Title	From Language Planning to Language Management : J. V. Neustupný's Heritage
Author(s)	Nekvapil, Jiří
Citation	= Media and Communication Studies, 63: 5-21
Issue Date	2012-11-30
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/51178
Right	
Type	bulletin (article)
Additional Information	

From Language Planning to Language Management: J. V. Neustupný's Heritage

Jiří NEKVAPIL

This paper pursues three goals: 1. to demonstrate the terminological shift from "language planning" towards "language management", 2. to point out that this shift is facilitated by the growing influence of a particular theory of language management, which I refer to as Language Management Theory, 3. to present the central features of the theory, arguing that it is well suited not only to the analysis of language macro-planning but also to language micro-planning.[1]

1. The origin and beginnings of language planning

Deliberate regulation of language and linguistic behaviour is a long-existing activity, with language problems and the ways of resolving them having been devoted much attention beginning in the early modern period (Neustupný 2006, Nekvapil 2011) or even before it. The remarkable modernization of tens of languages was carried out in the then Soviet Union in 1920s (Alpatov 2000). Nevertheless, the issue of "language planning" arose only in connection with the decline of the colonial system and the processes of moderniza-

---

tion in the developing countries, i.e. in the 1960s. These and the immediately subsequent years saw the establishment not only of the term "language planning" itself (following E. Haugen), but also of a specific and influential theory operating under the heading (cf. esp. Rubin/Jernudd 1971, Rubin/Jernudd/Das Gupta/Fishman/Ferguson 1977). Within its framework, language planning was conceived as the concern of technical experts with efficient techniques at their disposal, as an objective process basically independent of ideology, although the relation to extra-linguistic factors, and hence other social fields, was emphasized (political science and economics in particular). Language planning was considered a type of societal resource planning, with Language Planning Theory aiming at an optimum utilization of this particular resource. Language Planning Theory was firmly anchored in the theory of social and especially economic planning of the time. Accordingly, language planning was conceptualized as rational problem-solving, as weighing up the advantages and disadvantages of various alternatives in specific social, economic and political contexts. The goals planned always required the approval of the political authority as they constituted the goals of the society *as a whole*. It is characteristic that language planning was to be performed at the level of the state. A member of an international group of language planners commented on the political atmosphere in the group in the 1960s saying: "... we recognized and accepted the realities of political process and central state power; and we believed in the good of state action, that governments could act efficiently and satisfactorily" (Jernudd 1997: 132). Language Planning Theory constituted a coherent whole which may be defined not only positively but also negatively — i.e. by listing the factors absent from the theory which were to become the focus of scientific interest later. More than 20 years after its publication, one of the main authors of the collection *Can Language Be Planned?* (Rubin/Jernudd 1971) wrote about the book:

"Should the book be written today, it could not carry the subtitle 'Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations,' but would have to take account of a broad range of different sociolinguistic situations at different levels of enlargement (from nation to firm), of a broad range of different interests and population groups (from women to refugees), under widely different communicative circumstances (of media, channels, information processing), and foremost, of the different ideological and real, global and local sociopolitical conditions. A dominant contemporary economic ideology favors deregulation (paradoxically enforced by controlling state institutions or supranational organizations such as the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank), the *Zeitgeist* commands

attention to individual and small group rights and problems over and above positing a collective (public) interest, the struggling communities have largely been abandoned to their own fates." (Jernudd 1997: 135, 136)

The basic ideas on which language planning rested in the 1960s and 70s, typical for the period and certainly limited in a number of aspects, and which determined the way the theory was shaped, seem to suggest that the language planning of that time was something specific and in principle closed, and that the term "language planning" should therefore be reserved for the theory and activities of that period. This approach, not isolated albeit certainly not dominant today, presupposes as a self-evident fact that the investigation of deliberate regulation of language and linguistic behaviour is being further developed under a different heading.

2. Terminological and conceptual issues

Influential English language publications dealing with deliberate regulation of language and linguistic behaviour have been consistently using the term "language planning" (esp. Cooper 1989, Kaplan/Baldauf 1997), in spite of the fact that they have departed from the bases of language planning of the 60s to a considerable extent, dealing with a much broader scope of linguistic and social problems (esp. Kaplan/Baldauf 1997). It should be noted that R. B. Kaplan and R. B. Baldauf also promote this terminological trend through their extensive editing activities (cf. the title of their journal *Current Issues in Language Planning*, published since 2000, and the series *Language Planning in...* published since 1999).

Spolsky's books (2004) and (2009) constitute a marked exception. It is not that he does not use the term "planning" at all, but relatively marginally. In developing a theory of language policy, Spolsky distinguishes its three components: (1) language practices, (2) language beliefs or ideology, and (3) "any specific efforts to modify or influence that practice by any kind of language intervention, planning or management" (Spolsky 2004: 5). A few pages later, Spolsky's employment of the terms is further clarified: "There are also cases of direct efforts to manipulate the language situation. When a person or group directs such intervention, I call this language management (I prefer this term to planning, engineering or treatment)." (Spolsky 2004: 8). Accordingly, Spolsky uses the term "language management" to the gradual exclusion of the term "language planning", this being

clearly a mere shift in terminological convention in many cases.

Certainly, Spolsky (2004) and (2009) are not the first to use the term "language management". It was mentioned among other terminological possibilities by Cooper (1989: 29), and dealt with in more detail by Kaplan and Baldauf (1997: 27, 207–209), who treat it as equivalent to the French expression *aménagement linguistique*. And it may be appropriate to mention here that Nelde (2003) when addressing issues of the EU language policy, considers this French expression the most modern of European terms.

The term "language management" was introduced into sociolinguistic literature programmatically by Jernudd and Neustupný (1987) in their contribution at a conference in Québec, Canada.[2] Neustupný and Jernudd employ the strategy presented above: they associate "language planning" with a particular period of deliberate regulation of language and linguistic behaviour, and they introduce a new heading for a broader field of study; moreover, they point out the parallel development in Canadian sociolinguistics, saying: "The use of this term, *language management*, in lieu of the currently widely used *language planning* will leave the latter term free to refer to the particular phase of the 'linguistics of language problems' which developed in the 1970s. This usage coincides with the Canadian French use of the term *aménagement linguistique*..." (Jernudd/Neustupný 1987: 71)

Accordingly, Language Planning Theory, together with e.g. the Language Cultivation Theory of the Prague School, are examples of social systems of language management only. Following this terminological strategy, the expression "language planning stage of language management" may be employed (Neustupný 2012) and the whole field of study may be shifted into a more historical context (cf. Neustupný 2006).

It may have seemed so far that the difference between Spolsky (2004) on the one hand and Neustupný and Jernudd on the other consists merely in the fact that the latter are more careful in using the terminology. However, this is not the case. While in Spolsky's book the term "language management" can hardly be considered more than a trace of the emerging discourse, Jernudd and Neustupný develop a new specific theory.

This will be dealt with in the following section.[3]

---

2   It should be noted that it is Jernudd and Neustupný that Cooper (1989) and Kaplan/Baldauf (1997) refer to when mentioning the term "language management".

3   This as well as the following sections are based on Nekvapil/Nekula (2006).

3. Language Management Theory

The term "Language Management Theory" is used here to refer to the theory developed mainly by J. V. Neustupný and B. H. Jernudd and later by others. To avoid elementary misunderstanding, I should emphasize the self-evident fact that the identity of the theory is based on the set of its theoretical claims rather than on the heading "language management". I mention this here for two reasons: firstly, certain fundamental features of the theory were published under different labels, especially "the theory of language correction" (this version is dealt with by Cooper 1989: 40f.); secondly, some authors employ the term "language management" without referring to the theoretical propositions of Neustupný, Jernudd and their colleagues; they use the term as more or less synonymous with the expression "language planning", which is also the approach of Spolsky (2004).[4]

Language Management Theory (LMT) originated alongside Language Planning Theory (cf. in particular Jernudd's references to Neustupný in the collections Rubin/Jernudd 1971 and Rubin/Jernudd/Das Gupta/Fishman/Ferguson 1977; cf. also Jernudd 1983), however, it has gradually grown so far apart from it that it represents a distinct alternative (see Jernudd 1990). What seems to have been decisive was Neustupný's effort to base macro language planning firmly on the theory of language problems (cf. in particular Neustupný 1978). At the theoretical level, particular interactions (discourses) were recognized as the primary source of language problems, which shifted the focus of theoretical thought concerning language planning towards the micro dimension (see Kimura 2005). The ideal model of language-planning activity was found in a process which may be described as follows: the identification of a language problem in individual interactions → the adoption of measures by the particular language-planning institution → the implementation of these measures in individual interactions. Neustupný (1994: 50) formulates it as follows:

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

The most comprehensive treatment of the theory is presented in the monograph by

---

4 However, it should be noted that Spolsky (2009) to some extent acknowledges Language Management Theory in the vein of Neustupný and Jernudd.

Neustupný and Nekvapil (2003), in Neustupný's paper (2002), and its earlier version in the collection of lectures published as Jernudd (1991). A recent theoretical systemization is Nekvapil (2006) or Nekvapil and Nekula (2006), further innovations can be found in Nekvapil (2009), Nekvapil and Sherman (2009a, 2009b), Sloboda, Szabó-Gilinger, Vigers and Šimičić (2010), and Mariott and Nekvapil (2012).

3.1. What is language management?

The theory is based on discriminating between two processes which characterize language use: (1) the production and reception of discourse, (2) the activities aimed at the production and reception of discourse, i.e. metalinguistic activities. The latter process is called "language management". It is to be noted here that Neustupný, echoing Fishman's wording, often says that LMT deals with (besides certain mental phenomena) "behaviour-toward-language". Language management may be illustrated by a situation where speaker X repeats with careful pronunciation a foreign word which his interlocutor Y failed to understand or by the standardization of the pronunciation of foreign words carried out by an academic institution and authorized by a ministry.

3.2. Simple and organized management

As the above examples suggest, language management can be performed at two levels. The speaker can manage individual features or aspects of his own or of his interlocutor's discourse "here and now", i.e. in a particular interaction. Such management is "simple" or "discourse-based". It may be illustrated by Example 1, where the Czech television moderator uses the non-standard form of the pronoun "který" ("who"), and, having realized this, he adds the standard form "kteří" ("who"), in other words, he corrects himself.

Example 1 (from Nekvapil 2000a: 174)
Moderator: témata, o kterých bude dnes řeč, možná poznáte už podle jmen pánů, který kteří přijali dnešní pozvání [the topics which will be discussed today you may recognize just from the names of the gentlemen who (*non-standard*) who (*standard*) accepted today's invitation]

Organized language management is not restricted to one particular interaction, it is directed and more or less systematic. The organization of language management involves several levels. The growing complexity of social networks is accompanied by the increas-

ing degree of organization of language management. In very complex networks, organized management often becomes the subject of public or semi-public discussion among a large number of participants (including specialists, institutions), many of them referencing various theories or ideologies. This may be illustrated by the decision of the Czech government to suspend the obligatory teaching of Russian after 1989 and to promote the teaching of "western" languages. Language Planning Theory specialized merely in highly organized management; nevertheless, by stressing the analysis of the initial sociolinguistic situation, it implicitly acknowledged the existence of simple management, and its evaluation stage in particular (cf. Ferguson 1977).

LMT requires organized management to rely on simple management as much as possible. Due to their high frequency of occurrence, examples of type 1 (morphological vacillation between standard and common Czech) have indeed become the subject of organized management in the Czech Republic, which, however, has not resulted in specific language policy measures. The suspension of the teaching of Russian was based on the fact that Russian was generally considered a useless language, moreover symbolizing the communist regime (on both examples, in more detail, cf. Neustupný/Nekvapil 2003).

Simple as well as organized management are closely linked with the factor of power, i.e. with the capability to push certain interests through (Jernudd/Neustupný 1987, Nekvapil 2007). LMT is based on the assumption that, as a rule, the interests of different participants and social groups in language planning situations are not identical, and the distribution of power among them is uneven. Consequently, the problems of individual and group language rights and their violation emerged relatively early in LMT (Neustupný 1984); and in comparison with Language Planning Theory, LMT was characterized as "an academic response to people power in reaction against central imposition" (Jernudd 1993: 134).

3.3. Management networks

Language management takes place within social networks of various scopes. It does not occur only in various state organizations, with a scope of activities comprising the whole society — these were the major focus of the Language Planning Theory — but also in individual companies, schools, media, associations, families as well as individual speakers in particular interactions.

It seems evident that LMT deals not only with the macro-social dimension, but also with the micro-social one, whatever form the conceptualisation of the latter dimension

might take (see Section 4).

3.4. The management process

Language management involves several stages. The stability and certainty of the production and reception of discourse is based on the existence of norms. LMT assumes that the speaker *notes* the discourse as such the moment it deviates from the norm.[5] The speaker may then *evaluate* the deviation (or the language phenomenon which was noted) either positively or negatively. The speaker may further *plan* an adjustment, and finally *implement* that adjustment. These four stages (noting, evaluation, planning of adjustment, implementation) constitute different stages of language management. It is significant that all these stages need not be carried out, the management may end after any of the stages: the speaker may, e.g., merely note a certain phenomenon but refrain from evaluating it, or he may evaluate it without planning the adjustment, or plan the adjustment but withdraw from its implementation. In Example 1 we can see that the management process was terminated after the stage of implementation.

However, the above four stages may also be distinguished at the level of organized management. Ideally, noting is based on research or expert reports concerning language situations of various scopes here, which actually means that the simple management of a particular phenomenon (e.g., the pronunciation of foreign words in language X, or the communication between local and foreign employees in company Y) should be thoroughly researched. This stage may be followed by evaluation of various aspects of these situations, planning and preparation of linguistic and political adjustments and their implementation.

It is certainly of particular importance for organized language management to identify language problems, i.e. such deviations from the norm which are not only noted by individual speakers in particular interactions but also receive negative evaluation. On the other hand, it is to be noted that although LMT, in accordance with Language Planning Theory, was originally developed as the "linguistics of language problems", recently attention has begun turning also to those deviations from the norm which receive positive evaluation, i.e. so-called gratifications (Neustupný 2003). Even these may become a

---

5 Though this may represent the most typical case of noting, in the most recent development of the theory it is presumed that the beginning of the management process needn't be triggered by a *deviation* from the norm.

substantial impetus for language management, e.g. concerning the choice or offer of a particular foreign language in state or private schools.

3.5. Linguistic, communicative and sociocultural management

The term "language management" as well as most of the above examples seem to suggest that LMT deals mostly with language phenomena in the narrow sense of the word, i.e. the phenomena of "linguistic competence". However, this is not the case. It is also possible to manage communicative phenomena (cf., e.g. the special forms of address required among the members of certain social groups, e.g., political parties) as well as sociocultural phenomena.

The following example comes from Heller's (2001) ethnographic research carried out in a French minority school located in a large English-speaking city in the territory of Ontario, Canada:

Example 2 (from Heller 2001: 225)

1. Teacher: pourquoi lit-on? [why do we read?]
2. Michel: pour relaxer [to relax]
3. Teacher: pour se détendre, 'relaxer' c'est anglais [to 'se détendre' (*relax*), 'relax' is English]

Evidently, we can witness language management in line 3. The teacher noted that student Michael used an English word in his French discourse, he evaluated this negatively and implemented an adjustment. Both the teacher's and the student's linguistic competence must have been at play, since both were able to recognize the French and the English word. Nevertheless, there was also communicative competence involved. They were both oriented toward the norm that French is used consistently during teaching despite the fact that they are both bilingual. However, as pointed out by M. Heller, there is also socio-cultural management involved — the teacher was oriented toward the ideological maxim "form good Franco-Ontarians", which receives political and economic support.

As far as organized management is concerned, Neustupný and Nekvapil (2003) claim that linguistic, communicative and socio-cultural (socio-economic) management are ordered hierarchically. Successful language management (e.g. teaching Czech to the Roma) may be conditioned by successful communicative management (the establishment of common Czech-Roma social networks), which in turn may be conditioned by successful

socio-economic management (providing jobs which could lead to the establishment of the Czech-Roma networks).

3.6. Methodology

The essential requirement of the methodology used in the analysis of language management is based on the maxim that the adjustments designed at the level of organized management be anchored in the analysis of simple management. Therefore those methods which make it possible to analyze individual interactions are emphasized. Since its origin, the LMT has developed some of the findings of ethnomethodologically informed conversation analysis (particularly in the area of the analysis of correction sequences) as well as its methods. Ideally, both the auditory and visual aspects of naturally occurring interactions should be captured (Marriott 1991a, Neustupny 1996) and detailed transcripts of these interactions analyzed. However, since all stages of the management process are to be described (without being confined to the stage of implementation in the way conversation analysis is), the investigation of language management employs methods which make it possible to also deal with noting, evaluation and the planning of adjustments, i.e. with phenomena from the mental field. In this respect, the method used most frequently is the so-called follow-up interview. During such interviews the researcher lets the participants in the recorded interaction themselves reconstruct the individual stages of language management which occurred in the interaction investigated; e.g., listening to a particular segment of the recording, the researcher asks the speaker whether and how he evaluated a certain word-form used during the recorded interaction by his interlocutor (Neustupný 1999).

Since in a number of social settings the analysts are denied direct access to the actual interactions (e.g. for ethical or professional reasons), LMT relies also on methods which enable the analysts to at least approach these interactions in a relevant manner. In the so-called interaction interview (Muraoka 2000, Neustupný 2003, Sherman 2006) the speakers reconstruct the details of the interactions in which they have taken part, relying solely on their memory (and occasionally other aids such as appointment books), unlike in the follow-up interview. Further methods include focus groups, systematic (self) observation (To/Jernudd 2001) as well as other types of interviews (narrative, semi-structured). Obviously, the summarization of acts of language management which accompanies the application of these methods (the so-called "management summaries") represents a methodological problem which must receive due attention (Nekvapil 2004).

3.7. Terminology

It should be mentioned in the context of this paper that the conceptual apparatus of LMT has been devised not only in English but also in Japanese, Czech, Hungarian and German.

4. The macro-micro issue in language planning and in LMT

As indicated above, the "language planning stage of language management" developed after the decline of the colonial system as a reaction to the linguistic and social problems of the developing countries. Typically, it was the state, or institutions authorized by the state and experts acting on behalf of the whole society, that acted as the agents of language planning at that time. Up to now most attention has been devoted to deliberate regulation of language and linguistic behaviour performed at this very level. On the other hand, the weakening of the function of the state, progressing fragmentation of the society and growing democratization processes have given rise to the calls for the necessity of studying "language micro-planning" (Kaplan/Baldauf 1997; with respect to Europe, e.g. Phillipson 2003, van Els 2006).

Since its beginnings, the representatives of LMT have stressed it that the theory is constructed in such a way as to be capable of encompassing both the dimension of macro-planning and micro-planning. This is emphasized in particular by Kuo and Jernudd (1993), who recommend that analysts as well as national language planners employ the macro- and microperspective in a balanced manner. Marriott (1991b) arrives at a similar conclusion based on the analysis of interactions in Japanese-Australian shopping situations and of documents concerning tourism issued by governmental, industrial and corporate agencies. The following comments aim at presenting the relation between "micro" and "macro" in language planning and in LMT at a theoretical level.

Language planning which takes place at the level of the state is usually referred to as macroplanning. However, it is evident that language is also influenced by less complex social systems, which is why the term microplanning came into use. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) use this term in relation to the activities of such institutions as individual banks, companies, libraries, schools, shops, hospitals, courts or services; a single city constitutes a microplanning unit for them as well. It is beyond doubt that much may be learned by studying the planning activities in such less complex social systems and, importantly, the findings from such studies may clarify the relations between macro- and microplanning.

On the other hand, one should not ignore the fact that both macro and micro language planning are conceptualized here on the same basis — they merely operate within "social structures" of different complexity. "Macro" and "micro" represent extreme limits of social space ("continuum"), which could be further subdivided into "macros" or "micros" of various complexities. Following this line of thought, it is not surprising that a number of authors also mention meso-level planning (cf. Kaplan/Baldauf 1997).

However, the relationship between the dimensions of "macro" and "micro" may be conceptualized in yet another way, which is well known in sociology and also sporadically reflected in sociolinguistics. Generally speaking, the approach may be characterized as the contrast of social structure ("macro") vs. interaction ("micro") (cf., e.g. Boden/Zimmer-man 1991). The relationship between "macro" and "micro" within this conceptualization has been a permanent topic of discussion in sociology. Various points of view exist, delimiting the respective research agendas — two of which may be considered extreme positions: (1) "macro" and "micro" are two discreet areas of social phenomena and it is therefore legitimate to deal exclusively with one of them; (2) there is no fundamental difference between "macro" and "micro", since "micro" is also a "social structure". These two points of view, whether on the level of declaration or in research practice, are also sure to occur in sociolinguistics. Position (1) is in fact reflected in the two-part division of the popular text by Fasold (1984, 1990); by definition, the autonomous "micro" is close to so-called interactional sociolinguistics (Nekvapil 2000b), the autonomous "macro" to Language Planning Theory. Position (2) has been held by some representatives of eth-nomethodologically informed conversation analysis. Let us focus now on position (3), which is of particular importance to the present paper. It comprises views based on the idea that the relation between "macro" and "micro" is dialectical, in other words, these two dimensions of social phenomena elaborate on one another. What this means is, firstly, that in particular interactions the participants recognizably orient themselves towards social structures and thereby reproduce them, and secondly, that in particular interactions the participants contribute to the transformation of these structures; Giddens (1993: 165) formulates this as follows: "structure appears as both condition and consequence of the production of interaction." These general facts are difficult to translate into particular sociological or sociolinguistic research programs. The empirical research pertaining to position (3) seems to be directed solely toward the question of how social structures are reflected in particular interactions. For instance, Heller (2001) demonstrates how the regulations issued by the Ontario Ministry of Education (distal circumstances) influence the

language-planning documents of a particular French-speaking minority school (proximal circumstances), and how the contents of these documents are reflected in the types of correction activities performed by the teachers of the school in particular interactions (immediate circumstances) (cf. also Mehan 1991). Certainly, a complementary process may also be imagined where language problems occurring in particular interactions are reflected by a local institution or institutions, which results in a regulation being issued at the level of a ministry or even in the establishment of a ministry language-planning organization.

Obviously, LMT has been constructed in such a way that it can *fully integrate* the social dimensions of "micro" and "macro", the relationship between the two dimensions corresponding to the above type (3). Within the framework of LMT, language micro-planning is identified with simple (discourse-based) management, and language macro-planning with organized language management (in networks of various complexity[6]). As suggested above, the two types of language management may be intertwined with one another dialectically: organized management influences simple management, and yet organized management results from simple management.

Proceeding from theory to language practice, we can now observe that such language-planning situations may be considered optimal. However, there certainly exist other situations in which organized and simple management do not influence one another. These involve in particular the situations where the language managers underestimate or even deliberately ignore the language problems of the ordinary speakers in individual interactions. We would probably agree that such situations should be criticized. Providing a framework within which particular speakers and their discourses, and hence also their problems, have an irreplaceable position, LMT constitutes a suitable basis for such criticism.

5. Concluding remarks: the formation of a new discourse?

Language Management Theory is one of several theories of language management. I have tried to demonstrate that it occupies a specific position among these theories and is able to respond to contemporary issues. It is likely to surpass other theories of language

---

6 Up to now the relationship between "macro" and "micro" has been typically considered only as a relationship between different levels of organized language management.

management in terms of scope and generality; Neustupný (2004) therefore refers to it as the General Theory of Language Management. In accordance with this, LMT is capable of investigating the *historical processes* which have an impact on the deliberate regulation of language and linguistic behaviour (cf. Neustupný 2006, Nekvapil 2011).

The example of Spolsky's book (2004) has shown that the term "language management" becomes a part of a discourse in which the "original authors" no longer matter. This discourse may draw on various sources: I have mentioned two popular works on language planning, which refer to the term (Cooper 1989, Kaplan/Baldauf 1997), I have mentioned the equivalence of "language management" and "aménagement linguistique" (Kaplan/Baldauf 1997), the prestige of the French term being significant (Nelde 2003). It may also be interesting to note that some years ago, the Central Institute of Indian Languages in Mysore (India) was announcing the publication of the journal *International Journal of Language Management*. However, what seems to be of fundamental importance is that the usage of the term "language management" is promoted by the influence of Language Management Theory itself, which is acknowledged even by Spolsky (2009).

Drawing on the findings of theories of discourse, in particular in the Foucaltian vein, we may assume that we are witnessing not only a new way of speaking, but also the reorganization of an entire field of study[7].

6. References

Alpatov, V. M. (2000): *150 языков и политика 1917－2000. Социолингвистические проблемы СССР и постсоветского пространства* [150 languages and policy 1917-2000. Sociolinguistic problems in the Soviet Union and the Post-Soviet area]. Moskva: Kraft ＋ IV RAN.

Boden, D./Zimmerman, D. H. (eds) (1991): *Talk and Social Structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cooper, R. L. (1989): *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Fasold, R. (1984): *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell.

Fasold, R. (1990): *Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell.

Ferguson, C. A. (1977): Sociolinguistic settings of language planning. In J. Rubin,/B. H. Jernudd/J. Das Gupta/J. A. Fishman/C. A. Ferguson (eds), *Language Planning Processes*. The Hague/Paris/New York: Mouton Publishers, 9–29.

Giddens, A. (1993): *New Rules of Sociological Method*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heller, M. (2001): Undoing the macro/micro dichotomy: ideology and categorization in a linguistic minority school. In N. Coupland/S. Sarangi/Ch. N. Candlin (eds), *Sociolinguistics and Social Theory*. Harlow: Longman, 212–234.

---

7 Thanks are due to Tamah Sherman and Marián Sloboda for helpful comments at various stages in the development of this paper.

Jernudd, B. H. (1983): Evaluation of language planning — what has the last decade accomplished? In J. Cobarrubias/J. A. Fishman (eds), *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton, 345–378.

Jernudd, B. H. (1990): Two approaches to language planning. In V. Bickley (ed.), *Language Use, Language Teaching and the Curriculum*. Hong Kong: Institute of Language in Education, Education Department, 48–53.

Jernudd, B. H. (1991): *Lectures on Language Problems*. Delhi: Bahri Publications.

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. (1997): The [r]evolution of sociolinguistics. In Paulston, Ch. B./Tucker, R. G. (eds), *The Early Days of Sociolinguistics*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 131–138.

Jernudd, B. H./Neustupný, J. V. (1987): Language plannning: for whom? In L. Laforge (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning*. Québec: Les Presses de L'Université Laval, 69–84.

Kaplan, R. B./Baldauf, R. B., Jr (1997): *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kimura, G. C. (2005): Gengoseisaku kenkyu no gengokan o tou: Gengokeikaku/gengotaido no nibunhou kara gengokanri no riron e [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.

Kuo, E. C. Y./Jernudd, B. H. (1993): Balancing macro- and micro-sociolinguistic perspectives in language management: the case of Singapore. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 17, 1–21.

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

Marriott, H. (1991b): Language planning and language management for tourism shopping situations. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, Series S, No. 8, 191–222.

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

Mehan, H. (1991): The school's work of sorting students. In D. Boden/D. H. Zimmerman (eds), *Talk and Social Structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 71–90.

Muraoka, H. (2000): Management of intercultural input. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 10, 297–311.

Nekvapil, J. (2000a): Language management in a changing society: sociolinguistic remarks from the Czech Republic. In B. Panzer (ed.), *Die sprachliche Situation in der Slavia zehn Jahre nach der Wende*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang, 165–177.

Nekvapil, J. (2000b): On the formation of interpretive sociolinguistics. *Sociolinguistica* 14, 33–36.

Nekvapil, J. (2000c): Sprachmanagement und ethnische Gemeinschaften. In L. N. Zybatow (ed.), *Sprachwandel in der Slavia*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 683–699.

Nekvapil, J. (2004): Language biographies and management summaries. In H. Muraoka (ed.), *Language Management in Contact Situations* Vol. III. Report on the Research Projects No. 104. Chiba: Chiba University, Gradual School of Social Sciences and Humanities, 9–33.

Nekvapil, J. (2006): From language planning to language management. *Sociolinguistica. International Yearbook of European Sociolinguistics* 20, 92–104.

Nekvapil, J. (2007): On the relationship between small and large Slavic languages. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 183, 41–60.

Nekvapil, J. (2009): The integrative potential of Language Management Theory. In J. Nekvapil and T. Sherman (eds), *Language Management in Contact Situations. Perspectives from Three Continents*. Frankfurt am Main: 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*. Volume II. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 871–887.

Nekvapil, J./Nekula, M. (2006): On language management in multinational companies in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 7: 307–327 [reprinted in A. J. Liddicoat and R. B. Baldauf (eds), *Language Planning in Local Contexts*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2008, pp. 268–287].

Nekvapil, J./Sherman, T. (eds) (2009a): *Language Management in Contact Situations: Perspectives from Three Continents*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang,

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

Nelde, P. H. (2003): Prerequisites for a European language policy. In Ahrens, R. (ed.), *Europäische Sprachenpolitik/European Language Policy*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 415–431.

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

Neustupný, J. V. (1984): Language planning and human rights. In A. Gonzales, FSC (ed.), *Panagani. Essays in Honor of Bonifacio P. Sibayan on his Sixty-Seventh Birthday*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines, 66–74.

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

Neustupný, J. V. (1999): Následné (follow-up) interview [Follow-up interview]. *Slovo a slovesnost* 60, 13–18.

Neustupný, J. V. (2002): Sociolingvistika a jazykový management [Sociolinguistics and language management]. *Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review* 38, 429–442.

Neustupný, J. V. (2003): Japanese students in Prague. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 162, 125–143.

Neustupný, J. V. (2004): Gengo kanri riron no rekishiteki ichi: appude-to [The historical position of language management theory: An update]. In H. Muraoka (ed.), *Language Management in Contact Situations*. Vol. III. Reports on the Research Projects No. 104. Chiba: Chiba University, Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities, 1–7.

Neustupný, J. V. (2006): Sociolinguistic aspects of social modernization. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier and P. Trudgill (eds), *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2209–2223.

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 [reprinted in Baldauf, R. B. /Kaplan, R. B. (eds), *Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol. 2.: The Czech Republic, The European Union and Northen Ireland*. Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 2006, pp. 16–201]

Neustupny, R. (1996): Australians and Japanese at Morwell: Interaction in the work domain. In H. Marriott/M. Low (eds), *Language and Cultural Contact with Japan*. Melbourne: Monash Asia Institute, 156–171.

Phillipson, R. (2003): *English-Only Europe? Challinging Language Policy*. London/New York: Routledge.

Rubin, J./Jernudd, B. H. (eds) (1971): *Can Language Be Planned?* Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

Rubin, J./Jernudd, B. H./Das Gupta, J./Fishman, J. A./Ferguson, C. A. (eds) (1977): *Language Planning Processes*. The Hague/Paris/New York: Mouton Publishers.

Sherman, T. (2006): Uncovering institutionally imposed norms through the interaction interview: Mormon missionaries in the Czech Republic. In H. Muraoka (ed.), *Language Management for the Coming Multicultural Society* (= *Language Management in Contact Situations. Vol. 4*). Report on the Research

Projects No. 129. Chiba: Chiba University, Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities, 1–12.

Sloboda, M. (2010): Review: Applied Linguistics: Spolsky (2009). LINGUIST List, 21 (227). Available from http://linguistlist.org/issues/21/21-227.html.

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

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

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

To, Ch./Jernudd, B. H. (2001): Terminological problems and language management for internet language professionals in Hong Kong. *Journal of Translation Studies*, No. 6, pp. 95–110 (Department of Translation, The Chinese University of Hong Kong).

Van Els, T. J. M. (2006): The European Union, its institutions and languages: Some language political observations. In Baldauf, R. B./Kaplan, R., B. (eds), *Language Planning and Policy in Europe, Vol. 2.: The Czech Republic, The European Union and Northen Ireland*. Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters, 202–251.