

ISTVÁN LANSTYÁK

Language Problems, Language Related Social Problems, Metalinguistic Activities

Abstract: The paper is concerned with various kinds of language problems. The main question it poses is what kinds of problems a theory of language (problem) management should deal with. Applied linguistics is engaged with three areas of problems: 1. language problems in the narrow sense of the word; 2. social problems related to language (verbal communication), which require to implement changes in discourses or in the so-called language system; 3. social problems related to language (verbal communication), which do not necessitate implementation of changes in discourses or in the so-called language system. The author's conclusion is that any theory of language problem management should address only the first and the second of the afore-mentioned problem areas.¹

Keywords: language problems; social problems related to language; language problem management; language management theory; behaviour towards language.

1. Introduction

Just like anywhere else in the world, also in Slovakia, the language users or whole language communities face numerous bigger or smaller language problems. The project called "*Language and Communication Problems in Slovakia and Their Management*"², which was launched in August 2018 and is to last until July 2022, aims at uncovering various types of language problems as well as concomitant communication problems which speech communities in Slovakia face, with a special regard to the Slovak community as the majority community, then to the Hungarian and the Roma communities, which are minority communities with a substantial number of speakers, finally the community of the Carpathian Germans as a small community. Within the Slovak community the problems which the researchers are dealing with include the problems of the use of standard Slovak and Slovak dialects as well as language problems related to teaching Slovak in the minority communities. As to the minority communities the researchers are investigating various kinds of language and communication problems in these communities and making propositions concerning the ways of their management. The pro-

1 This work was supported by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under the contract no. APVV-17-0254 as well as by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences through the Grammar Language Office of the Forum Minority Research Institute.

2 The Slovak title of the project: *Jazykové a komunikačné problémy na Slovensku*, abbreviated as JAKOPROS.

ject also includes theoretical and methodological questions concerning the investigation and management of language problems and their ideological determinants.

The theoretical background for the project as a whole is the Language Management Theory (LMT), more exactly the expansion of the LMT on the basis of the management theories of other types of problems³ and application on the Slovak linguistic and social context. LMT was developed by J.V. Neustupný and B.H. Jernudd in the 1970s and 1980s as a more comprehensive alternative of the Theory of Language Planning.⁴

The management of language problems in Slovakia has not always been based on scientific principles and approaches so far, it has either been spontaneous or politically manipulated, and some of the problems have not been tackled at all. By the application of scientific principles and approaches the research team wants to achieve that the experience with the general problem solving as well as language problem solving in different communities be used in the management of language problems in Slovakia.⁵

The project topic is being approached from two perspectives: the first is the theoretical base for the whole research and the other is the application of the theoretical concepts. This paper aims to be a contribution to the theoretical base of the project, by trying to answer the question what kinds of problems LMT or a new theory of language problem management should deal with.

2. The scope of LMT

As can be seen from the above description of the project, the key concept of the project is that of “language problem”. This concept is of utmost importance for any theory which aims at dealing with the management of problems connected in some way to a language or to languages. The traditional definition of “language problem” in LMT – a negatively evaluated deviation from the norms or expectations concerning the verbal, communicational and associated socio-cultural behaviour of the participants in a par-

3 The most important of those which have been studied are: social problem solving, creative problem solving, insight problem solving, planning in general, critical planning, collaborative planning, decision making, strategic decision making, theories of practice, operational research, systems thinking, design thinking and knowledge management, see Lanstyák 2014, 2015 with references to the relevant literature.

4 Among the most important works about LMT (or *Teória jazykového manažmentu* [TJM] in Slovak) belong Jernudd 1993; Nekvapil 2006, 2009; Neustupný–Nekvapil 2003. A large bibliography of works dealing with LMT can be found on the website of the LMT (<http://language.management.ff.cuni.cz/en/bibliography>; last accessed 2021.06.21.)

5 These and further details of the project can be found in the Obligatory scheme for basic research of the APVV project.

ticular interaction⁶ (cp. e.g. Nekvapil 2006: 97, 2009: 3, 2012: 160) – may be suitable for the small-scale simple management of inadequacies, but it seems much less satisfactory for the small-scale or large-scale organized management of metaproblems occurring trans-situationally.⁷ If we want to be able to define the “language problem” in a more comprehensive and at the same time more elaborate way, we must start with more general questions of how to delineate the scope of LMT, i.e. we should answer the question: What kinds of language problems should LMT be concerned with?

2.1. Language problems proper

We may possibly limit “language problems” to those instances when changes in the discourse or in the so-called language system⁸ are being brought forth predominantly for linguistic and communicative reasons. That means that the foremost goal of language managing activities is to enhance the quality of communication or eliminate miscomprehension in communication.⁹ Of course, speaking in a different way in order to communicate more efficiently is usually not the ultimate aim of the interaction, only a means to achieve some other, non-linguistic aim, so it may not be simple to separate this group of problems from those below. One would think, for instance, that creating a standard language has purely linguistic and communicative goals, i.e. to be able to

6 For the sake of simplicity, I will use „norms” for the clumsy phrase „norms of expectations concerning the verbal, communicational and associated socio-cultural behaviour of the participants in a particular interaction”.

7 “Simple management” is a kind of management affecting few people, not requiring many resources; it may be spontaneous, even unconscious; it is typically interactional. In contrast, “organized management” affects many people or groups; it requires more resources; it is always conscious, directed and systematic; it is always supra-interactional (see e.g. Neustupný–Nekvapil 2003: 185; Nekvapil 2012: 10–11; Nekvapil–Sherman 2015). An “inadequacy” is an individual instance of a problem rising in a concrete interaction which is often managed within the same interaction (see e.g. Jernudd 1991: 62–63, 2009: 247). A “language metaproblem” as a concept is abstracted from many particular interactions; a metaproblem can be identified supra-interactionally (Lanstyák 2014, 2018). “Small-scale management” is a management of a problem affecting either an individual or a small group of people forming a small social system. “Large-scale management” is a management of a problem affecting a large group of people forming a large social system (Lanstyák 2014, 2020).

8 I use “language system” as a set of language ideologies about the regularities in the inner structure of the discourses which help us make out how the discourses are produced and understood.

9 Some of the activities of this kind are listed in Bianco (2004: 749): “purification, revival, reform, standardization, spread, lexical modernization, terminology unification, stylistic simplification, interlingual communication, language maintenance, and auxiliary-code standardization”.

communicate within a language community in the most efficient way, yet we know that often there is a hidden or unhidden agenda behind it, e.g. nation building, gaining political independence, elite closure etc. (Cf. Milroy 2001: 534–5)

This group of problems best conforms to the traditional definition of “language problem” in LMT: they usually manifest themselves in deviations from the norms (even if it is not always simple or even possible to identify these norms). Some of these problems can be successfully managed within the simple management, especially the micro level inadequacies. E.g. correcting a slip of the tongue has evidently purely linguistic and communicative reasons: to ensure the grammaticality, stylistic adequacy and comprehensibility of the discourse.

The requirement of the goals being predominantly linguistic does not mean that the means of accomplishing them should also necessarily be “linguistic”. On the contrary: it is duly emphasized in LMT that successful treatment of language problems – especially those which are handled within large-scale organized management – involves intervention into a number of fields outside linguistics. For instance to incorporate new terminologies into a language will not be successful if it consists only of coining new words and phrases and no attempt is made to disseminate them during the implementation phase of the LM process. (Cf. Hübschmannová–Neustupný 2004) Dissemination inevitably requires managing the outside world, not the language itself; something what Neustupný and other proponents of LMT call communication management and socioeconomic or sociocultural management. (See e. g. Neustupný–Nekvapil 2003: 186 and *passim*; Nekvapil 2009: 8–9; Neustupný 2012: 299) The management of many problems involves also the management of concurrent language ideologies.

2.2. Language related social problems (where intervention is needed)

Since the borderline between language problems proper and other kinds of language related problems is blurry, it may seem feasible to extend the concept of “language problems” to include those non-linguistic – social, political, educational, cultural, religious, etc. – problems the management of which requires changes in discourses or ultimately in the so-called language system, even though the real goals are clearly non-linguistic and non-communicative, e.g. lessening discrimination based on unequal allocation of power by “PC talk” or giving a new name to an Australian “rat-like” animal in order to save it from extinction¹⁰.

10 A number of marsupial species of animals in Australia got on the verge of extinction because their indigenous names had been replaced by the English *rat* or *mouse*. The names like *black-footed tree rat* are not only erroneous from biological point of view (these species are not related to rats or mice), but they arouse from people “bloodthirsty” attitudes similar to those which they have towards genuine rats and mice. A return back to aboriginal names has

I would definitely argue for including this type of problems among the issues which should be managed within the LMT framework. One of the arguments is the intent of bringing forth language changes. It seems expedient that all interventionist approaches should be considered part of LMT. Although these problems probably seldom manifest themselves in deviations from the linguistic and communicative norms, they clearly demonstrate the participants' "behaviour towards language" (see below) and so they are legitimate object of interest of experts in LMT.

Another argument in favour of the inclusion of this type of problems among language problems to be dealt with in the LMT framework is the great social utility of managing language related social, political, educational, cultural, religious etc. problems. As we know from critical discourse analysis and other critical approaches, language helps to create and sustain a lot of social injustice. Eliminating or alleviating social injustice is a non-linguistic goal, but it can be fostered by linguistic means, which may require changes in discourses and even in the language system. This should therefore be considered part of LMT, even if most laymen do not realize that discriminatory language use is a problem¹¹, and so these issues cannot be comfortably tackled within the "problem-is-what-the-layman-perceives-as-problem" paradigm.

Finally, as was suggested above, the large-scale metaproblems are seldom purely linguistic and communicative, they usually (maybe always) have social consequences; this is also a reason why LMT and other possible language problem management approaches should be concerned also with that kind of social problems the management of which entails intervention into discourses or language ideologies.

2.3. Language related social problems (where no intervention is needed)

Theoretically, we have the possibility to extend the category of LM even further, to every language-oriented act (or dealing) which reflects any possible form of "behaviour toward language", not just interventional behaviour.

"Behaviour toward language" as opposed to ordinary "language use" is mentioned as a matter of course in the works about LMT. (See e.g. more recently Sloboda et al. 2010: 95–6; Nekvapil 2011: 880; Marriott–Nekvapil 2012: 155; Nekvapil–Sherman 2013: 91) It is not clear, however, what this ready-made term is to denote exactly. Although in theory the authors claim that language management covers *all*

been proposed in order to change these attitudes and thus prevent their extermination. (Fill 2007: 198–199) On language related social problems from the applied linguistic perspective see e.g. Bianco 2004; Davies 2004, 2007; Davies–Elder 2004; Elder 2004; Pennycook 2004; Quang 2007.

11 As Gay (2007: 510) puts it: "While most people are conscious of the pain that words can cause, many social groups are often unconscious of injustices that language helps to create and sustain."

forms of “behaviour toward language”, i.e. all forms of metalinguistic activities (see Neustupný 1994: 52; Nekvapil 2009: 2; Dovalil 2013: 150), when specified, the authors usually have interventionist activities in mind. E.g. Nekvapil and Nekula (2006: 310) explicate “behaviour toward language” as “the activities aimed at the production and reception of discourse, that is, metalinguistic activities”. Activities aimed at the production and reception of discourse as *metalinguistic activities*, are undoubtedly interventionist activities (since ordinary language production and reception is not a metalinguistic activity), however, “metalinguistic activities” do not subsume only these two, but also metalinguistic reflection, i.e. thinking and consequent talking about language (including all linguistic research aiming at the description of discourses and language, with no intention to bring about changes in them).

A non-self-contradictory explanation of what “behaviour-toward-language” means, can be read in the announcement of the 3rd International Language Management Symposium, which defines language management “as any sort of *behaviour toward language*, in other words, *the various forms and manifestations of attention devoted to language or its use*.” It goes without saying that “attention devoted to language or its use” includes also non-interventionist metalinguistic activities like “innocent” reflexions about language and language use.

According to the cited statements all metalinguistic activities could be said to be the object of language management, including thinking and talking about language matters without the slightest intention to change anything in the discourses or in the language. In this case LMT should have concern – among others – towards problems dealt in forensic linguistics (Gibbons 2004, 2007; Coulthard–Johnson eds. 2010), like e.g. analysing the language of a blackmailing letter to find the blackmailer or deciding on the basis of a linguistic analysis whether a statement was a slander (and thus a language crime) or not, even if the management of such issues does not require intervention into the language. (Nobody would think of re-writing the blackmailing letter not to be blackmailing or a slanderous statement to be void of slander, let alone change the language in a way that no blackmailing letters or slanderous statement could be produced in it.) And we could go even further and present – say – Quirk’s *A comprehensive grammar of the English language* as a monumental example of language management effort – after all, a written grammar definitely belongs among “[v]arious forms and manifestations of attention devoted to the generation of sentences or communicative acts”. (Marriott–Nekvapil 2012: 156; see also Marriott–Nekvapil 2012: 155)

Since probably no proponent of LMT would like to go thus far, I tend to think that *all non-interventionist metalinguistic activities should be excluded from LMT*. In fact, actually they are *not* included, but theoretical definitions of LMT and the delimitation of “behaviour-toward-language” should be put in line with the practice. So broadly conceived language related problems do fall within the scope of applied linguistics, which shares with LMT its central interest in language problems (Davies–Elder 2004: 1–4, 11; Davies 2007: 158), but applied linguistics does not necessarily aim at bringing about changes in discourses or the language system.

4. JAKOPROS and language problems

Language problems dealt with in the project mentioned in the Introduction are typically unstructured, large-scale metaproblems called also “wicked problems”,¹² which have to be managed in an organized way. Both in respect to Slovak and in respect to the minority languages (Hungarian, Romani, and German) the focus is on the problems of minority speakers, whose variety or language is in some way stigmatized.

On the one hand the speakers of Slovak dialects (as opposed to the speakers of the Slovak standard) suffer discrimination, since the standard is the preferred variety considered “correct” and adequate to be used in public spaces; this way they can be considered a minority because of lack of political and social power to promote their interests. (Cp. Skutnabb-Kangas 1990) On the other hand the speakers of minority languages (as opposed to the speakers of the majority language, which is Slovak) are disadvantaged in many respects. Speakers of dialectal Hungarian and German (who constitute by far the greatest part of these speech communities) suffer double stigmatization: their varieties are considered less valuable both in respect to the Slovak language as such and the Hungarian and German standard, respectively. As far as Romani is concerned, the absence of a well-known standard variety prevents the speakers from feeling doubly stigmatized.

Though the management of the large-scale metaproblems is alleged to be based on the management of small-scale inadequacies in face-to-face communication in LMT, some of the ways of small-scale simple management of these problems are evidently unacceptable on the level of large-scale organized management.

One example may be suppressing dialectal features in face-to-face communication to prevent stigmatization, as a small-scale simple management of the problem. On the level of large-scale organized management the change of language ideologies should be fostered as the best solution: linguistic standardism should be replaced – or rather supplemented – by linguistic vernacularism, using additive approach to mother tongue education, i.e. considering the standard as a valuable variety which is to be added to the equally valuable vernacular variety without replacing it.¹³ As we can see,

12 The most important characteristics of the wicked problems (called also “messes”) are: they cannot be exhaustively formulated, it is impossible to define the aim of the problem management unambiguously, they do not have straightforward solutions, the outcome of the problem management is not scientifically predictable and not testable for effectiveness, those affected by the problem or those dealing with it make very different value judgements. (Rittel–Webber 1973; see also Whelton–Ballard 2002; for wicked problems in the language management context see Lanstyák 2014, 2015)

13 Linguistic standardism – or as it is often called: standard ideology – is the conviction about the superiority of the standard variety over other language varieties. (Cf. Lippi-Green, Rosina 1994; Milroy 2001; Deumert–Vandenbussche 2003) Linguistic vernacularism is a convicti-

the small-scale and the large-scale management are based on completely different attitudes: the small-scale management aims at preventing the problem by changing the linguistic behaviour, not dealing with the discrimination, while the large-scale management seeks to eliminate the discrimination.

Another example is using occasional code-switches into Slovak or ad-hoc paraphrases in the first language to fill in a language lapse or a language gap.¹⁴ These are often applied communicative strategies in Hungarian, Romani and German speech communities and as a matter of fact they solve the problem very successfully – in the framework of small-scale simple management of inadequacies in face-to-face communication. However, this strategy is not applicable at all in large-scale organized management of the “language lapse” or “language gap” metaproblem. One of the ways to manage these problems in the framework of large-scale organized management is to widen the scope of mother tongue education and of the bilingualism in these communities, so that the minority speakers would be exposed to the first-language equivalents of the Slovak words, phrases or grammatical structures, or (if they are already exposed to them to some extent), to substantially increase this exposition. (Lanstyák–Szabó Mihály 2005: 65, 2009: 62–64; see also Hübschmannová-Neustupný 1996) Again we can see that the small-scale management and the large-scale management are completely different.

The metaproblems mentioned above seem to belong to the first category of problems dealt with in Section 2.1. (language problems proper), since they all have to do with the “quality” of the communication, the way the discourses are formed, the difficulties the speakers come across when forming these discourses because of their restricted competence in the standard variety in the first example or in their first language in the second example. However, since their way of speaking is often stigmatized, the language problem is embedded into a social problem and thus the whole “package” can be said to be a language related social problem.

This way the examples presented above affirm our contention that both language problems proper and language related social problems requiring intervention into the “language” should be the object of language problem management in LMT and its expansion into a new theory that would include concepts and methodologies used in the management theories of other types of problems.

on about the great value of vernacular languages and of non-standard varieties of standard languages, which are the best vehicles for authentically expressing speakers’ local identity. (Lanstyák 2017)

14 I consider it a case of “language lapse” when a speaker is temporarily unable to recall a word or grammatical structure he or she is otherwise familiar with. A “language gap”, in my usage, is a case when a required word or structure is not part of the speaker’s linguistic system at all. (See Lanstyák–Szabó Mihály 2005: 65, 2009: 62)

5. Conclusions

The paper has dealt with the problem of delineating the scope of Language Management Theory and possible new approaches to language problem management stemming from it. It has aimed at identifying the kinds of problems which should be treated within the framework of these theories. In applied linguistics, three different circles of problems are handled: 1. language problems proper, 2. language related social problems whose management requires intervention into the “language”, 3. language related social problems whose management does not require intervention into the “language”. In contrast, it is argued that LMT and similar language problem management approaches should include only the first two of the afore mentioned three circles of problems.

Literature

- Bianco, Joseph Io 2004. Language Planning as Applied Linguistics. In: Davies, Alan–Elder, Catherine (eds.): *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Malden, USA etc., Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 738–762.
- Coulthard, Malcolm–Johnson, Alison (eds.) 2010. *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. New York, Routledge.
- Davies, Alan 2004. Introduction to Part I: Linguistics Applied (L-A). In: Davies, Alan–Elder, Catherine (eds.): *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Malden, USA etc., Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 19–24.
- Davies, Alan 2007. *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics. From Practice to Theory*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press Ltd. (Second edition.)
- Davies, Alan–Elder, Catherine 2004. General Introduction. Applied Linguistics: Subject to Discipline? In: Davies, Alan–Elder, Catherine (eds.): *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Malden, USA etc., Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 1–15.
- Deumert, Ana–Vandenbussche, Wim 2003. Research directions in the study of language standardization. In: Deumert, Ana–Vandenbussche, Wim (eds.): *Germanic Standardizations. Past to Present*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 455–469.
- Dovalil, Vít 2013. Ideological positioning in legal discourses on European multilingualism: Equality of languages as an ideology and a challenge. In: Barát, Erzsébet–Studer, Patric–Nekvapil, Jiří (eds.): *Ideological Conceptualizations of Language. Discourses of Linguistic Diversity*. Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 147–170.
- Elder, Catherine 2004. Introduction to Part II: Applied Linguistics (A-L). In: Davies, Alan–Elder, Catherine (eds.): *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Malden, USA etc., Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 423–430.
- Fill, Alwin 2007. Language contact, culture and ecology. In: Hellinger, Marlis and Pauwels, Anne (eds.): *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change*. Berlin–New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 177–207.
- Gay, William C. 2007. Language, war, and peace. In: Hellinger, Marlis and Pauwels, Anne (eds.): *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change*. Berlin–New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 493–521.

- Gibbons, John 2004. Language and the Law. In: Davies, Alan–Elder, Catherine (eds.): *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Malden, USA etc., Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 285–303.
- Gibbons, John 2007. Forensic linguistics. In: Hellinger, Marlis–Pauwels, Anne (eds.): *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change*. Berlin–New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 429–457.
- Hübschmannová, Milena–Neustupný, Jiří V. 2004. “Terminological” processes in north-central Romani. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, Vol. 5 Nr. 2. 83–108.
- Jernudd, Björn H. 1991. Individual discourse management (the 5th lecture). In: *Lectures on Language Problems*. Delhi, Bahri Publications.
- Jernudd, Björn H. 2001. What happened to language planning? *Noves SL. Revista de sociolingüística* 2/1. (http://www.gencat.cat/llengua/noves/noves/hm01hivern-primavera/internacional/jernudd1_3.htm; last accessed 2021.06.21.)
- Jernudd, Björn 2009. An apology for Language Management Theory. In: Nekvapil, Jiří and Sherman, Tamah (eds.): *Language Management in Contact Situations*. Frankfurt am Main etc., Peter Lang, 245–252.
- Lanstyák, István 2014. On the process of language problem management. *Slovo a slovesnost*, Vol. 75 Nr. 4. 325–351.
- Lanstyák, István 2015. Záludné jazykové problémy: čo s nimi? In: Wachtarczyková, Jana–Satinská, Lucia–Ondrejovič, Slavomír (eds.): *Jazyk v politických, ideologických a interkultúrnych vzťahoch*. (Sociolinguistica Slovaca 8.) Bratislava, Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV, 179–195.
- Lanstyák, István 2017. Jazykové ideológie (všeobecné otázky a glosár). In: István Lanstyák–Múcsková, Gabriela–Tancer, Jozef (eds.): *Jazykové ideológie v kontexte viacjazyčnosti na Slovensku*. Bratislava, Univerzita Komenského, 251–307.
- Lanstyák, István 2018. On the strategies of managing language problems. In: Fairbrother, Lisa–Nekvapil, Jiří–Sloboda, Marián (eds.): *The Language Management Approach: A Focus on Research Methodology*. Berlin, Peter Lang, 67–97.
- Lanstyák István 2020. Úrovne manažmentu jazykových problémov. *Jazykovedný časopis*, Vol. 71 Nr. 2. 229–246.
- Lanstyák, István–Szabó Mihály Gizella 2005. Hungarian in Slovakia. In: Fenyvesi, Anna (ed.): *Hungarian Language Contact outside Hungary. Studies on Hungarian as a minority language*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 47–88.
- Lanstyák, István–Szabó Mihály Gizella 2009. Hungarian in Slovakia: Language management in a bilingual minority community. In: Jiří Nekvapil–Tamah Sherman (eds.): *Language Management in Contact Situations. Perspectives from Three Continents*. Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 49–73.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina 1994. Accent, standard language ideology, and discriminatory pretext in the courts. *Language in Society*, Vol. 23 Nr. 2. 163–198.
- Marriott, Helen–Nekvapil, Jiří 2012. An introduction. “Noting” in the language management approach. In: Marriott, Helen–Nekvapil, Jiří (eds.): *Language Management Approach. Probing the Concept of “Noting”*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 155–159.

- Milroy, James 2001. Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, Vol. 5 Nr. 4, 530–555.
- Nekvapil, Jiří 2006. From language planning to language management. *Sociolinguistica*, Vol. 20, 92–104.
- Nekvapil, Jiří 2009. The integrative potential of Language Management Theory. In: Nekvapil, Jiří and Sherman, Tamah (eds.): *Language Management in Contact Situations*. Frankfurt am Main etc., Peter Lang, 1–11.
- Nekvapil, Jiří 2011. The History and Theory of Language Planning. In: Hinkel, Eli (ed.): *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Volume II. New York–London, Routledge, 871–887.
- Nekvapil, Jiří 2012. Some thoughts on “noting” in Language Management Theory and beyond. In: Marriott, Helen –Nekvapil, Jiří (eds.): *Language Management Approach. Probing the Concept of “Noting”*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 160–173.
- Nekvapil, Jiří–Sherman, Tamah 2013. Language ideologies and linguistic practices: The case of multinational companies in Central Europe. In: Barát, Erzsébet–Studer, Patric–Nekvapil, Jiří (eds.): *Ideological Conceptualizations of Language. Discourses of Linguistic Diversity*. Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 85–117.
- Nekvapil, Jiří–Nekula, Marek 2006. On Language Management in multinational companies in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7/2–3, 307–327.
- Nekvapil, Jiří–Sherman, Tamah 2015. An introduction: Language Management Theory in Language Policy and Planning, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, Vol. 232, 1–12.
- Neustupný, Jiří V. 1994. Problems of English Contact Discourse and Language Planning. In: Kandiah, Thiru–Kwan-Terry, John (eds.): *English and Language Planning: A Southeast Asian Contribution*. Singapore, Academic Press, 50–69.
- Neustupný, Jiří V. 2012. Theory and practice in language management. In: Marriott, Helen –Nekvapil, Jiří (eds.): *Language Management Approach. Probing the Concept of “Noting”*. (Journal of Asian Pacific Communication 22/2.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 295–301.
- Neustupný, Jiří V.–Nekvapil, Jiří 2003. Language Management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, Vol. 4, 181–366.
- Pennycook, Alastair 2004. Critical Applied Linguistics. In: Davies, Alan–Elder, Catherine (eds.): *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Malden, USA etc., Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 784–807.
- Quang, Vo Dai 2007. Critical applied linguistics: concerns and domains. *Journal of Science, Foreign Languages*, Vol. 23 Nr. 1, 34–51.
- Rittel, Horst W. J.–Webber, Melvin M. 1973 Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, Vol. 4, 155–169.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove 1990. *Language, Literacy and Minorities*. London, The Minority Rights Group.

- Sloboda, Marián–Szabó–Gillinger, Eszter–Vigers, Dick–Šimičič, Lucija 2010. Carrying out a language policy change: advocacy coalitions and the management of linguistic landscape. *Current Issues in Language Planning* Vol. 11 Nr. 2, 95–113.
- Whelton, Michael–Ballard, Glenn 2002. Wicked problems in project definition. In: *Proceedings of the International Group for Lean Construction 10th Annual Conference*, Brazil, August 2002. (<https://www.leanconstruction.org/media/docs/WickedProblemsinProjectDefinitionIGLC10.pdf>; last accessed 2021.06.21.)

Forum

Social Sciences Review

Társadalomtudományi Szemle

Content:

László Öllös

Hungarian–Slovak
Reconciliation
and the National Peace

László Gyurgyík

The Ethnic Composition
of Slovakia's Municipalities,
Based on the Data
of the 1950 census

Zsuzsanna Lampl

The Primary Results
of the last Hungarian
Identity Survey in Slovakia

István Lanstyák

Language Problems,
Language Related
Social Problems,
Metalinguistic Activities

Attila Simon

National Holidays
and the Hungarians
in Slovakia in 1919

Ágnes Tóth

The 1968 Resolution
on the Situation of the
Nationalities in Hungary

Judas Everett

Combatting
Illiberalism
in the Heart
of Europe:
Lessons from
Slovakia

Reviews

2021

5

FÓRUM TÁRSADALOMTUDOMÁNYI SZEMLE FORUM SOCIAL SCIENCES REVIEW

ANNUAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE
Volume XXIII (2021)

Editor
BARNABÁS VAJDA

Head of the Editorial Board
LÁSZLÓ ÖLLÖS

Members of the Editorial Board
Zoltán Biró A. (Romania), Csilla Fedinec (Hungary), Holger Fischer (Germany),
László Gyurgyík (Slovakia), Péter Hunčík (Slovakia), Petteri Laihonon (Finland),
Zsuzsanna Lampl (Slovakia), István Lanstyák (Slovakia), Zsolt Lengyel (Germany),
József Liszka (Slovakia), András Mészáros (Slovakia), Attila Simon (Slovakia),
László Szarka (Hungary), Andrej Tóth (Czech Republic), László Végh (Slovakia)

Content

Studies

| | |
|---|----|
| ÖLLÖS, LÁSZLÓ | |
| Hungarian–Slovak Reconciliation and the National Peace | 3 |
| GYURGYÍK, LÁSZLÓ | |
| The Ethnic Composition of Slovakia's Municipalities, Based on the | |
| Data of the 1950 census | 13 |
| LAMPL, ZSUZSANNA | |
| The Primary Results of the last Hungarian Identity Survey in Slovakia | 37 |
| LANSTYÁK, ISTVÁN | |
| Language Problems, Language Related Social Problems, | |
| Metalinguistic Activities | 61 |
| SIMON, ATTILA | |
| The Banned, the Controlled, the Shifted, and the Compulsory. | |
| National Holidays and the Hungarians in Slovakia in 1919 | 73 |
| TÓTH, ÁGNES | |
| In the Margins of a Party Resolution. The 1968 Resolution | |
| of the Political Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' | |
| Party on the Situation of the Nationalities in Hungary | 91 |

Central European Forum

| | |
|--|-----|
| EVERETT, JUDAS | |
| Combating Illiberalism in the Heart of Europe: Lessons from Slovakia | 107 |

Reviews

| | |
|--|-----|
| Öllös, László: European Identity (András A. Gergely) | 124 |
| Lampl, Zsuzsanna: The political identity of ethnic Hungarians in Slovakia, 1989-1990 (Gábor Csanda) | 128 |
| Gecse, Annabella: The Heart of Gemer/Gömör. Studies on the popular religious practice of Gemer/Gömör in Southern Slovakia (Péter Vataščin) | 131 |
| Liszka, József (ed.): Acta Ethnologica Danubiana 22. – Az Etnológiai Központ Évkönyve – Ročenka Výskumného centra európskej etnológie – Jahrbuch des Forschungszentrums für Europäische Ethnologie (Katalin Pajor) | 134 |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Guidelines for Authors | 136 |
|------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| Authors | 140 |
|---------------|-----|

Our journal is part of the European Reference Index for the Humanities and the Social Sciences – ERIH Plus evaluation system. The FSSR is part of the Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL) international database. Fórum Social Sciences Review is acknowledged by the Historical Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTA Történettudományi Bizottsága) as a fully accredited publication forum.

The publication is supported by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Magyar Tudományos Akadémia) and the Academic Council of Hungarian Scientists in Slovakia (Szlovákiai Magyar Akadémiai Tanács)

FÓRUM TÁRSADALOMTUDOMÁNYI SZEMLE / FORUM SOCIAL SCIENCES REVIEW

Editorial Office. In Hungarian: Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet, Park utca 4, Somorja, 931 01 Szlovák Köztársaság. In Slovak: Fórum inštitút pre výskum menšín, Parková 4, 931 01 Šamorín, Slovenská republika. In English: Fórum Minority Research Institute. Park Street 4, 931 01 Šamorín, Slovak Republic. • E-mail: vajdabb@gmail.com; ollos@foruminst.sk • Publisher: Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet Somorja / Fórum inštitút pre výskum menšín Šamorín, IČO: 34 028 587, represented by the Director, Attila Simon. • Making-up and graphics by Rokko Juhász – Kassák Intermediális Kreativitás Központ, Érsekújvár / Nové Zámky. • Price: 3 € • 2021. December • Registration Number: EV 904/08 • ISSN 2729-9740 • Internet: <http://www.forumszemle.eu>