



FACULTY OF ARTS
Charles University

Jiří Nekvapil

jiri.nekvapil@ff.cuni.cz

Noting as Social Action: Some Remarks on Language Management Theory

8th International Language Management Symposium: Language
Management in the Digital Era

Yangzhou University, October 18-20, 2024

Structure of the presentation

- General remarks on Language Management Theory (LMT)
- The issue of noting
- Voices from other approaches
- Analysis
- The issue of agency
- Conclusions (empirical & conceptual matters)

Three basic features of LMT

- **Interplay** of management produced by individuals in concrete interactions ('simple management') and management produced by institutions or organizations ('organised management') – **micro-macro linkage**
- **Processual** character of management (noting, evaluation, adjustment design, implementation, feedback)
- Close connection between **language management** (in the narrow sense) and **communicative** and **socio-cultural** (including **socio-economic**) management
- For more details see the language management website: <http://languagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/>

LMT as one approach to Language Policy and Planning

According to Baldauf & Hamid (2018) there are four basic approaches:

- 1) the neoclassical approach (Kaplan & Baldauf, and most recently, Gazolla, Grin et al. 2024: *The Routledge Handbook of Language Policy and Planning* – “language policy as public policy”)
- 2) the language management approach (Jernudd & Neustupny)
- 3) the domain approach (Spolsky)
- 4) the critical approach (Tollefson)
- However, LMT is not only among the main approaches to **language policy and planning**, but also represents a **specific (socio)linguistic theory** elucidating some major aspects of language

Research on language management in China

- More focused on macro than micro (detailed analysis of particular interactions missing)
- Varied conceptualization of language management: Spolsky's influence, LMT's influence
- He Shanhua, Dai Manchun, Zhang Zhiguo, Fang Xiaobing, Zheng Yongyan, Wang Yingjie, Yin Zhiping, Zhao Ronghui, Shen Qi ...

Language management as a sub-concept (the domain approach of B. Spolsky)

- Spolsky (2004) *Language Policy*. CUP.
- Spolsky (2009) *Language Management*. CUP
- Here, **language management** is one of the three components of the concept of **language policy**, that is, in addition to **language practices** and **language beliefs** (ideologies) (see Sanden 2016)
- Language management is defined as “the **explicit** and **observable** effort by someone or some group that has or claims authority over the participants in the **domain** to modify their practices or beliefs.” (Spolsky 2009:4)

Our symposium in Yangzhou

- The title of Björn Jernudd's announced but unfortunately not accomplished plenary speech:
- **Changing contexts for language management: From pen on paper and people conversing to automated communication**
- Consider the context of Jernudd's thoughts in his personal biography (B. H. Jernudd – born 1942)

The issue of noting

- The importance of noting consists in the fact that, logically and commonsensically, there is no language management without the phase of noting
- Important (research) questions:
 - What linguistic or communicative phenomena are noted or not noted by the speakers?
 - Under what circumstances does noting take place?
 - What methods enable us to find out that noting occurred?
 - What is the relationship between noting and further phases of language management?
 - How is noting in everyday interactions connected to organized language management?

Approaches to noting

- **My paper will focus on noting as social action.** This perspective leads us to devote attention to the use of everyday language and think of noting as an interactional rather than mental phenomenon
- **Discursive psychology** - A form of discourse analysis that focuses on psychological themes (attitudes, memory, emotions ...)
- Discursive psychology starts with psychological phenomena as things that are constructed, attended to, and understood in interaction.
- For example, a shift from considering attitudes as underlying mental constructs to focusing on people's practices of evaluation in particular settings.
- Analogically, would it be possible to perform a shift from 'noticing' to 'noting'?
- From noticing as underlying mental construct to practices of noting in particular settings

Noting vs Noticing (Dovalil 2022)

-
- “The term ‘noting’ should not be confused with ‘noticing’ a deviation/phenomenon. **Noting suggests a discursive activity, in which an utterance is generated and communicated to other participants, while noticing primarily denotes a psychological act of perception that does not necessarily lead to an utterance.** Noticing the deviations from the expectations can be indirectly assessed by carefully designed psycho-/neurolinguistic experiments (see e.g. Hanulíková et al. 2012, or Hanulíková 2021). When noticed phenomena are not articulated outwardly, the interlocutors do not have a chance of finding out what happens in the speaker’s consciousness, what exactly the speaker is paying (or has paid) attention to, etc. (for more details see Marriott and Nekvapil 2012)” (Dovalil 2022, p. 39)
 - This presumes that logically noting is not taken as a mental phenomenon (being a discursive activity) but in that case the following issue is emerging: when asking about the first stage of language management through follow-up interview, how should we formulate the question: did you notice this or that? Or: did you note this or that?
 - In Czech, both meanings, that is of noticing and noting, are covered by one word, that is *povšimnout si*

'Noting' as social action in literary studies and language education

- Hromadová, M. (2018). Managing a literary text: The perspective of a native and non-native speaker. In L. Fairbrother, J. Nekvapil and M. Sloboda (eds.), *The Language Management Approach: A Focus on Research Methodology*. Berlin, etc.: Peter Lang, 303-326.
- 'Noting' related to the concept of foregrounding as defined in Prague School literary structuralism (Jan Mukařovský)
- From the experiment instructions: "You may make remarks on the text, next to it, take notes on the margin ... It would be great if you could just highlight, underline anything you noticed, you evaluated in some way, tried to resolve in some way." (p. 312)
- Fan, S. K. (2017). Noting as learning: Its significance for teaching and learning Japanese in volunteer language classrooms for migrants. *Sains Humanika* 9 (4-2), 115-123.
- How to remove the inability to note deviations from norms underlying in Japanese speech situation, in other words, how to enhance noting through systematic classroom activities (Noting Through Observation, Noting Through Comparison, Noting Through Practice, Noting Through Performance, Noting Through Implementation In Real Life)

'Notice and Note' approach

- Beers, K. and Probst, R. E. (2013). *Notice and Note: Strategies for Close Reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- “Now, more than ever, reading seems to be a social act.”
- The authors developed a set of the so-called signposts (such as Contrasts and Contradictions / “Lessons of the Unexpected” or Again and Again), p. 84
- “The Notice and Note Signposts represent what we want students to do as they read. They notice something in the text and then stop to note what it might mean.” (p. 77)

'Noticing' in ethnomethodology

- Heritage, J. (2005). Cognition in discourse, p. 185 (on noticing, an interpretation of this word as used in the course of a conversation)
- Mondada, L. (2022). The situated and methodic production of accountable action, p. 295 ff. (on noticing, practices of noticing, production of noticing, noticing as a situated and embodied action)
- Activities: seeing a detail, noticing it, and showing it to the co-participants (the situation: a guided visit of a building constructed by a famous architect, the cultural manager of the building leads a small group of visitors)
- The importance of noticing is emphasized in the ethnomethodological distinction “seen but unnoticed” (cf. also the example on joint watching TV in Nekvapil 2012)

The use of spellcheckers

- What do spellcheckers really do?
- Noting **initiated** by a spellchecker
- Do spellcheckers do 'noticing' for the writer? And in this way do they make a following 'noting' possible?
- Thus 'noticing' would be a matter of inevitable perceptual monitoring done by humans or a matter of technologically based monitoring done by machines
- And 'noting' would remain social action

Two Czech students of a Teacher Training College talking about their homework assignment:

(translated from Czech, the source: Zeman 2015)

- T1 A: yesterday I was putting together the after-school activities. right, now I wrote down, I **ztrávila** ((spent)) two weeks as camp counselor. (..) and now I see, it underlined **ztrávila** in red.
- T2 B: it was wrong.
- T3 A: the letters were fine, (.) the letter **v** followed by **i**, I'm not that stupid. right,
- T4 B: I'd I write **prožila** ((passed)), and the problem would disappear.
- T5 A: I also wanted to formulate that differently, (.) but my brother came, and I say. what's wrong here. and he's like **s** should be there.
- T6 B: I thought, with **s** it's **strávit** ((digest)) in the stomach.
- T7 A: so did I. but there's no difference. (...) so I put **s** there, the red underline disappeared, and so it was correct.

Non-human agency

- Latour (2005) Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory
- Pennycook (2018) Posthumanist Applied Linguistics
- The actor-network-theory (ANT) demonstrates that everything in the social and natural worlds, human and nonhuman, interacts in shifting networks of relationships without any other elements out of the networks. **ANT challenges many traditional approaches by defining nonhumans as actors equal to humans.**

Dovalil's presentation of basic features of LMT

- Language Management Theory (LMT) encompasses the following features:
- 1) the actors involved in language-related behavior, their interests, social status, power and their (more or less complex) social networks;
- 2) the interplay between the micro and macro levels on which social actors conduct these activities;
- 3) the processual character of this behavior and its division into several phases;
- 4) the interconnection of socioeconomic, communicative and linguistic levels of language management activities

(Dovalil, 2022, p. 36)

Conclusions

- **Empirical matters**
- The use of spellcheckers exemplifies the interplay of human and non-human agency in language management, and much more research on this interplay is needed
- **Conceptual matters**
- Not only 'noting' but also 'noticing' is taken as social action in some approaches (ethnomethodology)
- In some approaches 'noting' and 'noticing' is distinguished programmatically (Notice and Note approach), and this distinction might be used also in LMT.
- Thus 'noticing' would be a matter of inevitable perceptual monitoring done by humans or a matter of technologically based monitoring done by machines and 'noting' would remain social action

References

- Baldauf, R. B. Jr. & M. O. Hamid (2018). Language planning ‘schools’ and their approaches and methodologies. In L. Fairbrother, J. Nekvapil & M. Sloboda (eds.), *The Language Management Approach: A focus on research methodology*, 43–66. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Beers, K. and Probst, R. E. (2013). *Notice and Note: Strategies for Close Reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Dovalil, V. (2022). Metalinguistic activities as a focus of sociolinguistic research: Language Management Theory, its potential, and fields of application. *Sociolinguistica: European Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 36 (1-2), 35-53.
- Fan, S. K. (2017). Noting as learning: Its significance for teaching and learning Japanese in volunteer language classrooms for migrants. *Sains Humanika* 9 (4-2), 115-123.
- Heritage, J. (2005). Cognition in discourse. In H. te Molder and J. Potter (eds.), *Conversation and Cognition*. Cambridge University Press, p. 184-202.

References, cont.

- Hromadová, M. (2018). Managing a literary text: The perspective of a native and non-native speaker. In L. Fairbrother, J. Nekvapil and M. Sloboda (eds.), *The Language Management Approach: A Focus on Research Methodology*. Berlin, etc.: Peter Lang, 303-326.
- Marriott, H. & Nekvapil, J. (eds.) (2012). *Language Management Approach: Probing the Concept of "Noting"*. [Special issue of *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 22 \(2\)](#).
- Mondada, L. (2022). The situated and methodic production of accountable action: The challenges of multimodality. In D. W. Maynard and J. Heritage (eds.), *The Ethnomethodology Program: Legacies and Prospects*. New York: The Oxford University Press, 289-321.
- Sanden, G. R. (2016). Language management × 3: A theory, a sub-concept, and a business strategy tool. *Applied Linguistics* 37 (4), 520-535.
- Zeman, J. (2015). Jazykové problémy v každodenní komunikaci [Language problems in ordinary conversation]. In M. Balowski (ed.), *Doświadczanie codzienności w języku i w literaturze czeskiej*. Bohemica Posnaniensia 12. Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, 303-309.

Thank you

Děkuji

Xiexie dajia
谢谢大家！

Final discussion: Language Management in the Digital Era

- The relationship of various approaches to **language management** (Spolsky versus Jernudd & Neustupný, that is LMT)
- ‘Language governance’ approach as another alternative to LMT? Can ‘language governance’ be integrated in LMT? possible benefits (?)
- What linguistic, communicative or sociocultural features of **digitalization** draw attention of social actors, that is, are managed?
- What phenomena bound to digitalization can be distinguished?