

LANGUAGE PLANNING NEWSLETTER

FILE COPY

JAN 26 1984

CCPC RMC

DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

Towards a Paradigm for Language Planning

J.V. Neustupný*

A need for an explanatory theory in language planning has been perceived for over a decade. It is not an exaggeration to say that recent discussions in the discipline convincingly show the shape of a paradigm. This situation may justify an attempt to outline some of the features which seem to be characteristic of the framework.¹

1. Language Problems

The paradigm perceives language problems as a universal phenomenon which occurs in a large variety of forms.

The problems of standard languages, their development, problems of script and literacy, or problems of specialized terminologies and functional styles—all these classical focuses remain. However, theory-building for the "linguistics of language problems" has additionally drawn into its realm issues of second and foreign languages, multilingualism and ethnic languages, social class and sex differentiation in language, translation and interpreting, the language of bureaucracy, language problems in the medical profession, communication problems encountered by speakers in contact situations, problems of politeness, address forms, problems of the establishment of communication networks and selection of topics, problems of non-verbal channels of communication and many others. Some of these problems affect whole communities, other individual speakers. This is true, for instance, in the case of a failure to comply with lexical or phonological rules in a particular discourse.

This radically broadened perception of language problems seems to be the major factor responsible for the rise of the language planning paradigm.

2. Language Correction

Along with the concept of language problems the key concept of the new paradigm is the concept of "correction."² It is through correction processes that language problems are removed. The "correction model" assumes that correction processes parallel and supplement the processes of generation of communicative acts such as described in traditional linguistics or sociolinguistics. When generation rules fail to produce adequate acts (i.e. a problem occurs), correction rules apply.

There is a scale of language correction systems with a rigorous system of language planning at one end and a whole set of phenomena of decreasing complexity following it: normative linguistics, language teaching, translation and interpreting, correction of children's language, request for clarification within a discourse, Labov's hypercorrection, and processes as simple as lexical correction within one simple utterance. The more complicated case of correction of a slip of tongue may be executed through the application of a relatively unconscious strategy.

However complicated or simple, all correction processes share the same structure: the decoding of a problem, a design for its removal, and the implementation of the design.

The concept of language correction is basic to the new paradigm for a number of reasons. Firstly, it provides a suitable framework for a theory which integrates language planning with grammatical linguistics, a discipline traditionally occupied with the generation of utterances. Correction processes (including language planning) are a necessary supplement to the process of generation of language.

Secondly, the concept of correction allows for an integration of macrolinguistic and microlinguistic approaches. It is obvious that global language reform and the process of the solution of communication problems of a single individual are processes of the same character. The differences are to a large extent of a quantitative nature. (Continued on page 2)

*The author is Professor and Chair of the Department of Japanese, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia.

Towards a Paradigm for Language Planning — continued

Thirdly, the concept of correction implies that the ultimate *location of all language problems is in discourse*: language problems are not abstract characteristics of language systems but sets of 'inadequacies' actually perceived in communication processes. It is only logical to require that all language planning must commence with the mapping of language problems in actual discourse, not with their reflections in attitudes or statements of the personnel concerned. Conversely, it is clear that the ultimate removal of a language problem hinges on its removal from actual discourse, a fact of primary importance for the implementation of language planning.

3. Language Treatment and Language Planning

Language correction is the widest frame of reference, language treatment is more specific and language planning is a subset of language treatment.

The term language treatment has been coined to refer broadly to all organized forms of societal attention to language problems, both in the past and at present. On the other hand, language planning is most suitably used to denote only such language treatment that is informed by a language planning theory: normally it will be systematic, theoretical, rational (in other words, "rigorous") and future-oriented.

A theoretically based system of language planning is necessary for two reasons. One is to ensure that the most appropriate positive steps are taken to stimulate a development through which existing language problems are removed. The second reason lies in the need to *prevent* language change that could lead to unwanted consequences. For instance, if a sociolinguistic theory predicts that a negative attitude to ethnic varieties is likely to occur within a community, language planners can take active measures towards preventing the event.

4. Socioeconomic Planning, Communication Planning and Language Planning

The first sociolinguistic theories of language problems were characterized by concentration on problems of grammatical competence (syntax, lexicon, phonology, script) and little attention was accorded to the relationship between such problems and problems of a higher order.

The paradigm described in this paper realizes that language problems cannot be solved by attention to language alone. For instance, the problem of maintaining vernaculars in the Pacific against the pressure of English and French cannot be solved unless associated socioeconomic problems are attended to. Hence, the requirement of identification of *socioeconomic determinants and consequences* of language problems by language planners and their active contribution to the solution of such problems. There is, also, the emerging requirement of language planning

not merely through attempts to reform the linguistic inventories, but through the process of varying the socioeconomic determinants of language use situations.

Secondly, there is an area which lies between socioeconomic problems and language problems: this is the area of *non-grammatical communication rules*³. Language planners realize that it is useless to create new inventories of languages, words, and grammatical means, or to reform them, unless we also plan how to make people use them. For instance, unless we change the communication networks and settings in which law is presently administered, it is useless to try to change the language of law into a 'plain language.'

Bilingual education must remain a temporary and inefficient measure, unless accompanied by policies which actively create situations for the use of language. However, such situations can only be induced if they make socioeconomic sense. Observed from the paradigm of language planning as planned and practised in many countries, "bicultural education" is a step in the right direction, but remains far from the whole wide range of policies needed.

5. The Myth of Objectivity and Emphasis on Democratization

In view of the close relationship between socioeconomic, communication and language problems, it would indeed be unrealistic to maintain that language planning theory could or should be a value-free politically neutral discipline.

Case studies of any historical process of language planning, old or new, reveal that the society/communication/language relationship necessarily introduces value judgements. Language planning in action has always been governed by socioeconomic value judgements. Some observers believed that "modern development" was a natural aim, that "national integration" was a necessary target, or that

Editor—Joan Rubin
Associate Editor—Björn H. Jernudd
Editorial Board
M. H. Abdulaziz
Joshua Fishman
Bertil Molde
Monsur Musa
Jiri Neustupný

Copies are available free of charge. Changes of address and requests to be placed on the mailing list should be addressed to:

Language Planning Newsletter
East-West Culture Learning Institute
East-West Center
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848 USA

All other correspondence should be addressed to the editor:

Dr. Joan Rubin
P. O. Box 143
Pinole, CA 94546
USA

Towards a Paradigm for Language Planning — continued

the acceptance of certain foreign varieties of language was generally desirable. However, there was nothing natural, necessary, or generally desirable in these policies. They did not reflect any neutral, objective judgements; their bias towards particular strata of society cannot be overlooked.

It has become obvious today that any theory of language planning must provide a full account of all political values involved in language planning processes. The public must be made aware what political aims are either intentionally or unintentionally supported by such policies as the retention of English as an official language in Singapore, by the current anti-reformist language cultivation processes in Japan or by the promotion of ethnic languages in contemporary Australia. This should be not an optional addition but one of the primary objectives of the discipline.

I cannot see how language planners, working within a rigorous theoretical framework, could be barred from supporting particular values and political aims. All those I know do take sides. Rather than incapacitating them through calls for sterile neutrality, the theory should assist them in clearly spelling out what their motives and objectives are.

The criterion of 'development' which favors those who control the process of economic production is receding in favor of the criterion of 'equal access' to resources, in other words to the criterion of 'democratization.' The issue includes language rights of ethnic minorities, the disadvantaged and those discriminated against.

Another related feature of the new way of thinking about language problems can be seen in a growing acknowledgment of driving forces other than national agencies. No doubt, national bodies will continue to play an important role. However, contrary developments have shown up on many occasions (movement for genderless language, language of mass media, industry, etc.) and one can agree that there is a growing need for language planning to develop within a pluralistic network which emphasizes the role of various social groups and the individual.

6. Typologies of Language Correction Systems

For developing policies on an empirical basis, a good theory is needed. In my view a typological theory is best suited to the needs of the new paradigm.

A typological theory assumes that although some features of language correction are universal and some are individual, many other features are characteristic for large groupings of languages, without being either universal or completely individual. Such features usually appear in whole clusters, in types. However, if it is true that many systems partly resemble each other, and that such resembling features occur in clusters, typological knowledge may help us to understand the

present state of the systems in question, and to predict their future.

In my previous work I have proposed a typology which examined types of correction systems such as Early Modern ('policy' type), Modern ('cultivation' type), Contemporary, and others. This is not the place to elaborate or defend this particular typology. I simply wish to point out here that *some* form of typology is a necessary component of the language planning paradigm.

7. Point of View of the Third World

Language planning is not, as it once appeared to be, solely an issue for the modernizing countries of Asia, Africa, or Latin America; however, their problems are among the most pressing of our age. This fact must remain fully acknowledged by those who are developing the theoretical base for the discipline.

As problems differ, so do their perceptions. Scholars working on the language planning paradigm have come to realize that approaches to language problems in some countries of the Third World, in particular, the perception of language problems by some Indian scholars, is of enormous value and must be fully acknowledged in any language planning theory.

Another important issue is the tendency of some Western social scientists to view their own perceptions and values as universally valid. Personally I have no doubt that the contemporary emphasis on the positive evaluation of variation in language and the resulting anti-assimilation position enriches our perceptions of language problems. These views at least partly overlap with the perceptions mentioned in the preceding paragraph. However, many countries of the Third World do foster assimilation policies and language planners everywhere should try to understand this position.

Rules established for Western societies cannot be automatically imposed on the Third World. I expect that language planners will ultimately develop special sets of approaches, within the same paradigm, but specifically suited to language situations of differing sociolinguistic types.

8. The Empirical Base of Language Planning

Historically oriented accounts of language planning processes in various societies are definitely useful. At the same time sociolinguistic surveys directly aiming at data for language planning will become more and more the standard equipment of the discipline. Other data collection methods, such as surveys of newspaper reports concerning language problems have also been developed.

However, a most beneficial enquiry method, based on the correction model, aims at the identification and explanation of language problems in discourse.

(Continued on page 4)

Towards a Paradigm for Language Planning — continued

Language planning which aims at the treatment of real problems, must attempt to identify their occurrences directly in discourse, rather than relying entirely on the study of their reflection in speakers' consciousness. All language problems ultimately derive from discourse inadequacies, and can only be removed qua inadequacies in discourse.

No doubt, language planning—when the paradigm is fully developed—will be entirely based on systematic "problem analyses" of whole communities.

NOTES:

- 1) The following remarks are based on a paper presented in July 1983, at a seminar of the Applied Linguistics Group at Monash University. They took their final shape thanks to my participation in the meeting on *Modernization and Language Development*, organized by Björn Jernudd at the East-West Center, Honolulu, September 1-7, 1983. The author is grateful to Michael Clyne for his invitation to present the original paper, as well as for his detailed comments. I also owe much to participants in the EWC meeting for many discussions and critical comments. My special thanks are due to Björn Jernudd, in cooperation with whom, and thanks to whom, my own work in language treatment and language planning has developed in the direction indicated in this paper. This paper has profited both from our longstanding cooperation and from many particular suggestions. I feel that his name should appear on this paper, along with mine.
- 2) Cf. Neustupný 1973. For a further discussion of the concept of language correction see Neustupný 1976, 1977, Jernudd & Thuan 1980, Rubin 1978-1979, Jernudd 1982, Jernudd 1983.
- 3) As a checklist for problems, Hymes' ethnography of communication can be used with profit. (Cf. Hymes 1974, Sherzer-Darnell 1972).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- HYMES, D. 1974 *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- JERNUDD, B.H. and E. THUAN 1980 To err is human: control of language through correction. (Unpublished)
- JERNUDD, B.H. 1982 Language planning as a focus for language correction. *Language Planning Newsletter* 8/4, 1-3
- JERNUDD, B.H. 1983 Evaluation of language planning: what has the last decade accomplished? *Progress in Language Planning*, ed. by J. Cobarrubias and J.A. Fishman, 345-378. Berlin: Mouton.
- NEUSTUPNÝ, J.V. 1973 An outline of a theory of language problems. Paper prepared for the VIIIth World Congress on Sociology, Toronto, August 16-24, 1974. Printed in Neustupný 1978, 243-257.
- NEUSTUPNÝ, J.V. 1976 Language correction in contemporary Japan. *Language Planning Newsletter* 2/3, 1-5. Reprinted in Neustupný 1978, 269-278
- NEUSTUPNÝ, J.V. 1977 Language planning for Australia. *Language Sciences* 45, 28-31
- NEUSTUPNÝ, J.V. 1978 *Post-Structural Approaches to Language*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- RUBIN, J. 1978-1979 The approach to language planning within the United States. *Language Planning Newsletter* 4/4, 1-6 and 5/1, 1-6.
- SHERZER, J. and R. DARNELL 1972 Outline guide for the ethnographic study of speech use. *Directions in Sociolinguistics*, ed. by J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes, 548-554. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Book Review

Language Planning: An Introduction by Carole M. Eastman. Chandler and Sharp Publishers, San Francisco, 1983, 276 pages, \$8.95.

Reviewed by J.V. Neustupný

This book is the first introduction to language planning available on the book market and as such is likely to raise considerable interest.

The first chapter of Eastman's Introduction is simply entitled "Language Planning." The author uses the term to mean virtually all historical and present processes of deliberate language change, but as far as the research discipline is concerned, only theoretical approaches of the last twenty years are referred to in this way (p. 107).

The author views the process of language planning

as (1) a choice of a language and (2) establishing a policy for the chosen language. A policy consists of formulation, codification, elaboration, and implementation (pp. 7-12); evaluation is added to this list later.

The rest of the book consists, almost totally, of accounts of existing literature in the discipline. Chapters 2 and 3 deal with features of language affected by language planning which are linked with political science (e.g., types of attachment to language), sociology (e.g., problems of ethnicity), economics (e.g., development), anthropology (e.g., problems of standardization), linguistics (e.g., language change), and education (e.g., bilingual education). This arrangement may be correct if the book is used "to acquaint people from a number of fields with ways in

Book Review — continued

which language planning may be useful to them" (p. ix). Language planning students may, however, prefer an arrangement according to the type of problems.

The next chapter, "The History of Language Planning Study," proves that to write a history of a discipline "just a little over twenty years old" is a difficult task. The author's scheme, reformulated several times (pp. 110, 121, 129-131), is not easy to interpret. The use of a larger amount of data (papers) and a lesser emphasis on generalizations might have produced a chapter that could serve as a source of information and a basis for understanding.

After reading and re-reading chapter 5 ("Language Planning Theory"), I am still not sure what, in the author's usage, the word *theory* means. As a result of her analysis, she outlines six assumptions called "language planning theoretic givens." Why should the fact that in developing areas "people need to know Languages of Wider Communication to participate in international trade" (p. 175) be a theoretic given? I would suppose that a language planning theory would start with clarifying questions such as "what are the language problems," "what is their relationship to other problems," "what are language planning acts," etc. None of these issues receives a full discussion in the chapter.

Much of Chapter 6 ("Language Planning Method") will be of interest to the general reader. Chapter 7 ("The Application of Language Planning") shows how Nahir's five types of language plans (purification, revival, reform, standardization, and modernization) can be described in terms of the author's six points: language choice, policy formulation, codification, elaboration, implementation, and evaluation. This pattern certainly represents one of the possible ways of describing language treatment systems, especially if the number of types and points is suitably augmented.

By and large, the book leaves language planners puzzled. Obviously the text deals with many of their problems, and the author shows an understanding of some principles of the new language planning paradigm of the 1980s. However, one wonders whether she had access to the literature quoted while writing the book. Her account of my paper on language treatment (p. 122) has little in common with what I wrote. Jernudd has never given the list of seven "reinforcement activities" attributed to him on pp. 146-147. How is it that Fishman edited his *Advances in Language Planning* in 1968 (p. 130) when only one out of twenty-five papers printed in the book was published in 1968! Note that the context makes it clear that this is not a simple printing error. Also, why should we use some key terms (such as standardization or cultivation) in other than their most common sense generally accepted in the discipline? Why should it be necessary to dig for the meaning of sentences, paragraphs, or whole sections and their relationship with other similar passages?

There is still a distinct need for a text on which introductory courses in language planning could be based.

The Civic Tongue: Political Consequences of Language Choices by Brian Weinstein. Longmans, New York and London 1983, xi, 213 pages, \$22.50.

Reviewed by D. P. Pattanayak*

Social scientists all over the world are taking keener interest in the phenomenon of language, which because of its familiarity and facility have heretofore eluded attention. It is becoming increasingly clear that if language is not always the cause, it is an important indicator of the presence or absence of access and control of educational and economic opportunities, cultural heritage, communication facility, political power and freedom, and in short to the totality of civic life and community well-being of a people. Brian Weinstein, whose refreshingly simple language and clear analysis strikes the reader, in definition of the title of the book says, "It is therefore imperative to begin to clarify the relation between language and the pursuit of power within and between communities, which is what I mean by the civic tongue" (p. 7).

Weinstein rightly makes a distinction between language of politics and politics of language. But those two do not exhaust the universe of discourse in this regard. Language, as any other basic social institution, is both perennial and transitory, both central and peripheral, and both an integral process and product of the making of a society. Use of language or a variety of it is not scale neutral. It results in status differentiation, access or underaccess to privileges, efficiency or otherwise of communication and serves as an aid or barrier to social mobility. Language does not merely discriminate, it enables one to comprehend and produce entities including language. Language is rooted in a substantive diverse environment which defines its social characteristics. Its simultaneous development and presence as well as absence of chronological development at any moment provides its psychological perspective. No wonder that linguistic, psychological, and pedagogical considerations would have important bearing on the enhancement or inhibition of language acquisition and its choice. Weinstein has tried to focus on this complexity from the vantage point of his discipline, political science. Consequently, he has been able to throw new light on theoretical and methodological approaches to language in society.

Weinstein, as Jarol B. Manheim rightly points out in his foreward, has built his thesis on the work of

*The author is Director of the Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore, India.

(Continued on page 6)

Book Review — continued

linguists, historians, political practitioners, and political scientists. While he has given an excellent analysis drawing on examples from different parts of the world, like many western liberal intellectuals he is uncertain and indeterminate about determinism and diversity. He recognizes the important contribution made by Whorf and Bernstein, but says that "their hypotheses are not valid" (pp. 28). He blames them for assuming "static linguistic situations" and underestimating human freedom. This is not true. As John and Lucy and Richard A. Shweder point out ("Whorf and His Critics: Linguistic and Non-linguistic Influences In Colour Memory," *American Anthropologist*, 81:30, 1979), Whorf's distinction between language and concept is a relationship "of a whole to a part." Such a view neither denies the ability of a person to change his or her linguistic repertoire or his or her status or both nor does it take a static view of language. While the categories organizing experience into concepts do not exhaust the linguistic potentials of a person, it cannot be denied that "ontology is a cultural inheritance reflected in the way members of a speech community talk to one another." The real fear of Weinstein is that the ideas of linguistic diversity "seem contradictory and possibly dangerous, since they may be manipulated to promote race or class prejudice" (p. 32).

Weinstein's Indian examples are based on misunderstanding of Indian ethos. It is not true that "Gandhi and Nehru were hostile to English" as he contends. Both were hostile to English replacing Indian languages and to exchanging Indian scripts for the Roman script. But this is not hostility to English. Both Gandhi and Nehru have emphatically spoken in favor of English in India, and Nehru has even been blamed for giving undeserved importance to English in national affairs. Neither of them can be blamed for manipulating "the ideas of linguistic determinism to suit the needs of the moment," Weinstein's second statement, "The idea that any Indian language spoken by Hindus could be studied or developed without any reference to Sanskrit was a linguistic revolution," if accepted must admit of the fact that such revolutions were acted and re-enacted several hundreds of years before Caldwell. Traditional grammars in Dravidian languages using categories different from Sanskrit had been written in all major Dravidian languages, and the Dravidian identity was well established before Caldwell. While Caldwell helped the Tamils to "rediscover their language and literature," he indirectly injected an anti-Sanskrit bias through statements such as their "language would flourish without its aid." Tamil has had a continuous living history for centuries, and it makes no sense to say that "today the revival of Tamil is compared with the revival and modernization of Hebrew by Tamil intellectuals." Weinstein has obviously been misled both by Caldwell and his interpretation by the contemporary intellectual. Imposition of Hindi as the only symbol of the nation has been opposed not only by the Tamils but even by other Sanskritic languages in the East, West, and North of India. India represents the countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America in their search for a model which bases its national building on the recognition of plurality of languages and cultures.

Coming from a cultural background noted for its dominant monolingual orientation, Weinstein is naturally concerned about the identity assertion of many languages all over the world. In America he recognizes that ethnic leaders are encouraged "to build broad constituencies and to demand support necessary to open the doors for economic and political opportunity," but at the same time he is cautious that "ethnic leaders in America and elsewhere cannot expect that the political system will provide funds for projects that may undermine its very foundations" (p. 156). As in the national scene he sees in the emphasis on linguistic pluralism an "effort to change American society as the federalist constitution makers organized it" (p. 155). In the international scene he recognizes the potential effect of language choices altering political and economic relations. What worries political leaders and leaders of commerce from countries who have enjoyed privileges so far is that any change in the existing linguistic scene "may conduct countries and businesses down uncharted pathways to unpredictable forms of world organizations" (p. 182). While recognizing the nation-building as well as the nation-destroying potentiality of language movements, Weinstein appears uncertain about the stand of social science in the struggle of the culturally and economically deprived for recognition of their aspirations. He is satisfied with the analysis of issues, leaving the choice and success to "the good fortune, our own ingenuity and intensity of our commitment to freedom, equality and justice within and between the communities to which we perceive we belong." This is both the weakness and the strength of the book, weakness because of its ambivalence in supporting oppressed people for fear of political instability and strength because of the recognition of the usefulness of the analysis and the policy.

In spite of the above, Weinstein in his four-part presentation gives an insightful analysis of: Are Language Choices Possible? Who Chooses?, What are the Effects of Choices and Politics and Language? The book is *compulsory reading* for all students of politics and sociolinguistics.

THE EAST-WEST CENTER is a national educational institution established in Hawaii by the U. S. Congress in 1960 to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training, and research. Each year more than 1,500 men and women from the many nations and cultures work together in problem-oriented institutes or on "open" grants as they seek solutions to problems of mutual consequence to East and West. For each Center participant from the United States, two participants are sought from the Asian and Pacific area. The U. S. Congress provides basic funding for programs and a variety of awards to participants. Because of the cooperative nature of Center programs, financial support and cost-sharing are also provided by Asian and Pacific governments, regional agencies, private enterprise, and foundations. The Center is administered by a public, nonprofit corporation with an international Board of Governors.

1777 East-West Road,
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848