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1.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I outline the development of some of the most widely used models of standardization and consider the extent to which they are able to account for the complexities of the standardization process and its different manifestations in diverse linguistic, historical and sociocultural contexts. The 2010s witnessed a renewed interest in standardization and the publication of a host of works addressing current questions such as restandardization or the applicability of models of standardization to minority and minoritized languages,1 as well as book-length studies of individual languages.2 Since standard language ideology has traditionally been associated with nationalist aspirations and identity politics, with its roots in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, recent studies have also questioned whether, in a postmodern world, with greater democratization and social change, the role of standard languages is weakening and the boundary between standard and non-standard is becoming less well defined (cf. Lüdi 2012: 217). All of this work has sharpened the need to reconsider the appropriateness of existing models and raised questions


2 For instance, on English (Curzan 2014, Hickey 2015), on Italian (Cerruti et al. 2017), on the Spanish-speaking world (Amorós-Negre 2018) or on Austrian German and other Germanic standard varieties (Dollinger 2019). A major new volume on the Romance languages (Lebsanft & Tacke 2020) appeared too late to be taken account of in this chapter.
Models, frameworks and theories of standardization have been developed and exploited in a number of different disciplines and sub-disciplines of linguistics, including (historical) sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, language policy and planning and the description of the histories of particular languages. In some cases, these different (sub-) disciplines have adopted and adapted the same basic models of standardization, whilst in others, independent work has emerged which may or may not be known outside that sub-discipline. It is striking, moreover, that different traditions have, to some extent, emerged according to the language, language family or language type being discussed (e.g. Germanic, Romance, minoritized). In addition, scholars publishing in different languages (English, German, Spanish, etc.) are to some extent working independently of each other, not least in part because of the absence of translations of certain key theoretical texts. As a result, it has proved difficult to provide useful syntheses of the different models (see Section 1.2.4.2 below).

Key questions, which run through much of the literature on standardization, include:\(^3\)

- How do we best conceptualize/theorize the standardization of languages?
- How do we best model the processes involved in standardization? How adequate are existing models, many of which were created for describing the standardization of European national languages?
- To what extent can we elaborate a general model of standardization that will allow us to make generalizations across different geographical areas, cultures, time periods, etc., and to conduct ‘comparative standardology’, an approach which is still relatively undeveloped more than thirty years after Joseph introduced the concept?

I will start by looking at the development of models of standardization and the relationships between them (Section 1.2). I will then outline some of the emerging and important themes in the work on standardization since 2000 which have proved challenging for the classic models of standardization (Section 1.3). I will conclude by revisiting Haugen’s model of standardization, described in Section 1.2.2, which is still used in many studies and descriptions of standardization, despite its well-known limitations. I will evaluate the extent to which it remains valid and outline some possible modifications (Section 1.4).

\(^3\) For a discussion of key recurring issues in studies of the nature of the standard, including whether it is exclusively written, whether it tolerates variation, whether it is an ideology or a reality and whether it is socially inclusive or divisive, see the Introduction to this volume.
1.2 The Genesis of Models of Standardization

1.2.1 The ‘Prehistory’ of Modelling Standardization

For reasons of space, this chapter will concentrate on the period from the 1950s onwards, when the first ‘classic’ texts on standardization begin to appear. Interest in the selection of norms has, however, a long history, and it is already apparent in the classical period. Quintilian (first century CE), having outlined the four bases for languages – reason, antiquity, authority and usage – concludes that ‘[u]sage is the surest pilot in speaking, and we should treat language as currency minted with the public stamp’ (I, 6.3, Quintilian 1920: 113). Usage, however, is not defined as that of the majority, but as the ‘agreed practice of educated men’ (I, 6.45, Quintilian 1920: 133), thereby moving from discussion of usage to good usage.

Neustupný (1993, 2006) identified four historical types of language planning (henceforth LP), which he termed the Premodern, Early Modern, Modern and Postmodern. As an example of the (late) Premodern period, Jernudd and Nekvapil (2012: 18–19) cite the founding and early activities of the French Academy in the seventeenth century, with its aim to give rules to the language and to render it capable of treating the arts and sciences. The Early Modern type is associated in Europe and the USA with the first processes of industrialization and the birth of the secular modern ideology of nationalism. It is illustrated by the nineteenth-century European national movements out of which arose a number of modern nations (e.g. Slovak, Czech, Norwegian, Finnish) in the Herderian sense (Jernudd & Nekvapil 2012: 19–20), and it is characterized by not only the selection or construction of varieties to be standardized and their implementation, but also the normalization of orthography and the controlled expansion of the lexicon. The LP of the Soviet Union in the 1920s and 1930s is thus also said to represent this type, whilst displaying in addition features of the Premodern and Modern types (Jernudd & Nekvapil 2012: 20–1). During the early Soviet period, in accordance with the principles set out in Lenin’s work, the Soviet state declared the right of self-determination for the many different ethnic groups of the Soviet Union, including schooling in their own languages, and as a result, codified standards and orthographies were created for many of them and textbooks and primers were produced (cf. Brandist & Chown 2011: 4–5). The interest in norms and standard Russian shown by linguists such as V. V. Vinogradov in the 1920s and 1930s in the Soviet Union, set against a background of sociological Marxist theories of national languages, focused on the relationship between social structure and linguistic variation and an evaluation of the way in which the war and

---

Revolution had affected the Russian language, rather than emphasizing the replacement of one social dialect by another (Bocadorova 1995: 165). Conversely, Jernudd and Nekvapil's example of the Modern type (2012: 21–2), Czechoslovakia and the Prague Linguistic Circle (or Prague School), sees the orientation shifting towards the microscopic level and a focus on the elaboration of the majority Czech standard language. The work of the Prague Circle was introduced to the English-speaking world above all by Paul Garvin (see Section 1.2.2), well after the Circle’s effective demise at the end of World War II. Another important figure in the 1920s was the Danish linguist Otto Jespersen, who maintained in *Mankind, Nation and Individual from a Linguistic Point of View* that the rise of what he termed ‘great national common-languages’ was ‘the greatest and most important phenomenon of the evolution of language in historic times’ (1925: 45). He reviewed some of the facts which have played a role in the creation and development of standard languages and their value in society.

### 1.2.2 1950s–1970s: ‘Classic’ Texts on Standardization

This period is characterized by a focus on the top-down, conscious processes of standardization, on the move from dialect to language and from vernacular to standard. This work is set against the backdrop of the emergence of sociolinguistics in the 1950s with the publication of foundational texts such as Weinreich (1953) and his elaboration in the following year of the concept of ‘diasystem’ (Weinreich 1954). In an early paper focusing on the case of Norway, Einar Haugen situates standardization clearly in the context of LP, which he defines narrowly as ‘the activity of preparing a normative orthography, grammar, and dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogeneous speech community’ (1959: 8); that is, to use later terms, as concerning ‘corpus’ rather than ‘status planning’. He also notes the somewhat hostile climate against what he calls ‘normative linguistics, because it brings in an element which is not purely scientific’, citing the views of Robert A. Hall and Leonard Bloomfield as representatives of this antagonistic trend (1959: 18).

In the same special issue of *Anthropological Linguistics*, Paul Garvin (1959: 28) identifies two intrinsic properties of standard languages: flexible stability and intellectualization. The first refers to the ‘requirement that a standard language be stabilized by appropriate codification, and that the

---

6 For later developments of the work on diasystems, see, for example, Koch & Oesterreicher (1990, 2001). For an application of the variational model to external linguistic history and questions of standardization, see Koch (2014).

7 It was only in 1979 that the journal *Language* published an article in this area on the decline and survival of prestige languages (Kahane & Kahane 1979). On Haugen, see Joseph et al. (2020).

8 These are said to derive, respectively, from Vilém Mathesius and Bohuslav Havránek, both members of the Prague School. The same ideas are developed in Garvin (1993), where intellectualization is defined as ‘the capacity of a language to develop increasingly more accurate and detailed means of expression, especially in the domains of modern life, that is to say in the spheres of science and technology, of government and politics, of higher education, of contemporary culture, etc.’ (1993: 43).
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codification be flexible enough “to allow for modification in line with culture change”. The second refers to ‘the requirement of increasing accuracy along an ascending scale of functional dialects from conversational to scientific’ (Garvin 1959: 28). He goes on to elaborate four functions of a standard language:9 the unifying, separatist and prestige functions (considered symbolic functions) and the frame-of-reference function, that is, serving as a frame of reference for correctness and for what he calls ‘the perception and evaluation of poetic speech’ (1959: 29). Finally, he identifies three typical standard-language attitudes: loyalty, pride and awareness of the norm.

Seven years later, some of these ideas were incorporated and developed in the first version of Haugen’s influential model of standardization (1966). Indeed, Haugen’s model – in one or other of its iterations (Tables 1.1–1.3) – has continued to be used to describe the standardization of numerous languages (see Section 1.4). It has also, as we will see, been taken up by scholars in language policy and planning. The simplicity and clarity of the model have contributed to its popularity, with standardization being described in terms of just four processes. In its first version, standardization comprises ‘four aspects of language development … as crucial features in taking the step from “dialect” to “language”, from vernacular to standard’ (1966: 933): (1) selection of norm: a model has to be selected as the basis of the norm; (2) codification of form: this concerns the form of the language or its linguistic structure – its target is to achieve ‘minimal variation in form’ for efficient communication; (3) elaboration of function: this is related to the functions of language and strives for ‘maximal variation in function’, the enabling of a language to fulfil all necessary communicative functions; and (4) acceptance by the community: for the norm to be the basis of the standard, it must be accepted by the community, albeit possibly by only a small but influential group of speakers (Table 1.1).

The flip side of the model’s simplicity and clarity is that it is not exhaustive. Moreover, whilst Haugen emphasizes that these are not necessarily successive stages and that they may be simultaneous or even cyclical, there is nevertheless a certain teleology associated with the model, common to many accounts of standardization. This coincides with what Richard Watts (2012) has termed either the tunnel or the funnel vision of standardization. Also missing from this model, of course, is a sense of the role of ideology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.1</th>
<th>The first version of Haugen’s model (1966: 934).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Codification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 These are first elaborated in a 1953 paper co-authored with Madeleine Mathiot. In 1993, a fifth function is added: the participatory function, associated with the desire to participate (Garvin 1993: 47–8).
Other criticisms of the model will be discussed later in the chapter (see Section 1.4).

There are a number of other publications by leading theorists from this period, some of whom influence Haugen’s work. First, there is the work of Heinz Kloss, whose use of the term Ausbau (1952: 28) is cited by Haugen (1966: 930–1) as corresponding to his concept of elaboration.10 The distinction between ‘Abstand languages’ and ‘Ausbau languages’ is developed by Kloss in a 1967 article, also published in Anthropological Linguistics. The first, glossed as ‘language by distance’, indicates that for a variety to be labelled a language rather than a dialect it must show considerable structural difference from related varieties, or a ‘definite break’ in Kloss’s terms. An Ausbau language, or ‘language by development’, is ‘recognized as such because of having been shaped or reshaped, molded or remolded – as the case may be – in order to become a standardized tool of literary expression’ (Kloss 1967: 29).11 Kloss’s second important distinction between ‘status planning’ and ‘corpus planning’, first expounded in 1969 (Kloss 1969: 81), is, as we shall see, incorporated into Haugen’s 1987 model, with him arguing that the former includes selection and the latter includes codification (Haugen 1987: 61). In another article on the relationship between language and nation, Kloss (1968) outlines a typology of languages according to four sets of variables:

- The type of state the country is, or purports to be, with regard to the language(s) spoken (e.g. genuine nation-state, multinational state);
- The developmental status of the language in the state in question (e.g. mature standard, young standard, preliterate standard);
- The juridical status of the speech community (e.g. national official, regional official, promoted, tolerated);12
- The language’s numerical strength.

Proposals relating to the typology of standard languages henceforth run in parallel with proposals for models of the processes of standardization.

Haugen also cites Charles Ferguson’s article on ‘Diglossia’ (1959), where he differentiates what he calls the H (‘high’) variety and the regional dialects called L (‘low’) varieties,13 as well as Ferguson’s classification (1962) of

---

10 According to Rutten et al. (2020: 260), elaboration for Haugen relates primarily to language, whereas Kloss (1967: 30) states that ‘[t]he concept of ausbau language is primarily a sociological one.’ Moreover, Kloss thought of Ausbau in terms of genres and domains.

11 This distinction is further elaborated by Mujaćić in a series of papers in the 1980s (see Mujaćić 1993: 89) considering not just dying languages, but also (re)emerging ones. He postulates two maximal evolutionary series of linguistic ‘descent’ and ‘ascent’ (1993: 88–92). As Millar notes (2005: 56), Mujaćić could be accused of adding too many terms to too few contexts, so that it becomes difficult to distinguish patterns shared by different situations.

12 Ethnologue now lists fifteen language recognition categories – see www.ethnologue.com/about/language-status (consulted 15 December 2019).

13 On the early history of the term ‘diglossia’, see Fernández (1995). The related concept of dilalia was introduced by Gaetano Beruto in the 1980s (1987, 1989) in order to capture those cases in which a clear functional differentiation exists (an H and L variety), but there is a functional overlap in spoken domains, with both L and H varieties used in ordinary conversation and primary socialization. For Auer’s (2005) notion of diaglossia, see Section 1.3.1.
the world’s standard languages according to two dimensions: their degree of standardization (from no important standardization (St. 0) to a language which has a single, widely accepted norm considered broadly appropriate for all purposes (St. 2)) and their utilization in writing (from W0 (not used for normal written purposes) to W3 (languages in which translations and résumés of scientific work in other languages are regularly published)).

A different attempt at establishing a typology of linguistic systems was offered by William Stewart (1968), who proposed classifying them on the basis of the presence/absence of four attributes: standardization (i.e. codification and acceptance within the community of users of a formal set of norms defining ‘correct’ usage), autonomy, historicity and vitality. In this article, Stewart (1968: 534) makes three other distinctions. The first is that between ‘informal’ and ‘formal’ standardization, both of which bring about increased uniformity, the former coming about through ‘more or less automatic adjustments which are made in terms of uncodified but socially preferred norms of usage’ and the latter through ‘deliberate conformity to codified rules’ (cf. the discussion of conscious/unconscious standardization in Section 1.2.3.3). The second distinction is that between ‘monocentric’ and ‘polycentric’ norms, referred to as both pluricentric and polycentric by Kloss (1978 [1952]: 66–7) and subsequently established as pluricentric by Clyne (1992), and the third distinction is that between standardization which is ‘endonormative’ (based on models of usage native to that country) and ‘exonormative’ (based on foreign models of usage). Stewart (1968: 540) also pays attention to the function of each of the linguistic systems within the national communities (official, provincial, wider communication, international, capital, group, educational, school subject, literary, religious) and specification of its degree of use by the population.

In a subsequent article, Haugen (1972 [1969]: 287) offers a broader definition of LP, which in his view deals primarily with written language:

[T]he term LP 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 standardization.

Language planners then describe and evaluate the background situation, and from this evaluation ‘arises the conception of a goal to be attained, of policies to be pursued for its attainment, and of procedures to implement these policies’ (Haugen (1972 [1969]: 293, emphasis in original). Some additional terminology is added (Haugen (1972 [1969]: 288): according to whether LP is primarily a matter of form or function, normalization may be distinguished from cultivation. Normalization requires the selection and codification of form, while cultivation requires the elaboration and propagation of functions.14

14 Note the use of ‘propagation’ rather than ‘acceptance’ as a more active term.
### 1.2.3 1980s

In 1983, Haugen returns to his model, again pointing out its practical aims (1983: 289). He admits it is only a starting point and does not amount to a theory of LP (1983: 274), since it has nothing to say about the end points, the goals to be reached or the ideals and motivations that guide planners; in other words, he is conscious of the lack of attention paid to aims and ideology. He nevertheless defends the model, simply proposing two minor adjustments: the column heading ‘Form’ is replaced by ‘Norm’, and ‘Acceptance’ by ‘Implementation’ (Table 1.2). He rejects the need to include Neustupný’s ‘cultivation approach’, which he thinks is contained in his notion of *elaboration*, but he does value his remarks on the need to add in *correction* procedures; he also argues that the need for *evaluation procedures* as suggested by Rubin is clear (Haugen 1983: 274).

A third, more detailed version of the model is offered in 1987 (Table 1.3). In each case, more information is included about the different steps, which he emphasizes may be simultaneous or even cyclical. For example, codification is broken down into the three sub-procedures of ‘Graphization’, ‘Grammatication’ and ‘Lexication’. The term ‘Graphization’ is derived from Ferguson (1968) and is glossed simply as ‘reduction to writing’, which he seems to conceive principally as the development of a writing system for a previously unwritten language. On ‘Grammatication’, Haugen (1987: 60) writes: ‘To some degree linguistics owes its existence to the practical services linguists could offer as

#### Table 1.2 Haugen’s 1983 model of standardization (1983: 270).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>(1) Selection (3) Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>(2) Codification (4) Elaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 1.3 Haugen’s revised model of language planning (1987: 64).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form (policy planning)</th>
<th>Function (cultivation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society (status planning)</td>
<td>(1) Selection (decision procedures) (a) Identification of problem (b) Allocation of norms (3) Implementation (educational spread) (a) Correction procedures (b) Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (corpus planning)</td>
<td>(2) Codification (standardization procedures) (a) Graphization (b) Grammatication (c) Lexication (4) Elaboration (functional development) (a) Terminological modernization (b) Stylistic development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

15 The ‘cultivation’ approach is contrasted with the policy approach. For Hornberger’s attempt to integrate these and Haugen’s categories, see Section 1.2.4.2.
codifiers of language. They learned to extract and formulate the rules of grammar, a process we may call grammatication. From Panini to the present grammars have been prescriptive, certainly the ones used in most schools. Whether they are also scientific depends on the skill of the linguist and the philosophy of the times. Finally, ‘Lexication’ is glossed as ‘the selection of an appropriate lexicon. This may also involve the assignment of styles and spheres of usage for the words of the language’ (Haugen 1987: 60).

The term ‘grammatization’, which, as defined by Sylvian Auroux, embraces both grammar and vocabulary, has been widely adopted in the French school of the history of linguistics:

> Par grammatisation, on doit entendre le processus qui conduit à décrire et à outiller une langue sur la base des deux technologies, qui sont encore aujourd’hui les piliers de notre savoir métalinguistique: la grammaire et le dictionnaire. (Auroux 1992: 28)

(‘By “grammatization”, we understand the process which leads to describing and “tooling up” [equipping] a language on the basis of two technologies which are still today the pillars of our metalinguistic knowledge: grammars and dictionaries.’)

### 1.2.3.1 In Haugen’s Footsteps: Milroy and Milroy

As we have seen, Haugen continued to refine his model during the 1980s. Some theorists build on this model, foremost of whom are James and Lesley Milroy, whose model has been widely exploited in histories of the English language (e.g. Nevalainen & Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2006; Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2011), but relatively little beyond this. The first edition of Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardisation appeared in 1985, with new editions following in 1991, 1999 and 2012.16

The Milroys propose rather more hypothetical stages in the implementation of a standard language.17 They stress that these hypothetical stages do not necessarily follow one another in temporal succession, and that maintenance, for instance, starts quite early in the process and then continues throughout. They nevertheless seem to imply that codification precedes prescription.

As the title of their volume suggests, the focus is on prescription and the effects of prescriptive attitudes on the daily lives of individuals (2012: 1).
Milroy and Milroy observe (2012: 2) that it is difficult to separate language prescription, glossed as the ‘imposition of norms on usage by authority’, from a number of related phenomena such as ‘normalization’ and ‘standardization’ of language. One of their key contributions is to stress that standardization is an ideology, ‘a set of abstract norms to which usage may conform to a greater or lesser extent’ (2012: 19).

1.2.3.2 Works on Norms

Interest in norms in linguistics had developed with the publication of Coşeriu’s seminal Sistema, norma y habla (‘System, Norm and Speech’), first published in 1952, but best known in its 1962 version. In this, Coşeriu proposed a third level of intermediate abstraction between system (langue) and speech (parole), which he termed la norma, the socially fixed restrictions against the rules of langue being extended absolutely (Joseph 1987: 28). We may think of the system as the possibilities of expression, speech as individual variation and the norm as indicating what is ‘normal’ or the frequency with which the possibilities are realized. It is a regularity norm rather than a prescriptive norm.

In the 1980s, different types of norm are explored. Bédard and Maurais (1983), for instance, consider the relationship between different norms and the prescriptive norm through a range of historical and synchronic studies. Renate Bartsch (1987, first published in 1985 in German) likewise distinguishes different types of norm: norms based on a convention and prescribed norms (1987: 79) and mandatory, permissive and power-conferring norms (1987: 80). In considering what happens to linguistic norms in language planning and development, she outlines a number of key notions (1987: 176–7), which in part overlap with Haugen’s stages of standardization. These include norm concept, a norm content which conceptualizes the expected regularity and which, together with the norm character (obligatory or optional), forms the norm kernel; norm formulation, a formulation of a norm concept; norm codification, an official formulation of the norm concept; and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.4 Milroy and Milroy’s model of standardization (2012: 22–3).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Diffusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once the selected variety is well established and has defeated its competitors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Elaboration of function → more value for purely utilitarian ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Acquisition of prestige → associated with the most successful people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Codification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Prescription</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Milroy and Milroy observe (2012: 2) that it is difficult to separate language prescription, glossed as the ‘imposition of norms on usage by authority’, from a number of related phenomena such as ‘normalization’ and ‘standardization’ of language. One of their key contributions is to stress that standardization is an ideology, ‘a set of abstract norms to which usage may conform to a greater or lesser extent’ (2012: 19).
normal promulgation, the activity of introducing a norm as valid for a population. She adds that, with respect to a population and a norm concept, we can speak of existence (as a practice), acceptance, adoption, validity and justification of the norm concept as a norm. Language standardization then involves ‘a shift or change in the popula-tional domains of existence (practice), acceptance, adoption, validity, and justification of the variety of a language that is chosen, or constructed, or that evolves as the standard of that language. … The same is true of non-standard varieties of that language, although with an opposite effect’ (1987: 248). The social reality of a norm consists of relationships between norm authorities, norm enforcers, norm codifiers and norm subjects, any of whom, in the case of linguistic norms, can in principle also fulfil the other roles (1987: 72).

1.2.3.3 Acts of Identity

A third interesting strand of work is that by Robert Le Page, either in collaboration with Andrée Tabouret-Keller (1985) or as single author (1988). As we shall see (Section 1.2.3.5), Joseph makes an important distinction between ‘language standards’ and ‘standard languages’, which finds echoes in Le Page’s model and its distinction between largely unconscious and more conscious standardization. Following the seminal volume Acts of Identity (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985), Le Page published an article in 1988 entitled ‘Some premises concerning the standardization of languages, with special reference to Caribbean Creole English’. The basis of the argument is ‘that the individual creates the patterns for his verbal behaviour so as to resemble those of the group or groups with which from time to time he wishes to be identified, or so as to be unlike those he wishes to distance himself from’ (Le Page 1988: 31). Le Page then argues that, in accounting for the process of standardization, we have to invoke the concepts of projection and focusing:

Linguistic activity is a process of projecting onto others images of the universe as we perceive it, and by implication inviting others to share our symbolization. … If we feel that those we are speaking to are part of a group we wish to identify with, we may modify our behaviour so as to be more like our percept of theirs. In that case, the behaviour of the group will become more focused, and since our symbolization centres on the characteristics with which we have endowed groups which we imagine we perceive in society, our own behaviour too will then in that particular respect become more focused, more regular. (Le Page 1988: 31–2)

Le Page (1988: 32) distinguishes three different kinds of language standard: standard in the sense of norm, standard in the sense of a set of defining characteristics and standard in the prescriptive sense. It is the first that

---

18 She notes that there can be acceptance of the norm by people without it being practised by them (Bartsch 1987: 96).
comes about through focusing, and it is likely to be a largely unconscious process. The progression from standard in the sense of a focused and socially marked norm, through a description of some aspects of that norm as a set of defining characteristics, on to a prescription of those characteristics for those who wish to (say) join the Mandarin class, occurs through ‘the progressive reification, totemization, and institutionalization of a language’ (1988: 33). Whilst the ‘classic’ texts had largely concentrated on standardization as a change from above, consciously implemented and adopted, the foundations are being laid for interest both in less conscious types of standardization and, ultimately, in standardization from below (see Section 1.3.4 and Chapter 3).

1.2.3.4 Koines and Koineization
Interest in the concept of koines and koineization also develops in the 1980s. The term ‘koine’, meaning ‘common’ in Greek, as in ‘common language’, was first used to refer to the form of Greek used as a lingua franca during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Siegel (1985: 359) lists some of the languages described as koines in the literature by different linguists from as early as 1949, commenting that very few, if any, of them could be said to have all of the formal and functional features of the original koine. For Ferguson (1988: 120), koineization, or the reduction of dialect differences by levelling and simplification, is one of at least three tendencies involved in the spread of a favoured variety. One well-documented component of koineization is therefore the avoidance of ‘stigmatized’ forms. The other tendencies are, first, ‘variety shifting’, in which ‘specific linguistic features come to be viewed as marking identity with particular social groups (“dialect shifting”) and particular communicative functions or occasions of use (“register shifting”), and individuals adopt such features as part of their “acts of identity” in producing utterances’ (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985). He adds that when this leads towards the spread of a supradialectal norm, we have standardization par excellence. The third tendency (Ferguson 1988: 121) is ‘classicization’, or the adoption of features considered to belong to an earlier prestige norm. Greenberg (1986: 273) likewise posits a ‘standardization cycle’, in which periods of dialect differentiation alternate with periods of standardization, first through the development of a koine and then, in communities with writing, the acquisition of prestige through literary use. Over time, the spoken koine develops local dialects, ‘so that ultimately, if linguistic unity is to be preserved, a new common language must develop on the basis of a dominant dialect of the old koine’ (Greenberg 1986: 273).
1.2.3.5 Joseph (1987) Joseph elaborates the important distinction between 'language standards' and 'standard languages'. He identifies the emergence of language standards as a sociolinguistic universal, arguing that '[i]t seems to be a trait of the species that once people become aware of variants in any area of behaviour, they evaluate them. Thus do standards of behaviour come into being' (Joseph 1987: 3). In his view, it is an inherent characteristic of any human speech community – literate or otherwise – to be consciously sensitive to language quality in one form or another (1987: 4). Conversely, standard languages arise from a deliberate act or legitimization through specific processes associated with the standard language ideology, and they ‘are not universal, but represent a specifically Western concept that has been spread by cultural tradition’ (1987: 7).

Joseph attempts to organize the criteria distinguishing standard languages from non-standard dialects into a 'standardization cycle', kept in motion by what he calls the dynamic interaction between a cultural tradition of eloquence and a social–political reality of power. He argues (1987: 132–3) that a language undergoing a sudden burgeoning of standardization activity will exhibit several of twenty-five characteristics. This list brings together elements of Haugen’s selection, codification, elaboration and diffusion, as well as Kloss’s concept of Abstand and Ferguson’s diglossia:

(1) Redefinition of the speech community and its unit of loyalty;
(2) Clearer emergence of synecdochic dialect;
(3) Emergence of rival synecdochic dialect(s);
(4) Change in degree of Abstand;
(5) Linguistic changes in standard norm;
(6) Linguistic changes in contingent norms;
(7) Change in definition of standard norms within synecdochic dialect;
(8) Change in the language’s prestige to outsiders;
(9) Changes in speakers’ attitudes towards the language within the community;
(10) Change in superposition situation (new H added, etc.);
(11) Growth or diminution of cultural avant-garde;
(12) Increase or decrease of intensity or influence of avant-garde’s activities;
(13) Change of writing system or orthography;
(14) Increase or decrease of use of written channel;
(15) Change in community literacy rate;

---

21 The chapter is organized broadly chronologically according to date of publication. However, Joseph’s (1987) volume was based on his PhD thesis, defended in January 1981 and published by University Microfilms.

22 As Jernudd and Nekvapil (2012: 27) observe, in the 1980s and the following years, a number of authors criticize the ‘covert’ ideological basis of classic language planning and begin to reflect more on questions of power and inequalities, as in Tollefson (1991), Blommaert (1996, 1999), etc.

23 See also the discussion of the nine factors characterizing a standard language (Joseph 1987: 6).
Alternatively, Haarmann (1990: 105) adds as his third category that of prestige planning (‘evaluations as regards the targets of planning’, both by the planners and the language users); he notes that its role is demonstrated when corpus and status planning fail because of lack of prestige.

Costa-Carreras et al. (forthcoming) discuss the history of the term ‘compositionality’ (composicional and composicionalitat in Catalan corpus planning where the term is most used), which is an alternative standardizing strategy. They cite Bibiloni’s (1997) definition of the ‘compositional model’ as a ‘unitarian standard constructed from contributions by all the dialects’ which ‘needs a codification based mainly on the criterion of diasystematicity’.

In his epilogue, Joseph examines changes in the status of the standard and the end of the cycle, themes which have been developed in more recent times. He introduces the terms destandardization (1987: 174) and restandardization, as well as the change from standard language to classical language (1987: 173).

1.2.3.6 Cooper (1989)

At the end of the decade, Robert Cooper (1989) offers an overview of LP and presents four descriptive frameworks for it: language is in turn considered as (1) the management of innovation; (2) an instance of marketing; (3) a tool in the acquisition and maintenance of power; and (4) an instance of decision-making. In addition, he argues that LP may occur in both ‘developing’ and ‘developed’ nations, thereby broadening the scope of LP activities. Particularly influential is his addition of acquisition planning to corpus and status planning (1989: 33–4); that is, planning directed towards increasing the number of users.

1.2.4 1990s: The Development and Establishment of Certain Key Notions

1.2.4.1 Introduction

By the early 1990s, many of the central ideas of standardization as elaborated by Kloss, Stewart and Haugen in the ‘classic’ texts were becoming well established and integrated into mainstream discussions of standardization. For example, Kloss’s notion of pluricentric or polycentric standards (1978 [1952]: 66–7) is taken up by Clyne (1992; see also Clyne & Kipp 1999), and pluricentric henceforth becomes recognized as the usual term in the literature. Figure 1.1 sketches the genealogy of some of these key notions.

---

(16) Codification of second-language grammar;
(17) Codification of native grammar;
(18) Change in functional range;
(19) Transference from H underway;
(20) Sentiment of ineloquence and calls for remedial elaboration;
(21) Altered conception or application of logic, purism, aesthetics;
(22) Desire to ideologize or obliterate connotative connections;
(23) Rejection of previous hierarchizations or limitations;
(24) Desire for greater or lesser variation within the standard;
(25) Change in status of absolute standard.

---

24 Alternatively, Haarmann (1990: 105) adds as his third category that of prestige planning (‘evaluations as regards the targets of planning’, both by the planners and the language users); he notes that its role is demonstrated when corpus and status planning fail because of lack of prestige.

25 Costa-Carreras et al. (forthcoming) discuss the history of the term ‘compositionality’ (composicional and composicionalitat in Catalan corpus planning where the term is most used), which is an alternative standardizing strategy. They cite Bibiloni’s (1997) definition of the ‘compositional model’ as a ‘unitarian standard constructed from contributions by all the dialects’ which ‘needs a codification based mainly on the criterion of diasystematicity’.
1.2.4.2 Hornberger’s Integrative Framework (1994, 2006)

A reflection of this consolidation of ideas in the 1990s is Hornberger’s integrative framework, originally proposed in 1994, which attempts to synthesize different schemes and typologies into a unified framework (Table 1.5). Hornberger (2006: 28) explains its rationale as follows. The two main axes represent widely accepted conceptual distinctions, namely language policy and planning (henceforth LPP) types and LPP approaches. LPP types capture the status/corpus/acquisition planning dimension. LPP approaches capture the distinction between policy and cultivation approaches to LP (following Neustupný 1974: 39). The policy approach, seen as attending to matters of society and nation, at the macroscopic level emphasizes the distribution of languages/literacies and is mainly concerned with standard language; it is often interpreted to be the same as status planning. The cultivation approach, seen as attending to matters of language/literacy, at the microscopic level emphasizes ways of speaking/writing and their distribution and is mainly concerned with literary language; it is often interpreted as being synonymous with corpus planning. Yet, Hornberger adds, the match is not perfect, and Haugen offers a more finely tuned interpretation which maps these two binary distinctions (status/corpus and policy/cultivation) onto a fourfold matrix defined by society/language and form/function axes and comprising selection of norm, codification of norm, implementation of function and elaboration of function as the four dimensions (1966, 1983). She follows his interpretation, with the addition of acquisition planning as a third type (Hornberger

Figure 1.1 The emergence of key notions.

The framework does not include ideology, although Hornberger refers to its importance.
Table 1.5 *Hornberger’s integrative framework (2006 [1994]).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Policy planning approach (on form)</th>
<th>Cultivation planning approach (on function)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status planning</td>
<td>Officialization</td>
<td>Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(about uses of language)</td>
<td>Nationalization</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardization of status</td>
<td>Spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proscription</td>
<td>Interlingual communication – international, intranational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition planning (about users of language)</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Reacquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education/school</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literary</td>
<td>Shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Foreign language/second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass media</td>
<td>language/literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Selection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language’s formal role in society</td>
<td>Language’s functional role in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extra-linguistic aims</td>
<td><strong>Extra-linguistic aims</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus planning</td>
<td>Standardization of corpus</td>
<td>Modernization (new functions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(about language)</td>
<td>Standardization of auxiliary code</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graphization</td>
<td>Stylistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Codification</strong></td>
<td>Renovation (new forms, old functions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language’s form</td>
<td>Purification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic aims</td>
<td>Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stylistic simplification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terminology unification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*′LPP types are in plain face, approaches in *italics*, goals in **bold**. The goals are shown in six cells. Haugen’s (1983) fourfold matrix is indicated by shading, and interpretative comments on those four quadrants are placed below the dashed lines. Additional interpretative comments are enclosed in parentheses throughout. The figure incorporates the work of Cooper (1989); Ferguson (1968); Haugen (1983); Hornberger (1994); Kloss (1968); Nahir (1984); Neustupný (1974); Rabin (1971); Stewart (1968).′*

2006: 30), thus yielding six rather than four dimensions of language/literacy planning. Hornberger (1994: 30–2) then adds in the goals of LPP, of which there are nearly thirty in her framework, which are drawn *inter alia* from Ferguson (1968), Nahir (1977, 1984) and Cooper (1989).

This is an extremely interesting attempt at synthesis but, as Hornberger herself hints, there are issues in trying simply to accumulate ideas and concepts from different models, where the different terms may have different values and may only partially overlap with related ones in other schemes and models.
1.2.4.3 Purism
At this time, a concept coming under scrutiny is purism. Thomas (1991) elaborates different types of purism (which he considers a sociolinguistic universal), the processes involved and the individuals and institutions concerned. He argues that there are three situations with which manifestations of purism are particularly associated (1991: 115): language standardization, language contact and language variation. On standardization, Thomas (1991: 115) refers to Brozović’s view that ‘every standard language undergoes some form of purism – even if it is not so named – and that purism (in the narrower sense of xenophobic purism) constitutes one of the fifteen criteria of standardness’. Thomas (1991: 116–22) elaborates four stages of standardization, each of which provides quite different opportunities and challenges for puristic intervention:

(1) Minimal standardization involving the rise of written dialects often based on a spoken koine and characterized by an openness to enrichment from all sources, making examples of active modes of purism quite exceptional.

(2) Pre-standardization involving some move towards a standardized idiom based on a single dialect, a compromise of dialects or a koine. Active forms of purism are well represented in many languages. Since it operates primarily on the written language, purism often has the effect of distancing written from spoken usage.

(3) Standardization proper, which sees the institution of a single prestigious autonomous standard; the puristic orientation is often inextricably linked to the values lying behind the creation of that standard. ‘Together with codification and enrichment [purism] forms an essential part of the process of Sprachanschluss, the modelling of a language on a prestigious language of culture so that it can eventually usurp the latter in its social functions’ (Thomas 1991: 121).

(4) Post-standardization, which involves the cultivation and further elaboration of the standard language. Purism may continue, but since the standard language is now well established, vigilance may be relaxed somewhat. However, the influx of international terms may find expression in outbursts of irrational puristic sentiment and activity, even where purism had been dormant or of little consequence.
One of the interests of Thomas’s volume is that he proposes ways of measuring and evaluating purism, thereby trying to avoid some of the pitfalls of more impressionistic accounts.

### 1.2.4.4 Prescriptivism and Verbal Hygiene

Work on prescriptivism has often received a bad press. Typical is Larry Trask’s (1999: 48) acerbic condemnation of it in the entry in his *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics* on descriptivism:

> Descriptivism is a central tenet of what we regard as a scientific approach to the study of language: the very first requirement in any scholarly investigation is to get the facts right. Prescriptivism, in great contrast, is not a scientific approach. The strong opinions of prescriptivists may be variously regarded as recommendations about good style, as an aspect of social mores, as a consequence of our educational system, or perhaps even as a matter of morality, but they are not statements about actual behaviour, and hence they are not scientific.

As Milroy and Milroy observe (2012: 4), linguists have often studied language as if prescriptive phenomena play no part in language. Yet, as they go on to argue (2012: 7), if we are going to have a complete picture of the nature of language, we must consider its social functions and characteristics, which include understanding standardization, questions of prestige and attitudes to language.

Deborah Cameron (1995) argues that ‘verbal hygiene’, which she differentiates from prescriptivism, is a natural part of human behaviour based on the basic impulse to evaluate. In the foreword to the 2012 edition of her study of verbal hygiene, she contends that it is a practice (or a collection of practices) which generates both representations of language and particular ways of using it (2012: ix–x). Moreover, most everyday discourse on language is above all evaluative (2012: xxii). In her view, LP is a form of verbal hygiene, but one protected by its expert, ‘scientific’ status. Cameron’s work is therefore another facet of the emerging interest in bottom-up perspectives and the role played by language users in standardization and language change.

### 1.2.4.5 Other Developments

The 1990s witness the emergence of important trends which we will see develop and expand from the 2000s on, including an increasing move away from the one nation–one language paradigm, recognition and respect for the plurality of languages and interest in language rights (Jernudd & Nekvapil 2012: 30–1). Hornberger (2006: 35) considers that frameworks such as Fishman’s Reversing Language Shift Model (Fishman 1991, 2001) encapsulate three fundamental aspects of this emerging paradigm: increased interest in language ideologies, linguistic ecology and human agency.

---

29 On Haugen’s concept of ‘language ecology’, see, for example, Eliasson (2013).
In Fishman’s model, the level of language endangerment is captured in the model through an eight-degree ‘graded intergenerational disruption scale’. This is complemented by interest in a language management rather than a LP approach, as first programmatically introduced by Jernudd and Neustupný at a conference in 1986 (Jernudd & Neustupný 1987).

### 1.3 Current and Emerging Trends: From the 2000s to the Present

#### 1.3.1 Introduction

From the 2000s, there has been a proliferation of publications and approaches, whether focusing on the linguistic, social, cultural, educational, political or other dimension, with the result that this section is necessarily highly schematic. As Deumert and Vandenbussche (2003: 11) remark, standardization is increasingly viewed as a complex process that merits further research from comparative and interdisciplinary perspectives, including Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), corpus linguistics, historical pragmatics, social geography and social history, to name but a few. In this section, I shall attempt to identify some of the major themes that emerge or grow in significance from the 2000s on. The first thing to note, however, is that there are also continuities. For instance, there are new versions or iterations of models of standardization tracing its different stages. A good example of this is the work of Metzeltin (2004), who elaborates the following stages in the development of the ‘main’ standard Romance languages:

- **Concienciación**: speakers are, or become, aware of the individuality/otherness of their language due to the need for translations, glossaries and a proper name.
- **Textualización**: a series of texts arises such as laws, lyrical poems and chronicles that inaugurate textual traditions.
- **Codificación**: works on spelling, grammars, dictionaries and poetics are produced that explicitly systematize the language.
- **Normativización**: recognized institutions emerge such as academies that, through a selection of variants, unify the language, regulate its writing and declare that the grammar and vocabulary thus selected is correct; above all, from this moment on, sociological consciousness of the dialects (dialectology) and conscious attitudes towards linguistic varieties (linguistic ethology) are developed.
- **Oficialización**: this language, now conscious, textualized, codified and normativized, is anchored in appropriate legislation so that it can be used for public powers to communicate both with themselves and with the public.
• **Medialización**: state organs try to introduce or impose the normativized and official language in all spheres of the public domain, particularly in schools through teaching and appropriate manuals.

• **Internacionalización**: state organs try to get their language recognized or to impose it as a means of international communication.

It should be noted that this schema concentrates very heavily on state organs and pays little attention to the many other actors at the meso- and micro-levels who play a role in LP.

### 1.3.2 Typologies of Standardization/Languages According to Their Degree or Stage of Standardization

Following in the footsteps of the pioneering work of Kloss (1968: 76) on the different types of languages according to the degree of standardization, different typologies have been proposed. An interesting and representative example is the taxonomy of the Germanic languages outlined by Deumert and Vandenbussche (2003: 2–3).

One of the most influential typologies is that of Auer (2005), in which he outlines five sociolinguistic types that also occur chronologically. Auer distinguishes between different types of diglossia (exoglossic diglossia, where the H variety is a separate, genetically distinct language; medial diglossia with an endoglossic standard; and spoken diglossia, when the standard language extends into spontaneous oral speech), to which he adds the concept of diaglossia. A diaglossic repertoire is characterized by intermediate variants between the standard and base dialect, often referred to as a *regiolects* (Auer 2005: 22). Such diaglossia is followed by dialect loss. Auer argues that we are not usually dealing with discrete categories, but a standard/dialect continuum. He furthermore maintains that few cases are not covered by this typology, a notable exception being Iceland. However, it should be noted that his typology is restricted to Europe and – as he admits – leaves out many multilingual repertoire types.30

### 1.3.3 Moving beyond the National and the European

The focus on national European languages in standardization studies has been increasingly challenged. First, scholars have questioned the validity of existing models if you apply them to non-Western and multilingual countries. As Milroy and others have pointed out (Milroy 2001: 540, 2012: 577–8), non-standardized languages do not necessarily exhibit definable boundaries and are not fully describable in ways typically employed...
by linguists, such as the structuralist approach which views languages as coherent systems. Smakman and Nekesa Barasa (2017: 23–4) contend that traditional approaches to standardization are unable to describe the situation not only in countries in which diglossia and multilingualism are a rule rather than the exception, but also in those where no historical dialects exist or the nation’s dominant language was imported, such as New Zealand. Moreover, they argue that these so-called deviant language settings are in fact quite common. Following on from Stewart’s (1968) distinction between ‘endonormative’ and ‘exonormative’ standardization (see Section 1.2.2), they explore the effects of colonialism and argue that, for newer varieties of language, the process of ‘nativization’ (as elaborated, for instance, by Kachru 1976) should be included in standardization theories. Amorós-Negre (2018: 32) considers implicit linguistic norms in non-Western languages, norms that are used both for ritual formulas and for supra-regional communication through implicit linguistic rules. Whilst these do not enjoy the prescriptive force of the explicit standard, they nevertheless function as models of correction and exemplarity for their speakers.

A second challenge comes from the growing interest in comparing and understanding the standardization history of minority or minoritized varieties. Whilst some studies have attempted to fit these into traditional models such as Haugen (see Section 1.4), others have highlighted the problematic, double-edged nature of standardization for minority/minoritized languages. For instance, Lane et al. (2017: 1) note the tension between the standardization of such languages as, on the one hand, a potent way of producing or inventing languages as bounded, discrete entities and enhancing the social status of those who use them, and, on the other hand, as inherently limiting variation and group-internal diversity and establishing new hierarchies in contexts where diversity is the very raison d’être, with minority language movements claiming that all ways of communicating are equally legitimate and that language diversity needs to be protected. Lane et al. (2017: 11–13) argue that minoritized language standardization efforts differ in three important ways from national language standardization projects. First, the low, yet potentially fluctuating social status of minoritized communities sets minority language standardization projects apart, since they are typically working within established political jurisdictions and in societies which continue to view their language and culture through deficit lenses. Second, unlike dominant state languages, the stages through which minority language standardization is achieved are a contemporary occurrence that is documented, accessible and visible. As such, this impedes (or complicates) the naturalization processes that rendered dominant language standards unquestionable (Woolard 2008). Minority language standards are consequently subject to ‘negotiation, debate, contestation

31 Note that histories of European national languages are also being written through the lens of multilingualism. See, for example, Pahta et al. (2017).
and appropriation by various types of social actors in very diverse circumstances’ (Lane et al. 2017: 12). Moreover, minority language users are not necessarily speakers: they may only depend on written forms in order to access niche markets, for instance. Third, there is the thorny issue of the relationship of minoritized languages to other languages. Under the homogenizing logic of state languages, the users of standard national languages were intended to be (or become) monolingual. In the traditional accounts, monolingual individuals are viewed as the norm and nation-states are typically constructed on the basis of one language. While such ideas have been held with respect to certain minoritized language groups (in particular in Catalan sociolinguistics, where bilingualism was viewed as a myth serving the progress of Castilian monolingualism; see Aracil 1982), many such communities are familiar with multilingualism and view diversity positively, as an asset. Deumert and Mabandla (in Lane et al. 2017: 212) argue that there is evidence of ‘a decolonial future for standard languages, i.e. a future in which a diversity of voices rather than a monolithic norm is the way in which we image the standard languages’. As yet, how this will be modelled has not been fully developed (cf. Chapter 6 in this volume).

1.3.4 Increasing Interest in the Agents of Standardization and Standardization ‘from Below’

In Ricento’s (2000: 208) view, ‘the key variable which separates the older, positivistic/technicist approaches from the newer critical/postmodern ones is agency, that is, the role(s) of individuals and collectivities in the processes of language use, attitudes, and ultimately policies’. In the case of standardization, this means a shift of focus to the social actors, their ideologies and practices, rather than on the processes involved.32 Ammon (2017; cf. Ammon 2003) affords an example of such a model of the social forces determining a language standard, comprising model speakers and writers (their public texts), codifiers (the linguistic codex), language experts (criticisms of the codex and the model speakers’ and writers’ language use) and language norm authorities (corrections), all of which interact with each other.

Both the fields of language policy and planning and historical sociolinguistics have increasingly turned their attention to the investigation of local actors as bottom-up policymakers. For instance, analyses of minority language standardization not only examine those agents who facilitate standardization, but also explore how social actors engage with, support, alter, resist and even reject standardization processes (Lane et al. 2017: 1).

The growing interest in historical sociolinguistics on language history ‘from below’ (see Elspaß 2005, 2007) has likewise had an impact on the

---

range of actors considered part of standardization. In research on standardization ‘from below’, the focus is shifted from the standardizing practices of an elite minority to consideration of majority language use by ‘ordinary’ people, from norms and theories to actual language practice and implicit language standards. Elspaß (Chapter 3, this volume) argues that standardization studies therefore need to look at a broader range of texts and to examine why some variants ‘from below’ succeed in becoming established in standard varieties. In relation to what Ammon (2017: 24) calls ‘standard by mere usage’, a key concept is that of communities of practice (or discourse communities if the people have never met); that is, people ‘who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavor’ (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 1992: 464). This includes ‘ways of talking, beliefs, values, power relations – in short, practices’ that emerge from this mutual endeavour.

1.3.5 Destandardization and Restandardization

The replacement of standard language by language standards is, according to Coupland and Kristiansen (2011: 27, see also Chapter 25, this volume), symptomatic of the increasingly anti-authoritarian, individualistic and democratic ideology that, according to some sociologists, characterizes Late Modernity. They distinguish two different processes (2011: 28):

- Destandardization: a possible development whereby the established standard language loses its position as the one and only ‘best language’. Democratization can lead to ‘value levelling’ that will secure access to public space for a wider range of speech varieties – this would be equal to a radical weakening and eventual abandonment of the ‘standard ideology’ itself.
- Demotization: the ‘standard ideology’ as such stays intact while the valorization of ways of speaking changes – the belief that there is, or should be, a ‘best language’ is not abandoned, but the idea of what this ‘best language’ is, or sounds like, changes. Demotization is revalorization, an ideological upgrading, of ‘low-status’ language to ‘best language’ status.

It is important to note, in passing, that these changes can occur even in a country like France which has a strong standardization ideology. As Lüdi (2012: 217) observes, regional varieties of French in France and in other countries are no longer automatically devalued, but acknowledged as manifestations of national and regional identities (in his terms, ‘destandardization’). Conversely, new forms of management of linguistic diversity in ‘Francophonie’, starting from international agencies and ending with

33 On demotization, see especially Mattheier (1997); the German term is already found in Maas (1985). Whilst some scholars prefer the term ‘restandardization’ for this type of change, more recently there has been discussion of possible differences between ‘demotization’ and ‘restandardization’ (see Chapter 25, this volume).
res-Bennett

 dictionaries for Swiss French, African French, etc., indicate a movement towards pluricentric ‘restandardization’.34

 We might then represent this movement as a cycle (Figure 1.2).

**1.3.6 Linguistic Regimes/Regimes of Language**

Standardization has also been situated in work on language regimes, which builds on the classic texts on language ideologies, such as Silverstein (1979) and Schieffelin et al. (1998). Gal (2006: 17, 2017: 223), for instance, describes standardization as only one language regime among others. According to Coulmas (2005: 7), ‘a language regime … consists of habits, legal provisions, and ideologies’; it therefore brings in a focus on the study of actions, ideologies and political economy. Costa (2019) likewise emphasizes that regimes of language are not merely synonymous with ideologies, but instead questions the organization and implementation of ideologies: how, in other words, they are connected to action.

**1.3.7 Evaluation of Standardization**

Costa-Carreras (2020) observes that evaluation of standardization has not been undertaken systematically (cf. Ricento 2006: 18–19). In his view, standardization sits at an intermediate level epistemologically between terminology

---

34 Symptomatic of this change is the renaming in 2001 of the former Délegation Générale à la Langue Française (DGLF) as La Délegation Générale à la Langue Française et aux Langues de France (DGLFLF; ‘General Delegation for the French Language and the Languages of France’).
planning on the one hand and language policy and planning on the other. Whilst policy evaluation theory has been developed extensively (e.g. in Gazzola 2014) and there is some work on terminology planning evaluation, there is insufficient research on the development, implementation and evaluation of specific policies relating to standardization. Costa-Carreras (2020) remarks how Haugen (1983: 274) already articulated the need for evaluation procedures as part of any good programme of implementation; in his view, it should also relate to the other three phases of his model. Amongst the criteria he proposes for the evaluation of standardization he includes relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and equity/fairness.

1.4 Haugen Revisited

Although understanding of the standardization history of different languages has certainly advanced and the field has greatly expanded over the past two decades, this final section considers the extent to which progress has been made in modelling language standardization. It is striking how many studies of standardization still begin by pointing out the problems associated with Haugen’s model whilst continuing to use it. These include accounts of particular languages or language families, such as French (Lodge 1993), Spanish (Penny 2000), the Germanic languages (Deumert & Vandenbussche 2003), Basque (Hualde & Zuazo 2007) and Catalan (Costa-Carreras 2007; Stillwell & Hetrovicz 2013). In a special issue of Sociolinguistica devoted to the standardization of minority languages (Daquennes & Vandenbussche 2015), a number of standardization histories, from Cornish to Mirandese, are viewed through the lens of Haugen. Similarly, Coupland and Kristiansen (2011: 12) ask whether Haugen’s model, focusing on language standardization processes, is well suited to Late Modernity – a social ecology very different from the one Haugen was confronting. Whilst they conclude that that his statist model of institutionalized standardization needs significant revision (2011: 29), they note its very wide applicability and particular relevance for Europe, where it provides a basis for ‘comparative standardology’. Characterized as the most influential model (Machan 2016: 63), the general clarity of the model (Deumert & Vandenbussche 2003: 9) and, we might add, its simplicity have contributed to its enduring popularity.

As already noted, the simplicity of having just four processes means that the model is not exhaustive. It has also frequently been censured for its somewhat teleological nature, even though Haugen (1987: 59) himself emphasizes that the numbering used for his stages of standardization does not mean that they are necessarily successive, and that they may indeed be

---

35 Grin (2003) constitutes one of the most detailed proposals for evaluation to date.

36 Lodge (1993: 26–7) goes beyond Haugen in one respect in adding maintenance into his account, a concept presumably derived from Milroy and Milroy’s model, discussed above.
simultaneous or even cyclical. Other scholars, such as Greenberg (1986) and Ferguson (1988), describe a circular development characterized by periods of standardization alternating with periods of dialect differentiation. Amongst the many other critiques, the following are worth highlighting:

- As Haugen (1987: 63) himself notes, the model does not take account of the motivations and non-linguistic goals of the ‘standardizers’ (whether individuals or public or private institutions). It therefore has little to say on the role of ideology.
- The question of agency (whether individual or institutional) is implied in the processes of selection, codification, elaboration and implementation, but notions of agency are not developed by Haugen.
- As described by Haugen, it does not include a ‘bottom-up’ perspective or the role of ordinary speakers.
- It does not take account of destandardization and other developments associated with Late Modernity.

Given its longevity, in the following sections, I briefly review what modifications and revisions might be made to Haugen’s model to improve it (cf. Rutten & Vosters 2020).

1.4.1 Selection

At least three sets of questions might usefully be addressed in order to help consistency across different case studies:

(1) What kind of norm is selected? Is it, for example:
- Monocentric/pluricentric/compositional?
- Endocentric/exocentric?
- Based on the usage of traditional or new speakers, etc.?

(2) Who/what are agents of the selection process?
- What is the role of model speakers and writers, language experts, language norm authorities, etc., in the (top-down) selection process?
- What is the role of other agents (bottom-up perspective) in bringing about convergence around a norm or standard?
- Is there always agency?

(3) What are the goals/outcomes of the selection?
- Officialization
- Nation-building
- Status enhancement (including preservation and revitalization of minoritized, endangered languages), etc.

---

37 In each case, the bullet point lists give examples rather than seeking to be fully comprehensive.
38 According to Machan (2016: 63), there does not need to be any specific agency behind selection, and one variety of a language simply may come to appear in the usages associated with standards and serve as the default in those domains. Alternatively, we might prefer to use a different term such as ‘reduction of variants’ in such cases.
1.4.2 Codification

Here, it may be useful to consider the following issues:

1. What is the nature of the codification?
   - Is it descriptive (codifying what is ‘normal’ or ‘frequent’ or ‘regular’ in language use), prescriptive (adding in a value judgment), purist in orientation or a mixture of these?
   - Does it focus on pronunciation, orthography, morphosyntax, lexis or a combination of these?

2. Who/what are the agents of codification?

3. What are the goals/outcomes of the codification, prescription and purist activities?
   - Is the codification intended to inhibit change/fix the language, enhance its status, etc.?
   - What is the relationship between the codifier’s or work’s stated/intended aims, use of metalanguage and outcomes? For example, is a particular text descriptive/prescriptive/purist in intention (consideration of stated/intended aims, etc.), descriptive/prescriptive/purist in expression (including, for instance, consideration of the extent to which apparently prescriptive language reflects a prescriptive attitude or rather reflects changing usage) or descriptive/prescriptive/purist in effect (e.g. is the reputation of a text as prescriptive based on an analysis of the text, the result of later manipulations of that text or a misconception of that text)?

1.4.3 Acceptance/Implementation

Whilst Haugen in subsequent models replaced acceptance first with propagation and then with implementation, the terms ‘implementation’ and ‘acceptance’ seem to suggest different perspectives, and might therefore both be usefully retained (cf. Rutten et al. 2020). Implementation, the more active concept, implies a top-down perspective and therefore sits within a LPP framework. With acceptance, on the other hand, we move away from a top-down perspective to a historical sociolinguistic approach and consideration of the extent to which the language community accepts the standard dictated from above or instead retains its own usages or language standards. For Rutten et al. (2020), education is vital in implementation, and perhaps is the main locus of norm transmission. A different, although related, distinction is made by Coupland and Kristiansen (2011: 23–6) between diffusion (dominant patterns of language use) and acceptance (concerned

---

39 For a much fuller discussion, see Ayres-Bennett (2020).
40 Described by Deumert and Vandenbussche (2003: 7) as the ‘Achilles heel’ of standardization.
with ideology or attitudes); they contend that standard languages hold a
much stronger position in terms of acceptance than in terms of diffusion.

This might lead then to the following set of questions for implementation:

(1) What is the nature of the implementation?
   • Is the implementation focused on status or corpus planning?
   • Is the implementation aimed at changing attitudes or behaviours
     (or both)?

(2) Who/what are the agents of the implementation?

(3) What are the outcomes of the implementation?
   • How successful is the imposition of the standard from above?
   • Can we elaborate correction/evaluation procedures for this?

And for acceptance:

(1) What is the nature of the acceptance?
   • Is the acceptance related to the language’s status or corpus?
   • Does the acceptance relate to ideologies or usage?

(2) Who are the leaders and laggards (in the sense of Nevalainen et al. 2011)
    in the acceptance of the standard?

(3) How widespread is the acceptance? What is the nature of the resistance
to it?

1.4.4 Elaboration

In considering elaboration, the following may be of interest:

(1) What is the nature of the elaboration?
   • Are we dealing with elaboration of function (i.e. the language moving
     into new domains of usage) or elaboration of forms (through the
     creation of new words, borrowings, etc.)?
   • In the case of elaboration of forms, which level of language is involved
     (phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, etc.)?
   • Following Joseph (1987: 104–5), is the elaboration remedial or
     cosmetic?

(2) Who are the agents of elaboration?

(3) What are the goals/outcomes of the elaboration?
   • Does it relate to modernization, purification, provision of technical
     terminology, etc.?
   • To what extent is it restricted to written, high-register usage or does
     it allow for variation?

This discussion might then be summarized in tabular form (Table 1.6).
The integration of Table 1.6 into the broader standardization cycle would
give a schema as broadly sketched out in Figure 1.3.
Table 1.6 Developing Haugen’s model of standardization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Society</strong></td>
<td><strong>Selection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of norm selected</td>
<td>Nature of the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents of selection</td>
<td>Agents of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/outcomes of selection</td>
<td>Goals/outcomes of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td><strong>Codification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of codification</td>
<td>Nature of the elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents of codification</td>
<td>Agents of elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/outcomes of codification</td>
<td>Goals/outcomes of elaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Selection</strong></th>
<th><strong>Implementation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of norm selected</td>
<td>Nature of the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents of selection</td>
<td>Agents of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/outcomes of selection</td>
<td>Goals/outcomes of implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.3** Schematic revised presentation of the standardization cycle.

### 1.5 Conclusion

Recent decades have witnessed a growing interest in standardization in different language ecologies. To some extent, this has led to a proliferation of different approaches, at times specific to different languages, language
families or language statuses, at others grounded in different (sub-)disciplinary fields. It is nevertheless remarkable how many of the key terms and distinctions set out in the classic texts of the 1950s and 1960s by Kloss, Stewart and Haugen have continued to be central to the theorizing of standardization. Similarly, whilst Haugen’s model was first proposed more than fifty years ago, it is still frequently used in case studies, despite the repeated critiques of its weaknesses. Given the very different sociopolitical context of the twenty-first century, the development of LPP as a discipline, the broadening of the focus away from accounts of the standardization of national European languages, the weakening of language standards and destandardization, to name just some of the key developments outlined in this chapter, much work remains to be done before we have an adequate comprehensive model to serve as a reliable basis for comparative standardology.
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