attempt at standardization of names in their species identification sheets. The scientific system has eliminated the translation problem by ruling that there shall be one and only one name for each species. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (Mayr 1969) authorizes a set of rules that makes a unitary naming system possible. But as concerns the common naming system, there seems to be little exchange of information concerning problems and solutions, objectives and procedures. Different communities that use the same language seek different solutions, whether knowingly or unknowingly, to the same or equivalent language problems in fisheries. In an increasingly interdependent world of trade and information exchanges this is at best inefficient. There is, *e.g.*, differential standardization and listings of preferred common names in languages such as English, French, Spanish, *etc.* FAO's effort for a globally valid English name is commendable, but what about the other languages? Difficulties multiply--and this extended example deals only with a problem of such limited connotation as naming fish.

Languages and features of languages interlock at multiple levels of usage. The interfacing between languages and user groups needs to be given much more attention by international organizations, governmentally sponsored or not, and serves as an example of action where private interests may lack motivation through lack of opportunity to reap profits or because private groups that would tackle the coordination tasks are each too small or simply lack perceived authority to organize at this scale and across boundaries.

The ninth lecture

RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Research on the circumstances of language management can be guided by an array of methodologies. Selection of method would depend on the research question. This is so because there is no closure to this research, other than what the researcher's own questions imply. The researchers are active in the broad field of language management when they identify by citation with workers in it and when they use any of its models and terms[35].

In commenting on the status of particularly "status planning" in language planning at a recent conference, Joshua Fishman[36] (1987:410) said 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." He noted that (426)

"far too few empirical studies were presented [...] in any but a historical vein. The study of history is, of course, empirical in terms of documentation of the past record. 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."

I agree and feel that, on the one hand, there is a glaring need for greater methodological awareness and for significantly greater discipline in following up suggestions by projecting and testing these on renewable "data"; on the other hand, there is a serious and immediate need for cross-reading between researchers and disciplines, not to impose a burden of compulsorily inter-

disciplinary execution of projects but to make available and to oblige attention to better methods and richer sources of theory. Much excellent work that is directly relevant to the subject matters of these lectures, both from substantive, methodological and theoretical points of view has been and is being undertaken outside of, or only marginally connected with, the narrower language management and language planning networks of scholars. There are works in history, political science, ethnography, literacy, geography, literature, linguistics, social psychology, and so on that offer crucial insights into language management and that offer methods.

Work on the political, social, and economic circumstances of language planning in particular and language management in general should be informed by variety in methods and theories in the respective disciplines, and should take advantage of variation and conflict of approach within the disciplines. If political science accommodates institutional and rhetorical approaches, both, the study of the politics of language should accordingly be informed by these institutional and rhetorical approaches (*e.g.*, compare the articles in Jernudd and Shapiro 1989). When theories of development replace each other, so should their projections on language behavior be reevaluated on the basis of appropriately enriched and enlarged data bases that correspond to these theories' analytical requirements.[37]

Fishman refers to the International Research Project on Language Planning Processes as a "serious beginning" (*ib.* 426) of empirical, exhaustive, multidimensional, quantitative work[38]. The research questions for this project were formulated during the research team's year at the East-West Center in 1968-69. The questions focus on the authorization, inner workings and products of language planning agencies and associations, and on responses among people to their work. The questions are published in an appendix to the book *Can Language Be Planned*? (Rubin and Jernudd 1971:293-305) and are still relevant. We relied mainly on questionnaires, and the questionnaires were formulated on the basis of social science methodology. Survey methodology provides data on knowledge of and opinion about the language planning agencies and their recommendations (their "products"), and surveys language use. Specifically, the project made use of sociolinguistic surveying methodologies in order to obtain valid and reliable self-reports on language use and to explore knowledge, use and evaluations of terms (including the word-naming technique, as

developed and evaluated by Fishman *et al.* 1971; see also Cooper 1975)[39]. We also worked from archival and published sources about agencies and projects, and to an extent obtained information by intensive interviewing of people in agencies and associated with agency work. We also directly observed aspects of agency work. Study of policy-processes called for "more detailed discussion and contingency-questioning than questionnaires are likely to permit" with a small number of very knowledgeable informants (Rubin and Jernudd:295)[40].

Still, this comparative project did not connect with individual management of language in discourse! It could have gathered more language data, and it could have focused at least partial analyses on processes of term evaluation in various situations of discourse (*i.e.*, in editing, lecturing, writing of manuals, industrial training, laboratory report writing, advertising, *etc.*). It could have related potential findings in these processes to the institutional, ideological and attitudinal findings that make up the main results of the study.

The language management discipline is not sufficiently served by interdisciplinary borrowing but calls for its own methods of research. These lectures argue that placing language management in the center is a reasonable undertaking. Its theories and methods must be explicitly related to, even embedded in, other disciplinary discourses that are related in a straightforward and trivial fashion by virtue of relations in life.

At the center of language management is discourse. An interest in discourse processes is not unique to language management. It is an indicator of the climate of our times that Clifford Geertz (1988) struggles with discursivity as a means to understanding what anthropologists do (and what anthropologists could and should do). Godfrey Lienhardt writes in his review (1988) how "Geertz will not convince all his anthropological colleagues that 'the separation of what someone says from how they say it ... is as mischievous in anthropology as it is in poetry, painting or political oratory.'" The discursive interest in anthropology, practical philosophy[41], literary criticism[42], political science[43], and history[44], 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. The diverse concerns in other disciplines that come to involve language (as a resource), is matched in linguistics and in the study of language management by a concern with how discourse itself gets formed, and with the bases for

discourse about discourse (*e.g.*, our own project, norms). 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. A review in Language (Basso 1989:383) calls for "richer detail" in study of

"ways in which ideas of personal experience, identity, and interpersonal relations are realized. Society seems to be treated as a functional given, an ordered system into which people fit themselves by performing roles that are somehow assigned to them. This outmoded idea should be replaced by a concern with DEVELOPMENTAL PROCESS. It would be better to see how roles and relations are represented as negotiated and transacted; it would be nice to hear about disorder in discourse."

Language management lets hear about disorder. The very reason for its focus on trouble in discourse is that *this* is the trouble that validates practices of language cultivation and language planning. Not that all discourse is equally laden with potential trouble due to originally creative derivation of novel utterances at each and every turn, far from! Much, perhaps most, language use reflects the idiomatically frozen, probabilistically expected, construction or phrase or sequence of utterances, the effective reproduction of which is less costly in effort of monitoring and evaluation than composing anew its constituent parts. If language behavior reduces risk of trouble in language use, then this lends further support to models that explore all aspects of individual management of potential trouble. By pointing in a "lexical" direction, this reasoning also allows common sense to support this approach to language management, because common sense has it that people want help with the "right word" and the "right expression." However superficial, a common sense reflection of a model of language behavior is comforting. It is easier to conceive of correction processes that deal mostly with "items" than with "underlying rules." Further, lexical phenomena take center stage in language management practices anywhere in the world.

In support of a lexicalist approach to first language acquisition, Schmidt and Frota (1985:90) quote Lakoff (1982:157) who

"has argued that a continued focus on core grammar, that portion of the grammar which happens to work by fully productive general

principles of compositionality, is unfortunate, since by his estimate the continuum between fully productive constructions and completely frozen expressions includes 95% to 98% of the constructions in English."

Among other branches of language study, conversation analysis[45] 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 process[46] as they are to the language managers' search for solutions. Conversation analysts' untiring attention to details constitute their (ethno)methodology; language managers make accessible and overt evaluation, adjustment, and implementation processes in discourse and situate these processes in institutional context.

Method in the study of language management in discourse first of all requires that the researcher pays the kind of attention to detail of representation of discourse that ethnomethodological researchers do; study of speech, then, is costly, of written expression less so. The model for language management in discourse 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. However, ethnomethodologists' and conversation analysts' work has shown that there are signals to be recovered from the record that allow interpretation according to, for example, models of repair (as discussed above), of sequences of misunderstanding and their

resolution, and so on. A video-recording of communication may allow guessing from close study of body movements that a hearer noted some aspect of the speaker's communication. The analyst may have prior knowledge, established independently of the discourse under study, that certain evaluations are likely to be made and to leave traces in discourse between persons characterized by different degrees of linguistic insecurity, *e.g.*, evaluations on the basis of stereotypes (Labov 1987:133-4) but evaluations that do not so coincide are lost with the moment of speaking--and are not recoverable in any case from a record of the interaction. One possible way to recover processes of discourse management is to play back a record of interaction to the participants in it, soonest after the event of discourse, and to request the participants to recollect their thoughts (feelings, (re)actions). There still exists a confounding possibility that the participants may give either ideologically informed, pre-packaged, person-based or situation-based explanations which only incidentally reproduce meanings that may have informed their earlier behavior. However, psychologists' interests during the last ten years have led to a reevaluation of the usefulness of tapping participants' reports on own behaviours (Ericsson and Simon 1984). Since individual discourse stands at the center of the language management discipline, application of methods that rely on participant reports is obviously extremely important[47]. Neustupný (1986a,b) discusses the application and interpretation of interaction and follow-up interviews in language management. Students of his from Monash University (Melbourne, Australia) are currently applying such techniques also to the study of language contact[48].

It is easier to recover notings, evaluations and adjustments for some language use than other. For example, classificatory terms are likely to be noted and evaluated in reaction to written or recitational discourse, because principles of taxonomic systematicity and morphological term-formation explicitly govern their selection and use. For written language in general, principles guide editing and evaluation of congruent parameters of a style, of document formulation and so on. Yet, in other language behavior than reading for the very purpose of principled evaluation, *i.e.*, in speaking, and in real-time written interaction through, *e.g.*, electronic means, such principles are but one source of evaluation and a source that it is difficult to apply as an evaluation metric at the moment of discourse. Yet, there is a way of capturing some parts of the creative process, *e.g.*, by registering all input a writer

makes at a computer keyboard when word-processing (*i.e.*, writing). There is such a project underway at the Royal Institute of Technology at Stockholm (Sweden). The detailed record of rewrite can be analyzed, and then, with questions guided by the analysis, presented to the writer for recollected comment and for reevaluation.

While it presents a serious methodological problem how to access the discourse management process as the assumed base for the systematic management of language, there are communications about language inadequacies that can be studied directly, indeed, with which the researcher can connect as a participant in the management process. I am referring to situations of language learning--if acquisition is one's problem area--and to characteristic situations of language cultivation. In the former case, the researcher may experience overt, consultative management as a participant either in the role of teacher or learner[49]. In the latter case, 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[50]. Archives of these agencies often record the suggested (recommended, or "correct") solution to the problem as well. The agencies regularly publish handbooks that spell out adjustment strategies and rules of language production, even justifications for these adjustments and rules; and their officers typically publish analyses of problem areas, sometimes in magazines and newspapers as columns. The archives, and the agency-based literature, together form a very valuable data base for any attempt to understand the community's language management system, *i.e.*, for understanding its base in discourse.

Topics in the public debate as manifested in newspaper articles and letters to the editor, in magazines, in commentaries, reflect a broad range of management issues. The topics may be motivated by experience in particular communicative situations or by reflection on systematic aspects of language, from various ideological and theoretical perspectives, however naive the latter may seem to the professional linguist. The public debate necessarily and inevitably blends into the experts' discourse, because it is consultation and search for principle that sustain a group's language management system(s). Some systematic work has been undertaken on such data[51]. Parliamentary records, dissertations, even letters, interviews and correspondence with knowledgeable persons, are other obvious resources for enquiry.

At this point, studies of the language management and planning institutions, personnel networks, distributions of and variations in language behaviors, as indicated at the beginning of this lecture, and of any relatable aspects of the economic, political, and social environment become relevant. Such studies require social science methodology for the enquiry and for analysis, a variety of analytical approaches, from the rhetorical to the factor analytical.

The key issue in language management is to relate the language problem to inadequacy in discourse.

Notes

1. If he understands the message. Pongsri (1989:82) tells: "a village headman Phuyai Lee... On his return from the capital he had all the villagers come to his house to hear him talk about the meeting. He said that the authorities wanted farmers to raise *pet* (ducks) and *sukorn* (a formal word for pigs). When one of the villagers asked Phuyai Lee what kind of thing was *sukorn*, Phuyai Lee readily answered: 'Well, don't you know that *sukorn* are just ordinary dogs.'"

2. Haugen (1966) is an easily accessible study of the Norwegian situation up to the early 1960's. There is a rich literature on the Norwegian language issue in Norwegian. Haugen updates his earlier study in an article that brings into focus "variation as an instrument of language planning" (1988).

3. Weinstein (1979) offers a particular elite-led model of ethnic mobilization. Beer (1985) suggests a very similar theory.

4. For a broad view of interrelationships between language, diversity and identity in social change, see Edwards (1984), especially his summary in points (304).

5. There are several recent articles presenting the situation on the Iberian Peninsula, among which Cobarrubias and Garmendia Lasa (1987), Bastardas Boada (1987), Rial (1985) and Rotaetxe (1987).

6. For recent and comprehensive overviews of the situation in Finland, see Allardt (1985) and Laurén (1987).

7. For Maori, see Biggs 1968.

8. A point of view regarding Hindi strongly proposed and also opposed during our Institute in Delhi.

9. For comprehensive overviews of the present situation in the Pacific, see Wurm (1979) and Benton (1981).

10. For historical interpretations, see Buck 1986a, 1986b; Reinecke 1969.

LECTURES on Language Problems

BJÖRN JERNUDD
National University of Singapore
Singapore

1991
BAHRI PUBLICATIONS