

Assessing language vitality: Overview of existing models

Kazan Federal University, 420008, Kremlevskaya 18, Kazan, Russia

Abstract

© 2019, Universidad del Zulia. All rights reserved. The article deals with the question of multidimensionality and complexity of creating a model assessing the linguistic vitality. A comparative analysis of the existing models corresponding to the sociolinguistic paradigm is presented. The problems and difficulties associated with machine data processing are considered. As a result, risks of future language losses are especially high in the tropics and in the Himalayas, as these regions harbor many small-population languages and are undergoing rapid economic growth. In conclusion, Machine data processing and machine learning are the most important stages of processing the actual base of language behavior.

Keywords

Indicators, Language vitality, Living abilities

References

- [1] ABRAMS, J., BARKER, V., and GILES, H. 2009. An examination of the validity of the Subjective Vitality Questionnaire. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Routledge. 30: 59-72. UK.
- [2] ALPATOV, V. 2013. Language Policy in the Modern World. *Scientific Dialogue. Philology*. Vol. 5. N 17: 8-28. Netherlands.
- [3] ANTIPOVA, E. 2003. Geography of the world population: a course of lectures. MN. BSU. pp. 74-78. http://elib.bsu.by/bitstream/123456789/30539/1/Курс%20лекций_География%20населения.pdf. Belarus.
- [4] BOURHIS, R. 1984. Conflict and language planning in Quebec. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Canada.
- [5] CRYSTAL, D. 2000. Language Death. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. UK.
- [6] Dube-Simard, L. 1983. Genesis of social categorization, threat to identity and perception of social injustice: Their role in intergroup communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. Vol. 2. N 2-3: 183-205. USA.
- [7] EDWARDS, J. 1992. Sociopolitical aspects of language maintenance and loss: Towards a typology of minority language situations. In *Maintenance and loss of minority languages*, ed. W. Fase, K. Jaspaert, and S. Kroon. John Benjamins. Pp. 37-54. Amsterdam: Netherlands.
- [8] GORDON, R. 2005. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, (15th edn.). SIL International. Web edition at: <http://www.ethnologue.com>. Dallas: USA.
- [9] GRENOBLE, L., and WHALEY, L. 2006. *Saving Languages: An Introduction to Language Revitalization*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. UK.
- [10] HAARMANN, H. 1986. *Language in ethnicity: A view of basic ecological relations*. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin: Germany.
- [11] LEWIS, P. 2005. *Towards a Categorization of Endangerment of the World's Languages*. SIL International. pp. 25-35. USA.

- [12] MCNAMARA, T. 1987. Language and social identity: Israelis abroad. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. Vol. 6 N 3_4: 215-228. USA.
- [13] MUSTAFINA, D. 2009. Language Situation in the Republic of Tatarstan (in the Context of the Russian and European Language Policy) [Text]. p. 170. Kazan: Russia.
- [14] OBIERO, O. 2010, From Assessing Language Endangerment or Vitality to Creating and Evaluating Language Revitalization Programs. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*. Vol. 19 N 4: 201-226. Africa.
- [15] SACHDEV, I., BOURHIS, R., PHANG, S., and D'EYE, J. 1987. Language attitudes and vitality perceptions: Intergenerational effects amongst Chinese Canadian communities. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. Vol. 6 No 3_4: 287-307. USA.
- [16] SAINT-BLANCAT, C. 1985. The effect of minority group vitality upon its sociopsychological behavior and strategies. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Vol. 6 N 1: 31-45. UK.
- [17] YAGMUR, K., and KROON, S. 2003. Ethnolinguistic Vitality perceptions and language revitalisation in Bashkortostan. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. Vol. 24 N 4: 319-336. UK.