Language Management Theory as one approach in Language Policy and Planning

Jiří Nekvapil

Published online: 10 Nov 2015.

Submit your article to this journal

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Language Management Theory as one approach in Language Policy and Planning

Jiří Nekvapil*

Department of Linguistics, Charles University in Prague, Prague, Czech Republic

Language Policy and Planning is currently a significantly diversified research area and thus it is not easy to find common denominators that help to define basic approaches within it. Richard B. Baldauf attempted to do so by differentiating between four basic approaches: (1) the classical approach, (2) the language management approach (Language Management Theory, LMT), (3) the domain approach and (4) the critical approach [Baldauf, R. B. (2012). Introduction – language planning: Where have we been? Where might we be going? *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, *12*(2), 233–248]. This paper takes up this classification and seeks to show the main features of LMT, while highlighting the features that it shares with the other approaches and the features that are unique to it. This is done against the background of Baldauf's works and their contribution to the spread of LMT.

Keywords: basic approaches to LPP; emergence of LPP discourse; history of language planning; language management; Language Management Theory; R.B. Baldauf; B.H. Jernudd; J.V. Neustupný

The aim of this paper is to introduce Language Management Theory (LMT) as one approach within Language Policy and Planning (LPP) and to point out how Richard B. Baldauf contributed to this conception. The purpose of this article is twofold. First, I present LMT and its (more or less) synchronic background; second, I sketch out an historiography of the genesis of this theory, which maps how its key proponents and supporters have participated in its creation and spread. Thus, this article also aims to elucidate the early formation of sociolinguistic and LPP discourse.

The historical perspective calls for the necessity of specifying precisely what I understand by LMT and language management. The term LMT is used here to refer to the theory developed mainly by Jiří V. Neustupný and Björn H. Jernudd and later by other scholars. Importantly, for one thing, some fundamental features of the theory were published under different labels, most notably *the correction model* (Neustupný, 1983); and for another, some authors employ the term Language Management without referring to the theoretical propositions of Neustupný, Jernudd and their colleagues (this applies particularly to Bernard Spolsky's rather eclectic works, discussed below).

Language management is a term which is currently being used in many different sectors and contexts. Even within the academic domain we may come across various terminological interpretations within at least three different research approaches. Sanden (2014) labels

---

them *language management as a theory, language management as a sub-concept* and *language management as a business strategy tool*. The foundations of LMT, that is, language management as a theory as conceived by Sanden, are closely connected with research conducted by Neustupný and Jernudd who met at Monash University, Australia in 1966 (see Jernudd, 2013), worked there over a number of years and continued their cooperation after leaving Monash and working at different universities (Neustupný in Japan, Jernudd in Hawaii, Singapore and Hong Kong). While Jernudd, closely following Fishman, was directly involved with the budding area of language planning research (see Rubin & Jernudd, 1971), Neustupný was more reserved about the early language planning theories and from the very beginning derived inspiration from some certain sociolinguistic concepts originating from the Prague School, such as the notion of "norm".[1] Even though, with hindsight, it is possible to trace some elements anticipating LMT in their earlier texts (for example, Neustupný, 1978), the term language management itself was first properly introduced in the literature in their joint study (Jernudd & Neustupný, 1987), which is now considered a classic work on LMT.

The reception of Jernudd and Neustupný's article (1987), also adopted by Baldauf, was vastly influenced by Joshua Fishman. In his afterword in the conference proceedings, where Jernudd and Neustupný's article (1987) was published, Fishman (1987) contemplates, among other things, how language planning can be delineated (pp. 409–410):

> For me, language planning remains the authoritative allocation of resources to the attainment of language status and language corpus goals, whether in connection with new functions that are aspired to, or in connection with old functions that need to be discharged more adequately. The definition, admittedly, leads in societal directions more than it does in linguistic ones, although it is fully compatible […] with the definition espoused by Haugen and reiterated by him in this volume. At a surface level, this definition seems to depart most obviously from the "correction" model and the management-planning distinction previously espoused by Neustupný and Jernudd and reiterated by them in this volume. The substantive and theoretical differences between these two definitions deserve to be fully explored. Is the latter more linguistically oriented? Does it materially broaden the field of investigation? Does it relevantly broaden the field of investigation? Does it more successfully relate the language planning efforts in *developed* countries to those planned, ongoing and completed in *third world countries*, focused upon in this volume and in most of the volumes mentioned above. We devoted relatively little attention to the Neustupný–Jernudd model, primarily because we devoted little attention to *any* model but, perhaps also, because it is still somewhat offbeat. At some future time and place it would be instructive to determine whether the distinctions between the two models are really etic or emic, i.e., whether they are just distinctions or whether they really make a difference; whether they really require different types of data or whether they lead to different conclusions based on the same data. I think we would all gain from a serious exercise along these lines.

It is obvious that Fishman presents the Neustupný–Jernudd model as an alternative to his notion of language planning, an alternative which is not – by implication – fully compatible with his own interpretation (unlike Einar Haugen's conceptualization). Jernudd (1990) formulates this interpretation by Fishman as encompassing "two approaches to language planning" (see also Jernudd, 1991, 1993). It is worth noting that what is being compared, are not *any* two approaches selected from a number of other approaches, but only *these two* approaches that characterize the field of language planning as a whole.

The Neustupný–Jernudd model was briefly introduced in an important language planning manual published only two years after their classic study, namely *Language planning and social change* (Cooper, 1989). Language Management is, however, only mentioned here as a terminological alternative to other existing terms, especially the term Language

Planning. Referring to Neustupný ([1983](#)) the manual also outlines some characteristics of LMT, called by Neustupný himself the "correction model" at that time, as noted earlier (see Cooper, [1989](#), p. 40f.).

Beginning with another important language planning manual, that is, Kaplan and Baldauf ([1997](#)), Baldauf enters our historiographic picture. Kaplan and Baldauf also devote little attention to LMT (see pp. 27, 28, 207–209) and emphasize that it is a different framework for language planning than those frameworks listed in the manual and in which they themselves ground their approach. As far as LMT is concerned, Kaplan and Baldauf entirely omit its technical features, that is, its conceptual apparatus; instead, referring to Jernudd ([1993](#)), they briefly discuss one of its characteristics, namely its orientation to discourse or, in other words, what happens in particular human interactions, which goes hand in hand with the "bottom-up authorization to language planning".

Not only did Baldauf familiarize himself with LMT through his extensive reading connected with the composition of the manual, but also in the 1980s he spent several months in the East West Centre, Honolulu, where he had the opportunity to discuss language planning both with Jernudd (as a visitor to Jernudd's Modernization and Language Development Project at the East West Centre) and Neustupný (at least at two conferences related to the project in September of [1983](#)).[2] What we must also take into account is Baldauf's close cooperation with Jernudd in the 1980s (only Kaplan & Baldauf, [1997](#) refers to Baldauf and Jernudd's four joint publications). Furthermore, Baldauf was intensively involved with LMT when editing an extensive monograph by Neustupný and Nekvapil ([2003](#)) prepared for *Current Issues in Language Planning* – the document exchange between the editor and the authors took place over the course of several months. It is, therefore, hardly surprising that in his overview of LPP research Baldauf ([2005](#)) introduces LMT with reference to this particular monograph.

This overview by Baldauf ([2005](#)) suggests that LPP as a discipline has various possible definitions. Most space he devotes to "an evolving language planning framework", which in his conception is a synthesis of the existing majority tradition in LPP. This synthesizing framework was elaborated by Baldauf in cooperation with Robert B. Kaplan; its major feature is that it distinguishes four planning activities and their goals: (1) Status planning, (2) Corpus planning, (3) Language-in-education (acquisition) planning and (4) Prestige planning. Baldauf ([2005](#), p. 962), however, comments that: "this view of a language planning framework is not the only way of conceptualizing the discipline". As the only alternative, he introduces a Language Management Framework, which he briefly characterizes, as previously mentioned, on the basis of the aforementioned monograph by Neustupný and Nekvapil ([2003](#)). This presentation of LPP by Baldauf essentially follows the line of "two approaches to language planning", which was promoted by Fishman ([1987](#)) and later by Jernudd ([1990](#), [1991](#), [1993](#)).

Several years later, the deepening diversity of the field of LPP brought Baldauf to a more nuanced perspective on the field. In his introduction to a special issue of *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada* devoted to LPP, Baldauf ([2012](#)) distinguishes four basic approaches: a classical, a language management, a domain and a critical approach. *The classical approach* is connected with language planning from the 1960s and 1970s and is based on Haugen's synthesis of the field published as Haugen ([1983](#)). Baldauf subsumes his own works under this category, including Kaplan and Baldauf ([1997](#)), but also the integrative framework by Hornberger ([2006](#)). What Baldauf refers to as *the language management approach* is the approach initiated by Neustupný and Jernudd, who tried to cover not only the macro level (*organized management*) but also the micro-level (*simple management*) in LPP. Further characteristics of this approach include the focus on the management

process understood as a sequence of specific phases. According to Baldauf, LMT is very "situation oriented" and its proponents use language problems as starting point for the analysis of language situations. The language management approach was further elaborated in numerous works that originated mainly in Australia, Japan and Central Europe (see Nekvapil & Sherman, 2009a). The third approach Baldauf lists is *the domain approach* – the main proponent of this approach, according to Baldauf, being Spolsky. Even though Spolsky uses other summarizing names for his approach, or more precisely his approaches (among others, he also includes the term Language Management), for his interpretations the notion of a universally understood language domain remains key (see Spolsky, 2004, 2009). The last approach listed by Baldauf is *the critical approach*. Critical approaches point to social inequalities, which are connected with LPP. In contrast with so-called politically neutral theories from the 1960s and 1970s, questions of power, social struggle, colonization, hegemony, ideology and resistance have now shifted to the foreground. Following Tollefson (2006), Baldauf singles out two main streams within the critical approach, these being *historical-structural analysis* and *the analysis of governmentality*.

In his presentation at the *3rd international language management symposium* at Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic, on 13th September 2013, Baldauf added to the four approaches listed above another, fifth approach, that is, *the ethnographic school*; an illustrative example of this approach being the volume of McCarty (2011). What is new in this Prague presentation of origin and in the article that is grounded in it (Baldauf & Hamid, in press) is that Baldauf also analyses these schools from the point of view of which methods they use.

Characteristic features of LMT[3]

Turning now to the characteristic features of LMT, I will first comment on various terminological complexities. As is obvious from the above, there is significant variation in the labelling of this approach, namely the LMT, the Language Management Model and the Language Management Framework. Very often the terminological choice is arbitrary, though in some cases, it may be representative of a specific understanding of this approach. In this paper I utilize the most commonly used variant, that is, LMT.

LMT is conceived as a broad general theory that clearly delimits its relationship to linguistics; however, it also significantly extends beyond its traditional boundaries and reaches over to the socio-cultural (and socio-economic) sphere. While the classical language planning, but also later approaches to language planning, stress the macro-social level (the role of social structures) and the linguistic behaviour of particular speakers in particular interactions is only taken for granted in these approaches, LMT reverses this perspective and shifts its focus to speaker interactions (often also referred to as *agency*).

LMT is grounded in the premise that in using language we can distinguish two main processes: (a) the generating of utterances (communicative acts) and (b) utterance management (management of communicative acts), that is, seen from a different angle, activities of linguistic and metalinguistic nature. Referring to Fishman (1971, p. 221) this distinction can be classified as the difference between "language behaviour" and "behaviour toward language". Language management is, thus, an activity (or *act of attention*) directed either at language itself or at communication, or rather certain aspects of language or communication.

The agent of such an activity can either be an institution (such as a Ministry of Education making decisions about when to introduce compulsory foreign language education at elementary school level, including which language has to be chosen), or an individual

in a particular interaction (e.g. switching into a standard variety of a local language or into English upon noticing that her/his communication partner, e.g. a tourist visiting a local town has difficulty understanding). Hence, within LMT, language management is not just a matter of institutions making decisions about language (which was the case in classical language planning), but also something mundane that often accompanies common language use in particular interactions. As mentioned earlier, such everyday management is referred to as simple or *discourse-based management*. Organized management or also *institutional management*, on the other hand, is management performed by institutions.

Simple management is divided into several phases: the initial phase is when an individual *notes* something in her/his own or the interlocutor's utterance (it is a remarkable research issue, what and under what circumstances it actually is that the speaker notes; for further details see Marriott & Nekvapil, 2012). The process can cease at this very stage or it can continue into the next phase, that is, the speaker *evaluates* the phenomenon (e.g. a deviation from the language or communicative norm) s/he noted. If the phenomenon noted is evaluated negatively, it is understood in LMT as *inadequacy*; in case the interlocutors have no routine solution at their disposal to overcome such inadequacy and provided this phenomenon is of a recurrent nature, LMT classifies it as a *problem*; however, if the phenomenon noted is evaluated positively, it is referred to as *gratification(s)* (Neustupný, 2003). The language management process can also end at this point. Nevertheless, it can continue into the next phase, called *adjustment design*, that is, when the speaker may, for example, start to think about re-wording her/his utterance. Even at this point, the process can come to a halt or it can enter into yet another phase in which the speaker *implements* the suggested adjustment design by employing it in the particular conversation. After going through all these phases, the interlocutors have essentially two options. First, they continue with their conversation without giving any further attention to their utterances, or one of the conversation interactants notes the implemented adjustment design, evaluates it further and thus the whole process may continue. Hence, management can become cyclical. Simple management, the phases of which have just been described, can also follow a more complex course, for example, the individual phases can be performed by different interlocutors (Kopecký, 2014). Or, alternatively, in some genres and situations simple management can be largely automatized.

Needless to say, it is not just individuals in everyday interactions who pay attention to language and language use. Often, it is institutions or organizations of varying degrees of complexity that focus on language-related matters. Such organized management shares some structural features with simple management, but its main characteristics are not based on a single interaction; rather they relate to a (long) string of such interactions and hence are of a trans-interactional nature. In summary, organized management can be characterized by the following features (Nekvapil, 2012, p. 167):

(a) Management acts are trans-interactional
(b) A social network or even an institution (organization) holding the corresponding power is involved
(c) Communication about management takes place
(d) Theorizing and ideologies are at play to a greater degree and more explicitly
(e) In addition to language as discourse, the object of management is language as system.

Recently, there have been several attempts to align LMT with process models on policy and management and with problem management theories and thus to elaborate the concept of

organized language management (see Kimura, 2014; Lanstyák, 2014), which has, to date, received less attention.

Ideally, organized management is based on the occurrence of simple management, that is, it resonates with speakers' noting and evaluating in particular interactions and with their effort to use adequate means to remove such problems or it meets their needs in case of gratifications. In connection with this, Neustupný's (1994, p. 50) formulation is often quoted (what is meant by language planning in this conception, is in fact organized management):

> I shall claim that any act of language planning should start with the consideration of language problems as they appear in discourse, and the planning process should not be considered complete until the removal of the problems is implemented in discourse.

LMT proponents have an ongoing interest in the mutual relationship between simple and organized management. It is specifically this research perspective that differentiates LMT from other approaches within the domain of LPP. As far as LMT is concerned, this complex relationship is conceptualized from various points of view, that is, as a language management cycle (Nekvapil, 2009), as pre-interaction and post-interaction management (Nekvapil & Sherman, 2009b), as instructed action (Sherman, 2010), as a dialectic or reflexive micro and macro relationship (Nekvapil & Nekula, 2006) or as discourse connecting both of these levels (Sloboda, Szabó-Gilinger, Vigers, & Šimičić, 2010). Several papers in Nekvapil and Sherman (2015) reveal that the relationship between simple and organized management can acquire many different forms, which are difficult to model in advance and this particular aspect is what brings LMT closer to the ethnographic school in LPP (see, e.g. Kimura, 2015 and Sherman, 2015).

The very term LMT points to the main focus of this theory, that is, management of *language*. The scope of LMT is much broader though. Apart from language forms, the object of study can also be various aspects of the communicative act. In connection with the Hymesian model of communication, the other aspects subject to management include variety, situation, function, setting, participants, content, form, channel and performance (Neustupný, 2004; Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003). The following model assertions indicate that interlocutors commonly manage these components of the communicative act, that is, they note them and evaluate them, etc. (some of the assertions may demonstrate management of more than one component):

> Clearly they didn't understand my dialect, so I switched to the standard/English (this account refers to the management of *variety*)
>
> I noticed that the use of that language was inappropriate in that situation, and felt bad, and decided to be more careful next time (management of *situation*)
>
> To be able to communicate with anyone wherever I go, I began to learn English (management of *function*)
>
> After midnight I noticed I had problems in expressing myself precisely, so I gave up (management of *setting*)
>
> Gradually I realized that people over forty had been oriented rather to learning German than English in the Czech firms, which I found too bad, but had to accept it and finally have accepted it in my capacity as CEO (management of *participants*)
>
> I became aware that it wasn't possible to say things like that (management of *content*)
>
> We were puzzled when the prof started posing questions to us in the middle of his lecture (management of *frame* or *form*)
>
> They claimed they couldn't do without power-point, and so they refused to accept other presentation formats (management of *channel*)

> I started speaking and in the course of my speech I became aware that I had no problems speaking German, so I spoke faster and faster (management of *performance*)

What is also highly relevant to performing and researching language and communication management is the socio-cultural dimension (including socio-economic factors, as stated above.) LMT is based on the premise that these three dimensions and thus also language, communication and socio-cultural management are closely interconnected. The revitalization of a certain language, for instance, does not only mean that field-specific terminology will be created (language management), but it also entails the establishment of participant communication networks that will use this newly introduced terminology and the language as a whole (management of communication), and the creation of such communication networks may be contingent upon new work opportunities for speakers of such language (socio-economic management).

The methodology of language management research

When researching language management, a number of methods, which capture both simple and organized management – or rather more precisely their interplay – can be utilized. Thus far, most emphasis has been on methods enabling the analysis of concrete interactions. LMT took up from the very beginning some of the findings originating from conversation analysis (especially as far as the analysis of repair sequences is concerned) and its methods. The goal was and remains to capture both the audio and visual aspects of naturally occurring interactions (Marriott, 1991; Neustupny, 1996) and to analyse their detailed transcriptions. Conversation analysis focuses chiefly on the *implementation phase*; LMT, on the other hand, aims at encompassing *all* phases of the management process, that is, its methods have to enable the researchers to analyse noting, evaluation and adjustment design; or in other words, activities and phenomena from the mental field. The most helpful method in this respect is the follow-up interview (Neustupný, 1990). During a follow-up interview the researcher lets the participant who has been previously recorded reconstruct the individual stages of language management in the interaction under scrutiny. After playing the selected section of the recording, the researcher interviews the speaker asking her/him, for example, how in the recorded interaction s/he evaluated at that time (i.e. when the interaction took place, not during the follow-up interview) a certain word form, which was used by the speaker or by her/his communication partner, or whether s/he noted the use of such a word form at all (Nekvapil, 2012; Neustupný, 1990). Since, in many social settings, people refuse to be recorded or even observed (e.g. for ethical or professional reasons), LMT is forced to rely on methods which enable the researchers to come as close as possible to such interactions. These usually take the form of different types of interviews. In the so-called interaction interview (Muraoka, 2000; Neustupný, 2003; Sherman, 2006), the speakers reconstruct the details of the past interaction, while (unlike in the follow-up interview) relying only on their memory. A specific feature of these interviews is thus not the fact that they are conducted in the form of interaction, but rather that their *topic* is interaction. Slightly more problematic is the use of narrative or semi-structured interviews, which, on the one hand, may provide valuable data for research on language biographies, while on the other hand they often contain summary accounts of simple language management in the form of statements such as "I always noticed that form, but never corrected it" (Nekvapil, 2004; Sherman & Homoláč, 2014). Hence, it may be sometimes difficult to distinguish what is a management summary and what is an extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986). As for the analysis of organized

management, what is often utilized is content analysis of various documents, discourse analysis and linguistic landscape analysis (Sloboda et al., 2010).

A brief comparison

The basic approaches in LPP as formulated in Baldauf (2012), or more recently in Baldauf and Hamid (in press), are by no means clear-cut types; rather, there is a fair amount of overlap, which also concerns the methods they employ. Throughout this paper I have tried to point out such overlaps, which is what I will continue to do in this section; however, here I also want to stress, and if possible explain, what may be some of the profound differences among these approaches.

What is rather unclear, even confusing, is the relationship between LMT and conceptions by Spolsky (2004, 2009), who also uses the language management label and, in his second book, tries to integrate LMT in a very eclectic manner (for critiques of his approach, see Dovalil, 2011; Jernudd, 2010; Sloboda, 2010). For this and other reasons, we should welcome Baldauf's characterization of Spolsky's approach, based on yet another prominent concept used by Spolsky, that is, as the domain approach. Sanden's (2014) formulation of the difference between LMT and Spolsky's approach as language management as a theory and language management as a sub-concept is again worth mentioning.[4]

As for the relationship between LMT and the classical language planning, the language management approach may have been born out of language planning, but has since surpassed it with its interest in the analysis of what is happening in the particular speakers' interactions (what we may call the social micro-level). What the language management approach has shared with the classical language planning is the interest in solving language problems; what goes beyond this common interest is the notion of language gratifications. What has also become a defining feature of the LMT research agenda, is that – by definition – language management starts with the noting of a certain linguistic phenomenon, that is, even before any negative evaluation takes place, and hence, even before a potential problem may arise. In sociolinguistic research it is important to find out not only what common speakers subject to management, but also what they leave unnoticed. This is, after all, a fundamental source of information for organized management focused on, for example, language standardization. There may, actually, be a profound difference between what is understood as a problem by linguists and between what everyday users consider a problem (it is not uncommon for experts to see as problematic phenomena which everyday users do not even note). For this particular reason, the very analysis of noting and gratifications may be extraordinarily interesting in diachronic linguistics when studying evolution of language. Finally, this being so, the description of language management is a part of the sociolinguistic description of language situations (Homoláč & Mrázková, 2014; Nekvapil, 2000).

It is evident that the LMT agenda is very broad and would remain rich and interesting even if we omitted the item that is covered by other LPP approaches, that is, helping to solve language problems, however defined. This may be one of the reasons why LMT does not focus on social critique, at least not to the extent of the critical approach in LPP or some directions in the ethnography of language policy. This is true in spite of the fact that the classical LMT paper by Jernudd and Neustupný (1987) was devoted to the very analysis of interests in language planning. Phenomena such as power and ideology, however, do fall within the scope of LMT (see, e.g. Dovalil, 2015; Fairbrother, 2015; Nekvapil & Sherman, 2013).

To conclude, LMT is essentially a linguistic, or more precisely a sociolinguistic theory, which elucidates one important aspect of language use, namely its management. It is a fairly widely accepted distinctive approach within LPP. After all, it was Neustupný's original intention to give language planning some solid linguistic foundations (see Neustupný, 1968). The proponents of LMT do not usually ask questions like "how can we as researchers and educators interact with the policy process to promote a social justice agenda?" (Johnson, 2013, p. 92). LMT, on the other hand, could serve these researchers and educators (among other things) as a diagnostic tool for the analysis of language policy processes (especially of their genesis) observed at the social micro-level. Thus, in the research area of LPP, LMT can contribute to answering the fundamental questions as postulated by Johnson:

> what research methods are most effective for establishing connections between macro and micro-level policy activity? How do we know when there is a connection and what kind of data are necessary to justify that there is, in fact, a connection? (2013, p. 92)

Concluding remarks

Baldauf was not only a knowledgeable interpreter of LMT, but also its occasional user. He and Kaplan wrote their most detailed paper on LMT based on their experience with editing texts (including Neustupný & Nekvapil, 2003) for *Current Issues in Language Planning*. In this paper (see Kaplan & Baldauf, 2005) they introduce basic technical features of LMT; LMT as a whole is presented here as a theory which frames the empirical analysis of particular language and mainly textual problems. In another study co-authored by Baldauf (Hamid, Zhu, & Baldauf, 2014), LMT frames the empirical analysis of "how a group of global TESOL practitioners in an Australian university evaluated usages of English as a second language, what criteria they used and what implications their judgments and decision-making processes have for TESOL pedagogy and World Englishes research" (p. 77). This particular text was probably the last paper published in his lifetime that Baldauf wrote about LMT.

Baldauf's influence, however, has continued. Thanks to his pedagogical activity, Baldauf's students and later colleagues have been informed about LMT as one approach in LPP; and some of them have gone on to choose LMT as the basic theoretical framework for their empirical work (see e.g. Ali, 2013).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes

1. The connection between LMT and the linguistic thinking of the Prague School has recently been stressed by Kaplan (2011).
2. B.H. Jernudd (personal communication). See also materials available at: http://languagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/en/node/362.
3. When presenting LMT, I use a number of introductory texts such as Nekvapil, (2006, 2009, 2011, 2014), Nekvapil & Nekula (2006) and Nekvapil & Sherman (2014). A large bibliography of further relevant papers can be found on the language management website maintained by experts working at the Charles University in Prague http://languagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/en/, with the possibility of downloading a number of the items.
4. Lately, Johnson (2013, p. 7) was also critical of Spolsky's conception of language policy, the sub-concept of which is precisely "language management".

Notes on contributor

Jiří Nekvapil is Associate Professor at the Department of Linguistics at Charles University in Prague, where he specializes in sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis. His current research focuses on multilingual practices in companies, discourses of economic behaviour in times of instability, and history of language planning.

References

Ali, L. H. (2013). *Language policy and planning in Malaysia: Managing English-medium instruction at tertiary level* (Unpublished PhD dissertation). Brisbane: The University of Queensland.

Baldauf, R. B. (2005). Language planning and policy research: An overview. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 957–970). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Baldauf, R. B. (2012). Introduction – language planning: Where have we been? Where might we be going? *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, *12*(2), 233–248.

Baldauf, R. B., & Hamid, M. O. (in press). Language planning "schools" and their approaches and methodologies. In M. Sloboda, J. Nekvapil & L. Fairbrother (Eds.), *The language management approach: Focus on methodology*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dovalil, V. (2011). Review of Spolsky (2009). *Sociolinguistica*, *25*, 150–155.

Dovalil, V. (2015). Language management theory as a basis for the dynamic concept of EU language law. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *16*(4), 360–377.

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.

Fishman, J. A. (1971). The Sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in the sociology of language* (pp. 217–404). The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, J. A. (1987). Conference comments: Reflections on the current state of language planning. In L. Laforge (Ed.), *Actes du Colloque international sur l'aménagement linguistique/Proceedings of the international colloquium on language planning* (pp. 407–428). Québec: Les Presses de L'Université Lava.

Hamid, M. O., Zhu, L., & Baldauf, R. B. (2014). Norms and varieties of English and TESOL teacher agency. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(10), 77–95.

Haugen, E. (1983). The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In J. Cobarrubias & J.A. Fishman (Eds.), *Progress in language planning. international perspectives* (pp. 269–289). Berlin: Mouton.

Homoláč, J., & Mrázková, K. (2014). K stylistickému hodnocení jazykových prostředků, zvláště lexikálních [On the stylistic classification of linguistic (particularly lexical) items]. *Slovo a Slovesnost*, *75*(1), 3–38.

Hornberger, N. (2006). Frameworks and models in language policy and planning. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 24–41). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Jernudd, B. H. (1990). Two approaches to language planning. In V. Bickley (Ed.), *Language use, language teaching and the curriculum* (pp. 48–53). Hong Kong: Institute of Language in Education, Education Department.

Jernudd, B. H. (1991). Language planning as discipline. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *12*(1–2), 127–134.

Jernudd, B. H. (1993). Language planning from a management perspective: An interpretation of findings. In E. H. Jahr (Ed.), *Language conflict and language planning* (pp. 133–42). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jernudd, B. H. (2010). Review of language management, by Bernard Spolsky, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *11*(1), 83–89.

Jernudd, B. H. (2013). On the occasion of J.V. Neustupný's 80th birthday. *Slovo a Slovesnost*, *74*(4), 316–319.

Jernudd, B. H., & Neustupný, J. (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.

Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Kaplan, R. B. (2011). Language management theory: From the Prague Circle to the present. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *32*, 85–93.

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

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

Kimura, G. Ch. (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. Ch. (2015). Spracherhalt als Prozess: Elemente des kirchlichen Sprachmanagements bei den katholischen Sorben. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *232*, 13–32.

Kopecký, J. (2014). Přechylování příjmení v češtině jako případ jazykového managementu [Derivation of feminine surnames in Czech as a case of language management]. *Slovo a Slovesnost*, *75*(4), 271–293.

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

Marriott, H. (1991). Native-speaker behavior in Australian-Japanese business communication. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *92*, 87–117.

Marriott, H., & Nekvapil, J. (Eds.) (2012). Language management approach: Probing the concept of "noting". [Special issue]. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *22*(2), 155–317.

McCarty, T. (Ed.). (2011). *Ethnography and language policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Muraoka, H. (2000). Management of intercultural input: A case study of two Korean residents of Japan. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *10*, 297–311.

Nekvapil, J. (2000). Language management in a changing society. In B. Panzer (Ed.), *Die sprachliche Situation in der Slavia zehn Jahre nach der Wende* (pp. 165–177). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Nekvapil, J. (2004). Language biographies and management summaries. In H. Muraoka (Ed.), *Language management in contact situations* (Vol. 3, pp. 9–33). (Report on the Research Projects No. 104). Chiba: Chiba University, Gradual School of Social Sciences and Humanities. Retrieved from http://languagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/en/node/352#2004

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

Nekvapil, J. (2009). The integrative potential of Language Management Theory. In J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (Eds.), *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* (Vol. 2, pp. 871–87). New York, NY: Routledge.

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

Nekvapil, J. (2014). Gengokeikaku kara gengokanri e – J. V. Neusutopuni no keishou. *Gengoseisaku/Language Policy*, *10*, 129–148.

Nekvapil, J., & Nekula, M. (2006). On language management in multinational companies in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *7*(2–3), 307–327.

Nekvapil, J., & Sherman, T. (Eds.) (2009a). *Language management in contact situations: Perspectives from three continents*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Nekvapil, J., & Sherman, T. (2009b). Pre-interaction management in multinational companies in Central Europe. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *10*(2), 181–198.

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* (pp. 85–117). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lan.

Nekvapil, J., & Sherman, T. (2014). Jazykový management a teorie jazykového managementu: úvodní poznámky [Language management and Language Management Theory: Introductory remarks]. *Slovo a Slovesnost*, *75*(4), 245–254.

Nekvapil, J., & Sherman, T. (Eds.). (2015). The language management approach: Perspectives on the interplay of bottom-up and top-down. [Special issue]. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 232, 1–214.

Neustupný, J. V. (1968). Some general aspects of 'language' problems and 'language' policy in developing societies. In J. A. Fishman, Ch. A. Ferguson, & J. das Gupta (Eds.), *Language problems of developing nations* (pp. 285–294). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Neustupný, J. V. (1978). *Post-structural approaches to language*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

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

Neustupný, J. V. (1990). The follow-up interview. *Japanese Studies Association of Australia Newsletter*, *10*(2), 31–33. Retrieved from http://languagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/node/352#1990

Neustupný, J. V. (1994). Problems of English contact discourse and language planning. In T. Kandiah & J. Kwan-Terry (Eds.), *English and language planning* (pp. 50–69). Singapore: Academic Press.

Neustupný, J. V. (2003). Japanese students in Prague. *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.

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

Neustupny, R. (1996). Australians and Japanese at Morwell: Interaction in the work domain. In H. Marriott & M. Low (Eds.), *Language and cultural contact with Japan* (pp. 156–171). Melbourne: Monash Asia Institute.

Pomerantz, A. (1986). Extreme case formulations: A way of legitimizing claims. *Human Studies*, *9*(2), 219–229.

Rubin, J., & Jernudd, B. H. (Eds.). (1971). *Can language be planned?* Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

Sanden, G. R. (2014). Language management × 3: A theory, a sub-concept, and a business strategy tool. *Applied Linguistics*. First published online: September 18, 2014. doi:10.1093/applin/amu048.

Sherman, T. (2006). Uncovering institutionally imposed norms through the interaction interview: Mormon missionaries in the Czech Republic. In H. Muraoka (Ed.), *Language management for the coming multicultural society: Language management in contact situations*) (Vol. 4, pp. 1–12). (Report on the Research Projects No. 129). Chiba: Chiba University, Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities. Retrieved from http://languagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/en/node/352#2006

Sherman, T. (2010). Proselyting in first-contact situations as an instructed action. *Sociologický časopis / Czech Sociological Review*, *46*(6), 977–1009.

Sherman, T. (2015). Behaving toward language in the Mormon mission: The Czech case. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 232, 33–57.

Sherman, T., & Homoláč, J. (2014). Management summaries and the follow-up interview in language biography research. *Slovo a slovesnost*, *75*(4), 294–324.

Sloboda, M. (2010). Review of Spolsky (*2009*). *LINGUIST list*, 21 (227). Retrieved from http://linguistlist.org/issues/21/21-227.html

Sloboda, M., Szabó-Gilinger, E., Vigers, D., & Šimičić, L. (2010). Carrying out a language policy change: Advocacy coalitions and the management of linguistic landscape. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *11*(2), 95–113.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [see Jernudd (2010), Sloboda (2010) and Dovalil (2011) for a review of this book].

Tollefson, J. W. (2006). Critical theory in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 42–59). Malden, MA: Blackwell.