

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360089852>

# Exploring interests and power in language management

Chapter · April 2022

DOI: 10.3726/b19351

CITATIONS

0

READS

28

3 authors:



**Marek Nekula**

Universität Regensburg

116 PUBLICATIONS 258 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



**Tamah Sherman**

The Czech Academy of Sciences

38 PUBLICATIONS 231 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



**Halina Zawiszová**

Palacký University Olomouc; Charles University

25 PUBLICATIONS 3 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Emotivity / affective stance display in Japanese conversational interactions [View project](#)



Language Management [View project](#)

**6**

**Prague Papers  
on Language, Society and Interaction**

**Marek Nekula/Tamara Sherman/Malina Zawiszová (eds.)**

# **Interests and Power in Language Management**



**PETER LANG**

**Bibliographic Information published by the  
Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available online at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

The preparation of this book was partially financed within the statutory activity of the Czech Language Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences (RVO No. 6837809). The print is covered by the University of Regensburg.

ISSN 1866-878X

ISBN 978-3-631-86061-8 (Print)

E-ISBN 978-3-631-86467-8 (E-Book)

E-ISBN 978-3-631-87081-5 (EPub)

DOI 10.3726/b19351



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution CC-BY 4.0 license. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

© Marek Nekula / Tamah Sherman / Halina Zawiszová (eds.), 2022

Peter Lang – Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Warszawa · Wien

This publication has been peer reviewed.

[www.peterlang.com](http://www.peterlang.com)

# Contents

<b>Contributors</b> .....	7
---------------------------	---

<b>Acknowledgments</b> .....	11
------------------------------	----

## Introduction

*Marek Nekula / Tamah Sherman / Halina Zawiszová*

Exploring interests and power in language management .....	15
--	----

## Part I: Language ideologies

*Goro Christoph Kimura*

Why and how ideology matters for Language Management Theory .....	37
---	----

*Petar Vuković*

Council for the Standard Croatian Language Norm: The failure of ‘hard power’ .....	51
--	----

*Jakub Kopecký*

Divergent interests and argumentation in Czech Language Consulting Center interactions .....	73
--	----

*Stephanie Rudwick*

Language politics at Stellenbosch University, South Africa .....	101
--	-----

## Part II: Minority languages and minoritized languages

*Roland Marti*

Language management from above (and from below), from outside (and from inside): The case of Lower Sorbian .....	125
--	-----

*Ben Ó Ceallaigh*

Interests, power, and austerity in Irish-language policy 2008–2018 .....	149
--	-----

*Nadiya Kiss*

Key actors in the organized language management of Ukraine: On the materials of language legislation development and adoption ..... 177

*Solvita Burr (née Pošeiko)*

The interaction of nationalist language ideology and the interests of individual actors: An unresolved dispute over language use on Latvian house number signs ..... 203

### **Part III: Foreign language policies, teaching and learning, and use**

*Lisa Fairbrother*

Interests and power in English education policy in Japan: A focus on the high school 'Teaching/Learning English in English' policy ..... 237

*Hiroyuki Nemoto*

The investment in managing interests and power through study abroad: Literacy and identities from a translingual perspective ..... 267

*Vít Dovalil*

German as a foreign and a minority language in the light of the interests of social actors: The case of the Czech Republic ..... 293

*Chikako Ketcham*

Non-Japanese business people's use of Japanese language in their workplace in Japan ..... 329

### **Epilogue**

*Björn Jernudd*

Some remarks on power in simple and organized language management 357

**Index** ..... 369

## Exploring interests and power in language management

### 1 Introductory remarks

This volume continues in the tradition of volumes and special journal issues exploring the language management (LM) framework with a focus on one of its specific aspects or broader themes. In the first of these, a special issue of the *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* (Marriott & Nekvapil 2012), the emphasis was placed on the first phase of the LM process, noting. Most recently, volumes have been published devoted to methodology in LM research (Fairbrother, Nekvapil & Sloboda 2018) and the interaction of micro and macro perspectives in LM (Kimura & Fairbrother 2020). As can be observed, multiple steps have been taken toward a comprehensive picture of LM, but the future leads in many more thus far insufficiently explored directions. Interestingly, moving along these paths involves going back to the beginnings of both Language Management Theory (LMT) and Language Planning and Policy (LPP) and examining the degree to which individual aims, topics and perspectives in selected original programs have been fulfilled.

Interests and power, the themes selected for the present volume, have been long acknowledged as important factors in various approaches in LPP. Despite this fact, it is not an exaggeration to claim that very little focused attention has been devoted to them compared to other factors such as motivation or goals of LPP. In LM, with its focus on noted deviations from norms, the evaluations of those deviations, and the design and implementation of adjustments, it can be, however, argued that interests and power are in fact the driving forces, observable and describable at every step of the process. The interests can be seen as a background for established norms and norms that emerge through simple and especially organized LM, and power may determine their reach in the process in LM. In fact, the seminal LM text from Björn H. Jernudd and Jiří V. Neustupný (1987) discusses this point extensively.

In order to show the importance of interests and power for LM, we first must have a look at how these concepts have thus far been understood. As the texts in this volume reveal, both are seen as something somehow possessed (or lacked) by social actors, power is acquired (or lost), someone may be in a “position of power,” or we can talk about “power dynamics,” “power balances” and “imbalances” or “hierarchies,” while interests are “declared,” “negotiated,” “pursued,” or “achieved.” On the other hand, languages or other non-human entities or concepts can also have or give power, but not interests and intentions.

## 2 Interests

Interests can be viewed as dispositions perceived as positive or beneficial for individuals, groups, institutions, and the like. They can take the form of internal psychological entities such as desires or needs, or be more explicit, aware, or declared, such as ambitions, aims, ends, or goals. They may be personal, political, ideological, material, or otherwise. We can illustrate this with the example of an act of LM: learning a specific language. It may serve one's personal interests if the language is used in a (mixed) family, one's political interests if the acquisition of majority and minority language is legally regulated, one's ideological interests if the ethnic identity is respected, or one's material interests if it is instrumental in finding employment.

Jiří V. Neustupný has defined interests as “aspirations for a certain state of affairs that is favourable to the subject” (Neustupný 2002: 3). And in their seminal 1987 text, a reaction to Brian Weinstein's (1987) exposition on the role of interests in language planning, Jernudd and Neustupný discuss how varied this “subject” can be, pointing out that there is often no set of universal interests that can be associated with an individual society or community. Individual interests may vary within a single community, and the collective interests of different communities may vary greatly or even stand in opposition or conflict to one another.

There are many examples of such language conflicts between linguistic communities within a society (for example between Walloons and Flemish in Belgium, Catalonians and Spaniards in Spain or Czechs and Germans in the Czech Lands) in which linguistic and non-linguistic interests are combined. In language conflicts, the suppression of linguistic interests of a minority or dominated community to communicate in their language may stem from the linguistic, social, and economic interests of a majority or ruling community which are also realized through the control of communicative domains. On the one hand, the communicative norms based on the differing status of respective languages seem to have to do with interests and power of the linguistic majority or dominant community and with powerlessness of linguistic minority or dominated community, as described in classical theories of nation building and LPP (Hroch 2015; Haugen 1966). On the other hand, we have to deal with the enforcement of non-linguistic (social and economic) interests of a social group within a minority or dominated community by combining them argumentatively with the linguistic interests of the whole linguistic minority or dominated linguistic community. This is one way of mobilizing the members of such communities in order to gain power in the fight against the imagined linguistic (and social) suppression, as constructivist theories of nation building and “imagined communities” suggest (Gellner 1983; Anderson 1991). They even contest the “imagined non-communities” to save the interests of children educated outside of their linguistic community (Zahra 2010). These “monolingual” linguistic communities and their interests are the result of the narration of “many as one” (Bhabha 2008 [1990]: 202).

Interests can be observed at various stages of the LM process. Foreign accents and learner varieties in the public domain, on the one hand, or the absence of a foreign variety understood as a necessary part of the repertoire of elites (in Central Europe Latin, later German, and now English), on the other hand, can be *noted* (and *evaluated*) by the members of the majority or by elites (Jernudd & Neustupný 1987: 78 f.) to promote their non-linguistic (social, economic) interests—to delimit and to control public and elite domains linguistically. At the stage of *adjustment design* and its *implementation*, the interests behind the norms mentioned above (“native” standard of majority language; knowledge of selected foreign language(s)), are implemented by the school that qualifies for the public sphere (standard needed in the legal system, authorities, education, media) and specific elite domains (English needed in international trade, economy, diplomacy, research) as well as by (language) certificates needed for job or residency applications. It is quite similar to the process of standardization of a language that can be seen as a result of a language planning process with respect to the educated variety whereas territorial and uncultivated social dialects were excluded. This enables the educated (bourgeois) middle classes of a linguistic community to use their cultivated code unfamiliar to other classes and, in this way, to realize their material and social interests—to delimit and control social resources as well as the transfer of knowledge within a linguistic community (Linke 1996).

In his paper on desegregation of the American education system by the act from 1954, Derrick Bell (1980) shows, however, that the interests of social groups need not be only in conflict but can also go together. The change in the American education system started with desegregation, of course, can be interpreted in different ways. On the one hand, the interests of black Americans in obtaining (more) equality in education seem to be enforced against the interests of the white middle classes. With respect to changing social settings inside and outside of America, Bell on the other hand sees the desegregation of the education system as the result of a “convergence” of interests. This change in the American education system then made America more credible, both internally for (black) veterans fighting in World War II for freedom and equality and externally, for the people of the third world where the US was in competition with the Soviet Union. Bell also interprets this change as a chance for industrialization of the southern states. In this sense, the act from 1954 was passed in the interest of white middle classes. There are social, political, and economic interests behind the act that opened the door for the implementation of norms of social equality in the American education system.

Of course, we can view the concept of interest convergence more generally and apply it also to language issues and LPP. The *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*, adopted as a convention on June 25, 1992 by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe and entered into force on March 1, 1998, can then be interpreted in a similar way. The *Charter* helps to satisfy the linguistic interests of autochthonous minorities within the European nation-states. At the same time, it also legally solidifies the hierarchy of majority and minority languages and supports the social, political, and economic interests of



majorities within the European nation-states by stabilizing them internally as democratic and giving them (and the EU, which adopts these principles) democratic authority externally—in the international context. Against the background of linguistic and non-linguistic conflicts in the post-Yugoslav and post-Soviet territories in the early 1990s, the EU seems to be a haven of stability also from the linguistic point of view although some states—like Greece, Bulgaria, Lithuania, and Latvia—have not signed it to avoid commitments to their minorities. The *Charter* is, however, without sanctions and is intended to protect only the autochthonous minority languages (cf. Raos 2015). The interests of allochthonous minorities (i.e., new migrant groups), which may be similar to the linguistic and social interests of autochthonous minorities, are not involved in the *Charter*. This is because the satisfaction of the interests of the allochthonous minorities would probably be economically more expensive and socially more complex and likely connected with a loss of full control over the communication in the public space, which the majority in the nation-states is interested in and why the majority language is presented as more important than the minority one. Both types of minorities seem to accept these language ideologies and the majority language as necessary social capital and learn it to satisfy their material interests. To promote and to realize such linguistic and social interests, linguistic communities seem to need power.

### 3 Power

There are many concepts of power discussed with respect to and applied in the analysis of LPP as well as interaction and discourse. Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser, for example, investigated the mechanism of “cultural hegemony” moderated by institutions such as churches or schools that appeal to individuals who voluntarily submit themselves—linguistically to the standard or to the majority language—in hope for social advancement (see Busch 2017: 92 f.). Michel Foucault discussed the “dispositive of power” based on institutional mechanisms and knowledge structures established in and controlled by (public) discourse (Foucault 1984: 109) which has to do not only with its categories but also with varieties and language choice. Norman Fairclough (1989) analyzed the power behind a (public) discourse and exercised in and performed through it. In this sense, the public discourse on allochthonous and autochthonous minorities enables or now allows the (limited) public use of the autochthonous minority language but not of the allochthonous minority language. This, of course, reflects the power distribution in a society. Pierre Bourdieu (1991) explained the relationship between language and power through the concept of “social capital,” accumulated by a language within a “social field,” that differs from the social capital of other languages in the “language market.” In the linguistic exchange, “the power relations between speakers [of these languages] or their respective groups are actualized” symbolically (Bourdieu 1991: 37). Florian Coulmas (2005) discussed language(s) and (their differing) power with respect to a “language regime” based on legal acts and language ideologies that limit speakers in their language use with respect to space established socially

and/or territorially. This concept seems to apply to both monolingual and multilingual regimes.

In research on LM, reference is made most frequently to Neustupný's definition of power as "the capacity to realize one's interests" (Neustupný 2002: 4), which more or less corresponds to the understanding of social and economic power of individuals and groups typical for many fields. The power then can be exercised, for example, by a teacher controlling the interaction and giving permission to a specific student to speak on the micro level as well as by institutions authorized by the majority that decide which language will be used as language of instruction and taught as subject on the macro level. In a later text, Neustupný talks about power as the object of management and uses the term "behavior-toward-power" (Neustupný 2004: 3). The power that he sees behind the establishment and dissolution of (linguistic and communicative) norms can be then noted and evaluated with respect to these norms and adjustments can be designed and implemented in this way as well. The linguistic and communicative norms can thus be strengthened or weakened based on the ways in which they are used to realize individual or group interests. Within LM, the power is established and questioned through choice and use, the image and proficiency of varieties and languages as well as images of language communities or territories. In this sense, the "behavior-toward-power" is realized as "behavior-toward-language."

In one case study, Neustupný (2004) specifically explores the process of assimilation of university students from abroad in Japan. Here, language acquisition is connected with power. On the one hand with the empowerment of the students learning Japanese, in which the "competence to communicate to fulfil [...] personal interests" is achieved, and on the other hand with disempowerment of these very same students, when individuals and groups subordinate linguistically (Neustupný 2004: 5). This subordination satisfies the interests of the majority or dominant group within a given context. These two phenomena then come together. In another example, wives of Japanese employees recruited in East Asian countries are, on the one hand, disempowered by having to learn the language of their Japanese husbands, but on the other hand they are empowered by successfully satisfying their needs and interests by learning Japanese.

In extension to Steven Lukes's distinction of "five types of power: coercion, influence, authority, force and manipulation" (Neustupný 2004: 6), Neustupný further suggests other types of power, such as status, prestige, and domination. He imagines "domination based on the norm that participants who are coerced to assimilate; the same is true of those who are influenced, possess lower authority, are affected by force, or are manipulated" (Neustupný 2004: 6). This applies not only for minority languages but also for the language of social groups like non-experts, children, etc.

There have been a number of studies in which power has been discussed in relation to LM as well as to LMT. Within this theoretical frame, Tamah Sherman (2009) discusses the choice of language as the struggle for power in intercultural situations, whereas Jiří Nekvapil and Sherman (2013) show the impact of power

on language ideologies supporting the non-acquisition of local language by actors with power on the one hand and the acquisition of dominant—glocal or global languages like German or English—by actors that are interested in achieving greater power in the diglossic settings of multilingual companies in Central Europe on the other hand. The first group is empowered in this way to control the communication on the level of top management but disempowered with respect to communication on the production level. The second group is disempowered in the communication on the level of top management but empowered with respect to communication with the production level. The enforcement of interests may also block other interests.

Likewise, Lisa Fairbrother (2015) analyzes the role of power established and resisted in LM activities at the micro level. In her study, she views the power based in linguistic and ethnic identity on the one hand, and on the other hand, she quotes Foucault and Sara Mills and emphasizes the “fluid” character of power “negotiated through interaction,” in which “everyone can be both powerful and powerless” (Fairbrother 2015: 60). Based on “language management summaries” in semi-structured interviews with plurilingual residents in Japan, the author analyzes specific situations in which the choice of and proficiency in Japanese “reinforce social hierarchy, transmit ideology and maintain the authority of institutions” or individuals (Fairbrother 2015: 59), whereas the declared ignorance of Japanese—at least by actors with a Caucasian, not Asian appearance who are not expected to master Japanese—helps to resist the power of Japanese communicative norms by switching to contact norms. This strategy helps to realize individual actors’ interests.

Junko Saruhashi (2018), however, shows long-term perspectives relevant for personal empowerment of various actors. Marián Sloboda (2020: 19) explores empowerment within the Vietnamese minority in the Czech Republic. He shows that the “communication in Vietnamese enabled the Vietnamese entrepreneurs to continue their businesses,” but this practice at the same time does not encourage them “to acquire Czech or other language skills which would pay off in the long run.” The consequence is their disempowerment: they remain dependent on providers of products and services available in Vietnamese. In this case, there is a conflict between the interests of different actors as well as between the interests within the same (group of) actor (s). Stephanie Rudwick (2018) focuses on the power of languages that are connected with specific actors. Afrikaans seems to be disempowered by the use limited to South Africa and specifically by the legacy of apartheid implicating problematic constellations between actors with and without power, whereas English is empowered by the expectations of actors to satisfy the interests of their social elevation and global action. English also profits from not being bound to an ethnic identity like Afrikaans.

All these papers demonstrate the impact of agencies in LM activities in different directions and on different levels. This impact has also been observed in the general LPP literature. Richard B. Baldauf (2006) presented an overview of shifting tendencies in the study of language planning (in which he also included LM), moving from the exclusive macro focus on the activities of politics or large organizations

to the meso and micro levels, or even to the interaction between these levels. Within this shift, contexts, actors, and agency in language planning activities were posited as a new nexus from which to view these activities. There have been many applications of Baldauf's conception, including that of Ben Fenton-Smith and Laura Gurney (2016), who examine language policy in regard to academic language and learning at Australian universities. They also empirically elaborate the classification of four types of power related to actors with power, with expertise, with influence, and with interest introduced by Shouhui Zhao (2011) and applied in this volume by Vít Dovalil. Fenton-Smith and Gurney (2016: 74) work with these agencies in relation to "the various levels and forms of power invested in the range of actors involved in policy and planning." They conclude that "people with expertise" and "people with interests" do not have the same position in academic language planning as "people with power" and "people with influence" (Fenton-Smith and Gurney 2016: 74). However, it should be pointed out that these authors, citing Zhao and Baldauf (2012), view people with interests (in this case, primarily students) as people who have *only* interests, that is, who do not have power, influence, or expertise.

There are, of course, also other possibilities for the examination of the interrelations between power and agency. For the specific purpose of negotiation of the standard variety, Ulrich Ammon (2005: 33) models a social power field in which four instances are involved in the negotiation of the standard variety: norm authorities, language experts, codifiers, and their manuals as well as exemplary texts produced by exemplary authors and speakers. This can be applied not only for the elaboration of the standard variety within the organized LM but also for the production of a specific standard text within the simple LM. Robert L. Cooper (1989) distinguished in general between formal elites, influentials, and authorities and mentioned the possibility of overlap between these categories. He traditionally connected the power with the top-down direction. He did not categorize the actors authorized by interests and expertise, who can unfold the power in the bottom-up direction, within the power frame. However, they can also be successful, as illustrated by the examples discussed in the various texts in this volume.

## 4 Interests and power in LM

As mentioned above, it cannot be stated that interests and power have never been important for LMT. Its foundational paper, published by Jernudd and Neustupný in 1987, entitled "Language planning: For whom?," was devoted predominantly to the issue of interests. Even the question "for whom?" in the title indicates the primary position of interests in interventions into language. The authors stress the need to examine the interests involved in each phase of the LM process, and distinguish between linguistic interests (based on perceived communicative needs) and non-linguistic (social and economic) interests. In one of the first volumes organized to combine the work of the Japanese, Australian, and Central European schools of LM (Nekvapil & Sherman 2009), the position of power in LM was stressed in the

texts coming out of the Central European School (see in particular Sloboda 2009; Sherman 2009; Lanstyák & Szabómihály 2009). Our aim in this volume, then, is to focus on both interests and power in their interplay as well as to discuss their role and use within the process of the simple and organized LM on both the micro and the macro level.

At first glance, we can observe that both interests and power are present in and guide or underlie the character of all phases of the LM procedure (i.e., noting, evaluation, adjustment design, implementation, and feedback). First of all, it is clearly observable that interests and power influence *what is noted*. This is related to the question of norm creation, expansion, and maintenance, for example, in the management of standard language varieties. Noting deviations from the standard variety in the classroom, for example, may be part of the job description of the teachers in public schools, who identify colloquial, dialect, and “non-native” variants and varieties that deviate from the standard. The teachers are authorized for this job by both their institutionally approved education and expertise as well as their role in the school system. The school is responsible for the acquisition of standard by the linguistic academy. The academy is responsible for standardization established for the standardization of public communication in whose effectivity the institutional authorities are interested in. This also has a social and economic effect. To guarantee the implementation of these interests of a linguistic community, both give them the power to influence pupils’ grades, and ultimately, their future paths in public life that has to do with their material interests. In order to realize their individual interests, the pupils submit to the teachers and acquisition of the (foreign) standard. They later become empowered by their previous disempowerment. That is why they and their parents also accept further steps of the LM oriented to the acquisition of the standard variety on the micro level of a school and an interaction as well as on the macro level of the school system and authorities responsible for standardization (on standard variety as process and product of LM cf. Dovalil 2013).

*Evaluation* is not only closely connected with noting in LM, but a positive or negative evaluation genuinely has to do with interests as explained above. The positive or negative evaluation implies a specific perspective: some linguistic phenomena or language choices are denied, while others are considered welcome, suitable, appropriate, or even desirable. In some institutional situations, such as in the classroom or among professional language managers (editors, consultants, etc.), the noting and evaluation of style or non-standard are guided by the interests of the given institution such as public schools or media that authorize schools and other actors with expertise for evaluation as well, whereas actors whose activities are the objects of this evaluation rather note and evaluate this institutional noting and evaluation without the power to defend themselves against it. There are of course also other examples of the interplay between interests and power. For example, Czech used in a memorandum addressed from Czech representatives of a Bohemian corporation to the ministry in Vienna before 1918 (see Nekula 2003: 169) not only was noted but also was evaluated negatively by the addressees.

The switch from German to Czech was a clear deviation from the norm of standardized communication between center and periphery based on and perpetuating the linguistic interest of a simple, reliable, and effective communication within a multilingual society. These interests went hand in hand with the non-linguistic interest of a unified state represented by central institutions in Vienna. In this case, the negative evaluation of this deviation is undertaken from the “power side” but there is of course also a positive evaluation of this deviation by the Czech representatives of the Bohemian corporation, albeit without the power to establish a new communicative norm before 1918 which would correspond with their interests for more autonomy and participation. The deliberate deviation from the existing norm, however, can be seen as a negative evaluation of the existing norm by replacing it with an alternative (subversive) language practice.

*Adjustment design* in LM follows along the line of the interests and power mentioned above. Adjustments are adhered to and taken as legitimate depending on who designs and refers to them. This applies for standard and non- or substandard in general, as implied already in terminology, as well as for orthography reforms specifically, that both are designed by and refer to language experts and language institutions as actors with expertise and power. These can argue for and legitimate orthography reform linguistically by declared modernization of spoken language or rationality of language system, based in and acceptable with respect to linguistic interests of language experts as actors with expertise, whereas non-linguistic opponents of orthographic reforms do not need to listen to these arguments and can argue and legitimate their opposition non-linguistically, based on cultural tradition and identity, the need for democratic participation in language issues as well as economic issues. Such opposing arguments, based on non-linguistic interests, can even weaken an orthographic reform designed by actors with expertise before this can be implemented, if actors with influence such as editors of media are involved and support other actors with (non-linguistic) interests and convince the actors with power. This happened, for example, as amendments of the Czech orthography reform from 1993 were adopted by the Czech Minister of Education. The minister, interested in support by the media and public in the next election, then suspended parts of the Czech orthography reform from 1993 (see Bermel 2007 for more details).

The actors with power can even deny an orthography reform, as exemplified by rejection of the Slovak orthography from 1931 designed by actors with expertise, who were close to the ideology of Czechoslovakism bridging the differences between Czech and Slovak, because their linguistic and other interests differed from the interests of Slovak actors with interests and/or power, who could not identify with the Czechoslovak ideology. However, there also was a remarkable difference between actors with expertise with respect to their linguistic and non-linguistic interests. As Roland Marti (1993) shows, whereas “unionists,” interested in the linguistic unity of the emerging Czechoslovak state, preferred to see Czech and Slovak as variants of the “Czechoslovak” state language and were open for convergence in orthography of both languages to enable communication within the

state common to Czechs and Slovaks, “separatists” were interested in maintaining the difference of Czech and Slovak orthography. In the orthography commission organized by Matica slovenská (Slovak Foundation) that prepared the 1931 Slovak orthography reform supervised by the young Czech linguist Václav Vážný (1892–1966), the “unionist” actors with expertise could push through. However, the reform could not be fully implemented during the 1930s, as discussed below.

Similar “unionist” and “separatist” arguments were also discussed with respect to adjustments of local standard variants of British vs. American English or of “Binnendeutsch” (Core German) vs. Austrian German. This “unification” also plays a role in the simple LM. Preparing his books for publication in Leipzig in the German Empire, Franz Kafka (1883–1924) tried to support the reception of his book by a broad German public by avoiding Prague and Austrian variants of German and by preferring variants used in the German Empire with respect to codification in German manuals of codification as well as with respect to his norm authorities (see Blahak 2015; Nekula 2016 for more details). This individual disempowerment, a kind of pre-interaction management, was intended as empowerment of his texts in the public sphere.

Coming back to the example of minority languages, we can see that the adjustments depend on context and that experts’ adjustments are not listened to and taken as legitimate in the same way in different contexts. With respect to linguistic and non-linguistic interests of speakers of autochthonous minority languages, the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (1992) argues for education and participation in the minority language not only as a way to maintain language, culture and identity of a minority, but also to guarantee the healthy development of the next generation and the fair democratic participation of minorities and their members in societal issues. These adjustments are not made by experts or rather not listened to by political representations if allochthonous minorities are addressed because of political, economic, and cultural interests of majorities that provide and control political and cultural institutions and economic resources. Because the implementation of these adjustments probably would be too expensive and could lead to the disintegration of communication, the actors with power representing the majority as actors with interests take advantage of their capacity to realize their interests and to prevent other interests.

The *implementation* of an adjustment within LM is closely connected with its design. Adjustments designed by actors with interest but without power, expertise and influence (cf. Zhao 2011: 910) will be hardly considered, let alone implemented. This can change when the adjustment is adopted by actors with influence (or power), such as in the LM for more gender equality or the identity politics expressed by choosing gender and identity sensitive language categories. They can have capacity to realize their interests in spite of the position of actors with expertise arguing, for example, based on the neutrality of generic masculinum, limits of gender-sensitive language use inherent to flexive languages, and uneconomic character of gender-sensitive language use.



Coming back to Bell's example for the concept of "convergence" of interests, the adjustments for maintenance of minority languages designed by activists of autochthonous minorities, that is, actors with interests, will be implemented on the national level if the actors with power are interested in doing so, to legitimize themselves inside and outside as democratic. This symbolic capital makes them able to prevent the implementation of the same adjustments for allochthonous minorities. With respect to the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (1992), however, the authorities of participating nation-states decide themselves which autochthonous minority language(s) will be protected and how. Supported by actors with expertise, they also decide what is a language and what is a dialect and which adjustments will be implemented. They can also restrict the adjustments territorially according to their political and economic capacities and interests. Then, the *Charter* does not contain any possibility of enforcing the rights of minority languages at the European level. The implementation of the *Charter*, of course, also can be expanded by actors with power in reaction to critique of actors with influence or expertise, as explored in this volume by Dovalil, as well as restricted by actors with power, as discussed in this volume by Ben Ó Ceallaigh. They also were not implemented in nation-states that deliberately did not sign the *Charter*.

The questions of who has the capacity to realize one's interests in this phase of LM process, that is, who decides whether an adjustment is implemented, who chooses the implementation actors and who decides which adjustments are implemented for whom and how, can of course be seen in other areas of language use as well. With respect to the Czech orthography reform of the 1990s, for example, we can see that its opponents, who were the actors with interests in this case, had—supported by actors with influence and some actors with expertise—the capacity to influence the responsible ministry as the most prominent actor with power and in this way to restrict the proposed adjustments to some extent and protect their linguistic and non-linguistic interests by using the old doublets (connected with rejection of acquisition of new orthographic norms argued as preservation of cultural identity). They nevertheless did not have the capacity to prevent the implementation of the orthography reform by actors of power through the school system educating the next generation of users of Czech that prefer to acquire the progressive doublet forms.

Similar questions also apply to a proposed fifth phase of LM process, that is, the feedback or post-implementation stage, that Kimura (2014, 2020) suggests in general: Who evaluates the implementation as successful or not? And who is authorized to do so, that is, to decide about the finish or restart of the LM process? This is what happened with the Slovak orthography reform of 1931. The Slovak public (actors with interests), the actors with influence as well as the "separatists" with expertise around the Slovak journal *Slovenská reč* (Slovak Language) noted and evaluated the results of this reform negatively. This is why a new Slovak orthography reform was expected and undertaken later. This reform was meant to be based both in the linguistic interests (communicative needs based in continuity



with the previously used orthography) and in non-linguistic ones (ethnic identity). The Czech linguists were disqualified from this endeavor by actors with power: Vážný was suspended as professor of the university in Bratislava at the end of 1938 and repatriated back to Prague. The later reforms of Slovak orthography and LM activities with respect to Slovak vocabulary enlarged rather than only maintained the linguistic distance between Czech and Slovak by invoking the interests of an imagined Slovak language community constructed in the public discourse as one. Similar processes can be seen, for example, in connection with the elaboration of national languages as a part of the nation building in the post-Yugoslavian territories discussed in this volume by Petar Vuković.

## 5 The contents of this volume

This volume consists of thirteen chapters divided into three parts and an epilogue. The three parts are entitled: *Language ideologies*, *Minority languages and minoritized languages*, and *Foreign language policies, teaching and learning, and use*. The topics of these three parts emerged organically in the process of preparing this volume but also represent the key issues that are repeatedly addressed when interests and power in LM become the foci of scholarly investigation. The majority of the chapters were presented at the symposium *Interests and Power in Language Management* hosted by the University of Regensburg in 2017. They make use of LMT, but other analytical tools, models, and methods are also adopted. The individual chapters work with highly diverse types of data and concern a variety of languages, areas, institutions, and polities. They approach the theme of this volume from a range of different angles and perspectives, thereby collectively developing our understanding of the role of interests and power in LM.

Language ideologies form an essential, albeit often ignored or backgrounded component of LM, which is in more or less explicit ways present in all the chapters of this volume. Four chapters that deal with the questions related to language ideologies most overtly are included in the first part of the volume, entitled *Language ideologies*.

The first chapter is of a more general and theoretical nature and, as such, contributes to the general discussion presented above. Penned by *Goro Kimura*, it offers an overview of the ways in which interests and power have been approached in LMT thus far and advocates for the notion of language ideology to be fully incorporated into the theory, arguing that it forms a vital part of LM processes both at the macro and micro level. Kimura suggests that language ideology reflects interests and constitutes a resource for power negotiation, and hence, may serve as a conceptual framework that allows us to study the metalinguistic environment of LM processes. So far, language ideology has typically been associated with the macro level. Therefore, in order to illustrate how language ideology operates at the micro level in relation to interests and power, the chapter presents a case study of the language maintenance of Sorbian in Lusatia, a region in Eastern Germany.

The remaining three chapters that constitute the first part of this book represent case studies of LM taking place at specific institutions. *Petar Vuković* draws on LMT in his analysis of the work of the Council for the Standard Croatian Language Norm. Established in 2005, the Council was disbanded only seven years later, following strong criticism coming from both experts and the general public alike. The author explains the Council's lack of power to influence the actual language use by pointing out its disregard for simple LM and narrow focus on the organized LM, without taking into account the ideological stances of its members or interests of the language users.

The chapter by *Jakub Kopecký* presents the results of an analysis of the argumentation used in language consulting telephone interactions between language users and language experts from the Language Consulting Center of the Czech Language Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences. Drawing on LMT, Kopecký focuses on the cases of disagreement and conflict, uncovering the underlying language ideologies and divergent interests of the parties involved in the interactions as well as the methods in which they resolve their disputes, all the while negotiating their power relations, especially the Center's authority.

The first part concludes with the chapter by *Stephanie Rudwick* in which the author applies LMT to investigate the interplay of interests and power in language policy discussions and changes at Stellenbosch University in South Africa. Rudwick analyzes the University's highly polarizing and conflict-riddled language politics, concentrating on the discourses and the underlying language ideologies related to the role of English, a widely desired academic lingua franca, as opposed to Afrikaans, which used to serve as the primary language of teaching and learning at the University. The case is particularly worthy of consideration because, as the author points out, it represents a successful example of bottom-up LM.

Focusing on diverse interests and power relations of various actors involved primarily in different stages of organized LM, the four chapters comprising the second part of this volume, entitled *Minority languages and minoritized languages*, deal with complex issues concerning minority languages or minoritized languages in different language polities in Central, Western, and Eastern Europe.

The chapter by *Roland Marti* complements the chapter by Kimura, as it details the history and discusses the present state of LM of Lower Sorbian, a severely endangered minority language in Eastern Germany, vis-à-vis Upper Sorbian, and German, the majority language. In particular, Marti focuses on organized LM of Lower Sorbian, initiated by the Upper Sorbian institutions, as well as on the impact of this top-down LM on the LM of Lower Sorbian on part of its speakers, explaining that Lower Sorbian has gone through the same stages of development as numerous other minority languages.

In the next chapter, *Ben Ó Ceallaigh* considers the impact of macro-level economic developments on Irish language policy between the years 2008 (marked by the international economic crash and the beginning of the Great Recession) and 2018. Based on policy analyses and ethnographic research in Gaeltacht (primarily Irish-speaking) communities, the author discusses the influence of economic

forces on Irish language vitality, demonstrating the detrimental impact that recent disruptions have had on these areas, including increased unemployment and out-migration. Also examined are the effects of post-2008 austerity measures on organized LM in Ireland and the substantial decrease in state support for the language. It is argued that neoliberalism, the economic hegemony of the last several decades, inherently conflicts with language revitalization.

*Nadiya Kiss's* chapter introduces the key actors in organized LM in contemporary Ukraine, the power relations that hold between them, and the varied interests that motivate them. Making use of a range of materials, Kiss provides an overview of language policy discussions and changes with regard to the use of Ukrainian and Russian in different domains of public life from the Euromaidan period up till the most recent developments. The ongoing trend towards Ukrainization is shown as closely connected to the socio-political situation in the country and the related changes in language attitudes and language use. Concurrently, it is also linked to the emergence of new problems related to the linguistic rights and needs of the national minorities in Ukraine.

In the closing chapter of the second part of this volume, *Solvita Burr* allows the reader to gain an insight into the language ideologies as well as interests and power relations of individual actors who have played a role in an unresolved dispute over language use on house number signs in Latvia. Framing the issue in terms of LMT, Burr examines the multi-level LM cycles involved in the case of a trilingual house number sign and the related discussions on language use in Latvian linguistic landscape, pointing out that it is possible to distinguish two main interest groups participating in these metalinguistic activities, namely, those that are guided by nationalistic language ideology and those that advocate for the rights of language minority groups.

The third part of the volume, entitled *Foreign language policies, teaching and learning, and use*, considers the management of languages which, in the context of their examination, are regarded as foreign. The four chapters that make up this part bring together the general theme of this volume and such topics as language policies, language teaching, language learning, and language use.

*Lisa Fairbrother* makes use of LMT in order to explore the intricate web of variously overlapping and intersecting LM processes occurring at different stages of development of the 'Teaching/Learning English in English' policy for high schools in Japan. Fairbrother uncovers the complex interplay of a variety of pedagogical, political, and economic interests as well as power relations between different agents and actors, as they manifest themselves at each stage of the policy-making process from the initial conceptualization of the policy all the way to the post-implementation evaluation. The author points out that the formulation of the policy offers substantial leeway regarding its interpretation, which, in turn, allows the variegated interests of the multiple agents and actors concerned to be met all the while slowly changing the English language high school education in Japan in the intended direction.

The study by *Hiroyuki Nemoto* adopts a mixed methods approach to find out about Japanese university students' investment in the management of their interests and power relations with a view to developing literacy and negotiating identities throughout the translingual processes of their (re-)socialization into academic and social contexts during and after study abroad. Nemoto applies LMT to explicate the correlations between the students' transcultural and translingual development of literacy and identities; their negotiations of both linguistic and non-linguistic interests and social positionings in their individual networks of practice and communities of practice; and their engagement in multidirectional and contextually situated practices through their socialization into the study abroad and the post-study abroad contexts.

The ensuing chapter is closely related to the chapters included in the second part of the volume, dealing with minority languages and minoritized languages. *Vít Dovalil* examines the interests and power relations of institutional social actors that partake in the metalinguistic discourses regarding the position of German in the Czech Republic at the macro level. Dovalil presents both quantitative data that illustrate the situation of German in the country and the results from an LMT-based analysis of organized management activities carried out by different institutions that mostly feel dissatisfied with the current situation and strive to strengthen the position of German in the country, both as a foreign and as a minority language with respect to its tutored acquisition. Based on the analysis of the metalinguistic behavior of the individual actors, the author categorizes them in terms of power, positions them within social networks, identifies the interests that motivate their behavior, and explains the failure of their heretofore efforts by the disparity between the macro and micro levels.

Authored by *Chikako Ketcham*, the final chapter of the third part of the book investigates how and why foreigners employed as white-collar workers in Japan use the Japanese language at their workplace. Ketcham argues that the non-Japanese business people use Japanese instead of English and use Japanese in a particular way with a view to further their own interests, irrespective of the language policy of the company that they work for or the Japanese sociocultural norms, generating thereby new power relations. Making use of LMT, the author distinguishes three domains of interests that seem to govern the non-Japanese business people's choice of Japanese language and specific Japanese language use in their workplace: (1) time efficiency and other work-related goals, (2) development of open communication with Japanese colleagues, and (3) fostering of in-group solidarity.

In lieu of an *Epilogue*, the volume concludes with a paper by *Björn Jernudd*, one of the founders of the LMT. Referring to sociolinguistic and communication theories, Jernudd offers his observations and questions with regard to the topic of power in both simple and organized LM.

## 6 Concluding remarks and future directions

As we can see in this volume, the study of interests and power constitutes an essential component of LM research and has always been present within it. We see the innovation of this volume in the fact that both areas—interests and power—are not analyzed separately, but are decidedly related to each other and—also considering the phases of the LM process—discussed in relation to their interplay. As far as (linguistic) interests are concerned, we show that these are rationalized by language ideologies, argued as seemingly objective, and thus also legitimized and enforced or delegitimized and prevented. In this way, we also establish the link between interests and power, which serves to mobilize in the pursuit of an agenda. This mobilization gives power to its protagonists, whereby general social norms are transferred to or negotiated through language norms and their underlying language ideologies. The volume shows—albeit in different elaborations in the contributions—the role of actors in the assertion of linguistic interests and relates this to an actor typology that typifies the derivation of their power. However, interests and power are always understood as processual variables of discursive and non-discursive actions. By staking out and spelling out these connections and interplays, we believe we have brought the discussion forward through this volume.

Yet much more remains to be done. We can conclude here that focusing on interests and power in all examinations of LM is desirable, but we should also call for more work, particularly of the theoretical sort, which makes explicit to a greater degree the benefits of using the LM approach for studying the relationships between language issues, power, and interests in general. In this volume, we have traced the linkage of interests and power established by language ideologies, with recourse to LMT, through a series of case studies located both in different language and cultural spaces in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and in different domains of organized LM. In doing so, we have demonstrated the relevance of both linking these categories and LMT to LPP, which deals, for example, with minority languages, foreign language acquisition, or language consulting.

Finally, it should be pointed out that there have been many disciplinary paths to the study of LM, and the exploration and integration of these remains an important goal. Power management is elucidated in this volume as a type of LM which integrates power into the interpretation of LM processes, but the question of how it is linked to the conventional theories of discourse and power is only touched upon. We do name them in this introduction, and they are also recalled in some of the contributions, but they are not discussed in more detail theoretically or consistently related to each other. We are, however, on the way to doing so by addressing the distinction between linguistic and non-linguistic interests as well as their linkage to language ideologies and thus also the linkage of linguistic and social norms, by focusing on organized LM, and by typologizing the power of actors, thus moving into the realm of language politics and language conflict, which is open to multidisciplinary study. Thus, in addition to linguistics, discourse analysis,

and philosophy, sociology, political science, or social history are also involved. The next steps thus seem to be clear: the integration of the broader context into the analysis of the (linguistic, communicative, and socio-economic) levels of LM processes connected with gender-equal, simplified, or minority language, as well as the adoption of findings and theoretical approaches used within the disciplines mentioned above to the LMT and vice versa. In this broader context, it is necessary to discuss not only how organized LM proceeds from the simple LM and its generalization, but also how organized LM is carried out through simple LM and adapts itself within it. Thus, a closer focus on simple LM with regard to interests and power that are linked to language ideology and thereby legitimized and enforced or delegitimized and prevented is to be made. Furthermore, the discussion about the relationship between interests and motivation and goals is still pending.

The embedding of interests and power in a broader context, which is dealt with in a multidisciplinary way, as well as the connection of LMT to it has already been mentioned above. In closing, it is thus important to recall the relationship between research and real-life LM, also in consideration of our general disciplinary aims. In the field of sociolinguistics, where issues such as inequality and discrimination have always been central, we find power in particular to be integrated into the analysis. In studies of language acquisition and acculturation or of historical language change, this may be less the case, though it is not entirely absent. We therefore face similar questions here that we face in any type of study: In drawing attention to power and interests, whose interests are we in fact representing or promoting? Can we be neutral as researchers and analysts? Do we even want to be? To what degree can we aim to have the results of our research translated into management by the relevant actors in real life? These are questions which should continue to provoke our inquiries.

## References

- Ammon, U. (2005) Standard und Variation: Norm, Autorität, Legitimation [Standard and variation: Norm, authority, legitimation]. In L. Eichinger & W. Kallmeyer (eds) *Standardvariation. Wie viel Variation verträgt die deutsche Sprache?* [Variation of Standard: How much Variation is Possible in German?]. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 28–40.
- Anderson, B. (1991 [1988]) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. 2nd edition. London, New York: Verso Books.
- Baldauf, R. B. (2006) Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 7 (2–3), 147–170.
- Bell, D. A. (1980) Brown v. board of education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review* 93 (3), 518–533.
- Bermel, N. (2007) *Linguistic Authority, Language Ideology, and Metaphor: The Czech Orthography Wars*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

- Bhabha, H. K. (ed) (2008 [1990]) *Nation and Narration*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Blahak, B. (2015) *Franz Kafkas Literatursprache: Deutsch im Kontext des Prager Multilingualismus* [Franz Kafka's Literary Language: German in Context of Prague Multilingualism]. Cologne, Weimar, Vienna: Böhlau.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Translated by G. Raymond and M. Adamson. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Busch, B. (2017) *Mehrsprachigkeit* [Multilingualism]. 2nd edition. Vienna: Facultas.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989) *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, F. (2005) Changing language regimes in globalizing environments. *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 175/176, 3–15.
- Dovalil, V. (2013) Zur Auffassung der Standardvarietät als Prozess und Produkt von Sprachmanagement [On standard variety as process and product of language management]. In J. Hagemann, W. P. Klein & S. Staffeldt (eds) *Pragmatischer Standard* [Pragmatic Standard]. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 163–176.
- 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., Nekvapil, J. & Sloboda, M. (eds) (2018) *The Language Management Approach: A Focus on Research Methodology*. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fenton-Smith, B. & Gurney, L. (2016) Actors and agency in academic language policy and planning. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 17 (1), 72–87.
- Foucault, M. (1984) The order of discourse. In M. J. Shapiro (ed) *Language and Politics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 108–138.
- Gellner, E. (2006 [1983]) *Nations and Nationalism*. Introduced by J. Breuilly. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Haugen, E. (2013 [1966]) *Language Conflict and Language Planning: The Case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hroch, M. (2015) *European Nations: Explaining Their Formation*. Translated by K. Graham. New York: Verso Books.
- 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.
- Kimura, G. C. (2014) Language management as a cyclical process: A case study on prohibiting Sorbian in the workplace. *Slovo a slovesnost* 75 (4), 255–270.
- Kimura, G. C. (2020) The bridging role of the researcher between different levels of language management: The case of a research project at the German-Polish



- border. In G. C. Kimura & L. Fairbrother (eds) *A Language Management Approach to Language Problems: Integrating Macro and Micro Dimensions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 237–253.
- Kimura, G. C. & Fairbrother, L. (eds) (2020) *A Language Management Approach to Language Problems: Integrating Macro and Micro Dimensions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lanstyák, I. & Szabó Mihály, G. (2009) Hungarian in Slovakia: Language management in a bilingual minority community. In J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (eds) *Language Management in Contact Situations: Perspectives from Three Continents*. Frankfurt on the Main: Peter Lang, 49–73.
- Linke, A. (1996) *Sprachkultur und Bürgertum* [Language Culture and Bourgeoisie]. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Marriott, H. & Nekvapil, J. (eds) (2012) *Language Management Approach: Probing the Concept of “Noting”*. Special issue of *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 22 (2), 155–317.
- Marti, R. (1993) Slovenskisch und Čechisch vs. Československisch, Serbokroatisch vs. Serbisch und Kroatisch [Slovak and Czech vs. Czechoslovak, Serbocroatian vs. Serbian and Croatian]. In K. Gutschmidt, H. Keipert & H. Rothe (eds) *Slavistische Studien zum XI. Slavistenkongress in Pressburg/Bratislava* [Slavic Studies at the 9th Slavic Congress in Bratislava]. Cologne, Vienna: Böhlau, 289–315.
- Nekula, M. (2003) *Franz Kafkas Sprachen: „...in einem Stockwerk des innern babylonischen Turmes...”* [Franz Kafka’s Languages: “...in one Floor of the Babylonian Tower...”]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Nekula, M. (2016) *Franz Kafka and His Prague Contexts: Studies in Language and Literature*. Prague: Karolinum.
- Nekvapil, J. & Sherman, T. (eds) (2009) *Language Management in Contact Situations: Perspectives from Three Continents*. Frankfurt on the Main: Peter Lang.
- Nekvapil, J. & Sherman, T. (2013) Language ideologies and linguistic practices: The case of multinational companies in Central Europe. In E. Barát, P. Studer & J. Nekvapil (eds) *Ideological Conceptualizations of Language: Discourses of Linguistic Diversity*. Frankfurt on the Main: Peter Lang, 85–117.
- Neustupný, J. V. (2002) Language and power into the 21st century. *International Conference on Language and Empowerment*, Malaysian Association of Modern Languages, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, April 11–13, 2002. On WWW at <http://lan.guagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/bibliography>.
- Neustupný, J. V. (2004) *Power of Language across National Boundaries: The Case of Tertiary Education*. Essen: University of Duisburg-Essen, LAUD Linguistic Agency.
- Raos, V. (2015) Linguistic landscapes in EU member states: Politics of visibility and presence. In S. Seubert & F. van Waarden (eds) *Being a Citizen in Europe: Insights and Lessons from the Open Conference*. Zagreb: EU, 245–268.



- Rudwick, S. (2018) The struggle to promote an African language at a South African university: A language management perspective. In L. Fairbrother, J. Nekvapil & M. Sloboda (eds) *The Language Management Approach: A Focus on Research Methodology*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 157–184.
- Saruhashi, J. (2018) Personal empowerment through language management. In L. Fairbrother, J. Nekvapil & M. Sloboda (eds) *The Language Management Approach: A Focus on Research Methodology*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 231–258.
- Sherman, T. (2009) Managing hegemony: Native English speakers in the Czech Republic. In J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (eds) *Language Management in Contact Situations: Perspectives from Three Continents*. Frankfurt on the Main: Peter Lang, 75–96.
- Sloboda, M. (2009) A language management approach to language maintenance and shift: A study from post-Soviet Belarus. In J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (eds) *Language Management in Contact Situations: Perspectives from Three Continents*. Frankfurt on the Main: Peter Lang, 15–47.
- Sloboda, M. (2020) Demarcating the space for multilingualism: On the workings of ethnic interests in a ‘civic nation’. *Working Papers in Language Management*. On WWW at <http://langagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/bibliography>.
- Weinstein, B. (1987) Language planning and interests. 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, 33–58.
- Zahra, T. (2010) Imagined noncommunities: National indifference as a category of analysis. *Slavic Review* 69 (1), 93–119.
- Zhao, S. (2011) Actors in language planning. In E. Hinkel (ed) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Vol. 2. New York, London: Routledge, 905–923.
- Zhao, S. & Baldauf, R. B. (2012) Individual agency in language planning: Chinese script reform as a case study. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 36 (1), 1–24.