

# John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 22:2  
© 2012. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com)).

Please contact [rights@benjamins.nl](mailto:rights@benjamins.nl) or consult our website: [www.benjamins.com](http://www.benjamins.com)

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at [www.benjamins.com](http://www.benjamins.com)

## An introduction

### “Noting” in the language management approach

H. Marriott, J. Nekvapil

The papers published in this issue are in the first place devoted to empirical analyses of linguistic phenomena under a specific perspective, that is, Language Management Theory. The main contours of this theory / model / framework have been outlined in the work of J.V. Neustupný and B.H. Jernudd (see the classic paper Jernudd and Neustupný 1987). In this framework “language management” has been theorized in a particular way which does not resemble the majority use of the term in current sociolinguistics (see below on Spolsky’s more or less eclectic approach). At this moment, “language management” as conceptualized in Language Management Theory (LMT) can be defined as any sort of behavior toward language or various forms and manifestations of attention focused on language or its use (for a more specific definition of LM see below). LMT originated against the background of the language planning theory of the 1960s and 1970s and both Neustupný and particularly Jernudd were originally involved in this language planning research (Nekvapil 2011). However, they transformed this research into what has become LMT, followed by new generations of researchers, some of them represented in this special issue.

As Neustupný and Jernudd were integrated in dense sociolinguistics networks and were connected to a number of universities on several or more continents, LMT has gradually spread and became highly internationalized. Today its use is particularly visible in Australia (Melbourne), Japan (Tokyo) and Europe (Prague). Logically, there arose a need for a meeting of interested people from different places and thus the first international symposium on language management came into existence, and was held at Monash University (Melbourne) in 2008. The second symposium took place at Waseda University (Tokyo) in 2011, and the third one is planned to be held at Charles University (Prague) in 2013. The present issue, though based on the symposium of 2008, represents well the LMT centres given above, and the language situations emerging in the respective countries.

This issue does not represent the first contact of the Journal of Asian Pacific Communication with LMT. LMT was introduced to this journal by Jernudd (2000, 2001) with the purpose “to celebrate Professor J.V. Neustupný’s contribution to language management”. Four years later, Marriott (2004) edited a special issue focused on academic interaction and, again, the perspective used was particularly that of language management (see Neustupný 2004, for instance).

The starting point of LMT is that it is possible to differentiate two processes in the use of language: 1. The generation of sentences or communicative acts; and, 2. Various forms and manifestations of attention devoted to the generation of sentences or communicative acts. The second process is called language management. There are three main features of LMT (Nekvapil 2009: 8):

1. A processual view of language management, which means that the management can proceed in several phases, these being (a) “noting” of a language phenomenon (to date, this has been commonly viewed as a deviation from a norm); (b) “evaluation” of the noted phenomenon, which is labeled “problem” if evaluated negatively or “gratification” (Neustupný 2003) if evaluated positively; (c) planning of an “adjustment design” developed for the treatment of a noted and evaluated phenomenon; and, finally “implementation” of the planned adjustment design. The important thing is that language management can stop after any of the phases given above or recommence in a cyclical manner. This kind of language management is labeled “simple”, considering that all these phases take place in particular interactions.
2. However, in addition to “simple” management there is also “organised” management taking place in institutions of varying complexity (ranging from family to Ministry of Education, for instance), and LMT strives for the clarification of the relationship between these two kinds of management in addition to investigating these two major types of management themselves.
3. Though the name itself of Language Management Theory points to “language” as the main focus of the theory, this is not so because the theory covers much broader subject matter. Language management is seen in relation to communication and also sociocultural management.

Even from this brief outline it should be clear that Spolsky’s approach to language management, so widespread due to his recent book (Spolsky 2009), is very different, though he tries to eclectically integrate some features of LMT in his work (for the critique of Spolsky’s approach from the viewpoint of LMT see Sloboda 2010 and Dovalil 2011).

Clearly, by definition, there is no language management without noting and this is why a thorough examination of this phase is crucial for the study of management processes. The fact that a given phenomenon was noted leads to an important

question for the researcher: why did the speaker focus on this particular feature of his or her communicative act? The researcher can pose a question whether it indicates a possible language problem or, the other way round, does it indicate that the speaker has a possible positive attitude to a form of his or her communication? No doubt, such questions may be important not only in particular interactions in which at least proper understanding between the participants is at stake, but also in institutions taking decisions on language measures having long-term effects on the ways of communication in the whole society.

Research questions posed by the authors of the issue include: what linguistic or communicative phenomena are noted or not noted by the speakers (for example, lexical versus morphological deviations from the norm)? Under what circumstances (including the sequential course of the conversation) does noting takes place? Do the speakers note rather socio-cultural features than linguistic ones? What sociolinguistic features are noted and negatively evaluated in intercultural contact situations? What methods enable us to find out that noting occurred? What is the relationship between noting and further phases of language management? How does noting in everyday interactions connect to organized management? These are just a few of the issues addressed in this volume.

Nekvapil opens the issue with an elaboration of noting in LMT and its contrast with the concept of “noticing” in second language acquisition studies, arguing for a discursive approach to be used in empirical studies. He also deals with issues of awareness and examines the linkage between simple and organised management. Next, Sherman explores language management from a Conversation Analysis perspective by focusing upon explicit noting as displayed by “checking” in her data involving American missionaries speaking in Czech in the Czech Republic. She also refers to the connection between simple and organised management, in this case, the former being exemplified by interactions of the missionaries with speakers of Czech and the latter by the formal courses in Czech language taken by them. Sherman also uses her own data for reflecting on the larger problem of who is expected to solve specific language problems. Following on with an analysis of another naturally occurring type of interaction in society, Marriott examines an encounter between an Australian and a Japanese businessman and identifies various kinds of norm dissonance between the two individuals. Through employment of a follow-up (or stimulated recall) interview in conjunction with the discourse data, Marriott’s study identifies instances of noting in conjunction with negative evaluations of some of the communication found in the encounter.

A number of the papers in this issue are analyses of language management by students or users of an additional language. Fairbrother and Masuda outline various factors that influence the noting of deviations from what was expected in contact situations involving Japanese and non-Japanese interactants in Australia and

Japan. They categorise these factors into four main groups relating to the types of the deviations themselves, the ongoing interaction, the participants and the types of norms applied. In her paper, Kurata combines language management theory with a sociocultural framework and investigates the interaction of one learner of Japanese in his interaction with his Japanese network members by examining his language management in relation to propositional and presentational problems and the factors which influence his language management behaviour. In another study, Nemoto applies a language management framework in his analysis of Japanese exchange students studying short-term at an Australian university and in doing so, also draws to some extent on the notion of legitimate peripheral participation. While providing copious examples of language management processes in the academic context, Nemoto identifies how noting and evaluation processes occur not only in relation to norm deviations but sometimes as a result of norm similarities or compatibility in cross-cultural communities of practice.

Internet-based communication is the focus of Pasfield-Neofitou in this issue. Recognizing substantial differences from face-to-face communication, the researcher investigates aspects of language management occurring in internet communication between learners of Japanese and their native-speaker peers, including noting and subsequent processes. In her conclusion, Pasfield-Neofitou rightly questions the pertinence of some of the sociolinguistic factors of communication found in earlier studies, indicating that research on internet communication demands a radical departure from many of our established notions.

The issue contains an epilogue by J. V. Neustupný on theory and its relevance to practitioners; here, he introduces the concepts of theory and practice networks. This was a conference paper written in 2001 and delivered at a language management conference in Mysore, India. Although not directly addressing the theme of this issue, it remains one of his unpublished papers and thus we take the opportunity of including it in this issue.

Also included are two reviews, one by Dawe and another by Jernudd. Finally, a report by Vitek Dovalil on the 2011 language management symposium held at Waseda University in Japan is also included and shows some of the new directions of thinking among the scholars working on language management.

## References

- Dovalil, V. (2011). Review of Spolsky (2009). *Sociolinguistica*, 25, 150–155.
- Jernudd, B.H. (Ed.) (2000). Language management and language problems, Part I. Special Issue. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 10(2).
- Jernudd, B.H. (Ed.) (2001). Language management and language problems, Part II. Special Issue. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 11(1).

- Jernudd, B.H. & Neustupný, J.V. (1987). Language planning: For whom? In L. Laforge (Ed.), *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning* (pp. 69–84). Québec: Les Presses de L'Université Laval.
- Marriott, H. (2004). Academic interaction. Special issue. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 14(1).
- Nekvapil, J. (2009). The integrative potential of Language Management Theory. In J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (Eds.) (2009). *Language management in contact situations. Perspectives from three continents* (pp. 1–11). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Nekvapil, J. (2011). The history and theory of language planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 871–887). Volume II. New York and London: Routledge.
- 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. (2004). A theory of contact situations and the study of academic interaction. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 14(1), 3–31.
- Sloboda, M. (2010). Review of Spolsky (2009). *LINGUIST List*, 21(227). Available from <http://linguistlist.org/issues/21/21-227.html>.
- Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [see Sloboda (2010) and Dovalil (2011) for a review of this book].