Language Planning and Policy: Recent Trends, Future Directions

Richard B. Baldauf Jr.
School of Education, University of Queensland, Australia
rbaldauf@bigpond.com, rbaldauf@uq.edu.au, http://www.cilp.net/

A framework for and overview of the key elements of language planning is presented covering status planning, corpus planning, language-in-education planning, prestige planning and critical approaches to language planning. Within each of these areas, key articles outlining important recent directions are discussed indicating the field's new found sense of vitality.

Introduction

In this presentation a framework for and an overview of key elements of language policy and planning are presented. Following a brief introduction to the field that examines some general key issues and provides a possible framework for the types of activities that define the field, five sections cover the four archetypal areas of principal interest to language planners, i.e. status planning, corpus planning, language-in-education planning, and prestige planning, while a final section examines critical approaches to language planning, with particular emphasis on minority language rights. Within each of these areas, key articles outlining important recent directions are discussed.

The recent publication of two new journals in the field, *Current Issues in Language Planning* (2000- <http://www.cilp.net/>) and *Language Policy* (2002-), the revitalization of an old one (*Language Problems and Language Planning*), the development of book series by Kluwer Academic (*Language Policy* – Amara & Mar'i, 2002; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003; Grenoble, 2003) and by Multilingual Matters (*Language Planning and Policy* – Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004); and the founding of a number of discipline-related journals (e.g. *Language, Identity and Education* <http://www.language-policy.org/>) and publications that take a critical perspective on language planning is indicative of the field's new-found sense of vitality.

General Issues

Language policy (statements of intent) and planning (implementation) (LPP) is defined as planning – often large scale and national, usually undertaken by governments – meant to influence, if not change, ways of speaking or literacy practices within a society. The "language engineering" practices on which the discipline was to be based emerged after the Second World War, but it only began to form as a discipline in the late 1960s (see, e.g. Fishman, 1968; Fox, 1975; Rubin & Jernudd, 1971). Theorizing the field was an early preoccupation (e.g., Ferguson, 1968; Fishman, 1974; Haarmann, 1990; Haugen, 1983; Hornberger, 1994; Nahir, 1984; Neustupný, 1974), but there is still no generally agreed upon framework for the discipline[1]. A framework that draws together much of this work Baldauf (2005) is provided in Table 1. It takes a goal orientation to the four activity types (i.e., status planning, corpus planning, language-in-education planning, and prestige planning) typically used to define the discipline and examines these across policy and cultivation planning (see Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003 for examples), and suggests that awareness of such goals may be overt (explicit, planned) or covert (implicit, unplanned), and may occur at several different levels (macro, meso, and micro).

It is to be noted that other ways of framing the discipline are possible (e.g., language management; Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003) and that while the four sets of activity types and their goals make sense for descriptive-pedagogical purposes, this makes them, of necessity, overly simplistic. In practice, language policy and planning goals normally are multiple and more complex, often cutting across activity types and sometimes coming into conflict with one another.

In this paper, I'd like to suggest four possible general developments, each with future implications for the directions of field[2] that arise out chapters written for the *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. These chapters were developed around the language policy and planning framework that has been previously presented:

- *Levels of language planning*. While much of the research cited in LPP has as its focus polity or macro level language policy and planning, there is an increasing interest in micro planning. While the former has important implications for agenda setting and the allocation of resources, the latter – although under-represented in the literature – looks more closely at specific practice and is becoming of greater interest (e.g., Baldauf, 2004).

- *Covert language planning*. The failure to make LPP explicit, or even to address some language issues at all (i.e., (in)decisions) – while it may seem in the context of language planning to be an oxymoron – effects how languages are learned and taught, and/or how they are contextualized and viewed (Baldauf, 1994; Eggington, 2002)

- *Who are the planners and what are their roles?* As LPP has moved from being viewed as a set of scientific procedures to having a focus on context, the role and motivations of planners has taken on greater importance (e.g., Ager, 2001; Baldauf & Kaplan, 2003).

- *Planning for Compulsory Early Foreign Language Learning, especially English (ESL/EFL/EIL)*. In many countries around the world, there is a move through LPP to increase exposure at an early age to foreign languages (especially English) in the hopes of increasing proficiency to join the knowledge economy. The development and impact of these programs and their impact on national, minority, indigenous and the teaching of other additional languages is a matter for LPP consideration.

These issues are illustrated to varying extents in each of the four types of language planning activities which we will now examine.

Status Planning

In a review of status planning in the context of teaching and learning second languages, van Els (2005) examines such high-level planning questions as "Which second languages should be known, learned and taught?", "What aspects of the language(s) chosen should be known, learned and taught, i.e., which variety and to what level?", "Who should learn them and to whom should they be taught?", and

"When should learning begin and under what circumstances?", and the particular needs for second languages that lie beneath such choices. These issues are illustrated in particular by examples from the Netherlands and Europe more generally.

The review argues that there are four aspects related to the status of second languages: 1) their status for their own communicative purposes, 2) their role as second languages – as a lingua franca or as a language of instruction, 3) their role as immigrant or ethnic minority languages and 4) the degree to which promotion of second language impacts on linguistic or language rights. All of these aspects need to be taken into account when making status planning decisions. Van Els argues however that whatever the status purposes, that status planning decisions should be based on community needs. The review then focuses on the nature of needs and how these needs can be identified, and therefore planned for through status planning. Finally, van Els argues that there is an adequate knowledge base and theoretical framework to tackle all status problems in the field of second language learning and teaching, but that there still seems to be a preference for uninformed laymen (politicians) developing policies without any recourse to empirical findings or advice. (Raises issues of covert planning, who are the planners, early foreign language learning)

Corpus Planning

In a review of the second archetypical area (Liddicoat, 2005) examines what is known about corpus planning and its relation to language teaching and research. Corpus planning – with its focus on the nature of the language to be taught and learned – is the activity area most dependent on linguistic input for its methodology, but it is shaped by status planning decisions, its output contributes in a major way to language-in-education planning and it may contribute to, or benefit from, the prestige that a language has in the community. Liddicoat initially describes in some detail the research foundations for the corpus planning process (i.e., codification – graphization, grammatication and lexication, and elaboration – lexical development, stylistic development, renovation), providing examples related both to polities and languages. Having an understanding of this process provides a basis for the production of corpus planning products, more specifically syllabus development and materials development. It is at this point that the language teaching and learning implications of corpus planning become most evident, particularly as teachers are often involved in syllabus and materials development and modification for use in classrooms. One issue that is becoming of growing concern as English language teaching expands, and is the increasingly use of English as a lingua franca between non-native speakers. That many teaching materials are developed by and reference cultural norms of L1 communities, are becoming a major corpus planning concern (e.g., Kirkpatrick, 2002). In addition, questions are being raised in such contexts as to whether the canonical literature, or local and regional texts are most suitable as vehicles for teaching (e.g., Xu, 2002).

Language-in-Education Planning

In their review of language-in-education policy and planning (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2005), sometimes known as acquisition policy, it was noted that language-in-education policy and planning often constitutes the sole language planning activity

in many polities, but that such activities are limited in their impact by slow rates of dissemination, a limited audience and often a lack of resources. While language-in-education planning occurs most often in schools, it also implicates less systematic teaching situations in the community or the workplace. (Baldauf & Ingram, 2003; Corson, 1999; Ingram, 1990; Tollefson, 2002a)

The chapter goes on to examine seven key language-in education policy (i.e., access policy, personnel policy, curriculum policy, methodology and materials policy, resourcing policy, community policy, evaluation policy) and four key language in education planning (i.e., language maintenance, language reacquisition, foreign / second language learning, language shift) goals by looking at examples of the implementation of these goals in three polities: Japan, Sweden and North Korea. A number of general implications for language-in-education are then drawn from these descriptions and those from other similar polity studies available in the published literature.

Prestige / Image Planning

Noting that prestige or image planning is not a well developed area within LPP, Ager (2005) suggests that it may initially be helpful for readers to look at three examples: Wales, Malaysia and Québec. The examination of LPP in these polities suggests that there may be three separate activities that underlie prestige planning. First, image (prestige) seems to be related to ethnic or civic *identity* (real or imagined) and the promotion of a language, as in the case of Québec. Second, image seems to be used to describe a *method* of implementing and manipulating language policy as in Wales. Finally, image has something to do with *motive* and the activities of language planners themselves, and the communities they plan for, as in Malaysia and increasingly Québec. Each of these three notions of image is explored in detail, bringing in further examples to illustrate these categorizations. In the final section, Ager illustrates how various aspects, of motivation related to powerful states and powerless communities, contribute to language policy development (Also see, Ager, 2001). Issues of prestige or image have implications what languages are studied and for the implementation of minority language rights. Ingram (2004) provides a personal narrative that suggests how individuals can seek to influence the standing and prestige of languages.

Minority Language Rights

As work in LPP has become more directly engaged in its socio-historical connections with the communities in which language policy and planning occurs, issues of minority language rights (MLR), sometimes referred to as linguistic human rights, are raised. The chapter discusses the often complex and contested nature of the interaction between LPP and MLR highlighting the wider socio-historical, socio-cultural and socio-political analysis of LPP, particularly as it relates to he question of the status, use and power of minority languages in the modern world. This approach contrasts with the apolitical, ahistorical and technicist paradigm that has characterised LPP, particularly in its early development. While this modernist constructivist approach to developing national languages was seen as a strength in developing national languages, it has lead to the pejorative positioning of minority languages and their speakers and to the consequent development of research on

MLR. The chapter outlines the concerns of MLR advocates in the context of language ecology and linguistic human rights paradigms (May, 2001, 2003, 2005).

The particular research issues that May addresses in the chapter to include: language shift and loss; language ecology; nationalism, minoritization, and historical constructionism; language replacement and social mobility; linguistic human rights; tolerance- and promotion-oriented language rights; and developments in international and national law. May argues that as a result of these research influences language planners and policy makers are now addressing more overtly the political and ideological aspects of LPP as well as their consequences for minority languages. In the micro planning sense, these issues are also finding their way more explicitly into the language teaching and learning literature.

Conclusion

In this paper an overview of LPP is provided and a number of recent trends and future directions related to language planning as a field and the critiques that have been made of are explored.

Notes

1. Recento (2000) provides an overview of some of the historical and theoretical perspectives related to Language planning.

2. There are of course other possible futures. For example, Tollefson (2002b: 423ff) suggests "the following eight issues [briefly summarised below] will receive attention by LPP researchers in the years ahead":

    1. A focus on exploitive LPP contexts and failed plans and policies;
    2. The role of local legal frameworks in LPP;
    3. Linking political theory and political processes to LPP;
    4. More direct work with sociology on social issues like migration, state formation or political conflict;
    5. The role of discourse and political leaders in shaping LPP;
    6. A greater focus on language on social identity and power, rather than languages as lingua francas;
    7. A move from a state (macro) focus to micro issues in the ethnography of communication; and
    8. A greater focus on Language rights for linguistic minorities.

References

Ager, D. (2001) *Motivation in Language Planning and Policy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ager, D. (2005) Prestige and image planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Chapt 56). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. (in press).

Amara, M. H. and Mar'i, A. Al-R. (2002). *Language Education Policy: The Arab Minority in Israel.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2004) Micro language planning. In D. Atkinson, P. Bruthiaux, W.

Grabe and V. Ramanathan (Eds) *Studies in applied linguistics: English for academic purposes, discourse analysis, and language policy and planning* (Essays in honor of Robert B. Kaplan on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2005) Language planning and policy research: An overview. In E. Hinkel (Ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Chapt 52). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. (in press).

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (1994). "Unplanned" language policy and planning. In W. Grabe and et al. (Eds.). *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *14* (pp. 82-89). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. and Ingram, D. E. (2003) Language-in-education planning. In W. Frawley (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (4 vols.) Vol. 2 (2nd ed.) (pp. 412-416). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. and Kaplan, R. B. (2003) Language policy decisions and power: Who are the actors? In P. M. Ryan and R. Terborg (eds.) *Language:Issues of Inequality* (pp. 19-37). Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autonama de Mexico.

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. and R. B. Kaplan (2005) Language-in-education policy and planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Chapt 55). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. (in press).

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. and Kaplan, R. B. (2004) *Language Planning and Policy in Africa, Vol. 1: Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Corson, D. (1999) *Language Policy in Schools: A Resource for Teachers and Administrators*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eggington, W. (2002). Unplanned language planning. In R.B. Kaplan (Ed.). *Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 404-415). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ferguson, C. A. (1968). Language development. In J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson and J. Das Gupta (Eds.). *Problems of Developing Nations* (pp. 27-36). New York: Wiley.

Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (1968) *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Fishman, J. A. (1974). Language planning and language planning research: The state of the art. In J. A. Fishman (ed.) *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague: Mouton.

Fox, M. J. (1975). *Language and Development: A Retrospective Survey of Ford Foundation Language Projects, 1952-1974.* (2 vols.) New York: The Ford Foundation.

Grenoble, L. A. (2003) *Language Policy in the Soviet Union*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Haarmann, H. (1990) Language planning in the light of a general theory of language: A methodological framework. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 86, 103-126.

Haugen, E. (1983) The implementation of corpus planning: theory and practice. In J. Cobarrubias and J. A. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in language planning: international perspectives* (pp. 269-289). Berlin: Mouton.

Hornberger, N. H. (1994) Literacy and Language Planning. *Language and Education* 8(1-2), 75-86.

Ingram, D. E. (1990) Language-in-education planning. In R. B. Kaplan, et al. (Eds.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 10* (pp. 53-78). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ingram, D. E. (2004) Looking back – Looking forward: A personal perspective. The Keith Horwood Memorial Lecture 2003. *Babel*, 4-15; 28.

Kaplan, R. B. and Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2003) *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2002) ASEAN and Asian cultures and models: Implications for ELT curriculum and for teacher selection. In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.) *Englishes in Asia: Communication, Identity, Power and Curriculum* (pp. 213-224). Melbourne: Language Australia.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2005) Corpus planning: Syllabus and materials development. In E. Hinkel (Ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Chapt 54). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. (in press).

May, S. (2005) Language policy and minority language rights. In E. Hinkel (Ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Chapt 57). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. (in press).

May, S. (2003) Rearticulating the case for minority language rights. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4(4), in press.

May, S. (2001) *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*. London: Longman.

Nahir, M. (1984). Language planning goals: a classification. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 8, 294-327.

Neustupný, J. V. (1974). Basic types of treatment of language problems. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.). *Advances in Language Planning* (pp. 37-48). The Hague: Mouton.

Neustupný J. and J. Nekvapil (2003). Language Management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4(2&3), in press.

Ricento, T. (2000) Historical and Theoretical Perspectives in Language Policy and Planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4(2), 196-213. [Also see In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology Politics and Language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 9-24). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.]

Rubin, J. and Jernudd, B. H. (Eds.) (1971) *Can Language Be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations* (pp. xii-xxiv). Honolulu: East West Center.

Tollefson, J. W. (2002a) (Ed.) *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tollefson, J. W. (2002b) Limitations of language policy and planning. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 416-425). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Els, T. (2005) Status planning for learning and teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Chapt 53). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. (in press).

Xu, Z. (2002) From TEFL to TEIL: Changes in Perceptions and Practices: Teaching English as in international language in Chinese universities in P. R. China. In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.) *Englishes in Asia: Communication, Identity, Power and Curriculum* (pp. 225-244). Melbourne: Language Australia.

Table 1. An Evolving Framework for Language Planning Goals by Levels and Awareness (Baldauf, 2005: in press)

Approaches to Goals		1. Policy Planning (on form)	2. Cultivation Planning (on function)	Levels Planning Processes and Goals					
				Macro		Meso		Micro	
				Awareness of Goals					
		Goals	Goals	Overt	Covert	Overt	Covert	Overt	Covert
Productive Goals	1. Status Planning (about society)	*Status Standardization* ▪ Officialization ▪ Nationalisation ▪ Proscription	*Status Planning* Revival ▪ Restoration ▪ Revitalisation ▪ Reversal Maintenance Interlingual Communication ▪ International ▪ Intra-national Spread						
	2. Corpus Planning (about language)	*Standardization* Corpus ▪ Graphization ▪ Grammatication ▪ Lexication Auxiliary Code ▪ Graphization ▪ Grammatication ▪ Lexication	*Corpus Elaboration* Lexical Modernization Stylistic Modernization Renovation ▪ Purification ▪ Reform ▪ Stylistic simplification ▪ Terminological unification Internationalization						
	3. Language-in-Education Planning (about learning)	*Policy Development* Access Policy Personnel Policy Curriculum Policy Methods & Materials Policy Resourcing Policy Community Policy Evaluation Policy	*Acquisition Planning* Reacquisition Maintenance Foreign / Second Language Shift						
Receptive Goal	4. Prestige Planning (about image)	*Language Promotion* ▪ Official/Government ▪ Institutional ▪ Pressure group ▪ Individual	*Intellectualization* ▪ Language of Science ▪ Language of Professions ▪ Language of High Culture ▪ Language of Diplomacy						