MACUROVÁ, A. (1983): *Ztvárnění komunikačních faktorů v jazykových projevech: Utváření významové perspektivy.* Praha: Univerzita Karlova.

MACUROVÁ, A. (1988): K poznávací hodnotě interdisciplinárního přístupu k slovesnému textu, zvl. uměleckému. In: J. Nekvapil – O. Šoltys (eds.), *Funkční lingvistika a dialektika* (= Linguistica, 17). Praha: ÚJČ ČSAV, s. 159–166.

MACUROVÁ, A. (2006): Jazyky v komunikaci českých neslyšících: český znakový jazyk a psaná čeština. In: *Vzdělávání sluchově postižených: Sborník příspěvků k mezinárodní konferenci Vzdělávání sluchově postižených (pořádané MŠMT ČR 6.–7. 12. 2006).* Praha: Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy ČR, s. 25–31.

MACUROVÁ, A. (v tisku): *Komunikace v textu a s textem.* Praha: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy.

MAREŠ, P. (v tisku): Texty a subjekty v komunikaci: O vědeckém díle Aleny Macurové. In: A. Macurová, *Komunikace v textu a s textem.* Praha: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy.

MAREŠ, P. – NEBESKÁ, I. (2006): Alena Macurová jubilující. *Slovo a slovesnost*, 67, s. 237–239.

Irena Vaňková

Ústav jazyků a komunikace neslyšících FF UK
nám. Jana Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1
<irena.vankova@ff.cuni.cz>

4TH INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE MANAGEMENT SYMPOSIUM

Language Management Theory (LMT), originally conceived by Jiří V. Neustupný and Björn H. Jernudd (see Jernudd & Neustupný 1987) and later developed by other scholars especially in Australia, Japan, and Central Europe, concerns various activities directed at certain aspects of language and communication both at the micro-level of everyday interactions (*simple management*) and at the meso- and macro-levels that include trans-interactional, more organised and systematic forms, such as institutional language planning and policy (*organised management*). Rather than viewing the management processes at these levels as completely different, the scholars working within the framework of LMT often examine the complex relationship between them and focus not only on linguistic phenomena in the narrow sense of the term, but also on other communicative and socio-cultural aspects that can become subject to management in particular interactions or in organisations of varying complexity. Traditionally, LMT assumes that the management process consists of four stages (the noting of deviations from norms or expectations, the evaluation – both negative and positive – of the noted phenomena, the adjustment design of the noted and evaluated phenomena, and the implementation of the adjustment design), but may end after any of the stages. In recent years, there has also been much discussion on such concepts as pre-interaction and post-interaction management (Nekvapil & Sherman 2009) and, following Kimura (2013, 2014), some have been calling for the addition of the fifth, post-implementation feedback stage.[1]

The most important social event for the researchers working within the framework of LMT and in related fields is a biennial International Language Management Symposium. The first symposium took place in 2008 at Monash University in Melbourne; the following symposia were organised at Waseda University in Tokyo in 2011 and Charles University in Prague in 2013. The symposium that this report concerns was the

---

[1] See materials and additional information at <http://languagemanagement.ff.cuni.cz/>.

fourth one in the series and was hosted by Sophia University in Tokyo on September 26–27, 2015. Each of the meetings had an overarching theme. While the first three focused on the act of noting as the first stage of language management, norm diversity and language management in globalised settings, and the methodological aspects of language management research, respectively, the focal point of the contributions at the latest one was the reconsideration of 'the process' in language management. There were 18 papers presented at the symposium in 6 consecutive sessions. In addition, there was a panel discussion featuring three leading scholars in the field, Björn H. Jernudd (independent researcher, Washington, D.C.), Jiří Nekvapil (Charles University in Prague), and Sau Kuen Fan (Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba). The overwhelming majority of the presenters were affiliated either with various institutions in Japan or Charles University in Prague, which well reflects the currently most active centres of LMT-informed research.

The contributions to Session 1 concentrated on the topic of the management of standard varieties. Vít Dovalil (Charles University in Prague) made use of the first stage of language management process and Niklas Luhmann's (2008) distinction between 'normative expectations' that are upheld despite disappointment and 'cognitive expectations', which are subject to change in case of disappointment, in order to explicate the conceptual difference between the destandardisation and demotisation of standard varieties. Dovalil explained that the process of demotisation takes place when language norm authorities refuse to abandon their normative expectations and keep noting and negatively evaluating deviations from what they consider standard in spite of their lack of power to implement the corrections. In the process of demotisation, the standard ideology stays intact, but the status of the 'authorities' in the relevant discourses is undermined. By contrast, in the process of destandardisation, the unfulfilled normative expectations are given up and replaced by cognitive expectations, which results in the established standard variety losing its status as the one and only 'best language' and in the weakening and eventual abandonment of the standard ideology. This is reported to be hap-

pening in the Norwegian language community (Kristiansen & Coupland 2011).

Hideaki Takahashi (Kansai University, Osaka) discussed the possibilities of using LMT to elaborate on his theory of 'the cycle of a prescriptive / descriptive process' (Takahashi 1996), which he had developed on the basis of studying the processes of standardisation and codification of German pronunciation. His model contains four stages: (1) codified and realised norms; (2) codified but not realised norms, which may be obsolete and inadequate or constitute a case of positively prescriptive norms; (3) socially or regionally dialectal forms that are neither codified nor used in official settings; and (4) norms that are not codified but are realised, and hence, if repeatedly used in formal situations, should be codified, the lack thereof suggesting judgement guided by negatively prescriptive norms. Takahashi considered the possible changes in between the categories, thereby illuminating the cyclical nature of the process and relating it to the process of language management as proposed by LMT. He emphasised that owing to the nature of phonetic features, deviations from the phonetic norms are not as easily noted as, for instance, the deviations from the orthographic norms, and pointed out the importance of the speakers' attitudes to different language varieties as well as their relationship with the interlocutor for their behaviour towards language within individual interactions.

The last presentation in the session allowed the participants of the symposium to learn about the free phone-based language consulting service for general public offered by the Czech Language Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences, widely regarded as the highest authority in deciding language matters in the country, from one of its employees. Martin Prošek first described how the service operates and explained the recent attempts of the Institute to make it more consistent by creating the phone enquiry database. Subsequently, using the transcripts of the recorded interactions, Prošek demonstrated that the language consulting service forms a management stage that the enquirers decide to incorporate into their language management processes at different phases of the process and with various intentions (Beneš et al. forthcoming). Finally, he presented the results of the analysis of the structure of the

interactions between the enquirers and the language experts, focusing primarily on the argumentation and the reasoning of both sides, such as the ways they tend to refer to the diverse sources of authority, so as to highlight some of the universal and specific features of the language consulting service.

The session was followed by a panel discussion, which was chaired by Lisa Fairbrother (Sophia University, Tokyo) and included three invited speakers. The audience first had the opportunity to listen to one of the founders of LMT, Björn H. Jernudd, who discussed the origin, development, and place of LMT in the context of language and communication research. Jernudd described the political and social climate of the 1960s, centred on the notions of planning and development, and showed that various ideas which fed into LMT had already been existent, present in other movements and discourses. He further reminded the participants of how LMT emerged as a distinct framework investigating language problems on both individual and institutional levels, using extensive referencing and focusing on answering the questions of "What language problems are there?" and "Whose are they?".

In the following talk, Jiří Nekvapil first looked into the driving forces in the current development of LMT, including new empirical research, the stimulating force of various contexts, and the identification of the inner problems and inconsistencies of the framework and its application in research. In particular, Nekvapil highlighted the ongoing discussions about the individual stages of the management process and pointed out that studies dealing with certain topics – such as organised language management, the place of language ideologies in LMT, or language, sociocultural, and communicative gratifications – are still quite rare. He further discussed various features of LMT as possible foci for research and demonstrated and explained some regional differences of using the framework in Central Europe, Japan, and Australia.

Sau Kuen Fan focused on the topic of language management in contact situations and discussed the theoretical significance of the concept of 'contact situation' for the studies using LMT. Having briefly summarised the impact of the 'discovery' of contact situations on the develop-

ment of LMT, Fan considered the importance of approaching language problems from the perspective of situation, echoing Neustupný in claiming that such an approach allows us to study not only the linguistic problems in the narrow sense of the term, but also sociocultural and communicative problems that arise in contact situations. Finally, Fan also addressed the question of the significance of 'contactedness' for the future development of LMT in the context of globalising postmodern societies. She emphasised the need to conduct empirical research on contact situations in various societies from the point of view of contactedness in order to create an updated typology of contact situations and allow for more refined studies of accustomed language management, i.e., language management behaviour towards language use in contact situations developed as a result of prolonged interaction in a given linguistic environment (Muraoka 2010).

The panel discussion was followed by Session 2, which included three contributions dealing with the topic of language management in educational settings. Hiroyuki Nemoto (Kanazawa University, Kanazawa) made use of LMT in investigating the management of socialisation processes into the teaching profession. Nemoto presented the results of a case study that he conducted among five junior Japanese secondary school teachers of English who had gone on a study stay to an English speaking country during their studies and at the time of the research were at the first year of their teaching career. The study revealed that the teachers had reached high levels of proficiency in the foreign language and had developed native-like manners, which boosted their professional confidence and made them highly respected by their students, who intuitively recognised their native-like behaviour and valued their professional skills. On the other hand, some of the teachers reported that their colleagues kept their distance from them, making some of the respondents feel excluded from their work group. Arguably, the reason for their exclusion was the feeling of inferiority among their fellow teachers who had not studied abroad.

Unlike most studies that involve Japanese non-native speakers in Japan and consider partner situations between Japanese non-native and native speakers, Kanako Takeda's (Sophia Linguistic

Institute for International Communication, Tokyo) case study focused primarily on the language management of Japanese non-native speakers in third-party contact situations. In particular, Takeda presented the results of her interviews with two international students enrolled in an English-medium science programme at a Japanese university. She concentrated on their negotiation of language selection in their everyday interactions in the university context. Takeda maintained that the international science students in Japan typically possess higher proficiency in English than in Japanese. One of her informants matched this description and the instances of his switching from English to Japanese were thus regarded by Takeda as a communication strategy to manifest membership and camaraderie with others at the laboratory. By contrast, the other informant was more proficient in Japanese than English, which made her stand out and led to a number of distinct language problems.

Nor Liza Ali (Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur) studied the interplay between the macro policies mandating the implementation of English as a medium of instruction and the simple management processes of ten content-area lecturers positioned as the actors in the implementation of the policy at a public university in Malaysia. Ali explained that while the shift towards the reintroduction of English as a medium of instruction for various academic subjects in Malaysian tertiary education reflects the worldwide trend, it had been facing three major problems: the lack of formal legislation which would make the use of English as a language of instruction binding, the lack of English language proficiency among students, and the inadequate English language proficiency among the content-area lecturers. In her talk, Ali employed the methodology of LMT to focus on the issue of the content-area lecturers' lacking English language proficiency and the response of the university to this issue. In the process, she problematized the stage of the adjustment design of organised management and, consequently, the application of LMT when investigating organised management.

Session 3 contained two presentations that dealt with language management and language planning and policy in border regions where communities of different nationalities live in contact. Marek Nekula (University of Regensburg, Regensburg) compiled a large collection of visual and textual material that documents the processes of language management and – in a broader sense – attitudes to language in various interest groups and organisations active on the territory of the Czech and Bavarian border areas. According to Nekula, both the language management processes and the attitudes to language can be effectively inferred from the share of Czech and German in the names of the organisations, titles of texts, logos, and promotional materials, the layout of Czech and German texts on a page, or the use of the two languages in a public space. The linguistic landscapes that the organisations thereby construct reflect not only the management of and attitudes to language and communication, but can also be related to the socioeconomic reality of the life on the Czech-Bavarian border.

In the other paper, Goro Christoph Kimura (Sophia University, Tokyo) focused on the research process itself by looking into the role of the researcher within the LMT framework. Using examples from his research stay in the German-Polish border area, Kimura argued that a researcher is not only an additional actor or an observer of the individual investigated communication situations, but also a part of the situation s/he studies, having a potential to act as a mediator between the different micro and macro levels involved. Kimura suggested that this bridging role of a researcher constitutes an important part of the language management process and its consideration should, therefore, be integrated into the LMT-based research.

Within Session 4, four presentations concerning language management in micro-level interactions were made. The interaction management of the Japanese and non-Japanese staff of business and industrial companies in Japan was investigated by Hiroko Aikawa (Sophia University, Tokyo). Aikawa focused on the interaction management processes that can be traced behind the ways the employees behave when communicating in English at their workplace. Aikawa took into consideration mainly the strategies of implementing various action plans when a deviation occurs. The study points out that if a speaker is not fully familiar with a communication norm,

it is difficult for him/her to select the appropriate expression as well as to identify the causes of communication failures if they occur. In addition, the findings suggest that better interaction management and improvement in the social relations at the workplace can be achieved by developing the individual employees' intercultural communicative competence.

Hourieh Akbari (Chiba University, Chiba) explored the ways Iranian long-term residents in Japan interact with Japanese native speakers using Japanese in the situations, which would require the use of *ta'arof*, Iranian etiquette. As both Japanese and Persian have very elaborate systems of expressing politeness and formality, contact situations between the speakers of the two languages tend to involve various complications stemming from the differences between the two systems. Having examined the behaviour of Japanese native speakers and Iranian Japanese non-native speakers in such speech acts as greetings, invitations, or giving thanks, Akbari showed that the communication situations in which *ta'arof* is to be employed may in some cases be disturbed as both participants have different expectations. Apparently, the disturbances are less serious if the Iranian speaker has acquired Japanese in real-life interaction with Japanese native speakers rather than in formal education settings.

The phenomenon of the construction, maintenance, and negotiation of one's identity that is demonstrated in one's language behaviour was elaborated by Seizo Miller (Chiba University, Chiba). Miller approached the topic from several viewpoints and to do so he drew on his own interviews with several foreign residents in Japan as well as the recordings of the research participants' actual conversational interactions. The research revealed various strategies the participants employed to perform, stress or conceal different identities.

Lisa Fairbrother (Sophia University, Tokyo) based her talk on the observation that language management studies usually concentrate on the perspective of only one participant of a communication situation that performs the management process. However, the cases when the management process is accomplished by the common effort of more than one participant have also been described and Fairbrother makes another valuable contribution to this area of study. Making use of a large set of data (consisting of video-recordings, follow-up interviews, and semi-structured and interaction interviews), which clearly illustrates different ways that the language management of the individual interactants may intersect, she outlined a comprehensive typology of intersecting management processes. The specific feature of such processes is that the interaction participants negotiate the management process on the spot and possible individual approaches to language management of individual participants are, therefore, modified or even given up and replaced with a new, common one.

The three papers in the following session shared an interest in the language management processes of individuals living for an extended period of time in foreign environments. Based on language biographies of six Japanese women who had been living in Shanghai because of their husbands' work assignment, Eri Fukuda (Ryūkoku University, Kyoto) demonstrated that the intrapersonal language status, i.e., the status an individual ascribes to a given language, is not stable, but rather dynamically changes over time and has stronger influence on language learning process than the actual frequency of engagement in contact situations or the daily communication needs. Fukuda showed that the intrapersonal language status management is influenced, for instance, by such factors as the extent and nature of one's language learning and living abroad experience, conscious or unconscious judgement of and attitude towards the local culture and society, and one's ideal self-image. In addition, Fukuda also pointed out that the women's intrapersonal language status management has significant effect on the language management on the family level as it typically influences the decisions about their children's education.

Halina Zawiszová (Charles University in Prague; Palacký University in Olomouc) presented initial findings from her case study, which examined the processes of language and intercultural management (*sensu* Muraoka 2000) in the daily life interactions of four long-term Japanese residents in the Czech Republic. Zawiszová mapped the development of the participants' personal networks, language use, attitudes towards Japanese

and Czech society and culture, and their manage-
ment of linguistic, communicative, and socio-
cultural problems. She paid special attention to
the routinely employed management strategies
and re-management processes, such as re-evalu-
ation, de-evaluation, and cumulative evaluation,
which are enabled by the long-term engagement
in certain contact situations. She emphasised
the impact of prolonged contact situations on
language and intercultural management and the
need for more studies that would take into account
the dynamic nature of the management processes.

Basing their methodology on cultural discourse
analysis and LMT, Junko Saruhashi (Aoyama
Gakuin University, Tokyo), YunSook Yu (Osaka
University of Economics and Law, Osaka),
Miyuki Hashimoto (Osaka University of Eco-
nomics and Law, Osaka), and Jeongja Ko (Kobe
University, Kobe) studied life story interviews
that they had conducted with first and second gen-
eration *Zainichi* Koreans (i.e., Korean residents
in Japan who either moved to Japan during the
period of Japanese occupation of Korea in the
first half of the 20th century or trace their roots
to the family members who did so), focusing on
their descriptions and evaluations of particular
life events and their language use and communi-
cation. In the presentation, the researchers con-
centrated on the first generation interviewees'
immediate responses to their questions as they
found out that, unlike the second generation inter-
viewees, they would repeatedly point out the
inappropriateness of the wording of their ques-
tions or the questions as such, suggesting a gap
between the participants' and the interviewers'
cultural, ethical, or sociolinguistic assumptions.

The final session of the symposium included
three papers which explicitly addressed the topic
of the process in LMT. Marián Sloboda (Charles
University in Prague) discussed the issue of the
(un)reliability in the analysis of language man-
agement processes, referring to the cases of lan-
guage management analysis, which, according
to Sloboda, can be carried out in different ways.
He maintained that while such stages as evalua-
tion and implementation tend to be rather explicit,
and thus relatively easy to identify, it is much
less clear what constitutes a deviation and what
exactly the deviation is from in a particular pro-
cess. Sloboda proposed alternative interpretation

of several instances of published LMT-based ana-
lyses and suggested that more detailed insight
into the circumstances of the particular processes
and the consideration of the language manage-
ment actors' point of view are necessary to make
the identification of the language management
stages in particular interactions more reliable.

Tamah Sherman presented a paper she col-
laborated on with Jaroslav Švelch (both from
Charles University in Prague). The authors looked
at the language management practices of people
who affiliate themselves with the label "Gram-
mar Nazis" (i.e., the individuals who habitually
note, point out, and evaluate negatively language
errors of others) on several Czech Facebook pages,
which serve as a platform for these individuals
to primarily share their discoveries of linguistic
deviations (mainly from standard written Czech)
and communally evaluate them for humorous or
other purposes. The researchers argued that these
instances are examples of incomplete (or partial)
management process cycles that are driven by
standard language ideology and realised as aims
in themselves for they are not performed with
a view of solving the language problems in ques-
tion, but rather, in order to demonstrate or enact
social hierarchies and power relations by virtue
of associating one's knowledge of grammar and
orthography with the level of one's educational
background and cultural capital.

In the final paper of the symposium, Hidehi-
ro Muraoka (Chiba University, Chiba) provided
a clear and comprehensive theoretical overview of
the significance of the concept of norms in LMT.
Muraoka summarised some of the basic tenets of
LMT by analysing main characteristics of norms
as understood in the framework, including the
recognition that norms differ in various societies,
are situation-bound and socially constructed, can
be either implicit or explicit (i.e., negotiated in
a particular communication situation), and that
noting of the deviations from them is closely
connected with the participants' substantive
interests. The idea of the 'deviation from norm',
which is at the centre of LMT, had been criticised
by Yamada (1999), who argued that such an idea
implies that "socially dominant 'norms' seem to
be concealed implicitly within its theory" (ibid.:
61). Departing from this claim, Muraoka inves-
tigated the implicit nature of norms in LMT by

considering selected examples of real-life situations where language management took place.

In sum, many of the contributions showed that LMT remains an inspiring theoretical framework especially for research into language behaviour in particular communication situations. However, theoretical elaboration of the framework and reconsideration of research methodology had their satisfactory share at the conference as well. The metalanguage developed within the LMT-based research, indeed, proved quite useful for describing the course of various actions oriented towards language. However, it is important for the researchers to consider their research goals properly when working with it so as not to make the application of the LMT terminology, such as the labels for the individual management stages, to their data a goal in itself. Significantly, certain cases of somewhat problematic delimitation of the individual stages of language management were discussed and important questions concerning the distinctive features of each of the stages were raised.

The need to fully acknowledge and work with the possibility of incomplete management process cycles was emphasized. For example, "grammar Nazis" criticising other people's deviations typically do not intend to implement any adjustment. Nonetheless, researchers should not treat the cases like this as a problem, because some stages of language management cycle do not come into effect, but rather, as a proof of the effectiveness of the framework for the very reason that it enables the researchers to make important distinction between the situations in which the management process is completed and the situations when the process is incomplete. Finally, it was also pointed out that for the LMT-informed analysis to be more accurate, the role of the researcher should always be taken into account and the dynamic character of language management in time and the management processes of different parties involved in the studied situations should also be considered.

We believe that the new insights as well as the questions that the symposium produced will become the starting point for further discussion, research and elaboration.

The next symposium is to take place in September 2017 at the University of Regensburg in Germany.

REFERENCES

BENEŠ, M., PROŠEK, M., SMEJKALOVÁ, K., & ŠTĚPÁNOVÁ, V. (forthcoming): Language consulting interaction and the Language Management Theory. In: M. Sloboda, J. Nekvapil & L. Fairbrother (eds.), *The Language Management Approach: Special Focus on Methodology*. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang.

JERNUDD, B. H. & NEUSTUPNÝ, J. V. (1987): Language planning: For whom? In: L. Laforge (ed.), *Actes du Colloque international sur l'aménagement linguistique / Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning.* Quebec: Les presses de L'Université Laval, 69–84.

KIMURA, G. C. (2013): Prohibiting Sorbian at the workplace: A case study on the cyclical process of language management. Paper presented at the sociolinguistic seminar at Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague, May 2013.

KIMURA, G. C. (2014): Language management as a cyclical process: A case study on prohibiting Sorbian in the workplace. *Slovo a slovesnost* 75 (4), 255–270.

KRISTIANSEN, T. & COUPLAND, N. (eds.) (2011): *Standard Languages and Language Standards in a Changing Europe*. Oslo: Novus Press.

LUHMANN, N. (2008): *Rechtssoziologie*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

MURAOKA, H. (2000): Management of intercultural input: A case study of two Korean residents in Japan. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 10 (2), 279–311.

MURAOKA, H. (2010): Sesshoku bamen ni okeru shūkanka sareta gengo kanri wa dono yō ni kijutsu sareru beki ka: Ruikeironteki apurōchi nitsuite [How should accustomed language management in contact situations be described? A typological approach]. *Language Management in Contact Situations* 8: *Report on the Research Projects* 228. Chiba: Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Chiba University, 47–59.

NEKVAPIL, J. & SHERMAN, T. (eds.) (2009): *Language Management in Contact Situations: Perspectives from Three Continents*. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang.

Takahashi, H. (1996): *Die richtige Aussprache des Deutschen in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz: nach Maßgabe der kodifizierten Normen*. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang.

Yamada, T. (1999): Esunomesodorojī kara mita 'gengo mondai' ['Language problems' from the perspective of ethnomethodology]. *Shakai Gengo Kagaku* [*The Japanese Journal of Language in Society*] 2 (1), 59–69.

Halina Zawiszová, Martin Prošek

Department of East Asian Studies,
Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague
nám. J. Palacha 2, 116 38 Prague 1,
Czech Republic

Department of Asian Studies, Faculty of Arts,
Palacký University Olomouc
Křížkovského 8, 771 80 Olomouc,
Czech Republic
<ZawiszovaH@gmail.com>

Czech Language Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences
Letenská 4, 118 51 Prague 1, Czech Republic
<prosek@ujc.cas.cz>