Detail the types and process of language planning. Provide an account of one case study to illustrate how language planning may take place and influence language policy and practice.

Isabell Long (12945093)

April 24, 2015

Language planning is a practice considered to be about changing language — for better or for worse — either to add new words for certain types of foods or behaviours for example, or to develop new languages, to name a few of many possible activities. It can also be used strategically by a country's leaders to select its official language or multiple official languages, or indeed campaigns from the general population. The concept of language planning and this term for it was coined by an American linguist Einar Haugen in the late 1950s. Over the years since 1960, linguists have taken a great deal of interest in language planning, with some deeming it detrimental to the natural evolution of language if, for example, new grammars or words are imposed by those part of high up groups or authorities (Fishman, 1974, p. 67). Language groups such as the French *Académie Française* are doing very well, however — they control to some extent what goes into the French dictionaries and draw up grammatical rules.

There are many types of language planning and many processes that can be used to perform it. There exist four types of language planning: corpus planning, status planning, prestige planning and acquisition planning, which are all elaborated on below.

Corpus planning deals with the internal structure of language, and its central purpose is creating and establishing linguistic norms such as grammar and spoken words (Mesthrie et al., 2009, p. 372). This becomes especially useful when there could be different languages taught for religious or educational purposes such as in schools or in places of worship, for example classical Hebrew for religious scriptures and modern Hebrew used for education and in day-to-day life. This is partly because classical Hebrew in this case is missing science and technology-related vocabulary which are becoming more and more important in this day and age.

Language planning of the status variety is about people making efforts to change a language's use within the realm of people who speak or write the language. This could be done by varying the language people learn in — from Dutch to English for example, if English is deemed the language of the world and if it is deemed important that everyone be immersed

in it. It has been shown that immersion has a key part to play in language learning, so instructing pupils in the target language is, some say, a good idea (Johnson and Swain, 1997).

Prestige planning, the penultimate type of language planning, is often used by governments to "influence how language is perceived" and to choose or determine by research what level of respect is given to the particular language (Grzech, 2013, p. 296). Prestige planning can be used with — or against — both speakers of the language or non-speakers of the language.

Acquisition planning is perhaps more self-explanatory. This final type is to do with how inhabitants of the country end up learning the language. Usually brought about via schools, with lessons being taught in the new language — partially as with status planning —, "language-in-education planning", as it is widely known thanks to Kaplan and Baldauf in 1997, concerns itself with books being published, recommending or blankly changing teaching methods, or deciding how much money should be spent on introducing this new language (Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997). That said, it is interesting to note that the framework for this type of planning is the only one to heavily and directly mention money. It could be argued whether money should come into influence or question when we are evaluating or changing something so fundamental to society as language use and adoption. Here, it is worth noting that poor countries still manage to harness the education system generally, with outside support, and don't need much money with which to do it, therefore it might be a moot point that language planning and therefore teaching in a language requires sizeable financial investment (Lockheed et al., 1991).

The processes of language planning lead on from the aforementioned types they are related to. A framework was developed in order to describe these processes of language planning, and it contains four stages: selection, codification, implementation and elaboration (Mesthrie et al., 2009, p. 375).

In the first stage — selecting language — one specifically chooses a language or a dialect to enable the performing of certain functions in society or group of people. Unfortunately, again according to Mesthrie et al. (2009, p. 375), it is "usually the most prestigious dialect or language [that] is chosen [...] for example Parisien French". This is unfortunate because

it may make some minority dialects, for example "la langue d'Oc" or "Oil" feel less valued or not at all recognised, and impact their ability to be able to be taught in schools in those areas of a country (again in this case, France).

The second stage as mentioned above — codification — also has sub-stages related to the development of written communication, grammatical rules and vocabulary specification which all help to fulfil its purpose of "creating a linguistic norm"(Mesthrie et al., 2009, p. 375). These are named graphisation, grammatication and lexicalisation respectively — "lexicon" of course meaning "[t]he vocabulary of a person, language, or branch of knowledge" (Dictionary, 2015a). The next stage — implementation — could be argued to be fairly self-explanatory: it involves implementing the new language in ways such as producing literature and introducing it into the education system as a formal, taught language or a language in which lessons are taught (Mesthrie et al., 2009, p. 378).

The fourth and final stage is sometimes referred to not as elaboration but as modernisation (Mesthrie et al., 2009, p. 379) and involves — as the second name suggests — modernising languages to "meet the needs of modern life and technology" (again Mesthrie et al., 2009, p. 379), such as new words like "selfie" or "computer" in the technological age. This or any creation of new words is known as "neologism" (Dictionary, 2015b), and is extremely important for the continued development of even a mature language like English, and therefore especially so for a young or minority language like — to take an example of a case study from Mesthrie et al. (2009) — Kohi, a South African language.

A case study is useful to analyse when making decisions about whether or not to use language planning. One such case study was famously conducted by Ivar Ansen and Knud Knudsen (reproduced in Mesthrie et al., 2009 from Haugen, 1987). It was centered around Norway and the adoption of a new language — Norweigan — and the cancelling of Danish as the de facto "language of administration, politics and education" when Norway gained its independence. Their research allowed them to separate so-called country language and state language into two, each creating one of "Landsmäl" and "Riksmäl" respectively. Eventually in the 1880s the Norweigan government recognised them both and they were the official languages of Norway, with their only real differences being with regard to their grammars and sentence structures. This got "awkward and impractical" and language committees formed

from the government sought to unify the two strands of language. This caused an even greater divide, however, between the lower classes and the upper classes who thought that their cherished languages curated over the years would get lost or infected with colloquialisms. These divides are a perfect example of why language planning can end up not being such a good idea, such a perfect solution for all, and this is where language planning — also known as language policy where governments are involved in setting rules, frameworks or policies to do with the adoption of language — becomes contentious.

To combat this discontent and perceived inequality, it has been brought into force by organisations like UNESCO as early as 1990 that people have rights to language, so much so that a Universal Declaration on Linguistic Rights was signed in a similar fashion to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Mesthrie et al., 2009, p. 390). The United States was the first to codify a person's linguistic rights in 1991. These include being able to communicate "freely" in any language they desire "in public or in private" and, especially applicable to minority languages (such as Navajo, of Native America), "to be able to maintain their native language and teach it to their offspring". This is very important so that heritage is not lost and historical records are preserved. If children learn minority languages as a matter of course, even not formally but passed down by their parents or grandparents, when their elders die they could possibly translate things in history, becoming an invaluable economic resource and allowing us to discover details about our planet — or indeed others — that might have remained buried by the sometimes overzealous actions of language planners always wishing to modernize by destroying or devaluing systematically a country or region's heritage.

The examination of the case study above illustrates why the process of language planning is referred to by Fishman (1974) as something that "should not be done", as explored in the introduction. However, it has many advantages, most of which have been touched on. Importantly, it is good for modernisation of countries' languages, which is very much needed in this day and age if citizens of any countries are going to be able to understand the world, and yet also if existing in some cases minority languages are to be preserved in often rural or societally excluded communities.

References

Oxford English Dictionary. *Definition: "Lexicon"*. 2015a.

Oxford English Dictionary. *Definition: "Neologism"*. 2015b.

J.A. Fishman. *Advances in Language Planning*. Contributions to the Sociology of Language [CSL]. De Gruyter, 1974. ISBN 9783111583600.

Karolina Grzech. Planning Language, Planning Identity: A case study of Ecuadorians in London. 2013.

Einar Haugen. Language Planning. *Sociolinguistics*, 1:626–637, 1987.

R.K. Johnson and M. Swain. *Immersion Education: International Perspectives*. Cambridge Applied Linguistics. Cambridge University Press, 1997. ISBN 9780521586559.

R.B. Kaplan and R.B. Baldauf. *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. Language Planning from Practice to Theory. Multilingual Matters, 1997. ISBN 9781853593710.

Marlaine E Lockheed, Adriaan M Verspoor, et al. *Improving primary education in developing countries*. Oxford University Press for World Bank, 1991.

R. Mesthrie, J. Swann, A. Deumert, and L. W. Leap. *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh University Press, 2009. ISBN 9780748638444.