1 Introduction

Language plays a crucial role in social interaction and is an all-important agent in the transmission of cultural and social values. It is shaped by the same political, social, and cultural forces which produce the world’s diverse civilizations and cultures. For example, the spread of the Roman empire throughout Europe between around B.C. 750 and 200 A.D. resulted in the birth of the Romance languages. Could that have been prevented? Had the Romans devised a plan to create a monolingual empire? Surely not, and from today’s point of view, the Romans cannot be said to have practiced a language planning policy. Looking back at the situation, though, it stands out that the profound changes which took place resulted from choices, social and linguistic. Broadly speaking, language planning requires such a sociolinguistic context where choices between alternatives can be made. Clearly, though, since the word “planning” is used, these choices must be of a different nature from those which bring about natural change. In fact, as Fasold (1984: 246) has suggested, language planning is about “explicit” choices. As it turns out, the concepts of “choice,” explicit or not, and “alternatives” are extremely complex. Yet, any attempt to define language planning without apprehending these concepts and addressing the question as to what role languages play in society, and how they can become objects of planning is sure to result in a narrowing of the scope of a phenomenon anchored deep within the dynamics of society.

1.1 The interrelation between language and society

How are linguistic choices made? As it turns out, even in so-called monolingual societies, linguistic choices are the rule. The fact that we say “gonna” instead of “going to” not only says much about our idiosyncratic way of using language, it also points to a number of social facts about the situation and domain of use, and reveals who we are from a sociodemographic and economic point of view. Language use reflects social stratification and is a form of social behavior (Labov, 1972a). Moreover, the study of these variant structures or sociolinguistic variables not only shows that there is social agreement in the use of language, but also that there is agreement as to the meaning of the differentiated use of language. This is why a speech community cannot be solely conceived as a group of speakers who all use the same linguistic forms, but rather “as a group who share the same norms in regard to language” (Fishman, 1971; Labov, 1972a; Bright, Denison, in chapters 5 and 4 of this volume). The same holds true for different varieties of a language where choices run between subtle structural features of phonology, syntax, and lexicon to sometimes dramatically divergent local varieties or even between standard literary languages and altogether different oral varieties (Schiffman, chapter 12). Yet grammatical rules are but one set of the underlying rules speakers have to interiorize. Cultural and social rules are also needed to produce acceptable linguistic and sociolinguistic behavior. It is that competency which enables speakers to adjust to different speech situations and social expectations (Hymes, 1971 [1972]; Kasper, chapter 23).

Choice is further complicated in multilingual societies where speakers must also choose between different languages altogether and thus have to internalize complex linguistic and sociolinguistic rules to cover the entire scope of sociolinguistically acceptable behavior (Gumperz, 1968 [1972]; Clyne, chapter 18). How can a speech community be defined in such a context where different languages are in contact? The answer lies again in the social forces which dictate language use. In these societies, where social prestige and power are unevenly distributed, each variety of a language or each separate language is assigned a functionally differentiated social role, where the prestigious or “High” variety tends to monopolize the official and public
functions while the “Low” or socially less valued variety is reserved for more private domains (Ferguson, 1959 [1972]; Fishman, 1967). Social forces reinforce this diglossic pattern, so that members of speech communities not only develop sociolinguistic competence in accordance with this pattern, they also develop shared norms about each linguistic variety and its usage. For example, a milestone study by Lambert (1967) showed that in the French–English bilingual Québec of the sixties, negative attitudes towards Québec French were not only quite uniformly shared by the English–speaking community but were almost as unanimously held by French–speaking Québécois. These types of situations have brought scholars like Fishman (1971: 28) to define a speech community as “one all of whose members share at least a single speech variety and the norms for its appropriate use.” Thus enlarged, the concept fits a wide variety of sociolinguistic situations worldwide. Yet, to complicate things further, many linguistic choices are not made consciously. Shared norms are based on feelings, on judgments, and attitudes. And since complex speech communities are a composite gathering of subgroups who share different and sometimes divergent norms, language is both a unifying and a separating force which gives rise to such feelings as language loyalty (Garvin, 1973: 27) and nationalism (Fishman, 1972 [1989]). Moreover, it is these same social forces at work within society that set the direction for the future and account for language change, both linguistic and sociolinguistic. It is no wonder then, that language should be envisaged as a societal resource (Jernudd and Das Gupta, 1971) which, like other types of resources, could be shaped to achieve sociopolitical goals. In that sense, language planning is a future-oriented intervention in language which aims to influence language and language use (Rubin and Jernudd, 1971: xvi). By definition it must be a deliberate and conscious choice which might either support and accentuate the ongoing sociolinguistic direction of the speech community, or aim to curb it. However, the question of why language and language use would be planned remains. Who would undertake such a venture? And what exactly does it mean to plan language?

2 Evolution of the Concept

2.1 The standardization approach

Language planning, as a subject of study, has come a long way since 1959 when Haugen (1959 [1968]) gave his definition of the term based on his analysis of the ongoing effort in Norway to modernize, promote, and implement a “national” language. Language planning was then seen as an activity concerned mainly with the internal aspects of language; It consisted in “preparing a normative orthography, grammar, and dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogeneous speech community” (Haugen, 1959 [1968: 673]). It aimed to solve problems related to “the presence of conflicting norms whose relative status needs to be assigned” (Haugen, 1983: 270) or else it addressed the “language problems” of the developing nations through “graphization,” “standardization,” and “modernization” (Ferguson, 1968). The language planner’s main task resided, within a social framework of conflicting languages, in the choice of the language or languages to be standardized, and in the choice of types of interventions, aiming at “regulating and improving existing languages or creating new common regional, national or international languages” (Tauli, 1968: 27). The comprehension of the whole process was akin to the “standardization” process as defined by Weinreich (1954 [1968: 314]) and Tauli (1968: 27).

2.2 The social components of the concept

At the time, language planning was seen as “a process of more or less conscious, planned, and centralized regulation of language” (Weinreich, 1954 [1968: 314], my emphasis). But, for Haugen, it consisted, even then, in “a deliberate” and thus conscious effort to intervene in the future of a language, this intervention being based on “knowledge concerning the past” (Haugen, 1959 [1968: 674]). Moreover, the whole process implied a decision, by the planners, as to the desired direction of language change. And although the end result was a “standard language,” there was an awareness of the social components of such a linguistic product which was described by Haugen (1959 [1968: 674]) as aving “two mutually supporting aspects, on the one hand a generally accepted orthography, and on the other a prestige dialect imitated by the socially ambitious.”

Since then, the concept of language planning has been refined to encompass both linguistic and sociolinguistic, economic and political aspects of the integration of language in society (as in Rubin and Jernudd, 1971; Weinstein, 1980; Weinstein, 1990).

2.3 The management and social planning approach

This broadening of the scope has led some scholars to approach language planning within a general social planning framework. Language is seen as a “societal resource,” language planning a “decision-making” process seeking to solve “language problems” (Jernudd and Das Gupta, 1971: 211) or, in a more sociopolitical perspective, “communication problems” (Weinreich, 1980). This has led some to adopt a
management point of view regarding language policies (Jernudd and Das Gupta, 1971) and to analyze it from a socioeconomic perspective (Thorburn, 1971; Jernudd, 1971; Grin, 1992).

Alongside these concerns, language planning studies taking into account societal multilingualism (Fishman, 1968; Fishman, Ferguson, and Das Gupta, 1968) helped develop an analytical framework. Such sociolinguistic concepts as language maintenance and shift, language dominance, linguistic minorities and diglossia, nationalism, nationism and ethnicity, became more and more of a concern to language planning scholars (Fishman, 1972). Emphasis was given to sociopsychological aspects of language behavior. Attitudes were seen as an all-important factor underlying language and sociolinguistic usage, language diffusion and change (Lambert, 1967; Cooper and Fishman, 1974; Giles, 1977; Cooper, 1982). Thus language planning is becoming a more integral part of sociolinguistics.

3 The Language Planning Components

If change in language and language use is the main target of the planning process, it is clear that, although linguistic variables are affected, language planning decisions and their implementation are motivated by nonlinguistic variables (Garvin, 1973: 24).

3.1 Language planning problems and goals

The devising of a language planning policy implies a vision of a future sociolinguistic situation that should be brought about. Yet surprisingly little effort has been made in trying to identify the objectives pursued. Language planning policies sometimes seem to develop as an afterthought following a period of sociopolitical turmoil such as when a country gains independence or when a political party is overthrown. Norway, for example, gained independence in 1814 and declared that the affairs of State would be carried on in the Norwegian language. Yet, until the 1880s, no indication was given as to which linguistic variety of Norwegian would be used.

Language policies are generally seen as a way of solving "language" or "communication problems" (Jernudd and Das Gupta, 1971; Weinstein, 1980). The different ways of dealing with these "problems" have led to the identification of three main types of objectives (Rabin, 1971; Rubin, 1984). Policies are said to pursue extralinguistic aims when they deal with changes in the social distribution of competing languages. For example, the spread of Swahili in Eastern and Central Africa (where it is an official language in Kenya and Tanzania, and a national language in Uganda) has important consequences, in that it deprives a number of native languages of political recognition. As for policies which seek to establish or change writing and orthographic systems, or to promote the spread of a specific pronunciation or linguistic variety, they are said to carry semilingual aims, since these types of interventions also have social and political consequences. For example, the fact that use of the Cyrillic script has been encouraged since the 1940s in the Republics of the former USSR, instead of the Latin script which had been previously imposed (in the 1920s), has important social repercussions in that it facilitates the acquisition of the Russian language, which uses Cyrillic, and thus makes cultural assimilation easier (Lewis, 1983: 322–3; Rubin, 1984: 8–9). Finally, when policies deal with vocabulary enrichment, standardization, and other types of intervention leading to the promotion of a linguistic norm, such as those of the French and Spanish language academies, they are classified as having linguistic objectives. Nahir (1984) lists 11 objectives ranging from language "purification," "standardization," and "modernization," through language "revival," "maintenance," and "spread" to "interlinguistic communication" at the national and international level.

Although these typologies are useful in sorting out specific aims, they do not encompass the full range of the underlying goals pursued by language planners and they do not yet constitute a comprehensive framework from which to classify and analyze the different types of language planning processes. As Rubin (1984: 9) has pointed out, the explication of goals is essential if any worthwhile evaluation of language planning is to be considered. Setting out the goals can help to minimize the distortion of the original goals as well as any backlash or boomerang effect which sometimes happen during the implementation phase. However, no clear–cut line can be drawn between the different types of objectives so that, in the long run, even linguistic aims serve sociopolitical goals. That is why language planning is more and more often seen as a way to resolve social, economic, and political problems through interventions in language (Weinstein, 1980: 56).

It is sociopolitical objectives which are pursued by language planning policies. This explains why the implementation of such goals–derived policies sometimes results in social turmoil. This aspect of language planning poses important ideological – and ethical – issues which must be dealt with in order to understand the whole process. In this frame of mind, Cobarrubias (1983: 63–6) has identified four language ideologies which motivate the undertaking of language reforms: "linguistic pluralism," "linguistic assimilation,"
"vernacularization," and "internationalism."

**Linguistic pluralism**

Linguistic pluralism promotes the "coexistence of different language groups and their right to maintain and cultivate their languages on an equitable basis" (Cobarrubias, 1983: 65). This can be achieved in a number of ways. For example, it might give rise to territorially based or individually based policies, or any combination of the two (Wardhaugh, 1992: 348). In Belgium, for example, French is officially recognized in the south, Flemish in the north, German in the east, while Brussels forms a bilingual French–Flemish district. The United States has also promoted some forms of pluralism at different times in its history, as when Louisiana was granted official bilingual status prior to its statehood (Cobarrubias, 1983: 65). Since 1968, Louisiana has adopted a law to promote the development of French. In Hawaii, the Hawaiian language was given official status alongside English in 1978. As for the rest of the States, although no federal law declares English the official language of the USA, and the State of New York officially tolerates the use of languages other than English, English had been given official status in at least 17 states by 1992 (Leclerc, 1992: 314–24). The US Bilingual Education Act of 1968 provides for bilingual programs designed to meet the needs of limited English-speaking students. This program, however, has many detractors, some of whom say that in reality, it does not pursue pedagogical improvement and cultural maintenance, but is actually a step towards acculturation of the minorities, since it is used as a transitory measure to the use of English as the sole language of education (Gray, 1987).

Although a policy based on a linguistic pluralism appears to be a democratic way of dealing with coexisting linguistic varieties, it nevertheless has its own weaknesses. Canada, for example, has a language policy based on both territorial and individual rights. Both French and English are recognized as official languages and speakers of both languages have access to public services in their own language (1969 and 1988 Official Languages Act, as well as the 1982 Constitution incorporating the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms). Yet, this policy has failed to reduce the rate of assimilation of French-speaking minorities living in Western Canada where the overwhelming majority is English-speaking. In New Brunswick, the only officially bilingual province of Canada (since 1969), French speakers find it hard to assert their rights even though they make up 34.5 percent of the provincial population (1991 census). As far as the province of Québec is concerned, in spite of the fact that French speakers form the majority (825 percent in 1991) and that they have, since 1977, their own linguistic legislation declaring French the official language of Québec ("The Charter of the French Language"), it seeks political separation from Canada, partly because French-speaking Québécois, who represent 24.6 percent of the total 1991 Canadian population, nonetheless see themselves as a linguistic minority within Canada and fear for their language and culture.

**Linguistic assimilation and nationalism**

Nationalism often favors linguistic assimilation to make sure that every member of a speech community is able to use the dominant language (Cobarrubias, 1983: 63–4). This results in transferring prestige to and asserting the superiority of the dominant language. In extreme cases, linguistic minorities are given little or no rights. Revolutionary eighteenth-century France, which put forth one of the first modern language planning policies, pursued such a goal when the government planned to annihilate the French “patois” and other peripheral varieties spoken in France. Primary schooling was to be in standard French exclusively, and French was decreed the sole language of the law. In 1832, use of the orthographic rules approved by the French Academy became compulsory (Walter, 1988: 116). Russification of the former Soviet Union is another example of a linguistic assimilation. In 1938, a federal law stipulated that all non-Russian schools had to teach Russian as a second language. Although a subsequent 1958 law granted liberty of choice as to the language of education, the Russian language remained mandatory in all schools, alongside the national languages. In most Russian Republics, Russian remained in effect the language of education, so much so that students could study all through the primary and secondary levels in the Russian language. In Estonia, Moldavia, and Lithuania, the right to monolingual teaching in the national language was recognized, although some bilingual schools were permitted (Leclerc, 1992: 119–20).

Assimilation policies are sometimes repressive. For example, Indonesia practices a rather successful linguistic assimilation policy with Bahasa Indonesia. However, the inhabitants of Timor and Irian Jaya resent this policy. Yet, use of the indigenous languages is discouraged (Gauthier et al., 1993: 29).

The nation–state ideology, which, especially since the nineteenth century, greatly changed Europe's geopolitical map (Fishman, 1972 [1989: 97–175]), has gone hand in hand with the tendency to adopt a “national” or “official” language (Deutsch, 1968; Wardhaugh, 1992: 346), which endangered less socially powerful languages. Today, although there are some 185 recorded languages within Europe's 40 states, only 35 of these have official status (Grimes, 1988; Leclerc, 1992: 54). The situation is even more complex in other continents, where 155 states grant official status to 69 languages of a total of approximately 6,000
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It is important to distinguish between official languages, which have the State's official recognition and are usually designated for use in official and public domains, and national languages, spoken by the majority of the people, and, in general, native to a country or State. National languages can be recognized officially as such and be used in public domains, usually in education. They nonetheless have an inferior status with regard to the official language. Whatever the official status granted to languages, it is clear that only a small number of the world's languages are thus recognized, and that the majority of the world's languages have a minority status, politically speaking.

Minority status cannot be defined on the basis of a language's demographic strength alone. Some scholars therefore speak of "minorized" languages and linguistic communities (Daoust and Maurais, 1987: 16). In Madagascar, for example, only 1 percent of the population speaks French, yet French was the only official language until independence in 1960, when Malagasy was also given official status (Leclerc, 1992: 495–8). A sophisticated concept of linguistic minority takes into account not only geographic distribution, but also ethnic, sociocultural, and political factors, as well as the resulting sociolinguistic status. The historical status (indigenous or immigrant) of the community may also, in some situations, constitute an integral part of the definition.

**Purism**

Purism is closely akin to the ideology of linguistic assimilation, and brings about similar results. It can best be described in terms of feelings and attitudes towards an ideal form of a language, usually in a written state, and dissociated from everyday speech. This form of language is associated with specific aesthetic and sometimes moral values which represent the speech community's social ideal and is the norm (Labov, 1972a). Its mastery ensures social recognition and is therefore promoted by social institutions such as the educational system (Bourdieu, 1982), or official organizations such as language academies (L. and J. Milroy, 1991). As a result, deviant varieties have negative connotations, their use being discouraged in public domains. Purism developed in conjunction with Europe's drive towards the nation-state which is endowed with a national language, a separate language for each "nation" (Deutsch, 1968; Lodge, 1993: 2–3).

**Internationalism**

Internationalism, the ideology which consists in adopting a nonindigenous language of wider communication either as an official language or as language of instruction (Cobarrubias, 1983: 66) underlies the language planning policies of several postcolonial countries. In Gabon, for example, French is the sole official language; in Cameroon both French and English are official languages, while in Haiti Creole is recognized officially alongside French. Such a choice is motivated by the fact that international languages facilitate sociocultural, economic, and political communication with other countries and access to science and technology. In some countries where a large number of languages coexist, a language of wider communication is felt to be the answer to communication problems. It is also a way of avoiding the choice between two or more competing national languages.

Adoption of an international language is expected to promote modernization and participation in world trade and technology. However, on the negative side, it reinforces the minorization of indigenous languages. For example, in Madagascar, only 1 percent of the population is competent in French, one of its official languages, while the rest of the population speak only Malagasy. The fact that the official international language is usually spoken by a socially powerful elite not only reinforces the prestige of this language, but also invests the elite with ever more sociopolitical power. This situation is further complicated where the national language is not written or has only recently been provided with a system of writing and orthography. This ideology shows how nationalistic feelings can clash with socioeconomic and political realities. This exemplifies the distinction put forward by Fishman (1972 [1989: 109]) between "nationalism," characterized by feelings of uniqueness and the desire to develop culturally and otherwise, and "nationism" which pertains to the more pragmatic problems of fulfilling these expectations.

**Vernacularization**

Vernacularization is an alternative to this kind of nationism. Indigenous or national languages are restored or modernized and officially recognized in lieu of or alongside an international language of wider communication (Co-barrubias, 1983: 66). Madagascar, where French and Malagasy both enjoy official status, is an example (Leclerc, 1992: 495–8). In 1978, as part of a general nationalization program, Malagasy was declared the language of education at the primary and part of the secondary levels, with French introduced as a second language in the second grade of the primary level. However, two kinds of problems have arisen. First, although Madagascar has a literacy rate of 44 percent (1986 statistics: Grimes, 1988: 254), standard
Malagasy is spoken only by a small educated minority, which makes teaching in Malagasy difficult. Second, standard Malagasy has serious shortcomings as a language of education and, although it has undergone a standardization process since at least 1835 when it was used to translate the Bible, it is at present undergoing a process of desstandardization (Bemananjara, 1987) and must be further modernized in order to become the language of education at the university level. Meanwhile, French continues to be used as the principal written language (Bemananjara, 1987: 311). By sending their children to French schools, the educated elites perpetuate the colonial diglossic model (Leclerc, 1992: 497).

Vernacularization sometimes involves the restoration of a literary language, as in Algeria and Tunisia, where Classical Arabic is now the official language in lieu of French (since 1976 in Tunisia and 1989 in Algeria). This poses special problems since Classical Arabic, a written language, is far removed from everyday “Dialectal Arabic” (Grandguillaume, 1990). Vernacularization policies can furthermore involve writing and orthography reforms, e.g., the adoption of the Roman alphabet for Turkish in the late 1920s. The writing of dictionaries and grammars, as for the Sami language of the northern parts of Scandinavia at the present time, is yet another aspect.

An extreme case of Vernacularization is found in Israel, where a religious language, Hebrew, was revived and installed as a national language.

### 3.2 Making choices and the fact-finding process

Identifying problems and establishing goals is no small task, and the end results do not always match the original plan. Nonetheless, choices are made and they shape the future sociolinguistic reality. Ideally, these choices are based on comprehensive knowledge of the sociolinguistic context. Rubin (1971: 218) has suggested that the first step in determining a language policy consists in “fact-finding” where the policy-maker investigates the “existing setting to ascertain what the problems are, as viewed both by persons who will execute the plan and by persons who will be the targets of the plan.” All parameters of society should be scrutinized, social, cultural, political, and economic. The planner should be aware “of the social direction of each of these parameters”; otherwise, it will be impossible to carry out any plan. Goals should be established only after a thorough fact-finding program.

Such a program is time-consuming. It assumes a management-like approach within a decision-making model, as well as the participation of many specialists. Moreover, it implies the willpower to devise a blueprint for society and requires substantial financial resources. Few language-planning policies come close to this ideal. In some ways, Québec can be regarded as a model of language-planning policy and strategy. Its policy has taken the form of comprehensive linguistic legislation which clearly states the goals and objectives pursued, as well as the social philosophy underlying the law. The use of French is presented as a right and, in a way, this linguistic law has some of the characteristics of a constitution. By declaring French the “official language of Québec,” the Charter of the French Language (Bill 101), in effect since 1977, states that it aims to make French the language of the State, as well as the “normal” language of work, teaching, communications, commerce, and business.

Target populations and domains are clearly identified and range from legislation and justice, the public sector and all intra- and intergovernmental communications, public signs and posters, commercial advertising, municipal and educational institutions, health and social services, as well as public utilities, professional corporations, and education from kindergarten to the secondary level. French is declared the language of work, commerce, and business. Firms of the private sector are required to offer their services in French and to ensure that French is the language of work at all levels.9

Québec’s French language law was directly linked and in some way the actualization of recommendations issuing from a far-reaching sociolinguistic study carried out from 1968 to 1972 for the government of Québec, by the “Commission of Inquiry on the Situation of the French Language and on Linguistic Rights in Québec.” In its final report, members of the Commission concluded that Québec Francophones formed a demographic and cultural majority, but a socioeconomic minority with respect to Anglophones, in Québec, Canada, and North America, and that French had to be preserved through different public means, including legislation, if necessary. Thus, even though Canada already had, since 1½%, federal legislation declaring French an official language of Canada alongside English, the Québec government saw fit to legislate for language use in its territory.

### 3.3 Who are the policy-makers and what type of plans do they devise?

Who is responsible for establishing a language-planning policy, and what types of policies can be devised? In Canada, the (federal and provincial) governments assume the responsibility of setting up language-planning programs. This seems to be the trend nowadays, and although there are few pieces of legislation as
Language has been an object of legislation for a long time. For example, the English government passed the "Statute of Pleading" law in 1362, making English the language used orally in court, Latin being the official written language of court and justice. The present-day tendency to promote linguistic reform through legal and official means does not prevent individuals playing an important role in language reforms. Linguistic change is often brought about by individuals and organizations who exert pressure on governments, embodying the aspirations of their speech community. Pressure groups sometimes gain official recognition and become instrumental in language reform programs. In Israel, for example, a language committee was set up in 1890 by Ben-Yehuda to promote Hebrew as a vernacular language. In 1922 this committee achieved the recognition by the Palestine government of Hebrew as an official language, alongside English and Arabic. In 1953 this committee became the Hebrew Academy.

Two other individuals who played a central role in a language-planning endeavor were Ivar Aasen (1813–96) and Knud Knudsen (1812–95) who devised and promoted a "national" language for Norway when it gained independence from Denmark in 1814. Their course of action is instructive in more ways than one. Aasen's view of Norway's linguistic problems led him to search for the most authentic Norwegian linguistic structures, which he found in the oldest rural speech varieties. He went on to "create" a new language from composite parts of these different varieties, which he named the "Lands-mar'(national language). It turned out, however, that his linguistic sources were less prestigious than the urban linguistic varieties used by the social elites, and thus proved hard to promote in the long run, although, at first, nationalistic feelings gave it a head start in spite of the fact that it had no native speakers (Haugen, 1959 [1968]; Gundersen, 1985). Knudsen, on the other hand, put forth a project aiming at adapting written Danish to an already existing Norwegian variety. The resulting Dano-Norwegian, later to be called the "Ryksmål" (State language), was based on two prestigious urban varieties. These two attempts to solve Norway's linguistic problems led into an impasse. In the 1880s both varieties were adopted officially and they have been in competition ever since. This example not only shows how profound an influence individuals can have, it demonstrates how risky language planning can be and how important it is to understand and evaluate the dynamics of society before embarking on such an endeavor.

The Norwegian situation poses another interesting problem in that the two competing varieties are in fact intercomprehensible (Haugen, 1959 [1968: 6771]. In a sense, the present-day situation is not altogether different from the initial nineteenth-century situation. It has been argued (Jernudd, 1987: 499) that the local varieties or dialects of each of the national Scandinavian languages are more linguistically distant than the standard varieties of these languages. But, whatever the linguistic status of both languages, the wish to put an end to 400 years of Danish control was reason enough to promote a "purely Norwegian" language. And even though the use of the Danish written form of language may not have represented a real communication problem for at least part of the population, the Norwegians felt their language stood apart. This brings to the fore the fact that language cannot be solely defined by its linguistic specificities, nor by its communicative capacities. Judgment of its speakers as to its legitimacy and status has to be taken into account.

3.4 The specific objects of planning: The corpus–status distinction

What is the object of language planning where it is seen as part of social planning? Although it is hard to draw a line between specific objects of planning, the corpus/status dichotomy introduced by Kloss provides useful heuristics. It emphasizes the dual nature of language planning, that is, its concern with both the linguistic and social aspects of language. "Corpus planning" refers to all actions aiming at modifying "the nature of the language itself" (Kloss, 1969: 81), while "status planning" is concerned with whether the social status of a language should be lowered or raised (Kloss 1969: 81). This dichotomy has set the trend in language planning studies for the past 25 years (as in Cobarrubias and Fishman, 1983; Laforge, 1987; Maurais, 1987; Weinstein, 1990; Marshall, 1991). However, corpus and status planning cannot be separated from each other. Care must be taken not to oversimplify the dichotomy. Language-planning policies can never be corpus-oriented or status-oriented exclusively. Another look at Québec's language–planning policy reveals that although the foremost aim was to promote the Francophones and build a new social image of French in order to improve its socioeconomic prestige, this was achieved in part by terminology planning using corpus–planning methods. In an evaluation study of terminological usage in commercial enterprises, I
have shown that the social forces at work in speech communities at large are also at work in the micro-
speech communities of enterprises. Norms develop about language and language use in much the same way
in both types of speech communities, and these language norms are all about social prestige. As a result of
terminology work in a firm, French technical terms may not be used with much higher frequency, but they
gain legitimacy and workers at all levels develop favorable attitudes towards these terms (Daoust, 1991a, b;
1992, 1994). This example illustrates the effect of corpus planning on the status of a language.

3.5 Implementation

It is impossible to control all of the factors involved in language planning, social, political, and linguistic. Yet
an overall implementation plan is the most promising precaution for avoiding haphazard results (Rubin,
1971; Cooper, 1989). The Norwegian case exemplifies the risks involved in the failure to design an
implementation plan beforehand. Aasen's and Knudsen's proposed language norms gained recognition partly
due to the nationalistic spirit of the time, and partly due to the fact that as schoolteachers they had access to
the education system. When, by the end of the 1880s, the government took charge of language planning, it
more or less adopted their diffusion method. As time went by, however, it developed a more formal
implementation program, mainly through setting up language committees charged with the task of creating
linguistic forms for each of the two official varieties of Norwegian. Having to deal with two competing
varieties soon proved awkward and costly. In 1909 the government therefore undertook the risk of fusing
the two into one. But this decision came too late, because the population was divided in its linguistic
allegiance. In 1963 the government appointed a “language peace” committee which was to promote the dual
linguistic heritage. This committee recommended the abandonment of the linguistic fusion policy (Haugen,
1983: 285). Thus the Norwegian government was forced to withdraw gradually from direct intervention. In a
way, in spite of all the language reforms undertaken, Norway’s implementation program was primarily
focused on linguistic aspects, paying too little attention to the social side. The overall failure of the language
reform policy exemplifies the fact that implementation of language planning decisions depends on
nonlinguistic variables (Garvin, 1973: 24). As a result of his comprehensive investigation of this case, Haugen
(1983: 275) proposed that the implementation phase be considered an educational process. This is what we
see in his twofold descriptive model which accounts for both of the linguistic and the societal aspects of
language planning.\(^{11}\)

Table 27.1 Haugen’s 1983 model of language planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society (status planning)</th>
<th>Form (policy planning)</th>
<th>Function (language cultivation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Selection (of norm) (decision procedures)</td>
<td>3 Implementation (educational spread)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) identification of problem</td>
<td>(a) correction procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) allocation of norms</td>
<td>(b) evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (corpus planning)</td>
<td>2 Codification (of norm) (standardization procedures)</td>
<td>4 Elaboration (functional development)(^{12})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) graphization</td>
<td>(a) terminological modernization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) grammaticalization</td>
<td>(b) stylistic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) lexicalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study of well-documented cases such as Norway's has helped to make implementation a built-in aspect
of modern language planning policies. For example, the implementation process is specified in Québé's
language law itself. The 1977 “Charter of the French Language” requires of large private enterprises that they
obtain a “certificate of Francization” attesting that French is the language of work, or that the firm is
implementing a “Francization program” aiming at satisfying the requirements of the law. The law stipulates
the details of the administrative procedure involved in the Francization process of the firm from the moment
it has to apply for the certificate, all the way to the content of the Francization program it must devise. Such
program requires: (1) knowledge of French by all personnel, including management; (2) use of French as a
working language and in internal and external communication, whenever possible; (3) use of French in the
firm’s working documents, especially manuals and catalogues; (4) use of French in communication with
clients, suppliers, and the public; (5) use of French terminology; (6) use of French in advertising; and (7)
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adoption of policies for hiring, promotion, and transfer which favor Francophones (article 141 of the law). In accordance with its exhaustive nature, the Charter specifies the mechanisms for the implementation of the policy. Three agencies were thus established to carry out the Francization mandate. One of these, the “Office de la langue franchise” (French Language Board), oversees the application of the law, and the design and dissemination of French terminology. All other domains covered by the law are dealt with in similar detail. As a result, although there were some complaints when the law was first enacted, the explicitness of the process helped its implementation and facilitated its acceptance (Bourhis, 1984; Daoust, 1984, 1990). Of course, the law made necessary the creation of a large administrative apparatus. Yet, in retrospect and in comparison with other language-planning projects, such as the Norwegian one, for example, the investment has paid off since there has been no social upheaval and the law has accomplished most of its objectives, at least from a socioeconomic point of view (Vaillancourt, 1993).

3.6 Evaluation

The last important component of language planning is evaluation. Remember that evaluation should be an integral part of the process, since language planning is a long-term future-oriented effort to change language and language use. Once a speech community has embarked on such an endeavor, there is no telling when it stops. Objectives must be periodically re-assessed, as well as implementation procedures. Since planned change usually interferes or at least intertwines with natural change, policies sometimes have to be adapted to new situations. For example, until recently no need was felt in France to protect the French language. However, under increased pressure from the spread of English, France in the early 1970s started to adopt measures for the defense of the French language. In 1972 Terminology Commissions were established, charged with the diffusion of French technical terms, and a law was enacted in 1975 to further prescribe the use of French in specific public domains. In 1994 the French government proposed yet another law regulating language use, requiring offenders to pay a fine. These measures come at a time when linguistic minorities all over the world seek to ascertain their linguistic rights. For example, in 1992 the majority of the members of the European Council adopted the European Charter of Regional and Minority Languages, thereby recognizing regional and minority languages as part of Europe’s cultural heritage and committing themselves to adopt measures for the protection and promotion of these languages. At the same time the European Community faces the task of devising a language policy which must take into account the sociopolitical and economic needs of all its members. Minority protection is only one priority on its agenda (Coulmas, 1991a, b).

4 Conclusion

Language reforms rely on attitudes about language, on the shared norms of speech communities, both linguistic and sociolinguistic, and on nationalistic feelings and the resulting sociolinguistic dynamics relating to change. Change in linguistic behavior and in attitudes is what language planning is all about. However, in the long run, unguided sociolinguistic forces dictate the course of action. It is these forces that language planners must learn how to shape. Change is a time-related phenomenon, and in some ways, it is hard to evaluate its impact, and harder still to assess if it is to be attributed to language policies, which after all are only one of the factors shaping speech communities. In a sense, language-planning policies can best be evaluated through their symbolic impact. If it is true, as Cooper (1989: 184) claims, that language planning is more likely to succeed with respect to attitude than with respect to behavior, it must also be realized that, in the long run, it is attitudes which lead to change.

1 See Lodge (1993) for a sociolinguistic type of analysis of the “birth” of French.

2 For an account of different studies whose results support this assumption, see L. Milroy, 1987.

3 N.B. In a 1977 study, right after Québec had passed a linguistic legislation in favor of French, Bourhis has shown that English was still perceived as being prestigious by French-speaking Québécois (1984).

4 The 1988 edition of Grimes lists 6,170 different languages used throughout the world.


6 As far as the other continents are concerned, the statistics are as follows: America has 6 official languages, 39 states, and 938 recorded languages; Asia has 37 official languages, 47 states, and 913 recorded languages; Africa has 16 official languages, 52 states, and 1,918 recorded languages; and Oceania has 10 official languages, 17 states, and 1,216 recorded languages (Grimes, 1988; Leclerc, 1992: 56–9).

7 Actually, only a small number of the world’s languages are used extensively. According to Leclerc (1992: 51–67), 9 percent of the world’s population uses 3 percent of all languages, which means that some languages are used by
very few people, so much so that more than 95 percent of all languages could be endangered.


10 Wardhaugh (1992: 28–30) cites a few similar cases, among them the one about speakers of Cantonese and Mandarin, who say they share the same language although the two dialects are not mutually intelligible.

11 This is a revised model of his initial 1966 one which has served as an inspiration for most language planning scholars.

12 “Elaboration” corresponds more or less to what Neustupný (1970) calls “cultivation” although the latter seems to have a broader meaning in that it refers to the treatment of problems related to matters of correctness, efficiency, specialized functions, style, constraints on communicative competence, etc. (as seen in Rubin, 1973: 3–4). Haugen’s notion refers more specifically to modernization of vocabulary and style.
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