LANGUAGE PLANNING AND EDUCATION : AN INTERTWINED MATRIX.

Seran Doğançay Aktuna
Boğaziçi Üniversitesi

Bu çalışma dil sosyolojisi alanında önemli bir yeri olan dil planlamasının genel bir tanımını yapmayı amaçlamaktadır. Dil planlaması yüzyıllardan bu yana dünyanın her tarafında yürütülmesine rağmen, ancak 1970lerden beri sosyal bilimciler tarafından bilimsel olarak tanınmış ve dikkat çekmeye başlamıştır. Dünyamızın son yıllarda yaşadığı coğrafik ve ulusal değişiklikler, eski kolonilerin veya savaşların egemenliğinden kurtulup özgürlüğünü kazanmaya çalışan yeni ulusların çabaları, hızlı modernleşme ve milliyetçilik akımlarının etkisiyle bu araştırma ve uygulama alanı daha fazla önem ve ilgi kazanmaktadır.

Dil planlamasının bir bilim dalı olarak gelişimine kısa bir göz attıktan sonra, dil planlaması ve karar üretiminin amaçları, hedefleri ve süreçlerine değinilecektir. Dil planlamasının uygulanmasında basının ve eğitimin rolü ana hatlarıyla işlendikten sonra, dil planlaması ve dil eğitimi arasındaki ilişki tartışılacaktır. Dil planlaması çerçevesi içinde Türk Dil Devrimi'ne ve Türkçe'nin durumuna da yer verilecektir.

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to give a theoretical background of the discipline of language planning (hereafter LP), outlining the processes involved, its goals and aims, and the functions it serves. These will then be related to education and language teaching in an attempt to make teachers and course designers more aware of the broader sociocultural perspective within which they implement LP policies. Throughout the discussion aspects of the Turkish Language Reform will be used as a familiar case of language planning.

LP is commonly defined as deliberate intervention in the process of language change. Through organized LP, official policies are made in selecting and promoting one language or language variety over others present. The selected languages/varieties are stabilized in their spelling and lexicons via dictionaries, grammars, spellers, and usage guides. The stabilized codes are then elaborated through the addition and creation of terminologies, etc., so that the selected code can fulfill its new functions more effectively. The codes in the verbal repertoire of the

community are further differentiated from one another by the creation of different styles, registers, and genres, thus becoming more cultivated.

LP concerns itself with a range of activities that can be roughly divided into two broad and related categories: status planning and corpus planning, as originally labeled by Kloss (1969). 'Status planning' focuses on the allocation of functions to varieties of language via authoritative policy making. It concerns itself with decisions regarding which language will be assigned or recognized for which purposes in a country. Procedures to implement these language policies are also in the sphere of status planning. For instance, a national policy making English as a compulsory foreign language in Turkey and measures taken to integrate this subject into the existing curricula will fall in the scope of status planning. 'Corpus planning', on the other hand, is concerned with the linguistic code itself, prompting changes in the linguistic structure, the script, the lexicon, styles, and so on. In Fishman's (1982) explanation, corpus planning seeks to establish a 'model of the good language.' The success of status and corpus planning are interdependent, and they are both necessary for effective LP. In most cases, languages that attain new functions via status planning decisions are unprepared in terms of their corpora to fulfill those functions in the most efficient manner, therefore need to be modified and elaborated via corpus planning. As Fishman (1982, p. 10) says,

> Status planning without corpus planning results in networks that cannot, even with the best intentions, use a language for the functions for which it is approved, because the language itself lacks the lexicon that such functions require. Similarly corpus planning without status planning (authoritative) is no more than busy work, since there is no dynamic leading to the use of the course material or the nomenclatures that may have been proposed.

Haugen (1983) and Hornberger (1990) also attest that status and corpus planning tend to occur together, with mutual influence on each other.

Parallel to the status-corpus planning distinction made by Kloss (1969) is Neustupny's (1974) distinction of policy and cultivation planning. Macroscopic, sociological policy planning concerns itself with issues of selection of national languages and their stratification, standardization, literacy, orthographies, and the like, thus focusing on linguistic varieties and their distribution, and hence, paralleling Kloss's status planning to some degree. The cultivation approach, on the other hand, focuses on the functional differentiation of language varieties from one another, putting emphasis on questions of correctness, efficiency, style, thus working on a more micro level than policy or status planning.

The earliest model of LP is the one proposed by Haugen in 1966 (later revised in 1972 and 1983). In his later work, Haugen successfully reconciles Kloss's and Neustupny's dichotomies within his fourfold model, which can be represented as follows:

Table 1: Haugen's Revised Model of Language Planning

	Form (policy planning)	Function(language cultivation)
Society (Status Planning)	1. Selection (decision procedures) a. identification of problem	3. Implementation (educational spread) a. correction procedures
Language (Corpus Planning)	2. Codification (standardization procedures) a. graphization b. grammatication c. lexication	4. Elaboration (functional development) a. terminological b.stylistic development

Note : From "The Implementation of Language Planning: Theory and practice" by E. Haugen. In *Progress in Language Planning* (p. 275), edited by J. Cobarrubias and J. Fishman, 1983, The Hague: Mouton.

Status planning is a societal undertaking, dealing with the initial decision-making procedure of identification of problems and allocation of language norms towards solving these problems (selection). It is a macro level process, making policies as to which language or language variety will enjoy (or not enjoy) what functions, and therefore, what status it will have in a society. This policy-based selection process is usually carried out by governments or bodies which have the authority to impose their decisions.

Codification refers to the process of standardizing the selected norm by giving it an explicit written form. Codification involves *graphization* (Ferguson, 1968, p. 29) as the first step, that is, the reduction of the chosen language into a written form, usually resulting in dictionaries. The second step is *grammatication* of the norm, such that the rules of grammar governing the norm are formulated and documented in grammar books and other guides to the language. The last step in codification is *lexication* whereby an appropriate lexicon is selected and new styles are developed for the new norm. Codification is said to be the first and crucial step in the development of a standard language out of a vernacular (Ferguson, ibid.).

Aktuna

Selection and codification are concerned with the form of the language. The former is part of status planning as a societal undertaking and the latter is in the domain of corpus planning. Implementation and elaboration are LP processes concerned with the cultivation of the functions of the new norm. In Haugen's (1983) words, "*Selection* and *codification* remain mere paper exercises unless they are followed by *implementation* and *elaboration* [italics original], the former involving social status and the latter the linguistic corpus" (p. 272). Implementation involves adopting and attempting to spread the selected and codified norm via education, the mass media and so on, sometimes prompted by rules and regulations. In the implementation of LP decisions and products, agents that carry weight with the public, such as governments, school systems, and the media are utilized. Elaboration refers to the functional development of the norm such that new terminologies are created to cultivate the selected norm, in order for it to fulfill the functions it will serve in the modern world. New styles for different registers are also developed within this process.

Haugen's framework can be applied to the case of Turkish Language Reform. For instance, selection of Turkish as the official language of the new Turkish Republic and the change from the Arabic to the Latin alphabet were the status planning decisions making new policies about the form and the function of the Turkish language. These decisions in turn led to the development of the corpus of the language, such that steps were taken to graphisize Turkish words that were in spoken use into dictionaries via processes of *derleme* and *tarama*. and the preparations of grammar books as a step towards standardization. Implementation of these innovations were than carried out via *Halkevleri*, schools and newspapers. Further purification of Turkish from external influences and the creation of new terminology for new functions followed as elaboration processes.

Following Haugen, several other scholars proposed LP frameworks which were similar to his in their contents, (cf. Rubin, 1971; Karam, 1974; Fishman, 1979). Haugen (1983, p. 274) says that Neustupny's (1974) 'correction procedures' and Rubin's (1977) 'evaluation procedures', important parts of LP, are included in his revised model as components of ongoing implementation. Such frameworks show the processes undertaken to carry out deliberate changes in the corpus and the functions of languages in a society.

To the status-corpus planning distinction made in the LP literature, Cooper (1989) adds 'acquisition planning' as a third focus of LP. He defines this as "increasing the number of users-speakers, writers, listeners, or readers " (p. 33) of a language, through promoting its learning by giving people the opportunity and the incentive to learn these languages. Thus, the definition of LP in Cooper's terms

(1989, p. 45) is "deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes", covering not only change in current linguistic behavior, but also including maintenance of the current state of affairs.

The frameworks discussed above focus on the processes of LP, revealing little about reasons for attempting LP. Nahir's (1977, 1984) classification of LP goals as the things language planners could attempt (and have attempted) fills in this void. Nahir lists the goals of LP as internal and external purification of languages, language revival, language reform, standardization, language spread, lexical modernization, terminology unification, stylistic simplification, interlingual communication, language maintenance, and auxiliary-code standardization. To this list Hornberger (1990, p. 20) adds officialization, nationalization, status standardization, vernacularization, and graphization.

The particular goals language planners seek reflect their orientations to language, as explained by Ruiz (1984). The orientation one holds towards the role of languages and their users determines the goals set for LP. The three language orientations given by Ruiz are 'language-as-right', treating language maintenance among minorities as a civil right and making allowances for them to maintain their languages. Under a 'language-as-problem' orientation linguistic diversity is seen as a threat to national unity as well as a handicap to speakers of minority languages. Thus, steps are taken to achieve the dominance of a single language which will in turn be implemented as the unifying link among the ethnolinguistically diverse groups. Pluralism as the maintenance and cultivation of all the languages in a state is the aim of the 'language -as-resource' orientation. Depending on the language orientations held, LP goals will be set and actions will be taken to implement these objectives. For instance, following a language-as-right or resource orientation, the existing languages in a country will be made official by making policies in status planning, and steps will be taken to standardize and further cultivate them within the domain of corpus planning.

The general definitions of LP in the literature seem to put emphasis on the linguistically oriented nature of LP, defining it as deliberate attempts to solve language problems in a society. Scholars such as Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971), Rabin (1971), Karam (1974), Rubin (1977), Fishman (1982), Olshtain (1989), to name a few, however, draw attention to the fact that political, economic, social, and scientific factors also have a great impact on LP goals, hence indicating the non-linguistic aims of LP besides linguistic ones. As Karam (1974, p. 108) puts it, "regardless of the type of language planning, in nearly all cases the language problem to be solved is not a problem in isolation within the region or nation but

is directly associated with the political, economic, scientific, social, cultural, and/or religious situation."

Indeed, LP is generally undertaken to solve problems which, though mainly linguistic and communication related, usually also involve political, sociocultural, economical, and other non-linguistic issues, such as achieving modernization or national identity. Rabin's (1971) classification of LP aims recognizes this variety:

1. *Linguistic aims*: fall in the scope of normative linguistics aiming for the cultivation of the linguistic code. Changes in corpus or usage are directly related to solving communication problems in an effort to make communication easier. These changes are made in order to attain greater precision, clarity, and efficiency in the language. Some examples of linguistic aims are the creation or adoption of vocabulary items to enlarge technical and non-technical lexicons; the refinement of the syntactic, morphological, and phonological structure of the language; and the development of language styles.

2. *Semi-linguistic aims*: These most frequent types of LP aims refer to changes made in the language that may have linguistic and communicative advantages but also serve social and political aims which might be covert as well as overt. Changes in the writing systems and in spelling, in pronunciation and language forms can be said to aid communication but also serve other sociopolitical purposes which might well be the initiative in LP. For example, the case of script reform in Turkey whereby the Arabic script was replaced by a Latin one was said to be done in order to adapt the alphabet to the phonology of the language, and was justified as a measure to increase the very low rate of literacy. On the other hand, it also served to move the new secular Turkish nation toward its goal of Westernization, and away from the impact of the Islamic Eastern world.

3. *Extra-linguistic aims*: concerns the use of languages vis-a-vis one another in the linguistic repertoire of societies. According to Rabin (1971, p. 277), extra-linguistic aims concern primarily sociologists and political scientists, and their implementation involves language spread through educational planning. Changes in the allocation of language functions with the aid of policies on language use would modify the domains and geographical spread of languages and their utilization by different strata of the society. Horizontal and vertical language spread, language revival, or suppression of existing languages are examples of extra-linguistic LP aims.

The above mentioned LP types, approaches, goals, and aims can be summarized as in Table 2, showing the way they integrate.

Table 2 : Language Planning: An Integrative Model.

Approaches	Policy Planning (focus on form)	Cultivation Planning (focus on language function)
Types of LP	Goals	Goals
Status Planning (about uses of language)	OFFICIALIZATION NATIONALIZATION STANDARDIZATION Status PROSCRIPTION International	REVIVAL SPREAD MAINTENANCE INTERLINGUAL COMMUNICATION Intranational
Acquisition Planning (about users of language)	EDUCATION/SCHOOL LITERARY SHIFT MASS MEDIA FOREIGN LANGUAGE/ WORK Language's formal role within society (Haugen's selection) (Rabin's extra-linguistic aims)	REACQUISITION RELIGIOUS MAINTENANCE SECOND LANGUAGE/ LITERACY Language's functional role within society (Haugen's implementation)
Corpus Planning (about language)	STANDARDIZATION Corpus Auxiliary code GRAPHIZATION Purification Stylistic simplification Language's form (Haugen's codification) (Rabin's linguistic aims)	MODERNIZATION Lexical Stylistic ENOVATION Reform Terminology unification Language's function (Haugen's elaboration) (Rabin's semi-linguistic aims)

    This model, adopted from Hornberger (Spring 1993), yields the important concepts of corpus, status, and acquisition cultivation and corpus, status, and acquisition policy. The focus of language cultivation is the linguistic code. This approach concerns itself with questions of correctness, efficiency, style, communicative capacity, and the linguistic levels in the language that can fulfill specialized functions (Neustupny, 1974). Corpus cultivation refers to the type of corpus planning with a cultivation approach where the goals are the modernization (enabling the language code to serve new functions) and the renovation of the

linguistic code (permitting the code to serve old functions with new forms) (Cooper, 1989). In this way, the language code is helped to be turned into a means of communication that can convey new, more extended concepts, using a greater range of styles. The language can then serve new functions and has new forms in its repertoire.

Status policy and status cultivation refer to the making of policies changing the status, the functional role of the linguistic code in society. Acquisition policy and cultivation refer to the policies and efforts made in influencing the uses and the number of users of a language or language variety. The Turkish Language Reform, for example, was a case of corpus cultivation, consisting of i) renovation of the language (via simplification of the style by discarding the ornate patterns of Persian and Arabic) and purification of the lexicon, and ii) modernization, especially lexical modernization, that is, enrichment of the language and the lexicon so that it would permit the developing language to fulfill new communicative functions. The main goal was to develop a national standard which would be both authentic and modern.

Language planning and education

Status, corpus, and acquisition planning decisions taken by authoritative figures are implemented mainly through schools and the mass media. This is done when these public institutions adopt and attempt to spread the language form(s) that has been selected and codified. Laws and regulations are proclaimed to prompt their use. Educational institutions are the perfect means for the small dominating elite to implement their chosen norm. In fact, Haugen (1983, p. 274) calls his 'implementation' process 'educational spread'. Indeed, in the years following the Turkish Language reform, educational insitutions and Halkevleri alongside newspapers were the means through which the people were familiarized with the new linguistic norm.

As Cooper (1989, p. 160) says, acquisition planning involves the planning of language instruction as in cases of teaching foreign or second languages, such as the teaching of English as an international LWC (Language of Wider Communication, Ferguson, 1962) in Turkey, or the teaching of French to native-speakers of English in Montreal respectively. New linguistic norms which are presented in classroom instruction, teaching materials, literature, newspapers, radio, and television give people the opportunity to learn the language being implemented. Policies making the promoted language compulsory in schools or for job entry provide the target population with the incentive to acquire it.

Bilingual education as carried out in many countries where there is linguistic diversity is a main means of acquisition planning, whether it is Transitional, Maintenance, or Enrichment type depending on the language orientations of the dominating groups. For example, when the predominant ideology is pluralism, hence following a language-as-right/language-as-resource orientation (Ruiz, 1984), the aim of language teaching is the maintenance of the minority languages in a country. If the underlying orientation is the one of language-as-problem, then the language of the dominant group is imposed upon the minority groups through a Transitional bilingual education program, whereby the mother tongues are used as bridges to facilitate the acquisition of the dominant language, or children from minority groups are simply submersed into schooling in the imposed language, with or without pull-out English as a Second Language classes.

Language teaching, whether teaching second or foreign languages, also exemplify cases of acquisition planning following status planning decisions at the government levels which are triggered by changing societal needs. For instance, the becoming of the English language the international language of diplomacy, science, technology, and popular art not only forced Turkish decision makers (along with many other nations in the world) to make English a compulsory schools subject in line with many jobs calling for proficiency in the language, but also stimulated an interest and great efforts in teaching it.

In short, as can be above LP and education are interrelated as education is a very effective organ used in the implementation and spread of LP policies.

Language planning and the media

Education is not the only means of implementing language planning policies and products. The media organs are also very powerful means of reaching a great number of people, though their power seems to have been somewhat overlooked in the current LP literature. According to Cooper (1989, p. 118), status planning decisions are made in relation to the language or the variety to be used in the media. Moreover, the language used in television and radio broadcasts and published in newspapers and popular magazines is usually perceived by the audience to be the linguistic norm to which they can aspire. This, however, does not mean that everyone aspires to the same norm. As Kress (1983, p. 43) attests, the media usually attempts to influence the ideological structure of the society as well as passing on other information. Thus, the way information is conveyed to the audience can differ in line with the political ideologies of the media organ. Examples of this can be seen clearly in the Turkish context: Newspapers with a tendency towards the left would use the neologisms produced by language planners;

they will act as disseminators of *Öztürkçe* 'pure Turkish', as shown by Sabuncuoglu's (1985) study. Moderate media organs will tend to use *Sade Türkçe* 'simple Turkish', whereas publications by very conservative religious groups will have many Arabic/Persian borrowings in them. The people will in turn choose those organs and products whose ideologies suit theirs the most.

In implementing the new norm of Turkish in Turkey, especially the neologisms, the newspapers were the initial and the main agents of dissemination used since the early nineteenth century. The Turkish elite and the government used newspapers to communicate to the people newly developing ideas on nationalism and social and political change. The initial language simplification efforts had started with the aim of making the elaborate Ottoman language more comprehensible for the people so that the language can be used as a vehicle for cultivating nationalism. In the 1920's and 30's, newspapers had gained even more popularity and influence on urban Turkey. Lists of neologisms and their foreign equivalents were published in every issue of newspapers in the 1930s. The radio and oral communication with the educated people of the rural areas, however, were the main means of disseminating language planning policies and products in the rural areas.

Television, radio, and newspapers are powerful means of reaching people all across a nation. Despite this, there has been little empirical research on their impact on language and implementation of language planning. In discussing television and language planning in Singapore, Kuo (1984, p. 62) talks about the role of television on the implementation of language planning and products. Quoting Das Gupta and Ferguson (1977, p. 5), Kuo says that "as an important agent of mass persuasion, television has a 'promotional function' to play to promote 'the products and standards among the potential user publics'" (p. 62). In the Turkish context too we can use such a powerful organ as television in controlling the influx of foreign words into the Turkish language by preferring and implementing the Turkish equivalents to many foreign terms that they have been using. For example, substituting *düzenleme* for *aranjman*, *izleme* for *rating* rekoru, *güncel konular* for *reality shows*, etc., while avoiding the use of borrowings (whose Turkish equivalents exist) for the sake of appearing cultures.

The media can also function in the codification of LP. In talking about the standardization of a vernacular, Karam (1974, p. 115) says that the mass media serve as an agent of 'conventionalization' of the formal and informal forms of the language. This conventionalization process has two components: "Codification of the language (in terms of a script, grammar, and dictionaries), and the dissemination of this codification to the population through educational and non-educational

channels of communication." Karam quotes Noss (1967, p. 64) saying that the media "exerts a decisive influence not only on the spread of the national language, but also on the form in which it is ultimately accepted by the public. It is here that new coinages and usages will stand or fall and not in the academy-approved grammars and dictionaries issued by the scholars" (1974, p. 116). Karam also points out that the role of the media in stabilizing language development has not received the attention it deserves, being treated as secondary to education as a vehicle of implementation (ibid., p. 117), although one can easily claim that people, especially in developing countries, have far limited access to education than they do to a television or radio.

Ferguson (1968, p. 32) also says that "The media are outlets for the formally approved codification and they provide the population with models of imitation of the prestigious spoken and printed usage. The media are also outlets for new terms, phrases, and discourse pertaining to all spheres of national and daily life."

From the above discussion on the role of education and mass media in implementing language planning policies and products, we can conclude that education is not the only powerful means of language implementation. Television, radio, and newspapers are powerful means of reaching the people all across a nation. The language of television and radio broadcasts serves as a norm and a model for language learning. In today's technological world one cannot possibly ignore their impact on language behavior. Moreover, when one considers the impact of the media as a powerful influence on people's thoughts and feelings, as well as on the language they use, the lack of attention given to the role of the mass media in LP implementation is surprising. Many LP case studies show that there is hardly ever a planning situation where the media was not used in the implementation process. More emphasis on the role of mass media in language planning can prove to be very useful for language planning theory as well as practice.

Language Planning and Foreign/Second Language Teaching

As aforementioned, foreign/second language teaching are cases of acquisition planning following status planning policies which determine the status and role various languages present in a nation will take. This section will attempt to relate LP and language teaching in an effort to show how LP can have direct influence on classroom instruction and language learning.

Although LP is most often perceived as taking place at government level, we need to consider also LP done at the level of educational institutions, curriculum developers, syllabus designers, and language teachers. Though the broad policy

decisions come from the upper levels of policy making, i.e., the decision makers, teachers and course designers who decide on the curricula and determine the foreign/ second language syllabus are also making language planning decisions. If we take, for example, the teaching of English in Turkey, we can see that steps such as deciding on the role of the English language in the Turkish society, finding out learners' needs for acquiring this foreign language, the way it can be taught, that is, using what kind of materials (authentic vs. non-authentic), classroom procedures (habit-forming drills vs. communicative activities), etc., as well as deciding on the variety of the target language to be emulated in teaching (American, British, or some non-native variety of the English language), and so on are all LP decisions which can be subsumed under the umbrella term of *acquisition planning* (Cooper, 1989). In multilingual nations, such as India, Belgium, Canada, etc., determining which languages should be used as the medium of instruction and when, whether other languages are to be taught as auxiliary languages or be alternative media of schooling are also issues of LP and educational policy making within the domain of status planning.

It is important to note that in any LP case policies reinforcing the teaching of foreign/second languages which are not in concord with the broader social, economic or political objectives and decisions of the nation, or which run against the national feelings and attitudes are bound to fail in the long run. For achieving success, language teaching plans need to be compatible with the language setting, the political and national context, the attitudes of the people, and the patterns of language use in society (Dubin and Olshtain, 1986). It is also incorrect to think of LP only in relation to language teaching. Indeed, LP applies to many other areas of everyday life in where spoken or written channels of communication are at work, for example, in the domains of business, administration, law, science and technology, etc. (Tollefson, 1989). LP decisions taken by the government and the relevant policies made influence the type of interaction in all the above spheres of life.

In the expanding field of second/foreign language acquisition, the role of LP and the impact of policy decisions on the process of language teaching and acquisition have not received their due attention by researchers, however. In a preliminary attempt, Tollefson (ibid.) formulates a framework to relate the two areas of inquiry. He shows how decisions taken by the government, ministries, curriculum boards, educational institutions, in a top-down hierarchy through which each level implements the policies taken by the level above, will have an impact on classroom (formal) and informal language learning. He details how governmental efforts to affect the structure and function of language varieties (that is, corpus and status planning respectively) can influence *input*, *learner*, *learning*, and *learned* variables,

which are the four main components on which language learning theories are generally based. *Input variables* refer to input and interaction by learners with their environment, that is, their teachers, native and other non-native speakers of the target language. For example, the type of language contact, thus input, can be of two types: face-to-face and indirect. The latter involves contact through radio, television, the press, and other means through which speakers of diverse languages come into contact. This type of input will shift along with the changing sociopolitical climate of the nation. For instance, if stronger ties thus more frequent or greater contact are desired with the United States than with Great Britain, then the aspired standard in language teaching will shift from British English to American English in line with changing needs in intercultural communication. This will be evident in teacher talk and the media norms. Macro-political decisions such as adapting oneself to the changing linguistic makeup of the world will decide which foreign language will be introduced in schools. A good example for the latter is the replacement of French by English in Turkey as the language of diplomacy and international trade, with the worldwide spread of English and its acquiring the role of the international language of communication.

Although *learner variables* such as cognitive style and personality traits do not seem to be changed by LP decisions, other learner variables such as motivation and attitudes can be affected by LP decisions which modify the role and status of a foreign language vis-a-vis the native tongue and the other languages available. Making a policy of using English as an additional language of intralingual communication in a multilingual country will greatly influence learner attitudes and motivation to learn English. Government policy decisions rewarding foreign language proficiency in employment, availability of overseas scholarships, and other incentives triggered by LP can also trigger language acquisition by providing instrumental motivation.

Learning variables which consist of factors related to the actual teaching of the foreign language are also influenced by LP such that decisions on what is going to be taught by whom and how can be directly determined by the choice of teachers, the type of qualifications required from them, and the availability of teaching materials. For example, LP decisions employing only teachers who have training in second/foreign language teaching and native-like fluency in the target language will improve the quality of teaching and the type of input learners receive, especially in a foreign language environment.

According to Tollefson, the impact of LP on *learned variables* such as the grammatical and pragmatic structures learners will acquire is not so evident, though one can claim that micro LP decisions on the type of syllabus and materials and

techniques to be used in teaching will be highly influential on the learners rate of success.

In searching for explanations of second language acquisition, it seems important that researchers take heed of Tollefson (1989, p. 31) who says that , "In an attempt to formulate an adequate model of SLA, it will be essential that researchers maintain an international perspective toward language acquisition." Indicating that research in the United States tended to ignore this point, he adds that in many countries of the world

> .... Language learning is often a component in modernization and development programmes and in ethnic, religious, economic, and political struggles where language is a symbol and a means to achieve mobility, social and economic advancement, and political power. In such situations, (language) planning may have a critical impact on language acquisition -- as either an obstructive or a facilitative factor. (ibid.)

One can add to Tollefson's words that both language learning and teaching, which are interdependent, are influenced greatly by language planning and policy making, as shown by many of the integrated models on language learning, teaching, and policy (Mackay, 1970; Strevens, 1976, 1977 cited in Stern, 1983). As teachers, teacher trainers, course designers and researchers we need to keep LP in mind in searching for answers in the fields of second/foreign language acquisition and second language pedagogy.

In the domain of teacher training, it is a good idea to introduce teacher trainees to the principles of language planning and show them language pedagogy in its sociocultural context alongside familiarizing them with disciplines underlying second/foreign language teaching (linguistics, curriculum and syllabus design, second language acquisition, etc.) which seem to be the current focus in such programs. It is not so much the case that teachers familiar with LP processes will become better teachers, but that they can be in a better situation to see where problems lie and the reasons for failure within a broader perspective. In this way, they can also modify their teaching to fit the requirements of the broader sociopolitical and economic context.

Summary and Implications for Turkish

As seen above, LP is a multifaceted discipline whose aims and goals are interrelated with the political, economic, and social aims of the community in question, as well as being influenced by what is happening in the world in general.

Languages, as part of people's national and ethnic identities, are modified in their linguistic structures and societal functions in order to satisfy various aims which may be covert or overt for the wider population. Foreign/ second language instruction are also carefully planned into the linguistic and educational framework of nations which aim modernization and carving a place for themselves in the technological and scientific mosaic of the world. LP policies are made by governing bodies and words, styles, registers are determined by linguists. These innovations are then disseminated to the masses via education and the mass media, which act as the main agents for the spread of the innovation (Cooper 1983, p. 21).

LP as an interdisciplinary field has gained considerable importance and scholarly attention in the last decades. As Olshtain (1989, p. 45) says,

> We are witnessing an intensification of interest in this field (LP) which is at least partially due to the phenomenon of a 'shrinking world' but is primarily related to two important trends in today's world: rapid modernization and national consolidation of new nations. Either or both are taking place in various parts of the world, increasing the need for careful language planning.

In nation-building, LP is needed to raise the status and increase the functions of the local languages and to elaborate their corpora before/while making them the official or national languages. These languages can then compete with external languages, as in the cases of Swahili in Tanzania or the many Turkic Republics as they are breaking away from the domination of Russian. Such LP activities aid in nation-building and the achievement of independence from the domination of ex-colonial powers.

Rapid modernization in developing countries brings two issues: the influx of foreign terminology entering the local languages along with the innovations and new concepts they carry, which are seen as undesirable influences on the local languages, and the need to teach international languages in order to follow technological and scientific developments. Both of the above issues can be seen in Turkey today, both areas calling for careful LP.

Taking the latter case first, we are witnessing an increase in both the number of students training to be teachers of English and in the number of private institutions offering English courses for various purposes. An examination of job advertisements in the newspapers show the great demand for foreign languages, especially English, by many institutions. As a result, LP is carried out at institutional levels in developing language teaching programs to spread the target language in the domains needed, to fulfill the need for intercultural communication.

This can be done at the level of public/private schools or by private companies which have programs to teach foreign languages for specific purposes, such as the teaching of English for engineers, business, banking, etc. All these decisions and actions to teach foreign languages are examples of language planning and policy making.

In the case of foreign words and expressions entering the mother tongue, the usual reaction is to attempt corpus planning, as done by *Türk Dil Kurumu* and many language academies throughout the world, and find alternatives for the borrowings by using the resources of the mother tongue. Coining neologisms, such as calling a 'one man show' a *tek adam gösterisi* in Turkish or *solo* in French, or ordering *hazır yemek* instead of 'fast food' (*Sabah*, March 6, 1994), or referring to the 'kompüter' as *bilgisayar*, etc. is one common alternative. In some cases, as in the example of the *Academie Française*, there is also action taken to ban the use of foreignisms such as *le highway*, *le weekend*, etc.

In Turkey today we are witnessing the influx of foreign, especially English words, into our everyday lives. We watch, for instance, *reality shows* on television, while listening to *aranjmans* on the *kompakt disk*. We follow the *medya* to learn the *rating rekors* and about *Iktisat Leasing* or hear the Prime Minister give a *brifing*. We eat *hamburgers* and *wafels* or visit the *salad bar*. The examples are endless.

In the face of such foreign words in everyday usage and in the domain of terminologies, Türk Dil Kurumu is proposing Turkish alternatives in each issue of their *Türk Dili* monthly. Some examples are *gösterge* for 'index', *dünya çapında/küresel* for 'global', *bütünlesmiş* for 'entegre', *ana kent* for 'metropol', *pekistirme* for 'konsolidasyon', (*Türk Dili Dergisi*, April 1994, No. 508). Despite their efforts though, these coinages do not seem to replace the foreign counterparts. This can be explained by referring to the aforementioned words of Fishman (1982, p.10) such that '... corpus planning without status planning (authoritative) is no more than busy work, since there is no dynamic leading to the use of ... the nomenclatures that may have been proposed.' Indeed, as also mentioned before, corpus and status planning need to occur simultaneously in a complementary fashion. Simply coining alternatives to borrowings is not sufficient for successful LP. The language planners must also have the authority to implement their productions. Türk Dil Kurumu, however, lacks the authority to impose its decisions on the public organs. Thus their work usually, and unfortunately, go unnoticed. For successful language purification and lexical modernization in Turkey there needs to be a body functioning in the capacity of a language academy which has the authority to carry out LP and implement its policies. We hope that steps will be taken soon to establish such an institution, before Turkish becomes once

again a hybrid of several languages through which intergenerational communication becomes difficult.

In conclusion, for the reasons listed above, LP is required by nations and needed to be undertaken in a scientific and systematic manner whereby all its components are taken into consideration. LP as a scholarly discipline needs to be integrated into teacher training and educational administration programs, not only to teach educators about the processes in LP, but also to show them how and why the policies they are implementing in the classrooms have been made. In this way teachers can be more aware of language as a social tool functioning as part of a complex sociocultural and economic matrix, besides internalizing their roles as important agents of implementation of LP policies as a means to serious ends.

References

Cobarrubias, J., & Fishman, J. A. (Eds.). (1983). *Progress in language planning: An international perspective*. Berlin: Mouton.

Cooper, R. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Das Gupta, J., & Ferguson, C. (1977). Problems of language planning. In J. Rubin, B. H. Jernudd, J. Das Gupta, J. A. Fishman, & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Language planning processes* (pp. 3-7). The Hauge: Mouton.

Dubin, F. & Olshtain, E. (1986). *Course design: Developing Programs and Materials for Language Learning*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Eastman, C. M. (1983). *Language planning: an introduction*. San Francisco: Chandler & Sharp.

Ferguson, C. (1962). Language factors in national development. In *Language structure and language use*. Essays by Ferguson, selected by A.S. Dil (1971). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ferguson, C. (1968). Language development. In J. Fishman, C. Ferguson, & R. Das Gupta (Eds.), *Language roblems of developing nations* (pp. 27-35). New York: Wiley and Sons.

Fishman, J. A. (1979). Bilingual education, language planning and English. *EnglishWorld-Wide*, 1 (1), 11-24.

Fishman, J. A. (1982). Sociolinguistic foundations of bilingual education. *Bilingual Review*, IX (1), 1-35.

Haugen, E. (1966). Linguistics and language planning. In W. Bright (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 50-71). The Hauge: Mouton.

Haugen, E. (1972). Dialect, language, nation. In J. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 97-111). Middlesex, Great Britain: Penguin.

Haugen, E. (1983). The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In J. Cobarrubias & J. A. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in language planning* (pp. 269-290). The Hauge: Mouton.

Heyd, U. (1954). *Language reform in modern Turkey.* Jerusalem: Israel Orientalini Society.

Hornberger, N. (1990). Bilingual education and English-Only: A Language-planning framework. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, [English Plus: Issues in Bilingual Education], *508*, 12-26.

Hornberger, N. (1993 Fall). Research Seminar in Language Planning and Educational Policies (Education 927), Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia, PA, USA.

Jernudd, B. H., & Das Gupta, J. (1971). Towards a theory of language planning. In J. Rubin, & B. H. Jernudd (Eds.), *Can Language be planned ?* (pp. 195-215). Hawaii: University Press of Hawaii.

Jernudd, B. H., & Shapiro, M. J. (Eds.). (1989). *The politics of language purism.* Contributions to the sociology of language. 54. Berlin /New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Karam, F. (1974). Toward a definition of language planning. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in Language Planning* (pp. 103-124). The Hauge: Mouton.

Kennedy, C. (Ed.). (1983). *Language planning and language education.* London: George, Allen & Unwin.

Kennedy, C. (Ed.). (1989). *Language planning and English language teaching.* United Kingdom: Prentice Hall International.

Kloss, H. (1969). Research possibilities on group bilingualism: A Report. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

Kress, G. (1983). Linguistic processes and the mediation of 'reality': the politics of newspaper language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *40*, 43-58.

Kuo, E. (1984). Television and language planning in Singapore. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *48*, Language and Television (Ed.) H.B. Beardsmore.

Kuyas, N. (1994, March 6). Dilde güzellik yasayla olur mu ? *Sabah,* p. 24.

Nahir, M. (1977). The five aspects of language planning. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, *1* (2), 107-122.

Nahir, M. (1984). Language planning goals: A classification. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, *8* (3), 294-327.

Neustupny, J. (1974). Basic types of treatment of language problems. In J.Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in language planning* (pp. 103-124). The Hauge: Mouton

Olshtain, E. (1989). The fact-finding phase in the policy-making process: The case of a Language of Wider Communication. In C. Kennedy (Ed.), *Language planning and English language teaching* (pp. 44-57). United Kingdom: Prentice Hall International.

Rabin, C. (1971). A tentative classification of language planning aims. In J. Rubin & B. H. Jernudd (Eds.), *Can language be planned ?* (pp. 277-280). Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Rubin, J. (1971). Evaluation and language planning. In J.Rubin & B. Jernudd (Eds.),*Can language be planned ? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations* (pp. 217-252). Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

Rubin, J. (1977). New Insights into the nature of language change offered by language planning. In B. G.Blount, B. G. & M. Sanches (Eds.), *Sociocultural dimensions of language change* (pp. 253-270). New York: Academic Press.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in Language Planning. *NABE Journal* , *8* (2), 15-34.

Sabuncuoglu, M. F. (1985). The Turkish language reform and national development in Turkey. Doctoral Dissertation, UC Berkeley. *Dissertation Abstracts Intenational*, 47/03A. (University Microfilms No. AAC8610194).

Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tollefson, J. W. (1989). The role of language planning in second language acquisition. In C. Kennedy (Ed.), *Language planning and English language teaching* (pp. 23-34). United Kingdom: Prentice Hall International.

Türk Dili Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi, 1994 Nisan, No. 508, Atatürk Kültür Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu. Ankara.