

LANGUAGE STANDARDISATION AS A COMPONENT OF LANGUAGE PLANNING: A SUGGESTED TYPOLOGY¹

Bonifacio P. Sibayan

The inspiration for writing this paper on language standardisation came from two persons. First, Joshua A. Fishman (1974:18) who writes on another aspect of language planning, that of formulation of policies (which may be applicable to language standardisation):

At any rate this most frequently observed aspect of language planning is much in need of systematization and conceptual integration if it is to escape from anecdotalism, historicism or local dimensionalism pure and simple.

The other is Charles Ferguson (1968:32) who writes, and I quote:

The process of language standardization (LS) is not well understood and needs both case studies and attempts at generalizations so that some testable hypotheses can be advanced, but at least two points can be made on the basis of present knowledge. First, there are many paths of standardization and a number of sociolinguistic variables to be investigated in connection with the different paths. Second, in most of the well-known cases of language standardization in Europe since the Renaissance, a number of features keep recurring, although they are not all present in each case: [Here I shall omit the 4 features listed by Ferguson although I may have occasion to refer to some later].

This paper, unlike many papers in this conference, does not report a case study on language standardisation. Rather this is an attempt at a systematic inventory or a typology of the various sociolinguistic variables in the uncharted paths to standardisation. The typology is

¹I record my appreciation to Dr. Edilberto P. Dagot, Dean, Graduate School, Philippine Normal College for reading and criticising the paper and to Dr. Ernesto Constantino, Professor of Linguistics, University of the Philippines, who made helpful suggestions on the frames. All shortcomings of the paper are mine, however. Thanks are due Mrs. Mila Arcibal and Miss Evelyn de Guzman for assistance in typing the manuscript.

a tentative one. It is my hope that some hypotheses, no matter how tentatively stated, may come out of the attempt so that studies and refinements may come from them especially with special reference to the standardisation of languages in Southeast Asia.

There are two works on language standardisation devoted to the subject which take practically the same position, the first by the Indian scholar Punya Sloka Ray (1963) and the other by the Estonian Scholar, Valter Tauli (1968).¹ Both consider language as a tool (Ray 1963:11; Tauli 1968:9) and claim that language standardisation should strive to make language efficient for communication purposes. I do not take this position in this paper; I concur with Haugen (1969:930-949; 1971:288) who criticises the position taken by the two scholars that there is much more to language than just being a tool or instrument. Haugen quotes Hjemsløv's definition of language as

the ultimate, indispensable sustainer of the human individual, his refuge in hours of loneliness, when the mind wrestles with existence and the conflict is resolved in the monologue of the poet and the thinker.

With this quotation Haugen cautions us that

These words should be pondered well before one sets forth on a program of either language planning or standardization.

(1971:288)

I take the position that language is more than just a tool. In the discussion that follows, this will be evident in many places.

Finally, before I set out to discuss the suggested typology of language standardisation (LS), a summary of the concept of LS may be appropriate at this point. One of the best summaries, in my opinion, is that set by Joshua A. Fishman who views LS as a societal behaviour towards language. He summarises his views and those of Stewart and Haugen in the following words: (Fishman 1971:288-289)

One of the best known societal behaviors towards language is Standardization, i.e., "the codification and acceptance, within a community of users, of a formal set of norms defining 'correct' usage" (Stewart 1968). Codification is, typically, the concern of such language 'gatekeepers' as scribes, storytellers, grammarians, teachers and writers, i.e., of certain groups that arise in most diversified societies and whose use of language is professional and conscious. Given codification as a goal, this desired 'good' is formulated or presented to all or part of the speech community via such means as grammars, dictionaries, spellers, style manuals, and exemplary texts, whether written or oral. Finally, the acceptance of the formally codified (i.e., the standardized)

¹For very pertinent evaluation of the two, see Einar Haugen, *Instrumentalism in Language Planning*. In Rubin and Jernudd, 1971.

variety of a language is advanced via such agencies and authorities as the government, the educational system, the mass media, the religious institutions and the cultural 'establishment'. The standard variety then becomes associated with such institutions, the type of interactions that most commonly occur within them, and the values or goals they represent (Haugen 1966).

I must now try to make the point clear that the foregoing quotation gives us the impression that LS seems to take place apart and ahead of implementation and acceptance.¹ LS actually takes place simultaneously with implementation and acceptance, at least gradual and therefore piecemeal acceptance. One does not wait (at least in the Philippine experience and I suspect in the Indonesian and Malaysian experience, too) for the language to be fully standardised before the results of LS is taken up (implemented) and accepted. The demands of the times where we find ourselves competing in a modern world that puts demands on language do not allow us the leisurely standardisation of our national languages. We must telescope or collapse many processes and it is this condition that makes LS in our societies in great need of systematisation. We must modernise the language, standardise it, and make it acceptable almost all at once. The job is not an enviable one and it will cause many anxieties (for example, on the part of teachers and on the part of the non-native speakers of the language being standardised), and many dislocations. Many people are practically forced to be marginal populations because of language, i.e., those who will never be able to possess the LS for many reasons, many not within their control.

When a nation proceeds to standardise a language, it embarks on a path that must be sustained by hope and powerful motivations - hope that the language will benefit as many citizens as possible and on the other hand reduce the frustration and sadness of those citizens who, because of a combination of circumstances, mostly beyond their control, will not be able to possess the standard language (SL) and therefore will have no access to the gains and privileges that the SL will make possible and accessible. Language Standardisation will therefore result in gains and penalties - for those who possess the SL, many of the good things; for those who do not, many penalties. One of the dimensions and components to be considered by language planners and decision makers should be the reduction of the penalties.

Ray (1963:70) reduces LS into two simple steps: first, the creation of a model for imitation and second, promotion of this model over rival

¹See both Ferguson and Haugen, various publications cited in this paper.

models. In that simple paradigm is a world of difficulties.

Take for example that second step - the promotion of the model over rival models. One of the deterrents or blocks to LS is the availability of a language of wider communication (LWC, after Ferguson), for instance, English in the case of the Philippines. Modernisation of aspects of life other than language is carried via English. While it is true that the general society now use Pilipino in much of the oral transactions (actually a type of a mixture - of code switching - of English and Pilipino), the written transactions (including the learning of the subject matter in these fields) are in English. This condition will 'delay' the standardisation of Pilipino. How much delay this will cause may never be measured. Maybe delay is not the right term. This is specially so because now the Philippines is committed to bilingualism - in Pilipino and in English.¹

It is therefore in this area where planners must look into more intense motivations for LS. The search for viable motivations for language standardisation is one of the most difficult aspects in LS.

Let me now address myself to the typology. Let me start (and this is intentional) with the intended user population (IUP). Sometimes the term target population is used.

The potential users of the LS may either be native speakers of a variety of the L to be standardised or non-native speakers, i.e., speakers of another language (in the Philippines, native speakers of Tagalog or speakers of languages such as Ilocano, Cebuano, Pampango, etc.) Or they may be children, out-of-school youths, or adults.²

Now to read the typological frame from left to right. If they are native speakers of a variety of the language to be standardised, they may be speaking a variety that is either dynamic or recessive (for example, speakers of Batangas Tagalog - here used without malice - may be considered speakers of a dynamic brand of T because the brand or variety tends to be perpetuated and speakers are quite proud of their Batangueñoness, whereas those that are near Manila tend to lose their characteristics and adopt the Manila Tagalog which can be defined as neither that of Batangas, nor Bulacan nor of some places in Laguna, say Liliw, for example). Or if they are non-native speakers of T, they

¹For the bilingual policy in Philippine education, see Department of Education and Culture Order No. 25, s. 1974.

²The importance of programmes for out-of-school youth was emphasised by the administration with the establishment of the Department of Youth and Sports Development on December 10, 1974. The President of the Philippines himself heads this new department pending the appointment of the regular secretary.

may either come from a group that tends to value and perpetuate the first language (for example, Cebuanos and Ilocanos) as opposed to those non-native speakers who speak a language that they do not particularly care to maintain (for example, a number of small language speakers such as those speaking Kankanaey or Ibaloi who do not seem to particularly care for the maintenance of their own language. They speak Ilocano, the regional lingua franca, among themselves).

If the intended user population (IUP) are children, do they come from advantaged or disadvantaged homes; or do they come from the upper, middle, or lower class stratum of the society; or do they come from urban centers of population and have facilities for contact with the L being standardised or from rural areas where no such facilities are available; or do they come from mobile/static populations?

To read the frame using an all-over reading: IUP may be children who are non-native speakers of the L being standardised, who come from disadvantaged homes located in a rural area and rooted (static) to the place. Or they may be children from a first language speaking group that is dynamic in character. A generalisation that may be made out of this description is that the chances of the first group of children of ever possessing the SL is practically nil. Now, that should be a testable hypothesis as Ferguson would put it (see earlier portion of this paper and cf. Ferguson 1968:32).

Take another description using an all-over reading. This is an adult native speaker from a recessive area (most likely from Calamba), of an advantaged family, with an extended educated family, rural (maybe semi-rural is better here), and is mobile. This person's chances of possessing the SL is great. A non-native speaker of the L being standardised under the same circumstances has less chances of ever possessing the SL.

The means of strategies for reaching such varying user populations will have to be different. Again this is a generalisation out of which a testable hypothesis may be formulated.¹

I shall now treat the institutions/agencies involved in LS. Included in this frame are the 'who' and their characteristics. Please refer to Table B.

Institutions involved in LS may either be doing this consciously,

¹The spread hypothesis of Jernudd and Das Gupta (in Rubin and Jernudd, 1971:206) may be refined. A hypothesis may be: The spread of the acceptance of the SL will differ greatly under a number of sociolinguistic and other factors, for example that of geography and means of communication as outlined and suggested in the typological frames.

i.e., deliberately or only unconsciously (non-deliberate). Their activities may be either done on a formal basis, that is with authority, generally from the government or some generally recognised authority; or informally, that is generally on a volunteer-basis.

Also, the activities may either be addressed to (or engaged in/by) the general population or special groups or segments of the society.

Now let us read from the frame. LS may be carried on consciously (deliberately) by the public schools for the general population or by private schools/colleges/universities or academies or institutes for special groups or segments of the population and on a formal (that is, with authority) basis.¹ Or this may be done informally (that is, on a voluntary basis) for the general population by publishing houses or by private organisations for special segments or sections/groups of the society by such organisations as linguistic societies (in the Philippines, the Philippine Association for Language Teaching, the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, the Pambansang Samahan sa Linggwistikang Pilipino, Ink., among others).

On the unconscious level which is marked non-deliberate in this tentative frame, fall the various agencies of the government (here the term domain of language may be appropriate, cf. Fishman, 1966 or Otones and Sibayan, 1969) that are not organised for language purposes but nevertheless use language and often issue their own circulars and memorandums on the use of certain terminologies such as for instance the armed forces; or they write decisions such as the courts and the law; or they issue rules and regulations and/or sermons such as the church. They operate with authority but their products are addressed to special groups or segments of the society and not to the general population. On the informal (voluntary) level are the mass media - newspapers, radio/TV programmes.²

Also operating on the unconscious and informal level are those who write professionally in the various disciplines/professions like medicine, law, sociology, psychology, etc. How these writers will be persuaded to write in the new idiom is a problem particularly where there is no tradition for writing such in the present society because of the presence of a language of wider communication - English.

¹By formal is meant that with authority from above; for example, the government, the church, etc.

²For a scholarly analysis of the language used by the Filipino bilingual, (where the Filipino switches from Tagalog to English or English to Tagalog popularly called mix-mix) see Bautista, Maria Lourdes, 1974. *A Model for Describing the Competence of the Filipino Bilingual*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Philippine Normal College-Ateneo de Manila University Consortium for a Ph.D. in Linguistics. Manila and Quezon City, Philippines.

Let us now look at the probable facilitators or obstacles in LS. We shall refer to Table C. This table is capable of being read in many ways. For example, one can read: Is there a tradition of financing from individual, group or national sources? National may generally be read government. Or what are the traditional values that are in conflict with individual group and national aspirations? Or what are the conflicting attitudes and aspirations of the group or national groups? Or is there a national symbol that provides motivations and capable of eliciting the proper attitudes for LS? Note that with various readings one can either interpret them as obstacles or facilitators in LS.

And now we must look at the 'concrete' results and chief means of 'perpetuating' or developing the SL (Table D): Grammars, dictionaries, thesauruses (thesauri), spellers, style manuals, references, texts, journals, encyclopedias. We shall include here translations and original research work. These may be for use in the complete educational system - primary, secondary, and college/university; for vocational, professional, and/or scientific learned societies and some for the general public.

The last Table (Table E) is one that I titled **Modernisation Demands for LS** in terms of linguistic components such as the demands of the science and technological world, transportation and communication, government and education, and special fields or disciplines for such things as a particular speech variety, discourse, pronunciation, orthography, and specially vocabulary or lexicon.

For the evaluation criteria for testing the status of the L being standardised, we may use those advanced by Garvin (1964:521-523; 1974: 69-78) which are in terms of 1) Intrinsic properties = a) flexible stability, b) intellectualisation; 2) functions = a) unifying, b) separatist, c) participatory (this one was added by Garcia in the 1974 paper), d) prestige, and e) frame of reference; and 3) Attitudes = a) language loyalty, b) pride and awareness of norm.

The foregoing can be read and interpreted in terms of the other Tables. For example, intellectualisation can be read with reference to Table D - Inventory of Documentary Evidence of a SL. One can test whether the language has been intellectualised through a study of original works published in journals and books and references or texts used by the general public, the higher education sector, professionals, or scientific and learned societies.

From these frames, one can set up a series of hypotheses to test. A general hypothesis, out of which minor ones can be drawn, is the following:

The time required for LS and the degree of mastery by the IUP are affected by the various factors (as stated in the Tables).

This hypothesis suggests that the next step would be the development of appropriate and adequate instruments which will reveal the dimensions of time and degree of mastery and the interaction of the various factors.

As the hypothesis is being tested, implementation processes will be taking place. The research, therefore, will have to account for these processes - to determine whether programmes being carried out which are presumably to accelerate LS are fulfilling their functions or actually retarding the processes.

It was fun playing around with these ideas. These Tables are tentative and at best suggestive. I hope other workers in the field will advance generalisations and hypothesis for research. I will appreciate suggestions and criticisms for improvement and application.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALISJAHBANA, S. Takdir

- 1971 'Some Planning Processes in the Planning of the Indonesian-Malay Language'. In: Rubin and Jernudd, eds. 1971.

ANSRE, Gilbert

- 1974 'Language Standardisation in Sub-Saharan Africa'. In: Fishman, ed. 1974:369.

BARNES, Dayle

- 1974 'Language Planning in Mainland China: Standardization'. In: Fishman, ed. 1974:457.

BLANC, Haim

- 1968 'The Israeli Koine as an Emergent National Standard'. In: Fishman, et. al. 1968:237.

FERGUSON, Charles A.

- 1964a 'Diglossia'. In: Hymes, 1964:429.
- 1964b 'Teaching Standard Languages to Dialect Speakers'. In: Shuy, 1964:112.
- 1968 'Language Development'. In: Fishman, et. al. 1968:27.

FISHMAN, Joshua A.

- 1966 *Language Loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1968 *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton.

FISHMAN, Joshua A.

- 1971 *Advances in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1972 *Language and Nationalism*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.
- 1974a 'Language Modernization and Planning in Comparison with other types of National Modernization and Planning'. In: Fishman, ed. 1974:79.
- 1974b 'Language Planning and Language Planning Research: The State of the Art'. In: Fishman, ed. 1974:15.

FISHMAN, Joshua A., ed.

- 1974 *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague: Mouton.

FISHMAN, Joshua A., Charles A. FERGUSON and Jyotirindra DAS GUPTA, eds.

- 1968 *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

GARVIN, Paul L.

- 1964 'The Standard Language Problem: Concepts and Methods'. In: Hymes, 1964:521.
- 1973 'Some Comments on Language Planning'. In: Rubin, Joan and Roger Shuy, eds. *Language Planning: Current Issues and Research*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press 1973: . Reprinted in Fishman 1974:69-78.

GARVIN, Paul L. and Madeleine MATHIOT

- 1964 'The Urbanization of the Guarani Language: A Problem in Language and Culture'. In: Hymes, 1964:365.

GUXMAN, M.M.

- 1960 'Some General Regularities in the Formation and Development of National Languages'. In: Fishman, 1968:

HAUGEN, Einar

- 1969 'Review of Introduction to a Theory of Language Planning by Valter Tauli'. *Language* 45:939-49.

HAUGEN, Einar

1971 'Instrumentalism in Language Planning'. In: Rubin and Jernudd, eds. 1971:281.

1972 *The Ecology of Language*. Selected and Introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

HYMES, Dell H.

1964 *Language in Culture and Society*. New York: Harper and Row.

JERNUDD, Bjorn H. and J. DAS GUPTA

1971 'Towards a Theory of Language Planning'. In: Rubin and Jernudd, eds. 1971:195.

KARAM, Francis X.

1974 'Toward a Definition of Language Planning'. In: Fishman, ed. 1974:103.

LABOV, William

1964 'Stages in the Acquisition of Standard English'. In: Shuy, ed. 1964:

NEUSTUPNY, Jiri

1968 'Some General Aspects of "Language" Problems and "Language" Policy in Developing Societies'. In: Fishman, et. al. 1968:285.

1974 'Basic Types of Treatment of Language Problems'. In: Fishman, ed. 1974:37.

RAY, Punya Sloka

1963 *Language Standardization*. The Hague: Mouton.

RUBIN, Joan and Bjorn JERNUDD, eds.

1971 *Can Language be Planned?* Honolulu: The University of Hawaii Press.

SHUY, Roger W., ed.

1964 *Social Dialects and Language Learning*. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

SIBAYAN, Bonifacio P.

- 1974 'Language Policy, Language Engineering and Literacy in the Philippines'. In: Fishman, ed. 1974:221.

TAULI, Valter

- 1968 *Introduction to a Theory of Language Planning*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. *Studia Philologiae Scandinavicae Upsaliensia*, 6.

- 1974 'The Theory of Language Planning'. In: Fishman, ed. 1971:49.

VALDMAN, Albert

- 1968 'Language Standardization Diglossia Situation: Haiti'. In: Fishman, et. al. 1968:313.

LANGUAGE STANDARDISATION AS A COMPONENT
OF LANGUAGE PLANNING: A SUGGESTED TYPOLOGY

APPENDIX

TABLE A INTENDED USER POPULATION (IUP) OF THE SL											
	Type of Speech Community		Home Back-ground		Class Membership			Geo-graphical Setting		Patterns of Movement	
	Dynamic	Recessive	Advantaged	Disadvantaged	Upper Class	Middle Class	Lower Class	Urban	Rural	Mobile	Static
A. SPEAKERS											
1. Native speakers of a variety of L Std.											
2. Non-Native speakers											
B. GENERATION											
1. Children											
2. Adults											
3. Out-of-School Youths											

TABLE B INSTITUTION/AGENCIES FOR LS				
	FORMAL (AUTHORITY)		INFORMAL	
	Gen Pop	Special	Gen Pop	Special
Conscious (Deliberate)	Public Schools	Language Committees Private Sch. Coll./Univ. Asso./Insti- tutes, e.g., INL	Publishers	Private Org. LSP, PALT PSLP
Unconscious (non-deliberate)		Military Courts and Law Church	Mass Media Newspapers TV Radio Pulong- Pulong Market	Disciplines/ Professions Writers

TABLE C OBSTACLES/FACILITATORS OF LS					
	TIME AND TENDENCIES		SOURCE		
	Traditional + - ∅	Current + - ∅	Individual	Group	National
Scholarship Financing					
Values Attitudes Aspirations Motivations Symbols					

TABLE D DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE OF A SL							
	General Use	Primary Schools	Secondary Schools	Colleges	Vocational Schools	Professional	Scientific/ Learned
Grammar Dictionaries Thesauruses Spellers Style Manuals References Texts Journals Encyclopedia Original Work (Various genres) Translations							

TABLE E MODERNISATION DEMANDS FOR LS					
DEMANDS MADE BY:	SPEECH VARIETY	DISCOURSE	PRONUNCIATION	ORTHOGRAPHY	VOCAELARY (lexicon)
Science/Industry Government Education Transportation Mass Communication Special Fields (Law, Medicine etc.					

ADDENDUM*

Bilingual Education in Double Secondary Bilingualism

Language of Instruction	S P E A K E R S			
	TAGALOG		NON-TAGALOG	
PILIPINO	Urban (MNL)	Rural	Urban	Rural
		MT school, and speech community (SC) media	MT school speech community	SL school and partial media
ENGLISH	SL school partial SC	SL school	SL school partial media	SL school

*From Sibayan, B.P. 1974, 'Rationale for Bilingual Education in the Philippines', *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching*, Vol. VII, May 1974, p.7.