

MODULE 2

Unit 1	Language Planning and Policy: Preliminaries
Unit 2	Different Aspects of Language Planning and Policy
Unit 3	Objectives, Goals and Ideologies of Language Planning and Policy
Unit 4	Language Planning and Policy Issues
Unit 5	Prestige and Multiglossic Nature of Languages
Unit 6	Official Orthographies

UNIT 1 LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY: PRELIMINARIES**CONTENTS**

1.0	Introduction
2.0	Objectives
3.0	Main Content
3.1	Definitions of Language Planning and Policy (LPP)
3.2	The Nature of Language Policy
3.3	Stages in Language Planning
4.0	Conclusion
5.0	Summary
6.0	Tutor-Marked Assignment
7.0	References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This unit examines different definitions of language policy and planning in multilingual communities. It also highlights the different stages of language planning.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define language planning and policy;
- describe language planning and policy;
- identify the nature of language policy; and
- discuss some different stages in language planning and policy.

HOW TO STUDY THE UNIT

- a. Read this unit as diligently as possible.
- b. Find meaning of unfamiliar words in the unit using your dictionary.
- c. As you read, put major points down in a piece of paper or jotter.
- d. Do not go to the next section until you have fully understood the section you are reading now.
- e. Do all the Self-Assessment exercises in the unit as honestly as you can. In some areas where it is not feasible to provide answers to Self-Assessment exercises, go to the relevant sections of the unit to derive the answers.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Preliminaries of Language Policy and Planning

3.1.1 Definitions of Language Planning and Policy (LPP)

Scholars use the terms “language planning and policy” and “language policy and planning” sometimes interchangeably. In this course, we adopt the same strategy. My argument is premised on the fact that planning usually precedes policy formulation and a policy also needs planning for effective implementation. Thus, according to Haugen (1969: p.701), language planning “includes the normative work of language academies and committees, all forms of what is commonly known as language cultivation and all proposals for language reform or standardisation.”

Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971:p. 211) define language planning as a “political and administrative activity for solving language problems in society.” Gorman (1973: p.73) defines the term “language planning” as “measures taken to select, codify and in some cases, to elaborate orthographic, grammatical, lexical, or semantic features of a language and to disseminate the corpus agreed upon.”

For Fishman (1974: p. 79), the term “language planning” refers to the “organised pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at the national level.” Weinstein (1980: p. 55) argues that language planning can be defined as “a government authorised long term sustained and conscious effort to alter a language itself or to change a language’s functions in a society for the purpose of solving communication problems.” According to Karam (1994: p. 105) language planning is “an activity which attempts to solve a language problem, usually on a national scale, and which focuses on either language form or language use or both.”

Trughill (2003) sees it as activities carried out by governmental, official or other influential bodies that are aimed at establishing which language varieties are used in a particular community, and subsequently at directing or influencing which language varieties are to be used for which purposes in that particular community, and what the linguistic characteristics of those varieties are to be.

Romaine (2003) opines that language planning and policy is the attempt to manage linguistic and cultural contacts and potential conflicts resulting from managing or mismanaging multilingualism within the framework of agencies of the modern nation-state.

It has been argued that:

The field of language planning, as its name suggests, has concentrated its efforts on the description and practice of planned language development. This is after all its *raison d'être*, to provide future oriented, problem-solving language-change strategies to meet particular language needs. This orientation means that language planning is one of the key descriptive topics in applied linguistics, bringing together as it does theory from a variety of disciplines and putting that into practice (Richard & Bauldorf, 1997:82).

Language planning in multilingual nations needs to be properly defined and described because it concerns human beings, their behaviour, attitudes, emotions, and their relationships with one another (Adegbija, 2004). Due to the importance of language planning, Du Plessis (1994: p. 284) argues that status planning is an aspect of language planning and management, with “people planning.”

The formulation and implementation of language planning and policy in many multilingual nations such as Nigeria have been integral parts/elements of social and educational policies. Questions of national and official language selection, of orthographic selection and spelling standardisation of language use in government, judiciary and education, standardisation and modernisation of language are the functions of language planning and policy. Reagan (2006) notes that language planning and policy activities are not limited to spoken languages, and that LPP has a growing significance in sign languages and a broad framework for their development and implementation.

Cobarrubias (1989) argues that despite the conceptual difference between corpus and status planning, the two interact with each other. The allocation of new language functions (status planning) often requires changes in the linguistic system (corpus planning) such as

development of new styles and lexical items. To exemplify the interaction between corpus and status planning, Deumert (2003) cites the example of the adoption of Hebrew as medium of instruction in Palestine, which necessitates expansion the expansion of vocabulary of Classical Hebrew in order to provide terms for the teaching of modern school subjects such as chemistry, physics and biology (Rubin, 1989).

Fishman (1987: p. 409) sees language planning as: “authoritative allocation of resources to the attainment of language status and language corpus goal, whether in connection with new functions that are aspired to, or in connection with old functions that need to be discharged more adequately.” “Language planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes (Cooper 1989: p. 45).” Reagan (2006: p.157) opines that language planning is an “applied sociolinguistic activity with great potential to function either as a tool for empowerment and liberation or as a means of oppression and domination”, and that each of these functions manifests in every sphere of human life.

The American linguist, Einar Haugen in the late 1950s introduced the term “language planning.” It refers to all conscious efforts that aim at changing the linguistic behaviour of a speech community. It can as well include anything “from proposing a new word to a new language” (Haugen, 1987, p. 627). Language planning is sometimes used interchangeably with language policy. It has been argued that language policy refers “to the more general linguistic, political and social goals underlying the actual language planning process” (Deumert, 2003, p. 385).

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Look critically at the arguments presented above and give your own definition of language planning.

3.2 The Nature of Language Policy

Emenanjo (2002) describes a policy as a general declaration of intent, for the implementation of a mission statement about a vision for something, about anything, and for everything. A policy may or may not be found in any *corpus juris*, text(s) or document(s). In relation to this perspective, definition of policy, a language policy is about human language, its status, its use and usage and its overall management in any polity. It is a policy about who uses or adopts what language, when, where, why and how, in any polity no matter its ethnic or racial make-up...

Language policy is thus a deliberate effort to mandate specific language behaviours in particular contexts. Such policies can, and do, involve decision about language development and allocation, language use, language rights, and a host of other important issues. This simply means an official and deliberate allocation of roles to languages in a multilingual speech community.

3.3 Stages in Language Planning

Bamgbose (1983a) refers to stages in language planning as fact-finding, policy decision, implementation and evaluation, and he sees this as ‘the canonical model of language planning’; suggesting that it needs to be revised to reflect the reality of language development activities in many developing countries where ‘planning’ sometimes takes place without real planning.

Conversely, Adebija (1989) proposes five stages in language planning. First, there is the spadework and preparation stage (during which fact-finding is done and policy formulated). Second, there is the mass mobilisation and enlightenment stage, during which the plan is advertised, the citizenry is educated about it and familiarised with it. Third, there is the implementation stage, which handles the details of the language policy. Fourth, there is the evaluation stage, a continuous process for monitoring the effectiveness, problems and prospects of the policy from the perspectives of the set objectives. Finally, there is the review stage, also seen as a continuous process in which changes, informed by findings in the evaluation stage, are effected from time to time as the situation demands. He identifies the following contexts as pertinent to managers of language resources: the language context, the socio-political context, the psychological context, the administrative/governmental context, and the educational.

It has been argued that, in multilingual environments, at least the following aspects of public life and domains of language use deserve special language planning attention: the national languages, the languages of nations or official languages, the languages of intercultural or interethnic communication, the languages of international communication, and, most importantly the languages of education (Adebija, 2004, p. 187).

In the Nigerian context, language planning for education has received most attention, perhaps because this domain also affects other domains for which language planning is required. For instance, it impinges on language planning for official language use or nationalism, a role which English has played in Nigeria since colonial times. Attempts have also been made to cultivate Hausa, Yoruba and Igbo into national languages through language planning, but those attempts lag in implementation

and have not enhanced the success of the policy. As far as planning for international purposes is concerned, the policy has not overtly stated so, but English has naturally played and still plays this role. Language policy in Nigeria has not also overtly indicated planning for inter-ethnic communication, but major community languages have served in such a capacity in most States.

Thus, Ufomata (1999: p. 315) has argued that:

If indeed, linguistic ecology refers to the communicative behaviours of a group, as well as the physical and social contexts in which their communication occurs ... then Nigeria presents a classic example of a complex linguistic ecology. The number of languages spoken within Nigeria is put at between 150 and 427. With such an extremely complex multilingualism, policies need to be carefully formulated to take into account language attitudes of members of the community. They also need to take cognizance of all the functions, including symbolic ones that various languages perform within that society.

4.0 CONCLUSION

This unit has examined the preliminaries of LPP, the different stages, its scope and how it can be reflected. It has shown you that language policy is a deliberate effort, based on the survey of language planners. The next unit will focus on the different aspects of language planning and policy.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt:

- the definition of LPP
- the stages of LPP
- the nature of Language Policy.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

- i. Differentiate between language planning and language policy.
- ii. Examine the stages of LPP.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Adegbija, E. (2004). "Language Policy and Planning in Nigeria." *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 5(3): 181-246.

- Adekunle, M. (1995). *English in Nigeria: Attitudes, Policy and Communicative Realities. New Englishes: A West African Perspective*. Ayo Bamgbose, Ayo Banjo & Andrew Thomas (Eds). Nigeria: Mosuro Press.
- Cobarrubias, J. (1983). "Ethical Issues in Status Planning." In: J. Cobarrubias & J.A. Fishman (Eds.). *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*. (pp 41-85). Mouton Publishers.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Deumert, A. (2004). "Language Planning." In: R. Mesthrie (Ed.). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Du Plessis, T. (1994/2006). "From monolingual to bilingual higher education: The repositioning of historically Afrikaans-medium universities in South Africa". *Language Policy*, 5(1): 87-113.
- Emenanjo, E. N. (2002). "Language Policies and Cultural Identities." Paper Presented at World Congress on Language Policies, Barcelona, 16-20 April. Available online at www.linguapax.org/congres/plenaries/Emanege.html
- Fishman, J. (1974). *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Gorman, T. P. (1970). *Language in education in Eastern Africa*. Nairobi, Kenya: Oxford University Press.
- Haarmann, H. (1990). "Language planning in the light of a general theory of language: A methodological framework." *IJSL*, 86:103-26.
- Haugen, E. (1966) *Language conflict and language planning: the case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1968). *Language Planning in Modern Norway*. In: Fishman (Ed.). pp. 673-687.
- Karam, F. X. (1974). "Toward a definition of language planning." In: J. A. Fishman (Ed.). *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague: Mouton.

- Kloss, H. (1969). *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.
- Nahir, M. (1984). Language Planning Goals: A Classification. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 8: 294-327.
- Reagan, T. (2006). The Explanatory Power of Critical Language Studies: Linguistics with an Attitude. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 3,(1): 1-22.
- Ricento, T. K. & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). "Unpeeling the Onion: Language Planning and Policy and the ELT Profession." *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (3):401-425.
- Richard, B. Jr. & Bauldorf, B. (1997). "Foundations of Language Policy and Planning." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 14: 82-89.
- Robert, B. K. & Richard, B. B. (1997). *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*.
- Romaine, S. (2005). "Language Contact Studies." In: Ammon, U., Dittmar, N., Mattheier, K. J., and Trudgill, P. (Eds). *Sociolinguistics-Soziolinguistik. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. pp. 49- 58.
- Stewart, W. A. (1968). Sociolinguistic Typology of Multilingualism. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. J. Fishman. (Ed). The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Trudgill, P. (2003). *A Glossary of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ufomata, T. (1999). "Major and Minor Languages in Complex Linguistic Ecologies: the Nigerian experience." *International Journal of Educational Development*. 19, 315–322.

UNIT 2 DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Different Aspects of Language Planning and Policy
 - 3.1.1 Language-in-Education
 - 3.2 Process of Language Planning and Policy
 - 3.3 Spheres of LPP
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In the previous unit (unit one), you learnt the definitions, stages and nature of language planning and policy. This unit describes aspects, process and spheres of language planning and policy.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- define aspects of language policy and planning;
- describe the process of language planning;
- discuss the spheres of language planning and policy; and
- identify language choice with aspects of LPP.

HOW TO STUDY THE UNIT

- a. Read this unit as diligently as possible.
- b. Find meaning of unfamiliar words in the unit using your dictionary.
- c. As you read, put major points down in a piece of paper or jotter.
- d. Do not go to the next section until you have fully understood the section you are reading now.
- e. Do all the Self-Assessment exercises in the unit as honestly as you can. In some areas where it is not feasible to provide answers to Self-Assessment exercises, go to the relevant sections of the unit to derive the answers.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Different Aspects of Language Planning and Policy

3.1.1 Language-in-Education

One of the aspects of LPP is language-in-education. Ingram (1990: p. 53) defines language-in-education as the ideals, goals and content of language policy that can be achieved within realisable extent, within the educational system.

Liddicoat (2004:155) has observed that:

Even though language policy documents do refer to questions of method, few academic studies of language planning and policy have treated method as a specific instance of language-in-education planning. A notable exception is the work of Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, p. 2002), who divide language-in-education policy into a number of areas of focus:

- a) access policy: policies regarding the designation of languages to be studied and of the levels of education at which language will be studied;
- b) personnel policy: policies regarding teacher recruitment, professional learning and standards;
- c) curriculum and community policy: policies regarding what will be taught and how the teaching will be organised, including the specification of outcomes and assessment instruments;
- d) methods and materials policy: policies regarding prescriptions of methodology and set texts for language study;
- e) resourcing policy: policies regarding the level of funding to be provided for languages in the education system; and
- f) evaluation policy: policies regarding how the impact of language in education policy will be measured and how the effectiveness of policy implementation will be gauged.

So far, in Nigeria, sections of the National Policy on Education and the 1999 Constitution is the only language policy document in circulation. This means that Nigeria is yet to fashion out a workable language policy.

3.1.2 Language Choice

Language choice is another aspect of LPP. What is language choice? Fitch and Hopper (1983:115-6) observe that:

- (a) language choice decisions are often emotional to participants in conversations and such choices play a role in group inclusion;
- (b) language choice is primarily used to include or exclude others, and more often the latter;
- (c) language choice decisions often evoke strong evaluative and emotional reactions;
- (d) attitude towards the language choice decision of others often take the form of cultural and linguistic stereotypes.

Language choice could be examined both at individual and societal levels.

Individual Level of Language Choice

Every individual considers their competence in the various languages in their choice of language. Therefore, there is a conscious effort and decision to choose a language that is very suitable for every occasion and situation, while also taking into consideration the attitude of the addressee or interactant to the language he/she can speak. Adegbija (2004) argues that at individual level of choosing a language variety, the concept of 'language choice' is typically and frequently applied in sociolinguistic literature in multilingual contexts. Scotton and Ury (1977), cited in Adegbija (2004), observe that multilingual individuals do evaluate communicative situations thereby choosing amongst available codes on the account of intelligibility, semantic needs, sociolinguistic norm and other factors.

There exist several studies/researches on the choice of language in certain communicative situations. For example, Fergusson (1959) identifies three factors that are crucial determinants of language choice in a multilingual context. These are:

- (a) the social group to which one belongs (education, for instance, affects one's social standing and normally has a remarkable impact on language usage);
- (b) the situation in which one finds oneself while the communication is occurring (language usage at a funeral, for instance, is different from language usage at a birthday party);
- (c) the topic one is discussing (most topics have their distinct registers).

At the micro-level, Milroy's (1980) study of social networks in Belfast reveals that occupational affiliations and family ties can have a remarkable impact on the individual language choice.

Using data from ethnographic studies of the use of French and English in Ontario and Quebec (Canada) in a variety of settings (hospital,

factory, school, and so on.) over a period of 12 years (1978–1990), Heller (1992) describes language choice as a political strategy, especially as a strategy of ethnic mobilisation. She further states that code switching must be understood in terms of individual communicative repertoires and community speech economies, particularly as these are tied to a political economic analysis of the relationship between the availability and use of linguistic varieties. Heller (1995) writes that individuals use language choices and code-switching to collaborate with or resist symbolic domination.

Lanca *et al.* (1994) investigate language use among 103 Portuguese immigrants or first generation Canadians of Portuguese descent who completed a questionnaire in their preferred language (English, French, or Portuguese) to assess their modes of acculturation, self reported ethnic identity, self-esteem, individualistic and collectivistic tendencies, and self-reported competence in speaking and reading English, French, and Portuguese. The results of the research indicated that language preference was associated with ethnic identity.

Kasuya (1998) examines the degree of parents' consistency in their language choice and the promotion of their children's active bilingualism and kinds of discourse strategies Japanese-speaking parents provide when children use English (the societal language). The result of the study reveals that Japanese parent's consistency in using Japanese with the child appeared to be related to the child's choice of Japanese and in addition, a discourse strategy whereby parents made their preference for the use of Japanese quite explicit, had the highest success rate in relation to the child's subsequent choice of Japanese

3.2 The Process of Language Planning

Haugen (1966, 1989) writes that the process of language planning consists of four stages:

1. Selection
2. Codification
3. Elaboration
4. Implementation

Language planning activities begin with selection, which means preference for a language or its varieties among others, and promoting the preferred one. Language policy is a deliberate effort to mandate specific language behaviours in particular contexts. Such policies can, and do, involve decisions about language development and allocation, language use, language rights, and a host of other important issues. This simply means allocation of roles and functions to languages in a multilingual speech community. For instance, English has been

allocated official functions in Nigeria, since it is used in all government/official transactions, in spite of the fact that the country has about 400 languages. Thus, English represents the norm that has been selected and accepted. Wardhaugh (2006: p. 34) points out that “the chosen norm inevitably becomes associated with power and the rejected alternatives with lack of power. Not surprisingly, it usually happens that a variety associated with the elite is chosen.”

Codification refers to the standardisation process whereby that language has been codified to some extent. Thus, the language has been reduced to writing in the form of an accepted orthography/letters of the alphabet, accepted rules for the use of grammar, pronunciation, syntax, dictionaries, primers and a few literatures. This means that, to a large extent, there is an agreement about what is acceptable and what is not in the language. Thus, it brings together competing orthographies, and one is eventually picked as a standard or frame of reference. Again, this represents the norm. A standardised variety of a language can be used as the identity of the speakers and can also differentiate between the High status and Low status languages.

Elaboration of the vocabulary and functions follows the first and second steps. This means going beyond everyday usage to do direct translations, borrow, coin and accommodate new words, expressions and terminologies in that language, especially in the fields of science and technology. It would also involve “the development of pedagogical materials for all levels of formal education” (Wolff, 2000, p. 334).

The final stage is the implementation of the first three stages in the process. How does this take place? Is it immediate or gradual? This stage will determine, to a large extent, how these changes will affect language use in a speech community. For instance, if government creates a lot of awareness by promoting and sponsoring such changes, thereby enhancing the prestige and status and also giving official recognition to this stage, it should be successful.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Which of the aspects of LPP is the most problematic in a country like Nigeria?

3.3 Spheres of LPP

Reagan (2006) states that language policies are reflected in the following:

1. the political sphere: the language of political debate and discourse, etc;
2. the judicial sphere: the language of law, as well as the language used by the police and courts;
3. the religious sphere: the language used for worship, as well as the language in which key religious texts are written;
4. the cultural sphere;
5. the commercial and economic sphere; the language of business and industry;
6. the educational sphere: the language of instruction, additional language studied by pupils; and
7. the interpersonal and familial sphere: the language used in the home, with relatives, and so on.

4.0 CONCLUSION

This unit has examined the aspects, process and spheres of language planning and policy. The next unit will focus on the different objectives, goals, ideologies and types of language planning and policy.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt:

- scholars opinions about the different aspects of LPP
- the spheres of LPP are reflected in different segments such as political, economic, and so on,
- Haugen's (1966, 1989) process of LPP is central to planning.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Examine Haugen's (1966, 1989) process of LPP and discuss how this can be applied in Nigeria.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Adebijaja, E. (2004). "Language Policy and Planning in Nigeria". *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 5(3):181-246.
- Cobarrubias, J. (1983). "Ethical Issues in Status Planning". In: J. Cobarrubias & J.A. Fishman (Eds). *Progress in language planning: International perspectives* .(pp 41-85.). Mouton Publishers.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Deumert, A. (2004). "Language Planning". In: R. Mesthrie (Ed.). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Haarmann, H. (1990). "Language Planning in the Light of a General Theory of Language: A Methodological Framework". *IJSL*, 86:103-26.
- Haugen, E. (1966). *Language conflict and language planning: the case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1968). *Language planning in modern Norway*. In: J.A. Fishman (Ed.). *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. (pp 673-687).The Hague: Mouton.
- Heller, M. (1995). "The Politics of Code-switching and Language." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Matters*, 13: 123-142.
- Kaplan, R. B. & Baldauf, R. B. Jnr. (1997). *Language Planning: From Practice to Theory*. Clevedon, UK : Multilingual Matters.
- Kaplan, R. B. & Baldauf, R. B. Jnr. (2002). *Language and Language-in- Education Planning in the Pacific Basin*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kasuya, H. (1998). *Determinants of Language Choice in Bilingual Children: The Role of Input*. 2 (3), (November) 327-346.
- Kloss, H. (1969). *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

- Liddicoat, A. (2004). "Language Policy and Methodology." *IJES*, 4 (1): 153-171.
- Milroy, L. (1980). *Language and Social Networks*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Nahir, M. (1984). "Language Planning Goals: A classification." *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 8: 294-327.
- Reagan, T. (2006). "The Explanatory Power of Critical Language Studies: Linguistics with an Attitude." *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 3 (1): 1-22.
- Robert, B. K. & Richard, B. B. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ricento, T. K. & Hornberger, N.H. (1996). "Unpeeling the Onion: Language Planning and Policy and the ELT Profession". *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (3): 401-425.
- Stewart, W. A. (1968). "Sociolinguistic Typology of Multilingualism". *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. In: J. Fishman. (Ed.). The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Trudgill, P. (2003). *A Glossary of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. (5th ed.). UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wolff, H. E. (2003). "Language and Society". In: Heine, B. and Nurse, D. (Eds). *African Languages: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

UNIT 3 OBJECTIVES, GOALS AND IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Objectives and Goals of Language Planning and Policy
 - 3.2 Meso Level of Planning
 - 3.3 Ideologies of LPP
 - 3.4 Types of Language Planning Activities
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This unit is a continuation of the previous one. It takes the discussion on language planning further by looking at its objectives, types and goals in addition to its ideologies.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- identify the goals and objectives of language planning;
- state the underlying ideologies of language planning that would enable it to solve language problems; and
- differentiate between types of language planning activities.

HOW TO STUDY THE UNIT

- a. Read this unit as diligently as possible.
- b. Find meaning of unfamiliar words in the unit using your dictionary.
- c. As you read, put major points down in a piece of paper or jotter.
- d. Do not go to the next section until you have fully understood the section you are reading now.
- e. Do all the Self-Assessment exercises in the unit as honestly as you can. In some areas where it is not feasible to provide answers to Self-Assessment exercises, go to the relevant sections of the unit to derive the answers.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Objectives and Goals of Language Planning and Policy

Cooper (1989:182) observes:

That language planning should serve so many covert goals is not surprising. Language is the fundamental institution of society, not only because it is the first institution experienced by the individual but also because all other institutions are built upon its regulatory patterns... **To plan language is to plan society.** A satisfactory theory of language planning awaits a satisfactory theory of social change (my emphasis).

Nahir (1984) earlier suggests specific goals and functions of language planning with sub-categories. The same scholar later identifies eleven Language Planning Goals (Nahir, 2003):

1. Language Purification – prescription of usage to preserve the “linguistic purity” of language, protect language from foreign influences, and guard against language deviation from within.
2. Language Revival – the attempt to turn a language with few or no surviving native speakers back into a normal means of communications.
3. Language Reform – deliberate change in specific aspects of language, like orthography, spelling, or grammar, in order to facilitate use.
4. Language Standardisation – the attempt to garner prestige for a regional language or dialect, transforming it into one that is accepted as the major language, or standard language, of a region.
5. Language Spread – the attempt to increase the number of speakers of one language at the expense of another.
6. Lexical Modernisation – word creation or adaptation.
7. Terminology Unification – development of unified terminologies, primarily in technical domains.
8. Stylistic Simplification – simplification of language usage in lexicon, grammar, and style
9. Interlingual Communication – facilitation of linguistic communication between members of distinct speech communities.
10. Language Maintenance – preservation of the use of a group’s native language as a first or second language where pressures threaten or cause a decline in the status of the language.
11. Auxiliary-Code Standardisation – standardisation of marginal, auxiliary aspects of language such as signs for the deaf, place names, or rules of transliteration and transcription.

The table below provides an overview of some of the types of objectives, goals and functions to be found in language planning.

Summary of Language Planning Goals

Macro Level	Alternative Formulations	Examples
Language Purification		
External purification		
Internal purification		
Language Revival	Language revival Restoration Language regeneration	Hebrew Language revival Revitalisation Revival
Language reform		Turkish
Language standardisation		Spelling and script standardisation
Swahili		
Language spread		
Lexical Modernisation		Term planning
Swedish		
Terminological		Discourse planning
Interlingual communication		
Worldwide IC		
Auxiliary languages		
English LWC		
Regional IC		Regional identity
Regional LWC		National identity
Cognate languages IC		
Language Maintenance		
Dominant LM		
Ethnic LM		
Auxiliary code standardisation		

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Considering the peculiar multilingual situation in Nigeria, what would you recommend as language planning goals?

3.2 Meso Level Planning

This level, according to Kaplan and Bauldorf (1997:240), is more limited in scope and is often aimed at a specific group within the society, such as schools, libraries, and so on.

Administration: Training and certification of officials and professionals

Administration: Legal provision for one

The Legal Domain

Education equity: Pedagogical issues

Education equity: Language rights/identity

Education elite formation/control

Mass communication

Educational equity: Language handicap

Social equity: Minority language access

Interlanguage translation: Training for professions, business, law, and so on.

3.3 Ideologies of Language Planning

Both implicit and explicit goals and objectives of LPP are ideological. There are fundamental and inherent ideologies related to LPP activities. Tolleson (1991: pp 207-208) explains the inherent ideology in LPP activities as follows:

Language policy is a form disciplinary power. Its success depends on in parts on the ability of the state to structure the institutions of society the differentiation of the individuals into “insiders” and “outsiders”... To a large degree, this occurs through the close association between language nationalism. By making language a mechanism for the expression of nationalism, the state can manipulate feeling of security and belonging...the state uses language policy to discipline and control its workers by establishing language-based limitations on education, employment, and political participation. This is one sense in which language policy is inherently ideological.

The government authority saddled with the responsibility always conceives an ideology for such language planning venture. LPP activities promote several agenda of the government on languages in a country and their roles. Ideologies therefore, underlie status planning.

Cobarrubias (1983) identifies four ideologies of language planning as: linguistic assimilation, linguistic pluralism, vernacularisation and internationalisation.

1. Linguistic Assimilation

This is a language ideology which tends to favour monolingual models of society. It involves the rejection and replacement of other languages in the society, at least in the public sphere. It tends to encourage a belief in the public sphere and the superiority of the dominant language in a society; in practice, it often results in the denial of language rights of speakers of languages other than the dominant language.

2. Linguistic Pluralism

However, the ideology of linguistic pluralism emphasises the language rights of minority groups and, in general also supports language diversity in society. It exists in a variety of forms, ranging from relatively weak toleration of diversity to strong support for multiple languages. It also supports granting of official status to two or more languages in a society. Examples of country in which official language status is granted to more than one language include Nigeria – English, Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba are official languages in Nigeria. It helps to solve language related problems in developing nations to avoid domination of less powerful languages by powerful ones.

3. Vernacularisation

This ideology entails the selection of one or more indigenous languages in a society to serve in an official capacity. The selection involves language engineering which focuses on educational sphere with the production of textbooks, curricular materials, matriculation examinations, and so on.

4. Internationalisation

It involves the selection of a language of wider communication, such as English or French, for use as a country's official language. This is a common practice in developing nations/countries and it reflects the colonial past experiences of a nation, for example Nigeria and other African nations.

3.4 Types of Language Planning

Kloss (1968 & 1969) distinguishes two types of language planning: status and corpus planning. Recently, two more dimensions of language

planning have been identified, and these are prestige and acquisition planning.

Status Planning

Status planning refers to the allocation of new functions to a language. It is primarily undertaken by administrators, politicians and people in the government authority. Language planners distinguish many functions of a given language. Such functions are as follows. Stewart (1968) outlines 10 functional domains in language planning.

1. Official - An official language “function[s] as a legally appropriate language for all politically and culturally representative purposes on a nationwide basis.” Often, the official function of a language is specified in a constitution. For instance, English in Nigeria.
2. Provincial - A provincial language functions as an official language for a geographic area smaller than a nation, typically a province or region (for example Hausa in core Northern Nigeria, Yoruba in the Southwest and French in Quebec).
3. Wider communication - A language of wider communication is a language that may be official or provincial, but more importantly, function as a medium of communication across language boundaries within a nation (for example Hindi in India; Swahili language in East Africa, Pidgin in Nigeria).
4. International - An international language functions as a medium of communication across national boundaries (for example English, and to some extent, Yoruba in Republic of Benin and Hausa in Ghana).
5. Capital - A capital language functions as a prominent language in and around a national capital (for example Dutch and French in Brussels).
6. Group - A group language functions as a conventional language among the members of a single cultural or ethnic group (for example Hausa, Yoruba, Igbo in Nigeria and Hebrew amongst the Jews).
7. Educational - An educational language functions as a medium of instruction in primary and secondary schools on a regional or national basis (for example English in Nigeria, Urdu in West Pakistan and Bengali in East Pakistan).
8. School subject - A school subject language is a language that is taught as a subject in secondary school or higher education (for example French is taught in Nigerian schools as a subject).
9. Literary - A literary language functions as a language for literary or scholarly purposes (for example Ancient Greek).
10. Religious - A religious language functions as a language for the ritual purposes of a particular religion (for example Latin for the

Latin Rite within the Roman Catholic Church and Arabic for the reading of the Qur'an).

Corpus Planning

1. Graphisation refers to development, selection and modification of scripts and orthographic conventions for a language. The use of writing in a speech community can have lasting sociocultural effects, which include easier transmission of material through generations, communication with larger numbers of people, and a standard against which varieties of spoken language are often compared.
2. Standardisation is the process by which one variety of a language takes precedence over other social and regional dialects of a language. This variety comes to be understood as supra-dialectal and the 'best' form of the language. The choice of which language takes precedence has important societal consequences, as it confers privilege upon speakers whose spoken and written dialect conforms closest to the chosen standard. The standard that is chosen as the norm is generally spoken by the most powerful social group within the society, and is imposed upon the less powerful groups as the form to emulate.
3. Modernisation is a form of language planning that occurs when a language needs to expand its resources to meet functions. Modernisation often occurs when a language undergoes a shift in status, such as when a country gains independence from a colonial power or when there is a change in the language education policy. The most significant force in modernisation is the expansion of the lexicon, which allows the language to discuss topics in modern semantic domains. Language planners generally focus on creating new lists and glossaries to describe new technical terms, but it is also necessary to ensure that the new terms are consistently used by the appropriate sectors within society.

Acquisition Planning

Acquisition planning involves a national, state or local government system aims and goals to influence aspects of a language such as its status, distribution and literacy through education. Acquisition planning is integrated into a larger language planning process in which the statuses of languages are evaluated, corpuses are revised and the changes are finally introduced to society on a national, state or local level through education systems. Government, communities, non-governmental organisations or ministries of education's efforts to spread and promote the learning of a language are instances of acquisition planning. The activities of institutions such as the British Council, the

Goethe Institute are general towards promoting the learning of English and German respectively. The Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs, Office of English Language Programs also promotes the learning and use of Standard American English (SAE). Maori community in New Zealand promotes the acquisition of Maori.

Prestige Planning

Prestige planning is psychological. It is directed towards preparing a favorable psychological background which is very significant for the success of language planning activities (Haarmann, 1990). Prestige planning is prerequisite for status planning. A low prestige language or variety that is targeted for high prestige needs prestige planning.

Since it is not possible to get an ideal speech community situation where the population would be linguistically and culturally homogeneous, it is crucial that language planning, resources and policies are adequately managed in order to achieve the best results. Therefore, for a workable and successful language policy, Adekunle (1995:66) suggests the following, among others:

- (i) correct information about the sociolinguistic habits of the target population and knowledge of the social basis for language policy
- (ii) the involvement and support of the target population in decision-making
- (iii) a clear articulation of the objectives of the policy
- (iv) a thorough examination of the method and processes of implementation, its probable consequences and possible remedies
- (v) provision for the evaluation of its success.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The objectives, goals and ideologies of language policy and planning point to the fact that it is crucial that language planning, resources and policies are adequately managed in order to achieve the best results.

5.0 SUMMARY

This unit has discussed imperatives in language planning, which are essentially achievable objectives, laudable goals and ideologies, and proper implementation in order to achieve a successful language policy.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Having gone through the unit, briefly explain the different types of language planning and their relevance to successful language management.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Adekunle, M. (1995). English in Nigeria: Attitudes, Policy and Communicative Realities. *New Englishes: A West African Perspective*. Ayo Bangbose, Ayo Banjo & Andrew Thomas (Eds). Nigeria: Mosuro Press.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cobarrubias, J. (1983). "Ethical Issues in Status Planning." In: J. Cobarrubias & J.A. Fishman eds.). *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*. Mouton Publishers. 41-85.
- Deumert, A. (2004). Language Planning. In: R. Mesthrie (Ed.). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Haarmann, H. (1990). Language Planning in the Light of a General Theory of Language: A Methodological Framework. *IJSL*, 86, 103-26.
- Haugen, E. (1966) *Language Conflict and Language Planning: The Case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1968). "Language Planning in Modern Norway." In: J. Fishman (Ed.). (pp 673-687).
- Kaplan, B. R. & Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (1997). *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kloss, H. (1969). *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.
- Nahir, M. (1984). "Language Planning Goals: A classification". *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 8, 294-327.

- Nahir, M. (2003). "Language Planning Goals: A Classification." *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings*. C. B. Paulston & G. R. Tucker (Eds). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Robert, B. K. & Richard, B. B. (1997). *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ricento, T.K., & Hornberger, N.H. (1996). "Unpeeling the Onion: Language Planning and Policy and the ELT Profession". *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (3):401-425.
- Stewart, W. A. (1968). "Sociolinguistic Typology of Multilingualism." *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. J. Fishman. (Ed.). The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning Language Planning Inequality*. London: Longman.

UNIT 4 LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY ISSUES

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Stages of Language Planning
 - 3.2 Framework of Language Policies in Africa
 - 3.3 Types of Language Policies
 - 3.4 Challenges of Language Planning Policy
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This unit is a continuation of the previous one. It takes the discussion on language planning further by looking at its objectives, types and goals in addition to its ideologies.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- identify the stages and types of language planning;
- discuss the framework of language planning that would enable it to solve language problems; and
- highlight the challenges of LPP.

HOW TO STUDY THE UNIT

- a. Read this unit as diligently as possible.
- b. Find meaning of unfamiliar words in the unit using your dictionary.
- c. As you read, put major points down in a piece of paper or jotter.
- d. Do not go to the next section until you have fully understood the section you are reading now.
- e. Do all the Self-Assessment exercises in the unit as honestly as you can. In some areas where it is not feasible to provide answers to Self-Assessment exercises, go to the relevant sections of the unit to derive the answers.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Stages of Language Planning

Language planning issues (status and corpus planning) are often discussed theoretically in the sociolinguistics class. It would be interesting to have a practical and field experience of the process of language codification/graphisation. It is also often difficult to locate the roles of the linguist in a nation's socio-political affairs as adviser and expert on language related matters. Language planning transcends mere description of language use in contexts and genres, for example, in the media.

Ideally, language planning would take place in stages as follows:

- (i) Sociolinguistic Survey: this involves the gathering of facts on the number of languages available, their functions, the orthographies, the challenges of teaching them, their standards and so on.
- (ii) Setting of Goals: this involves a definition of what one hopes to achieve by teaching these languages and the strategies that have been put in place for teaching them. Also, the teaching outcome has to be predicted
- (iii) The Actual Implementation: this looks at the challenges faced while the languages are being taught. Do the children like it? Do teachers have enough materials? How are the children tested?
- (iv) Getting Feedback: this is mainly gotten from the teachers either through questionnaires on achievements and challenges of teaching that language, the teachers' observations, number of teachers available, students' performances and general reactions.

3.2 The Framework of Language Policies in the West African Region

A language policy involves determining, with precision, the methodology and the means and resources to be used. But for successful implementation, it is essential to make good institutional arrangements and laws and to take other measures to enable the decisions related to the language policies to be successfully implemented. Thus, in language planning, policy and decision making in West Africa, three foci are involved.

- The Individual: very often language planning is largely the result of efforts by individuals like linguists, researchers and teachers, outside the framework of formal organisations.
- Formal Organisation or Institutions: decisions about language planning and education matters are often influenced or determined by formal organisations or institution, religions,

churches, schools, professional associations, printing and publishing houses and companies. Those decisions concern both status and corpus planning.

- **The Government:** many decisions concerning language status, language use and usage are initiated by governments. They are formulated by government agencies and made prescriptive by the appropriate political and administrative authorities.

In our analysis of the language situation and language policy in West Africa, we are naturally inclined to focus on public policy, which is, as Dye and Robey's (1983) point out, "finding out what governments do, why they do it, and what difference it makes." However, a balanced and relevant analysis should include what individuals, pressure groups, formal organisations and institutions also do, why they do it, and what the outcome of the action is with reference to the language situation in West Africa.

3.3 Types of Language Policies

Noss (1971) identifies three types of policy, namely:

- (i) **Official language policy:** this relates to the languages reorganised by the government for specific purposes – for example in Nigeria we have Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba while in Ghana we have the six government sponsored languages.
- (ii) **Educational Language Policy:** this relates to the languages recognised by education authorities for use as media of instruction and subjects of study at the existing levels of education for example, the Nigerian 1989 National Policy on Education.
- (iii) **General Language Policy:** this relates to unofficial government recognition or tolerance of languages used in mass communication, business and contact with foreigners. For example in Nigeria and Ghana, families use the indigenous languages in order to preserve their cultures. Also in Nigeria, Nigerian Pidgin English and Standard English are used in the mass media. Politicians also find the use of indigenous languages useful in their campaigns.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

From what you have read so far, which type of policy exists in Nigeria?

3.4 Challenges of Language Policy and Planning in Nigeria

1. Marginalisation of Minority Languages

In the various attempts at language policy and planning in Nigeria, recognition has been accorded to the major languages, and to some extent, languages of state importance, to the detriment of those in the minority category. Such overt recognition includes the provision in section 1, paragraph 8 of the national policy on education (1981) that in the interest of national unity, every child should learn one of the three major languages in addition to his own. This recognition is also entrenched in the 1979 Constitution in section 51 also 91 and repeated in section 55 and 97 of the 1999 Constitution that:

- (iv) The business of the national assembly shall be conducted in English and in Hausa, Ibo and Yoruba when adequate arrangements have been made therefore.
- (v) The business of the House of Assembly shall be conducted in English, but the house may, in addition to English, conduct the business of the house in one or more other languages spoken in the state as the house may by resolution approve.
- (vi) Ethnic loyalty of Nigeria's minority language speakers: governments' pronouncements with regard to the status of the three major languages have awakened the language loyalty or ethnic loyalty of Nigeria's minority language speakers. They have risen to resist what they regard as attempts to make them socially, economically and politically subservient to the speakers of the dominant languages. It has been argued (Beardmore, 1980) that next to religion, language loyalty overrides all other questions that impinge on Nigerian life, uniting conflicting ideologies and drawing together social classes with contradictory interests.
- (vii) Unstable Government: the incessant cabinet reshuffle in Nigeria has made it difficult for a lasting decision to be made concerning the language policy in Nigeria as language planners come and go with each new regime.
- (viii) Non-Implementation of Language Policy: up till now, the constitutional provision for the use of the three major languages in the National Assemblies has not been implemented. This has been partly attributed to the abrupt interruption of democratic rule by the 1983 military take-over but more importantly, this lack of will to implement the provision arises from the circumstances in which it was enacted. It reads: "Government shall promote the learning of indigenous languages" section 19(4).
- (ix) Also, the provision in the national policy of education that every Nigerian child should be encouraged to learn one of the major languages in addition to his own has not been implemented. This might not be unconnected with the belief of the minority speakers

that the recommendation is an imposition. Thus, non-implementation is a way to certify their opposition.

- (x) Minority languages are not developed: many of the minority languages craving for a place in the language policy are not developed in terms of being codified, as such, there are no textbooks and teachers for such languages.
- (xi) Lack of funds to carry out a quantitative and qualitative language survey in Nigeria.

There is the need to know the actual number of languages and dialects that we have in the country in order for language planners to make authentic recommendations but the government has not given attention to this aspect of our national affairs.

- (xii) Poor media input in language matters: Sometimes ago, it was customary for newscasters on national television to symbolically greet their viewers “goodnight” in the three major Nigerian languages at the end of the 9 o’clock network news. Today, this practice has been abolished because the media fell to the pressures from speakers of minority languages.

The probable way forward for Nigeria, according to Bamgbose (1992) is that posing the language problem in Nigeria in terms of a majority/minority dichotomy is an exaggeration because there is no justification for such a dichotomy, due to state creation, which has thrown several languages into prominence. Thus, we will suggest that speakers of other languages like Edo, Somaika, Egun, Okun, Nupe, Igala, Ijaw, should encourage their children to study these languages so that first, the languages will not suffer language death; and in the future, these children can develop the languages that are not yet codified or standardised.

In addition, scholars, linguists and educationists should shift their focus away from a concern with the problems and prospects of the implementation of the language provisions of the 1979 Constitution and of the national policy on education as revised in 1981, to drawing the attention of the Nigerian government to the need for a consciously and systematically drawn language policy.

Comparing Nigerian and Ghanaian Language Planning Efforts, one would observe that, although both countries have made concerted efforts to have a deliberate language policy, there is no general language policy. However, the situation in Ghana as regards government’s interest in the indigenous languages is better than that of Nigeria because of the existence of the nine government-sponsored languages. In both

countries, nonetheless, implementation of the language policies is a major challenge.

While Nigeria has spelt out in the NPE (in theory) that the use of indigenous languages in the early stage of primary education would be encouraged, Ghana has completely abolished the use of their indigenous languages in education.

From the outset, Ghana had the British lay a solid foundation for the use of the indigenous languages as media of instruction at the lower primary level...

4.0 CONCLUSION

This unit has dwelt on the stages and the different types of language planning, the workable framework and challenges of language planning.

5.0 SUMMARY

This unit has discussed imperatives in the formulation of language planning and policy; it has proffered a workable framework and has examined some challenges that may arise in the process.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

What are the implications of the identified challenges of language planning in Nigeria?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Bamgbose, A. (1982/1992). "Standard Nigerian English: Issues of Identification." In: B. Kachru (Ed.). *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*. (2nd ed.). (pp. 148–160). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, Beardsmore, B. H. (1980). "Bilingualism in Belgium." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1 (2):145-154.
- Dye, T. R. & Robey, J. S. (1983). "Politics versus Economic Development of the Literature on Policy Determination." In: Thomas R. Dye & Virginia Grayfields. (Eds). *The Determinants of Public Policy*. Lexington: Lexington Books - D. Health 6 Co. pp.3-17.
- Noss, R. B. (1971). "Politics and language policy in Southeast Asia." *Language Sciences*, (16): 25-32.

UNIT 5 PRESTIGE AND MULTIGLOSSIC NATURE OF LANGUAGES

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 The Prestige of a Language
 - 3.2 Determining Factors of Language Functions
 - 3.2.1 Prestige and Status
 - 3.2.2 Levels of Development
 - 3.2.3 Historical and Political Profile
 - 3.2.4 Institutional Policies and Planlessness
 - 3.2.5 Numerical Strength
 - 3.3 Multiglossic Nature of These Languages
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

A language has prestige due to certain functions it performs. The multiglossic nature of these functions and their relevance are discussed in this unit.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the term “prestige and status of a language”; and
- identify the factors that contribute to the allocation of language functions in a multilingual society.

HOW TO STUDY THE UNIT

- a. Read this unit as diligently as possible.
- b. Find meaning of unfamiliar words in the unit using your dictionary.
- c. As you read, put major points down in a piece of paper or jotter.
- d. Do not go to the next section until you have fully understood the section you are reading now.
- e. Do all the Self-Assessment exercises in the unit as honestly as you can. In some areas where it is not feasible to provide answers to Self-Assessment exercises, go to the relevant sections of the unit to derive the answers.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 The Prestige of a Language

The prestige of a language is enhanced by the specific number of functions it performs in a multilingual context. For example, the English language in Nigeria and some other countries such as South Africa has a number of functions, which invariably enhances its prestige and the high preference for it in certain domains. According to Kachru's (1996: p. 58) framework, English has interpersonal, regulative, instrumental and innovative/imaginative functions. The instrumental function refers to the use of English as a symbol of elitism and modernity, as a link language between speakers of various languages in a multilingual context; the instrumental function basically is concerned with the use of English in a country's educational system; the regulative function concerns its use for the regulation of conduct in such domain as the legal system and administration; and the innovative function entails the use of English in various literary genres.

Adegbija (2004) notes that at the individual level of multilingualism, the roles and functions assigned to a language in particular contexts is inseparable from people's perception and its suitability for the occasion, the subject matter, the participants, the intention of the communicative encounter, and interpersonal goals relating to identity, solidarity, exclusion and committing oneself. In addition, language functions at this level keep changing; the importance or salience of languages in particular contexts are neither stable nor fixed.

At the societal level, the functions of language seem fixed. These roles or functions include nationalist and nationist roles relating to official language, national language, education language, media language, language of wider communication (LWC), international functions, school subject functions and judiciary functions. This is related to national identity, solidarity and integration and cohesion among the citizens of a multilingual context and the machinery for the smooth running of a government (Bangbose 1991, Ferguson 1959, 1968; Ferguson & Das Gupta, 1968; Fishman 1967, 1968a, 1972, 1978). In a multilingual nation such as Nigeria, there is a variety of functional manifestation at different levels and hierarchies such as in administration, education, commerce, media, science and technology (national, regional and local levels). Some languages also graduate in functions and roles at several levels of usage, societal and individual. There is "multiglossic" situation, which is a widening extension of Ferguson's (1959) "diglossia" (Adegbija, 2004). Hary (2000) defines "multiglossia" as a linguistic state in which different varieties of a language exist side by side in a language community and are used under different circumstances or with various functions. In addition, it may

refer to the use of different varieties of a language for distinctively separate purposes.

Hellinger and Babman (2001) assert that in Morocco, for example, Moroccan Arabic is in multiglossic relationship with other varieties of Arabic: (i) Classical Arabic is used for liturgical purposes, mainly in the reading of the Holy Koran (ii) Standard Arabic is used in the press, on the radio and television, and one of the languages of instruction alongside French. (iii) Educated Moroccan Arabic is used by educated Moroccans in formal spoken situation.

3.2 The Determining Factors of Language Functions in a Multilingual Context

There are factors, which determine language functions in a multilingual context. These are:

3.2.1 Prestige and Status

The status and prestige of a language determines its roles and functions. A prestigious language is assigned prestigious functions. During status planning process, the status of a language might be enhanced or elevated to perform certain prestigious functions. The functional allocation is tantamount to the perceived prestige, both at the individual and societal levels. For example, the English language in Nigeria is a high prestige language used in education, judiciary, administration, governance, politics, and foreign relations, etc. This prestige is shown in the Nigerian National Policy on Education (2004).

The policy provides for:

- (i) Mother-Tongue (MT) and/or Language of the Immediate Community (LIC) as the language of initial literacy at the pre-primary and junior, primary levels, and of adult and non-formal education.
- (ii) The three major (national) languages - Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba – as the languages of national culture and integration.
- (iii) English - the official language - as the language of formal literacy, the bureaucracy, secondary and higher education, the law courts, and so on.
- (iv) Selected foreign languages especially, French, and Arabic, as the languages of international communication and discourse. These are the languages for which language villages have been set up.

Although unstated, yet implied, the NPE policy/statement on languages:

- (i) advocates multilingualism as the national goal
- (ii) recognises English as the de facto official language in the bureaucracy and all tiers of formal education
- (iii) treats Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba as potential national languages which are to be developed and used as L1 and L2 all through the formal educational system
- (iv) regards all Nigerian languages as meaningful media of instruction in initial literacy, and in life-long and non-formal education.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Determine the prestige and status of your language in your country. Do this objectively.

3.2.2 Levels of Development

Development here refers to standardisation or modernisation and graphitisation of a language to determine its functions and prestige. Other measures such as availability of dictionaries and linguistic descriptions, lexical expansion, metalanguage or register for various domains of modern life, school subjects and literature are vital in enhancing the functions of a language. For example, Yoruba, Igbo, Hausa and Efik are the only school subjects among many Nigerian indigenous languages because of their development.

3.2.3 Historical and Political Profile

Languages with a historical and political tradition tend to attract greater functions than other languages that are endowed as they are. For example, the international functions of English in the world today is directly related to the political power-brokering of the combined force or alliance of the native speakers of English, namely United States of America, Canada and Britain.

3.2.4 Institutional Policies and Planlessness

Institutional policies of government ministries, organs or agencies, cultural and religious organisation, language development centers, universities and other educational institutions and the media contribute to the determination of language functions in a multilingual nation such as Nigeria. For example, in Nigeria the institutional support enjoyed by Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba has increased their salience at the societal level, at least. And at the individual level, it is stated in the Nigerian National Policy on Education (cf. NPE, Revised 1985, 2004) that every citizen should learn at least one of the national languages.

3.2.5 Numerical Strength

The number of speakers of a language enhances its functions and prestige. This principle, according to Adegbija (2004), seems to be true in all multilingual nations around the world. In Nigeria, for example, the national functions allocated to Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba are directly related to the population of their speakers.

3.3 Multiglossic Nature of Language Functions

In multilingual Nigeria, languages are categorised into three: exoglossic languages (English, Arabic and French); the indigenous languages, and Pidgin or contact language, and there is a hierarchical distribution of language functions among the various languages in the country at the federal, state, and local government levels. Besides the function of English as an official language in every state, other languages also function, depending on the geographical areas. Other factors which determine language functions are role-relationship, the speech partners or interlocutors, the social venue, the interaction type and the medium (Putz, 1991). For example, English is used as the language of education, the mass media, international diplomacy, the judiciary, but it is possible any other language or mother tongue features in these settings.

The interlocutors and nature of their interaction determine this situation. This shows the chameleon-like nature of languages in a multilingual context. Nigerian indigenous languages are also employed to express ethnic solidarity, local interactions, religious worship and media broadcast on local or state radio and television stations. Multiglossic nature of language functions is examined in certain domains in Nigeria; these include government, the media, commerce and religion.

Government

English is a major language in government parastatals as the official medium of communication. Information, announcements and documents including instructions are produced first in English, before some of them are later translated into the regional language or language of the immediate environment.

Commerce

English is the official language of business and commerce because transactions are conducted usually in English. However, in some cases such as in some parts of Delta, Edo, Rivers, Ebonyi, and Bayelsa states of Nigeria, Nigerian Pidgin is regarded as the official language of business and commerce in semi-formal contexts.

The Media

The official language of the media in Nigeria is basically English. This can be seen in the number of newspapers published in English in Nigeria. Only very few newspapers are published in the indigenous languages, for example *Alaroye*; *Gaskiya Tafi Kwabo* etc. Official broadcasts such as Presidential broadcasts are first aired in English before they are translated into other Nigerian languages.

3.3.4 Religion

The colonialists spoke English and they brought The Bible and other Christian literature also written in English. Gradually, other forms of literature were translated into major Nigerian languages. Also, as a result of Pentecostalism, churches that conduct their services in English appear to far outnumber the ones using indigenous languages, and they are more popular, attracting a lot of youths.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Factors that determine language functions equally contribute to the prestige of that language, while exhibiting the multiglossic nature of these language functions.

5.0 SUMMARY

This unit has examined what contributes to the prestige of a language, the multiglossic nature of language functions and the several factors that determine language functions in a multilingual situation.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Write short explanatory notes on:

- (i) Exoglossic languages
- (ii) The indigenous languages
- (ii) Pidgin or contact language.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

Adegbija, E. (2004). *Multilingualism: A Nigerian Case Study*. Africa World Press: New Jersey.

Bamgbose, A. (1991). *Language and the Nation: The Language Question in Sub-Sahara Africa*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Ferguson, C. A. (1959). "Diglossia." *Word*, 15: 325–340.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1968). "Language Development." In: Charles A. Ferguson & Thom Huebner (1996). *Sociolinguistic Perspectives: Papers on Language in Society, 1959-1994*. Oxford University Press US, pp 40-47.
- Fishman, J. A. (1968a). *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley.
- Fishman, J. A. (1968b). *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Fishman, J. A. (1978). *Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J. A., Ferguson, C.A. & Das Gupta, J. (Eds). (1968). *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York/London: Wiley.
- Hary, B. H. (2000). *Multiglossia in Judeo-Arabic*. Brill.
- Hellinger, M. & BuBmann, H. (Eds.) (2001). *Gender Across Languages: The Linguistic Representation of Women and Men*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
- Kachru, B. (1996). *Language Research in Multilingual India. The Book Review XIX (8) :14-15*.
- Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., Nelson, C. L. (2006). *The Handbook of World Englishes*. Blackwell Publishing Limited.
- Putz, M. (1991). "Language maintenance and language shift in the speech behavior of German-Australian migrants in Canberra." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 12 (6):477-492.

UNIT 6 OFFICIAL ORTHOGRAPHIES

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Definition of Orthography
 - 3.2 Standard/Official Orthographies of Nigerian Languages
 - 3.3 Standard Orthographies of Major Nigerian Languages and Controversies
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

A language has recognised orthographies. The standard/official orthographies of the three major Nigerian languages and their relevance are discussed in this unit.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- explain the term “orthographies”;
- identify the factors that contribute to the standardisation of orthographies; and
- highlight the controversies surrounding the standardisation of these orthographies.

HOW TO STUDY THE UNIT

- a. Read this unit as diligently as possible.
- b. Find meaning of unfamiliar words in the unit using your dictionary.
- c. As you read, put major points down in a piece of paper or jotter.
- d. Do not go to the next section until you have fully understood the section you are reading now.
- e. Do all the Self-Assessment exercises in the unit as honestly as you can. In some areas where it is not feasible to provide answers to Self-Assessment exercises, go to the relevant sections of the unit to derive the answers.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 Definition of Orthography

The orthography of a language refers to the agreed letters used to represent the sounds of the language – the letters being collectively known as the alphabet of the language. The orthography also refers to the agreed rules for spelling or writing the language. The spelling rules deal with issues such as capitalisation, punctuation, tone marking, word division, and compound words (Ohiri-Aniche, 2008). According to Ezikeojiaku (2002: p. 282):

Orthography is a very sensitive aspect of language planning which requires expert knowledge. A system of orthography for any language may be described as a way which the owners of a language choose to represent letters of the alphabets (sic) of such a language. It is a graphic system of representing the sounds of the language.

Because of the recognition of the three major languages—Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba by the National Policy on Education (1989 & 2004) in Nigeria, there has been an increase in the production and publication of educational materials, texts and literature in the three major languages. However, Hausa and Yoruba scholars and writers have advanced in the development of teaching and reading materials than their counterparts in the Igbo language.

This could be traced to the arguments that have overtime arisen on the standard/official orthographies of some Nigerian languages.

Beyond the linguistic considerations, there are other factors – social, historical, psychological, and political issues in making decisions about the system of writing for a language. However linguistically and technically sound orthography might be, acceptance by the people for whom it is designed determines its eventual and effective use (Grenoble & Whaley, 2006). They give important suggestions as follows: (i) the involvement of local leaders and native speakers must be integrally involved in the process of developing an orthography, (ii) an orthography must be acceptable to authorities such as familial or clan heads and civil leaders who have some sort of influence over the educational practices of a community, (iii) other factors such as sociopolitical considerations, ethnolinguistic factors, economic and technological variables can play important roles in the choice of the orthography of a language, and (iv) the writing system to adopt at least

one among the four types of writing systems: logographic, alphabetic, semi-syllabic, and consonantal.

1. Alphabetic writing systems use single symbols to represent individual phonological segments. In Western Europe, the Roman and Cyrillic alphabets are common alphabetic systems in use.
2. Consonantal system is a sub-type of alphabetic writing which uses symbols to represent systems in use.
3. Semi-syllabic writing systems use single symbols to represent syllables. Brahmi script in India is the oldest of these scripts and it has spread through Asia. Other developed syllabic scripts Cherokee (North America), Vai (India), Djuka (Suriname), and the Ol Chike syllabary for Santali (India).
4. Logographic systems make use of graphic signs or logograms to represent words or morphemes. Chinese is the most widely recognised logographic system today. Japanese and Vietnamese also make use of logographic symbols borrowed from China.

3.2 Standard/Official Orthographies of Nigerian Languages

Standard/official orthography is a fully developed, time-tested orthography that is widely used and accepted by the language community. Standard orthographies are *sine qua non* in language planning processes. Without orthographies other aspects of language engineering or modernisation (material production, metalanguage, and so on) which are crucial to language planning process seem rather impossible.

As observed by Emenanjo (1990:91 cited in Adegbija, 2004), only 44 languages among many languages in Nigeria have standard orthographies: 14 of these were published by the Language Development Centre, 28 for the Rivers State language under the control of the Rivers Readers Projects; and four for the Niger State languages; 14 for the former Bendel State languages (now Delta and Edo States). The Language Development Centre has produced more orthographies for 33 Nigerian languages in six manuals (Adegbija, 2007). A few individual and communal efforts, for example Oko-Osanyin Orthography Project (Adegbija, 1992) have yielded tremendous results in the production of orthographies for small-group or minority languages.

This number indicates that many Nigerian indigenous languages are yet to be standardized, since hitherto developmental attention in Nigeria has been focused on only Hausa, Yoruba and Igbo, and, at times, on a few other languages because of their population/size including Edo, Efik, Fulfulde, Ijaw, Kanuri Tiv. There have been various developments which are concentrated on these few languages (Adegbija, 2004). For

example, a glossary of technical terminologies for primary schools in Nigeria; primary school first language curriculum for Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba designed by the National Educational and Research Development Council (NERDC 1982/1983) and Braille terminologies were prepared in Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba (NERDC 1981/1984).

The nexus between mother tongue literacy and orthography has been identified. Contemporary language literacy programme is fraught with many challenges and constraints, such as the lack of orthography for a large number of Nigerian indigenous languages. The prospect for mass literacy therefore is not feasible unless the Federal Government of Nigeria directs its efforts to developing orthography and literature in many unstandardised indigenous languages (Okedara & Okedara, 1992). The lack of orthographies of many indigenous Nigerian languages will definitely deny many people, particularly in the rural communities, a very significant opportunity to receive literacy education in their first languages.

Baker (2001) and Cummins (2000) have stated the benefits of literacy in L1 before L2 as follows: use of a familiar language to teach beginning literacy facilitates an understanding of sound-symbol or meaning-symbol correspondence; content area instruction is provided in the L1, the learning of new concepts is not postponed until children become competent in the L2; the affective domain, involving confidence, self-esteem and identity, is strengthened by use of the L1, increasing motivation and initiative as well as creativity; L1 classrooms allow children to be themselves and develop their personalities as well as their intellects, unlike submersion classrooms where they are forced to sit silently or repeat mechanically, leading to frustration and ultimately repetition, failure and dropout, etc.

Recent effort by the Centre for Black and African Arts and Civilisation (CBAAC) is a good venture to harmonize the orthographies for the four major languages spoken in Cameroun, Benin and Niger Republic. The core of the harmonisation effort is to reduce the influence of foreign languages. In the *Next Magazine*, May 6th, 2011, Professor Tunde Babawale commented: "It is disturbing to note that African languages no longer enjoy places of pride in most homes and schools. Children are encouraged to use foreign language in most homes and our schools also pejoratively label our indigenous language as vernacular". Also the Director, Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (CASAS), Kwesi Prah, says: "We must know, incontrovertibly, that without our languages, we are not going anywhere. Unless we realise that, if we want to see progress on the African continent, then we must develop our languages. We must develop our language, orthography; take advantage of the resource" (2011: p. 34).

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Trace the development of the orthography of your language.

3.3 Standard Orthographies of Major Nigerian Languages and Controversies

The Igbo language, for example, is constantly plagued by deviations from the official Igbo (Onwu) orthography. These controversies have stalled the development of the language (Emenyonu, 2001). Aniche (2007) also notes that these deviations are gradually dragging Igbo orthography into a state of anarchy, because a widely accepted standard may no longer exist.

Since the beginning of official publications in the language in the 1850s, three key orthographies – “Standard Alphabet”, the “Africa Orthography” and the “Official (Oñwuü) Orthography” – have been used to write Igbo. In 1973, the Society for the Promotion of Igbo Language and Culture (SPILC) established the Igbo Standardisation Committee (ISC), which in no small measure helped in the standardisation of Igbo orthography until 1990 when both the SPILC and its ISC were phased out.

Overtime, the “Onwu orthography” – a product of a committee set up by the then Eastern Region, with Dr. S.E. Onwu, an Igbo indigene as its head – has assumed the role of the Igbo official orthography and is being used in government publications, newspapers and the media. Even in the educational sector, it is approved by the West African Examinations Council (WAEC), the National Examination Council (NECO) and the Joint Admissions and Matriculation Board (JAMB); and is used in the students’/pupils’ core texts.

The Onwu Orthography is made up of twenty-eight consonant and eight vowel letters:

a b ch d e f g gb gh gw h ii j k kp kw l m n ñ nw ny o o p
r s sh t u ü v w y z

However, this orthography too is not without criticisms (in the use of different symbols and tonal notations in dictionaries) and deviations (in spelling rules). The SPILC, through the ISC platform, produced the first volume of its “Recommendations of the Igbo Standardisation Committee in 1976”, the outcomes of the seminar themed, “Standardisation of the Igbo Language, Literature and Culture.” These recommendations, amongst other issues focused on the alphabet, spelling rules, purism and dialect, borrowing/loan words, tones and

technical vocabulary in Igbo language. Yet, the debates on the standard orthography for Igbo are still on (Emenyonu, 2001).

The Igbo alphabet and the Yoruba alphabet were introduced about 1842 by the early Christian missionaries. In comparison however, the standardisation of Yoruba orthography has not spawned any debates, even though its standardisation does not in any way mean that the sectional dialects are liable to die. Iconic in the development of Yoruba orthography is Bishop Samuel Ajayi Crowther who, with other Christian missionaries, set the pace for the Yoruba writing system. This writing system has been revised several times, and the first novel in the Yoruba language was published in 1928.

The current orthography of Yoruba derives from Bamgbose's (1965) study, along with the report of the Yoruba Orthography Committee (1966). It is still largely similar to the older orthography and it employs the Latin alphabet modified by the use of the digraph ⟨gb⟩ and certain diacritics, including the traditional vertical line set under the letters (ẹ), (ọ), and (ş). In many publications, the line is replaced by a dot (ē), (ō), and so on.

Yoruba Alphabet

A	B	D	E	Ẹ	F	G	GB	H	I	J
K	L	M	N	O	Ọ	P	R	S	Ş	T
U	W	Y								

The orthographical standardisation and harmonisation of Hausa language did not also cause any rancour. The first phase of Hausa orthographic standardisation began with Vischer's "Rules for Hausa Spelling," and culminated in the 30s. In 1934 the Reverend G.P. Bargery published his seminal work "A Hausa-English Dictionary and English-Hausa Vocabulary," which contains about 40,000 entries and indicates, for the first time in a consistent manner, vowel length and tonal structure. The second phase of Hausa standardisation efforts may be associated with the founding of the Hausa Language Board in 1955.

Its goals were to unify the spelling of Hausa words and loans from other languages and to be the consultant on all matters regarding the Hausa language. There was harmonisation of Bamako system used in Niger as a result of Bamako UNESCO meeting of experts and GASIYA-standard in Nigeria in 1980. The Nigerian standard was accepted by both countries (Wolff, 1991).

4.0 CONCLUSION

Orthography, an essential part of standardisation, is a specialist's prerogative. Acceptance of this orthography is crucial. Orthography, once accepted, remains constant.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have examined standardisation efforts and processes with specific focus on orthographies of some Nigerian languages.

6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

Identify the features of official orthographies, using relevant examples.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Adebija, E. (1992d). "The Graphization of a Small-Group Language: A Case Study of Oko." *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 102: 153-173.
- Adebija, E. (2004). *Multilingualism: A Nigerian Case Study*. USA, New Jersey: Africa World Press, Inc.
- Adebija, E. (2007). "Language Policy and Planning in Nigeria". In: Kaplan, R.B. (Ed.). *Language Planning and Policy in Africa*. Algeria, Cote D'Ivoire, Nigeria.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. (3rd ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bamgbose, A. (1965). *Yoruba Orthography*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Emenyonu, E. N. (2001). "Achebe and the Problematics of Writing in Indigenous Languages." Retrieved from http://www.kintespace.com/kp_emenyonu.html
- Emenanjo, E. N. (1990). *Multilingualism, Minority Languages and Language Policy in Nigeria*. Agbor: Central Books Limited in Collaboration with the Linguistic Society of Nigeria.
- Ezikeojiaku, P. A. (2002). "The Role of Government in Indigenous Language

- Development in Nigeria: A Micro Study of the Igbo Speaking States”.
In: *Perspectives on Applied Linguistics in Language & Literature*. Adebayo Lawal, Ifeoma Isiugo-Abanihe & Isaac N. Ohia (Eds.). Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Publishers.
- Okedara, J. T. & Okedara, C. A. (1992). *Mother-Tongue Literacy in Nigeria. World Literacy in the Year 2000*. 520: 91-102.
- Ohiri-Aniche, C. (2008). “Stemming the tide of centrifugal forces in Igbo orthography.” *Dialect Anthropology*, 31:423–436.
- Grenoble, L. & Whaley, L. (2006). “Orthography.” In: *Saving Languages: An Introduction to Language Revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 137-159.
- Wolff, H. E. (1991). “Standardisation and Varieties of Written Hausa (West Africa).” *Standardisation of National Language, Symposium on Language Standardisation*, 2-3 February.