Editing Contributed Scholarly Articles from a Language Management Perspective

Robert B. Kaplan
Emeritus Professor, University of Southern California
Mailing address: PO Box 577, Port Angeles, WA 98362, USA   rkaplan@olypen.com

Richard B. Baldauf Jr.
Associate Professor, School of Education, The University of Queensland
Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia rbaldauf@bigpond.com

Abstract

Taking language management as its initial perspective, this paper examines some of the sorts of linguistic problems that second language writers of English face when contributing to scholarly journals and some of the issues that editors face when working with authors on those problems. Language management theory (hereafter LMT) is briefly explained. Drawing on a substantial corpus (slightly less than 500,000 words), illustrations of various categories of problem types are provided. One finding shows that it is difficult, in practice, to differentiate between simple language management issues and organized language management issues, because what may appear to be simple management issues may in fact have extended implications. Some problem types are not unique to non-native speakers, but appear with different frequency and distribution in non-native speaker texts as compared with native-speaker texts. Some ethical questions implicit in editing non-native speaker texts are explored.

Keywords: NNS writing; Revision; Editing; Research article; Scientific English; Language management, Ethical issues

Introduction

In the *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Joy Burrough-Boenisch (2003) published an extremely interesting article entitled "Shapers of published NNS research articles." In that article, she illustrates the various layers of editing through which an article may pass from the author's word processor (or pen?) to the printed page. Her article uses, as the examined corpus, articles in hard-science disciplines and, specifically, articles written in English by Dutch speaking authors. While a number of the editorial layers she describes would be the same for both NS and NNS contributors (i.e., the journal editor, the journal reviewers, the copy editor), others differ (i.e., initial collegial

input is likely to be from NNS – rather than NS – and there is likely to be a "corrector" or language editor involved)[1]. Her research raises important issues which teachers of writing in English[2] as a second/foreign language need to consider.

While the multi-layered process she describes is undoubtedly important in the context of certain kinds of scholarly journals, it represents but one of a number of such editorial processes in use. We are involved in a somewhat different concept of editing, from content (domain), theoretical, and procedural perspectives. We are co-editors of the "polity stream" in the journal *Current Issues in Language Planning* (CILP). The journal is bifurcated into two annual sets of volumes – those concerned with actual language (and language-in-education) planning in specific polities, and those concerned with the broader issues underlying such "national" planning. In this discussion, we will be concerned only with the former, what we term "polity studies."

While we do get inquiries or occasional manuscripts submitted for the polity studies section of the journal, it is our practice, by intent, to commission or solicit contributors who have had some direct involvement in the language planning activities in the polities they describe. Given the international focus of the journal, and the editorial preference for examining polities that are not well represented in the international literature, some contributors are quite likely to be non-native speakers of English. The importance of insider perspectives, however, is critical to the intent of the journal. Individuals with such a perspective may also be local scholars, but in the normal course of events they might not see "policy reporting" as an academic activity. We provide a framework[3] intended to guide authors. While the outcome is likely to be descriptive, it may also be critical (see, e.g., Heugh, 2003). Finally, unlike shorter more focused science articles, these articles range from 25,000 to 60,000 words; as a consequence, it is often necessary to consult with authors over two or more years before a text is ready for submission.

When considering the editorial process, Burrough-Boenisch (2003, 232) specifically notes what she calls "The Ethical Dilemma": "A further factor affecting the corrector's work has to do with the ethics of improving a text which, once published, enhances the author's standing in the academic community." On the same page, she also quotes DeBakey and Woodford (1973, 150); "From an ethical standpoint, it seems improper for an editor to revise a manuscript extensively – in essence, to rewrite it – and keep the original author's name in the published version." In terms of general editorial processes, the question being posed is whether correctors should do no more than act as "copy editors" or whether it is legitimate for them to become involved in more demanding editorial processes. The scope of the discussion of this question also needs to be restricted to academic journals (publications), since anyone who has been trained as an editor would recognize that this basic dilemma exists for all editors involved in higher order editorial work – regardless of the NS/NNS status of the author. The editor needs, first to get the author's express permission to suggest changes beyond the copy editing level, and second to be sure that it is the author's, not the editor's, voice that comes through in the text.

The editing of non-native speaker texts (indeed, even native-speaker texts, excepting perhaps only those of the most experienced writers), however, is common practice among virtually all journals. Thus, the question is not whether the practice is acceptable, but the extent to which, when extensive editing occurs, the editing is acceptable. Quite a number of journals allow or even encourage resubmission, and some

of such resubmission may be based on extensive referees' comments that may even speak to the structure of arguments.[4] Additionally, many journals have language editors who provide significant feedback, as Burrough-Boenisch has observed. However, it is possible that there is another ethical dilemma that Burrough-Boenisch does not consider – the ethical dilemma of rejecting work largely because the language is not adequate. This has become a particular problem as the "international" journal literature has become more English dominant, making it increasingly imperative for scholars from ESL/EFL backgrounds to be able to publish in English (See, e.g. Ammon, 2001; Baldauf, 2001). In this climate, opinions on the question of language editing vary extensively.[5] But, unlike the case of many science journals – those dependent largely on unsolicited contributions – which can merely accept the best that arrives,[6] we have a focus and an agenda which requires us to deal with these language problems – not to avoid them as many other journals can. While ultimately quality must prevail, and quality must come from the author, we can in some cases contribute to the process of massaging a text into acceptability. What we do is unique only in that the content refereeing and the language editing are combined.[7]

In developing this article, we were concerned with trying to preserve the anonymity of individual authors as we provide examples of the types of language problems we have encountered. This is appropriate as we are not primarily interested in either the countries discussed or the authors of particular polity studies in this article; rather we are interested in the language problems that arise for EFL and ESL authors when writing for professional English-language journals. Thus, we will identify and focus on the "language problems" that authors present and not on the authors themselves or on the polity contexts in which those language problems occur.

Language Management Theory (LMT)

We have, as a consequence, adopted the perspective of "Language Management Theory" [LMT] as a framework for our discussion. That theory had its origins in "Language Correction" theory (Neustupný, 1978), and that notion was subsequently developed in the 1970s and 1980s, mainly by Neustupný and Jernudd, as an extension and adjustment of language planning theory – such as it was in that time period (Jernudd and Neustupný, 1987; see also Neustupný, 1983, 1985, 2004).

In "Language Management Theory" (hereafter LMT), the word *management* refers to a wide range of acts in which attention is focused on language problems. In the language planning theory of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, language problems were principally seen as problems of language in the narrow sense of the word – i.e., largely in the context of morpho-syntax and phonology, in orthographic transcription, and in lexical expansion. LMT, on the other hand, aims to incorporate not only the whole of language as defined in the traditional narrow sense, but it also aims to incorporate a wide range of additional problems implicating, for example, matters of discourse, of politeness, of communication in intercultural contact situations, as well as matters arising in proof reading, in speech therapy or in literary criticism.

LMT is characterized by five features. An initial basic feature of LMT lies in a distinction between simple and organized language management. Simple management is management of problems as they explicitly appear in individual communication acts, for example, the problem of some particular spelling[8], or the problem of inappropriate pronoun reference. Organized management occurs at a different level. The main features

of organized management are:

1.   Two or more persons participate in the management process;
2.   Metalinguistic discussion of management issues occurs, and
3.   Conscious thought and ideology come into play.

As these features occur to various degrees in "real" discourse, there is necessarily a reciprocal movement between simple and organized management. Management within families, for example, often relies on simple correction in discourse, but it may also incorporate parental decisions discussed in detail, and may derive from ideologies of ethnicity, e.g., the decision to raise children bilingually. An example of a highly organized management process is language reform – a complex process consisting of many inter-related components. LMT maintains that, in principle, language problems, originating in simple management, eventually migrate to organized management. This claim, however, does not imply that organized management consists merely of a summary of simple management acts. Finally, the results of organized management are applied directly to discourse. It is this final step of adjusting individual discourse that imbues the whole management process with meaning.

A second prominent feature of the LMT is its procedural quality. Both simple and organized management is seen as developing in a number of stages (Neustupný, 1985). These stages begin with some deviation from a norm, in relation to which different participants often possess different norms or "expectations." A norm is, necessarily, a flexible entity subject to continuous adjustment. It would, however be simply unrealistic to suggest that norms do not exist at all (Neustupný, forthcoming). Following the identification of a deviation, the deviation may be noted (or ignored), a noted deviation may be evaluated, and an adjustment plan may subsequently be selected. Finally, the selected plan may be implemented.

A third feature of LMT concerns the development of a hierarchy between language (in the narrow sense) and communication and socioeconomic management. Language management alone (e.g., the removing of gender-loaded items from a language) is insufficient. It is necessary to guarantee that such forms are not used in communication without reference to the formal proscription of such forms. In order to guarantee the removal of the forms from communication it is further necessary to remove them from the socioeconomic structure. To accomplish this, the appropriate sequence may be defined as moving from "Socioeconomic Management" to "Communicative Management" to "Linguistic Management." However, communicative management does not inevitably follow from socioeconomic management, nor does linguistic management inevitably follow from communicative management; each must be accomplished in its own right.

A fourth feature of LMT consists of the insistence on the recognition of the multiplicity of interests within any community. Language management is not a value-free objective. The capacity to implement one's interests is subject to variation; no language management system can overlook this matter because this capacity is in fact a function of relative power.[9]

Finally, while traditional language planning theory focused largely on society-wide management networks (e.g., various governmental agencies and organizations), LMT takes a more ecological view. It recognizes that management occurs at a

multiplicity of micro, meso, and macro levels (e.g., not only at the level of central government agencies, but also at the level of communicating individuals, of professional associations, of social organizations, of the media, of economics agencies, of educational institutions, of local governments, and even of international bodies).

Given these features of LMT, we have examined the language problems in texts submitted to us for publication in CILP. Unlike the analysis of a full LMT problem, we are not undertaking language planning in the macro sense; indeed, the top level (socioeconomic analysis) of the theory will not be applied in our analysis. Only to the extent that a professional journal promulgates a model for language change do we incidentally introduce communicative language planning, and to the extent we do, language planning outcomes are secondary to our editorial purpose. We will identify a number of language problem sites and illustrate them with examples drawn from our corpus. In doing so we take note of Enkvist's caveat:

> The important point is to realize that the text is the father of the sentence, and that text strategies come before the syntactic formation of individual sentences. Giving a sentence its textual fit, its conformity with the text strategy, is not a cosmetic surface operation polishing the sentence after it is already there. Textual fit is a far more basic requirement, determining the choice of words as well as the syntactic structure of a sentence. To modern text and discourse linguists this is so obvious that it seems curious that grammarians and teachers of composition have, through the centuries, spent so much time and effort on syntactic phenomena within individual sentences, while overlooking the fundamental questions of text strategy and information flow (1997, 199).

In short, our editing is not directed toward sentence correctness, but rather it aims to take account of strategies to improve overall text coherence and cohesion.

Of course, there are simple language management issues in these texts; we will provide illustrations of such matters, even though these are problems found to some extent in both NS and NNS texts, and even though it is our purpose here to illustrate ESL/EFL related language problems. We will, therefore, focus on organized language management issues. It should be apparent that two or more persons are involved in the management process (i.e., the author(s) and the two of us, as well as a third content editor). Each of us (*CILP* editors) independently reads and edits every manuscript. We also send the manuscript to an area specialist for additional content editing. All of the editing is then collected into a single version that is sent to the author[10] with the expectation that the author will respond to our editing. Several responses are possible: The author may simply accept our editorial changes, or s/he may reject our suggestions, or s/he may wish to enter into a discussion of an alternative strategy for resolving what we believe to be a language problem. Thus, the author:

1. May recognize the language problem and accept our strategy for changing it, or
2. May not recognize the existence of a language problem, refusing to make any change, or
3. May recognize the existence of a language problem but may suggest a different change strategy – possibly on the grounds that our strategy obscures or modifies the author's intent.

It is important to recognize that "organized" language problems do not often lend themselves to clear right/wrong options, as simple language problems (e.g., spelling, grammar) might; rather, the language problem may elicit a question from the editors, or may elicit two or three alternative options. In short, the issue is rarely black and white.

It is important to recognize that the solutions to language problems that we suggest are precisely suggestions; an author is not required to make any change. Our intent is simply to call attention to a problem site, to offer one or more alternatives for change, and to leave the change to the author. While this system works well in principle, it must be understood that final responsibility to the publisher and the subscribers rests with the editors. If an author rejects a significant number of the identified problem sites and the solutions proposed by the editors without providing alternative formulations, at some point the author's desire and the editors' need may come into irresolvable conflict. In such instances (which are at the moment purely theoretical – none have ever occurred) the editors' judgment will prevail. The point is simply that, while the editorial process inherently involves editorial and linguistic power relationships, the editors try in so far as possible to work collaboratively with the author to solve language problems.

It is also important to recognize that, once the author and the editors have finished with the manuscript, it goes on to the publisher where it goes through the publisher's editorial processes and is subject to the publisher's norms, except that the manuscript is not normally vetted by content reviewers.

Examples of Organized Language Problems

At this point, it seems appropriate to identify some language problem types and to present some examples of problem sites. (In a few of the following examples, specific problem areas are marked with italics; in some examples, the entire cited bit of text constitutes the problem.)

An initial language matter, inherent in all English language manuscript editing, relates to the difficulties caused by the co-existence of several metropolitan varieties of English, and of which one to select. *CILP* authors do not only come from ESL/EFL backgrounds, but they may have learned, and be speakers and writers of, different varieties of English. This is an ideological as well as a pragmatic issue about which some authors feel very strongly[11], and one, which teachers of second language writers and language correctors, when working with such writers, need to consider. Furthermore, while British and American English may be the two major variants or norms[12], lexical variation occurs much more widely. Thus, while our position is informed by the location of the publisher (in England) and the publisher's standard style sheet, we have to consider such variation and how to handle it. While initially we suggest to authors that the publisher has a particular preference, ultimately we are prepared to accept styles that consistently meet either of the norms. It is also our responsibility to point out usage which may relate to a particular variety and which therefore may not be accessible to an international audience, and to suggest either alternatives or glosses (or the need for them) to the authors.

Some language problems, for example, arise from a misunderstanding of the audience on the part of the author. Because authors are intimately familiar with the history and "culture" of the polities they are studying, they may fail to recognize that a broad international audience may lack pertinent historical, social or cultural knowledge. Admittedly, such failures to recognize audience limitations are not unique to NNS

authors; they are, however, more common to NNS authors whose historical/geographic contexts may be more local. In part, we have tried to address this problem by requiring regional maps, but that solution addresses only geographic issues; it does not address historical or cultural matters.

EXAMPLE 1

The decisive factors were no longer economic but social (e.g., the reunification of families) and following the birth of an independent [country name] also *political (dissent from Prime Minister [minister's name, possessive] political attitudes)*.

In such a case, we are likely to suggest a footnote since readers not thoroughly familiar with the polity which is being discussed, will have no idea what the prime minister's political attitudes may have been.

EXAMPLE 2

Most of these tribes originated from South Africa during *the Defecane Wars*.

Again, a footnote (or at least a parenthetical note) may be necessary to place the Defecane Wars in historical time.

EXAMPLE 3

Towards the end of the 1990s some [people] attempted to improve their situation by emigrating, for example to Britain or Canada. However, these avenues have been closed by the governments of the countries in question. *Admittedly some work has been done and the future is not entirely grim.*

The final sentence of this cluster is entirely ambiguous; the reader may need to know what kind of work (i.e., scholarly or political?) has been done by whom? When was this work done? Which future is not grim and why is it not entirely grim? Here a footnote will not serve; perhaps the sentence should be rewritten to remove the ambiguity. Since the editors cannot resolve the ambiguity, they can only identify the problem site and, through questions like that suggested, point to the source of the problem.

There are many instances of this sort of failure to consider the reader in the corpus. In addition, there are a number of terminological matters to consider. This may be more of a problem for this journal, than perhaps for some others, because one of the avowed aims is to "give rise to language planning description comparable across polities" in order "to move toward an understanding and a viable theory of language planning." It seems essential that such discussion be enhanced by consistent terminological use. (See Kaplan & Baldauf 1997, Chapter 1 for a discussion of some of the contradictory usage.)

For example, the term *mother tongue* has been widely used in the literature and often occurs in official documents. However, that term is neither sufficiently explicit nor sufficiently accurate. Literally, it means the language spoken by one's mother. Ferguson

(1982, vii) was an early critic of the use of the term. In the Foreword to Kachru's (1982) book, he writes:

> Linguists, perhaps especially American linguists, have long given a special place to the "native speaker" as the only truly valid and reliable source of language data, whether those data are the elicited texts of descriptivists or the intuitions the theorist works with. Yet much of the world's verbal communication takes place by means of languages that are not the user's "mother tongue," but their second, third, or nth language, acquired one way or another and used when appropriate…. In fact, the whole mystique of native speaker and mother tongue should probably be quietly dropped from the linguists' set of professional myths about language.

A point not explicitly mentioned by Ferguson is the obvious one; in many cases, the first language spoken by an individual is NOT the language spoken by his/her mother. In intertribal marriages in sub-Saharan Africa, for example, the first language in the home is likely to be the language of the father, not that of the mother. In instances in which a child grows up in a multilingual environment, it may be impossible to determine the role played by the mother's language. The language of a caretaker, the language of playmates, the language of school may play the dominant role. Were that not so, immigrant children would grow up literally speaking their mother's tongue.

EXAMPLE 4

After World War II, *the idea that all effective learning, including language learning, should be based on the mother tongue* … gradually began to gain ground….

This author may have in mind the early United Nations discussions of education. However, the term *mother tongue* is probably inappropriate; it is no longer widely used in language planning literature, and its continued use contributes to confusion. Unfortunately, the term is so well embedded in what Ferguson calls "the linguists' set of professional myths about language" that the problem occurs in many contributions and is common throughout our corpus. We recommend *first language* in lieu of *mother tongue* as perhaps being a bit more accurate. Of course, in those instances in which the term *mother tongue* appears in official documents, we respect the usage.

EXAMPLE 5

[The organization] does not specify media of instruction, but rather states that "the process of indigenous education involves cultivating and recuperating the *mother tongue* and learning the second language as a means of intercommunication with other cultures" [citation].

Another problem site occurs around pronominalization and relexification. Only occasionally do any of the contributors use an incorrect pronoun, and that is usually a function of not knowing whether an individual cited is male or female. Many non-native speakers of English, however, have a limited understanding of the range over which a

pronoun can function as well as the problem of pronoun confusion when several nouns occur in the context and the point at which relexification should occur.

EXAMPLE 6

Another reason is that, with the definition of majority and minority being non-numerically determined, such data would quickly bring to the attention of the people that what government regards as major ethnic groups are actually minorities in numerical terms. *This* has hampered easy access to empirical and scientific data that would provide an accurate description of the sociolinguistic complexity of the country.

In this instance, *this* is quite ambiguous; it does not seem to refer to any of the nouns given in the preceding sentence. Perhaps the author meant *this* to imply **The absence of ethnic and/or linguistic information.**

While the first 6 examples, illustrative of simple language management, occur in our corpus with higher frequency than could, we believe, be expected in native English-speaking text, they do occur in native English-speaking text and are not unique to Non-Native texts. The following examples, illustrative of organized language management issues, are more characteristic of Non-Native English texts.

One such example involves the misplacement of sentence openers and various modifiers. This problem site in particular illustrates the importance of looking at discourse rather than at individual sentence correctness. While the problem occurs in many contributions in our corpus, it is more frequent in the Eastern European texts, possibly because of the authors' knowledge of German.

EXAMPLE 7

It is of interest the question of what language was considered as ~~mother tongue~~ first language by those who reported as [XXX ethnicity] or [YYY ethnicity].

Here, the sentence opener "It is of interest" is distracting. The real subject of the sentence is "the question." A more appropriate rendition might be "The question of what language was reported as first language by those who reported one or another ethnicity was of interest." Note that *mother tongue* should perhaps be changed to *first language*.

EXAMPLES 8-9

8. Incidentally, this speaker is one of those who personally consulted *concerning their return* with President [name].
9. ….a process which began several centuries earlier during the Middle Ages and has continued until present times, with different levels of intensity, *almost unabated.*

In example 8, the phrase "concerning their return" may be misplaced; it should probably occur at the end of the sentence: "Incidentally, this speaker is one of those who personally consulted with President [name] concerning their return." In example 9, the

last item (almost unabated) seems to refer to *continued* and perhaps should be closer to that item.

It must be remembered that most of the contributors to CILP are non-native speakers of English. When they attempt to sound native-like by using idiomatic expressions, they often create problem sites because they do not fully understand the semantic restrictional rules that constrain idiomatic expressions. Examples of this type of problem site are not as common as some other types.

EXAMPLE 10

10.	Throughout ~~the~~ modern history, [names of two "provinces"] *played second and third-fiddle.*

The creativity in this problem site is extremely interesting. The idiomatic expression is "to play second fiddle." Because two provinces are involved, the author of this item adds a "third fiddle" which makes numerical sense but doesn't fit the idiomatic structure, let alone general sense in terms of orchestral structure from which the metaphor derives.

Time expressions are sometimes skewed, especially the use of *today*, or the more conversational *nowadays*, as a kind of short hand for the present time. NNS perhaps are unaware of the distinctions in levels of usage among the available expressions. It is true that undergraduate NS also employ such usages, but they rarely occur in scholarly writing. While these problems look like simple management sites, they are actually, in our opinion, organized language management sites because the time element affects the meaning of the structures. Following are three examples of several interesting usages of time expressions:

EXAMPLES 11-13

11.	*Today*, attitudes toward slang are more relaxed, and this reflects, among other things, a more frequent use of slang expressions within the language of the mass media.
12.	A large number of words that arrive *today* from English (such as in the area of computing, popular music or sports) are felt to be slang.
13.	This situation gives motivation for a rather optimistic conclusion: *nowadays* the […] languages are transmitted from generation to generation, to a higher degree than was the case during at least the three previous generations.

An interesting problem site involves structures that are syntactically correct but that link, within the same "structure," quite disparate content. Traditional grammar texts do not often deal with this type of problem site; while NS authors do create such structures, the problem sites are not identified as illustrative of "grammatical errors" but rather are normally dealt with through conferencing (either "in-person" or through written marginal comments). Two examples follow:

EXAMPLES 14-15

14.	Tourism has recently surpassed sugar as the main revenue and indeed the future of the sugar industry is in doubt, with preferential prices coming to an end and many expiring leases on land owned by indigenous [people], but farmed mostly by [others], not being renewed.
15.	Government Ministers made statements in public that were reported in the newspaper, and they were of interest to people trying to gauge the thinking of the government of the day on a variety….

In the first example (14), the statement appears to claim that the future of the sugar industry is in jeopardy because tourism has surpassed sugar production, because preferential prices for sugar are no longer available, and because leases on indigenously owned land (that is farmed by others) are not being renewed. One wonders who is not renewing the leases, what purpose is served by the termination of leases, and, more importantly, what the cause/effect relationship among the several conditions is. In the second example (15), a causal relationship seems to be established where none exists.

Another problem site is created by text that defies understanding because the text constitutes a syntactic maze. In such instances, the editors may only call attention to the existence of a problem site; it would be literally impossible to offer an alternative solution, sometimes because the problem site is genuinely ambiguous, sometime because the maze is simply impenetrable. Three examples follow:

EXAMPLES 16-18

16.	Their action doesn't lead to a state of the world which will be completely favorable for them or the actual state of the world makes their action more difficult.
17.	Post-colonialism, while professedly about the telling of these alternative stories, in fact ensures the review of empire with the pen of the "other."
18.	One aspect of disadvantage, necessary is language shift in non-English speaking research groups, which may be an aspect of LHRs too.

Another problem site is marked by interesting mixed metaphors. It is hard to determine whether the mixed metaphors are the result of language difficulty or the result of carelessness. Obviously, mixed metaphors occur in NS texts as well, but with a lower frequency and in somewhat different contexts.

EXAMPLES 19-21

19.	Competence appears to be the tool which contributes to success, and this tool is part of the state of the world.
20.	…serves to initiate *a bridge across the chasm* between academic research and actual socioterminological realities of usage.
21.	…serve abstract purposes such as in generalized language *policies without much teeth.*

More complex is the problem site in which a number of disparate ideas, not clearly related to each other, are pasted together as independent clauses. The syntax of this passage is easy to revise, but such a revision will not deal with the unrelated ideas.

EXAMPLE 22

> The attainment tests written at the end of grade four are in Setswana in all the four subjects tested (except English). These subjects are Setswana, English, Mathematics and Science. Kamanakao Association was then formed in 1995 to continue the work of Mr. Seidisa and Professor Westphal. Its aim is to develop and maintain the Shiyeyi language and culture. The work on orthography was completed in 1998, and work on materials production and training is on-going. The organization has produced a draft of an inter-denominational hymnbook, a phrase book for teaching Shiyeyi and a booklet with songs, stories and poems. It also produces a calendar in Shiyeyi. The Wayeyi installed their Chief and they plan to hold a biannual cultural festival.

Conclusion

The problem sites identified in this review of text editing from a language management perspective provide illustrations of a number of issues that should be of interest both to editors and to ESL/EFL teachers, particularly to teachers of writing. First, it should be immediately evident that – simple language problems aside – organized language problems often implicate long stretches of text and are rarely limited to individual sentences. These are difficult to illustrate given the limitations implicit in an article of this kind, since the length of examples is constrained by the space allotted for an article. We seriously considered presenting one entire text, running to some 12,500 words, but that would create an instance of the tail wagging the dog, since the example alone (without commentary) would be roughly twice as long as this article.

We began this exercise with the conviction that the bulk of what we do involves organized language management issues; however, careful analysis of what we have actually done over a rather large corpus shows that the preponderance of our work seems to involve simple management. However, on closer inspection, we have concluded that much of what looks like simple language management is actually organized language management. This is so, since simple changes in text do not merely involve correction of grammatical errors or spelling errors but rather involve textual fit – conformity with text strategy – and not merely cosmetic surface operations.

Obviously, there are other kinds of language management sites that we have omitted:

- examples of misrepresentation of the research of other scholars,
- extensive repetition,
- lack of effective parallelism,
- peculiar word choice,
- contradictions across large texts,
- descriptions of situations in a given polity without noticing that the particular situation is widespread across many polities,
- leaps from the specific to the general,

- inclusion of irrelevant material,
- problem oversimplification,
- lack of evidence,
- over/under estimation,
- insufficient discussion of important elements,
- over/under assumption of audience knowledge, and so on.

We will illustrate only the point about misapprehension of audience:

EXAMPLE 23

> The French Language is a member of the Romance group of the Italic sub-family of the Indo-European family of languages. Historically, the French language developed as a consequence of colonisation of Gaul by the Romans, out of spoken Latin – subject to the influence of various factors – until it constituted a new language clearly distinct from classical (written) Latin.

Such a comment may be unnecessary (indeed, grossly oversimplified) in an article directed to an audience presumably somewhat sophisticated about language matters.

Whether these are language management issues can certainly be debated; some result from insufficient research or knowledge of the literature. Illustration of many of these problem sites would require the inclusion of great quantities of text. We have not illustrated such simple management types as misspellings and the omission or misplacement of punctuation.

In her discussion of the publication of NNS texts, Burrough-Boenisch (2003) indicates that the editorial process has implications for theory:

- Revision Theory assumes that the writer does the revising,
- Error Analysis suggests that the language teacher triggers the revision.

Burrough-Boenisch argues that both insights are needed. Drawing on LMT, we would argue that it is the authors' and editors' responsibility to engage in communicative management to develop a discourse suitable for the audience. For the humanities and social sciences literature, this audience may be broader than the specialist academic reader. Therefore, this process, while not ignoring simple language management, takes the construction of an appropriate discourse (for the content) to be the objective of the editorial process. Because the discourse to be constructed is complex and perhaps somewhat unfamiliar, especially to ESL/EFL speakers, negotiation is often required, to ensure that meaning is communicated to the wider audience. In the humanities and social sciences, the editors cannot rely on the traditional scientific framework (Problem, Review of the literature, Methods, Results, and Conclusions) to provide a formulaic framework for communicating the content and must therefore take a more proactive role. Clearly, such a more proactive role involves more than copyediting.

Our point, then, is that the editing of text composed by NNS for publication in an English-language journal is a complex process, not only implicating a number of layers of review – as Burrough-Boenisch has properly suggested – but also implicating several

complex ethical issues as well as the recognition that "the text is the father of the sentence, and that text strategies come before the syntactic formation of individual sentences." The implicit text strategies intended by the NNS author are not always transparent; thus, a LMT approach is helpful because it permits and encourages the consultation necessary to the development of appropriate revision strategies for creating a suitable discourse.

Notes

1. The issue of the availability and provision of specialist language help and/or correction is a complex one that goes beyond the scope of this article. While employing correctors may not constitute a resource problem in some academic contexts – either in terms of availability or finance – it may be a significant issue in others, say for an Eastern European (or African) academic where the cost of such a service many exceed a month's salary (Candlin [2000]; see also Djité [2000], footnote 2, for Côte d'Ivoire financial constraints on academics). Some journals published in English, but catering for NNS authors, like the *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, employ language editors as part of their editorial process. Other publications may recruit voluntary support for NNS from NS colleagues (see, e.g., the acknowledgements in Maurais and Morris [2001] for English to French or [2003] for French to English translations).
2. Of course, a similar problem may exist for native English-speaking authors attempting to write in another language; see, e. g., Baldauf (2001).
3. See the specific 22 questions each author is asked to address, available at http://www.cilp.net. See also the "Aims of the Journal" which appears on the inside back cover of each issue of CILP.
4. See, e.g., the notations on articles in some journals that give submission and resubmission dates, as well as acknowledgements that credit not merely pre-submission input, but also the comments of the referees.
5. For example, Ammon's (2001) book was criticized in one review (Ammon, personal communication) because he had not, in the reviewer's opinion, edited the English strictly enough – he had chosen "not to eliminate all the non-native-speaker traces." (Ammon, 2001, x)
6. Such a process may systematically disadvantage authors by age, experience, gender, national origin, and/or language background – the reality of the post-modern arguments. For us to reject a submission – even one with fairly serious language problems – one that we had possibly encouraged an author to submit, one that was 30,000 or more words in length (equivalent to the maximum length of 3-6 articles in many journals), one that may have taken two years to write, and one that is unlikely to be publishable elsewhere because of it specific focus and content, solely for language related reasons, would pose a major ethical dilemma. There are of course other journals, like *Sociolinguistica*, that face similar ethical problems (Ulrich Ammon, personal communication).
7. This is not to say that we do all of the content editing; on the contrary, we regularly send manuscripts to area specialists for content review as well.
8. For example, the differences between British convention versus American convention: harbour/harbor; organised/organized, etc.

9. While interests of various sorts have been noted in LMT under various names (see, e.g., Neustupný [1983]; Jernudd and Neustupný, [1987], the specific concept of power was added later (see, e.g., Jernudd, [1996]; Neustupný, [1996]).

10. We will continue to speak of a singular author, but in fact many of the manuscripts submitted to CILP have two or more authors. How the individual authors divide the work of responding to our editing is not a matter of concern to us.

11. An Australian colleague had a chapter accepted for a volume to be published in the United States. The US editors insisted that the author revise the article using American English spelling conventions. The author felt strongly that the required changes were a blatant case of "linguistic imperialism" so relexified the article to eliminate words with alternative American and Australian spellings. Thus, the author was able to say that Australian spelling had been used throughout.

12. Of course, the question of which varieties of English may count as "standard" or "metropolitan" varieties is complex. Generally, Australian, Irish, New Zealand, South African, UK, and US "standard" academic varieties may count, but what about Indian English, for example; to its users in India, it is a "prestige" variety, but its level of prestige elsewhere is open to question. There are a number of indigenous varieties, perfectly acceptable in their sites of usage, but open to challenge elsewhere; e.g., Philippine English, Taiwanese English, etc.

References

Ammon U. (Ed.) (2001). *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science: Effects on Other Language Communities.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2001). Speaking of science: The use by Australian university staff of language skills. In U. Ammon (Ed.) *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science: Effects on Other Language Communities* (pp. 139-165). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Burrough-Boenisch, J. (2003). Shapers of published NNS research articles. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), 223-243.

Candlin, C. (2000). Opinion. *AILA News*, 4, 1.

DeBakey, L. and Woodford, F. P. (1973). Extensive revision of scientific articles: Whose job? *Scholarly Publishing*, 3, 147-151.

Djité, P. G. (2000). Language planning in Côte d'Ivoire. *Current Issues in Language Planning,* 1, 11-46.

Enkvist, N. E. (1997). Why we need contrastive rhetoric. *Alternation*, 4(1), 188 – 206.

Ferguson, C.A, (1982). Foreword. In. B. B. Kachru (Ed.) *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures.* (pp. vii-xi). Urbana, IL: The University of Illinois Press.

Heugh, K. (2003). Can authoritarian segregation give way to linguistic rights? The case of the Pan South African Language Board. *Current Issues in Language Planning.* 4(2), 126-145.

Jernudd, B. H. (1996). Language planning. In H. Goebl, P. H. Nelde, Z. Starý and W.Wölck (Eds.) *Kontaktlinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung* (pp.833-842). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Jernudd, B. H. and Neustupný, J. V. (1987). Language planning: For whom? In L. Laforge, (Ed.) *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning* (pp. 69-84). Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

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

Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (Eds.) (2001). Geostrategies des langues. *Terminogramme,* 99-100. [Special Issue]

Maurais, J. and Morris, M. A. (Eds.) (2003). *Languages in a Globalising World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Neustupný, J. V. (1983). Towards a paradigm for language planning. *Language Planning Newsletter,* 9(4), 1-4.

Neustupný, J. V. (1985). Problems in Australian-Japanese contact situations. In J. B. Pride (Ed.) *Cross-Cultural Encounters: Communication and Mis-Communication* (pp.44-84). Melbourne: River-Seine Publications.

Neustupný, J. V. (1996). Current issues in Japanese-foreign contact situations. In *Kyoto Conference on Japanese Studies 1994,* Vol. II (pp. 208-216). Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies.

Neustupný, J. V. (2004). A theory of contact situations and the study of academic interaction. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication.* 14 (3), 3-31.

Neustupný, J. V. (Forthcoming). Language and power into the 21st century. Paper presented at the Language and Empowerment conference, organized by The Malaysian Association of Modern Languages, April 11-13, 2002, Kuala Lumpur.

Richard B. Baldauf Jr. is Associate Professor of TESOL in the School of Education at the University of Queensland and a member of the Executive of the International Association of Applied Linguistics (AILA). He has published numerous articles in refereed journals and books. He is co-editor of *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (Multilingual Matters, 1990), principal researcher and editor for the *Viability of Low Candidature LOTE Courses in Universities* (DEET, 1995) and co-author with Robert B. Kaplan of *Language Planning from Practice to Theory* (Multilingual Matters, 1997) and *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin* (Kluwer, 2003). They co-edited *Language Planning and Policy: Africa, Vol. 1: Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa* (Multilingual Matters) in 2004. He is Executive Editor of *Current Issues in Language Planning*.

Robert B. Kaplan is Emeritus Professor of Applied Linguistics at the University of California. He has published numerous books and articles in refereed journals and written several special reports to government both in the US and elsewhere. He is the founding Editor-in-Chief of the *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* and of *Current Issues in Language Planning* and is a member of the editorial board of the 1st and 2nd editions of the *Oxford International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Additionally, he edited the *Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. He has served as President of the National Association for Foreign Students Affairs, of TESOL, and of the American Association for Applied Linguistics.