

TESOL as language planning: An examination of a Refugee Processing Center in Thailand¹

Joel Hardman

This paper demonstrates how TESOL can be a form of language planning by examining ESL programs that are in place in a Refugee Processing Center in Thailand. A language planning process is shown to be at work there that is intertwined with the particular geo-political history of the region and the socio-political aims of the U.S. Department of State.

The Theory

Studies of language planning (LP) have usually approached a widely recognized case of planning and used it to develop a generalizable framework of why planning takes place (goals), how it takes place (processes), or to what effect (evaluation). Such work has come up with a useful, though often confusing, collection of definitions of LP, definitions which now might be used in reverse: using a widely recognized LP framework, one can approach an unknown language situation and judge whether or not planning is taking place, essentially defining new language planning situations.

The TESOL classroom may be one such new situation. TESOL has not usually been thought of as part of the LP process. It is part of the implementation of a nation's language policy, but is it part of a centralized process controlled by an identifiable decision-making body whose aim is the effecting of deliberate change in language use? (Rubin and Jernudd's definition, 1971:xvi): language planning is "deliberate intervention in language change; changes in the systems of language code or speaking or both that are planned by organizations that are established for such purposes or given a mandate to fulfill such purposes.") Crossing that threshold level of centralization needed to qualify for the LP label will be the subject of this paper, even if it is only a theoretical possibility. Within the generally accepted framework for talking about LP in terms of status and corpus, and

policy and cultivation (Neustupny, 1974), TESOL will be discussed as the implementation of status cultivation. For Neustupny, 'cultivation' is the more micro-oriented development of functions for a language.

Recognizing TESOL as the implementation of language policy means placing it in a socio-political context, and as the implementation of status cultivation, in its functional context. The articulation of a nation's language policy (either stated or unstated) can be placed on a continuum between English as a Second Language (ESL), English as an Additional Language (EAL), or English as a Foreign Language (EFL). For the purposes of this paper those terms (ESL, EFL, EAL) describe 'language situations' and not types of teaching programs, although one may imply the other. Judd (1981:59-63) describes how the environment in which TESOL occurs influences the direction that instruction will take. The continuum can be seen as expressing the number of registers of a language necessary to function competently in a given society, a reflection of the amount of time one would spend speaking the language. For ESL one would need a number of registers to get by (formal, informal, etc.), while an EFL situation may require only a single register (academic, or literary).

In practice, the distinctions within the ESL - EFL continuum are messy. Some examples may seem very straight forward: English would be a foreign language in Thailand. English would be a second language in the United States. But already those are mistakes. Certain domains in Thailand, for example the tourist service industry, require a large repertoire of English registers (formal business negotiation, polite entertaining conversation, hard-sell solicitation), while in the U.S. large segments of the population get by with hardly any English at all.

The subject of this paper, a Refugee Processing Center (RPC) in Thailand, is another extreme example of how the ESL - EFL continuum breaks down. The context of instruction includes no functional domains of English use outside the classroom (which itself isn't even a very authentic domain), and there are almost no native speakers of English present in the daily lives of the refugees. One might then think of it, at best, as an EFL situation.

But theoretically the English student is being prepared for an ESL type environment, the U.S. Such a context, it will be argued, is ripe for the possibility of language planning because this population may be being deliberately prepared to use a severely restricted repertoire of English so as to make them able to serve specific but marginal roles in American society. It is partly the EFL type environment on the surface that makes this ESL planning possible.

Cobarrubias (1983:41) states that language planning, particularly the change in status of a language, "implies the allocation or reallocation of the functions of such a language in a speech community". The reverse may work as well. That is, the allocation of the functions may imply that LP is going on. In particular, the teaching in the RPC of 'survival ESL', a minimal collection of functional competencies, may constitute language planning.

'Survival ESL' springs out of the TESOL community's current embrace of curricula based on helping students achieve communicative competence in English rather than just linguistic competence, concentrating on the teaching of language use rather than language form. One way of going about this is to slice up the totality of language use into 'functional competencies' such as complimenting, apologizing, shopping, getting a job, and so on. The list is theoretically endless. In practice in the U.S., the teaching method is usually thought of as humanistic and student-centered because students can bring their experiences in 'real life situations', their functional needs and desires, into the classroom to give direction to a curriculum.

In the construction of a 'survival ESL' curriculum, though, only a handful of functional competencies get pre-selected for presentation to the student. These are the competencies deemed by those who design curricula as necessary for survival in America. The end result, especially in a non-ESL environment, is a prescriptive lesson plan that has no relation to the every-day reality of the student. This culling of competencies by certain decision-making bodies reflects such a body's values and ideology, and the resulting curriculum will envision a very specific socio-cultural reality for the student in the U.S.

As stated by Auerbach and Burgess, "....no curriculum is neutral: each reflects a particular view of the social order.... This 'hidden curriculum' generates social meanings, restraints and cultural values which shape students' roles outside the classroom" (1985:476). If such decision-making can be shown to be an effective centralized process for the implementation of stated goals for the status cultivation of a language, LP may be said to be going on.

The issue of *effectiveness* of any instance of LP might be seen as tangential. Effectiveness is not a requisite for planning. Planning surely occurs whether it is effective or not. However, as Ferguson (1983:32) argues, LP is hardly worth its name unless it has its intended effect on language change, unless it is effective. Another way to think of the relation is that the *possibility* of effectiveness of the implementation of a language policy would give someone with the *power* to plan the *will* to plan. And, without trying to make LP out to be any kind of crime, if there can be shown to be a motive (goals) *and* opportunity (an effective process), it makes a stronger case for the possibility of "the deed", LP.

The Place

The situation chosen to be investigated here as an example of TESOL-as-LP might be thought to be too marginal and unusual to be applicable to language planning and education generally. True. This paper is not attempting to say that since English teaching in the RPC is LP, all English teaching is LP. It *is* trying to say that since TESOL may be part of the LP process here, other TESOL environments could be similarly investigated and situated in relation to LP. The RPC is a particularly neat example because in its isolation it is a kind of language teaching laboratory where uniform implementation of curricular decisions is possible and the channels of decision making power can be traced back to a single authority, the U.S. Department of State.

So what exactly *is* an RPC? Most importantly, it is not a "refugee camp." A camp is the place of first asylum for the refugee. In Thailand, the camps are generally along an international border, either just outside Cambodia or Laos. The camps along the Thai-

Cambodia border are the most numerous and highly populated, and technically do not hold refugees but 'displaced persons', similar to illegal aliens, who have no hope of ever leaving the camp until they can safely go back to Cambodia. The camps along the Thai-Lao border, of which Ban Vinai is largest, do hold 'refugees' who are slowly being resettled to third countries, almost always the U.S. When a refugee is granted permission to resettle, they are sent to a Refugee Processing Center to be prepared for the trip. The RPC in Thailand at Phanat Nikhom, like other RPCs in the Philippines and Indonesia, is coordinated and funded by the Bureau for Refugee Programs of The U.S. Department of State.

Those coming into Phanat Nikhom are both Cambodians who fled Cambodia before 1980, when they were declared "displaced persons" by Thai authorities, and refugees from Laos, mostly Hmong. The Hmong will be paid particular attention to here. Their history, their reasons for being on their way to the U.S., will be discussed in order to try and get at the socio-political context of instruction in the RPC. The Hmong are particularly interesting for a number of reasons. For one, thanks to the U.S., they are an extremely planned population, militarily, socio-economically, geographically, and educationally, as shown below. Language planning would be only one more in series. Furthermore, their history of being planned makes them highly susceptible to and dependent on planning, creating an atmosphere where effectiveness of any plan is likely.

A Brief History

1960-1975: The 'secret' war in Laos

1960-- On August 8, there was a coup by centrist-neutralist forces against the right-wing government. A three-way civil war broke out between the new centrist government, rightist military rebels, and the leftist Pathet Lao. The U.S., through the C.I.A., backed the right-wing troops with money, guns, and intelligence. The C.I.A. forged an alliance between the rightists and the Hmong, and the Hmong became the C.I.A.'s main tool for fighting "communism" in Laos.

1961--"As Meo [Hmong] are over-run by Communist forces and as men leave food-raising duties to serve as guerillas, a problem is growing over the care and feeding of non-combat Meos [Hmong]. CIA has given some rice and clothing to relieve this problem. Consideration needs to be given to organized relief..., to the handling of Meo [Hmong] refugees and their rehabilitation." --Gen. Edward G. Lansdale of the CIA
(cited in McCoy et al, 1972:273)

1962-- In July, the US and the USSR signed the Geneva Agreements on Laos, supposedly ending all military operations in Laos. The CIA continued to operate through USAID training Hmong 'irregulars', and was allowed to air-drop "humanitarian aid" (guns, rice, and money) to Hmong villages.

1962-1968-- The CIA was relatively successful at checking the power of the Pathet Lao by dragging tens of thousands of Hmong, both military and civilian, around north-east Laos. The Hmong, growing increasingly dependent on the CIA, went wherever the CIA dropped rice and money, even when the drop-site was a battle zone.

1968-1973-- Despite, or maybe because of, the fact that the US Air Force since 1963 had been blanket-bombing north-east Laos, on Hmong villages and Pathet Lao alike, rightist forces began to lose ground as the Pathet Lao increased in power. By 1971, over 150,000 Hmong were refugees in their own land, "evacuated" from their villages by the CIA before the Pathet Lao could get to them. In 1973, the CIA gave up and air-lifted the elite Hmong military leadership out of Laos and into Thailand. Mass migration of Hmong into Thailand began.

1975-1988: Migration

Since 1975 over 110,00 Hmong have fled Laos, and thousands have died trying (see Figure 1). It is estimated that less than one-third of the original population of Hmong in Laos are still there. Roughly half of those that fled have been resettled, mostly to the US, but over 60,000 remain in camps in northern Thailand. In Ban Vinai, the biggest of the northern camps, there are almost 40,000 Hmong, the largest concentration of Hmong ever in any one place.

LAOTIAN HILLTRIBE MOVEMENT TO THAILAND
AND RESETTLEMENT IN OTHER COUNTRIES

<u>Year</u>	<u>Camp Arrivals</u>	<u>Resettled</u>
1975	44,659	454
1976	7,266	4,593
1977	3,873	2,481
1978	8,013	5,424
1979	23,943	13,328
1980	14,801	28,927
1981	4,356	4,437
1982	1,816	3,003
1983	<u>1,785</u>	<u>453</u>
Total	110,512	63,100

Figure 1: From The Hmong Resettlement Study (1985)

The most important information to be drawn from this history is the cultivation of dependence on the U.S. by the planning of all aspects of the Hmong's lives for over a generation (see especially Gen. Landsdale's comments to get a hint that this cultivation may have been in fact a goal of American policy), and the responsibility of the U.S. for the Hmong situation, specifically their presence in the camps and the RPC. A Hmong soldier said this of the responsibility:

The Americans in Laos had an agreement, a contract with us: "you help us fight for your country, and if you can't win, we will take you with us and we will help you live." Now the country has fallen and now we come to this country. We have not found jobs yet, and the government cuts help. It is very difficult for those who don't speak English and have no skills. Have they forgotten what they promised? (The Hmong Resettlement Study 1985:19)

In light of this responsibility and dependence, it is interesting to look at what the U.S. is doing in the RPC (and also in Ban Vinai, a camp where the State Department has begun implementing its educational programs) to "fulfill" their promise. There are three main educational programs in the RPC: Intensive English as a Second Language (IESL), Cultural Orientation (CO), and Pre-employment Training (PET). They have been implemented since 1980 and last between twenty and thirty weeks. As the ESL Resource Manual designed for use in the RPCs states:

The Intensive English as a Second Language (IESL), Cultural Orientation (CO), and Pre-employment Training (PET) Program in the refugee processing centers in Southeast Asia provides a pathway to a new life for refugees from Indochina. In this U.S. Department of State-funded program, basic survival English and cultural orientation skills are taught to U.S. - bound refugees to help make them ready for the process of resettlement in U.S. communities and to accelerate their goal of self-sufficiency. For those refugees with very minimal English language proficiency and education, Pre-employment Training prepares them to function better in any entry-level job. (Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), 1983a:1)

Each program is broken down into functional competencies. The list of competencies for ESL and CO are quite similar. Classroom Orientation, Health, Housing, Employment, Transportation are on both lists. CO also covers Sponsorship and Resettlement, Family and Social Roles, Consumerism and Finance, Community Services, and Time Management. ESL also includes Clothing, Food, Post-Office, Banking, and Transit Process from Southeast Asia to the U.S. Like both ESL and CO, the PET program of course covers employment related competencies. In practice the main difference between ESL and CO seems to be that CO is conducted in the refugees' native languages.

All the programs seem to be 'assimilationist' in nature, as is hinted at in the CO Resource Manual's description of CO lessons "designed to take the students on a three-part journey from their own culture, through the transitional experience of camp life, to their new life in America". And overall, "less time was spent on bringing the Khmer and lowland Lao cultures into the classroom or defining a progression from the native culture to camp life and then on to America" (CAL, 1983b:12-13). This issue will be addressed later on in terms of LP goals.

The Process

A number of schemas have been devised for describing the various components of the language planning process. The one used here is most similar to Fishman's (1979), and will include *decision-making*, the whys of which will be called the *goals*, *implementation*, and *evaluation*. Each will be discussed separately.

The decision-making process can be either centralized or de-centralized (Tollefson, 1981). "Decentralized LP" borders on being a contradiction in terms. If there is more than

one actor making decisions regarding a specific language situation, is 'planning' happening at all? But a decision-making process can occur over several hierarchically related levels. If there is a single decision-making body at the top that decides on a framework within which lower levels must make their decisions, the entire process itself is centralized, and therefore planned, even though there is an element of de-centralized planning embedded in the process. Such is the case with planning in the RPC.

James Tollefson observed and participated in the process of curriculum development for the RPC programs from 1983-1985. He described the decision-making method as follows:

Regional curricula for each component of the RPC program are established and reviewed in region-wide meetings attended by program managers, supervisors, teachers, and curriculum developers, *as well as by representatives of the U.S. State Department* and the Center for Applied Linguistics. (1986:652; emphasis added)

Oversight by the State Department, who is the funding and coordinating body of the RPCs, is a strong centralizing factor.

Another observer of these meetings describes what resources were used to guide the competency review:

[Participants made use of] Competencies identified by the Mainstream English Language Training (MELT) Project. Participants wanted to make informed decisions about revising, adding, and deleting competencies. Participants felt that the MELT results were an excellent source of information.... As a result, participants recommended that the MELT results be consulted as each competency was reviewed. (Kharde and Corey, 1986:44)

The MELT project is also State Department funded, through the Office for Refugee Resettlement, "to develop consistency among English language training programs for refugees across the U.S. and to establish linkages with the Overseas Refugee Training Program." (Kharde and Corey, 1986:44).

Such centralized decision-making could theoretically be off-set by de-centralized implementation of the curricula by teachers who are not under the constant watchful gaze of the Department of State. But the teachers can't really be considered active participants in the decision-making process for two reasons. For one, the regional curriculum

development meetings, with the aid of MELT, produce the master list of appropriate 'survival competencies' which the teachers only have the power to shorten, not fundamentally change. For another, had the teachers the power, they would not be likely to exercise it. Most teachers are from the host country, as in Phanat Nikhom where the typical teacher profile is "young (perhaps 25-30); Thai; college graduate...this is likely to be the first job in his or her career" (CAL, 1983b:12). Therefore, as Tollefson says: "Because many locally hired teachers are inexperienced and without previous training in ESL or in education, the curricula are extremely detailed and are used by many teachers as actual lesson plans" (1986:651).

So what power teachers may theoretically have as "de-centralized decision-makers" is so restricted by the over-arching central power in the regional curricular development meetings that the LP decision making process as a whole can be said to be centralized.

The whys of the above process, to what end language change is being effected, are LP goals. A recurrent problem, which is especially noticeable when talking about goals, is the separation of language planning goals from social planning goals. The goals discussed below may seem first and foremost social goals, and only tangentially LP goals. It is difficult to separate the two because the planners (U.S. Department of State) are responsible for structuring an entire social identity for refugees, from language use to the distribution of labor, which only serves to reinforce the political nature of LP.

Goals can be broken down into three types: officially stated, unofficially stated, and unstated. An officially stated goal of the programs can be found in the introduction to the ESL Resource Manual already referred to, which is to "make refugees ready for the process of resettlement in U.S. communities and to accelerate their goal of self-sufficiency" (1983a:1). That is, to provide the students with the English proficiency necessary for success in the new world. Though this goal is referred to as "their" (the refugees') goal, it is more likely the goal of the State Department.

That the goal of 'success' for the refugees is primarily the goal of the State Department and only secondarily that of the refugees becomes clear when one looks at the

unofficially stated goals, which are based on the premise that 'success' means only 'getting a job.' Tollefson quotes a former Deputy Coordinator for Refugee Programs of the U.S. Embassy in Manila as giving this goal for PET: "keeping refugees on a track into employment rather than onto welfare rolls or other government assistance" (1986:654). Though this may at first look like just a social planning goal, the deputy later says that the refugees "have to understand that there is a philosophy of employment embodied in the language" (1986: 654).

So it is nearly impossible to separate LP from social planning when the goal of LP is expressed as the teaching of a variety of English commensurate with a specific internalized social identity. LP is then a way of using language change to change the refugee's socio-cultural values and attitudes. The following are stated curricular objectives of the ESL program from the ESL Resource Manual (also cited in Tollefson 1986:656):

1) To "identify common entry level jobs which can be held by those with limited English ability" (CAL, 1983a:31-32).

2) To "answer basic direct questions about pay, work availability, and hours (Is \$4.00 an hour OK? Yes. When can you start? Tomorrow. Can you work nights? Yes.)" (1983a: 32).

3) To "ask if a task was done correctly (Is this right?)" (1983a: 33-34).

4) To "respond appropriately to supervisor's comments about quality of work on the job including mistakes, working too slowly, and incomplete work (I'm sorry. I won't do it again.)" (1983a: 33-34).

5) To "ask permission to use or do something" (1983a: 46-47).

These are stated goals, but they point towards what may be the unstated goals of the program. As Tollefson says, these competencies "attempt to inculcate attitudes and values that will make refugees passive citizens who comply rather than complain, accept rather than resist, and apologize rather than disagree" (1986:656-57). The refugee is being taught the English necessary for a passive role in society. This theme is not limited to refugee materials, but riddles much Survival ESL curricula. "In survival materials, this hidden

curriculum often takes the form of preparing students for menial positions and teaching them the corresponding language of subservience" (Auerbach and Burgess, 1985:434).

All these goals, stated and unstated, need to be read in light of the assimilationist nature of programs as a whole (see above introduction to the RPC Programs). If the programs were designed to encourage development of the refugees' own culture in concert with the new, with an orientation to (for example) Hmong-language-as-resource rather than Hmong-as-problem, there would be less reason to believe in such insidious unstated goals. However, if the State Department feels that Hmong culture (idleness, insolence, and irresponsibility, one must imagine) will only delay their getting off the government payroll, such a culture (and related socio-linguistic behavior) must be replaced with a more appropriate one.

The above goals are implemented in the classrooms. Whether or not this makes the teachers themselves the 'implementers' is still an open question. Because the decision-making process has been said to be centralized, the activities of the regional curricular development meetings could be said to be implementation of the above goals, as there is little alteration between those curricular decisions and what actually goes on in the classrooms. Nevertheless, what goes on in the classroom *can* be called implementation, though the implementer may not in fact be the teacher.

As Tollefson said, the curricula designed in the regional meetings get used in the class as actual lesson plans, so one need only look at them to get a good feel for what actually goes on in the classroom. Of the ESL competencies mentioned earlier, Classroom Orientation and Employment will be presented in detail here.

Classroom Orientation is divided up into nine sub-competencies. It is the first competency taught, as it teaches appropriate classroom behavior to be used throughout the ESL course. The first sub-competency is "Identify self", so the following lesson might be the first a student experiences. It is designed for high level students, who would be literate in their native language and have some knowledge of English. This incomplete dialogue is written on a large sheet of paper or on the blackboard:

A: _____ ?
 B: Laos.
 A: _____ ?
 B: Lao.
 A: _____ ?
 B: Vientiane.
 A: _____ ?
 B: 430891
 A: _____ ?

(CAL, 1983a: 304)

The students fill in the blanks with the proper questions (apparently, what country are you from, what language do you speak, what city are you from, what is your I.D. number, and do you speak English). Not exactly "Hi how are you my name is Sukpeth."

The final Classroom Orientation sub-competency is "Observe classroom etiquette."

The following lesson is designed for mid-level students (literate in first language, at least a little English). The stated objective of the lesson is "Students can express general classroom rules." A jazz chant is used:

Keep those long legs off your chair. Keep those big feet on the floor.
 Take your hat off when you come in; you're not outside anymore.
 Keep your mouth shut when someone's talking. When your sleepy,
 don't just yawn.
 Don't speak _____ in the classroom. And don't litter on the floor.
 Say "Hello" when you come in. And "Goodbye" when you go home.

(CAL, 1983a: 334)

The inside-the-classroom/outside-the-classroom dichotomy running through this lesson goes along with the assimilationist nature of the program, with "outside" language and behavior (sitting with feet in chair?) forbidden.

Despite the fact that there is the separate PET program, 11 of the 70 ESL competencies listed in the ESL Resource Manual are on employment. They are: 1, 2, 3) Describe work experience, skills, and educational background, 4) Recognize common entry-level jobs, 5) Indicate job preferences, 6) Locate possible jobs, 7) Give relevant information when applying for a job, 8) Get information about a job, 9) Follow instructions on the job, 10) Give explanations for sickness, lateness, absence, mistakes, 11) Converse with fellow employees. Taught in this order, they tell the story of locating

the appropriate job to apply for, applying for it, then doing everything necessary to keep it.

Under "Recognize common entry-level jobs," ("entry-level-job" is a euphemism for "unskilled menial labor") one lesson for beginning students (CAL, 1983a: 404-405) shows pictures of people working and the students are to say what each job is. The pictures show a man standing at a stove, a man pushing a floor polisher, a man watering bushes, a woman at a sewing machine, a man painting a house, and a woman putting a doll together on an assembly line.

A higher level lesson, an "Indicate job preference" competency, has the objective of students being able to distinguish between want-ads for skilled and unskilled labor (CAL, 1983a: 414-415). The students are shown two ads, such as one for secretary (\$5.50 an hour) and one for hotel maid/janitor (\$3.75 and hour), and they must describe the jobs and say which is better for them. They are supposed to choose the unskilled job, as a note at the end of the lesson says: "The teacher should help the students be realistic about the types of jobs they can expect initially in the U.S." It becomes clear that "indicate job preferences" actually means "indicate preference for the unskilled job."

One of the final employment competencies, "Follow instructions on the job," is taught to mid-level students using a game (CAL, 1983a: 439). The class is divided into two teams. Each team works in pairs: a boss and an employee. A "boss" from one team is given a card on which is written some on-the-job instructions which the "boss" reads to an "employee." If the employee correctly performs the task, the team wins a point. The lesson plan lists the following as instructions that could be written on the cards:

- Stack the boxes.
- Carry two chairs outside.
- Count the boxes.
- Clean the table.
- Empty the bucket.
- Sweep the floor.
- Put the trash outside.
- Get rid of the boxes.

The "employee" never speaks. The team with the most points wins.

The most obvious conclusion to be drawn from the above lesson plans is that the implementation of the LP goals provides the clearest articulation of those goals. Students learn to speak a specific register in English, a "language of subservience" marked by one-word answers, deference, non-confrontation and silence. They are taught to comprehend (obey) a specific register, a language of suppression marked by interrogation and directives. The acquisition of such a sociolinguistic system is necessary to help keep refugees from taking an active role in defining their social identity, which could cause civil unrest or unionizing, or from free-loading at the tax-payer's expense.

The regional decision-making meetings also serve as running evaluation of the LP process. Kharde and Corey's "Competencies Revisited: Revising the Overseas ESL Curriculum" serves as a written evaluation of the LP implementation as it had been practiced from 1983 to 1985. It is a very upbeat evaluation:

...ESL teachers and supervisors in the Overseas Refugee Trainin Program were asked to evaluate the ESL curriculum. For the most part, the response was enthusiastic. Program staff liked the curriculum because it focused on survival skills, [and] taught "real-life" language... (1986:43)

The overall purpose of that meeting was the deletion of unnecessary competencies. For example, the highest level 1983 "Health" competency had eight sub-competencies. After 'revision' only one was left, "Respond to questions about means of payment." It was perhaps the most 'passive' of all the 1983 competencies. The more 'active' performative verbs from the deleted competencies were "fill out," "explain," "describe," "name," "get information," "telephone or write," and "offer" (Kharde and Corey, 1986: 49). Evaluation seems generally to be pushing the RPC programs in the direction of less active language use, more responding to the demands of others.

A less biased evaluation of the LP process here, actually outside the loop altogether, is Tollefson's. He claims that the plan is not working, that there is "no evidence that adoption of any particular set of values or attitudes aids refugees' resettlement in any way" (1986:638). That is, no reduction in unemployment or use of public assistance can be linked

to the RPC program and in fact refugees who have been through the RPC programs utilize cash assistance programs at the same rate as those who haven't. (1986: 660)

But Tollefson is here evaluating the plan in terms of the U.S. Department of State's stated goal only, the teaching of the necessary proficiency in English to enable one to get a job. In terms of their possible unstated goals, such as the pacification of a population through the teaching of a language of subservience, evaluation is much more "wicked" (Rubin, 1986). It may help to return to the story of the Hmong. By the tens of thousands they found large American urban centers inhospitable. In Philadelphia they were harassed to the point of becoming intra-national refugees again, and fled to the mid-west. Such non-confrontational behavior could be the expression of traditional Hmong attitudes towards adversity, or the result of good planning, the Hmong having been successfully trained to be a passive population.

One thing this investigation needs to legitimate its claims is an ethnographic observation of the regional curricular meetings, the decision-making process in action. Only such a method could determine whether or not LP is actually taking place, by studying just how much the State Department representatives control consensus and wield authority. There is the possibility that the ESL professionals at the meetings articulate opposing goals to those of the State Department. If they are powerful enough to be decentralizing the decision-making process by bringing in their different goals and evaluative standards, they may be effectively preventing this process from being language planning proper by encroaching on the systematicity of the process.

Finally, not until the teaching of English in the RPC has been shown to *be* LP, which has been the main purpose of this analysis, can it be discussed *as* LP. *As* LP, TESOL is a deeply political activity. As stated by Judd (1983:265), "Those of us who are engaged in the teaching of English to non- or limited-English speakers are, in addition to teaching, also directly or indirectly implementing a stated or implied language policy as well as actively promoting a form of language change in our students. Because we are engaged in all of these activities simultaneously, we are involved in a political process." It is

especially political in the RPC because one is working with people who are fleeing from a politically inhospitable environment to an economically inhospitable one. TESOL helps write the itinerary for this flight.

Being a political act in this case (the RPC) stems from and reflects back upon the motives, the goals, of the planners. Being political doesn't necessarily make TESOL an example of LP, nor does being LP make TESOL political. Causative arrows are not being drawn. However, the deeply political context of the RPC along with the political sensibilities of those involved in curricular design can influence the degree to which the LP process gets centralized in order to assure the effective implementation of the planners' goals.

¹This paper was originally written for a class on "Language Policy and Education" taught by Dr. Nancy Hornberger in the fall of 1983.

References

- Auerbach, Elsa Roberts (1986). Competency-based ESL: one step forward or two steps back? TESOL Quarterly, 20, 411-429.
- Auerbach, Elsa Roberts, and Denise Burgess (1985). The hidden curriculum of survival ESL. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 475-495.
- Center for Applied Linguistics (1983a). English as a Second Language Resource Manual (Vol. 3). Manila: U.S. Department of State, Refugee Service Center of the Bureau for Refugee Programs.
- Center for Applied Linguistics (1983b). Cultural Orientation Resource Manual (Vol.3). Manila: U.S. Department of State, Refugee Service Center of the Bureau for Refugee Programs.
- Ferguson, Charles A. (1983). Language planning and language change. In Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua Fishman (Eds.), Progress in Language Planning (pp. 27-40). New York: Mouton.
- Fishman, Joshua (1979). Bilingual education, language planning and English. Language in Society, 2, 23-43.
- Judd, Elliot L. (1981). Language policy, curriculum development, and TESOL instruction: a search for compatibility. TESOL Quarterly, 15, 59-65.
- Judd, Elliot L. (1983). TESOL as a political act: a moral question. On TESOL '83, 265-273.
- Kharde, Linda Smith, and Kathleen Corey (1986). Competencies revisited: revising the overseas ESL curriculum. Passage, 2, 43-49.
- McCoy, Alfred, Cathleen B. Reed and Leonard P. Adams II (1972). The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia. New York: Harper and Row.
- Neustupny, J. V. (1974). Basic types of treatment of language problems. In Joshua Fishman (Ed.), Advances in Language Planning (pp.37-48). The Hague: Mouton.
- Office of Refugee Resettlement (1985). The Hmong Resettlement Study. Volume 1: Final Report. Washington, D.C.
- Rubin, Joan (1986). City planning and Language Planning. In E. Annamalai, Bjorn Jernudd and Joan Rubin (Eds.), Language Planning: Proceedings of an Institute. Honolulu.
- Rubin, Joan and Bjorn Jernudd (1971). Can Language Be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Tollefson, James W. (1981). Centralized and decentralized language planning. Language Problems and Language Planning, 5(2), 175-188.
- Tollefson, James W. (1986). Functional competencies in the U.S. Refugee Program: theoretical and practical problems. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 649-664.