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

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 happening 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 development 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 re-introduction 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. 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 her talk, Ali elaborated on how the lecturers’ 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 management of linguistic, communicative, and sociocultural problems. She paid special attention to the routinely employed management strategies and re-management processes, such as re-evaluation, 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 Economics and Law, Osaka), and Jeongja Ko (Kobe University, Kobe) studied life story interviews that they had conducted with first and second generation 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 communication. In the presentation, the researchers concentrated on the first generation interviewees’ immediate responses to their questions as they found out that, unlike the second generation interviewees, they would repeatedly point out the inappropriateness of the wording of their questions 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 management processes, referring to the cases of language management analysis, which, according to Sloboda, can be carried out in different ways. He maintained that while such stages as evaluation 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 process. Sloboda proposed alternative interpretation of several instances of published LMT-based analyses and suggested that more detailed insight into the circumstances of the particular processes and the consideration of the language management 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 collaborated 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 “Grammar 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 question, 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, Hidehiro 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 investigated the implicit nature of norms in LMT by
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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


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