On the process of language problem management*

ISTVÁN LANSTYÁK

ABSTRACT: In this paper, I present an outline of the process of language problem management, which draws on the common elements of various models of the process of problem management in general. Since language problems are just one group of human problems occurring in various domains of life, I reached the conviction that a workable model of language problem management should build on problem management in general, while taking into account the specific features of language problems and language problem management. In considering the specific features of language problem management, I utilize a number of concepts from Language Management Theory.

Key words: language problem, problem management, language management, language problem management, small-scale vs. large-scale management, inadequacies vs. meta-problems, problem management process, problem management theories, Language Management Theory

1. Introduction

The subject of this paper is a part of my investigations, the aim of which was to find out how insights from applied linguistics as well as a number of non-linguistic academic disciplines and research areas concerned with social, economic, political, environmental, health, psychological, learning, interpersonal, and other problems could enrich Language Management Theory (henceforth LMT)[1] and make it more compatible with other problem management (henceforth PM) approaches[2], thus enhancing its potential for successful treatment of complex language problems such as standardization of non-standardized languages, the development of writing systems for unwritten languages, reversing language shift or revitalizing dying or dead languages, or language reforms

---

[1] As this paper is intended to be published in a monothematic issue of a linguistic journal concerned with language management (LM), I mostly dispense with the general characteristics of LMT and the definitions of most of the basic concepts in LMT. Those who are not familiar with the basics of the theory are recommended to read some of the works which present the outline of the theory, such as Jernudd (1993), Nekvapil (2006, 2009), Neustupný & Nekvapil (2003), where the key issues of the theory are discussed and key concepts defined. A large bibliography can be found on the LM website maintained by LM experts working at the Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic (http://languagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/en/bibliography #2012), with the possibility of downloading a number of the items.

[2] Some of the areas which seem to be useful for LM are social problem solving, creative problem solving, insight problem solving, decision making, strategic decision making, operational research, planning in general, critical planning, collaborative planning, theories of practice, systems thinking, design thinking and knowledge management. For the sake of simplicity, I will refer to all of these as "PM approaches".

(of normally transmitted languages).[3] My motivations as well as goals were similar to those of Kimura (2013), without my knowing his paper at that time.

However, my perspective later shifted, and in this version of my paper I am trying to find the elements in LMT which can enrich theories of PM and make them suitable for dealing with language problems specifically. My long-range objective is to contribute to the development of a tentative model of the process of language problem management (LPM) which draws on the common elements of various PM process models and supplements them with several important concepts from language management and language planning approaches.

The model I am seeking should subsume the LPM of various types. The ultimate aim is not so much theoretical as practical: I would like to contribute to creating a tool for managing both the individual instances of problems rising in concrete interactions (i.e. inadequacies) and types of problems which can be identified supra-interactionally (i.e. meta-problems): problems of various ranges, from those in the management of which only one person or a handful of persons are involved to those which require the co-operation of hundreds of actors at various places within a large administrative unit such as a province or a state or a group of states. The model should not be merely descriptive in its character, showing how the LPM process usually occurs, but it should also serve as an instrument for devising the management of previously unmanaged or not adequately managed problems. Yet this LPM process model should not be strictly prescriptive ("this is to be done"), but rather *instructive* ("previous experience shows that this might help; it may prove expedient to do this").

The reason why such an instrument should not be prescriptive is that it is utterly impossible to prescribe clear-cut "solutions" for most of the complex language problems, which are wicked in character; actually no definite "solution" exists for such problems (Rittel & Webber 1973: 155; see also Klein 2007: 80; Devaney & Spratt, 2009: 639). Moreover, in the course of the ongoing LPM process, the actors continually acquire new relevant knowledge and insight about the problem, and the use of this knowledge and insight can substantially modify the ongoing LPM process. Although under such circumstances it is not possible to say at the outset what "should be done", it *is* possible to learn from the previous experience with problems of similar character and utilize this knowledge in managing the previously unmanaged or not appropriately managed problems. The model should, in a way, be a repository of that knowledge.

2. Basic concepts

2.1. *Language activities*

One of the great merits of LMT is that it makes the issue of human intervention into discourses or into the language system an organic part of language theory. It differentiates between l a n g u a g e u s e and l a n g u a g e m a n a g e m e n t. The for-

---

[3] Further important territories are mentioned in Neustupný (1983: 1).

mer is the "ordinary" generation of utterances, while the latter is an activity the object of which is the utterances themselves, i.e. "behaviour towards language". In this way, LMT brings these two processes together into a unified framework, emphasizing that "managing language is an integral part of language activities" (Kimura 2005: 12). "L a n g u a g e a c t i v i t i e s" is thus a common term denoting all kinds of language related behaviour, i.e. both language use and language management (Kimura 2005: 9 and *passim*; see also Neustupný 1983: 1; Nekvapil 2009: 1–2). Of these two, the object of LMT is, of course, language management only.

Contrary to the approach of LMT, my focus is on the management of language *problems*, which is just one kind of language management, albeit probably the most important one (cf. Lanstyák 2014). The ultimate aim of the management of language problems is to bring about changes into the discourses of one or more languages or into the lexicon or the grammatical system of these languages, with the aim to alleviate or solve one or more language problems; if the ongoing changes in a language or some of their aspects are evaluated as "negative" in the light of certain language ideologies, the aim of LPM may also be to impede or halt these changes in order to preserve the former language system or the former arrangement of language varieties etc. The attribute *ultimate* at the beginning of the previous sentence is important, because analysing the problem situation may consider language matters without interventionist intent, but if it is one stage in the LPM process, it may be regarded as management of language problems.

All of this shows that a distinction has to be made between "language management" and "language problem management", or more naturally: "management of language problems". The term "language management" denotes a broader range of activities: in addition to the management of language problems, it also includes LM of non-interventionist character, e.g. dealing with positively evaluated deviations from the norms or expectations of the interactants or thinking and talking about discourses or language without the intent to bring about changes in them.

2.2. *Problems and interaction*

There is a basic distinction between language problems which have arisen in a particular interaction and have often been managed within the same interaction or only a relatively short time after it on the one hand, and types of problems which are abstracted from many particular interactions, on the other hand.

On the i n t e r a c t i o n a l l e v e l, interactants in concrete situations, *hic et nunc,* encounter a particular instance of a problem (a "problem token"), which in LMT is many times called i n a d e q u a c y (Jernudd 1991: 62–63; 1993: 138; 2001; 2003; 2009: 247; Neustupný 1978: 250; 1994: 52; Nekvapil 2009: 5). An example of an inadequacy may be someone saying on a single occasion *punctuation* instead of *punctuality* and being ridiculed. The management of such a problem can be said to be i n t e r a c t i o n a l. If problems of identical character reoccur, the speakers may

perceive them as permanent problems represented in a generalized form as m e t a -
p r o b l e m s (or "problem types"). For instance, someone may regularly confuse
words which sound similar; if this bothers his/her interlocutors, he/she may decide to
look up these "difficult" words in a dictionary and learn the difference (cf. Jernudd
1991: 63; Sloboda & Nábělková 2013: 200). This is a s u p r a - i n t e r a c t i o n a l
l e v e l ; the management of such problems can be said to be supra-interactional.

Inadequacies can be managed either "online" or "offline" (Jernudd 2001, 2003, 2009:
247). O n l i n e m a n a g e m e n t is LM taking place in the same interaction as
the inadequacies have arisen. It is called also "pre-management" or "in-management"
or "post-management" depending on whether the LM occurs "before the appearance
of a potential deviation" or "after the start of generating an utterance" or "after the
appearance of the deviation" (Pasfield-Neofitou 2012: 277; see also Hübschmannová
& Neustupný 2004: 90–91; Marriott 2006: 330). O f f l i n e m a n a g e m e n t is
LM taking place either before the inadequacies occur, with the aim to prevent their
appearance or after their occurrence, but in another interaction. The former is called
"pre-interaction management", while the latter is called "post-interaction management"
(Nekvapil 2009: 7; Nekvapil & Sherman 2009: 185). An example of an inadequacy
managed offline is looking up a word in a dictionary either in advance in anticipation
of a possible inadequacy in the future interaction, or after the inadequacy has arisen,
as a corrective adjustment (cf. Nekvapil 2009: 5; Nekvapil & Sherman 2009: 185;
Pasfield-Neofitou 2012: 277).

The meta-problems are, of course, always managed offline, either proactively in the
form of pre-interaction management, or retroactively in the form of post-interaction
management (more exactly, but ungrammatically: "post-interactions" management).
An example of a pre-interaction management of a meta-problem is the organization
of language courses for employees before they start working in an international com-
pany. An example of post-interaction management of a meta-problem is the organiza-
tion of language courses for employees in an international company after the employ-
ers have realized that the employees' language competence is not sufficient for their
work (cf. Nekvapil & Nekula 2006: 321–322; Nekvapil & Sherman 2009: 192;
Engelhardt 2011: 114).

2.3. *The extent of problem management*

A PM theory aimed at managing language problems should be capable of handling
language problems affecting groups of people and organizational structures of various
sizes. On this basis, s m a l l - s c a l e m a n a g e m e n t (SSM) and l a r g e -
- s c a l e m a n a g e m e n t (LSM) can be distinguished, with groups of differing
sizes in-between.

There is a close relationship between the number of people affected by a problem
(stakeholders, as they are called in PM theories) and the informal or formal organiza-
tional units into which they group. SSM is thus a management of a problem affecting

either an individual or a small group of people forming a small social system. If three people without a common language meet and have to work together and communicate with each other, they encounter a small-scale problem, which they may solve by developing a sort of foreigner talk. LSM is the management of a problem affecting a large group of people forming a large social system. If a large number of people with no common language come into regular contact with each other, e.g. because of migration, they encounter a large-scale problem which will probably be managed by different means, e.g. by the spontaneous development of a pidgin language (under special circumstances) or through the organization of language courses to learn an existing common language.[4]

Any social system may be the basic unit of LM, whether formal or informal, from a small group like a family or a work team through medium-size groups like associations, schools, universities, companies to large groups like provinces, states or groups of states (see e.g. Neustupný 1983: 1; Marriott 2006: 329; Nekvapil & Nekula 2006: 308, 311; Nekvapil 2012: 15).[5] The proponents of LMT are convinced that "there is no intrinsic difference among the levels" (Kimura 2005: 7).

LSM always deals with meta-problems; to go back to the example about confusing words from the previous section: the meta-problem may be formulated as confusing words similar in sound (used by a given stratum of the population), and the remedy for it on this level may be devising dictionaries of paronyms or initiating the inclusion of this topic into the curricula of mother tongue and foreign language education.

The stakeholders may range in number, from a single individual to the whole population of a province, a state or a group of states. This is also true of those who actively take part in the PM process (the actors in the process), who may also be of varied status, from individuals acting on their own to persons representing various organizations to government officials. This is a different aspect which should not be confused with the previous one. A problem may affect large numbers of people and yet be relatively simple to manage, and therefore a small group of managers may do the work (e.g. to devise and implement a terminological innovation through education). Conversely, some problems may affect relatively few people, e.g. a small community, yet their management requires a large team of managers (e.g. the revitalization of a small dying language).

---

[4] If a problem affects a larger number of people, but they are affected solely as individuals, and each of them manages his/her problem independently of others, we cannot speak of large-scale PM, but rather, only of many parallel small-scale PM acts or processes. Large-scale PM presupposes that the management is accomplished for the whole group. Thus if some elderly individuals throughout a bilingual community are monolinguals in the first language of the community, the minority language, they may encounter communication problems which nobody tries to solve on community level: each of these individuals acts on his/her own behalf to solve his/her own individual problems or meta-problems. This is a case of SSM, more exactly many independent SSMs. If, however, some measures are taken to help (theoretically) all these people, e.g. a legal regulation is enacted which enables these people to apply for an interpreter, we classify this as an instance of LSM.

[5] For the sake of simplicity, PM within medium-sized groups like schools, companies, local churches, units of local administration, etc. will be considered part of LSM in this paper.

2.4. *The complexity of the problems*

Language problems, like other kinds of problems, are highly varied (Neustupný 1983: 1) and differ greatly in their complexity. Some problems, like correcting a slip of the tongue, are very s i m p l e, having a simple structure, some others, like (reversing) language shift, are much more c o m p l e x, consisting of a large number of subproblems which interact with each other and thus affect the whole problem in an unforeseen way (cf. Jackson 2003: 19).

The complexity of the problem is t e c h n i c a l if it is related to the physical, mathematical, computational – or in the case of language problems, linguistic – nature of the problem; the complexity of the problem is s o c i a l or h u m a n, if it is related to the interrelationships between the stakeholders (Daellenbach 2001). To use a T-form or V-form when addressing someone is linguistically a very simple issue, but socially it may be a rather complex problem, especially in some languages in the Far East.

The relationship between the (groups of) stakeholders may be unitary, pluralist or coercive (Jackson 2003: 19). If the stakeholders have similar values, ideologies and interests, and therefore share common purposes, their relationship is said to be u n i - t a r y and the problem is socially simple. Such may be the problem of the members of a family in deciding in which languages for TV channels they should subscribe to. The stakeholders' relationship is p l u r a l i s t, if they do not share the same values and ideologies, but their basic interests can be made compatible through debate or a conflict-resolving process. Socially, such a problem has a certain extent of complexity. Such may be the question of deciding how intensely a minority language should be taught, if the decision is in the hands of the representatives of the minority community. If the stakeholders hold conflicting values and ideologies and have very few interests in common, such that no compromise can be reached about the objectives of the PM process, their relationship is c o e r c i v e. Such a problem is socially very complex. In this case, decisions are taken on the basis of who has more power, and coercion is needed to ensure the execution of the directives. This is typically the case in a language situation with a majority and one or more minority languages, where both the representatives of the majority and those of the minorities are involved into the decision-making process.

Technically complex problems are not necessarily difficult to manage. To understand this, it is useful to mention a typology of problems based on the method used to manage them. In this respect, problems can be divided into three categories. A l g o r i t h m i c   p r o b l e m s are problems which can be easily defined and which can be managed (solved) by applying well-known procedures; there is no need to search for solutions.[6] H e u r i s t i c   p r o b l e m s are also easily defined, how-

---

[6] The attribute *algorithmic* is used here in a somewhat looser sense, "algorithm" being here simply "a set of well-defined steps required to accomplish some task" (Harris & Ross 2006: 1; Skiena 2008: 3). "Algorithm" in the stricter sense of the word is "an explicit, precise, unambiguous, mechanically-executable sequence of elementary instructions" (Erickson 2013: 1/1), but language problems can seldom (if ever) be solved by such algorithms, with perhaps the exception of grammatical problems such as forming the third person singular

ever, their management is not obvious, known solutions do not fit, ways to manage them must be sought. Finally, m e s s e s are unstructured problems which cannot be satisfactorily defined at all and it is not at all clear how to manage them either. (Cf. de Vries 1993: 5; Mackenzie et al. 2006: 157–158; Puccio et al. 2012: 17–18.)

Algorithmic and heuristic problems are often called w e l l - s t r u c t u r e d, w e l l - d e f i n e d or t a m e p r o b l e m s, while messes are called i l l - s t r u c - t u r e d or i l l - d e f i n e d or w i c k e d p r o b l e m s. The term "wicked problems" comes from Rittel & Weber (1973) and is widely used in various PM theories. They are problems whose most important characteristics are the following: they cannot be exhaustively formulated, the goal of the management process cannot be unambiguously defined, they do not have clear solutions, the outcome of the PM process is not scientifically predictable and not testable for efficacy, very different value judgements are made by those affected by the problem or those dealing with it (see e.g. Rittel & Webber 1973; see also de Vries 1993; Whelton & Ballard 2002; Christis 2005; Restrepo & Christiaans 2004; Song 2005; Vidal 2006; Hunter 2007; Klein 2007; Ayoub, Batres & Naka 2009; Devaney & Spratt 2009; Marcucci et al. 2010; Howard & Melles 2011). Many complex language, communication and socio-cultural problems are probably wicked problems, e.g. the problems caused by dialectal and language diversity such as the lack of easily accessible common means of communication, minority language shift, the problems with the selection of official languages in multilingual states, and the like.

2.5. *The complexity of the problem management*

Not only the problems themselves, but also the LPM systems may be of varied c o m p l e x i t y, from simple lexical corrections in an utterance or requests for clarification within a discourse through translation and interpreting, language teaching, language cultivation to reversing language shift, developing and disseminating a standard language variety or working out and implementing a language regime for a multilingual state (cf. Neustupný 1983: 1).

In LMT, simple and organized LM is distinguished, with many transitional stages between the two extremes (see Neustupný & Nekvapil 2003: 185; Hübschmannová & Neustupný 2004: 90; Kimura 2005: 9; Nekvapil & Nekula 2006: 310; Engelhardt 2011: 117–118; Sloboda & Nábělková 2013: 200). S i m p l e m a n a g e m e n t is a form of SSM, since it affects a small number of individuals; it is interaction-based; it does not require many resources; it may be spontaneous, even unconscious; it is seldom regulated by specific laws. O r g a n i z e d m a n a g e m e n t is typically a form of LSM, since it usually affects a large number of individuals or groups; it is always supra-interactional; it consumes more resources; it is directed, systematic and,

---

of a previously unknown verb in English. Application of the algorithm in the strict sense of the word always leads to the correct solution (Dunbar 1998). This kind of algorithms is called deterministic (the result of the process can be exactly defined on the basis of the input) (Harris & Ross 2006: 2).

of course, always conscious; it may be regulated by specific laws (such as language laws); metalinguistic communication about the LM takes place.[7]

3. Levels of problem management

One of the two basic distinctions needed to identify the typical cases of LPM is the distinction between interactional and supra-interactional level, i.e. the management of inadequacies which have arisen in a concrete interaction and the management of meta-problems, i.e. problem types abstracted from a number of concrete interactions. These two processes are radically different in nature, even if there is a connection between them. The other crucial distinction is SSM involving a small number of participants and LSM involving a large number of participants. We may suppose that if the process model works for these typical (and, in a way, extreme) cases, it will also work for other possible (in-between) cases. All other distinctions, those addressed as well as those not addressed[8] in Section 2 appear to coincide with these to a remarkable extent.

I will deal with three typical co-occurrences, which I will call l e v e l s o f l a n g u a g e p r o b l e m m a n a g e m e n t :

	interactional	*supra-interactional*
small-scale	1.	2.
large-scale	x	3.

Level 1: interactional (management of inadequacies) / online or offline – small-scale – simple management of simple / algorithmic problems[9]

Level 2: supra-interactional (management of meta-problems) / offline – small-scale – organized management of simple or technically somewhat more complex algorithmic or heuristic problems

Level 3: supra-interactional (management of meta-problems) / offline – large-scale – organized management of all kinds of problems, with special regard to messes (wicked problems)

---

[7] A further feature of the organized LM that is mentioned in the literature is that the process builds on previous knowledge, beliefs, language ideologies and attitudes (Neustupný & Nekvapil 2003: 185; Hübsch-mannová & Neustupný 2004: 90), but this is equally true of simple LM. Even minor corrections may be motivated by these factors, e.g. the mere fact that the speaker corrects a language form which does not cause misunderstanding or is not more difficult to understand than the correct one, may be influenced by his/her ideologies. In any case, it is true that the role of these is more conspicuous in the case of organized LM.

[8] Such are e.g. individual vs. group PM; private vs. public PM; lay vs. expert PM; bottom-up vs. top-down PM, self-imposed vs. other-imposed PM (the results of the latter are imposed on the stakeholders, usually by a legal authority); informal vs. formal PM; unregulated vs. regulated PM (the latter is PM which at least partly depends on previously existing informal or formal rules or regulations specific for the purpose of the PM and relevant to it); unconscious vs. conscious PM, etc.

[9] It appears as if interactional SSM could also be organized, when e.g. a one-off violation of the language rights of an individual is proceeded to court; however, in such cases the problem is actually large-scale and it may potentially affect many people, otherwise the possible language behaviour would not be regulated by a law.

4. The process of the problem management

One of the characteristics of LMT is the emphasis on the processual character of LM. According to the traditional model, the process starts on micro level with the rise of the potential problem, which manifests itself in (0) a d e v i a t i o n from the norms or expectations of the participants in an interaction. If one or more participants (1) n o t e the deviation and if they (2) e v a l u a t e it negatively, the potential problem becomes an actual one. If one or more participants are willing to manage the problem, they plan an (3) a d j u s t m e n t, which then needs to be (4) i m p l e m e n t e d (see e.g. Jernudd & Neustupný 1987: 78–80; Neustupný 1994: 52; 2003: 127; Kimura 2005: 7; Marriott 2006: 329; Nekvapil 2006: 97; 2009: 3–4; 2012: 12; Marriott & Nekvapil 2012b: 156). More recently, some amendments were suggested according to which it is not necessary for a LM process to be triggered by a deviation from the norms or expectations of the interactants and if a deviation does take place, a LM process may be launched even if the deviation is evaluated neutrally or positively.[10] Moreover, an additional phase was suggested to close the LM process and, if necessary, launch a new one; this phase is proposed to be called f e e d b a c k or e v a l u a t i o n o f i m p l e m e n t a t i o n (Kimura 2013: 7, 14–15).

Although the terminology clearly shows that this process was originally identified within small-scale (simple) LM – more exactly, on level 1, the same processes are said to be distinguishable within small-scale or large-scale (organized) LM – i.e. on level 2 and 3 (see e.g. Neustupný 1994: 50; 2003: 126; 2012: 299; Nekvapil & Nekula 2006: 307–309, 311 and *passim*; Jernudd 2009: 248; Nekvapil 2009: 2; 2012: 168). While fully acknowledging the importance of highlighting the connection between the processes on all the three levels of LM, I cannot follow LMT in modelling the process of the large scale LM of highly complex problems on the process of LM in an interaction. Since LMT does not only seek to model LPM, but LM in general, including metalinguistic reflection without the aim of bringing about changes in the discourses or the language (see section 2.1), the adherence to the "uniformitarian principle" of regarding the processes on different levels as being of the same nature, is understandable (though not at all unquestionable). I think, however, that if one's aim is not to model LM in general, but LPM in particular, it is not expedient to follow this principle. It goes both against logic and against intuition to presume that the LSM of a complex problem must have exactly the same phases the SSM of a tiny slip of the tongue has in an individual interaction.

If the "uniformitarian" principle does not hold, how can we explain the unquestionably existing similarities between the LPM processes on levels 1, 2 and 3? I have reached the conviction that it is not because "conscious handling of micro-level language problems in interaction (simple management) can be regarded the archetype of language management at other levels (organised management)" (Kimura 2005: 9), but because of the universality of the ways of managing human problems, of which

---

[10] See <http://languagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/en/process>.

language problems are an integral part. This means that it is not the case that SSM and LSM of language meta-problems is a reflection of SSM of language inadequacies, but all three are reflections of the general ways of managing problems which humans encounter in various areas of life, including in language and communication. If this is so, a realistic model of LPM should not build on everyday communicative acts, but on the general principles of human PM, of which LPM is only one type.

This of course does not mean that the study of the management of language inadequacies cannot have an important role in finding ways of managing small-scale and large-scale meta-problems. Since all the three types of problems are *language* problems, it is unquestionable that there *is* an interconnection between them. I only claim that in many ways the process of organized management of language meta-problems resembles the process of the organized management of any other type of meta-problems more than a simple communicative act resembles the organized management of language meta-problems. For example, the way in which a language revitalization process is organized resembles in many respects how a forest revitalization process is organized much more than the ways in which a language lapse is managed in an individual communication act (e.g. when the speaker cannot recall the word he/she otherwise knows). Similarly, the way in which a language reform is organized resembles in many crucial respects the process of any other large-scale social reform much more than the individual communication act in which a father decides that from that time on he will not call his son by his informal nickname, but by his formal proper name. A third example: organizing a language course at school resembles in many ways the organization of a dance course or a cooking course much more than a speaker encountering an individual problem in an interaction, e.g. not understanding a word used by the participant speaking a language in which he/she is not fully competent, even if the linguistic component of the management certainly has to take into consideration such communication problems in individual interactions.

As is well known, according to LMT the LM can be stopped at any phase of the process (Nekvapil 2006: 97; Nekvapil & Nekula 2006: 311; see also Marriott 2006: 329; Marriott & Nekvapil 2012b: 156). This fact is also highly problematic from the point of view of LSM of meta-problems: imagine a great project aimed at revitalizing a dying language with dozens of full-time workers which would just stop before the implementation phase; it is not impossible theoretically, but such a step would be rather different in its consequences than an individual speaker's decision not to correct his/her slip of the tongue.

From all this follows that the present-day LMT model of the LM process can hardly be made compatible with a workable model of LPM. This is the reason why I do not consider the proposed model to be a supplemented and amended variant of LMT model any more (as I did in Lanstyák 2014), but rather a model based on various PM theories, utilizing some important concepts from LMT.[11]

---

[11] I am very grateful to the anonymous reviewers of the previous version of my paper who helped me considerably to realize this.

In the next two sub-sections, I will present a tentative outline of this process model. I will refer to persons and organizations involved in the process by the following labels: 1. i n t e r a c t a n t s: those involved in an interaction, in which they are confronted with an inadequacy (level 1); 2. s t a k e h o l d e r s: those affected by a large-scale meta-problem (level 3);[12] 3. c l i e n t s: those who have the legitimacy and power to initiate the LSM process and monitor it (level 3);[13] 4. a c t o r s: all those who actively take part in the accomplishment of the small- or large-scale meta-problem management process (level 2 and 3); 5. p a r t i c i p a n t s: all those who are encountering an inadequacy or are affected by a meta-problem or are involved in the management of a meta-problem (interactants + stakeholders + clients + actors) (level 1–3).

The LPM process will be tentatively divided into six p h a s e s and four m e t a - - c o m p o n e n t s, and within the phases some crucial s t e p s will be set apart. Some of these steps could perhaps be identified as separate phases, but to decide this requires future investigation into the nature of the LPM process on the basis of empirical data.

Similarly to the LMT process model, the proposed model also tries to handle all the levels of LPM processes, despite the great differences among them, within a unified framework. The difference between the two approaches, as it has been suggested above, is that the LMT process model builds the organized LM (and within it the organized LPM) on the very rudimentary process of SSM of inadequacies in individual discourses, while the proposed model builds all three levels of LPM – SSM of inadequacies in individual discourses, SSM of meta-problems and LSM of meta-problems – on the common features of various PM models from the most varied domains of human life. This way of treating the process model follows from the conviction that language problems are just one specific bundle (as a matter of fact, a very large and varied bundle) of problems human beings encounter in their lives, and therefore the process of their management can be divided into the same phases as the process of the PM in other areas of human life.

4.1. *The main phases of the problem management process*

In this section, I present the main phases of the management process of language problems. Since the model I am outlining is "instructive" rather than prescriptive, the fact that it gives a description of the complete LPM process does not mean that on level 1 the process could not stop at any stage. Moreover, on level 1, some of the stages may simply be skipped.

---

[12] In some theories, the stakeholders are defined differently. For example, Ulrich & Reynolds (2010: 245) distinguish four groups of stakeholders: beneficiaries, decision makers, experts and witnesses. Vidal (2006: 71) defines stakeholders as "those individuals outside or inside the organisation that can either affect or be affected by the action plan". However, I will follow those who limit "stakeholders" to those affected by the problem (Baptista 2005: 5). The stakeholders may or may not be involved in the PM process.

[13] See Vidal (2006: 78). The clients may or may not belong among the stakeholders. They are called "problem owners" in the problem solving paradigm (cf. Isaksen 1995: 161; Jackson 2003: 190) and "decision makers" in the decision making paradigm (see e.g. Hansson 1994/2005: 79; Fülöp 2005: 1; Fülöp, Roth & Schweik 2005: 1; Vidal 2006: 71; Ulrich & Reynolds 2010: 245; Moghadam, Tehrani & Amin 2011: 1019–1020). "Clients" seems to be the most neutral term.

0. Deviation

On level 1, the deviation from the norms or the expectations of the interactants has taken place (*hic et nunc*); the deviation may also manifest itself in a language gap, i.e. in the absence of something which should be existing according to the interactants' norms or expectations but actually is not (see Lanstyák & Szabómihály 2005: 65). On level 2 and level 3, such a deviation occurs regularly or exists continually.

1. Noting

On level 1, the interactants note the deviation from their norms or expectations; similarly they note, if this is the case, the absence of something that is expected to be present in that situation. On level 2, the actors realize that the deviation from their norms or expectations occurs regularly or continually. On level 3, the language managers entrusted by the clients obtain knowledge about the stakeholders' having noted the regular or continual deviation from the norms or expectations, or if they have contact with the speech community in question or are its members, they themselves may have noted the deviations.

From LSM perspective, obtaining knowledge about the deviation from the norms or expectations of the stakeholders is, in itself, such a minor matter that it would not be worth identifying it as a separate phase in the process,[14] if it had not been for its greater importance in SSM of inadequacies (see Marriott & Nekvapil 2012a).[15] However, this does not mean that this component of the PM process would be negligible, even if the general PM theories seem to ignore or undervalue the question of noting the deviation from the stakeholders' norms and expectations as well as its evaluation (cf. Neustupný 1994: 55–56). It is wise to reckon with the rise of the problem as an important antecedent of the actual LPM process, since the possible deviations from the norms or expectations of the speech community members and the way in which they are noted and evaluated may influence the representation of the problem (see 4.2) and through it the problem analysis, the action design and its implementation as well.

Noting on level 1 as opposed to noting on levels 2 and 3 does not differ only in significance, but also in character. As Fairbrother & Masuda (2012: 230) state: "The factors that determine how governments and institutions select particular language problems to manage may be very different from those seen in micro level interactions, so further research should aim to make these results relevant to LMT on every level."

2. Problem identification

On level 1, the interactants evaluate the deviation from their norms or expectations negatively, which also includes the situations in which something that they consider necessary is absent and therefore they evaluate it as a *need*. On level 2, the regular or

_____

[14] It could be taken together with phase 2 or even 2 and 3, the problem identification (evaluation) and problem analysis, or it could be analysed as the initial phase of representation (see 4.2).

[15] See Marriott & Nekvapil (2012b: 156): "Clearly, by definition, there is no language management without noting and this is why a thorough examination of this phase is crucial for the study of management processes."

constant deviation from the norms or expectations of the actors is evaluated negatively, or something that is considered necessary is regularly or continually absent, and is therefore evaluated as a *need*. On level 3, the language managers obtain knowledge about the fact that the deviation from the norms and expectations is evaluated negatively by the stakeholders, or they themselves evaluate it negatively; this includes also knowledge about something that the stakeholders perceive as a need. The negative evaluation on all the three levels is usually an important aspect of the whole process of problem identification on these levels, although problems can be – and should be – identified also by other criteria, e.g. on the basis of hindrance which they cause in communication (see Lanstyák 2010a: 25–28; 2010b: 41–44).[16]

The term "problem identification" seems to be more suitable to denote this phase than the term "evaluation" used in LMT, for at least three reasons: 1. it is somewhat broader, and so it allows for the identification of the problem by criteria other than the negative evaluation of the deviations from the norms or expectations;[17] 2. it is in line with the terminology of many of the PM approaches; 3. evaluation as such is present in *all* phases of the LPM process: not only the deviation from the norms is evaluated, but also – among others – the action design or its implementation, even on level 1 and much more on level 2 and 3 (see the meta-component "monitoring" below).

3. Problem analysis

On level 1, the interactants may be thinking about the inadequacy, its various aspects, and sometimes even analysing it in their own way. On level 2, the actors think about the reoccurring or continuously existing problem, its various aspects, and may analyse it in their own way. On level 3, language managers and other actors (experts in various fields outside linguistics hired by the clients) analyse the meta-problem, with or without the active involvement of the clients and the stakeholders in the process.

With the possible exception of trivial meta-problems, the analysis proper is preceded by extensive i n f o r m a t i o n g a t h e r i n g on level 2 and especially on level 3, which is the initial step in problem analysis (see e.g. Eisenhardt & Zbaracki 1992: 18; de Vries 1993: 3; Hansson 1994/2005: 10). "Just to understand and define the problem itself, there is an overwhelming amount of information to be processed." (Wang & Ahmed 2002: 6) The concluding step within this phase is p r o b l e m d e f i n i t i o n or p r o b l e m s t a t e m e n t: problem analysis usually ends with the provision of an explicit definition of the meta-problem as it manifests itself under the given circumstances. A crucial part of this definition is the identification the problem type. The fact that a problem is simple or complex (either technically or socially),

---

[16] Marriott (2006: 329) does not associate problem identification in LP approaches with the evaluation phase of the LM process, but with the noting phase; however since neutrally or positively evaluated deviations do not constitute a problem, it seems that problem identification in LP and PM approaches is closer to the evaluation phase of the LM process than to the noting phase.

[17] In another respect, "problem identification" is narrower than "evaluation", because it excludes the cases of neutral or positive evaluation of the deviation from the norms or expectations, but this aspect is relevant only for language management, *not* for language *problem* management, which this model is about.

or that it is an algorithmic, heuristic or wicked problem, determines to a considerable extent the next phase, the action plan design.

The "problem analysis" phase is explicitly unrecognized in LMT, in spite of its utmost importance. It is unthinkable that action plans for technically and socially complex language and communication problems such as (reversing) language shift or the absence of important registers from a language, which are many times closely tied to socio-economic problems (as is rightly recognized in LMT), could be designed without a profound exploration of various aspects of a whole bunch of interconnected social problems. Even identifying the stakeholders, i.e. finding out for which strata of the speech community a socially complex matter *is* a problem and how serious it is, calls for profound analysis (cf. Hunter 2007: 37; Ayoub, Batres & Naka 2009: 230; Devaney & Spratt 2009: 638).[18] No less important a task is to uncover the varied socio-economic, political and other interests of the actors and the stakeholders of the would-be LPM process. As we know, "different interests of participants necessarily lead to different management processes" (Neustupný 2012: 298). The fundamental questions of "What is the problem?", "Whose is the problem?" and "Who is responsible for solving the problem?" (Jernudd 2009: 248) must also be answered during this stage of the LPM process.

In order to see the problem clearly, one must also see what the "ideal" state of affairs for the various layers of society would be as well as what could realistically be achieved. This means that the analysis itself is done in consideration of the possible goals and objectives (cf. Rittel & Webber 1973: 161). Nevertheless, goal setting itself is a part of the next phase in the process, "action design".

It is evidently not possible to subsume problem analysis under either the label "evaluation of the deviation from the norm", i.e. "problem identification", or under the label "designing the adjustment", i.e. "action design" (see below), therefore it seems inevitable to insert it as a separate phase of the LPM process between the two.

In the PM literature, this phase can be found under the labels "problem analysis", "problem definition", "problem identification", "problem formulation" or "problem structuring" (de Vries 1993; Geoghegan, Renard & Brown, 2004: 11; Restrepo & Christiaans 2004; Paucar-Caceres 2008: 7–8; Agrawal, Subramanian & Kapoor 2010; Nezu, Nezu & D'Zurilla 2013: 6; cf. also Nicolini 2012). Since the term "problem identification" is needed to designate the previous phase of the process and "problem definition" is also needed to denote one step in this phase, "problem analysis" seems to be the most suitable. ("Problem formulation" and "problem structuring" would be more fitting to denote some other steps at this stage of the process.)

4. Action design

On level 1, the interactants design an adjustment in order to manage the inadequacy which has just arisen. On level 2, the actors design an action plan to manage a reoccur-

___

[18] In participatory planning, stakeholder identification and stakeholder analysis are even two separate phases of the PM process (see Geoghegan, Renard & Brown 2004: 15).

ring or continuously existing problem. On level 3, one or more a c t i o n p l a n s are designed by the language managers and other actors, with our without the active involvement of the clients and the stakeholders into the process. The first step within this phase is s e t t i n g t h e g o a l s a n d o b j e c t i v e s of the LPM. The next step is c o n s t r u c t i n g a s t r a t e g y for the LPM, which then determines what kind of action plan will be designed. The strategy leans to a great extent on the problem type (inadequacy or meta-problem; simple or complex; algorithmic, heuristic or wicked), since all these types require rather different management strategies.

If more than one action plan is designed, which is quite usual in the case of technically or socially complex problems, in a separate step within this phase or maybe in a distinct phase, a decision is made as to which plan is to be implemented in the next phase of the process. The assets and liabilities of the individual plans including the financial, political, psychological etc. costs have to be evaluated and the possible undesirable outcomes have to be taken into account before the decision as to which one to follow is made.

The term "adjustment", which is traditionally used in LMT, does not seem to be appropriate to denote complicated processes like revitalizing a dying (or dead) language or introducing far-reaching language reforms, standardizing and codifying a previously not standardized language, choosing a script for a previously unwritten language or changing the script for a language that previously used a different script etc. "Action plan" seems to be a term which is broad enough to be appropriate for all the three levels of LPM.

In the case of socially complex problems treated on level 3, designing an action plan may be a complicated and elaborate activity. Even goal setting may be troublesome, if more than one stratum of the speech community is affected by the problem or by the consequences of its management. It is therefore not unusual for the various strata of the speech community to have radically different views about what should be done. This is one of the reasons why most of the PM theories reckon with alternative solutions (see e.g. Eisenhardt & Zbaracki 1992; D'Zurilla, Nezu & Maydeu-Olivares 2004: 16; Baptista 2005: 12; Vidal 2006; Robertson & Tinline 2007: 5; Agrawal, Subramanian & Kapoor 2010; Nezu, Nezu & D'Zurilla 2013: 6, 13), and decision theory even builds on alternatives (Anderson 2002; Fülöp 2005; Fülöp, Roth & Schweik 2005; Siew 2008).

5. Implementation

On level 1, the adjustment to manage an inadequacy, designed by the interactants in a given situation, is implemented either in the same interaction or later when the interaction where the inadequacy occurred is over. On level 2, the action plan designed by the actors is implemented. On level 3, the (selected) action plan is implemented by the language managers and other actors, with or without the active involvement of the clients and the stakeholders. On level 2 and 3 implementation may sometimes last extraordinarily long, depending on the character of the problem; e.g. a language revitalization process – level 3 management – may last decades before it is successfully completed.

The implementation phase is a stable component of most of the process models in various PM theories. In the management of more complex language problems, implementation consists of a lot of activities which have little to do with linguistics and concerns areas like state administration, public education and media, which have a crucial role e.g. in the dissemination of the results of corpus managing activities (i.e. PM activities aimed at changing the language rather than the discourses of a language).

6. Verification (evaluation)

On level 1, the interactants evaluate the outcome of the SSM process of an inadequacy. On level 2, the actors evaluate the outcome of the SSM process of a meta-problem. On level 3 the clients, the stakeholders, the language managers and possibly all the other experts involved evaluate the success of the LSM of a meta-problem. The results of the evaluation can serve as a f e e d b a c k for further LPM.

It is conspicuous how much attention is devoted to the evaluation of the PM in most of the PM theories. Many of them contain an evaluation phase (see e.g. Jackson 2003; D'Zurilla, Nezu & Maydeu-Olivares 2004: 16; Geoghegan, Renard & Brown 2004: 11; Baptista 2005: 12; Robertson & Tinline 2007; Agrawal, Subramanian & Kapoor 2010; Dorst 2010: 134; Hélie & Sun 2010: 995). The absence of this phase from the traditional version of LMT may be explained by the fact that the starting point for the LM process in LMT is the micro level, where the evaluation is not so significant. However, the LM of large-scale, complex language problems, which requires vast intellectual and financial resources, cannot dispense with a final evaluation phase. This is what led Kimura (2013: 5–7, 14 and *passim*) to add such a phase to the LMT process model. Another motivation for the inclusion of a new phase was to create the possibility of linking two or more LM processes, and thus cope with the cyclical character of many LM processes. Cyclical models are quite usual not only among language policy models, but also among various models of PM outside the realm of language.

Since – as we have stated – complex language problems managed on level 3 are probably wicked problems, and as such can never be satisfactorily solved, it is more appropriate to speak about alleviating the problem situation than about solving "the" problem (cf. pl. Rittel & Webber 1973: 162; de Vries 1993: 6; Whelton & Ballard 2002; Jackson 2003: 188; Devaney & Spratt 2009: 638; Innes 2013: 19). Even to find out how successful the LPM was requires a serious analysis. The results of the analysis can be used in further LPM processes, which – especially in the case of wicked problems – may be said to be absolutely necessary. As Rittel and Webber (1973: 160), in their classical study about wicked problems, put it: "Social problems are never solved. At best they are only re-solved – over and over again."

Although – as it will be noted below – evaluation is actually present in most of the phases of the LPM process, as a part of the monitoring process, it seems expedient to build in a separate project evaluation phase into the process model, which would conclude the current LPM process and hopefully start a new one. "Evaluation" seems to be the best label for this phase of the LPM process, but since in the classical LMT process model it is used for another phase, "verification" could be used instead (as it actually

is in some of the theories, see e.g. Dunbar 1998; Isaksen & Treffinger 2004: 78; Paucar-Caceres 2008: 7–8; Hélie & Sun 2010: 995; Nezu, Nezu & D'Zurilla 2013: 6, 13–16). This phase of the LPM process would at least partly overlap with the noting phase of the next LPM process aimed at managing some of the remaining problems or the new problems which have arisen as a consequence of the previous LPM process.

4.2. *The meta-components of the problem management process*

Beside the actual chronological phases of the LPM process, which constitute a relatively stable sequence,[19] especially on levels 2 and 3, it seems expedient to supplement the process model with several meta-components[20] which are crucial and indispensable parts of most large-scale processes of complex problems. Unlike the actual phases of the process, they comprise activities that may be performed during various stages of the LPM process.

1. Problem representation

The representation of the problem is an indispensable part of the LPM process on all three levels of LPM. It is continuously present in all the phases, but is especially important in phases 2 and 3, problem identification and analysis (cf. Hansson 1994/2005; Dunbar 1996, 1998; Jackson 2003: 186; Dorst 2010).

The questions of representation are widely dealt with in the PM literature, especially in writings applying psychological (see e.g. Huitt 1992; Anderson 2002; Dunbar 1996, 1998), systems (see e.g. Jackson 2003; Rodríguez-Ulloa, Montbrun & Martínez-Vicente 2011; Wastell 2012) and design (Restrepo & Christiaans 2004) approach. The importance of the representation lies in the fact that the way a language problem is represented can affect not only the identification of the problem, but also its analysis and even the designing of the action plan and thus all subsequent phases of the process as well as its outcome:

> "Creating […] representation is of the utmost importance, because what we think about is necessarily not reality but our representations of reality. We all go through life in "cognitive bubbles", responding to our representations of reality as though they were reality, itself. To the extent that the representations are in error, all subsequent thought is likely to be in error." (Anderson 2002: 63)

Each problem is represented at least in one way on level 1 and 2, and in more than one way on level 3. Problems are necessarily represented mentally, i.e. in the minds of those who have noted them and evaluated them negatively; problems may also be

---

[19] It must be noted, however, that in spite of the LPM process model being basically linear, overlaps between adjacent or even more distant phases as well as feedback loops are not at all unusual (cf. Restrepo & Christiaans 2004). The most stable place in the process is that of the noting of the deviation and the problem identification, although, as decision theory literature shows, it may happen that managers prepare action plan designs in advance, waiting for a problem to arise (Fülöp, Roth & Schweik 2005: 2).

[20] I borrowed the term "meta-component" from one of the theories of creative problem solving (see Isaksen & Treffinger 2004: 92). In this theory, meta-components include continuous planning, monitoring, managing, and modifying behaviour during creative problem solving (ibid.).

represented by a wide range of emotions like excitement, anxiety, sadness, fear, aversion, frustration, anger, surprise, curiosity.

On level 1, mental and emotional representation may remain the only way of representing an inadequacy, but may not: it is possible that the participants will talk about it, so it will be represented also verbally. Verbal representation may be supplemented – or in some cases perhaps substituted – by facial expression and bodily gestures, which is another possible way of representing an inadequacy. Another possible representation of an inadequacy is writing (e.g. sketching the problem in one or two sentences in order to get help via internet from someone); other kinds of representation in the case of SSM are probably rare. On level 2, the most important representation seems to be the mental and the verbal representation (the latter is not necessary in the case of a meta-problem concerning only one individual); these may be complemented by written representations of the meta-problem. On level 3, a meta-problem is typically represented in writing; the written material may contain the results of the problem analysis phase, using graphs, maps, pictures etc. Films or computer multimedia materials may be produced as complex representations of the problem.

Each type of problem representation has its advantages and disadvantages, therefore a combination of various representations serves the case best.[21]

2. Monitoring

Large-scale management of complex language problems is inconceivable without constant monitoring or supervising of the activities done that far, from at least the problem analysis phase, especially in the case of large-scale projects having serious financial, social, cultural, political and practical corollaries (cf. Isaksen & Treffinger 2004: 78, 92; Ricento 2007: 227–229; Dorst 2010: 134). The supervision of the LPM process is typical of level 2 and 3; however, it may probably be present in some form also on level 1, if the LPM process is not entirely automatic.

The monitoring of the action plan is especially relevant if it contains alternatives (cf. Hansson 1994/2005; Anderson 2002; Fülöp 2005). Supervising the implementation process is also of utmost importance: at least some of the implementation activities are performed by actors different from those who have designed the action plan; e.g. the corpus planning is done by linguists, but its results are disseminated with the help of legislative, educational and administrative institutions as well as the media. Evaluation as the key element in the monitoring process may trigger a feedback loop in any phase of the PM process (Peet 1992: 75, 78).

The PM activities are necessarily supervised by those actors who were performing them, however, some PM approaches devote much space to questions of how these processes are (or should be) monitored by others, e.g. by the clients, the stakeholders, or disinterested facilitators, who are neutral towards the issue being managed.

---

[21] It is worth mentioning that in LMT, the method of conducting narrative interviews about respondents' language biographies is actually a way of obtaining verbal representations of the respondents' language problems and other language-related matters (see Nekvapil 2004). Specifically, the so-called management summaries are a remarkable way of representing language meta-problems (Nekvapil 2004: 24–28).

3. Problem decomposition (reduction)

Some of the PM theories point to the importance of problem decomposition or reduction, which can be applied especially when the problems to be managed are technically complex (see e.g. de Vries 1993: 6; Vidal 2006: 72). The decomposition may take place in the problem analysis phase or in the action design phase at the latest. Decomposition has, of course, consequences for the implementation and verification phases as well. Decomposition must not lead to isolated treatment of the sub-problems, since they form a unified system whose elements are interdependent (Jackson 2003: 4–5).[22] In this respect it is much safer to decompose an algorithmic problem than a heuristic one or (especially) a wicked one.

4. Allocation of resources

As in some PM theories, allocation of resources could also be distinguished as a separate phase of the large-scale meta-problem management process. The most important kinds of resources are undoubtedly human, financial and material ones. As for the h u m a n   r e s o u r c e s, different actors – among them experts – are involved (or, actually, not involved) in the process in the different stages of LPM. Theories like participatory/collaborative planning, soft organizational research or systems thinking (Jackson 2003; Geoghegan, Renard & Brown 2004; Baptista 2005; Mäntysalo 2002, 2005; Vidal 2006) put great emphasis on procedures devised for ensuring that all groups of stakeholders could be in some way involved in the process of PM. In addition to expert knowledge, non-expert knowledge, the "crowd wisdom" is also of great importance (Brabham, 2009). It has been attested that ignoring the local knowledge of the stakeholders often leads to the failure of the PM:

> "Many instances have been documented where the scientists made wrong assumptions and where laymen with firsthand knowledge could have corrected it if scientists had listened and collaborated with them." (Innes 2013: 11)

While the question concerning human resources is not entirely irrelevant even on level 1, the allocation of f i n a n c i a l   r e s o u r c e s becomes pertinent only on level 2 and even much more so on level 3. The questions concerning the cost of various activities (and also of the possible inactivity) already appear in the problem analysis phase ("how much do the consequences of the problem cost"), then in the action designing phase ("how much would this or that possible managing strategy cost"), and later they also appear in the implementation phase and in the verification phase ("how much did the LPM and the management of the consequences of the problem cost").

LMT is well aware of the economic aspects of LM: proponents of the theory speak of the need of communicative and socioeconomic management as a supplement to language management itself (Neustupný & Nekvapil 2003: 186; Kaplan & Baldauf

---

[22] In LMT, too, the term "reduction" is used occasionally, to denote one way of dealing with unsolvable problems (see Muraoka 2009: 160–161). On "reductionism" as a traditional scientific method and its critique, see Jackson (2003: 4); cf. also Devaney & Spratt (2009: 638).

2005: 50; Nekvapil 2006: 98; Neustupný 2012: 299; Nekvapil & Sherman 2013: 91); this approach is exemplary for the proposed LPM model as well. What should be stressed is that these three types of management cannot be separated from each other: "no issue is intrinsically 'sociological', 'linguistic', 'political' or 'economic'. Rather, almost every issue presents sociological, linguistic, political, and economic dimensions" (Grin 2007: 273). In dealing with the economic aspects of LPM, it appears useful to utilize the insights of the field of economics called economics of language.[23]

5. Concluding remarks

In this paper, I have dealt with the questions concerning the process of managing various types of language problems. Originally, my point of departure was the process model of LM as it is known in LMT. I tried to harmonize this model with various process models from the literature on PM. The reason for this was the fact that language problems are just one bundle of various kinds of problems human beings encounter during their lives. Since process models based on very different kinds of social and other problems are strikingly similar to each other, I assumed that the process of LPM cannot be radically different from these either. I identified the most important common traits of a large number of process models of PM and made an attempt to supplement the LMT model with those which are lacking in the LMT model or are there only implicitly.

However, later I realized that to harmonize the PM models with the LMT model is not as simple as it appeared at first glance. The reason is that there are some inconspicuous, yet substantial differences between PM models on one hand and the LMT model on the other hand. One of these is that the theories of PM base their models on the LSM process of meta-problems, not on the SSM of concrete instances of problems (inadequacies) or on the SSM of meta-problems. Contrary to this, LMT draws its model on the SSM of the discourses (not necessarily only on the inadequacies found in them). Since the kinds of activities that are routinely applied in the SSM of inadequacies tend to differ substantively from those applied in SSM or LSM of meta-problems,[24] it did not prove expedient to build a model designed to serve predominantly as a tool for the LSM of meta-problems on the process of the SSM of inadequacies. This is one of the reasons why I had to abandon the idea of supplementing the existing LMT model by phases relevant in SSM and even more in LSM of meta-problems, and I had to go the other way around: devising a model based on general PM and utilizing some insights from LMT in it.

---

[23] According to Grin (2007: 273), the economics of language is part of theoretical economics. It "uses the concepts and tools of economics in the study of relationships featuring linguistic variables; it focuses principally, but not exclusively, on those relationships in which economic variables also play a part".

[24] For instance, online, in the process of SSM of inadequacies, a language gap is filled quite differently than offline, in the process of LSM of meta-problems (Lanstyák & Szabómihály 2009: 62–64).

Another difference between PM models and the LMT model is that while PM theories model the process of *problem* management, the LMT has a wider scope and also tries to model other processes. Therefore, in the realm of language, it is vital to distinguish between two similar, but not identical concepts, "language problem management" and "language management". "Language problem management" is necessarily an interventionist activity, the ultimate aim of which is either to bring about changes into the discourses or into the system of one or more languages or to prevent unwanted changes (e.g. a language shift). As for "language management", i.e. the management of the discourses of one or more languages or the management of the languages themselves, it is a somewhat ambiguous term in this respect: theoretically it also subsumes non-interventionist activities like thinking or talking about language without the intention to bring about changes in the discourses or the languages or to preserve a certain state of the languages, yet in practice "language management" usually means either interventionist activities like devising an action plan to solve a language problem or implementing it, or actions which prepare these activities, such as evaluating a deviation from the speakers' norms or expectations (see Lanstyák 2014). Although LMT mostly deals with language problems, it would certainly be a mistake to ignore other aspects of the theory.[25]

The proponents of LMT have rightly recognized that all language problems, even those affecting whole societies, can be traced back to concrete instances of problems (inadequacies) experienced by individuals in interaction events. To reflect this fact, I developed a three-level model of the LPM process, which takes into consideration both the interactional and the supra-interactional level of LPM, as well as the small-scale and the large-scale dimension of LPM. The difference between this approach and the LMT approach in this respect is that the proposed model of the process of LPM draws on the general ways of managing problems in various areas of human life, while the LMT model of the LM process is based on the SSM of discourses at the interactional level.

In spite of the fact that the proposed model is built on PM theories, it is important to emphasize its strong ties to LMT. Since LPM is not only "a" part of LM, but surely its most important part (at least at present), it is evident that the model of the process of LPM owes much to LMT and this will certainly remain so in the future as well.

---

[25] There are at least three reasons why it is important to also consider other aspects of LM, in addition to managing language problems. Firstly, the LM process need not lead to treating the problem itself at all, it may stop at the noting or evaluating or designing phase, and these instances of LM are also of interest for LMT. Secondly, LMT "does not limit itself to language problems, but its point of departure is the fact that efforts to influence the language behaviour of the self or others can also be motivated by positive feelings (e.g., that someone likes a language, its form, etc.)" (Nekvapil 2011: 881). That means that LMT is not interested only in managing language *problems*, but also other aspects of conscious or unconscious effort to change the individual's or a collective's way of speaking and thus ultimately also the language system. In brief: LMT deals with the management of discourses and the language itself. In this way, LMT could also be able to model language change in general. Finally, LMT is a *theory* and its theoretical interest in LM may lead to valuable research into the nature and functioning of human language, regardless of the practical applicability of this research.

REFERENCES

Agrawal, S., Subramanian, K. & Kapoor, S. (2010): Operations research: Contemporary role in managerial decision making. *International Journal of Research and Reviews in Applied Sciences* 3, 200–208.

Anderson, B. F. (2002): *The Three Secrets of Wise Decision Making.* Portland: Single Reef Press.

Ayoub, N., Batres, R. & Naka, Y. (2009): An approach to wicked problems in environmental policy making. *WSAES Transactions on Environment and Development* 5, 229–239.

Baptista, I. (2005): Is there a theory of collaborative planning we can talk about? Paper presented at the 46th AESOP Conference "The Dream of a Greater Europe", July 13-17, 2005, Vienna, Austria. Available online at: <http://www.wteamup.pt/docs/Baptista_AESOP2005.pdf>. Retrieved: December 2, 2013.

Brabham, D. C. (2009): Crowdsourcing the public participation process for planning projects. *Planning Theory* 8, 242–262.

Christis, J. (2005): Theory and practice of soft systems methodology: A performative contradiction? *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 22, 11–26.

Daellenbach, H. G. (2001): Hard OR, soft OR, problem structuring methods, critical systems thinking: A primer. *Proceedings of the ORSNZ Conference Twenty Naught One, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, NZ, 30 November 2001 – 1 December 2001.* Available online at: <http://orsnz.org.nz/conf36/papers/Daellenbach.pdf>. Retrieved: May 11, 2014.

Devaney, J. & Spratt, T. (2009): Child abuse as a complex and wicked problem: Reflecting on policy developments in the United Kingdom in working with children and families with multiple problems. *Children and Youth Services Review* 31, 635–641.

de Vries, E. (1993): Stretching the initial problem space for design problem solving: Browsing versus searching in network and hierarchy structures. In: *OCTO-report* 93/02. Eidenhoven: Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences, Eindhoven University of Technology. Available online at: <http://alexandria.tue.nl/repository/books/398140.pdf>. Retrieved: October 7, 2013.

Dorst, K. (2010): The nature of Design Thinking. In: K. Dorst, S. Stewart, I. Staudinger, B. Paton & A. Dong (eds.), *Interpreting Design Thinking.* Sydney: Faculty of Design, Architecture & Building, University of Technology, 131–139.

Dunbar, K. (1996): How scientists think: Online creativity and conceptual change in science. In: T. B. Ward, S. M. Smith & S. Vaid (eds.), *Conceptual Structures and Processes: Emergence, Discovery and Change*. Washington: APA Press, 461–493.

Dunbar, K. (1998): Problem solving. In: W. Bechtel & G. Graham (eds.), *A Companion to Cognitive Science*. London: Blackwell, 289–298. Available online at: <http://www.utsc.utoronto.ca/~dunbarlab/pubpdfs/probsolv2.pdf>. Retrieved: October 8, 2013.

D'Zurilla, T. J., Nezu, A. M. & Maydeu-Olivares, A. (2004): Social problem solving: Theory and assessment. In: E. C. Chang, T. J. D'Zurilla & L. J. Sanna (eds.), *Social Problem Solving: Theory, Research, and Training*. Washington: American Psychological Association, 11–27.

Eisenhardt, K. M. & Zbaracki, M. J. (1992): Strategic decision making. *Strategic Management Journal* 13, 17–37.

Engelhardt, O. (2011): Management of multilingualism in multinational companies of German origin in the Czech Republic. In: G. Garzone & M. Gotti (eds.), *Discourse, Communication and the Enterprise. Genres and Trends.* Bern: Peter Lang, 111–129.

Erickson, J. (2013): *Algorithms.* Available online at: <http://www.cs.illinois.edu/~jeffe/teaching/algorithms/>. Retrieved: January 13, 2014.

Fairbrother, L. & Masuda, Y. (2012): Simple management in contact situations. What factors determine whether a deviation will be noted or not? *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 22 (2), 213–231.

Fülöp, J. (2005): Introduction to decision making methods. Paper developed for the BDEI3 Workshop. Available online at: <http://academic.evergreen.edu/projects/bdei/documents/decisionmaking-methods.pdf>. Retrieved: October 5, 2013.

FÜLÖP, J., ROTH, D. & SCHWEIK, C. (2005): What is meant by "decision-making" in the context of eco-informatics? Available online at: <http://academic.evergreen.edu/projects/bdei/documents/decisionmakingsummary.pdf>. Retrieved: October 7, 2013.

GEOGHEGAN, T., RENARD, Y. & BROWN, N. A. (2004): *Guidelines for Participatory Planning: A Manual for Caribbean Natural Resource Managers and Planners.* Laventille, Trinidad: Caribbean Natural Resources Institute.

GRIN, F. (2007): Economics and language policy. In: M. Hellinger & A. Pauwels (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 271–297.

HANSSON, S. O. (1994/2005): *Decision Theory: A Brief Introduction.* Stockholm: Department of Philosophy and the History of Technology Royal Institute of Technology (KTH). Available online at: <http://home.abe.kth.se/~soh/decisiontheory.pdf>. Retrieved: October 21, 2013.

HARRIS, S. & ROSS, J. (2006): *Beginning Algorithms.* Indianapolis: Wiley Publishing.

HÉLIE, S. & SUN, R. (2010): Incubation, insight, and creative problem solving: A unified theory and a connectionist model. *Psychological Review* 117, 994–1024.

HOWARD, Z. & MELLES, G. (2011): Beyond designing: roles of the designer in complex design projects. In: *OZCHI 2011. Proceedings of the 23rd Australian Computer-Human Interaction Conference.* Canberra: ACM, 152–155.

HÜBSCHMANNOVÁ, M. & NEUSTUPNÝ, J. V. (2004): 'Terminological' processes in North-Central Romani. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 5, 83–108.

HUITT, W. G. (1992): Problem solving and decision making: Consideration of individual differences using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. *Journal of Psychological Type* 24, 33–44. Available online at: <http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/papers/prbsmbti.html>. Retrieved: August 9, 2014.

HUNTER, B. (2007): Conspicuous compassion and wicked problems. *Agenda,* 14 (3), 35–51.

INNES, J. (2013): *A Turning Point for Planning Theory? Overcoming Dividing Discourses.* Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Urban and Regional Development. Available online at: <http://www.iurd.berkeley.edu/publications/wp/2013-02.pdf>. Retrieved: October 20, 2013.

ISAKSEN, S. G. (1995): CPS: Linking creativity and problem solving. In: G. Kaufmann, T. Helstrup & K. H. Reigen (eds.), *Problem Solving and Cognitive Processes.* Bergen-Sandviken: Fagbokforlaget Vigmostad – Bjorke AS, 145–181.

ISAKSEN, S. G. & TREFFINGER, D. J. (2004): Celebrating 50 years of reflective practice: Versions of creative problem solving. *The Journal of Creative Behavior* 38 (2), 75–101.

JACKSON, M. C. (2003): *Systems Thinking: Creative Holism for Managers.* Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

JERNUDD, B. H. (1991): The fifth lecture: Individual discourse management. In: B. H. Jernudd, *Lectures on Language Problems.* New Delhi: Bahri Publications, 62–68.

JERNUDD, B. H. (1993): Language planning from a management perspective: An interpretation of findings. In: E. H. Jahr (ed.), *Language Conflict and Language Planning.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 133–142.

JERNUDD, B. H. (2001): What happened to language planning? *Noves SL: Revista de sociolingüística* 2 (1). Available online at: <http://www6.gencat.net/llengcat/noves/hm01hivern-primavera/internacional/jernudd1_3.htm>. Retrieved: December 11, 2013.

JERNUDD, B. H. (2003): Cognition and language management. In: E. Morais (ed.), *Issues in Language and Cognition: Selected Papers from the Conference on Language and Cognition.* Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press, 1–14.

JERNUDD, B. (2009): An apology for Language Management Theory. In: J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (eds.), *Language Management in Contact Situations: Perspectives from Three Continents.* Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang, 245–252.

JERNUDD, B. H. & NEUSTUPNÝ, J. V. (1987): Language plannning: 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.

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

Kimura, G. C. (2005): How do researchers on language policy perceive language? From the language planning / language attitude dichotomy to Language Management Theory. *Gengoseisaku* [Language Policy] 1, 1–13.

Kimura, G. C. (2013): Prohibiting Sorbian at the workplace: A case study on the cyclical process of language management. In: *Paper presented at the sociolinguistic seminar at Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague*, May 2013, 1–17. Available online at: <http://languagemanagement. ff.cuni.cz/en/system/files/documents/kimura_2013_prohibiting%20sorbian.pdf>. Retrieved: October 11, 2014.

Klein, G. (2007): Flexecution as a paradigm for replanning: Part 1. *Intelligent Systems* 22 (5), 79–83.

Lanstyák, I. (2010a): A nyelvi problémák típusai [The types of language problems]. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* 12, 23–48.

Lanstyák, I. (2010b): Typy jazykových problémov. *Fórum spoločenskovedná revue* 12, 39–62.

Lanstyák, I. (2014): A nyelvmenedzselés-elmélet két kérdéséről [On two problems in the Language Management Theory]. In: K. Misad & Z. Csehy (eds.), *Speculum varietatis. Jazykový a literárny manažment v multikultúrnom priestore a (pseudo)identita textov.* Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, 7–38.

Lanstyák, I. & Szabómihály, G. (2005): Hungarian in Slovakia. In: A. Fenyvesi (ed.), *Hungarian Language Contact Outside Hungary: Studies on Hungarian as a Minority Language*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 47–88.

Lanstyák, I. & Szabómihály, 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 am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang, 49–73.

Mackenzie, A., Pidd, M., Rooksby, J., Sommerville, I., Warren, I. & Westcombe, M. (2006): Wisdom, decision support and paradigms of decision making. *European Journal of Operational Research* 170, 156–171.

Mäntysalo, R. (2002): Dilemmas in critical planning theory. *Town Planning Review* 73, 417–436.

Mäntysalo, R. (2005): Approaches to participation in urban planning theories. In: J. Zetti & S. Brand (eds.), *Rehabilitation of Urban Areas: Brozzi and Le Piagge Neighbourhoods.* Florence: University of Florence, 23–38.

Marcucci, D., Russell, M., Smith, B. & Wainger, L. (2010): Five concepts in planning theory useful to coastal management. In: *Shifting Shorelines: Adapting to the Future, The 22nd International Conference of The Coastal Society, June 13–16, 2010. Wilmington, North Carolina.* Available online at: <http://nsgl.gso.uri.edu/coastalsociety/TCS22/papers/Marcucci_papers.pdf>. Retrieved: October 20, 2013.

Marriott, H. (2006): Micro language planning for student support in a pharmacy faculty. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 7, 328–340.

Marriott, H. & Nekvapil, J. (eds.) (2012a): *Language Management Approach: Probing the Concept of 'Noting'. Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 22 (2). Special issue.

Marriott, H. & Nekvapil, J. (2012b): An introduction: "Noting" in the language management approach. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 22 (2), 155–159.

Moghadam, A. H., Tehrani, M. & Amin, F. (2011): Study of the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and management decision making styles. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 12, 1017–1025.

Muraoka, H. (2009): A typology of problems in contact situations. In: J. Nekvapil & T. Sherman (eds.), *Language Management in Contact Situations: Perspectives from Three Continents*. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang, 151–166.

Nekvapil, J. (2004): Language biographies and management summaries. *Language Management in Contact Situations 3: Report on the Research Projects*, 104. Chiba: Chiba University, Graduate

School of Humanities and Social Sciences, 9–33. Available online at: <http://languagemanagement. ff.cuni.cz/node/352#2004>. Retrieved: September 26, 2014.

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*. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang, 1–11.

NEKVAPIL, J. (2011): The history and theory of language planning. In: E. Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning 2*. New York, London: Routledge, 871–887.

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

NEKVAPIL, J. & NEKULA, M. (2006): On language management in multinational companies in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 7, 307–327.

NEKVAPIL, J. & SHERMAN, T. (2009): Pre-interaction management in multinational companies in Central Europe. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 10, 181–198.

NEKVAPIL, J. & SHERMAN, T. (2013): Language ideologies and linguistic practices: The case of multi-national companies in Central Europe. In: E. Barát, P. Studer & J. Nekvapil (eds.), *Ideological Conceptualizations of Language. Discourses of Linguistic Diversity*. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang, 85–117.

NEUSTUPNÝ, J. (1978): *Post-structural Approaches to Language: Language Theory in a Japanese Context*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

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

NEUSTUPNÝ, J. V. (1994): Problems of English contact discourse and language planning. In: T. Kandiah & J. Kwan-Terry (eds.), *English and Language Planning: A Southeast Asian Contribution*. Singapore: Academic Press, 50–69.

NEUSTUPNÝ, J. V. (2003): Japanese students in Prague: Problems of communication and interaction. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 162, 125–143.

NEUSTUPNÝ, J. V. (2012): Theory and practice in language management. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 22 (2), 295–301.

NEUSTUPNÝ, J. V. & NEKVAPIL, J. (2003): Language management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 4, 181–366.

NEZU, A. M., NEZU, C. M. & D'ZURILLA, T. J. (2013): *Problem-Solving Therapy: A Treatment Manual*. New York: Springer.

NICOLINI, D. (2012): *Practice Theory, Work, and Organization: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

PASFIELD-NEOFITOU, S. E. (2012): Learners' language management in internet-based communication with Japanese peers. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 22 (2), 271–293.

PAUCAR-CACERES, A. (2008): Operational research, systems thinking and development of management sciences methodologies in US and UK. *Scientific Inquiry* 9, 3–18.

PEET, J. (1992. *Energy and the Ecological Economics of Sustainability*. Washington: Island Press. Available online at: <http://www.hawaii.edu/publichealth/ecohealth/si/course-ecohealth/readings/Peet-Ch5.pdf>. Retrieved: October 22, 2013.

PUCCIO, G. J., MANCE, M., BARBERO SWITALSKI, L. & REALI, P. D. (2012): *Creativity Rising. Creative Thinking and Creative Problem Solving in the 21st century*. Buffalo: ICSC Press, International Center for Studies in Creativity.

RESTREPO, J. & CHRISTIAANS, H. (2004): Problem structuring and information access in design. *Journal of Design Research* 4 (2), 1551–1569. Available online at: <http://home.fa.utl.pt/~franc/de1/ext01/restrepo.pdf>. Retrieved: October 20, 2013.

RICENTO, T. (2007): Models and approaches in language policy and planning. In: M. Hellinger & A. Pauwels (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 211–240.

Rittel, H. W. J. & Webber, M. M. (1973): Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences* 4, 155–169.

Robertson, S. & Tinline, G. (2007): *Effective Problem Solving.* Manchester: Robertson Cooper Ltd. Available online at: <http://www.canon.dk/Images/Problem_sovling_report_and_evaluation-v1_0_tcm81-612892.pdf>. Retrieved: August 31, 2013.

Rodríguez-Ulloa, R. A., Montbrun, A. & Martínez-Vicente, S. (2011): Soft system dynamics methodology in action: A study of the problem of citizen insecurity in an Argentinean province. *Systemic Practice and Action Research* 24, 275–323. Available online at: <http://albertomontbrun.com.ar/archivos/soft_system_dynamics_methodology_in_action.pdf>. Retrieved: November 29, 2013.

Siew, T. F. (2008): *Transferable Decision-making Procedure for Integrated Flood Management. A Theoretical Approach to the Micro Studies of Human Decision-making and Decision Makers Heuristics.* Freiburg: Institut für Forstökonomie.

Skiena, S. S. (2008): *The Algorithm Design Manual.* 2nd edition. New York: Springer.

Sloboda, M. & Nábělková, M. (2013): Receptive multilingualism in 'monolingual' media: Managing the presence of Slovak on Czech websites. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 10, 196–213.

Song, H. (2005): Motivating ill-structured problem solving in a web-based peer-group learning environment: A learning-goal perspective. *Journal of Educational Computing Research* 33, 351–367.

Ulrich, W. & Reynolds, M. (2010): Critical systems heuristics. In: M. Reynolds & S. Holwell (eds.), *Systems Approaches to Managing Change: A Practical Guide*. London: Springer, 243–292.

Vidal, R. V. V. (2006): Operational research: a multidisciplinary field. *Pesquisa Operacional* 26, 69–90.

Wang, C. L. & Ahmed, P. K. (2002): Tapping into the 'softness' of soft systems. In: *Working Paper Series No. WP001/02*. Wolverhampton: University of Wolverhampton. Available online at: <http://www.wlv.ac.uk/PDF/uwbs_WP001_02_Wang_Ahmed.pdf>. Retrieved: October 22, 2013.

Wastell, D. (2012): Systems thinking: An introductory essay. Available online at: <http://www.managingbydesign.net/my_library/systems_thinking.pdf >. Retrieved: October 22, 2013.

Whelton, M. & Ballard, G. (2002): Wicked problems in project definition. In: *Proceedings of the International Group for Lean Construction 10th Annual Conference, Brazil, August 2002*. Available online at: <http://www.leanconstruction.org/media/docs/WickedProblemsinProjectDefinitionIGLC10.pdf>. Retrieved: October 14, 2013.

ZHRNUTIE

O procese manažmentu jazykových problémov

Vo svojom príspevku sa zaoberám otázkami týkajúcimi sa procesu manažmentu jazykových problémov. Východiskom môjho prístupu k zaobchádzaniu s jazykovými problémami je fakt, že jazykové problémy sú len jedným z mnohých druhov problémov (spomeňme napr. spoločenské, hospodárske, politické, etnické, rasové, environmentálne, dopravné, zdravotné, psychické, problémy s učením, problémy s ľudskými vzťahmi, problémy s výchovou detí, problémy súvisiace s kriminalitou atď.). Rôzne teórie manažmentu problémov ukazujú, že všeobecné postupy v nich aplikované sú vo veľkej miere podobné, a preto sa dá predpokladať, že aj v riešení jazykových problémov sa môžeme opierať o výsledky výskumov manažmentu problémov v iných oblastiach života.

Po krátkom úvode sa vo svojom príspevku venujem niektorým základným pojmom, resp. termínom z oblasti manažmentu jazykových problémov; značná časť týchto pojmov, resp. termínov pochádza z teórie jazykového manažmentu.

V hlavnej časti príspevku sa sústreďujem na otázky týkajúce sa procesu manažmentu jazykových problémov. Rozlišujem tri úrovne, na ktorých proces manažmentu zvyčajne prebieha: prvú tvorí jednoduchý manažment tzv. neadekvátností (jednotlivých problémov) v konkrétnych interakciách, majúci dopad na úzky okruh zainteresovaných osôb (napr. jedného človeka alebo jednu rodinu); druhú tvorí organizovaný manažment tzv. metaproblémov (zovšeobecnených typov problémov) majúci dopad na úzky okruh zainteresovaných osôb; tretiu tvorí organizovaný manažment metaproblémov majúci dopad na široký okruh zainteresovaných osôb (napr. jeden podnik alebo hoci aj obyvateľstvo jedného alebo viacerých štátov). Proces manažmentu jazykových problémov rozdeľujem na šesť fáz (1. povšimnutie, 2. identifikácia problému, 3. analýza problému, 4. vypracovanie akčného plánu, 5. implementácia akčného plánu, 6. hodnotenie výsledkov problémového manažmentu) a štyri tzv. metakomponenty (1. reprezentácia problému, 2. monitorovanie procesu problémového manažmentu, 3. dekompozícia alebo redukcia problému, 4. alokácia zdrojov). Metakomponenty sa môžu viazať k rozličným fázam problémového manažmentu.

Prezentovaný model vychádza z rôznych modelov používaných v teóriách manažmentu problémov všeobecne, pričom berie ohľad aj na fázy procesu jazykového manažmentu rozlišované v rámci teórii jazykového manažmentu. Zásadný rozdiel medzi modelmi problémového manažmentu všeobecne (vrátane modelu prezentovaného v tomto príspevku) a medzi modelom procesu jazykového manažmentu známeho z teórie jazykového manažmentu je, že sa modely problémového manažmentu zakladajú na procesoch prebiehajúcich na tretej úrovni (manažment metaproblémov majúci dopad na široký okruh zainteresovaných osôb), kým model procesu jazykového manažmentu sa zakladá na procesoch prebiehajúcich na prvej úrovni (manažment tzv. neadekvátností v interakcii).

V závere svojej práce zdôrazňujem potrebu rozlišovania pojmov „jazykový manažment" ako sa používa v teórii jazykového manažmentu a „manažment jazykových problémov", ktorý je základnou kategóriou v mojom príspevku. „Jazykový manažment" je širší pojem, ktorý v sebe zahrňuje okrem manažmentu jazykových problémov aj iné aktivity metalingvistického charakteru.

Comenius University in Bratislava, Faculty of Philosophy
Department of Hungarian Language and Literature
P. O. BOX 32, Gondova 2, 814 99 Bratislava, Slovakia
<lanstyak@fphil.uniba.sk>