1.0 The widening gap between those who see LSP as the study of 'special languages' for ultimately pedagogic purposes, and those who see 'specific purposes' as the decisive consideration has already been noted in this Newsletter. At one level, the controversy can be seen in terms of priorities: language research precedes needs analysis, or vice versa. This would be too simple, however, since the ontological status not only of 'special languages' but even of 'languages' themselves has been called into question: many course designers grappling at grass roots level with the problem of the learner's communicative needs will point out that it is unparsimonious to invoke the notion of a 'special language' variety when what we are in fact dealing with is simply variation on the language as such.

And where the 'L' in LSP is controversial, the 'S' is even more so, its ambiguity compounded partly of an uncertainty as to modification, and partly of a fuzziness per se in the terms 'specific' and 'special'. Firstly, does the 'S' lean towards the 'L' or the 'P'? Where the term 'specific' is preferred it clearly indicates the latter since 'specific languages' could hardly mean language varieties. 'Special', on the other hand, could refer to both, as demonstrated by the explicit formulation 'Special Languages for Special Purposes' (suggested by P. Strevens). Though this interpretation seems to have the advantage that it bridges the gap between the two approaches above, it leads, in fact to an undue restriction of the scope of LSP, as I shall try to show. Secondly, where the terms 'special' and 'specific' as such are concerned, does the 'special' in 'special languages' refer to the domain of use, the user, the mode of analysis, to some, or all of these? And in the case of 'specific' (see 'specific purposes'), what degree of 'specificity' can qualify? Another aim of the article will thus be to bring these blurred areas into sharper focus.

There have been some recent attempts to define the basic L, S and P concepts. But a noticeable feature of such characterizations is an implicit bias with regard to domain (the hegemony of Science and Technology is particularly apparent) and to medium (viz. the written language). Thus, lastly, some attempt will also be made to redress the balance by a consideration of their viability in terms of the spoken language, and in terms of other domains.

It might be asked even at this point why anyone should bother to take so seriously what obviously started out as nothing more than a rather unfortunate working term: the hair-splitting philosopher can have a field-day with terms like LSP but such discussions may have only limited amusement value for an LSP practitioner. Now, while partly sympathizing with this view, I also think that the frustration felt by many linguists, course designers and learners over the previous lack of clarity in the objectives of this increasingly important branch of study is fully justified. Possibly, through concentration on learner objectives, LSP has neglected its own higher order ones. This does not mean that definition of itself can remedy the situation - in fact the countervailing tendencies referred to in the title of this article are probably the result of definitions of an 'exclusive' type which err in the opposite direction. The two approaches can, I think, be harmonized within a comprehensive framework without leading to vacuousness at the level of objectives.

2.0 Special Languages

2.1. Opacity
Sager, Dungworth and McDonald's extremely thorough book, 'English Special Languages', (1980) gives an unusually explicit definition, and one which provides a convenient starting point for the discussion: 'Special
Languages are semi-autonomous, complex, semiotic systems based on and derived from general language; their use presupposes special education and is restricted to communication among specialists in the same or closely related fields' (69). Some of the other elements in the definition will be taken up later, but its most individual feature, the restriction on the role relationships involved, deserves first consideration because of its important implications as to the scope of LSP. Firstly, if 'special language' is a specialist-to-specialist language, the corollary for LSP is that those 'languages' used for asymmetrical relationships, such as, doctor-patient, solicitor-client, teacher-pupil, etc., would fall beyond its purview - that is, if one accepts the premise that inter-specialist communication is the only purpose that is special/specific in the required sense. Secondly, the sociological implications of this constraint, in combination with the requirement 'special education' are also of interest: LSP would seem uniquely to concern those within the A/B professional bracket rather than those in the skilled and semi-skilled strata, depending on the force of the word 'special' (academic?) and 'education' (cf. training), a point which will be taken up later in connection with specific purposes(3.2).

The equation of 'special language' with the language of specialists (1) underlines the undoubted truth that no member of a speech community is 'omni-competent', i.e., conversant with the rules of use of all the varieties of the language (Lyons 1977, 586), and further, that where a variety attaches via the semantic component to a branch of knowledge incorporating a framework of concepts of which a given member is ignorant, its unavailability is not simply of a linguistic order. In other words, it is the conceptual-cum-linguistic density of the special language that renders it opaque to the layman. Presumably, the layman armed with a specialist dictionary would find less difficulty in processing the sign GUSSET (language of Tailoring) than he would INITIAL BOOTSTRAP (language of Computer Science) since the latter requires not simply referential identification but rather a complex cross-referencing to a whole vocabulary of inter-related concepts and procedures, as can be readily seen from the following definition: 'The method wherein the operating system is read into mass storage devices. At the conclusion of the initialization, the Executive control routines, called the resident Executive, are read into main storage and are given control' (Sperry Univac Manual, 1975, 7).

This suggests that a degree of opacity might be criterial for determining which varieties are legitimately 'special', and which are not. In this way many of the trade/craft/occupational varieties might go by the board. Are even 'special subject' varieties themselves immune? Do the Physical Sciences, for instance, spawn truer 'complex semiotic systems' through the concept - configurational base than, say, the Social Sciences (which have been accused, amongst other things, of employing 'the smokescreen of jargon' to compensate for a lack of conceptual density (Andreski, 1974)).

While Sager et al. do not engage in special pleading of this kind, the burden of their argument is carried by the paradigm of Science and Technology (1). Even here there may be problems in deciding precisely where the razor should fall: if there exist the identifiable levels of scientific text that Huddleston (1971) calls 'High' (learned journals), 'Mid' (undergraduate textbooks) and 'Low' (popularized literature), would the cut-off point for specialist languages be before or after 'Mid'? (1)

Despite the apparent link, the term 'special language' is more likely to have come into being as a back-formation from 'Language for Special Purposes' than as a derivation of 'language for specialists'. (1)

As the sub-title: 'Principles and Practice in Science and Technology' indicates.
2.2 Domain

Many treatments either explicitly or implicitly define the scope of LSP in terms of what Fishman (1965) calls 'domains of language behaviour', i.e., major clusters of interaction situations bound by typical sets of topics, role relations and locales.

In these terms 'languages' are 'special' by reference to, and by virtue of, the selection of domains. The normal distinction is between, on the one hand, those involving leisure activities and 'primary' relationships like kinship and friendship, where largely non-opaque 'everyday' or 'ordinary' language varieties are employed, and those of the 'academic' and 'occupational' kind, on the other. In the German tradition, for instance, we find the latter major division of special language domains enshrined in the terms Wissenschaftsprache (the language of Science), and Fachsprache (the language of trades, crafts, occupations).

The major problem with this approach seems to be that one cannot infer the existence of a variety as a semi-autonomous entity standing in one-to-one relationship with a domain from the mere fact that there is a relevant division within a pre-existent taxonomy of occupational and academic life; in other words, such a correlation must be empirically determined by sociolinguistic analysis rather than simply taken for granted. Thus, because Biology, for instance, is one of the conventional divisions of the sciences, this does not entail of itself the existence of a corresponding variety distinct, say, from that of Physics, and presumably hierarchically lower divisions and hybrids in the scientific family will have even less chance of establishing semi-autonomy - take Biophysics, Molecular Biology, and so on. Nor is the problem necessarily less higher up the tree. 'Business' is conducted in a typical set of primary locales (offices, boardrooms, company premises), but it may instantiate a whole constellation of widely different potential varieties like those of Personnel Management, Finance, Law, Supply and Distribution as well as those of Science and Technology, which taken together, can hardly add up to a semi-autonomous 'Language of Business'. Presuppositions of this type are often seen at work in the titles of published LSP courses. In the formulas of the trade one seems to cross a rickety logical bridge from, for instance, 'English for Bankers' (user) to 'English in Banking' (domain), to arrive at 'Banking English' (special language).

2.3 Mode of Analysis

The residual problem is, therefore, one of giving sense to the term 'semi-autonomous'. 'Special Languages' are variously described as 'varieties', 'codes', 'sub-codes', 'registers', etc.; they are not whole languages, and for this reason cannot be autonomous. They are said to overlap with the common core and with each other to form families of varieties, but in what ways can they be said to be demarcated? At this point the problem of definition devolves upon methodology, and 'special languages' will be operationally defined in terms of the mode of analysis.

The obvious method seems to be the comparative, though this is not always the line adopted. Huddleston (op. cit.), for instance, exemplifies the domain-based approach - the variety in question is 'scientific' simply because the texts analysed are drawn from science domain sources (learn@& journals, textbooks etc.), not because it contrasts with some norm. There are, of course, degrees of comparativism: the hard-liner, perhaps better described as contrastivist, would look for elements, or 'style markers', that are absolutely distinctive in the sense that the sign EOZOOON, say, is unique to...
the 'special language of Geology' (though I doubt that he would ever go so far as to require an additional uniqueness in the signifier).

Since, however, such uniqueness can only be found at the lexical level, the effect of such an approach would be to reduce special languages to mere terminologies, i.e., lists of discrete items rather than linguistic sub-systems, and thus to strain the term 'languages' to breaking point. (Something of this reductionism can be found in Drozd and Siebicke (1973)).

The major thrust in the current study of special languages has thus been in the direction of text stylistics, an approach which attempts to uncover the differential (rather than identify the absolutely distinctive) in the weighting of style markers at different levels of analysis. The more sophisticated analyses have moved away from impressionistic methods towards quantitative ones, and within the latter category of analyses, away from word frequency lists and structure counts (the passive seems to be a special favourite) towards more 'delicate' analyses of the differential aspects of deep structure.

More recently still, such sentence-by-sentence analysis has been overtaken by a new concentration on the supra-sentential structuring of text. Thus Enqvist (1974), in his analysis of the theme-dynamic patterning of cohesive ties, finds that science texts typically establish rhyme-theme rather than theme-theme topical links, while Hoffman (1979) quotes statistical evidence which indicates that in Russian scientific text the frequency distribution of functional sentence perspective patterns is determined more by genre (journals, textbooks, manuals) than by subject (Mathematics, Physics, Biology, etc.). At a wider level still, speculative attempts have been made to map these 'textual surface structures' on to the 'textual macro-structures' determined by such coherence relations as entailment and presupposition (Van Dijk, 1972).

Text analysis is still in its early stages, and so far the samples analysed have been too limited to establish any degree of significance. A fundamental problem is that no single linguistic model (TGG, Generative Semantic, Systemic, FSP, etc.) can cope with the range and variety of style markers necessary to the delineation of varieties in a convincing way. Eclecticism may be the only answer, though many would consider the resulting model-mix unscientific. Others would prefer to do away with varieties altogether and talk in terms of variation (see 1.0), of linguistic options determined in use by the variables of the communication situation (the role, status, sex, age, education, attitudes, cognitive assumptions, etc. of the speakers, together with role relations, time and setting).

A way out of the impasse into which such largely immanent analyses lead is to broaden the base to include semiological phenomena on the one hand (scientific communication, for instance, is rich in such non-verbal devices as graphs, formulae, diagrams, symbolic notation, etc.), and on the other hand, the pragmatic determinants of the linguistic code. A variety under this reading is thus not (or not only) typified and distinguished from other varieties by its formal linguistic properties but by the profile of illocutionary acts that underpins it. 'Doing Science', for instance, typically involves such acts as hypothesizing, defining, classifying, concluding. In this vein of scepticism as to a purely linguistic characterization of varieties, Widdowson (1979, 27) maintains that the so-called scientific variety should rather be seen 'as the realisation of a type of discourse which is defined in functional terms and distinguishable from other uses of language in general terms of what concepts and procedures are communicated'. Between these polar extrinsic and immanent tendencies lies the synthetic approach which gives due emphasis to both and yields a global

(1) The 'Hocus Pocus' v. 'God's Truth' debate of the 60's is relevant here; are varieties there to be discovered, or are they simply function of the mode of analysis?
characterization of varieties or text types through a multi-focal analysis in semantic, syntactic and pragmatic terms (Gorm Hansen, Lundquist and Rasmussen (1978) and Lundquist (1980)).

The point being made here is that special languages are susceptible of as many definitions as there are methods and models that are employed in their analysis.

2.4 Special Languages and the Spoken Medium

The suspicion may have dawned at this point that the case for special languages has been established largely on the basis of written communication. In Sager et al's treatment of 'the special language of Science', for instance, discussion of the spoken form is notably absent. Why?

Without rehearsing in detail the now-popularized insights of post-war communications theory, one might recall at this point the way the spoken and written mediums were severed by the demonstration, amongst other things, of the impermanency of speech, its sensitivity to noise and concomitantly greater degree of redundancy. In contrast, it is clear that the replicability, the ordered linear presentation of informational bits, the characteristic linguistic well-formedness, and the inherently ossified character of formal non-idolectal written text make it highly amenable to contained analysis. Language is found here in its 'competent' state, of which spoken discourse in the Chomskyan analogy is the 'degenerate' form. And where the domain of science is concerned, though oral communication between specialists in L1 or L2 occurs in the laboratory, at seminars and conferences, etc., the archetypal mode of communication is surely the learned article, the working paper, the report, the conference script.

The difficulty in applying the concept of 'special language' to speech-demanding contexts may derive less from the role relations of the interlocutors and the domain of use than from the different modes of analysis that the spoken and the written languages entail. Thus the central problem for the discourse analyst as opposed to the text analyst is one of containment: when he expands beyond the confines of the linguistic system to include a whole host of situational variables and ancillary paralinguistic and kinesic codes there is clearly the danger of a slide into endlessness. The analysis of face-to-face communication in particular is beset by the difficulty of isolating and interpreting a multiple coming-together of possibly relevant factors in a constantly shifting process. Something of the sheer weight and subtlety of matter to be analysed, together with some ways of sifting it, is described by Cicourcel (1980). He identifies three major approaches: the speech act model analyses discourse in terms of the derivatives of the Austinian categories of performative verbs (expositives, commissives, exercitives, interrogatives, verdictives and behabitives), but does not specify aspects of the participants' knowledge base, nor the researcher's, nor does it explicitly include the emergent properties of social interaction; the problem-solving model is preoccupied with the individual's knowledge base and the explicit attribution of goals, plans, intentions, actions and motives; lastly, the expansion model is 'of such generality that virtually any concept can be included in order to create an analysis that appears to be exhaustive' (128). It is therefore con-
cerned with 'the relationship between what is actually said, including paralinguistic and non-verbal activities (intonational cues and stress; eye-gaze, facial expressions and bodily movements (1)), the expansions that are part of the researcher's analysis, the attribution of intentions, and the way the interaction unfolds because of locally generated conditions and the broader socio-cultural context in which talk is embedded' (111). Thus whereas the first model is also applicable to the written sentence or text, and the second to its institutionalized goals, the third presents one with the sort of open horizon more fundamentally characteristic of speech.

Consequently, the choice for the discourse analysis is between formalistic neatness and validity. Both spoken discourse and written text are amenable to some measure to parallel forms of analysis i.e. in terms of sentence grammar, cohesion (2), coherence (3), speech acts, etc. However, in limiting the analysis to those modes employed by the text analyst of 'special languages', the discourse analyst may well fail to capture the characteristic immediacy and unpredictability of speech (4) and underplay the importance of those ancillary codes and factors (see Expansion Model) which determine the course and effectiveness of spoken interaction.

Discourse analysis is an even newer preoccupation of linguists and socio-linguists than text analysis, and though it has investigated such areas as therapeutic discourse, classroom interaction, doctor-patient and attorney-witness interviews, the major impulse has been directed towards the language of conversation - to such general factors as openings, closings, turn-taking and sequencing routines (e.g. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974). The consequences for the ontology of special language speech modes are interesting. In terms of domain all the above analyses (barring of course the conversational, which is not domain-specific) can be said, qua occupational, to fall squarely within the 'special language' bracket: on the other hand, they are disqualified on the grounds that they involve the asymmetrical role relation Specialist-Layman with its accompanying low linguistic opacity potential. Some examples from the appendix to Candlin, Leather and Bruton's (1976) paper on Doctor-Patient discourse in the Casualty ward will serve to illustrate that while the profile and sequencing of functions in such structured situations may well be distinctive, the linguistic realisations themselves depart hardly at all from the 'ordinary' use of language. (only part of the taxonomy has been reproduced here):

A GREET  D: 'Hullo';
       D: 'Good morning';
       D: 'Mrs Jones?' etc.

B ELICIT  D: 'Can you tell me what happened?...' etc.

C INTERRO-
       GATE  D: 'Do you remember if your whole weight
       was on the foot?'
       D: 'Did you bend right back when you fell? etc.

D QUESTION D: 'Does this hurt?'
       D: 'Can you bend it?' etc.

(1) My brackets
(2) In the sense of Halliday and Hassan (1976)
(3) In the sense of Labov (1972)
(4) As Fishman (1973) points out, a shift in situation does not necessarily entail a variety shift any more than a change in variety necessarily signals a change in situation. The case should not be overstated, however, since certain highly structured speech situations exhibit a great degree of predictability in the language used.
E MAKESURE  D: 'Does it hurt here?'
P: 'No, not really.'
D: 'It doesn't hurt?'

F EXTEND  D: 'Can you walk all right?'
P: 'Yes'.
D: 'So it doesn't hurt to put your weight on it?'
P: 'No'.

Now, if one accepts the premise that LSP uniquely concerns 'special language' in Sager et al's sense, one is faced with the paradoxical result that in the pursuance of his prime occupational functions of diagnosing, prescribing, advising, curing, etc. the doctor has moved beyond its purview altogether since of all the major possible encounters that he may be engaged in within a complex communicative network (see diagram), in the course of a working day, in the same locale, it is precisely the doctor-patient ones, by reason of their asymmetry, which are least likely to call into play a specialized code.

Consultant

Registrar 🔄 DOCTOR 🔄 Nurse

Patient

Clearly this is the parting of the ways. One course leads to an investigation into the total communicative needs of the interlocutor established by an on-the-job analysis of actual situational demands, and the task of the discourse analyst in this and similar cases will be to conduct an empirical survey of the different levels of code employed, not only where these relate to the highly specialized (consultant-consultant/doctor) or intermediate strata of variation (doctor-nurse) but also where they pertain to expert-layman discourse, and even to the conversational forms used in canteens, corridors and common-rooms. It would have to establish in a non-aprioristic way, for instance, to what extent consultant-doctor discourse approximates to the formal style of the medical journal, and to what extent and in what situations specialist jargon is interlaced with it (1), as also what paralinguistic and non-vocal variables are conducive to the ease and effectiveness of the interactions (2). The other course leads to the study for itself of language in restricted situations, or of special language for theoretical purposes.

(1) The opacity potential of such jargons for the specialist learner is frequently underplayed. My informant from the Danish subsidiary of a multinational organization tells me that at a Personnel Manager's annual meeting in London he was floored by the seeming illogicality of the reiterated phrase 'to compensate overtime by toil', only later to realise that TOIL was the acronym for Time Off In Lieu.

(2) Of some relevance here are the postural tactics of certain schools of psycho-therapy: the therapist sits back in his chair to elicit free associations from the patient; and leans forward to reassure and advise. (Scheflen 1964).
The bearing of the first of these two types of research within LSP is summed up by Mackay and Mountford (1968, 5/6) as follows: 'The emphasis of the word 'special' then, in English for Special Purposes should be firmly placed upon the purpose of the learner for learning the language, not on the language he is learning'. This does not mean that the role of language analysis is minimized, but rather that an assessment of the uses of language that the language user will need to master depends on a prior consideration of the situations the user is likely to find himself in. There are of course arguments on both sides: the 'special language' researcher with ultimately pedagogic objectives might counter this by claiming that an adequate description of, say, the 'special language of Law' would cover all those uses that any individual user operating in this domain would need, and that the course designer could simply draw upon those parts of the analysis that were relevant. From the other side it could be argued (as it was above) that analyses of such a degree of adequacy and comprehensiveness are not yet to be found, and that the course designer cannot simply wait for the linguist to finish his task (if 'finish' makes any sense in this connection), he must obviously conduct the necessary ad hoc analyses himself (1). My own belief is that the two forms of research are complementary since the accumulating fund of piece meal needs-based research in various domains could well be incorporated into systematic over-all analyses to yield more adequate descriptions, which will in turn provide a source of reference for the designer. Such an ongoing interchange of insight and experience could be more fruitful to both parties than the present polarization.

3.1 Purposes, needs and situational demands

Although LSP, as Perren (1974) says, 'is not very satisfactory as a blanket term to cover a variety of vocational and professional reasons for learning or teaching languages', some of the implications seem worth spelling out, especially in view of what has been said about 'special languages'. Firstly, the term 'purposes' suggests a conscious aim on the part of the learner or the teacher/course designer. In practice, however, the learner's purposes will be of a highly schematic kind, which have virtual significance in simple opposition to the state of having no end in view, or to learning the language for its own sake, to going through a secondary level syllabus, etc. At this very general level, special/specific purposes have been divided into the Academic and the Occupational (ETIC, 1975), while more recently the Vocational seems to be coming into its own (Trimble and Trimble, 1978). But the basic bi-partite division has the disadvantage that since the 'Academic' can hardly be a purpose in itself for the learner, where learning is a means to an ultimately occupational/professional end, it blurs the distinction between purposes as the conscious goals of the learner, on the one hand, and those of the course designer on the other, and thus also of the former and the objective communicative demands of situation which it is the designer's business to discover.

The distinction between purposes and situational demands is crucial in LSP as anyone involved in the designing of occupational courses will testify. Whereas the learner's formulation of his purposes may be nothing more specific than, say, 'to do Engineering English', the designer's purposes cannot be other than specific since they will involve the setting of prime objectives and sub-goals based on a con-

(1) And, of course, have the knowledge to do so - a need recognized by the increasing number of institutions offering Applied Linguistics courses with an LSP bias.
sideration of the resources available, the relevance of instructional techniques and, most important of all, the communicative requirements on the learner. What is specific for the learner is precisely the last item. This does not mean, however, that he is conscious of the full range of socio-linguistic factors that come into play in the domain in which he operates, or intends to, so 'specific purposes' is a misnomer here. Such factors will have to be teased out from the learner's own perceptions of his needs by means of questionnaires, interviews, feedback, etc. These, of course, are not the only methods of arriving at a 'needs profile', though they are normally the only feasible ones in terms of costeffectiveness. I would prefer to restrict the term 'needs analysis' to this approach, thus distinguishing it from that involving an on-the-job analysis of the situational demands for communication. In rather simplistic terms, they represent the phenomenological, learner-sided view, and the 'outer' socio-linguistic one. In practice, of course the second may incorporate a large ingredient of the first, while the second may require (depending on the type of analysis) a translation into communicative terms; thus, ideally a combination of the two would presumably yield the best results.

This is hardly an idle distinction when one considers the conflict in the learner's and designer's assessment of needs/demands that frequently occurs. An anecdote will illustrate this: the author was commissioned to design a course for the Danish Military Police serving with the United Nations Force in Cyprus. At the feedback stage it was pointed out that one of the elements of the teaching module was in conflict with a proscription on the use of the '-ING Form' to be found in the Danish M.P. manual, the stated ground for which was a pragmatic one, namely, the invariable misuse of this form by Danish speakers. It was subsequently revealed, however, that a multiple confusion was at play: firstly, the gerundive and participial uses were not distinguished; secondly, Aspect was confused with Tense (an important fact since Danes have greater difficulty in distinguishing the semantic function of Progressive and Zero Aspect in combination with the Present than with other tenses); lastly, the manual specifically referred to written reports. This last was clearly irrelevant to a unit designed to practise the interrogation of Cypriot suspects that involved the use of utterances where aspectual marking had a crucial bearing on meaning, viz.

What were you doing when the bomb went off?
What did you do when the bomb went off?

The example does not intend to depreciate the value of feedback generally; the designer can rarely, after all, aspire to the intimate knowledge of content, procedure and context that the professional brings with him to the learning situation. It simply highlights the role of the designer/teacher as socio-linguistic adviser, who must take the learner's assessment on its merits, rather than assume that the customer is always right.

3.2 Types and Levels of Specificity

In terms of Mackay and Mountford's definition, there are not the same overt constraints imposed on the role relations and domains that we find in Sager et al. However, despite the title, 'English for Specific Purposes' in fact concentrates uniquely on 'English for Science and Technology', and on the communicative needs of non-native professionals and university students in these domains, so there is some warrant for thinking that the assumptions as to scope are tacitly the same.

Now the motivation for the term 'specific' becomes ob-
scure when restricted in this way (1). As we have seen, there appear to be good grounds for calling needs profiles and designer objectives 'specific' but this does not bind us to any particular range of domains or class of user, any more than it does to a 'specialized variety'.

The case of 'English, French, German, etc. for Immigrants' is interesting in this connection because it is probably considered (if at all) to be on the borderline of LSP. It is obvious that the communicative needs of the immigrant community are not simply met by the provision of specialized courses for professionals (see Candlin et al., op.cit.) - all levels of the occupational structure are involved from the professional/managerial, through white collar to skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled manual. The purpose of immigrant language teaching programmes from the standpoint of public policy is to equip the immigrant with the communicative competence necessary to counteract as far as possible the disadvantages that might accrue from communicative inadequacy, especially in the domain of employment, but not uniquely so. It has been estimated that in Great Britain 40% of Asian men and 60% Asian women speak English slightly, if at all (PEP, 1976); it is clear that for this group, rather than for university-trained professionals of high linguistic fluency, communicative needs will relate just as much to the immigrant's role as parent, friend, union member, tenant, householder, car-owner, complainant in a discrimination action, newcomer to the host country, etc. as to worker. Such 'daily life' communicative needs relate to 'specific purposes' via a common base of problems specific to an identifiable social group; in terms of domain and communicative network they are indistinguishable from those of the host population.

The term 'specific' might seem to be over-taxed at this point. But so is it also in the case of most published LSP courses for the simple reason that the tenacious demands of marketing potential will force the publisher to concentrate on broad subject areas, such as Physical Science, Technology, Medicine, Business. While possibly satisfying the common sub-stratum needs of the learner within the given domain, such courses can hardly do so with his specialist ones ('Business' is a particularly notorious case, as was mentioned above). At the other end of the specificity scale, we find self-revising, loose-leaf format courses, tailor-made for groups of learners which are homogeneous in terms of linguistic proficiency, L1, role, status and objective, namely, those of the type described in Mackay and Mountford (op. cit.), and above (e.g. the Danish Military Police course). Broad band LSP courses can fulfil the useful function of providing a foundation on which the truly specific tailor-made type can later be grafted (where resources allow); nevertheless, it is clear that 'specific' must be taken with a pinch of salt where this refers to the domain, without reference to the user, his intentions and the variables that define his needs.

The view that has been questioned here is the one which restricts the scope of LSP to 'special languages for special-specific purposes'. It has been maintained above that while the use of a 'special language', when suitably defined, may be a sufficient condition of the user having a specific purpose (i.e. operating in a specific domain and within a specific class of role networks), it can scarcely be a necessary one. Whereas domain may be a crucial determinant of 'special language', it is not of 'specific purposes (see LSP for Immigrants), nor can the range of specific purposes be exhausted by simply listing the writing, reading or other skills needs of academics and professionals in symmetrical (specialist-specialist) role relationships. In fact the deployment of a wide range of non-specialized multi-levelled variation on the common core may be more problematic, in face to face

(1) Except of course where it simply reflects the market potential of LSP courses, which in Science and Technology is very high.
interaction, at least, than a receptive and productive activation
of the formal 'special language' culled from learned journals. Any
narrower circumscription of LSP would seem to be motivated more by
partisanship than by consideration of practical realities.
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