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**Abstract**

This paper deals with the concepts of *language planning* and *language standardization* which are in direct relation with the concept *language policy*. In line with the said, the stands of several linguists about the a/s phenomena are presented as the subject of their studies and beneficial in giving an account of this issue.

*Language planning* encompasses changes in the language, changes of the relations among languages as well as human acting upon the languages and their interrelations. *Language standardization* means design of or search for orthographic and grammar rules which are common for all the users of a language thus aiming at expansion of its use in as many areas of human life as possible. *The standard language* is a planned and designed unitary referential variant the purpose of which is to provide cultural, political, and social cohesion on the territory on which it is official.

By elaborating these concepts, man’s attempt to act upon the language and the effects are presented.
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**LANGUAGE PLANNING**

The word *planning* *(planification)* enters the French language in the year 1935 as a term of economics used to signify organizing by a specific plan. The planning consists of determining precise objectives and utilization of means and methods for their realization by the set dead line. In this context, planning is related to the State, resting upon medium term and long term analyses, and encompassing design, realization, and evaluation of the plan. However, there is a potentional problem with the use of the term *languagе planning* as it is placed within the framework of State Planning thus nearing the Economic Planning. Thereby, the expression *language planning* places language next to things apt to be planned, managed or navigated such as birth rate, development, economy, education, civil engineering, etc. Therefore, it is of key importance and quite natural to pose the question whether language could be planned at all and to what extent.

In 1964, Haugen defines the concept of *planning* as a human activity proceeding from the need for finding a solution to a problem. As such, it can be quite informal, ad hoc, but it can also be organized and conceptualized. If planning is well designed and realized, it may consist of several phases such as extensive research of data, putting into effect alternative action plans, reaching a decision on planning implementation, etc.[[1]](#footnote-1)

The expression *language planning* was promoted in 1959 by Haugen[[2]](#footnote-2), and the expression *language policy* was first introduced by Fishman in 1970[[3]](#footnote-3). Though these two expressions have been frequently used in numerous research papers all over the world ever since, they are often vague and insufficiently defined. According to Haugen, *language planning* is a part of Applied Linguistics[[4]](#footnote-4), whereas Fishman specifies it as a part of Applied Sociolinguistics. In their writings, Ferguson and Das Gupta say *language planning* is a new activity and the activities in the field of the language make a part of the national planning[[5]](#footnote-5).

Calvet presents the structuring of a language / languages in the following way[[6]](#footnote-6). S1 is a starting, unsatisfactory sociolinguistic situation, and S2 is the target situation. The defining of the differences between S1 and S2 is a part of the language policy, whereas the realization of the activities in arrange in between S1 and S2 is the language planning. If the State takes over the management of the language state, it will also manage the means necessary to reach the target. In this case, questions arise concerning the intervention in the form of the languages, the modes of modification the relations among languages, the process of transition from language policy to language planning, etc.

At a higher level, the language policy can determine the relations among languages, the choice of one or more languages for specific multi-language situations, the regional arrangement of multilingualism, the decision making on which of the languages will be used in specific areas of life (education, media, the military, etc.).

At the core of language planning there are three features; the first two are typical of the language itself, and the third one is typical of human action. The first feature is that language changes – a fact that cannot be disputed at all, and is easily proved with the diachronic processes and the history of language. The second feature is the fluctuation of the relations among languages, which can easily be confirmed by the numerous language research. The third feature is the potential in-vitro human action as humans are conscious beings who are able to influence the languages and the relations among them in the same way as they influence certain natural sciences.

With the opposition language norm versus language description taken as the point of departure, Modern Linguistics is a science with an objective to describe the language, and not to prescribe norms and rules or tips on correct language use. The evolution of a language or the development of relations among languages results from a number of factors, not from a directed course of intervention by humans.

Language policy can have a *practical* and a *symbolic function.*

*The practical function* is exhibited when a newly-formed state determines which language or which of its dialects to expand as its national language. Language planning comes next; the chosen language is introduced and used into all areas of social life and the previous official language is squeezed out of use.

*The symbolic function* is employed when a decision of a state is not practiced from the moment it is put into effect or when it is never practiced at all. A good example of the a/s is the Decision of the Nationalist Party of Indonesia reached in 1928 to promote the Malayan language as the country’s official language at the time when it was under the colonial rule of Holland. Upon the fact that the party did not have any means nor possibilities to put this decision into a realization, the recognition of the Malayan as the official language of the country symbolically confirmed the existence of an Indonesian nation which needed the period of the following 20 years and the Independence Declaration for the Decision of 1928 to be implemented and thus give way to the practical function.

Calvet has described the a/s supporting it with the following chart[[7]](#footnote-7). The full line arrows in the chart emphasize the logical connection between the practical function of language policy and language planning, whereas the dotted line arrows display the possibility for connecting alternative solutions.

1. **Language policy**
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Intervention in the language: Intervention in the languages:

- Orthography  - Choosing a national language

- Lexicality - Organizing multilingualism

- Dialectal forms - Functional distribution, etc.

**LANGUAGE STANDARDIZATION**

Standardization is a socio-economic phenomennon dating from the first third the 20c. When industrialization takes place along with the realization of numerous technological achievements. The rate of this phenomenon slows down in the period of WW2, and starts to accelerate in the beginning of the fifties of the 20c. In fact, the purpose of standardization is to mitigate and increase international trade exchange. Basically it rests upon the two principles that follow:

а) standardization of goods and production processes spurs trade and consequently the trade exchange. Thus, if a product X is in accordance with the international standards, its sale will be approved in all those countries which have adopted the said standards;

б) standardization of goods and production processes enables decrease of production expenses by promoting mass or serial production, thus eliminating hand-made products and services. Multinational companies quickly grasp the enormous economic benefits of standardization. This is exactly why they invest enormous financial resources shares in it.

Aside from the economic benefits, that a small number of users can experience, standardization enables socio-cultural benefits for the broader population. In fact, encompassing all of the areas of human activity (clothes, food, household gadgets and appliances, transport, information, etc.), standardization takes hold of the whole of the life style tending to unify it i.e. standardize it[[8]](#footnote-8).

In linguistics, standardization of a language is design of or search for orthographic and grammar rule common for all the users of a language, tending to expand its use in as many areas of human life as possible.

The idea for interventions in language – i.e. its standardization, is more than old. Even Dante Alighieri – when defending the local Tuscan dialect in which he wrote his books, stood for its standardization on the basis of the Ancient Greek and Latin – both of which had a standardized grammar. Alighieri supports his demand for standardization за стандардизација with his argument that a language with no grammar is no language. The same principle is supported by the poet du Bellay who encouraged the competition of the French language with the Ancient Greek and the Latin language as well as for its enriching, improving and accurate defining on the grounds of the latter ones. Du Bellay wants to transform the “barbarian and vulgar” French language into an elegant and noble language. With his colleagues from the Pleiades, he plans to enrich the French language and make it referential for use in education and in the other areas of human life and activity.

Regarding *the degree of standardization,* Fergusson[[9]](#footnote-9) suggests the distinctive feature  for standardization [± standardized] which enables differentiating H (high) degree meaning high level of standardization from L (low) state which means starting point or low level of standardization. His criterion for standardization entails design of descriptive grammar books and dictionaries, and establishing the phonetic norms and orthographic ones.

Standardization a specific language may be realized by acting upon several different fields of the language. Firstly, the *writing system* or the *script* can be acted upon by creating a new writing system or by changing the existing orthography and the alphabet, etc. Next, standardization can be implemented in the field of *lexicality*, by introducing new words borrowed from the dialects of the language or from other languages, by borrowing or conveying lexical content from one or more fields of human activities, constructing and coining new words, etc. Standardization can be implemented in the *dialectal forms* as well by choosing one of the number of regional forms and creating a new standard form with many elements borrowed from different regional dialectal variants.

The process of standardization depends on the chosen language policy. It entails reaching a consensus when negotiating over the features of the standard language, determining the fields of its use, choosing the referential corpus upon which new dictionaries will be made to cover the whole vocabulary. Also, within the frames of standardization, the design of orthography is included as well as grammar which will study the constituents, and give descriptions of the grammar rules of the standard language.

During the standardization process of a certain language, academy and associations for language promotion are to be founded and work under formal or informal authority as well as literature resource centers which would support the standard language and the translation of religious scripts and the Bible into the standardized language for its use at church services and religious ceremonies.

Standardization also entails the use of the standard language in the educational system so that it could be studied as a second native or as a foreign language. Standardization regulates the use of the standard language in all spheres of public life, in the judicial system, and in the legislative one. It encompasses design of legislative and legal corpus of laws and amendments to the constitutional ones which would provide it with legal status and official use.

When a language community appears to need a language variant which would surpass the local frameworks, the selection of a *standard language* begins and the basis upon which this selection is made are mostly the dialects of the economic and urban centers. In certain cases such as with the German, the Arabian or the Italian language, a prestigious variant derived from literary or religious texts is used. The use of certain lingua franca in the process of standardization may present a mediatory - i.e. transition stage in order to have the necessary time for design of all the elements of the language being standardized.

*Standard language* is a planned and designed unitary referential variant which derives from its dialects or from one and the same dialectal system. This variant is used in all segments of social life; it has its official alphabet and is officially used. Its purpose is to provide cultural, political, and social cohesion on the territory on which it is officially standard – i.e. it becomes a national language.

The standard variant has its implicit and explicit norms codified by an certain national board assigned to regulate this specific field. The phrase *literary language* is also used to refer to the standard language largely because it is mostly used in written form. The *standard language* is also used in oral communication – both by those native speakers who have some degree of education and the ones who have acquired it as a second native language or as a foreign one.

**CONCLUSION**

The word *planning* enters the French language in the second half of the 20th century as a term of economics used to signify organizing by a specific plan. Later, Haugen defines it as a human activity deriving from the need for finding a solution to a problem. According to him, *language planning* is a part of Applied Linguistics, while Fishman sees it as a part of Applied Sociolinguistics. Ferguson and Das Gupta point out that language planning is a new activity and that these activities in the field of the language make a part of the national planning.

*Language planning* entails changes in the language, changes of the relations among languages and potential acting of humans upon the languages and their interrelations.

According to Calvet, language policy defines the differences between the initial-unsatisfactory and the target-satisfactory language state. The realization of activities in between these two is part of language planning.

*Language standardization* is grounded upon standardization which is a socio-economic phenomenon dating from the first half of the 20th century. Its purpose is to mitigate and to increase trade exchange at an international level, and tends to unify – i.e., to standardize the whole life-style. *Language standardization* means design of or search for orthographic and grammar rules which are common for all the users of a language thus aiming at expansion of its use in as many areas of human life as possible.

The process of standardization depends on the selected language policy. Standardization of a certain language means acting upon the *writing system* or the *alphabet*, the *lexicality* and the *dialectal forms*. It includes making dictionaries, elaborating orthography and grammar, establishing a standardized orthoepy, founding institutions and asssociations for promotion of the language, spurring literary writing and translation, boosting its use in all spheres of public life, making both its status and usage official, etc.

*The standard language* is a planned and designed unitary referential variant which derives from its dialects or one and the same dialectal system. Its purpose is to provide cultural, political, and social cohesion on the territory on which it is officially standard – i.e. national language, When referring to the standard language the phrase *literary language* is also used although educated speakers use it both in written and in oral communication.
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