

7TH INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE MANAGEMENT SYMPOSIUM

Language Management Theory (LMT) has gradually emerged as a distinct framework investigating language problems at both individual and institutional levels over the past three decades (Nekvapil 2006, 2012; Nekvapil & Sherman 2015). The increasing importance of LMT is demonstrated by the fact that the International Language Management Symposium was organised for the 7th time on August 30–31, 2021. The event was hosted by the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia, and, due to the pandemic situation, it was held entirely online.

The biennial International Language Management Symposium is one of the most important social and academic events for researchers working within the framework of LMT. The first symposium was held in Melbourne in 2008, and since then it has been organised every two years by different universities, always focusing on a special, overarching theme of the theory, from the act of noting to the language management of intercultural interactions.¹

The seventh symposium was titled *Standardisation as Language Management*. Accordingly, the presentations were primarily concerned with how standardisation can be interpreted within LMT, and what role standardisation (a process of intervention in linguistic variation) can play after social modernization, in today's era of linguistic pluralism (cf. Neustupný 2006). During the two-day symposium, participants had the opportunity to listen to a total of 2 invited talks and 17 session presentations.

The first day's invited lecture was given by Björn H. Jernudd (Washington, D.C.), a leading

scholar in the field and one of the founders of Language Management Theory (Jernudd & Neustupný 1987). The talk explored various approaches to standards, standard language and standardisation in language management. At the beginning of his presentation, Jernudd addressed how the concepts of standardisation and standard are interpreted in linguistics and beyond. He pointed to possible links between standardisation efforts and the theory and practice of language management. In addition to terminological and conceptual issues concerning standardised language varieties, the presentation also raised the question of whether there are uniform features that emerge whenever a standardised language variety is created. Jernudd also explained how and why different types of standardisation processes can occur. Finally, he demonstrated that Language Management Theory and language management methods help identify a broad range of issues and problems that can be addressed.

The first session, chaired by the conference host Petar Vuković, featured three presentations highlighting a range of areas for which LMT holds relevance from the study of various types of linguistic knowledge through the shaping of public policy to language consulting practices. The first speaker Martin Beneš (Czech Academy of Sciences) began by distinguishing between two levels of linguistic knowledge, namely implicit, unconsciously learned rules on the one hand and explicit, consciously learned, often prescriptive rule-sentences on the other, also commenting on their relationship (Beneš 2020). It can lead to language problems if the two levels of linguistic knowledge conflict with each other, i.e. if the linguistic norm in use is not in line with the learned and memorised rule-sentences. The presentation used a specific Czech example (*díky* 'thanks to' in a negative sense) to illustrate that prescriptive, disapproving rule-sentences can have an impact on usage. Hence it may be very difficult to obtain a real picture of what the norm is because of corrections made to texts due to rule-sentences. Beneš pointed out that

¹ See materials and additional information at <<http://languagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/>>.

we know little about the impact of non-corresponding rule-sentences, although this would be important since it has far-reaching consequences for the conceptualisation of norms and correct, adequate forms, and thus also for language planning.

The second speaker of the session, Alexandra Savić (University of Belgrade, Serbia) discussed how the theoretical frameworks of language policy and public policy are interrelated and what the benefits of an interdisciplinary approach can be. The lecturer started from the premise that language is a complex construct and cannot be investigated without paying attention to all sorts of other political and social phenomena. The lecture highlighted the potential, usefulness, and necessity of interdisciplinary research linking linguistics and political science by comparing the methods of language policy in sociolinguistics and public policy in political science.

The last presentation in the session allowed participants to learn about the work of the Language Consulting Centre of the Czech Language Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences. Kamila Smejkalová's (Czech Academy of Sciences) talk focused on the analysis of telephone interactions between enquirers and members of the Language Consulting Centre (LCC). The work of the LCC makes a significant contribution to linguistic standardisation because the language users' issues at the level of micro-management serve as a data source for the process of organised language management at the macro level (Beneš et al. 2018). Through the study of several examples, the presentation offered a detailed description of various types of inquiries (questions, complaints and requests for intervention, suggestions) as post-interaction management.

The contributions to Session 2, chaired by Marián Sloboda displayed rich thematic variety, highlighting numerous aspects of standardisation. Zsófia Ludányi and Ágnes Domonkosi (Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics and Eszterházy Károly Catholic University) considered standard ideology as the source of language problems. They analysed the language problems of Hungarian university students based on their language diaries. The analysis of a database of 120 language diaries and a total of 600 diary entries showed that in a standard-oriented culture such as Hungarian, the standard variety, in addition to its many advantages, can also be a source of language problems.

In their language diaries, students recorded interesting and noteworthy language phenomena and situations. These diary entries show that the language problems they observed can have a wide range of consequences, from simple feelings of discomfort to mockery, while the sanctioning of non-standard language use does not seem to be typical, according to the database.

The second presentation in this session was given by Alenka Valh Lopert (University of Maribor, Slovenia). Her talk consisted of a theoretical assessment of the situation and varieties of the Slovenian language and a part on related empirical research. Slovene has its standard variety, several non-standard varieties, seven dialectal groups, and regional colloquial varieties as well. The presented empirical research focused on the realisation of phonological elements of Maribor urban speech in the non-prepared spoken discourse of non-professional speakers in media discourse at two radio stations on the level of vowels. An important conclusion of the presentation is that non-standard characteristics of radio speech (Valh Lopert & Kolečnik 2018) may lead to changes in the spoken standard variety of Slovene.

This session was closed by Jiří Nekvapil, an internationally renowned expert on Language Management Theory (Charles University, Czechia). His presentation focused on the social and cultural environment that influences orthography and typography. He pointed out that orthography in all languages, including Czech, is loaded with social meanings and is often the subject of heated debates. He presented an orthographic attempt which, as a kind of pre-interaction language management, aimed at avoiding a particular language problem by introducing a new letter, the so-called 'middle ž'. The motivation for this avoidance strategy was that in Czech typographic practice the word '*Žid*' beginning with a capital letter denotes the Jewish ethnic group and the word '*žid*' with lowercase letter denotes the Jewish religion, but in many social and historical contexts, it is difficult or even impossible to distinguish between these categories. This situation is evaluated negatively by members of the ethnic group because in their opinion the rules of Czech orthography cannot capture the complexity of Jewish identities (Wein 2021). A recent attempt to introduce a 'middle ž' was aimed at investigating whether the use of a new letter would be an effective solution to this cultural problem.

The third session, chaired by Jiří Nekvapil, opened with a presentation by Oluhsola B. Are (Adekunle Ajasin University, Nigeria). He discussed the standardisation of Nigerian pidgin (also known as Naija language). As the most widely spoken language in Nigeria today, Nigerian pidgin is the major vehicular language, used mainly in informal contexts. The speaker explained that Naija is often promoted as a possible national language because of its political and ethnic neutrality, but most argue against this on the grounds that the language is not standardised. However, recent years have seen successful efforts at codification, as the Naija Language Academy has developed a Naija reference guide, phonetic alphabets, a comprehensive dictionary and a standard guide for its orthography. The author concluded that the major factor against the elevation of Naija to national language status is not the factor of standardisation or the lack of it, but the absence of political will.

Vít Dovalil's (Charles University, Czechia) presentation discussed the dynamics of how standard varieties emerge in pluricentric languages (cf. Dovalil 2018). The starting point of the research was that pluricentric standards of a language arise in discourses that are created by metalinguistic activities involving various actors. The author highlighted the difference between the management of monocentric and pluricentric standards through the example of labelling products in Austrian stores. While in the management process of the monocentric standard, deviations from normative expectations corresponding to the monocentric perspective are noted and evaluated negatively, in the pluricentric standard they are evaluated positively (gratification, see Neustupný 2003) or at least not entirely negatively. Therefore, gratifications of these deviations contribute to their stabilisation in public discourses.

The final speaker of the session, Petar Vuković (University of Zagreb, Croatia), discussed the failed reform of Russian and Czech spelling in the early 1960s from the perspective of LMT. The main aim of the reform initiatives was to facilitate the acquisition of spelling in schools, which was to be achieved by strengthening the correspondence between the phonemes in the language and the graphemes in the orthographical system. After reviewing the two spelling systems, the author analysed them in terms of LMT and pointed out that political power played a key role in the two reform initiatives.

The invited speaker on the second day of the symposium was Marko Stabej (University of Ljubljana, Slovenia), whose presentation focused on standardisation of the Slovene language and the attitude of Slovenian language users towards it (cf. Stabej 2007). In Slovenia, the standardisation process has recently undergone a significant transformation, becoming more data-driven and speaker-centred. Language policy-making relies heavily on dialogue with language users and on the competence of speakers. This is achieved through a portal designed to keep language users up to date on current language developments in Slovenia and an online forum for discussing sociolinguistic issues. However, the attitude of the community towards the standard language has not changed. Stabej sees the reason for this in the ideology of language in education.

The plenary speech was followed by eight presentations in two sessions. As on the first day of the conference, the topics of the presentations were varied, but on this day the focus was on the standardisation of language learning processes and the measurement of language proficiency as well as language management situations in the contact between languages and cultures. The fourth session of the conference, chaired by Vít Dovalil, included four presentations.

Goro Christoph Kimura (Sophia University, Japan) discussed the role of simplified languages as artificially created language variants, describing them as the result of a language management process. He compared the features, functions, and social contexts of the “Yasashii Nihongo” (simplified Japanese) in Japan and “Leichte Sprache” (easy language) in Germany. Although these two language varieties appear to be similar in function, they are placed in different social contexts. The German Leichte Sprache aims to better involve native speakers of German who have difficulty in reading complicated texts, such as persons with learning difficulties or intellectual disabilities. In contrast, the Japanese Yasashii Nihongo is aimed at foreigners living in Japan. The two simplified languages differ not only in their purpose but also in their direction of development. While in Japan the functions of the simplified variety are becoming relevant to various people and contexts, in Germany Leichte Sprache is primarily used to simplify formal texts. Kimura convincingly proved that the LMT framework can be used effectively

to analyse these essential differences beneath superficially similar linguistic phenomena. Different trends in the two simplified varieties can be described in terms of different language management processes, beginning with different noting and evaluation, followed by dissimilar adjustment plans, contrastive implementation, and feedback.

The second speaker of the session, Emi Murata-Margetić (University of Zagreb, Croatia) presented the transformation of JFL (Japanese as a foreign language) teaching and the situation of Japanese language teaching in Croatia. The phenomenon of standardisation in this field concerns attempts at standardising language teaching and the measurement of language proficiency. The Japan Foundation has developed a framework for the effective assessment of Japanese language learners' language proficiency, modelled on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. In Japan, certain residence permits, job opportunities, and in some cases, university admission depend on language assessment, and a test is needed that measures speaking, listening, writing, and comprehension. The speaker presented the language proficiency test developed by the Japan Foundation and related textbooks and websites, as well as the history of Japanese language teaching in Croatia.

In the next presentation, Tamah Sherman and Jiří Homoláč (Czech Academy of Sciences) also spoke about the possibility of standardising the measurement of language skills and testing immigrants' language competencies. They interpreted the testing of immigrants' language skills as organised language management. Since 2008, immigrants from outside the EU in the Czech Republic have had to pass a language test to obtain a permanent residence permit. However, testing does not always guarantee that they will actually learn and use the language. Based on so-called language biography interviews with test-takers, and semi-structured interviews with test designers, examiners and teachers, the authors have sought to find out what the connections are between the standardisation of language knowledge required through testing and individual processes of language acquisition and use, what the similarities are between speakers of different languages, and how the experiences of exam-takers can help the organised management of immigrant language acquisition.

Lisa Fairbrother (Sophia University, Japan) presented a specific problem of residents in Japan, caused by the lack of standardisation in the writing system. Foreign names can be transcribed in various ways in the Japanese writing system. This is particularly problematic for users with non-Japanese names when they are using digital services. These services vary in the characters and transcription methods they use, and set different limits for name length, thus some users may not be able to give their full names or may have to use different spellings when using different services. Based on the online comments of Japanese residents with 'non-Japanese' names and the experiences they describe in interviews, this presentation examined what kinds of name-related problems are noted and how they are managed. Fairbrother argued that the problems of writing non-Japanese names are discriminatory language practices whose management may ultimately require legislation.

The four contributions to Session 5, chaired by Tamah Sherman, concentrated on the topic of minority languages. The first presentation was given by Oliver Currie (University of Ljubljana, Slovenia) on the position of two minoritised, politically subordinate languages, Welsh and Scottish Gaelic, in the United Kingdom. The author pointed out the paradox that although these two Gaelic languages are increasingly present in the broadcast media and taught at schools, with central areas also experiencing an increase in population, there has been a continued decline in the proportion and number of speakers in their heartland areas as well as in their use as community languages, so their cultural status has been weakened. The talk concluded that language planning for minoritised languages needs to take into account certain factors, including social, economic and cultural changes, and try to anticipate the impact of these factors and changes on language maintenance, in particular of community level bilingualism with a dominant language.

The second presentation, given by Zuzana Týrová (University of Novi Sad, Serbia), focused on the sociolinguistic situation of the Slovak minority in Vojvodina, which is considered a multilingual region, since it is home to 26 ethnic groups. After giving an overview of language policies and legislation, the author went on to discuss language management and selected language problems in detail. In practice, there are still problematic issues

and areas, but also several positive developments. The author highlighted the need for preventive linguistics, language management for the preservation of Slovak as the language of the enclave.

Sean Meades (Algonia University & NORDIK Institute, Sault Ste. Marie, Canada) discussed language management and state formation in the Canadian white settler colony. The research combined several methods to investigate how Indigenous people at Baawating have adjusted their language choices in response to institutionalised language policy, and how Canadian “Indian policy” has affected the language choice of Indigenous people at Baawating. The conclusion was that Canada is experiencing a decline in linguistic diversity due to a number of influencing factors. The Anishinabe-dominant domains are gradually eroding, and recreating spaces for intergenerational transmission and new learners requires interventions in multiple spheres.

Tobias Weber (Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich, Germany), the final speaker of the session and also of the symposium, outlined a research approach that combines documentation efforts on minority languages with a developing standard language and sociolinguistic study on language attitudes, language policy and meta-linguistic discourse. He proposed a dynamic, bottom-up approach to deciding on standardisation and terminology, investigating modern languages in modern domains, focusing on content experts’ authentic language use. The first step in data collection is to document the professionals’ own language use. Data can be collected through structured interviews and focus group discussions with blue collar workers about their professions. The expected outputs of the research are language documents, policy recommendations and teaching materials. As an overarching theoretical background to the research, LMT focuses on meta-linguistic negotiations. The author concluded his presentation by stating that the synergy between LMT and Language Documentation could fruitfully contribute to research on standardisation and offer support for disenfranchised members of minority language communities.

Although the symposium was held entirely online for the first time, very exciting and thought-provoking discussions followed the presentations, not only in spoken conversation but also in writing, in the chat window.

The main aim of the symposium was to explore all basic aspects of standardisation processes from the perspective of Language Management Theory. The topic of standardisation was an important and productive choice as the main theme of the conference. The rich and varied presentations at the symposium confirmed Neustupný’s (2006) findings on standardisation, namely that it is linked not only to the emergence of a standard language variety in each language but also to language cultivation, the development of genres and terminology, language teaching (including standardisation of language testing processes), and the establishment of norms and standards for intercultural contact. Standardisation processes are often criticised for their restrictive role, but the presentations at the symposium all pointed to the function of the standard in creating equal treatment and equal opportunities, as it makes language proficiency measurable. At the same time, and in connection with the efficient apparatus of this theory, language management opens new possibilities of analysing the processes of language destandardisation.

Since the 7th Symposium also demonstrated how effectively LMT can be applied and what a broad range of contexts it is relevant for, the speakers and the conference organisers agreed that the symposium would again be held in two years’ time, as has been the tradition.

REFERENCES

- BENEŠ, M. (2020): Language rules, rule-sentences, and how they are interrelated, or Norm vs. codification. *Naše řeč* 103 (5), 393–408.
- BENEŠ, M., PROŠEK, M., SMEJKALOVÁ, K. & ŠTĚPÁNOVÁ, V. (2018): Interaction between language users and a language consulting centre: Challenges for language management theory and research. In: L. Fairbrother, J. Nekvapil & M. Sloboda (eds.), *The Language Management Approach: A Focus on Research Methodology*. Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Warszawa, Wien: Peter Lang, 119–140.
- DOVALIL, V. (2018): *Standard Varieties of Pluricentric Languages: A Language Management Approach* (= Working Papers in Language Management 3). Available online at: <http://language.management.ff.cuni.cz/system/files/documents/wp1m-03_dovalil.pdf>. Cit. 7/2/ 2022.

- 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.
- NEKVAPIL, J. (2006): From language planning to language management. *Sociolinguistica* 20, 92–104.
- NEKVAPIL, J. (2012): From language planning to language management: J. V. Neustupný's heritage. *Media Komyunikeshon kenkyu / Media and Communication Studies* 63, 5–21.
- NEKVAPIL, J. & SHERMAN, T. (2015): An introduction: Language Management Theory in Language Policy and Planning. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 232, 1–12.
- 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. (2006): Sociolinguistic aspects of social modernization / Soziolinguistische Aspekte gesellschaftlicher Modernisierung. In: U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier & P. Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society 3 / Soziolinguistik: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Wissenschaft von Sprache und Gesellschaft* 3. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2209–2223.
- 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.
- VALH LOPERT, A. & KOLETNIK, M. (2018): *Non-Standard Features of the Slovene Language in Slovene Popular Culture*. Maribor: Univerzitetna založba Univerze.
- WEIN, M. (2021): *Dějiny Židů v českých zemích: Od Hilsnera po Slánského* [The History of the Jews in the Czech Lands: From Hilsner to Slánský]. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.

Zsófia Ludányi – Ágnes Domonkosi

Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics, Institute for Language Technology and Applied Linguistics
Benczúr u. 33, 1068 Budapest, Hungary

<ludanyi.zsofia@nytud.hu>

<domonkosi.agnes@nytud.hu>

MEDZINÁRODNÁ SLOVOTVORNÁ KONFERENCIA V PREŠOVE

Jednou z odborných komisií pôsobiacich pri Medzinárodnom komitáte slavistov (MKS) je aj Komisia pre slovanskú slovotvorbu pri MKS¹, ktorá každoročne zasadá a diskutuje o derivatologických otázkach. Vlni sa komisia stretla vo Varšave pri téme *Slowotwórstwo w przestrzeni komunikacyjnej*, ale z dôvodu pandémie koronavírusu sa konferencia realizovala len online formou. Tohtoročné podujatie pod názvom *Slovanská slovotvorba: synchronia, inovácie, neologizácia*² sa uskutočnilo v dňoch 7. 9. – 9. 9. 2021 na pôde Filozofickej fakulty a Pedagogickej fakulty Prešovskej univerzity v Prešove a opäť len v online režime. Medzi spoluorganizátormi boli aj Slovenská jazykovedná spoločnosť pri Jazykovednom ústave Ľudovíta Štúra SAV a samotná komisia. Tematika konferencie sa pohybovala v okruhu inovácií a neologizácie so zreteľom na ich terminologické a teoreticko-metodologické aspekty, nomináciu a slovotvorbu, na jazykovoštruktúrne a komunikačno-pragmatické aspekty, interlingválne vzťahy, synchroniu a diachroniu. Organizačný tím pod vedením Martina Ološtiaka a Ľudmily Liptákovej pripravil zaujímavý program v rámci možností, ktoré dovolil virtuálny priestor.

Konferenciu otvoril Martin Ološtiak (za Prešovskú univerzitu v Prešove) a Gabriela Múcsková (za Jazykovedný ústav Ľudovíta Štúra SAV v Bratislave). Úvodné slovo patrilo predsedovi komisie Aľaksandrovi A. Lukašanecovi (Minsk),

¹ Medzinárodný komitét slavistov prijal návrh o vytvorení tejto komisie v r. 1994 na svojom plenárnom zasadnutí v talianskom meste Urbino. Iniciátorom vzniku komisie bol Igor S. Uluchanov z Inštitútu ruského jazyka V. V. Vinogradova v Moskve, ktorý novovytvorenej komisii predsedal do r. 2008 (od r. 2008 doteraz pôsobí vo funkcii predsedu Aľaksandra A. Lukašaneč). Prvá konferencia slovotvornej komisie sa uskutočnila v r. 1996 v ruskom Volgograde. Dávame do pozornosti správy o činnosti tejto komisie v českej literatúre (Bozděchová, 2007/2008, 2008). Bližšie informácie o komisii možno nájsť na: *Commission on Slavic Word Formation at the ICS/KCC при МКС*. Dostupné online na adrese: <<http://iml.basnet.by/commission-slavic-word-formation-ics-kss-pry-mks>>.

² Webová stránka konferencie je dostupná na adrese: <<https://slovotvorba-2021.unipo.sk/>>.