István Lanstyák

On the strategies of managing language problems[1]

Abstract This chapter utilizes the theoretical framework of LMT to present the strategies of managing language problems on the basis of empirical data coming from various sources. The author differentiates between 'language management' and 'language problem management', the latter being a narrower concept. After presenting a short definition of the key concepts, the paper deals with various kinds of language management suprastrategies and strategies. One of the important distinctions is the distinction between D-management (management of particular discourses), C-management (management of the circumstances of language use), and I-management (management of ideas, opinions, ideologies concerning languages and language use). One of the tenets of the paper is the assertion that language as a set of features and regularities can be managed through all three, whereas language as an ideological construct can be managed mostly through I-management. However paradoxical it may seem, in the process of language problem management anything but language is managed.

Keywords Language Management Theory, language problems, problem management, management suprastrategy, management strategy

1 Introduction

One of the most important metalinguistic activities which can be effectively analyzed and interpreted within the Language Management Theory (LMT) framework is the management of language problems or language-related social, legal, cultural etc. problems (for the sake of simplicity, I will henceforth refer to all of these as 'language problems'). As is well known, implementing a solution to a problem is only one of a number of ways to manage language problems (cf. Fan 2009; Muraoka 2009). The aim of this paper is to identify and classify language management (LM) strategies according to their main characteristics and to illustrate these characteristics with examples.

The examples come from three sources: (1) general literature on the language situation of speech communities throughout the world as well as specific literature

on language problems; (2) short accounts of language problems in the language diaries of students studying the Hungarian language and literature, or Hungarian as a foreign language at Comenius University in Bratislava, Slovakia, written between 2006 and 2013;[2] (3) the author's own experiences and participant observation of others encountering language problems. A substantial proportion of these observations took place in the bilingual community of Hungarians in Slovakia, in which the author lives. From a methodological point of view it is important to stress that the use of data coming from very different sources was a means of ensuring the greatest possible data diversity.

Many of the existing strategies of language problem management appear in some way in the literature on LMT, however, a comprehensive description is yet to be supplied.

2 The Basic Concepts

2.1 Language problems

According to the traditional definition in LMT, "language problems" are negatively evaluated deviations from a norm (Nekvapil 2009: 3). A more comprehensive definition is that "language problems" are "the linguistic, communicative and associated socio-cultural phenomena that are not only noted but also evaluated negatively" (Nekvapil 2012: 160). Actually, the first mentioned definition relates to just one type of language problem called inadequacies in LMT; they are problems which occur at the interactional level (micro level), in concrete situations (Jernudd 1991; Sloboda & Nábělková 2013; Nekvapil 2009).[3] Supra-interactionally, however, we can talk about a constant or a regularly occurring, negatively evaluated deviation from an 'ideal' state of affairs or from a certain kind of general 'norm' or expectation held by the stakeholders. Outside the concrete situation, there are no inadequacies, only the representations of previously occurring inadequacies in the minds of the stakeholders, which can be called metaproblems (Lanstyák 2014). For example, not being able to refrain from using substandard words and grammatical features in certain situations may be a metaproblem identified on the basis of previous specific instances when concrete persons used nonstandard words and grammatical features in such situations and were confronted with their interlocutors' negative evaluations of their speech.

A language inadequacy can therefore be defined as a particular kind of language problem, which can be tied to a particular place and time when it occurred, or to a period through which it lasted. As opposed to this, a language metaproblem will

---

2   In the language diaries the students describe and analyze various kinds of language problems or other noteworthy events concerning language they encounter during the semester.
3   Neustupný (1994: 52) seems to equate "inadequacy" and "language problem", maybe he accepted the distinction later.

be defined as a generalized language problem, i.e., a problem type, which subsumes many particular instances of inadequacies of similar character, as they are represented in the stakeholders' minds. Whenever we think of both or either of these types, we use the term 'language problem' which can be considered a generic term including both 'inadequacy' and 'metaproblem' (see Appendix).

It should be stressed, however, that 'problem' is not an objective reality, as its existence heavily depends on what the individual or a community considers a problem, which again greatly depends on their interests and ideologies. The same applies to the 'language problem' (Jernudd & Neustupný 1987), as it has been recognized by the proponents of LMT, who consider a language problem to be only what the speakers in the given community perceive as a problem, and what can be traced back to the particular discourse[4] where it occurred (Neustupný 1994; Nekvapil 2006, 2007, 2012; Nekvapil & Nekula 2006; Fan 2009).

2.2 Problem situations

On the interactional level, a problem situation is a set of circumstances which all work together to create the impression to the interactants that a deviation from a norm or expectation took place at a certain location and time. On a supra-interactional level, a problem situation is a set of circumstances which all work together to create the impression to the stakeholders that a metaproblem exists.[5] In the case of language inadequacies and language metaproblems, the problem situation necessarily has a linguistic or a communicational component. 'Dealing with the problem,' therefore, actually means dealing with some or all of the components of the problem situation.

Since managing language problems equals managing various circumstances of a language situation, of which only one or a few elements are discourse-related, it is understandable that the management of language problems, especially 'organized management' (OM),[6] often consists of the management of various non-linguistic entities (the 'outer world' and ideas about various aspects of what is generally called 'language' and 'language use'), as will be detailed in the next section of the paper.

---

4   In this paper, by 'discourse' I mean the verbal – either oral or written – constituent of the interaction in which the language (related) problem occurred.

5   As can be seen, those who are affected by an inadequacy are called interactants, and those affected by a metaproblem, are called stakeholders in this paper. When both are meant, the term participant is used. 'Stakeholders' is the most prevalent term used for those affected by a metaproblem in problem management theories (Lanstyák 2014).

6   OM can be characterized by the following: it usually affects a large number of individuals or groups; it is always supra-interactional; it consumes many resources; it is directed, systematic and always conscious; it may be regulated by specific laws (like language laws); metalinguistic communication about the LM takes place (Sloboda & Nábělková 2013).

2.3 Management strategies and suprastrategies

Generally speaking, a 'strategy' can be defined as an intentional plan of activities adopted to accomplish an explicit goal (see, e.g., Mintzberg 1978; Wodak 2008). By way of metonymy, 'strategy' often denotes the actions taken in order to fulfil the plan as well, i.e., the problem management itself (cf. Feldman & Orlikowski 2011). A broader concept of 'strategy', therefore, includes not only plans intended to fulfil, but also strategies "that were realized despite intentions" (Mintzberg 1978: 934); thus "intended strategies" and "realized strategies" can be distinguished (Mintzberg 1978: 935).

In LM, 'strategy' may be defined as an intentional plan to accomplish either a linguistic or a social, political, economic, psychological etc. goal through metalinguistic or discourse-related extralinguistic activities (intended strategy).[7] By extension, 'strategy' may mean the realization of the plan as well, including ways of realization which were not planned in advance (realized strategy). In LM, either the goal or the intentional plan of activities will generally have a linguistic or communicational component. The most general strategic approaches towards language problems are termed 'suprastrategies' in this paper.

It is worth mentioning that a language problem may cease to exist without applying any management strategy, simply by radical changes in the circumstances. For instance, if an individual, who suffered from not being proficient in a language, which he or she needed for his or her work, retires, his or her problem ends without applying any management strategy. In such cases we may talk about the termination of the problem. However, this type of problem solution will not be dealt with in this paper, since it cannot be considered a 'strategy'.

2.4 Language problem management and language management

Generally speaking, 'problem management' can be defined as dealing in any relevant way with a problem situation, including the causes and consequences of the problem[8], with the aim of bringing forth a more desirable state of affairs for at least some of the stakeholders. In LMT 'problem management' means dealing with a discourse-related problem situation. In terms of LMT, the outcome of the management process should be a state of affairs where there is no negatively evaluated deviation from norms or expectations, or the deviation is smaller, or is perceived to

---

7   Metalinguistic activity is for instance arguing about the correctness or incorrectness of a word or a grammatical feature with the aim of making the stakeholders use it or discard it. Discourse-related extralinguistic activity is e.g., disseminating a publication about correct and incorrect language use with the aim to help the readers – the stakeholders – decide which words and grammatical features to use in certain contexts and which not to use.

8   For the sake of brevity, normally I will substitute clumsy phrases like "dealing with a discourse-related problem situation, including the causes and consequences of the problem" with simpler phrases like "dealing with a language problem".

be smaller, than before. Directly, this approach can be applied only to the management of inadequacies. In the case of metaproblems it is the negatively evaluated deviation from an ideal state of affairs that should become smaller or non-existent, or be perceived as smaller.

It is important to emphasize that in LMT the management of language *problems* is just one kind of language management, albeit probably the most important one (Lanstyák 2014: 345). The term 'language management' denotes a broader range of activities; besides the management of language problems it includes also LM of a non-interventionist character, e.g., dealing with positively evaluated deviations from the norms or expectations of the interactants, or thinking and talking about language or discourse without the intent to bring about changes to them. In LMT commonly four phases of the LM process are distinguished, from which only two fall under the heading 'language problem management':

Table 1: The phases of LM – problem management perspective

1. noting	2. evaluation	3. adjustment design	4. implementation
problem recognition		problem management	
language management			

Since the subject matter of this paper is not language management in general, but specifically language *problem* management, hereafter by 'management' I mean 'language problem management' (i.e., phases 3 and 4 of the LM process as perceived in LMT).[9]

2.5 Levels of problem management

According to LMT, language management – and so, by implication, language problem management – can be performed either on the micro level or macro level. The micro level is the level of concrete interactions and small-scale structures like a family or a group of people (friends, students, co-workers, strangers in a lift or a waiting room etc.) talking to each other etc., while the macro level is the level of large-scale social structures like education, research, economic and government institutions (Nekvapil 2006, 2009, 2012; Nekvapil & Nekula 2006). These levels can be distinguished, as seen above, at the interactional level, where language inadequacies occur, and at the supra-interactional level, where language metaproblems are managed (see Appendix).

---

9   Some authors sometimes include the "deviation from the norms or expectations" among the phases of LM (e.g., Neustupný 2003), but it can be argued that a deviation is simply the state of affairs, not a phase of the process of LM, since it goes against all logic that any kind of management could take place prior to the noting of the deviation.

3 Suprastrategies and strategies of managing language problems

The suprastrategies employed in LM can be classified on the basis of three criteria which provide answers to the following three questions: (1) what to do with the problem (to manage it or not to manage it), (2) when to start the management process (the point of reference being the problem's time of occurrence), (3) what is to be managed. The participants may decide not to involve themselves in the problem management (non-involvement suprastrategy) or they may decide to involve themselves (involvement suprastrategy), and both decisions may take effect either proactively or reactively (Puccio et al. 2012). The involvement strategies may aim at changing the discourse (D-management suprastrategy); the circumstances of language use, i.e., the 'outer world' (C-management suprastrategy); or the ideas, thoughts, opinions of the participants, i.e., their 'inner world' (I-management suprastrategy).[10] With respect to these categories the non-involvement suprastrategy may be called N-management (non-management) suprastrategy.[11]

3.1 Suprastrategies

By applying the aforementioned three criteria, nine (partially overlapping) suprastrategies can be distinguished:

1. Non-involvement (or non-management, N-management) is a suprastrategy of not dealing with a problem at all, i.e., refraining from any conscious management act aimed at changing the problem situation. It may be applied proactively or reactively.[12]
2. Involvement is a suprastrategy of actively coping with a problem by managing various aspects of the problem situation in some way or another. It again may be applied proactively or reactively.
3. A proactive suprastrategy entails taking notice of, or dealing with, an anticipated problem (either an inadequacy or a metaproblem) before it actually occurs. It may be applied both as a non-involvement suprastrategy (if the problem is only anticipated, but the problem situation is not dealt with) and as an involvement suprastrategy (if the problem situation *is* dealt with).

---

10 A more detailed description and examples are provided in the next sub-section.
11 The term "non-management" is used by Neustupný (2005: 321–322) to denote "generative" processes that precede the problem management itself. Similarly, "N-management" means "non-management of language *problems*", which nevertheless *is* interpreted as *language* management in LMT.
12 'Non-involvement' means non-involvement in the problem *management*, not necessarily non-involvement with the problem. If somebody faces the problem without the intent to manage it – i.e., he or she chooses the strategy of endurance (see below) – we consider it as an instance of applying the suprastrategy of non-involvement.

4. A reactive suprastrategy entails encountering a problem (either an inadequacy or a metaproblem) after it has actually occurred. Similar to the proactive suprastrategy, the reactive suprastrategy may also be applied both as a non-involvement suprastrategy (if the problem is noticed, but the problem situation is not tackled) and as an involvement suprastrategy (if the problem is noticed and consequently the problem situation is tackled).

5. A proactively applied involvement suprastrategy, i.e., prevention, can be defined as precluding the occurrence of a foreseen problem, by engaging with some aspects of the problem situation consciously. It can also be considered to be a simple strategy.

6. A reactively applied involvement suprastrategy, i.e., intervention, is another lower-level suprastrategy, which can be defined as actively coping with an already existing problem by bringing about changes in various aspects of the problem situation.

7. D-management is one of the three involvement suprastrategies, applied either proactively or reactively. It consists of LM activities directed at the discourse in a concrete interaction (whether monolingual or multilingual), with the aim of bringing about changes to the discourse. From this definition, it follows that D-management is always performed within the framework of 'simple management' (SM)[13] (as we know, OM is supra-interactional). In OM, all influence exerted on the actual discourse is mediated by acts of C-management and I-management. Typical D-management activities are: self-repair, correcting a text, consciously using another word than before to denote a certain concept because of being convinced by some linguistic authority that the previously used word was 'wrong' or less adequate in the given situation. D-management often goes hand in hand with C- and I-management.

8. C-management is another involvement suprastrategy, applied either proactively or reactively. It consists of LM activities directed at the circumstances of language use with the aim of bringing about changes in the overall language situation and thus managing the language problem. While D-management is confined to SM, C-management is typical of OM, although, in some form or other, it may appear also in SM. For instance, if some employees in an international firm deliberately choose to perform a particular communication act in writing rather than orally (e.g., sending an e-mail instead of calling by phone) in order to prevent communication problems (see Nekvapil & Nekula 2006), they carry out an act of C-management with the aim of influencing the discourse in such a way that it becomes more understandable or more easily manageable. C-management, when performed in the context of SM (in this example, using a certain communication

---

13 SM can be characterized by the following: it affects a small number of individuals, it is interaction-based, it does not require many resources, it may be spontaneous, or even unconscious, it is seldom regulated by specific laws (Sloboda & Nábělková 2013).

channel rather than another), is usually accompanied by D-management, as is the case in this example (chosing a different communication channel enables more time to be spent formulating the message, which may result in avoiding mistakes which could not have been avoided in oral communication).

9. I-management is also an involvement suprastrategy, applied either proactively or reactively with the aim of bringing about changes in how participants think about the language problem; it often entails the use of various language ideologies which are related to linguistic aspects of the problem. It is probably more typical of OM, although in SM interactants may, in a given situation, apply ideological statements to influence the discourse. For example, in a bilingual community, a speaker may justify his or her language choice with some sort of language ideology or somebody may try to make someone else change their language by arguing based on certain ideologies (see Langman & Lanstyák 2000).

One may wonder why no 'L-management' (denoting 'the management of language') is included among the suprastrategies answering the question 'what is to be managed'. The reason is simple: I have not found any language-related activity that would be expedient to be labelled as an act of 'L-management'. 'Language' as such is basically a socio-cultural and ideological construct, not an artefact of reality (see e.g., Gal 2006; Jørgensen et al. 2011; Jørgensen & Varga 2011), and therefore it obviously cannot be managed in any other way than virtually, within the framework of I-management. So-called 'corpus planning', i.e., proposing new rules and words, cannot be regarded as managing 'the language': it is a way of influencing the speakers to observe previously non-existent or unobserved rules and use previously non-existent or unused words, thus effectuating changes in the discourse, not in the 'language'. Only after the new rules and words have been established in discourse, may the speakers or the language experts have the feeling that 'the language' has changed.

For instance, codifying a new standard language[14] consists of a series of C-management acts accompanied by I-management. Language experts elaborate a set of rules for the would-be standard language and a list of words intended to become the basis of the word-stock of the new language variety, usually drawing on one or more dialects or the older forms of language preserved in older texts (I-management)[15]. The proposed set of rules and word list is then disseminated by the help of state administration, the educational system, media etc. (C-management). The language experts or others make up ideologies about why this standard should be used (I-management). Only when these new rules and words appear in actual discourse can we talk about D-management, however, this

---

14   It goes without saying that what follows is a drastically simplified 'model' of the standardization process.

15   Some may think that this is exactly 'language' management. However, this 'language' exists only in the minds of the language experts, i.e., in the form of thoughts, so its management cannot be anything but I-management.

actually happens outside the framework of OM; observing the proposed rules and using the proposed words is an act of SM on the part of the individual members of the speech community.

Reactive codification adjustments in an already existing standard language, within the context of LM, can also be interpreted as acts of C-management accompanied by I-management. The publication of new rules and words changes the circumstances of language use (C-management) and thus influences what people think about their language and how they should use it (I-management). If they become acquainted with the new rules and words, they may decide to manage their discourses accordingly (D-management).

As we can see, it is impossible to find a point where anything like 'L-management' would be needed. Since 'language' is an ideological entity, not an artefact of the real world, it is evident that all activities which are directly aimed at bringing about changes in it are of an ideological character, i.e., instances of I-management. As to those activities, which are aimed at bringing about changes in the 'language' indirectly, they are instances of C-management.[16] Contrary to the 'language', the discourses people produce, do exist in reality and so they can be managed through D-management. What LMT calls 'language management' consists of these three kinds of management: D-, C- and I-management. The label 'language management' may seem indispensable even for non-essentialist linguists, but it is important to realize that it is misleading at best (on essentialism in linguistics see e.g., Janicki 1989; Linell 2005).

3.2 LM Strategies

In the empirical material used for this study eleven LM strategies could be identified (see Table 2. below). In the next three subsections, their general characteristics will be explained along with a number of examples of how they are used proactively or reactively. Since a 'strategy', as defined above, is primarily a plan, and only secondarily an implementation of that plan, the classification of the examples coming from the literature, language diaries and the author's own experiences is not based on the outcome of the LM process, but on the intent of the managers and in some cases (alleviation/mitigation, solution/elimination) on the ways such intent is achieved. This is because the outcome can be rather different, e.g., the intent may have been the solution of the problem, but what actually was accomplished may be only its alleviation (or in the worse case, its aggravation, which is not at all untypical, especially in the OM of metaproblems; see Lanstyák 2015).

---

16 A direct way, e.g., substituting a word for a politically more correct one, is to deal with the word openly, i.e., to persuade the speakers that the word used till then was for some or other reason not suitable (I-management). An indirect way of reaching the same is to change the outer circumstances by e.g., instructing language editors to substitute the word with another one hoping that if the readers do not encounter the word in the media they will use it less and less.

Table 2: Language management suprastrategies and strategies on the supra-interactional level

non-involvement		involvement		
proactive	reactive	proactive (prevention)	reactive (intervention)	
avoidance	endurance			N-management
		devolution alleviation solution		C-management D-management
		ignoring denial belittlement mitigation elimination acceptance		I-management C-management

4 Non-involvement strategies

The two non-involvement strategies presented below, i.e., avoidance and endurance, are two ways of refraining from any conscious management acts aimed at changing the problem situation. The first of them, avoidance, may involve many management activities on the part of the participants or the problem managers, however, the aim of managing the circumstances of language use is not to solve the problem, or alleviate it, or transfer its burden on somebody else, but to change the circumstances of language use in such a way as the participants would not have to deal with the problem at all.

4.1 Avoidance

Avoidance is a non-involvement strategy employed before the expected language problem occurs.[17] Its aim is to circumvent situations where the problem could possibly occur. The participants do not strive to remove or alleviate the problem; they just try to avoid it. It is typically a micro-level strategy and either inadequacies or metaproblems can be avoided in this way. The participants may manage their circumstances (e.g., finding an alternative way of fulfilling a task, without having to communicate), however, this is not an involvement strategy (C-management), since the aim is not to deal with the language problem, but rather to avoid having to deal with it.

---

17 "Avoidance" may also refer to the avoidance of disclosing information which would influence the evaluation of the speaker's discourse by his or her interlocutors (Fairbrother 2015: 72–73).

Avoidance strategies are explicitly mentioned in LMT. Together with 'prevention', they fall under the heading "pre-management" (cf. Neustupný 1978: 248) or "pre-interaction management" (Nekvapil & Sherman 2009). In LMT, avoidance strategies are "management strategies that involve not performing a communicative act due to the difficulties associated with it, or selecting a communicative act which requires less work, less confrontation or does not threaten one's professional image" (Nekvapil & Sherman 2009: 187). However, as one of my anonymous reviewers notes, avoidance is surely more than that, even in LMT, it is a general face saving strategy applicable to non-professional contexts.

Avoidance strategies within the SM of inadequacies are often used to evade language gaps or language lapses[18] (Schmid & de Bot 2004; Nábělková 2007). They may be applied by speakers with various language proficiencies, such as semi-speakers, multilingual speakers speaking their non-dominant language or competent mono- or multilingual speakers speaking their non-dominant dialect or register. They can also be applied to fully competent speakers speaking their dominant language or language variety, especially in situations of stress, such as when they perform a difficult task like interpreting etc. Avoidance may consist of circumventing some linguistic or orthographical forms; avoiding speaking about a particular topic or a set of topics, shunning a medium of communication (e.g., face-to-face spoken language, see Nekvapil & Nekula 2006) or avoiding interaction altogether (Nekvapil & Sherman 2009; Fan 2009; Muraoka 2009; Fairbrother 2015).

In addition, using certain 'compromise forms' to avoid anticipated language problems may be a metaproblem management strategy. For example, some parents in the community of Hungarians in Slovakia prefer to give their children names which are identical or almost identical in Slovak and Hungarian, e.g., *Dávid, Tibor, Patrik; Anna, Anita, Laura,* etc. One reason is to prevent the linguistic identity of their children being deduced from their first name and so avoid possible discrimination from the majority authorities or majority population. The motivation may also be to prevent the authorities from Slovakizing the name of their children, which was a common practice in the past when Hungarians with names which had their etymological or conventional counterpart in Slovak were forced to use the Slovak forms, like *Štefan* instead of *István,* or *Vojtech* instead of *Béla* (see Zalabai 1995).

In multilingual states, all provisions which enable the use of a minority language in official contexts may be considered avoidance strategies applied within the framework of the OM of metaproblems. The aim of the provisions is to avoid anticipated communication problems, which speakers communicating in their non-dominant language could encounter. In Switzerland, the inhabitants are even spared from actively using the other official languages of the state and thus can

---

18 A language gap is when a required word or structure is not part of the speaker's linguistic system; a language lapse is when a required word or structure is part of the speaker's repertoire but he or she is temporarily unable to recall it (see Lanstyák & Szabómihály 2005: 65).

avoid the concomitant problems. As is well-known, the strict territorial compart-mentalization of the languages and their official use in the federal government in multilingual federal states, like Switzerland, is meant to be a way of ensuring that most inhabitants of the country may essentially remain monolingual and yet be able to fulfil all their language-related needs (see e.g., Grin 1998; Stępkowska 2010).

One may argue that choosing a name for a child or making provisions for the use of minority languages in official contexts is active involvement in managing problems, so it cannot be classified as an avoidance strategy, avoidance being a non-involvement strategy. However, it is important to realize that all avoidance may entail active in-volvement –not in managing the circumstances in order to solve the problem itself, but to manage the circumstances in order not to get involved in potential problems. By choosing an ethnically neutral name the problems relating to the use of ethnically marked names do not cease to exist, only the individual with an ethnically unmarked name will not have to engage with them. Similarly, if the minority language can be used in official contexts, the speakers will not have to engage with the problems which would arise if they had to use the majority language. In this sense these examples can be regarded as examples of the avoidance strategy. Of course if the problem is defined otherwise, the same activities may also be interpreted otherwise.

4.2 Endurance

Endurance is a non-involvement strategy which manifests itself in being confronted with a problem but without any efforts made to avoid or manage it. In essence, the participant recognizes the problem and bears all the consequences. Thus it can be described as a non-involvement strategy applied 'reactively'[19], a sort of passive acceptance of the problem, as opposed to "acceptance", which is an active acceptance of the problem (see later). Although literally taken not dealing with a problem is not a management strategy, it is worth examination, since deciding which language problems to deal with and which to set aside is, in a way, itself an act of LM.

Endurance is not really dealt with in LMT, although a kind of reference to it can be found in the form of a requirement; Fan (2009) emphasizes that problems which cannot be solved (temporarily or permanently) should also be attended to. Thus, endurance may be the next step after unsuccessful attempts to manage the prob-lem. Nekvapil (2009) also points out the possibility that problems may be noted by stakeholders and consequently brought to the attention of language managers, but they may prove unsolvable (more exactly: unmanageable) or the designed action plans may not be accepted by the stakeholders.

A speaker who is not able or willing to invest more time and effort into learning a language which he or she needs occasionally or regularly, actually applies the endurance strategy, knowing that he or she will have communication problems, and possibly also concomitant problems like being disparaged, isolated or even

---

19 Here, *not* reacting is treated as an extreme form of weak reaction.

persecuted for his or her ignorance. This falls into the category of the simple non-management of inadequacies and metaproblems.

An example from a language diary: an ethnic Hungarian living in the Czech Republic with fossilized Hungarian language competence (he used his mother tongue, Hungarian, regularly when he was a child), on his visit to Hungary referred to a young female shop assistant as *néni* 'auntie', which is how small children may refer to a shop assistant, but not adults. This aroused a negative reaction on the part of the shop assistant, resulting in the both the customer and the accompanying author of the language diary feeling embarrassed.

5 C- and D-management strategies

As has been shown above, C-management strategies involve LM activities directed at the 'circumstances of language use' with the aim of managing the language problem. Three different types of C-management strategies will be presented below: devolution, alleviation and solution. By 'circumstances of language use' I mean anything that is not discourse or ideas about language, i.e., metaphorically speaking, everything that is in the outer world, not in the speaker's mouth or head. In the case of SM, the strategies of devolution, alleviation and solution may consist of D-management, i.e., the management of the discourse in concrete interactions. In other cases C- and D management are concurrent. For this reason they will be treated together.

5.1 Devolution

Devolution is an involvement strategy consisting of making adjustments with the aim of transferring the burden of the problem onto somebody else (an individual or a group). The problem remains, but some of the participants redirect the consequences of the problem to others, or redirect the responsibility for managing the problem to others. This occurs normally when the participants with greater power impose their will on participants with less power. Since devolution is a kind of aggressive, obtrusive or at least inattentive act, it usually needs ideological justification; therefore C-management is often accompanied by I-management, and in the case of SM, also by D-management.

The marginalized Romani-speaking communities in Southern Slovakia, e.g., the communities near Dunajská Streda / Dunaszerdahely in Malý háj / Malomhely, in which the majority of the population is still monolingual in Romani, provide an example of this phenomenon. Since Romani is generally not used in public services, the whole burden of doing things in offices and elsewhere for the members of the community is laid on those few members who speak Hungarian and/or Slovak (see Pintér & Menyhárt 2007). That means that although the stakeholders are those who do not speak either Hungarian or Slovak, they are basically exempt from having to bear the consequences, since the language brokers will do the work for them.

More generally speaking, it is a quite usual practice throughout the world that individuals belonging to the (powerful) majority in the country as a whole do not

bother to learn the language of the *local* (powerless) majority,[20] even if they are individuals of lower social status. In many countries where linguistically mixed areas exist, the usual language policy is that only the subjugated speech community is obliged to learn the language of the dominant speech community, even if the subjugated community is actually a numerical (but powerless) majority and the dominant community is a tiny numerical minority.

For instance, in Slovakia, Slovak, the language of the dominant group, is a compulsory subject in the schools with Hungarian as the language of instruction, while Hungarian is not even an optional subject in Slovak schools, even in the areas where Hungarians are a numerical majority (Lanstyák & Szabómihály 2005). That means that in communication between Slovak monolinguals and Hungarians, the latter group has to make all the effort to make themselves understood (by using their non-dominant language). Similarly, various documents of Hungarian minority organizations are translated into Slovak by bilingual Hungarians, i.e., those who do not need the translation because they understand both languages. The experiences of the author show that those who understand only Slovak often do nothing but passively wait for the bilinguals to manage their comprehension problems and often they do not even consider this to be a favour for which they should be grateful.

Devolution strategies can be employed even in situations where the languages in a multilingual community have an equal status *de jure*, when the actual distribution of power between the languages is uneven. For example, in pre-1991 Yugoslavia, Slovenian was one of the official languages of the country. Yet in the federal political bodies, such as in administration, diplomacy and the army, and in some other domains like certain mass media, predominantly Serbo-Croatian was used officially. Serbo-Croatian was a compulsory subject in Slovenian schools, without any reciprocity – Slovenian was not taught outside Slovenia (Stabej 2007). It was expected that the comprehension problems would be managed unilaterally by the Slovenes by using Serbo-Croatian in outgroup communication, without the need of the Serbo-Croatians to make themselves understood in Slovenian.

A similar situation is evolving in many parts of the world as a consequence of English becoming 'the' world language (see Edwards 2004). For example, by English becoming the single international language of science and technology, all the burden of professional communication in this area is laid on the speakers of languages other than English: "When we have a single language which is not really a *lingua franca* for everyone, parts of the scientific community do not have to invest time and resources to learn the new languages, but may use these for their own research activities" (Carli & Calaresu 2007: 541).

---

20   On the concept of powerful and powerless majorities see Skutnabb-Kangas (1990: 11).

5.2 Alleviation

Alleviation is an involvement strategy which, on the level of OM, consists of making adjustments in the circumstances of language use in order to make the problem more bearable, i.e., creating a partial solution. In the case of SM, it is often the discourses themselves that are adjusted for the problem to become more bearable (D-management). Alleviation may take various forms, e.g., reducing a complex problem by solving some of its components, or dealing with (some of) the consequences of the problem, without addressing the problem itself. It is also possible to lessen the weight of a problem, by reinterpreting the problem situation. Since this latter case is an I-management strategy, it will be discussed later, and under a different name (mitigation).

Alleviation is not treated in LMT as a clearly identified LM strategy, although Muraoka (2009: 160) emphasizes the need to reduce "irremovable problems." In other theories of problem management alleviation *is* attested under different names, including 'alleviation', also 'dissolution' and 'amelioration' of the problem (see Vidal 2005; Paucar-Caceres 2008; Ulrich & Reynolds 2010; Jackson 2003). Also 'improving the problem situation' may refer to alleviation (Simonsen 1994; Jackson 2003; Christis 2005).

When interactants are speakers of different language varieties or languages, communication problems and other problems can be alleviated by speaking less spontaneously and self-monitoring one's speech in order to be able to accommodate other interactants, which is a type of D-management. In the language diaries, there were several reports from which it can be seen that some members of the community of Hungarians in Slovakia, when speaking or writing to Hungarian speakers from Hungary, exercise more self-monitoring than usual to avoid using Slovak loanwords or code-switches.[21]

Foreigner talk is an example of such a special register which is typically used with the intention of alleviating communication problems[22] (Tarone 1980; Neustupný & Nekvapil 2003; Nekvapil & Sherman 2009). It can be classified as a proactive strategy, in cases when one starts to use foreigner talk in anticipation of one's interlocutor's communication problems, i.e., when the problems have not occurred yet (and thanks to the use of foreigner talk, they do not even have to occur). If, however, one starts to use it after perceiving the communication problems of the interlocutor, it is a reactive strategy. In both cases, the use of foreigner talk is an act of SM, and it is one of the D-management strategies.

Using code-switching to bridge the language gap (see Lanstyák & Szabómihály 2009) is another alleviation strategy within SM for those speakers who believe in

---

21 The ultimate objective is not always to be more understandable, but also to prevent being considered a not fully competent speaker of the Hungarian language or even being a non-Hungarian.

22 With regard to the use of foreigner talk for a different, non-linguistic aim, see Fairbrother (2015).

purist, standardist and Platonist ideologies; for those believing rather in pluralist ide-
ologies it may be a solution strategy. As it occurs within discourse, code-switching
is another instance of D-management. The regular use of codeswitching leads to
borrowing, which can be considered a way of solving the communication problem
in the informal spoken register, but seldom in formal spoken or written registers.
However, for those believing in the purist, standardist and Platonist ideologies, the
problem may persist, as the use of loanwords may be perceived as only a way of
alleviating the problem (Lanstyák 1999–2000).

Strengthening indigenous languages in post-colonial multiethnic states is another
typical case of an alleviation strategy in cases when nobody can believe that these
languages may really become equal in relation to the long-established languages of
the powerful groups of previous colonizers. In contrast to the previous discourse-
based examples, this can be regarded as an act of C-management in the context of
OM. For instance, in South Africa, after the fall of the apartheid regime, nine in-
digenous languages were accorded official status, along with the previously official
languages, English and Afrikaans. Although this act of status planning "has changed
the parameters of power relations between the symbolic attributes of groups and
regions" (Blommaert 2007: 137), the sociolinguistic reality of South Africa is such that
English and Afrikaans continue to enjoy a higher status and play a more dominant
role in society than other languages, despite having relatively fewer native speak-
ers than most indigenous African languages (Kamwendo 2006; Blommaert 2007;
Ricento 2007).

5.3 Solution

Solution is an involvement strategy which consists of making adjustments, via
which the participants intend to *completely* remove the problem.[23] This does not
mean that new problems will not come into existence as an unwanted consequence
of the problem solution (either linguistic or non-linguistic). In the case of OM, it
is basically the circumstances of language use that are changed (C-management),
whereas in the case of SM, it is the discourses that are adjusted (D-management).

In the case of the OM of complex metaproblems, which are also referred to as
'wicked', 'messy' or 'ill-defined' and 'ill-structured' problems (in general problem
management literature see Rittel & Webber 1973; Whelton & Ballard 2002; in the
LM context see Lanstyák 2014), the solution is more a theoretical than a real op-
tion. "[T]here are few language issues where we achieve a full resolution; applied
linguists – like all scholars – are involved in a continual process of striving, often
making progress, but rarely fully attaining" (Gibbons 2007: 429). Solution is a strat-
egy – together with alleviation – which can have a very different outcome than
anticipated. "Examples of successful language planning and policy implementation

---

23 When the strategy of solution is applied proactively, it may be called prevention in
    the stricter sense of the word.

in which stipulated goals, widely shared by all affected groups, are substantially achieved are relatively rare" (Ricento 2007: 212).

We should be aware of the fact that 'solution' cannot be equated with 'good solution'. On the one hand sometimes, because of poor funding, the incompetence of managers or for other reasons, 'worse than best' solutions may be planned. On the other hand, often solutions are beneficial for some members of the concerned community, and detrimental to others (Lanstyák 2014, 2015). What is considered a good or bad solution is, to a great extent, influenced by language ideologies.

Some problems require solutions that may take years or decades to be completed, e.g., acquiring literacy or learning/acquiring a new language in order to solve communication problems (cf. Neustupný 1978). In such cases, the problem can be seen as being gradually alleviated before it is finally solved. Indeed, the process of learning itself is packed with various language problems (cf. Davies 2007).

In LMT, 'solution' as a LM strategy is usually taken for granted, or it is tacitly equated with 'language management', therefore it is not analysed as a LM strategy. All that has been written about the difficulties of reaching an overall solution to a problem pertains to the OM of metaproblems: authors emphasize the need for taking into account the communicative, socio-cultural and socio-economic determinants of the problems as a prerequisite of successful management (e.g., Hübschmannová & Neustupný 2004; Kaplan & Baldauf 2005; Nekvapil 2006). The situation is fairly different in SM, where a lot of tiny inadequacies, like correcting a slip of the tongue, are generally solved successfully in the course of D-management. One of the most typical kinds of SM of inadequacies on the micro level is the correction of speech errors in discourse. Examples of this kind are referred to in the LMT literature quite frequently, the reason for which may be the fact that LMT originated from 'correction theory', which dealt primarily with the issue of corrective interventions into language use (Neustupný 1983, 1994; Nekvapil 2006; Nekvapil & Nekula 2006).

Interlinguistic comprehension problems can be either alleviated or solved through translation or interpretation. Here the strategy is applied proactively, to prevent communication problems. Translating or interpreting is an adequate way of solving comprehension problems if it is not crucial to understand every detail of the text. Interpreting speeches at a cultural event (e.g., at the opening of an exhibition) or even interpreting papers at a scholarly conference may be such cases.

Problems relating to 'correct', i.e., standard, language use and language incompetence in general can be successfully solved, or at least alleviated either within an SM or an OM framework. SM may consist of consulting grammar books, dictionaries, stylistic handbooks etc. or asking for help from somebody else, which are acts of C-management all resulting in D-management, i.e., influencing the realization of the discourses. OM on the micro level may consist of learning the standard language, or its formal registers, e.g., by way of conscious exposure to many (formal) standard language texts. OM on the macro level may consist of making the teaching of the mother tongue and foreign languages more effective, or writing and publishing dictionaries and handbooks (cf. Nekvapil 2007; Davies 2007); all these are cases of C-management, with the ultimate aim of changing future discourses (D-management).

In some cases, restandardization or destandardization may be accomplished, which is, however, rather I-management than C-management or D-management.

One of the most complex language problems is the revitalization of a dying language or the revival of a dead language. One (the only?) example of a very successful complex language revival process is the 'raising' of the Hebrew language 'from the dead' during the 19th and 20th centuries. Of course, all cases of language revitalization are instances of applying solution strategies, since the aim of the language managers cannot be less than a solution, even if the actual result is total failure or a slowing down of the language shift at best.

6 I-management strategies

I-management strategies are strategies aimed at influencing participants' thoughts about the linguistic and non-linguistic aspects of the language problems. With regard to the linguistic aspects, I-management entails using various language ideologies. Ideas about the problem situation are often conveyed to the participants by way of C-management, e.g., by producing TV programs the aim of which is to show how a problem 'has already been solved' (i.e., it does not exist anymore) or that it is not as serious as people think it is.

6.1 Ignoring, denial and belittlement

These three strategies are involvement strategies which share one characteristic feature: in each of them the participants are manipulated into believing something about an existing problem which they would not have thought of otherwise. There are several reasons for treating them together. One is that they have an important trait in common; the aim of all the three is to prevent the problem from being managed in a meaningful way. Another reason for treating them in the same subsection is that relatively little is known about them. Furthermore, it is not always easy to distinguish them in practice, even if the distinction between them is theoretically clear-cut. Finally, there is a lack of concrete examples in the literature, not counting as an example the situation when the belittlement of someone's language competence is the problem itself (Fairbrother 2015).

Ignoring means consciously acting as if the problem did not exist, without verbally denying or belittling it. It seems similar to the non-involvement strategy of endurance, but in fact it differs from it substantially. If a problem is endured, it may be talked about, while if a problem is ignored, all possible efforts to alleviate or solve it are killed by the 'conspiracy of silence'. In the case of endurance, the participants do not oppose the meaningful treatment of the problem, they merely lack the power to do so. Denial refers to verbally disclaiming an existing problem and acting as if it did not exist, whereas belittlement means talking about the problem as if it were less serious than it really is. Since the aim of the 'managers' in all these cases is to make stakeholders *think* something about the problem (in extreme cases, to think that it does not exist at all, in other cases that is does exist,

but is less grievous than it seems to be), it is the thoughts that are managed, i.e., this kind of LM is I-management.

These I-management strategies may be accompanied by attempts to conceal the problem (in the case of ignoring and denial) or to create the impression that the problem is much less serious than it really is (in the case of belittlement) by way of C-management activities. However, this C-management is not intended to solve the problem or lessen its weight. On the contrary, it aims at preventing the problem from being solved or even from being alleviated. As an example we may refer to the situation when bilingual Hungarians living in the countries around Hungary and attending schools with Hungarian as the language of instruction are taught Hungarian as a mother tongue from textbooks which apply the same monolingualist approach as textbooks used in Hungary, instead of using textbooks designed specifically for them, which take into account their bilingualism and the language problems caused by their limited exposure to their mother tongue. Designing, producing and using textbooks with a monolingualist approach are acts of C-management with the aim of strengthening the conviction that bilingualism is not a problem.

'Ignoring', 'denial' and 'belittlement' are not specifically identified as strategies or ways of dealing with language problems in LMT. Yet some examples of them are mentioned in the literature on LMT, without explicitly identifying them as such. For example, Muraoka (2009: 161) deals with the strategy of "making unsolvable problems covert", which is either identical or closely related to the strategy of ignoring.

Another example from the research using LMT is the denial or belittlement of the comprehension problems of Czechs reading Slovak articles on Czech webpages through the "downgrading and marginalizing of those who do not understand Slovak as deviants" (Sloboda & Nábělková 2013: 203). In this example, the alleged inability of a Czech reader to comprehend a Slovak article on a Czech web-page was categorized as only his personal, i.e., rather isolated, problem. On the other hand, if the ultimate aim of the managers had been to let the individual manage his or her comprehension problems without giving him or her help, this strategy would be a case of devolution.

The use of slang, or the interference of slang with the standard language, is often considered to be a problem in the Hungarian language community, although this problem is partly ideological in nature. According to Neustupný and Nekvapil (2003) the traditional OM strategy in the Czech language community and elsewhere concerning slang was not to mention it at all. This seems to be an instance of ignoring a language problem. Although many problems concerning slang in various languages are ideological in nature, they can be eliminated by changing the underlying ideologies (see the strategy of elimination below), however, some of the problems may be real.[24]

---

24 One such problem is the incomprehensibility of certain slang words for those who do not use them, but sometimes are exposed to them (as e.g., parents are exposed to their children's slang). Another is the problem of young people when learning the

6.2 Mitigation and elimination

The I-management strategies of mitigation and elimination are again well distinguishable on theoretical grounds. If the aim of the LM is to lessen the weight of the problem, but not completely remove it, the strategy employed is termed mitigation. If the aim is the complete removal of the problem by way of I-management, the strategy employed is elimination. However, since in the examples the intent of the language managers is not always clear, it is not always possible to separate the two cases.

Mitigation is an involvement strategy aimed at the reinterpretation of the problem situation in order to see it as devoid of some aspects of the problem. This can be achieved by changing the underlying language ideologies. Mitigation is different from belittlement in that its aim is to manage the problem, while the aim of belittlement is to create the impression that the problem is not as serious as the participants think, without changing the underlying ideologies. As discussed above, the weight of a problem may be lessened also by way of C-management. In order to distinguish the two cases, the latter is referred to as alleviation.[25]

Elimination is an involvement strategy which consists of the reinterpretation of a problem situation in order to see it as devoid of the problem. This occurs in cases when there are no outer world circumstances which would require change by way of C-management. Such a reframing can be achieved by changing the underlying language ideologies. The very best way to eliminate a problem is by turning it into asset. The problem may be done away with also by way of C-management but this latter case would be referred to as a solution strategy.[26]

While mitigation is not a clearly identified strategy in LMT, elimination is well-known, although it appears under a different name, or it does not get a separate label at all. Nekvapil (2009: 8) clearly describes elimination when he writes the following: "[W]hat an individual perceives as a problem can change, in other words, deviations from norms which the individual has consistently evaluated negatively can be evaluated neutrally, or even positively, with the passing of time." Following Fairbrother (1999), Sloboda & Nábělková (2013: 207), in connection with the use of Slovak on Czech web-pages, talk about "reprocessing", i.e., altering an ongoing LM process by "norm replacement", "de-evaluation", "re-evaluation" etc. All these processes evidently aim at changing language-related attitudes, such as changing

---

standard variety: they are not always aware of some slang words' stylistic value in the formal or neutral standard language variety, which may be a source of stylistic errors (involuntary diction shifts) in written texts intended to have a formal or neutral style (see Lanstyák 2010: 24–29).

25 As a generic term, 'alleviation' could of course be used in a broader sense of the word but here it is used to refer only to alleviation by way of C- or D-management.

26 As a generic term, 'solution' could be used in a broader sense of the word but here it is used to refer only to solution by way of C- or D-management.

the attitudes towards the appearance of a Slovak text on Czech web-pages so that it would not be considered a language problem.

The following language diary entry provides an amusing instance of elimination of the language problem (miscomprehension) by reinterpreting the context (actually, the 'real world') within SM:

Linda and Attila went shopping; after coming home Attila was showing his would-be mother-in-law, Margit, what they had bought. When showing her a delicate bar of soap, Attila commented: *Ezt magának vette*, meaning that Linda bought it for *herself.* However, since the word form *magának* is homonymous in Hungarian, the sentence could also mean 'She bought it for you' (using a V-form). This is exactly how Margit interpreted Attila's words; she thought her daughter Linda had bought the soap for her as a small present. That's why she reacted gladly by saying: *Oh, she needn't have bought me anything!* Attila did not tell her the truth, but accepted that the soap would be his future mother-in-law's. By telling Linda privately what happened and how he solved the problem, the act of reframing the situation was finished and the miscomprehension problem was eliminated by changing the interactant's original intention. Since no outer circumstances were changed in the process, we cannot identify this as an act of C-management. We cannot consider it to be an act of D-management either, since Attila did not try to reformulate what he said to convey the intended meaning (i.e., that Linda bought the soap for herself, not for her mother).

Many forms of linguistic discrimination can be mitigated within SM by participants believing that those who discriminate are not right. For example, somebody may be discriminated against at their workplace for speaking a non-standard variety. Although changing standardist and homogenist ideologies into pluralist ideologies in itself cannot eliminate the problem, it may become easier for people to bear such discrimination if they do not feel ashamed.

As is well-known, linguistic diversity is considered an asset by some and a problem by others (Ricento 2007). On the state level, linguistic diversity is a language problem first of all from nationalistic, homogenistic and puristic ideological stances. If these ideologies are changed into pluralistic ideology, the former problem may become an asset, i.e., multilingualism may be seen as a resource of national wealth (Fill 2007). Of course, many language problems remain and have to be managed, but their weight would probably be perceived as lighter.

The same may be said of dialect diversity, which is a language problem mostly for those who believe in the ideology of homogenism and standardism. If participants alter their views to a pluralistic stance, the former problem may become an asset; multidialectism may be seen as a sign of the wealth of the national language. As in the case of multilingualism, many language problems remain and have to be managed, but their weight would probably be perceived as lighter. A classic example is Norway, where through conscious LM toward fostering linguistic diversity, the language managers succeeded in changing negative attitudes towards dialects – not only rural, but also urban dialects – into positive attitudes (Omdal 1995).

As we know, not only regionally restricted dialects can be stigmatized, but also commonly used *koine* dialects,[27] if they are perceived as non-standard. There were, for example, efforts made to manage the problem of the stigmatization of the contact varieties of Hungarian in Slovakia, by reinterpreting Standard Hungarian as being pluricentric (Lanstyák & Szabómihály 1996, 2009; Kenesei 2006; Kontra 2011).

6.3 Acceptance

Acceptance is an involvement strategy which consists of acknowledging the existence of a problem and working out mental strategies to accept the existence of the problem without the intent to bring about changes in the circumstances of language use. Here, the *aim* is not to alleviate or mitigate the problem, only to put up with it; however, the *effect* may often be that the problem becomes mitigated (one feels it is easier to live with it now than before he or she accepted it and made it part of his or her life). Acceptance may be sometimes accompanied by adjustments in the circumstances of language use, when not consciously aimed at devolving, mitigating or solving the problem. So just like elsewhere, here it also can be seen that the theoretical types of strategies are in real life often intermingled.

Acceptance should not be confused with endurance. Acceptance is an active approach to the problem, finding a way (or more ways) to live with the problem, while endurance of the problem is its passive acknowledgement, a non-involvement strategy.

Acceptance has not been widely dealt with in LMT as an LM strategy. Only Muraoka's (2009: 158) pursuit to distinguish not only "avoidance strategies", but also "strategies for living with unsolvable problems" appears in the literature. He also asserts that "the management of unsolvable problems" plays a crucial role in contact situations (Muraoka 2009: 163).

A typical example of an acceptance strategy within SM is abandoning communication, either in general or concerning a topic for which the participant's language competence is not enough. (On the other hand, if one does not even deal with the topic to begin with, it can be taken to be the non-involvement strategy of avoidance.) However, this abandonment must be accompanied by certain management activities like explaining to one's interlocutor the nature of the problem, otherwise it would be 'endurance' of the problem, not 'acceptance'. Such explanation is a typical form of I-management, since it brings about changes in the interlocutor's mind, not in the outer circumstances.

---

27 According to Siegel (1985: 363), "a koine is the stabilized result of mixing of linguistic subsystems such as regional or literary dialects. It usually serves as a lingua franca among speakers of the different contributing varieties and is characterized by a mixture of features of these varieties and most often by reduction or simplification in comparison". However, in a looser use of the term, a koine may be simply a supraregional language variety used as a lingua franca, which for some (mainly ideological) reason is not accepted as a (regional) standard.

Observations in the bilingual community of Hungarians in Slovakia show that some Hungarian monolinguals do not just passively endure, but consciously accept, that they have no or minimal competence in Slovak and tolerate this state of affairs in general, which is an acceptance of the metaproblem. At the same time, they find ways to manage each particular language problem they come across by mostly avoiding some situations and asking for help in unavoidable situations. Although the metaproblem is accepted by the stakeholder, many of the concrete everyday inadequacies must be managed in a different way (e.g., asking someone for help, which is C-management).

On the OM level, one of the consequences of the world's great linguistic diversity is that the majority of the world's languages have too few speakers for it to be expedient to standardize these languages. That means that the speakers of these small languages will remain dependent on some other language or languages. In such situations it may be important to show the stakeholders that this is a problem they have to live with; they must accept that there are a number of resources which they can access only with the help of one or more other languages. Besides the mental process of accepting this situation, the management of concomitant language problems is needed and it is mostly accomplished by way of C-management (e.g., acquiring or learning other languages to be used in the functions which the small languages cannot fulfil).

7 Conclusion

This paper has dealt with the strategies of managing language problems within the theoretical framework of LMT. After the short definition of key concepts, such as 'language problem', 'language inadequacy', 'metaproblem', 'problem situation', 'management strategy', 'problem management', etc., various kinds of language management suprastrategies and strategies were discussed. The data came from varied sources, which enabled the identification of a great number of different strategies, some of them being scarcely attested in the literature on language problem management.

The main suprastrategies were identified on the basis of three criteria. The first was how the participants relate to the problems. According to this criterion two suprastrategies were distinguished. If participants do not actively deal with a problem, they choose a non-involvement suprastrategy. If they, however, decide to do something in order to remove the problem or make the problem situation to be, or at least to *look,* more favourable, they choose the involvement suprastrategy. The second criterion concerns when the problem is managed in relation to the time of the occurrence of the problem. On this basis, proactive and reactive management suprastrategies were differentiated. In the case of a proactive suprastrategy, participants deal with the problem situation before the problem actually occurs, whereas in the case of a reactive suprastrategy, they start dealing with the problem only after it has occurred. The third criterion relates to what is being managed. This led to the identification of three types of suprastrategies. If the immediate object of the management is discourse, as it appears in a concrete interaction, the participants will choose the D-management suprastrategy. If the participants decide to manage the circumstances of language

use (and as a consequence, the overall language situation), sometimes with the ultimate aim to bring about changes in the language system itself, they will apply a C-management suprastrategy. If they try to change the participants' way of thinking about the problem, they will apply an I-management suprastrategy. If nothing is managed, we may speak of an N-management (non-management) suprastrategy.

At the intersection of the non-involvement suprastrategy and proactive suprastrategy we find the avoidance strategy (evading situations where the problem could occur). Where the non-involvement suprastrategy and reactive suprastrategy meet, we find the endurance strategy (being confronted by a problem, but not avoiding or managing it). At the intersection of the involvement suprastrategy and the proactive suprastrategy we find nine strategies. The same nine strategies can be found at the crossing point of the involvement suprastrategy and the reactive suprastrategy, and moreover, their reactive application is more common than their proactive application. The proactively applied involvement strategies may also be considered to be a suprastrategy, which can be called the prevention suprastrategy. Similarly, the reactively applied involvement strategies may be considered to be part of an intervention suprastrategy.

Three of the involvement strategies are basically C-management strategies: devolution (aiming to transfer the burden of the problem onto somebody else), alleviaton (aiming to reduce the problem without getting rid of it) and solution (aiming to resolve the problem). This means that these strategies are accomplished mainly by means of C-management, although C-management may be accompanied by acts of I-management, and in the case of SM, also D-management.

Six of the involvement strategies are basically I-management strategies, which are often accompanied also by acts of C-management: ignoring (acting as if the problem did not exist), denial (refusing to acknowledge the problem's existence), belittlement (creating the impression that the problem is less serious than it is in reality), mitigation (mentally lessening the problem without managing the outer circumstances of the problem situation), elimination (getting rid of the problem by reinterpreting the problem situation), acceptance (mentally justifying the need to live together with the problem as it is).

D-management is possible only in SM, and its aim is usually the devolution, alleviation or solution of a problem.

Finally, this paper raises these important issues:

1. It is important to stress that the nature of the problem usually does not determine the strategy that will be followed. Some types of problems do preclude certain strategies, while others can be managed in a variety of different ways. The same language problem or language-related social problem can often be managed by applying a number of different LM strategies. Which one is chosen, depends to a great extent on language ideologies.[28] If the management strategy requires

---

28	The evaluation of the outcome also depends on ideologies.

monetary investment, this may be one of the most important factors in deciding which strategy to choose.

2. There is a great difference between strategies dealing with inadequacies and those dealing with metaproblems (Fairbrother & Masuda 2012; Lanstyák 2014). This partly correlates with the difference between SM and OM. Many problems that are unmanageable for an individual in a particular situation may be handled in the OM process (e.g., a lack of certain terminology in the language), and the other way round; individuals may solve an inadequacy, but the metaproblem persists (e.g., the individuals manage the problem of comprehension in a given situation, but they must live with their incompetence in that language).

3. The investigation of the strategies of managing language problems should continue along two different tracks: the SM and the OM process should be studied separately and *then* synthesized. This is because the compound treatment prevents us from seeing the peculiarities of the two approaches. Further reasons for separating the two are the vast differences in the complexity of the task,[29] in the proficiency of the participants and in the overall aims of the LM process (Lanstyák 2014).

---

29 For example, it is simply absurd to treat the correction of a slip of the tongue on the one hand and the revitalization of a dying language on the other hand alike.

Appendix

An example of the possible ways of managing a language problem

Language problem		
Inadequacy	**Metaproblem**	
Interactional level management	*Supra-interactional level management*	
Micro level management		*Macro level management*
Simple management		
	Organized management	
The problem — An individual does not understand an official letter received from a governmental office, which contains administrative and legal terminology.	Comprehension problems with official texts containing administrative and legal terminology.	
Possible LM strategies — The individual consults dictionaries and encyclopaedias or other aids (if they exist and if he or she has access to them).	The individual regularly consults dictionaries and encyclopaedias or other aids (if he or she does not have such at his or her disposal, he or she acquires them to be able to use them regularly).	Initiating research on administrative and legal terminology and publishing specialized dictionaries and encyclopaedias or other aids.
	If he or she considers the metaproblem grievous enough to invest more into it, he or she may consciously learn the administrative terminology and get trained in understanding the formulations typical for these registers.	Initiating changes in the educational system to train students at schools, colleges and universities to understand these registers better.
		Changing the way of formulating these texts to make them simpler and thus more understandable for laypersons of any educational background (i.e., launching a 'Plain Language Movement')

References

Blommaert, J. (2007) Linguistic diversity: Africa. In M. Hellinger & A. Pauwels (eds) *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 123–149.

Carli, A. & Calaresu, E. (2007) Language and science. In M. Hellinger & A. Pauwels (eds) *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 523–551.

Christis, J. (2005) Theory and practice of soft systems methodology: A performative contradiction? *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 22, 11–26.

Davies, A. (2007) *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics. From Practice to Theory.* (2nd edition.) Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Edwards, J. (2004) Language minorities. In A. Davies & C. Elder (eds) *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* Malden, USA etc.: Blackwell Publishing, 451–475.

Fairbrother, L. (1999) *The Management of Cultural Deviations in Contact Situations.* Unpublished M.A. thesis. Chiba: Chiba University.

Fairbrother, L. (2015) The management of language and power in intercultural contact situations in Japan. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 232, 59–78.

Fairbrother, L. & Masuda, Y. (2012) Simple management in contact situations: What factors determine whether a deviation will be noted or not? *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 22 (2), 213–231.

Fan, S. K. (2009) Language planning or language management: Treatment of problems for the development of "Japanese in context". *Intercultural Communication Studies* 21, 7–35.

Feldman, M. S. & Orlikowski, W. J. (2011) Theorizing practice and practicing theory. *Organization Science* 22, 1240–1253.

Fill, A. (2007) Language contact, culture and ecology. In M. Hellinger & A. Pauwels (eds) *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 177–207.

Gal, S. (2006) Migration, minorities and multilingualism: Language ideologies in Europe. In C. Mar-Molinero & P. Stevenson (eds) *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices. Language and the Future of Europe.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 13–27.

Gibbons, J. (2007) Forensic linguistics. In M. Hellinger & A. Pauwels (eds) *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 429–457.

Grin, F. (1998) *Language policy in multilingual Switzerland: Overview and recent developments.* Paper presented at the Cicle de confèrencies sobre política linguistic:

Direcció general de política linguistic. Barcelona, December 4, 1998. On WWW at http://www.ecmi.de/uploads/tx_lfpubdb/brief_2.pdf. Accessed August 3, 2017.

Hübschmannová, M. & Neustupný, J. V. (2004) "Terminological" processes in North-Central Romani. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 5 (2), 83–108.

Jackson, M. C. (2003) *Systems Thinking: Creative Holism for Managers.* Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Janicki, K. (1989) Rebuttal of essential sociolinguistics. *York Papers in Linguistics* 13, 167–178. On WWW at http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED320406.pdf. Accessed August 3, 2017.

Jernudd, B. H. (1991) The fifth lecture: Individual discourse management. In B. H. Jernudd, *Lectures on Language Problems.* New Delhi: Bahri Publications, 62–68.

Jernudd, B. H. & Neustupný, J. V. (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.

Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M. & Møller, J. S. (2011) Polylanguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities* 13 (2), 23–37.

Jørgensen, J. N. & Varga, S. (2011) Norms and practices of polylingual behaviour: A sociolinguistic model. *ESUKA – JEFUL* 2 (2), 49–68.

Kamwendo, G. H. (2006) No easy walk to linguistic freedom: A critique of language planning during South Africa's first decade of democracy. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 15 (1), 53–70.

Kaplan, R. B. & Baldauf, R. B. Jr. (2005) Editing contributed scholarly articles from a language management perspective. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 14 (1), 47–62.

Kenesei, I. (2006) Hungarian as a pluricentric language. Presentation at the EFNIL Conference in Madrid, November 20, 2006. On WWW at http://www.efnil.org/conferences/archives/madrid-2006/papers/07-EFNIL-Madrid-Kenesei.pdf. Accessed August 7, 2017.

Kontra, M. (2011) Language contact issues in Central Europe. *Język, Komunikacja, Informacja* 6, 45–61.

Langman, J. & Lanstyák, I. (2000) Language negotiations in Slovakia: Views from the Hungarian minority. *Multilingua* 19 (1–2), 55–72.

Lanstyák, I. (1999–2000) Types of loanwords in the varieties of Hungarian in Slovakia. *Philologia Fenno-Ugrica* 5–6, 15–48.

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

Lanstyák, I. (2014) On the process of language problem management. *Slovo a slovesnost* 75 (4), 325–351.

Lanstyák, I. (2015) Záludné jazykové problémy: čo s nimi? [Wicked problems: What to do with them?] In J. Wachtarczyková, L. Satinská & S. Ondrejovič (eds) *Jazyk v politických, ideologických a interkultúrnych vzťahoch* [Language in political, ideological, and intercultural relations]. Bratislava: Veda. 179–195.

Lanstyák, I. & Szabómihály, G. (1996) Contact varieties of Hungarian in Slovakia: A contribution to their description. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 120, 111–130.

Lanstyák, I. & Szabómihály, G. (2005) Hungarian in Slovakia. In A. Fenyvesi (ed.) *Hungarian Language Contact Outside Hungary: Studies on Hungarian as a Minority Language.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 47–88.

Lanstyák, I. & Szabómihály, G. (2009) Hungarian in Slovakia: Language management in a bilingual minority community. In J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (eds) *Language Management in Contact Situations: Perspectives form Three Continents.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 49–73.

Linell, P. (2005) *The Written Language Bias in Linguistics: Its nature, origins and transformations.* London, New York: Routledge.

Mintzberg, H. (1978) Patterns in strategy formation. *Management Science* 24 (9), 934–948.

Muraoka, H. (2009) A typology of problems in contact situations. In J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (eds) *Language Management in Contact Situations.* Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang, 151–166.

Nábělková, M. (2007) Closely related languages in contact: Czech, Slovak, "Czecho-slovak". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 183, 53–73.

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

Nekvapil, J. (2007) On the relationship between small and large Slavic languages. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 183, 141–160.

Nekvapil, J. (2009) The integrative potential of Language Management Theory. In J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (eds) *Language Management in Contact Situations.* Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang, 1–11.

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

Nekvapil, J. & Nekula, M. (2006) On language management in multinational companies in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 7, 307–327.

Nekvapil, J. & Sherman, T. (2009) Pre-interaction management in multinational companies in Central Europe. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 10, 181–198.

Neustupný, J. V. (1978) *Post-structural Approaches to Language. Language Theory in a Japanese Context.* Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

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

Neustupný, J. V. (1994) Problems of English contact discourse and language planning. In T. Kandiah & J. Kwan-Terry (eds) *English and Language Planning: A Southeast Asian Contribution.* Singapore: Academic Press, 50–69.

Neustupný, J. V. (2003) Japanese students in Prague. Problems of communication and interaction. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 162, 125–143.

Neustupný, J. V. (2005) Foreigners and the Japanese in contact situations: Evaluation of norm deviations. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 175–176, 307–323.

Neustupný, J. V. & Nekvapil, J. (2003) Language management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4 (3–4), 181–366.

Omdal, H. (1995) Attitudes toward spoken and written Norwegian. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 115, 85–106.

Paucar-Caceres, Alberto (2008) Operational research, systems thinking and the development of management sciences methodologies in the US and the UK. *Scientific Inquiry* 9 (1), 3–18.

Pintér T. & Menyhárt J. (2007) Nyelvek és lehetőségeik Malomhelyen [Languages and their possibilities in Malý Háj]. In C. Bartha (ed.) *Cigány nyelvek és közösségek a Kárpát-medencében* [Gipsy languages and communities in the Carpathian Basin]. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, 293–307.

Puccio, G. J., Mance, M., Switalski, L. B. & Reali, P. D. (2012) *Creativity Rising: Creative Thinking and Creative Problem Solving in the 21ˢᵗ Century.* Buffalo: ICSC Press – International Center for Studies in Creativity.

Ricento, T. (2007) Models and approaches in language policy and planning. In M. Hellinger & A. Pauwels (eds) *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 211–240.

Rittel, H. W. J. & Webber, M. M. (1973) Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences* 4, 155–169.

Schmid, M. S. & de Bot, K. (2004) Language attrition. In A. Davies & C. Elder (eds) *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* Malden, USA etc.: Blackwell Publishing, 210–234.

Siegel, J. (1985) Koines and koineization. *Language in Society* 14 (3), 357–378.

Simonsen, J. (1994) *Soft Systems Methodology: An Introduction.* Computer Science. Roskilde University. On WWW at http://www.jespersimonsen.dk/Downloads/SSM-IntroductionJS.pdf. Accessed August 3, 2017.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1990) *Language, Literacy and Minorities.* London: The Minority Rights Group.

Sloboda, M. & Nábělková, M. (2013) Receptive multilingualism in 'monolingual' media: Managing the presence of Slovak on Czech websites. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 10 (2), 196–213.

Stabej, M. (2007) Size isn't everything: The relation between Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian in Slovenia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 183, 13–30.

Stępkowska, A. (2010) Cantonal identity and the question of English as an intra-national language. *Styles of Communication* 2 (1), 126–139.

Tarone, E. (1980) Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning* 30, 417–431.

Ulrich, W. & Reynolds, M. (2010) Critical systems heuristics. In M. Reynolds & S. Holwell (eds) *Systems Approaches to Managing Change: A Practical Guide.* London: Springer, 243–292.

Vidal, R. V. V. (2005) The art and science of problem solving. *Investigação Operacional* 25, 157–178.

Whelton, M. & Ballard, G. (2002) Wicked problems in project definition. *Proceedings of the International Group for Lean Construction 10th Annual Conference*, Brazil, August 2002. On WWW at http://www.leanconstruction.org/media/docs/WickedProblemsinProjectDefinitionIGLC10.pdf. Accessed August 3, 2017.

Wodak, R. (2008) The contribution of critical linguistics to the analysis of discriminatory prejudices and stereotypes in the language of politics. In V. Koller & R. Wodak (eds) *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 291–315.

Zalabai, Z. (ed.) (1995) *Mit ér a nyelvünk, ha magyar? A "táblaháború" és a "névháború" szlovákiai magyar sajtódokumentumaiból 1990–1994* [What is our language worth if it is Hungarian? Documents from the 1990–1994 printed media about "road-sign war" and "name war"]. Pozsony [Bratislava]: Kalligram Könyvkiadó.

PRAGUE PAPERS ON LANGUAGE,
SOCIETY AND INTERACTION

Edited by Jiří Nekvapil, Tamah Sherman and Petr Kaderka

VOLUME 5

PETER LANG
EDITION

Lisa Fairbrother / Jiří Nekvapil / Marián Sloboda (eds)

The Language Management Approach

A Focus on Research Methodology

PETER LANG
EDITION

Contents

Part III: Exploring micro-level management

Part IV: Exploring attitudes towards languages and varieties

Epilogue