Filozofski fakultet
Sveučilišta u Zagrebu

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Zagreb

7th International Language Management Symposium

Standardization as Language Management

Program and Abstracts

30–31 August 2021

Zagreb & online

Contents

Rationale

Standardization as a process based on intervening in variation is usually aimed at efficient communication on a larger scale. It not only covers the emergence of standard varieties of languages, but also language cultivation, the elaboration of genres and terminologies, and language teaching as well as the development of norms and standards for industry, commerce and intercultural contact.

How far should standardization go? Standards help to measure and compare quality. Achieving standards in various areas of human activities, extending far beyond language use, has been a product of the modern era. Standardization is inextricably linked with social modernization, i.e. with social and cultural development through industrialization, urbanization, and digitalization as well as political, economic and cultural integration and unification. This era is followed by the pluralization of the existing standards in connection with the post-modernist bolstering of regional and minority identities (Neustupný 2006).

Standardization as a major goal of language development is usually conceived as politically authorized or as the organized activity of particular interest groups, but its success is ultimately measured by the implementation of proposed standards within the wider speech community; however, such standards may be contested and resisted in everyday interactions. In addition, some standards emerge in a bottom-up manner, stemming, for example, from evolving community norms. For these reasons, research on standardization is well-suited for the language management approach (Fairbrother et al. 2018, Kimura & Fairbrother 2020).

The symposium aims to explore all basic aspects of standardization processes from the perspective of language management theory as well as other relevant theories.

References

Fairbrother, L., J. Nekvapil & M. Sloboda (Eds) (2018). *The Language Management Approach: A Focus on Research Methodology*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Kimura, G. C. & L. Fairbrother (Eds) (2020). *A Language Management Approach to Language Problems: Integrating Macro and Micro Dimensions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Neustupný, J. V. (2006). Sociolinguistic aspects of social modernization. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier & P. Trudgill (Eds), *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society / Soziolinguistik: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Wissenschaft von Sprache und Gesellschaft*. Volume 3 / 3. Teilband (pp. 2209–2224). Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Scientific & organizing committee

Scientific committee

Nor Liza ALI (University Teknologi Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur)

Lisa FAIRBROTHER (Sophia University, Tokyo)

Milan FERENČÍK (University of Prešov)

Obaidul HAMID (The University of Queensland, Brisbane)

Shanhua HE (Yangzhou University)

Nobuhle HLONGWA (University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban)

Goro Christoph KIMURA (Sophia University, Tokyo)

István LANSTYÁK (Comenius University, Bratislava)

Hidehiro MURAOKA (Chiba University)

Marek NEKULA (University of Regensburg)

Jiří NEKVAPIL (Charles University, Prague)

Hiroyuki NEMOTO (Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto)

Anita PETI-STANTIĆ (University of Zagreb)

Tamah SHERMAN (Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague)

Hotimir TIVADAR (University of Ljubljana)

Petar VUKOVIĆ (University of Zagreb)

Organizing committee

Petar VUKOVIĆ (chair) (University of Zagreb)

Kristina KATALINIĆ (University of Zagreb)

Mihaela MATEŠIĆ (University of Rijeka)

Krešimir MIĆANOVIĆ (University of Zagreb)

Anđel STARČEVIĆ (University of Zagreb)

Vít DOVALIL (Charles University, Prague)

Marián SLOBODA (Charles University, Prague)

Acknowledgement

Participants

	SURNAME, Name	E-mail	Affiliation	Country
1	ARE, Olushola B.	olushola.are@aaua.edu.ng	Adekunle Ajasin University	Nigeria
2	BENEŠ, Martin	benes@ujc.cas.cz	Czech Academy of Sciences	Czechia
3	CURRIE, Oliver	oliver.currie@uni-lj.si	University of Ljubljana	Slovenia
4	DOMONKOSI Ágnes	domonkosi.agnes@uni-eszterhazy.hu	Eszterházy Károly University	Hungary
5	DOVALIL, Vít	vit.dovalil@ff.cuni.cz	Charles University	Czechia
6	FAIRBROTHER, Lisa	l-fairbr@hoffman.cc.sophia.ac.jp	Sophia University	Japan
7	HOMOLÁČ, Jiří	homolac@ujc.cas.cz	Czech Academy of Sciences	Czechia
8	JERNUDD, Björn	jernudd@gmail.com	independent scholar	USA
9	KIMURA Goro Christoph	g-kimura@sophia.ac.jp	Sophia University	Japan
10	LIU Qian	173717397@QQ.com	Sichuan University	China
11	LUDÁNYI Zsófia	ludanyi.zsofia@uni-eszterhazy.hu ludanyi.zsofia@nytud.hu	Eszterházy Károly University Eötvös Loránd Research Network	Hungary
12	MEADES, Sean	sean.meades@algomau.ca	Algoma University NORDIK Institute	Canada
13	MURATA-MARGETIC, Emi	emurata@ffzg.hr	University of Zagreb	Croatia
14	NEKVAPIL, Jiří	jiri.nekvapil@ff.cuni.cz	Charles University	Czechia
15	SAVIĆ, Aleksandra	aleksandrasavic@gmail.com	University of Belgrade	Serbia
16	SHERMAN, Tamah	sherman@ujc.cas.cz	Czech Academy of Sciences	Czechia
17	SMEJKALOVÁ, Kamila	smejkalova@ujc.cas.cz	Czech Academy of Sciences	Czechia
18	STABEJ, Marko	marko.stabej@ff.uni-lj.si	University of Ljubljana	Slovenia
19	TANG Dongxu	18284531224@163.com	Sichuan University	China
20	TÝROVÁ, Zuzana	zuzana.tyrova@gmail.com	University of Novi Sad	Serbia
21	VALH LOPERT, Alenka	alenka.valh@um.si	University of Maribor	Slovenia
22	VUKOVIĆ, Petar	petar.vukovic@ffzg.hr	University of Zagreb	Croatia
23	WEBER, Tobias	weber.tobias@campus.lmu.de	Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München	Germany

Program

Day 1: Monday, August 30, 2021
9:10   **Opening**
9:30   **Björn Jernudd** (Washington, D.C., USA) Exploring approaches to standards, standard language and standardization in language management (Invited talk)
Session 1 Chair: Petar Vuković
10:15   **Martin Beneš** (Prague, Czechia) Language planning and two levels of linguistic knowledge
10:45   **Aleksandra Savić** (Belgrade, Serbia) Language policy as public policy – combining theories
11:15   **Kamila Smejkalová** (Prague, Czechia) Requirements for stricter language standardization: A specific type of post-interaction management

Break (11:45-12:00)

Session 2 Chair: Marián Sloboda
12:00   **Zsófia Ludányi and Ágnes Domonkosi** (Budapest, Hungary) Standard ideology as a source of language problems in the language diaries of Hungarian students
12:30   **Alenka Valh Lopert** (Maribor, Slovenia) Non-professional speakers' communication on Maribor radio stations
13:00   **Jiří Nekvapil** (Prague, Czechia) How to write about Jews in Czech: The new letter "middle ž" as an avoidance strategy

Break (13:30–15:00)

Session 3 Chair: Jiří Nekvapil
15:00   **Olushola B. Are** (Akungba-Akoko, Nigeria) Standardizing Nigerian pidgin: Issues, challenges and prospects
15:30   **Vít Dovalil** (Prague, Czechia) Formation of pluricentric languages as a case of language standardization
16:00   **Petar Vuković** (Zagreb, Croatia) Failed reforms of Russian and Czech spelling of the 1960s: LMT perspective
16:30   Day 1 closes

Day 2: Tuesday, August 31, 2021
9:10　**Marko Stabej** (Ljubljana, Slovenia)   Language standardization in Slovenia: We still haven't (quite) found what we're looking for (Invited talk)
Session 4   Chair: Vít Dovalil
10:15　**Goro Christoph Kimura** (Tokyo, Japan)   Simplified language: for whom? – A comparison between "Yasashii Nihongo" (Simplified Japanese) and "Leichte Sprache" (Easy German)
10:45　**Emi Murata-Margetic** (Zagreb, Croatia)   The Japan foundation's JF-standard practice based on the Common European framework of reference for languages – The transformation of Japanese language education and Japanese language education in Croatia
Break (11:15-11:30)
11:30　**Tamah Sherman and Jiří Homoláč** (Prague, Czechia)   Language testing for immigrants: Standardizing trajectories of language acquisition and use?
12:00　**Lisa Fairbrother** (Tokyo, Japan)   Problems relating to insufficient language standardization in digitalization: The case of 'non-standard' names in Japan

Break (12:30–14:00)

Session 5   Chair: Tamah Sherman
14:00　**Oliver Currie** (Ljubljana, Slovenia)   Language management and language maintenance: the twin challenge of language planning for minoritized languages
14:30　**Zuzana Týrová** (Novi Sad, Serbia)   Language management and language problems in Vojvodina, Serbia: the case of Slovak
Break (15:00–15:15)
15:15　**Sean Meades** (Sault Ste. Marie, Canada)   Language management and state formation in the Canadian white settler colony
15:45　**Tobias Weber** (Munich, Germany)   Coming to terms: Research on standardisation in minority languages between language documentation, sociolinguistics, and education research

15:45　**Final discussion**
16:30　Day 2 closes

Abstracts

ordered alphabetically by the first author's surname

Standardizing Nigerian Pidgin: issues, challenges and prospects

Olushola B. ARE

Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Nigeria

olushola.are@aaua.edu.ng

A lot has been written about Nigerian pidgin. One of the issues that has often been explored is the question of its suitability or otherwise as the national language in Nigeria, in which case it would replace English as the official language and perform several other sundry functions currently exclusive to English. Critical among the factors often raised against the elevation of pidgin to national language status is the fact that it has not been standardised. Yet, standardization is crucial in view of the limitless possibilities in divergences of form, which is a corollary of the natural geographical and situational flexibility associated with pidgins. As Nigerian pidgin continues to evolve, it is important to continue to review academic positions on issues surrounding it including the matter of standardization. This paper, therefore, attempts an overview of past and current concerns regarding this issue, and posits that in the current state of things, any claims that Nigerian Pidgin has issues of standardization are becoming largely irrelevant, particularly in view of the fact that there have been successful efforts at codification, as well as substantial production of formal written texts in the language, albeit at lower levels of organised management. Indeed, the challenges of acceptability, which itself is a critical component of standardization is increasingly ceasing to be an issue with the massive expansions of the roles of Nigerian pidgin in society. The only remaining challenge in this regard is the unhelpful typical incongruous injection of comic relief into formal pidgin discourse. This paper concludes that the major factor against the elevation of pidgin to national language status is not the factor of standardization or the lack of it, but the absence of the political will to disrupt the comfort zone which English currently provides. In this regard, there is a need for more organised management of the standardization process at the mainframe governmental level. Achieving this would involve more vigorous advocacy from exponents of pidgin as the Nigerian national language.

Language planning and two levels of linguistic knowledge

Martin BENEŠ

Czech Language Institute, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czechia
benes@ujc.cas.cz

It is widely held, at least since Graf & Schacter (1985), that there are two levels of linguistic knowledge (memory or representation): 1. implicit, unconscious, spontaneously acquired knowledge consisting of rules (or norms) and 2. explicit, conscious, learned and remembered knowledge consisting of rule-sentences (see e.g. Gloy 2012, Itkonen 2003). Beside clear cases, where shared norms and remembered rule-sentences do match each other, there can be also problematic cases, where language users know and follow rule X, but had been told and have remembered, that to express the same meaning and/or function they should follow rule-sentence non-X (see Beneš 2020). Situations of this kind presents a challenge for language planning, since they suggest that multi-faceted relations between usage (as represented by corpora), norm (in the form of shared rules) and codification (in the form of rule sentences in various kinds of reference books) are much more complicated than it is usually thought. The aim of the paper is to investigate this complexity, using the example (case study) of the so-called Czech purpose adjectives ending with -ící and the so-called verbal adjectives ending with -ící (e.g. *hodnotící* 'evaluative' vs. *hodnotící* 'evaluating'; cf. Veselý & Veselý 2019) and sketch out a preliminary typology of usage, rules and rule-sentences relations. It will be shown that if there are variants in a corpus, we cannot decide in any straightforward way, whether each particular form enters a corpus due to the following the rule or following the rule-sentence. This has far-reaching consequences for the notion of norm (its definition and disambiguation) and language correctness and confronts us with the problem of presenting these issues to the general public through reference books. As a conclusion, paper argues that we are in need of new tools (corpora of non-edited texts), adapting methods of inquiry into users' minds (not necessarily psycholinguistic ones) and new ways of presenting our findings to the general public.

References

Beneš, Martin (2020). Language rules, rule-sentences, and how they are interrelated, or Norm vs. codification. *Naše řeč*, 103(5), 393-408.

Gloy, K. (2012). Empirie des Nichtempirischen: Sprachnormen im Dreieck von Beschreibung, Konstitution und Evaluation. In S. Günthner, W. Imo, D. Meer & J. G. Schneider (Eds), *Kommunikation und Öffentlichkeit: Sprachwissenschaftliche Potenziale zwischen Empirie und Norm*. Berlin, Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 23-40.

Graf, P. & Schacter, D. L. (1985). Implicit and explicit memory for new associations in normal and amnesic subjects. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 11, 501-518.

Itkonen, E. (2003). *What is Language? A Study in the Philosophy of Linguistics*. Åbo/Turku: Åbo Akademis tryckeri.

Veselý, L. & Veselý, V. (2019). Nekodifikujme, raději popisujme a vysvětlujme normu a úzus: Pěstujme jazykovědu, nepěstěme jazyk [Let's not codify language, let's describe and explain it's norms and usage instead: Let's practice linguistics instead of refining language]. *Korpus – gramatika – axiologie*, 20, 47-62.

Language management and language maintenance: the twin challenge of language planning for minoritized languages

Oliver CURRIE
University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
oliver.currie@uni-lj.si

For minoritized languages, it may often be less of a challenge elevating their formal status and expanding their domains of use (for example in the media and public administration) through status and corpus planning than it is to maintain their use in traditional domains such as in the home and the community. Similarly, while corpus planning and language management can help develop the lexical resources of minoritized languages to encourage and facilitate their use in a wider variety of domains, simply maintaining native lexicon and idiom in actual discourse can be a more immediate challenge in the face of widespread diglossia and code-switching with a dominant language. This twin challenge of language management and language maintenance reflects the fact that standardization is a more complex and less stable process for minoritized languages compared to dominant languages. While all standard languages are inherently unstable because of political, social and linguistic change (Milroy, 1994: 19), minoritized standard languages are doubly so because they are subject not only to internal linguistic competition (between variants of the same language) but especially to external linguistic competition with a dominant language.

In this paper, I will argue with reference to two Celtic languages of the United Kingdom – Welsh and Scottish Gaelic, which are in competition with and threatened by English – that a factor which contributes significantly to the challenge of language planning, management and maintenance in the case of minoritized languages is cultural change combined with language shift, and that language planning should take into account this cultural dimension. While Welsh and Scottish Gaelic have in recent decades received more official recognition (in particular Welsh), have now a greater presence in the broadcast media, are taught more widely in schools and, largely thanks to the education system, have increased their number of speakers outside their heartland areas, there has been a continued decline in the proportion and number of speakers in their heartland areas as well as in their use as community languages. The cultural position of the languages is also weaker, not only because they are no longer universally used in their traditional communities, but also because the traditional cultures with which they are associated, in particular the church – historically a particularly strong domain of use, which also contributed significantly to the development of the standard literary languages as well as literacy – have declined, both as a result of secularization and a shift to English. So while the education system – the key plank of the language planning system – can ensure a degree of minoritized language transmission even in communities undergoing language shift, it cannot on its own maintain community use of the language. We can thus observe a paradox, reflected in a major recent sociolinguistic survey of the

traditionally Gaelic speaking Hebrides (Ó Giollagáin et al. 2020: 287, 301), where although members of the community express support for the Gaelic language, many Gaelic speakers use English more and the cultural identity of the islands is also shifting to one based primarily on English.

References

Ó Giollagáin, C., G. Camshron, P. Moireach, B. Ó Curnáin, I. Caimbeul, B. MacDonald & T. Péterváry (2020). *The Gaelic Crisis in the Vernacular Community: A Comprehensive Sociolinguistic Survey of Scottish Gaelic*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Milroy, J. (1994). The notion of "standard language" and its applicability to the study of Early Modern English pronunciation. In D. Stein & I. Tieken-Boon van Ostade (Eds), *Towards a Standard English: 1600-1800*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 19-29.

Formation of pluricentric languages as a case of language standardization

Vít DOVALIL
Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic
vitek.dovalil@ff.cuni.cz

Pluralization of standards as a form of gradual de-standardization poses one of the sociolinguistic phenomena of postmodern diversity. This presentation deals with the dynamics of the formation of standard varieties of pluricentric languages. The research draws upon the fact that pluricentric standards of a language arise in discourses which are created by metalinguistic activities of various actors (individual speakers as well as institutions). They follow their specific interests in various contexts. Such activities reflect these actors' behaviour toward language, which defines the concept of language management (Fairbrother, Nekvapil & Sloboda 2018, Dovalil & Šichová 2017; see also http://languagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/language-management).

The language management approach enables to analyze the phases of such dynamic processes (expectations of relevant actors aimed at standards → noting the deviations from the expectations → evaluation → adjustment design → implementation). Taking advantage of these phases, I will address the following theory-driven questions: What do which actors expect in which socio-cultural contexts when a pluricentric standard emerges? Related to the problem of public awareness, which deviations from these actors' expectations are noted? Which of the noted deviations are evaluated positively, which ones negatively? Which adjustments are designed, which ones are implemented?

I will elaborate on the hypothesis as follows: In cases of monocentric standards, the deviations from the normative expectations are noted and evaluated negatively. Alternative variants, which are designed in accordance with such monocentric standards, are implemented as *corrections*. In contrast, the management of pluricentric standards contains positive evaluation (gratification) of some of these deviations. This fact contributes to the desirable stabilization of such new standard variants in public discourses, because the deviations are not replaced by any monocentric variants. This kind of management processes does not lead to the changes of linguistic structures (implementation of monocentric variants instead of the emerging pluricentric ones), but it illustrates the changes of the expectations from which new management cycles are derived.

I will exemplify different types of management processes by data based both on interactions (micro-level), and on acts carried by institutions (macro-level). The situation in Austria and in Germany is in the foreground.

References

Dovalil, V. & Šichová, K. (2017). *Sprach(en)politik, Sprachplanung und Sprachmanagement*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Fairbrother, L., J. Nekvapil & M. Sloboda (Eds) (2018). *The Language Management Approach: A Focus on Research Methodology*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Problems relating to insufficient language standardization in digitalization: The case of 'non-standard' names in Japan

Lisa FAIRBROTHER

Sophia University, Tokyo, Japan

l-fairbr@sophia.ac.jp

One standardization issue that has become more salient due to advances in digitalization is the (mis)representation of names originating from different language systems. Indeed, research has shown that computer language filters may disallow the input of certain names (Kelley, 2012), or discriminate against users with 'non-standard' names (Rattansi, 2007). In Japan it is common to see complaints on online forums from people with 'non-Japanese' names regarding being denied access to services, due to problems relating to the lack of standardization concerning the written representation of their names online. These problems include 1) being unable to register names online that include standard characters, but which computer language filters disallow, 2) being unable to input a particular name in the *hiragana* script, 3) having multiple representations of names in the *katakana* script at different institutions, 4) different institutions using different word orders and spacing conventions, particularly concerning middle names, 5) software only allowing a 'Japanized' Romanization of names, 6) software restricting the number of possible characters in a name, and 7) different institutions using different scripts (*katakana*, *hiragana* or the Roman alphabet) for the representation of 'non-Japanese' names. These issues cause serious problems in the daily lives of people with names considered to be 'non-Japanese' or 'non-standard' and can restrict their access to products and services.

Based on the online comments of Japanese residents with 'non-Japanese' names and the experiences they describe in interviews, this study examines what kinds of name-related deviations are noted and how those deviations are managed both by the customers with 'non-standard' names and the service providers whose computer systems create such problems. I argue that many computer systems used by service providers, such as banks, rely on 'over-standardized' language filters, which can limit the inputting of even some traditional Japanese names. On the other hand, there is a clear lack of standardization between institutions, as different institutions are able to 'officially' register names according to varying standards of script type and spacing, leading to customers being considered as different people. Regarding the implementation of adjustments, institutions are very firm in the implementation of these digitalized standards, often refusing access to customers whose names are represented differently at different institutions. Conversely, institutions make it difficult for customers to rectify the inconsistencies in the representation of their names and show little interest in improving the problematic computer programmes they use. As a result, a heavy burden is placed on the individual customer to try to negotiate the institutional bureaucracy and attempt to gain equal access to services and products. There is clearly a conflict between individual, institutional and

programmers' interests, and a lack of necessary adjustments implemented on the macro level. Ultimately, legislation may be needed to rectify these discriminatory language practices.

References

Kelley, J.B. (2012). Gay naming in online gaming. *Names*, 60 (4), 193-200.

Rattansi, A. (2007). *Racism: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Exploring approaches to standards, standard language and standardization in language management

Björn JERNUDD

Washington, D.C., USA

jernudd@gmail.com

1. In the language sciences, what is implied in the use of 'standard', 'standard language' and 'standardization'? What behaviors do standardization and the concept of standard imply, in the language sciences and beyond?

2. I propose to base my discussion on first taking a narrow view, bringing up the definition of 'standard' in terminology.

3. Why is vocabulary development that is sometimes called creation of terms not a matter of standardization of terms? Who develops vocabulary and why?

4. Can I identify conceptual characteristics of 'standardization' that result in 'standard languages'? What can I adduce from the Swedish notion of rikssvenska?

5. I will stake out some markers how to approach this and how and why different kinds of standardizations happened.

6. Our interests that bring us to this meeting are varied. Thus, given these diverse interests, yet seeking unity, what does application of the model and methods of language management offer?

Simplified language: for whom? – A comparison between "*Yasashii Nihongo*" (Simplified Japanese) and "*Leichte Sprache*" (Easy German)

Goro Christoph KIMURA

Sophia University, Tokyo, Japan

g-kimura@sophia.ac.jp

In recent years, promoting easy/simplified language as a subtype of the "usual" standard language has increasingly become a topic of organized language management in various countries. This paper discusses the question for whom these intentionally created variants are deemed beneficial, by comparing two different discourses: "*Yasashii Nihongo*" (simplified Japanese) in Japan (Iori et al. eds 2019, Iori ed. 2020) and "*Leichte Sprache*" (Easy Language) in Germany (Bock 2014, Bredel & Maaß 2016). Despite their superficial similarity – both are promoted by issuing manuals and are increasingly visible on government websites and other public spheres -, these two language varieties of the reciprocal standard language are situated in quite different social contexts. Originally, "*Yasashii Nihongo*" has emerged as a linguistic means of disaster mitigation for those inhabitants of foreign origin in Japan whose Japanese language ability is not high enough to understand essential disaster-related information. It has developed to cover also information relevant for foreigners' daily life in Japan. So, generally it is understood as part of multicultural coexistence policy (*Tabunka kyosei*) in Japan. In Germany, "*Leichte Sprache*" has emerged as a way of enhancing social participation for those who have difficulty in reading complicated texts, such as persons with learning-difficulties or intellectual disability. It is understood as linguistic means for barrier-free access to information. A further difference between these approaches concerns the direction of development of the reciprocal varieties. "*Yasashii Nihongo*" has developed in the direction to include a wide range of functions. It is now conceived as a lingua franca-variety of Japanese in contrast to Japanese as native language and is also used as a pedagogical approach to accelerate the acquisition of the Japanese language by children with immigrant background or deaf children. Supporters of "*Leichte Sprache*", on the other hand, have worked toward legal acknowledgement of this variety and providing certification marks to approved texts. To put it in a nutshell, the Japanese development can be described as expanding the functions of simplified Japanese to make it relevant to various people and contexts, whereas the German development can be characterized as restricting its function and regulating its linguistic features in order to maximize its effect. In this paper, the LMT-framework is used to illustrate these essential differences beneath superficially similar linguistic phenomena. The different tendencies in both countries will be described as different management processes, beginning by different noting and evaluation, followed by dissimilar adjustment plans, contrastive implementation and feedback/verification after implementation. Finally, it is discussed how the Japanese and German approaches can complement each other for the benefit of both.

References

Bock, B. (2014). "Leichte Sprache": Abgrenzung, Beschreibung und Problemstellung aus Sicht der Linguistik [Easy language: Delimitation, explanation and current problems from the viewpoint of linguistics]. In S. J. Jekat, H. Elisabeth Jüngst, K. Schubert & C. Villiger (Eds) *Sprache barrierefrei gestalten. Perspektiven aus der Angewandten Linguistik*. Berlin: Frank & Timme, 17-51.

Bredel, U. & C, Maaß (2016). *Leichte Sprache: theoretische Grundlagen: Orientierung für die Praxis* [Easy Language: theoretical basis: Orientation for the practice]. Berlin: Duden.

Iori, I. et al. (Eds) (2019). *'Yasashii Nihongo' to tabunka kyosei* [Simplified Japanese and multicultural coexistence]. Tokyo: Coco Publishing.

Iori, I. (Ed.) (2020). *'Yasashii Nihongo' hyogen jiten* [Encyclopedia of expressions in Simplified Japanese]. Tokyo: Maruzen.

The interaction between the micro level and the macro level of language management—From the perspective of linguistic landscape in scenic spots of Chengdu, China

Qian LIU
Sichuan University, Chengdu, China
173717397@QQ.com

Dongxu TANG
Sichuan University, Chengdu, China
18284531224@163.com

Introduced from sociology, there is a dialectical relationship between the social communication (micro level) and social structure (macro level) (Nekvapil 2006). Language management is not only language planning in national administration at macro level, but also various social communications at micro level, which includes individuals and social institutions. The interaction between the macro level and the micro level has been discussed for a long time, one of the possible perspectives to take a closer look at may be the linguistic landscape, which refers to the landscape formed by the written linguistic signs in public areas (Landry & Bourhis 1997). The linguistic landscape not only represents the features of local language communities, but also objectively reflects the language management and selection tendency of specific language communities. Indeed, the linguistic landscape is what could be found at micro level and reflects the language planning at macro level, i.e., a possible efficient way to explore the interaction between the two levels.

Chengdu is the capital city of Sichuan province in the South-east of China. In recent years, Chengdu has developed rapidly and opened up in economy and culture on a large scale. That's why the city has attracted lots of foreign tourists and placed an increasing number of slogans translated in different languages. By selecting and analysing the slogans of the scenic spots above 3A level in Chengdu, the tourism linguistic landscapes of Chengdu can be characterized as following: Bilingual slogans account for a relatively high proportion; the choice of a certain second foreign language needs to be combined with the local language ecology; the linguistic landscape is closely linked with the culture behind it. This also shows that the language management in Chengdu tends to be in line with internationalization, but it does not tend to affect the original language ecology through the integration of foreign words.

To sum up, the tourism linguistic landscape in Chengdu city at micro level showed a relatively high bilingual ratio, a combination of the chosen translated foreign language with local language ecology, a close link between the linguistic landscape and the interrelated culture. From the perspective of language management at the macro level, all the characteristics above revealed a tendency of internationalization without affecting the original language ecology in Chengdu. In order to achieve the

objective, it is a must to avoid the inappropriate expressions in the slogan and maintain the balance between the Chinese and exotic elements. One of the possible methods is standardization, which could be interpreted as a set of uniformed renewed standards of translation on linguistic landscape.

References

Nekvapil, J. (2006). From language planning to language management. *Sociolinguistica* (20), 92-104.

Landry, R., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: an empirical study. *Journal of Language & Social Psychology*, 16 (1), 23-49.

Standard ideology as a source of language problems in the language diaries of Hungarian students

Zsófia LUDÁNYI

Eszterházy Károly University, Eger, Hungary, & Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics, Eötvös Loránd Research Network, Budapest, Hungary

ludanyi.zsofia@uni-eszterhazy.hu & ludanyi.zsofia@nytud.hu

Ágnes DOMONKOSI

Department of Hungarian Linguistics, Eszterházy Károly University, Eger, Hungary

domonkosi.agnes@uni-eszterhazy.hu

The existence of language problems is a linguistic universal. In standard language cultures (Milroy 2001), the source of some of the language problems can be explained by attitudes to the standard itself. The reason for this is that what members of a given community perceive as a language problem is highly dependent on ideologies underlying the interpretation of linguistic situations (Lanstyák 2018: 69).

The aim of the present research is to show, based on the language diaries of Hungarian university students, how certain attitudes towards the standard and its functioning can cause language problems.

According to Language Management Theory, phenomena that are noted and evaluated negatively by ordinary speakers are considered to be language problems (Nekvapil 2012: 160). Following and slightly extending the interpretation of Lanstyák (2010), we consider any language-related event as a language problem when it 1) occurs during or in connection with verbal communication; 2) causes discomfort to the speaker and/or speech partner and/or a third person; 3) causes interruptions and communication difficulties; or even 4) prevents communication.

It has long been a common practice in sociolinguistics for the researcher to ask informants to keep a language diary. This method has so far mainly been used to examine the language practices of multilingual speech communities (see e.g. Ure 1971), but it can also be used to explore language problems (Lanstyák 2008). In this research, we analyse 120 language diaries with a total of 600 diary entries collected from students studying for teacher certification at Eszterházy Károly University (cf. Ludányi & Domonkosi 2021).

In their language diaries, students have to record language-related events in which they were either directly involved or which they heard about from others and found interesting or noteworthy. Besides recording a linguistic phenomenon or problem, they have to analyse and interpret it as well, offering an explanation of how the observed linguistic element functions in its communicative context, what may have been the reasons behind its use, etc. During data processing, each linguistic phenomenon is labelled and categorised. The analysis has shown that under close scrutiny, language problems recorded in these language diaries often turn out to be

problems only from the perspective of standardist ideologies, whereas they do not pose any real problems for everyday speakers.

Based on the collected language problems and speakers' interpretations of how the standard ideology works, the following types of attitudes towards the standard can be distinguished: 1) The speaker sees the standard variant as a value, a norm to be followed. The language problem is caused by a perceived need to conform to the standard. 2) The speaker is familiar with the standard form but is critical of it, the problem is caused by a discrepancy between the standard and the speaker's preferred language use. 3) When interpreting a new linguistic form, the speaker interprets the lack of standardization and regulation as a language problem.

References

Lanstyák, I. (2008). *A nyelvi napló mint a nyelvi problémák feltárásának eszköze* [The language diary as a tool for exploring language problems]. 5. Workshop für Applied Linguistics. Budapest, 18–19. September 2008

Lanstyák, I. (2010). A nyelvi problémák típusai nyelvi jellegük szerint [The types of language problems according to their linguistic character]. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle*, 12 (2), 23–46.

Lanstyák, I. (2018). On the strategies of managing language problems. In L. Fairbrother, J. Nekvapil, & M. Sloboda (Eds), *The Language Management Approach: A Focus on Research Methodology*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 67–100.

Ludányi, Z. & Domonkosi, Á. (2021). Die Rolle von Sprachtagebüchern im problembasierten Unterricht von Ungarisch als Muttersprache. *Journal of Applied Technical and Educational Sciences jATES*, 11 (1), 44–65.

Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 5 (4), 530–555.

Nekvapil, J. (2012). Some thoughts on "noting" in language management theory and beyond. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 22 (2), 160–173.

Ure, J. (1971). Eine Untersuchung des Sprachgebrauchs in Ghana. In R. Kjolseth, & F. Sack (Eds), *Zur Soziologie der Sprache*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 136–156.

Language management and state formation in the Canadian white settler colony

Sean MEADES

Algoma University & NORDIK Institute, Sault Ste. Marie, Canada

sean.meades@algomau.ca

Research focused on the macro-trends in Canadian language policy (LP) has largely focused on two broad trajectories: (a) the processes of accommodation of Anglophone and Francophone communities (including the limitations of Canada's policy of bilingualism for French-speaking or official-language minority communities) (Martel & Pâquet, 2010; Mackey, 2010; Cardinal, 2015); and (b) the ongoing exclusion of The Other (i.e. "immigrant" and Indigenous communities) within Canada's existing LP framework (Haque, 2012; Haque & Patrick, 2015; Patrick, 2018). This research turns its focus to the place of language in the state formation processes of Canada that preceded its "Bilingualism within a multicultural framework," and its place in settler/Indigenous relations and processes of colonization. Drawing on Spolsky's framework of language policy (2009; 2019) that emphasizes the interplay of language practices, beliefs and management in a social ecology, this work offers a case study of the specific experiences of Indigenous peoples in the communities surrounding Baawating (at the junction of Lake Superior and Lake Huron) to exemplify the diverse and sometimes nuanced mechanisms of language management and standardization that contributed to the region and its people being engrossed by the emerging Canadian white settler hegemony in the early twentieth century. The study uses a mixed-methods approach that combines content analysis of language policy documents, historical records, demographic data and interviews of local Indigenous residents on their experiences of language choice and use to triangulate the interplay between macro-level LP, ideologies of language, and language shift. The research demonstrates the interconnection of LP with social, economic, political and technological domains and processes of rendering Indigenous and non-Anglophone subjects intelligible as citizens in a settler state. Furthermore, it illuminates how language has been used to 'stand-in' for race in the construction of idealized national subjects within a liberal order since at least the early twentieth century in Canada.

References

Cardinal, L. (2015). State Tradition and Language Regime in Canada. In Cardinal, L. & S. Sonntag (Eds) *State Traditions and Language Regimes*. Montreal, Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 29-43.

Haque, E. (2012). *Multiculturalism within a Bilingual Framework: Language, Race, and Belonging in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Haque, E., & D. Patrick (2015). Indigenous languages and the racial hierarchisation of language policy in Canada. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 36 (1), 27-41.

Martel, M. & M. Pâquet (2010). *Langue et politique au Canada et au Québec: Une Synthèse Historique*. Montréal: Éditions Boréal.

Mackey, W. (2010). History and Origins of Language Policies in Canada. In M. Morris (Ed.), *Canadian Language Policies in Comparative Perspective*. Montreal, Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 18-67.

Patrick, D. (2018). Indigenizing language policy in Canada: Redressing racial hierarchies in language and education. In G. Lane-Mercier, D. Merkle, & J. Koustas (Eds), *Minority Languages, National Languages, and Official Language Policies*. Montreal, Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language Management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2019). A modified and enriched theory of language policy (and management). *Language Policy*, 18, 323-338.

The Japan Foundation's JF-Standard Practice based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: The transformation of Japanese language education and Japanese language education in Croatia

Emi MURATA-MARGETIC

University of Zagreb, Croatia

emurata@ffzg.hr

Since the European Union set in the idea of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in Europe, The Japan Foundation also has established the JF Standard for Japanese-Language Education (2017). So far, it has become possible to evaluate students who study Japanese in order to enrol at Japanese universities or acquire government-sponsored recommendations for scholarship, as well as to evaluate Japanese language learners who work and study Japanese due to their interest in language. Based on the students, Japan Foundation has created the JF-Standard, with textbooks and websites for Japanese learners. In addition, the Japan Foundation organises seminars for Japanese language teachers for modern teaching methods and seminars for using JF Standard in the class.

Moreover, in 2019, the Japanese government decided on the basic policy for the new status of residence "Specially Designated Skills", which will be established based on the revised Immigration Control Act with the aim of increasing the number of foreign workers, the operational policy for each field, and the comprehensive measures for foreign nationals in general. This requirement includes Japanese language proficiency, therefore, just as there are language tests for non-native speakers in Europe and elsewhere, it has become necessary to develop such tests in Japan. Until now, Japanese language proficiency has been defined as the ability to study in Japan and acquire the Japanese language skills required for university enrolment, but now there is a need to determine the Japanese language skills required for everyday life. For this reason, the Japan Foundation has developed the JFT-Basic test, which measures the four skills of speaking, listening, writing and reading.

The presenter is currently involved in Japanese language education in Croatia and is a member of the Croatian Association of Japanese Language Teachers, which was founded in 2008. In this contribution, Japanese language education in Croatia will be presented.

References

Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment.* Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

吉島茂・大橋理枝（訳、編）（2004）『外国語の学習、教授、評価のためのヨーロッパ共通参照枠』初版第一版、朝日出版社

Kumano, N., Toda, T. & Adachi, S. (2021). 「国際交流基金日本語基礎テスト」の開発―生活場面でのコミュニケーションに必要な言語能力（A2レベル）を判定する   CBT- The Japan foundation departmental Bulletin Paper 17, Japan: The Japan Foundation, 48-63.

Japan Foundation （2017） *JF Standard for Japanese-Language Education* https://jfstandard.jp/summaryen/ja/render.do

Japan Foundation (2019). *JFT-Basic Test* https://www.jpf.go.jp/jft-basic/e/index.html

Japan Foundation (2021). *Japanese Language Proficiency Test* https://www.jlpt.jp/e/index.html

Japan Foundation Minnano Can do site Online site https://jfstandard.jp/cando/top/ja/render.do

Japan Foundation Marugoto Online site https://www.marugoto.org/

Japan Foundation (2019). *Croatia* https://www.jpf.go.jp/j/project/japanese/survey/area/country/2019/croatia.html

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (2020). *Specified Skilled Worker has started* https://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/ca/fna/ssw/jp/index.html

How to write about Jews in Czech: The new letter "middle ž" as an avoidance strategy

Jiří NEKVAPIL

Charles University, Prague, Czechia

jiri.nekvapil@ff.cuni.cz

Orthography is loaded with social meanings, and as the property of educated people constituting a substantial share of modern societies, it has become a subject of heated disputes (Jaffe et al. 2012). Czech society is no exception (Bermel 2007). This paper examines a recent attempt to introduce a new letter (the so-called "middle ž") to Czech orthography, or typography for that matter. Management processes resulting in the invention of "middle ž" were triggered by the pressure of the current Czech orthography that imposes a particular identity on a group of Jewish people – either ethnic or religious – through the choice of the capital letter (i.e. "big" letter) or lowercase letter (i.e. "small" letter) at the beginning of the word (cf. Cz. *Žid* or *žid*). "Middle ž" works as an avoidance strategy, freeing the language user from this dichotomy, in other words, a particular group of people needn't be categorized either in terms of the Jewish ethnicity (capital letter) or Jewish religion (lowercase letter), which is difficult or even impossible to distinguish in particular social and historical contexts. As the author of this paper has been drawn into this matter, we can follow the management processes linked to this phenomenon also from inside and in some unusual detail (see Kimura 2020 for an analogy). Overall, the issue of "middle ž" confirms the author's idea that the Czech language situation has become favourable to the formation of a spelling of Czech comprising variants specific for individual functional domains of the standard language (Nekvapil 2008: 260).

Keywords: orthography, typography, ethnic identity, religious identity, Jews, Czech spelling, functional differentiation of spelling

References

Bermel, N. (2007). *Linguistic Authority, Language Ideology and Metaphor: The Czech Orthography Wars*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jaffe, A., Androutsopoulos, J., Sebba, M. & Johnson, S. (Eds) (2012). *Orthography as Social Action: Scripts, Spelling, Identity and Power*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kimura, G. (2020). The bridging role of the researcher between different levels of language management: The case of a research project at the German-Polish border. In G. Kimura & L. Fairbrother (Eds), *A Language Management Approach to Language Problems: Integrating Macro and Micro Dimensions*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 237-253.

Nekvapil, J. (2008). Language cultivation in developed contexts. In B. Spolsky & F. M. Hult (Eds), *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell, 251-265.

Language policy as public policy – combining theories

Aleksandra SAVIĆ

Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, Serbia

aleksandrasavic@gmail.com

Recent linguistic theories define language as a complex construct, which means that it cannot be researched without paying attention to all sorts of other political and social phenomena. Due to its complex nature, it is possible and even necessary to explore various language activities by combining several social theories. Language policy is a theory in the field of sociolinguistics just as public policy is a scientific area within political science. Both of them are broadly defined as activities of the state or some government institution in particular public (or language) problems. Because of their similarities, we can explore them using interdisciplinary approaches. In this paper, I will define language policy, its methods, actors, courses of action, and implementation by applying results of two combined sciences – sociolinguistic and political science. Regarding the first of the two, I will use language policy theory which is developed in sociolinguistics and later as a critical sociolinguistic discipline. The second one provides me with the knowledge and scientific results about public policy theories in a broad range of government activities. Political science researchers in the past decades developed a broad spectrum of theories and methodological frameworks to examine how public policies are made, how they are implemented, and what results and consequences they have. On the other hand, sociolinguistics, as the science that analyses language in society and society in language, will help me to observe how language issues affect society and vice versa. I believe that we can use both theories and their strengths and weaknesses to create one of the possible approaches to these questions because public policy theory is more concentrated on results, measurements, and implementation, whereas language policy theories are involved in examining languages and their influence on society. Together, these approaches can make a concept that pays attention to both the processes of making public policies and their results. This approach does not mean that there is only one way to examine language policies. It represents the author's belief that the interdisciplinary approach is the future of social sciences and a call to all researchers to use different sciences, approaches, and theories to explain complex social phenomena. Language is unquestionably one of them.

References

Corcoran, P. (1989). Language and Politics. In Swanson, D. L. & Nimmo, D. (Eds) *New Directions in Political Communication*. Newbury Park, California: SAGE Publications, 51-86.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. New York: Longman.

Filipović, J. (2015). *Transdisciplinary Approach to Language Study*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Filipović, J. (2018). *Jezik i moć*. Beograd: Zadužbina Andrejević.

Joseph, J. E. (2004). Language and politics. Davies, A. & Elder, C. (Eds), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 347-367.

Lo Bianco, J. (2000). Making languages an object of public policy. *Agenda*, 7 (1), 47-61.

Patten, A. (2001). Political Theory and Language Policy. *Political Theory*, 29 (5), 691-715.

Sabatier, P. A. (2007). *Theories of the Policy Process*. Cambridge: Westview Press.

Savić, A. (2020). Interdisciplinarni odnos jezika i politike. *Anali Filološkog fakulteta*, XXXII (2), 263-276.

Language testing for immigrants: Standardizing trajectories of language acquisition and use?

Tamah SHERMAN
Czech Language Institute, Prague, Czech Republic
sherman@ujc.cas.cz

Jiří HOMOLÁČ
Czech Language Institute, Prague, Czech Republic
homolac@ujc.cas.cz

In target countries for immigration, the newcomers' language competence has long been managed through processes of standardization by state institutions. First of all, there is the need to define norms for sufficient linguistic, communicative and sociocultural competence in various areas of life, such as employment, education or general well-being (cf. Hogan-Brun et al. 2009, Milani 2017). Then there is the need to establish methods for ensuring that the behaviour of immigrants conforms to these norms, and above all, to check this conformity. The most common resulting form of organized management is the creation, implementation, and ongoing adaptation of language tests (Extra et al 2009, Extramiana & Van Avermaet, 2011, Shohamy 2007).

This paper will focus on the Czech Republic, where individuals from non-EU countries (also known as third-country nationals) have had to pass a language test to obtain permanent residence since 2008. The CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) test level began at A1, and in 2021, it was raised to A2. This requirement is treated (and accordingly managed) by individuals in a number of ways: as a primarily administrative hurdle, as a confirmation of already-existing language knowledge, or as a major challenge requiring extensive preparation. As a result, the test may constitute a key transition in their life courses on the trajectory of language acquisition and use, leading to their linguistic integration into the host society and overall linguistic autonomy. Conversely, it may not influence their later language acquisition and use at all.

Based on the analysis of language biography interviews with third-country nationals who have passed the test, online discussions in which these individuals offer advice and opinions regarding it, and semi-structured interviews with test designers, examiners, and teachers, we pose the following questions: 1) What are the connections between the standardization of language knowledge required through testing and individual processes of language acquisition and use? 2) How are these connections between testing, acquisition and use similar or different among speakers of specific languages? 3) How do the experiences of exam-takers inform the organized management of immigrant language acquisition?

We outline several different trajectories of management observable among different individuals or groups and conclude with the question of whether the current testing

regime in the Czech Republic is able to appropriately fulfil its original standardization aim for all of them.

References

Extra, G., M. Spotti & P. Van Avermaet (Eds) (2009). *Language Testing, Migration and Citizenship: Cross-national Perspectives*. London: Continuum.

Extramiana, C. & P. Van Avermaet (2011). *Language Requirements for Adult Migrants in Council of Europe Member States: Report on a Survey*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Hogan-Brun, G., C. Mar-Molinero & P. Stevenson (Eds) (2009). *Discourses on Language and Integration: Critical Perspectives on Language Testing Regimes in Europe*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Milani, T. M. (Ed.) (2017). *Language and Citizenship: Broadening the Agenda*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shohamy, E. (2007). Language tests as language policy tools. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice* 14 (1), 117–130.

Requirements for stricter language standardization: A specific type of post-interaction management

Kamila SMEJKALOVÁ

Czech Language Institute, Prague, Czechia

smejkalova@ujc.cas.cz

Language standardization in the Czech language community is connected with scientific and educational institutions. The Czech Language Institute of the Academy of Sciences (CLI) is considered an authority in standard language. CLI's work significantly contributes to the standardization of the language and makes part of organized management at the macro level. Language standardization takes place through the publication of codification sources for the general public (dictionaries, grammar books, Internet Language Reference Book) and by providing a language consulting centre, which forms a linkage between micro management and macro management (see Beneš, Prošek, Smejkalová & Štěpánová 2018). Enquirers consult their language problems from the micro level (simple management) with linguists working at the macro level (organised management). Information about language users' issues within the micro management is a valuable source of data for the process standardization of language. In my paper, I focus on post-interaction management, in which enquirers ask questions about particular language phenomena that caught their attention while listening to or reading texts (noting). They evaluated the phenomenon as incorrect (deviation from standard language) and they ask linguists of CLI as an authority to intervene against this kind of deviations from standardization. Usually, these requirements apply to the media, documents and web pages of public institutions etc. Very often, language users give CLI more power than it really has and they believe that it is entitled to decide what is and what is not correct and can issue ban to certain language behaviour. My research focuses on the analysis of telephone interactions between enquirers and members of LCC, in which users thematize language standardization. I analyse which language means, genres and types of communication are most often the subject of their enquiries, complaints and suggestions. I compare the difference between their ideas about standardization and the actual process of standardization in the Czech language situation.

Reference

Beneš, M., Prošek, M., Smejkalová, K. & Štěpánová, V. (2018). Interaction between language users and a language consulting centre: Challenges for language management theory and research. In L. Fairbrother, J. Nekvapil & M. Sloboda (Eds), *The Language Management Approach: A Focus on Research Methodology*. Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Warszawa, Wien: Peter Lang, 119–140.

Language standardization in Slovenia: We still haven't (quite) found what we're looking for

Marko STABEJ

University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

marko.stabej@ff.uni-lj.si

The official management of Slovenian language standardization has recently gone through many changes. It has seemingly become a much more data-based and speaker-oriented process; it gives an impression of a pluralistic, inclusive and democratic endeavor, more than ever before. On the other hand, the attitudes of the general public toward standard language and language standardization remain mainly unchanged, expecting a clear top-down standardization hierarchy, not willing (and not able) to take any other linguistic responsibility than obeying (or disobeying) the given rules. Most likely this is the consequence of a prevalent standard language ideology in the school curricula and practices of language teaching. How to manage such a situation, how to empower the speakers for communication in an open, responsible and inclusive community?

Language management and language problems in Vojvodina, Serbia: the case of Slovak

Zuzana TÝROVÁ

Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad, Serbia

zuzana.tyrova@gmail.com

The main objective of this paper is to present the sociolinguistic situation of Slovakian minority in multilingual Vojvodina (here we also have other minorities which can officially use mother tongue in schools: Hungarians, Croatians, Ruthenians, Romanians). This paper summarizes language policy and legislation, and deals in more detail with language management and selected language problems. The Slovak language in Vojvodina was studied and examined from the perspective of sociolinguistics (Fishman 1972) by Mária Myjavcová (2001, 2015), Miroslav Dudok (2008), Dalibor Sokolović and Zuzana Týrová. Slovak-Serbian bilingualism in the area of the present-day Vojvodina has existed for over 270 years. It is present in various modifications and it is of changeable intensity, which is influenced by the communicative needs and habits of the Slovak minority. The frequency of usage of the Serbian language is under the influence of extralinguistic factors such as: sociolinguistic situation, the presence of language, prestige, etc. There is thus the necessity of language management and preventive linguistics in order to preserve Slovak as the language of the enclave. Language preservation is the effort to prevent languages from becoming unknown. A language is at risk of being lost when it no longer is taught to younger generations. There are different factors that can put a language in danger of becoming extinct. One is when a language is no longer being taught to the children of the community, or there are political and/or economic problems. The paper provides an overview of the theoretical backgrounds for exploring the aspects of Slovak-Serbian bilingualism in Vojvodina and language management (Fairbrother et al. 2018, Nekvapil 2008). The essence of the problems of language policy in Vojvodina seems to lie in the absence of the individual language choice in some the spheres of society. The cases presented in this paper, however, suggest that the officially formulated language policy is often declaratory and the implementation of various adjustments depends on the willingness of people in power.

References

Dudok, M. (2008). *Zachránený jazyk* [A saved language]. Nadlak: Vydavateľstvo Ivan Krasko.

Fairbrother, L., J. Nekvapil & M. Sloboda (Eds) (2018). *The Language Management Approach: A Focus on Research Methodology.* Berlin: Peter Lang.

Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society.* Rowley: Newbury House.

Myjavcová, M. (2001). *Slovenčina v jazykovej enkláve* [Slovak in a language enclave]. Báčsky Petrovec & Nadlak: Kultúra & Ivan Krasko.

Myjavcová, M. (2015). *O slovensko-srbskom bilingvizme vo Vojvodine* [On Slovak-Serbian bilingualism in Vojvodina]. Báčsky Petrovec: Slovenské vydavateľské centrum.

Nekvapil, J. (2008). From language planning to language management. *Sociolinguistica: International Yearbook of European Sociolinguistics* (20), 92-104.

Non-professional speakers' communication on Maribor radio stations

Alenka VALH LOPERT

Department of Translation Studies, Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor, Slovenia
alenka.valh@um.si

The Slovene language was strengthened in 1991, when it gained the status of an official language of the country, and later in 2004, when Slovenia joined the European Union. As a communicative tool, it is used in all situations, including formal speech situations. The article consists of two sections. The theoretical one presents Slovene, which has its standard variety as well as several nonstandard social varieties. In addition, it has seven dialectal groups and regional colloquial varieties. The language spoken in Maribor is influenced by features taken from Carinthian, Styrian and Pannonian dialects. It is a non-standard north-eastern regional colloquial variety referred to as Maribor urban speech. The empirical section concentrates on Maribor urban speech, comparing non-professional speakers on two radio stations in Maribor, i.e. the commercial Radio City and the public Radio Maribor. The linguistic analysis focuses on the realisation of phonological elements of Maribor urban speech in the non-prepared spoken discourse of non-professional speakers in media discourse on both radio stations on the level of vowels with regard to the following:

a. the quality and quantity of vowels *e* and *o* (non-standard for [←] standard): vowel *e*: *é* ← *ê*, e.g. *méne* ← *mêne* 'me'; *é* ← *è*, e.g. *pogléd* ← *poglèd* 'a view'; *ê* ← *é*, e.g. *včêraj* ← *včéraj* 'yesterday'; *ê* ← *ə*, e.g. *têmni* ← *tèmni* 'dark'; vowel *o*: *ó* ← *ò*, e.g. *vhód* ← *vhòd* 'entrance'; *ô* ← *ó*, e.g. *sôdni* ← *sódni* 'judicial'; *ó* ← *ô*, e.g. *dóbro* ← *dôbro* 'well';

b. reduction of vowels: at the beginning of the word as in *_mam* ← *imam* 'I have'; in the middle of the word as in *dan_s* ← *danes* 'today'; at the end as in *nikol_* ← *nikoli* 'never';

c. stress shift: one syllable to the beginning of the word as in *prêveč* ← *prevèč* 'too much'.

The results show the importance and advantages of mastering code-switching between the local speech and Standard Slovene (bidialectalism) – depending on the circumstances and the purpose of use. The author concludes that while on the one hand, there is a need for identification with the language of the local environment, on the other there is a need for the national language used in the public sphere in order to express collective identity. It points at the intertwining of the regional and Standard Slovene, thus raising the awareness that regional language "deviations" from the norm may/should lead to changes in the spoken Standard Slovene if we are to keep the language alive. In this respect, media have a strong impact on language changes.

Failed reforms of Russian and Czech spelling of the 1960's: LMT perspective

Petar VUKOVIĆ

University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

petar.vukovic@ffzg.hr

In the early 1960s, initiatives emerged to radically reform two spelling systems with long traditions and stabilized contemporary use: Russian and Czech. The initiatives' main intention was to facilitate spelling acquisition in schools (Efimov 1962, Bělič 1963-64), which was to be achieved by strengthening the role of phonological spelling, i.e. the correspondence between the phonemes in the language and the graphemes in the orthographical system. A vigorous debate about the need and direction of the spelling reform ensued in both the Russian and Czech public, one of the results of which was the emergence of elaborated Russian theory of orthography (e.g. Vinogradov 1965, Ivanova 1976 etc.). However, both reform initiatives were soon rejected.

The paper analyses the two failed attempts at spelling reform from the perspective of language management theory, with the focus on ideology, interests and power (Neustupný 1983, Jernudd & Neustupný 1987), as well as on the relationship between the macro and micro levels of language management (Neustupný 2002, Nekvapil & Sherman 2015, Nekvapil 2016).

Documents from Russian archives demonstrate that the reform initiative came from the highest political circles and was related to Khrushchev's educational policies: facilitated spelling acquisition was expected to free up time in schools for subjects believed to be more beneficial for the national economy (Arutjunova 2015). There are indications that politicians encouraged the spelling reform in Czech, too (Cvrček 2006).

Both reform initiatives took into account primarily interests of children learning how to write, while at the same time neglecting already literate language users, for whom a radical spelling reform would create significant difficulties. Russian linguists soon began to point to this as a serious drawback (Sazonova 1964, Vinogradov 1964). Czech linguistics went one step further and empirically demonstrated that pupils (Janáček 1964-65, Dokulil 1965) and students (Dvořák 1965-66) did not experience such serious spelling problems, as well as that attitudes of Czech speakers towards the radical spelling reform were predominantly negative (Tejnor 1969).

In addition, the emphasis on the phonological spelling did not lead to the facilitation of spelling acquisition, as was expected. In the Russian context, in which the Moscow and Leningrad phonological schools had significantly different understandings of the Russian phonological system, the spelling debate almost turned into a power struggle between the two schools. The reform proposal was eventually formulated in accordance with the Moscow school principles (Panov 1963, Predloženija… 1964), which provoked criticism by members of the Leningrad school (Ivanova 1964).

Although the debates have soon made clear that it would be difficult to introduce even minor changes in the two well-established traditions of spelling, the reform initiatives were finally rejected only after Khrushchev was replaced by Brezhnev in the role of the Soviet leader in October 1964. Language management can be viewed as a political process (Jernudd 1982), and on the macro level it is often carried out in the way other policies are adopted in the societies concerned. In accordance with that, the key role in the two analysed reform initiatives belonged to the central political power: it encouraged the reform, channelled the discussion about it, and eventually rejected it.

References

Arutjunova, E. V. (2015). *Reformy russkoj orfografii i punktuacii v sovetskoe vremja i postsovetskij period: lingvističeskie i social'nye aspekty*. (Doctoral dissertation, Russian State University for the Humanities). http://www2.rsuh.ru/binary/object_50.1429199537.11893.pdf.

Bělič, J. (1963-64). Odhodláme se k výraznějšímu zjednodušení pravopisu? *Český jazyk a literatura* 14, 145-156.

Cvrček, V. (2006). *Teorie jazykové kultury po roce 1945*. Praha: Karolinum.

Dokulil, M. (1965). Průzkum obtíží našeho pravopisu (Výsledky a výhledy práce pravopisné komise). *Naše řeč* 48, 30-36.

Dvořák, E. (1965-66). Průzkum pravopisného úzu studentů pražských vysokých škol. *Český jazyk a literatura* 16, 97-113.

Efimov, A. I. (1962). Krasnorečie i orfografija. *Izvestija*, 23 March, p. 3.

Ivanova, V. F. (1964). O morfologičeskom principe russkoj orfografii. *Russkij jazyk v škole* 3, 6-13.

Ivanova, V. F. (1976). *Sovremennyj russkij jazyk: Grafika i orfografija*. Moskva: Prosveščenie.

Janáček, G. (1964-65). K reformě pravopisu. *Český jazyk a literatura* 15, 117-124.

Jernudd, B. H. (1982). Language planning as a focus for language correction. *Language Planning Newsletter*, 8 (4), 1–3.

Jernudd, B. H. & J. V. Neustupný (1987). Language planning: for whom? In L. Laforge (Ed.), *Actes du Colloque international sur l'aménagement linguistique / Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning*. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 69–84.

Nekvapil, J. (2016). Language Management Theory as one approach in Language Policy and Planning. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 17 (1), 11–22.

Nekvapil, J. & T. Sherman (2015). An Introduction: Language Management Theory in Language Policy and Planning. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 232, 1–12.

Neustupný, J. V. (1983). Towards a paradigm for language planning. *Language Planning Newsletter* 9 (4), 1–4

Neustupný, J. V. (2002). Sociolingvistika a jazykový management. *Sociologický časopis* 38 (4), 429–442.

Panov, M. V. (1963). Ob usoveršenstvovanii russkoj orfografii. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2, 81-93.

Predloženija po usoveršenstvovaniju russkoj orfografii (1964). *Izvestija*, 24 September, p. 3-4.

Sazonova, I. K. (1964). Obsuždenie 'Predloženij po usoveršenstvovaniju russkoj orfografii' v izdatel'stve 'Sovetskaja ènciklopedija'. *Russkij jazyk v škole* 6, 51.

Tejnor, A. (1969). Český pravopis a veřejné mínění. *Naše řeč* 52, 265-285.

Vinogradov, V. V. (1964). Kul'tura reči i orfografija. *Literaturnaja gazeta*, 13 June, p. 2.

Vinogradov, V. V. (Ed.) (1965). *Obzor predloženij po usoveršenstvovaniju russkoj orfografii (XVII-XX vv)*. Moskva: Akademija nauk SSSR.

Coming to terms: Research on standardization in minority languages between language documentation, sociolinguistics, and education research

Tobias WEBER

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Munich, Germany

weber.tobias@campus.lmu.de

This project pitch outlines a research approach which combines documentation efforts on minority languages with a developing standard language and sociolinguistic research on language attitudes, language policy, and metalinguistic discourse. At the core of this endeavour lies the negotiation of technical terminology and the strategies employed by professionals in their fields, preferably blue-collar professions.

In many contexts of codifying a (modern) standard language, the elites are the driving forces behind standardization – occasionally also supported by linguists or other scholars. Consequently, laypeople may feel disenfranchised or detached from the standardization process and the policy-makers, which can lead to the rejection of the standard. A dynamic bottom-up approach to standardization can offer a solution for connecting linguistic and professional expertise in the creation of technical terminology – Language Management Theory appears as an ideal framework to describe and analyse the social, psychological, and linguistic factors at work in this negotiation process.

The initial step of the data collection comprises the documentation of professionals describing their work, processes, artefacts or tools, and vocational knowledge. While these narratives or descriptions are a common type of historical fieldwork, often outlining traditional procedures or culturally specific practices, accounts of daily labour in modern settings are regularly missing in documentation outcomes. Closing this gap with documentation does not only yield valuable language data, it also makes professionals visible in their work, dealing with different sets of terminology including loanwords and calques. While these strategies do not conform to purist ideologies or monolingual norms, they illustrate authentic language use or translanguaging as a contrast to top-down standardised language forms. The documentation of language use can be extended by semi-structured interviews and focus groups discussing terminology. In addition, sociolinguistic questionnaires can provide structured information on language attitudes and beliefs about standardization. This should also include the values and the prestige of languages which is being signalled in opting for a particular set of terminology.

The resulting data will provide insights to language management strategies, both on-line and off-line, and supply information on sociolinguistic factors in standardization. At the same time, the data and resulting analyses can share insights about the adoption of a standard language by laypeople, and provide reference points for bottom-up corpus development. Ultimately, the data can support

vocational education and the creation of teaching materials for the communities. The combination of Language Management Theory with language documentation can subsequently offer interesting avenues for research on standardization, as well as supporting disenfranchised members of minority language communities.

Language management theory at the University of Zagreb

Awareness of language management theory in Croatia began to spread due to its connections with the language cultivation theory of the Prague School, which has traditionally been influential among Croatian linguists. The two theories were connected as early as in the work of one of the founders of LMT, Jiří V. Neustupný, and they continue to be intertwined in the research of a group of linguists based in Czechia, who work within the frame of LMT today. In the book *Jezična kultura: Program i naslijeđe Praške škole* (*Language cultivation: Program and legacy of the Prague School*, ed. by Petar Vuković) from 2015, Croatian translations of two papers by J. V. Neustupný and J. Nekvapil were published, in addition to classical works of the Prague School focusing on language cultivation. Today, LMT in Croatia is applied primarily to issues related to language standardization, both in the analysis and critique of the codification of contemporary standard language and in the field of historical sociolinguistics.

Petar Vuković from the University of Zagreb prepared a Croatian translation of the language management website at http://languagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz.