/3 forthcoming). *ELT in Africa*. London: British Council.
Engle, P. L. (1975). The use of vernacular languages in education. *Papers in Applied Linguistics. Bilingual Education Series no. 3*. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word*, **15**, 325–40. Reprinted in Giglioli (ed.) (1972), 232–51.
Ferguson, C. A. (1966). National sociolinguistic profile formulas. In Bright (ed.), 309–24.
Ferguson, C. A. (1966). Sociolinguistically oriented language surveys. *Linguistic Reporter*, **8**, 4, 2–6.
Ferguson, C. A. (1968). Language development. In Fishman *et al.* (eds.), 27–36.
Ferguson, C. A. (1971). Contrasting patterns and literacy acquisition in a multilingual nation. In Whiteley (ed.), *Language use and social change* (Oxford University Press), 234–52.
Ferguson, C. A. & Heath, S. (eds.) (1981). *Language in the USA*. Cambridge: University Press.
Fishman, J. A. (1968). Nationality–nationalism and nation–nationism. In Fishman *et al.* (eds.), 39–51.
Fishman, J. A. (1971*a*). National languages and languages of wider communication in the developing nations. In Whiteley (ed.), 27–56.
Fishman, J. A. (1971*b*). The relationship between micro and macro sociolinguistics in the study of who speaks what language to whom and when. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (eds.) (1972), 15–32.
Fishman, J. A. (1971*c*). The impact of nationalism on language planning. In Rubin & Jernudd (eds.), 3–20.
Fishman, J. A. (1972*a*). *Language and nationalism : two integrative essays*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
Fishman, J. A. (1972*b*). *National languages and languages of wider communication in developing nations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Fishman, J. A. (1973). Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization and planning. *Language in Society*, **2**, 1, 23–42.
Fishman, J. A. (1977*a*). *Bilingual education*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
Fishman, J. A. (1977*b*). The sociology of language. In R. Cole (ed.), *Current issues in linguistic theory* (London: Harvester Press), 51–75.
Fishman, J. A. (1980*a*). Bilingualism and biculturalism as individual and as societal phenomena. *JMMD*, **1**, 3 15.
Fishman, J. A. (1980*b*). Bilingual education, language planning, and English. *EWW*, **1**, 1, 11–24.
Fox, M. J. (1979). U.S. international English language policy. In J. Alatis & G. Tucker (eds.), 8–22.
Galton, M. (1980). *Curriculum change*. Leicester: University Press.
Giglioli, P. (ed.) (1972). *Language and social context*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Goldy D. L. (1981). An introduction to English in Israel. *LPLP*, **5**, 1, 11–56.
Gonzalez, A. (1980). *Language and nationalism : the Philippine experience thus far*. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
Gopinatham, S. (1980). Language policy in education. In Afendras & Kuo (eds.), 175–202.
Gorman, T. (1973). Language allocation and languag planning. In Rubin & Shuy (eds.), 72–82.

Gorman, T. P. (ed.) (1971). *Language in education in Eastern Africa*. London: Oxford University Press.
Grant, N. (forthcoming 1982/83). Materials design for Nigerian secondary schools. In *ELT Documents*, **115**.
Harding, J. & Kelly, P. (1977). A study of curriculum diffusion. *Journal of the National Association of Inspectors and Educational Advisers*, **17**, 21–31.
Harries, L. (1976). The nationalisation of Swahili in Kenya. *Language in Society*, **5**, 153–264.
Harrison, W., Prator, C. & Tucker, G. (eds.) (1975). *English language policy survey of Jordan*. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Haugen, E. (1966*a*). Dialect, language, nation. In Pride & Holmes (eds.) (1972), 97–111.
Haugen, E. (1966*b*). Linguistics and language planning. In Bright (ed.), 50–71.
Haugen, E. (1972). *The ecology of language*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Hauptfleisch, T. (1977). *Language loyalty in South Africa*. Vols. 1–3. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
Heath, S. B. (1972). *Telling tongues: language policy in Mexico – colony to nation*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Hudson, R. A. (1980). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jernudd, B. (1971). Notes on economic analysis and language planning. In Rubin & Jernudd (eds.), 263–76.
Jernudd, B. (1973). Language planning as a type of language treatment. In Rubin & Shuy (eds.), 11–23.
Jernudd, B. & Das Gupta, J. (1971). Towards a theory of language planning. In Rubin & Jernudd (eds.), 195–215.
Jernudd, B. & Shaw, W. (in preparation). *World maps of English and other languages of wider communication*. Hawaii: East–West Culture Learning Institute, Honolulu.
Judd, E. L. (1981). Language policy, curriculum development, and TESOL instruction – a search for compatability. *TESOL 1/4*, **15**, 1, 59–66.
Kachru, B. (1981). The pragmatics of non-native varieties of English. In Smith (ed.), 15–39.
Kaplan, R. (1980). The language situation in Australia. *Linguistic Reporter*, **22**, 5, 2–3.
Kaplan, R. (1981). The language situation in New Zealand. *Linguistic Reporter*, **23**, 9, 1–3.
Kaplan, R. (1982). The language situation in the Philippines. *Linguistic Reporter*, **24**, 5, 1–4.
Katzner, K. (1975). *The languages of the world*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls.
Kelman, H. C. (1971). Language as an aid and barrier to involvement in the national system. In Rubin & Jernudd (eds.), 21–51.
Kelz, H. P. (1981). Sprachplanung auf den Philippinen und die Entwicklung einer Philippinischen Nationalsprache. *LPLP*, **5**, 2, 115–36.
Kerr, A. (1979). Language and the education of immigrants' children in Sweden. *Polyglot*, **1**, 3.
Khan, V. S. (1980). The 'mother-tongue' of linguistic minorities in multicultural England. *JMMD*, **1**, 1, 71–88.
Khubchandani, L. M. (1977). Directions for language planning. In B. Sibayan & A. Gonzalez (eds.), 35–51.
Khubchandani, L. M. (1979). Language planning processes for pluralistic societies. *LPLP*, **2**, 3, 141–59.
Kloss, H. (1968). Notes concerning a language-nation typology. In Fishman *et al.* (eds.), 69–85.
Kloss, H. (1969). *Research problems on group bilingualism*. Quebec: International Research Center on Bilingualism.
Kloss, H. (1975). *The linguistic composition of the nations of the world. Vol. 1. Western, Central and South Asia*. Quebec: International Research Center on Bilingualism.
Kloss, H. (1977). Ten types of language planning. In B. Sibayan & A. Gonzalez (eds.), 52–9.
Kloss, H. & McConnell, G. D. (eds.) (1978*a*). *The written languages of the world: a survey of the degree and modes of use. Vol. 1. The Americas*. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
Kloss, H. & McConnell, G. D. (eds.) (1978*b*). *The linguistic composition of the nations of the world. Vol. 2. North America*. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
Kotey, P. F. & Der-Houssikian, H. (eds.) (1977). *Language and linguistic problems in Africa*. Proceedings of the VII conference on African linguistics. Columbia S.C.: Hornbeam Press.
Ladefoged, P., Glick, R. & Criper, C. (1972). *Language in Uganda*. London: Oxford University Press.
Le Page, R. (1964). *The national language question*. London: Oxford University Press.
Lewis, G. E. (1981). *Bilingualism and bilingual education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Lewis, G. E. & Massad, C. (1975). *The teaching of English as a foreign language in ten countries*. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.
Lieberson, S. (1980). Procedures for improving sociolinguistic surveys of language maintenance and language shift. *IJSL*, **25**, 11–27.
Linguistic Minorities Project reports (1980, 1981, 1982). London: Institute of Education.
Litteral, R. (1975). The use of pidgin in education. In Pride (ed.) (1979), 152–63.
Mazrui, A. (1975). *The political sociology of the English language*. The Hague: Mouton.
Mkanganwi, K. G. (1980). *Zimbabwe : sociolinguistically speaking*. Issues in development, 15. University of Zimbabwe, Centre for Applied Social Sciences.
Miller, J. R. (1981). The politics of Philippine national language policy. *LPLP*, **5**, 2, 137–52.
Mobbs, M. (1981). Two languages or one? The significance of the language names 'Hindi' and 'Urdu'. *JMMD*, **2**, 3, 203–12.
Mother tongue and English teaching project (*MOTET*) (1980). (Working Papers Nos. 1–3). School of Research in Education, University of Bradford, England.
Nadkarni, M. V. (1978). Cultural pluralism as a national resource: strategies for language education. In Yap (ed.), 69–79.
Neustupny, J. V. (1970). Basic types of treatment of language problems. *Linguistic Communications*, 1, 77–98.
Neustupny, J. V. (1978). *Post-structural approaches to language*. University of Tokyo Press.
Noss, R. (1967). Language policy and higher education. *Higher education and development in South East Asia*. 3, 2. Paris: UNESCO.
Nwoye, O. G. (1978). *Language planning in Nigeria*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Georgetown University.
O'Barr, W. M. & O'Barr, J. F. (eds.) (1976). *Language and politics*. Contributions to the sociology of language, 10. Mouton: The Hague.
O'Donnell, W. R. & Todd, L. (1980). *Variety in contemporary English*. London: Allen & Unwin.
Okoh, N. (1979). Survey of the language situation in Nigeria. *Polyglot*, **1**, 2, B3–C11.
Oshtain, E. (1979). *A theoretical model for developing the teaching of a language of wider communication on a national scale*. Unpublished Ph D. dissertation, UCLA.
Otheguy, R. & Otto, R. (1980). The myth of static maintenance in bilingual education. *MLJ*, **64**, 3, 350–6.
Papers from English strategies for Namibia seminar (1980). United Nations Institute for Namibia, Lusaka.
Papers on mother tongue and bilingualism (1980). DES Consultation, Bournemouth, England.
Papers of 16th regional seminar on New varieties of English (1981). RELC: Singapore.
Parasher, S. V. (1981). Indian English: a sociolinguistic perspective. *ITL*, **51**, 59–70.
Paulston, C. B. (1974). Implications of language learning theory for language planning: concerns in bilingual education. *Papers in Applied Linguistics*. Bilingual Education Series 1. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Perren, G. E. (1979). Languages and minority groups. In Perren, G. E. (ed.), 45–59.
Perren, G. E. (ed.) (1979). *The mother tongue and other languages in education*. London: CILT.
Pfaff, C. W. (1981). Sociolinguistic problems of immigrants: foreign workers and their children in Germany. *Language in Society*, **10**, 2, 155–88.
Platt, J. T. (1977). The sub-varieties of Singapore English. In Crewe (ed.), 83–93.
Platt, J. T. (1980). Varieties and functions of English in Singapore and Malaysia. *EWW*, **1**, 1, 97–121.
Platt, J. T. & Weber, H. (1980). *English in Singapore and Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
Pool, I. (1973). Communication systems. In I. Pool *et al.* (eds.), *Handbook of communication* (Chicago: Rand McNally), 3–26.
Prator, C. (1968). The British heresy in TESL. In Fishman *et al.* (eds.), 459–76.
Pride, J. B. (ed.) (1979). *Sociolinguistic aspects of language learning and teaching*. London: Oxford University Press.
Pride, J. B. (ed.) (1982). *New Englishes*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
Pride, J. B. & Holmes, J. (eds.) (1972). *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Proceedings of conference on the methodology of sociolinguistic surveys, Monti al. (1975). Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Quinn, T. J. (1980*a*). New directions for school language study. In F. Christie & J. Rothery (eds.), *Varieties of language and language teaching* (Horwood Language Centre, University of Melbourne: ALAA Occasional Papers, 4), 59–71.

Quinn, T. J. (1980*b*). Establishing a threshold-level concept for community language teaching in Australia. Paper presented at National Congress of Modern Language Teaching Associations, Sydney.

Quirk, R. (1981). International communication and the concept of Nuclear English. In Smith (ed.), 151–65.

Rahin, C. (1971). A tentative classification of language planning aims. In Rubin & Jernudd (eds.), 277–9.

Rhodes, J. (1977). *Linguistic diversity and language belief in Kenya: the general position of Swahili.* Maxwell school of citizenship and public affairs, foreign and comparative studies. African Series 26. Syracuse, New York.

Rice, F. A. (ed.) (1962). *Study of the role of second languages.* Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Richards, J. C. (ed.) (1979). *New varieties of English: issues and approaches.* RELC Occasional Papers, 8. Singapore: RELC.

Roe, P. (1977). *Scientific text.* Discourse analysis monographs 4. ELR, University of Birmingham.

Rogers, E. M. & Shoemaker, F. F. (1971). *Communication of innovations: a cross-cultural approach.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Romaine, S. (1980). A critical overview of the methodology of urban British sociolinguistics. *EWW*, **1**, 2, 163–98.

Rosen, H. & Burgess, T. (1980). *Language and dialects of London school children.* London: Ward Lock Educational.

Ruhin, J. (1971). Evaluation and language planning. In Rubin & Jernudd (eds.), 217–52.

Rubin, J. (1973). Language planning: discussion of some current issues. In Ruhin & Shuy (eds.), 1–10.

Rubin, J. (1977). Bilingual education and language planning. In Spolsky & Cooper (eds.), 282–94.

Scotton, C. (1978). Language in East Africa: linguistic patterns and political ideologies. In Fishman (ed.), 719–59.

Sibayan, B. P. (1975). Survey of language use and attitudes towards language in the Philippines. In Ohannessian *et al.* (eds.), 115–43.

Sibayan, B. & Gonzalez, A. (eds.) (1977). *Language planning and the building of a national language.* Philippine Normal College: Linguistic society of the Philippines and language study center.

Simply Stated. Washington: Document Design Center.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Toukomaa, P. (1976). *Teaching migrant children's mother-tongue and learning the language of the host country in the context of the sociocultural situation of the migrant family.* Finland: University of Tampere.

Smith, L. E. (ed.) (1981). *English for cross-cultural communication.* Hong Kong: Macmillan.

Sonntag, S. (1980). Language planning and policy in Nepal. *ITL*, **48**, 71–92.

Sonntag, S. (forthcoming). Factors in language policy. Hawaii: East-West Culture Learning Institute.

Spencer, J. (ed.) (1963). *Language in Africa* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spencer, J. (1971). *The English language in West Africa.* London: Longman.

Spencer, J. (1980). Economic and technological implications for language planning. Paper presented at English strategies for Namibia seminar, Lusaka.

Spolsky, B. (1978). *Educational linguistics.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Spolsky, B. & Cooper, R. (eds.) (1977). *Frontiers of bilingual education.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Spolsky, B. & Cooper, R. (eds.) (1978). *Case studies in bilingual education.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Stenhouse, L. (1977). *An introduction to curriculum research and development.* London: Heinemann.

Stern, H. (1981). Unity and diversity in L2 teaching. In Smith (ed.), 57–73.

Stewart, W. A. (1968). A sociolinguistic typology for describing multi-lingualism. In Fishman (ed.), 531–45.

St. Clair, R. & Eiseman, J. (1981). The politics of teaching English as a foreign language. *ITL*, **51**, 21–36.

Stubbs, M. (1980). *Language and literacy.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Survey of language use and language teaching in Eastern Africa (various editors). 5 vol. series (1972–1980). London: Oxford University Press.

Tadadjeu, M. (1980). *A model for functional trilingual education planning in Africa.* Paris: UNESCO, Division of structures, content, methods and techniques of education.

Taylor, A. (1981). Language policy in Papua New Guinea. *Linguistic Reporter*, **24**, 1, 1 and 8–9.
Thorburn, T. (1971). Cost benefit analysis in language planning. In Rubin & Jernudd (eds.), 253–62.
Todd, L. (1974). *Pidgins and creoles*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Todd, L. (1979). Language options for education in a multilingual society: Cameroon. *Polyglot*, **2**, 1.
Tollefson, J. W. (1980). Types of language contact and the acquisition of language. *Language Sciences*, **2**, 231–45.
Tollefson, J. W. (1981*a*). The role of language planning in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, **31**, 2, 337–48.
Tollefson, J. W. (1981*b*). Centralised and decentralised language planning. *LPLP*, **5**, 2, 175–88.
Tongue, R. K. (1974). *The English of Singapore and Malaysia*. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.
Tosi, A. (1979). Mother-tongue teaching for the children of migrants. *Language Teaching & Linguistics: Abstracts*, **12**, 4, 213–31.
Tosi, A. (forthcoming, 1983). *Immigration and bilingual education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Trudgill, P. (1974). *Sociolinguistics*. Pelican Books.
Tse, J. K.-P. (1980). Language planning and EFL in middle school education in the Republic of China. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of S. California.
Ubahakwe, E. (ed.) (1979). *Varieties and functions of English in Nigeria*. Ibadan: African Universities Press.
UNESCO (1953). *The use of vernacular languages in education*. Monographs on fundamental education 8. Paris: UNESCO.
UNESCO Statistical Yearbook.
Ure, J. (1981). Mother-tongue education and minority languages: a question of values and costs. *JMMD*, **2**, 4, 303–8.
United Nations Institute for Namibia (1981). *Toward a language policy for Namibia*. Namibia studies series 4, Lusaka, Zambia.
Voegelin, C. & Voegelin, F. (eds.) (1977). *Classification and index of the world's languages*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
Watson, J. K. P. (1980). Cultural pluralism, nation building and educational policies in Peninsular Malaysia. *JMMD*, **1**, 2, 155–74.
Weinstein, B. (1979). Language strategists: redefining political frontiers on the basis of linguistic choices. *World Politics*, **31**, 3, 345–54.
Weinstein, B. (1980). Language planning in francophone Africa. *LPLP*, **4**, 1, 55–77.
Whiteley, W. (1973). Sociolinguistic surveys at the national level. In Pride (ed.) (1979), 44–56.
Whiteley, W. (ed.) (1974). *Language in Kenya*. London: Oxford University Press.
Widdowson, H. G. (1968). The teaching of English through science. In J. Dakin, B. Tiffen & H. Widowson (eds.), *Language in education* (London: Oxford University Press), 115–75.
Wigzell, R. (forthcoming, 1982/83). The role and status of English as a subject in the Zambian English-medium context. In *ELT Documents*, **115**.
Wong, I. (1982). Native-speaker English for the Third World today? In Pride (ed.), 259–86.
Wurm, S. A. (1977). New Guinea Pidgin – today and tomorrow. In B. Sibayan & A. Gonzalez (eds.), 218–37.
Wurm, S. A. & Hattori, S. (in press). *Language atlas: Pacific area*. Part II. Stuttgart: Geo Center internationales Landkartenhaus.
Yap, A. (ed.) (1978). *Language education in multilingual societies*. RELC Anthology series 4. Singapore: Singapore University Press.