Syed Harun Jamallullail
Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS, Malaysia
University of Zagreb, Croatia
Shahrina Md Nordin
Universiti Teknologi PETRONAS, Malaysia

ETHNOLINGUISTICS VITALITY THEORY: THE LAST STANCE FOR A LANGUAGE SURVIVAL

Summary. The survival of a language represents a part of the cultural identity of a group; therefore, groups often try to protect their identity from extinction. Hence, this prompts an understanding of how an ethnic group tries to protect their language in an inter/intra-ethnic setting concerning the Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory which considers two main aspects to be important, namely the 'Sustainability' (Su) of the language and the 'Strength' (S) that must be met for a language to survive. The author shows that both aspects are vital to ensure that a language survives or faces extinction. The clashes of 'Conflict amelioration/exacerbation' and 'Manufactured Identity' lead to certain groups condoning violence to dominate the other and the other group to avoid language death. The study discusses Ethnolinguistics and the Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory and its issues, language death in its two forms such as Linguicide and Glottophagy, and the processes that can ensure language survival, such as Reclamation, Revitalization, and Reinvigoration, providing concrete examples from various parts of the world to illustrate the discussed processes. Research concludes by stating that various inter/intra-ethnic conflicts are inevitable and may lead to the presence or the death of the language, but group's motivation to preserve its language and identity can lead to language maintenance and survival.

Keywords: conflict; violence; discrimination; linguistics; death; ethnocentrism.

Introduction

Have you ever wondered about the possibility to communicate without using language? The answer is impossible (Lunenburg, 2010). This is because language is the sole method for the communication process, be it verbal or non-verbal. Although there is no denying that language helps to connect groups to create understanding, it can also be used to destroy relationships as well. This is condoned by the misuse of language through spreading the message of power whereby abuse is often propagated (Bolinger, 2014). As a result, language loses its neutral stance and can be used either as a blessing or as a curse (Bolinger, 2014; Žižek, 2016).

History shows that language is often used as a method of repression. Faltis (1993) explained that certain language policies were created to deny groups from achieving certain goals that might threaten the status quo. This was obvious during the regime of Fascist Spain whereby the Catalan language was banned. Piulats (2007) explained that the ban on the Catalan language was introduced to ensure that Catalans do not demand independence. Hence, this led to conflicts between the Catalans and the Spaniards. Kraus (2015) described that the conflict between the Catalans and Spaniards was due to language(s) being intermingled with cultural factors. Thus, this might be the reason why Spanish had been introduced as the sole official language in Fascist Spain. The Fascist government took another step further by banning the usage of Catalan in schools, media and public life (Anderson, 2020).

Aside from that, language is used to unite groups. Beer and Jacob (1985) deliberated that language helps to unite people from different groups. However, there are both positive and negative implications for this role of language. From the former perspective, language unites people from different backgrounds by having a common language to communicate. Nye (1987) stated that a common language unites groups that consist of different ethnicities. This is observed in Indonesia, whereby the country has more than 100 languages. Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian language) was then chosen by Sukarno[1] and Suharto[2] to unite the Indonesians by implementing a sense of unity between different ethnic groups in the country (Paaw, 2019).

Although language was viewed positively to unite groups, it too has its limitations. Sotirović (2018) stated that language tends to coerce unity. This was the case in the Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRJ), especially among the Slovenes, Croats, Muslims[3], Serbs, Montenegrins, Macedonians as well as other ethnic groups[4]. Marshall Josip Broz Tito implemented Serbo-Croatian as the official state language, with the co-official languages Slovene in the Socialist Republic (SR) of Slovenia, and Macedonian in SR Macedonia to unite the Yugoslavians. Although Slovene and Macedonian were considered co-official as stated in the constitution, the reality does not coincide with

---

[1] Soekarno is the first president of Indonesia.
[2] Suharto is the second and the longest serving president of Indonesia.
[3] Muslims represent Bosniaks, Gorani, Torbeš and Pomak.
[4] This refers to the ethnic minorities such as Jews, Italians, Romani people, etc.

the constitution.

Gabrič (2020) mentioned that despite both Slovene and Macedonian being recognised as co-official in SR Slovenia and SR Macedonia, both Slovenes and Macedonians were prohibited from speaking their languages in the army (Gabrič, 2020). This is ironic as both languages were granted similar rights on paper, but they were banned from speaking. The ban on speaking both Macedonian and Slovene was to ensure the concept of 'Brotherhood and Unity' was practised. Allowing different ethnic groups to speak their language may surge a sense of nationalism which would highlight the differences such as cultural (Ognjenovic & Jozelic, 2021) and ideological (Bowman, 2021).

The infamous nature of language may lead to conflicts. Tension arises when one language is forced onto another. Hence, groups may retaliate back. This became obvious in Estonia whereby the Estonian government banned the teaching of the Russian language in schools (Rausing (2004; Library of Congress, 2016) to unify the Estonian community. This policy angered the Russians as they felt discriminated against (Hughes, 2005; Koort, 2014) as certain rights such as voting for the Riigikogu[5] were blocked (Puddington, Piano, Eiss, & Roylance, 2007). However, the Estonian government is attempting to bridge the gap between the Estonians and Russians through various efforts such as officials learning the Russian language (Scrutton & Mardiste, 2017) and improving the Russians' grasp of the Estonian language via military conscription (Scrutton & Mardiste, 2017).

One of the main premises on how language becomes a threat is ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism is defined as a sentiment in which a group believes that it is superior to another due to certain elements such as language, behaviour, identity as well as religion (McCormack & Ortiz, 2017). Perry, Priest, Paradies, Barlow and Sibley (2017) described that ethnocentrism has led to various conflicts when the 'in-groupers' discriminate against the 'out-groupers'. Languages create tension as those who speak differently are often discriminated against by imposing various measures, such as limited voting rights (Puddington, Piano, Eiss, & Roylance, 2007) and denial of services (Bourhis, 2019). This shows that ethnocentrism weaponizes language.

---

[5] Riigikogu is the national parliament.

Therefore, this prompts the study to understand the Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory which specifies that a language struggles to ensure its survival when threatened. To ensure that their language survives, groups may take certain actions by discriminating against those that speak their language differently (Grondelaers, Speelman, Lybaert, & Van Gent, 2020) and these processed may cause various tensions.

The Irony of Language? Destroying Instead of Fixing Bridges

Language is also known for its dangerous nature since many takes advantage to pursue certain goals, i.e., promoting ethnocentrism and ethnic hatred (Bolinger, 2014). This becomes evident in North Macedonia (Koneska, 2016) whereby the Macedonians often use the pejorative 'Shqiptar' [6] against the Albanians (Poshka, 2018). As Poshka (2018) stated, the constitution of North Macedonia allows free speech (Уставот на Република Македонија, 2022), but this is often manipulated to spread hatred. Besides, this occurred in Moldova as well (David, 2018) where the Moldovan-Romanian dictionary was established to distance itself from Romania (Mocanu, 2020). This is considered ironic as both Romanian and Moldovan [7] are considered the same language by certain political leaders whereas others view both as related but different (Dogaru, 2004; PCGN, 2005). Hence, many Moldovan linguists rubbish the claim of a different identity between Moldovan and Romanian due to political inference on the language (Grejdeanu, 2014).

Aside from that, there are certain instances whereby groups manipulate language to pursue their nationalistic goals such as the establishment of different identities (Mocanu, 2020). Although most disagreements can be resolved via dialogues, poor management or failure often leads to violence (Žižek, 2016). Therefore, language is often used to spark ethnocentrism in an intercultural setting (Liu, 2018). Thus, this should be thoroughly examined to observe how language manipulation leads to resentment.

---

[6] In Albanian, 'Shqiptar' carries the meaning Albanian, but it is considered offensive especially among Albanians in the South Slavic community.
[7] Although both Romanian and Moldovan are viewed similarly, Romanian is written in a Latin script whereas Moldovan is written in a Cyrillic script. However, more Moldovans use the Latin script rather than the Cyrillic script.

Ethnicity vs. Language: Which Impacts What?

Ethnolinguistics. There are various arguments among researchers on 'what' influences 'what' (Onuch & Hale, 2018; Sebastian, & Ryan, 2018). Some state that ethnicity plays a greater role in causing language change. However, the score is settled as both impact one another and both are related to one another (Saint-Jacques, 1979; Jovanović, Vladisavljević, Branković, & Žeželj, 2017). Ethnolinguistics or cultural linguistics describes how an ethnic identity influences language and the usage of language in a social setting (Ferraro, 2006). This further explains when different ethnic groups use language as a tool of perception. Hiene (1997) added on how different cultures and ethnicities impact language usage.

Once an ethnic group forms a language based on the group's differences due to cultural (Ognjenovic & Jozelic, 2021) and ideological (Bowman, 2021) factors, it begins to change the perception of speakers who speak differently, leading to ethnocentrism. McCormack and Ortiz (2017) assert that ethnocentrism started when one group felt superior compared to others, especially in terms of language (Neuliep & Speten-Hansen, 2013), behaviour (Han & Guo, 2018), customs (West & Evans, 2021) and religion (Nameni, 2020). Thus, Kon (1989) described that ethnocentrism is defined as an ethnic group's beliefs that they are better than those who they used to associate with. Since language plays a significant role in spreading propaganda, it explains how ethnicity influences languages.

There are instances where ethnocentrism plays a huge role in languages. Bonfiglio (2010) stated that prejudices are expressible due to conceptualisation of the language. This is because language acts as the method to promote ethnocentrism whereby the identification of ethnic groups is impossible without motives that are linked to ethnicity such as cultural features (Bowman, 2021; Bonfiglio, 2017). As a result, language becomes the main source of all ethnocentric linguistic studies (Bonfiglio, 2010). Terms such as "our native language" lead to the concept of those speaking a different language (or the similar language in a different lexical, suffixes, accent etc.) becoming a threat to the present status quo of the society (Bonfiglio, 2010).

Klein & Tokdemir (2019) add that an attack against an ethnic group

does not only consist of a physical attack but also the use of an image through words, expressions, and sentences used within the linguistic expressions (Klein and Tokdemir, 2019). Regardless of most non-verbal and para-verbal messages being excluded from being classified as ethnocentric, there are exceptions as well. There are certain issues when certain non-verbal behaviours such as certain gestures may be considered offensive to an ethnic group. Examples are some gestures used in Poland[8] (Ogiermann, 2012) as well as certain accents spoken in the Dutch language that were declared as offensive towards another group[9] (Grondelaers, Speelman, Lybaert, & Van Gent, 2020). Therefore, ethnolinguistics paves a way for certain ethnic groups to spread the concept of 'us against them' (Schweigkofler, 2000).

Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory. Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory (EVT) defines the language vitality as a collective entity to preserve its existence through time (Ehala, 2015). This means that the theory states how a language attempts to avoid being dominated by other languages. Thus, when languages clash, groups try to ensure that their language survives instead of being subjugated by another language due to various factors, such as cultural practices, social cohesion and its kinship to collective identity (Ehala, 2015) in various settings, e.g., institutional ones (Yagmur & Ehala, 2011).

The EVT is an incorporation of the social identity theory based on Giles and Johnson (1987)'s theory of Ethnolinguistic Identity and Ethnolinguistics. Ehala (2015) then enhanced the Ethnolinguistic Identity Theory by adding language vitality as he points out that there are two main elements to ensure a language survival. These elements are: 1. Strength; 2. Sustainability.

According to Dubinsky (2019), there are two main conflicts in Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory: Conflict Amelioration and Manufactured Identity. Although both may share similar concerns, they differ based on the geographical and historical context (Dubinsky, 2019). Ehala (2015) considers that the key components needed are 'sustainability' and 'strength' of the group to continue its existence throughout time. Ehala (2015) alluded that

---

[8] One of the examples is directly pointing at a person's forehead (Evason, 2017).
[9] This is referred to the Dutch language spoken in an American or English accent (Nejjari, Gerritsen, Van der Haagen, Korzillius, 2012).

Group Sustainability (Su) is defined as group's attempts to preserve its language[10] whereas Group Strength (S) refers to the current population of speakers of the language[11]. These two elements are vital to ensure that a language does not face extinction. Ehala (2015) maintains that if either one of the criteria is neglected, it is guaranteed that the language will face extinction. Hence, this represents the 'Sustainability' criterion of EVT which is considered vital.

Ehala (2015) indicated that the other element is crucial to ensure a language survival. Therefore, the first criterion, Strength (Su) being established based on the incorporation of the Social Identity Theory and ethnolinguistics which explains that groups express their kinship to their respective group. Hence, group members that align themselves close to their group may lead to favouritism whereby out-groupers will be discriminated against (Turner and Oakes, 1986). Therefore, the current population of the group members is a key point to ensure the survival of the language (Ehala, 2015).

The Last Stand. Since the first key element of the EVT as was previously deliberated as the Group Strength (S), the second key factor of EVT is the Group Sustainability (Su) which emphasises the groups' motivation to protect their language. Thus, language survival depends on the speakers' attempt to preserve the language. If the group fails to protect itself, it will automatically face extinction.

Language death *nee* Language shift is defined as the state of language when it has lost its final native speaker or the loss of both L1 and L2 speakers. If a language is spoken only by an elderly generation, but not regularly, it is on the verge of being extinct and such language status is then considered 'moribund'. A 'Moribund' language is defined as a technically dead language. This is because the language will not be passed on to the next generation

---

[10] This elaborates on how groups feel about their status in the current situation, either they are 'threatened' or not. Hence, if groups feel threatened, they will fight back against any attempts from others to dominate them. If they do not feel threatened, groups will then allow other groups to influence/dominate them (Ehala, 2015).

[11] This represents the current population of the speakers of a language. If a group has a small population, it then has a weak 'strength' whereas if there is a huge group population, the 'strength' is considered strong (Ehala, 2015; Dubinsky, 2019).

(Crystal, 2000). Hendriks (2003) alluded that language death is a slow process as language is then reduced from a common language into a liturgical language. With the lack of exposure to the next generation, children will grow up without any fluency in the language, marking the language death (Crystal, 2000). Language death is seen occurring in two main ways, which are: 1. Linguicide; 2. Glottophagy.

Linguicide. Linguicide is defined as the death of a language due to certain causes such as political, natural, or geographical (Zuckermann, 2012). It is often associated with language discrimination whereby a speaker of a language is discriminated against in terms of wealth, education, and social status (Zuckermann, 2012). Consequently, the speaker refuses to speak their native language (Bosch & Sebastián-Gallés, 2001) due to certain features such as a distinct accent, vocabulary, modality, and syntax (Minga, 2017).

Wierzbicka (2013) indicated that one of the main contributors to linguicism is the use of a dominant language (Pool, 1991). An official or dominant language causes problems for both parties as the speakers of another language are discriminated against and monolinguals remain monolinguals (Zuckermann, 2012). As part of linguistic imperialism, most states often implement the language of the past colonizers as the official language. Wierzbicka (2013) notes that the use of the language of the previous colonizer(s) usually benefits the elites and hinders the masses. This leads the younger generation to adopt the dominant language.

Aside from linguistic discrimination, the death of a language occurs due to various issues such as language genocide, and physical or biological language death, unlike linguicism which is linked to language discrimination that leads to language extinction. Linguicide means language death due to certain factors that are often natural and political, usually by force. Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (1996) point out that linguicide is often employed to legitimise a group's inequality based on language; whereas Zwisler (2021) ascertains that certain policies implemented by governments and globalization speed up language death, i.e., policies imposed by governments in the political and education spectrum may cause an indigenous language to be extinct. Since these rights are violated, problems occur to the younger generations who are

prohibited to practice their language. Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar (2010) state that the usage of a dominant language in schools, businesses and regions catalyzes language death.

Glottophagy. Glottophagy is defined as the absorption of a minor language by another dominating language. Although Glottophagy and Linguicide may share common grounds, they differ in terms of death. Linguicide happens due to language policies or natural disasters whereas Glottophagy occurs when a language adopts too many loan words or grammar structures from another language and this influx of foreign loan words leads to its death (Calvet, 2006). Since languages are often assimilated between the minority group and the dominant group, the minority group tends to accept the influences brought by the dominant group. Baaij (2012) state that multilingualism is viewed as one of the main solutions towards glottophism as condoned by the English language, but the results differ (Chiti-Batelli, 2003). Chiti-Batelli (2003) argues that multilingualism is viewed as impractical as it leads to the decisive victory of the English language in a social setting. This is due to the dominance of English accelerating the death of other languages. Dalby (2003) asserts that the use of excessive loan words from a dominant language heavily impacts the linguistic diversity of a country, posing a threat to a language's future.

According to the Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory, the second key factor is Strength. This is because of the group's motivation to ensure its survival, as discussed by Fishman (2001). If this requirement is not met, the language will then face death. Consequently, both elements are vital to create the base for the Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory (Ehala, 2015).

The Last Stance: Between Death and Revitalization. The survival of a language highly depends on intergroup relations. If the group members believe that inequality exists in the intergroup setting, it prompts the group to protect their language. However, if the speakers have low vitality perception, they will perceive the intergroup relations as stable and legitimate. Thus, social mobility will then happen as the group will accommodate the language of the other, leading to the language shift.

As previously mentioned, there are certain issues in which a language

fails to protect itself leading to language death. Despite many claims that the death of a language does not correspond to the death of identity, language is one of the important factors in developing identity (Tabouret-Keller, 2017). If a language faces death, a part of its identity is considered dead. However, if these factors are present, the language will certainly survive, with efforts and motivation from the speakers.

Language Revitalization. Language revitalization is the opposite process whereby a language (either vibrant, endangered, or moribund) gains more speakers which reverses the extinction process. Certain languages may face threats due to the dominance of another language or discriminatory language policies. Thus, language revitalization implies the opposite result (Pine & Turin, 2017). By implementing various language revitalization measures, a language could reverse the language shift. Fishman (2001) provided a language revitalization model that undergoes eight stages, whereby the early stages focus solely on the motivation of the group to revive the language. Although the eight-stage model could probably revive most languages, Tsunoda (2006) disputes that the language revitalization model highly depends on the vitality of the language. Therefore, languages that are moribund or extinct will not be revived.

Zuckermann (2020) describes three types of language revitalization, namely reclamation, revitalization and reinvigoration, as illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1

Types of language revitalization (Zuckermann, 2020)

Types of language revitalization	Reclamation	Revitalization	Reinvigoration
→			
Numbers of native speakers	No native speakers at that moment of revival	Severely endangered. A small number of speakers	Endangered. A huge number of speakers
Example of Language	Hebrew, Manx	Romani language, Pannonian Rusyn	Belarussian, Welsh, Basque

According to Zuckermann (2020), reclamation, revitalization, and reinvigoration share similar goals, which are to revive a language. However, the main difference between these three is the number of speakers at the moment.

Reclamation

Reclamation is a process in which a group attempts to revive a dead language with no speakers (at that moment). One of the most successful languages that went through this process was Hebrew. Hebrew faced a lot of difficulties before achieving success. This was due to Hebrew being considered a pidgin language spoken by the Jewish diaspora (Bensadoun, 2015) and a liturgical language. This sees Eliezer Ben-Yehuda attempting to reclaim the language by embarking on the Ben-Yehuda dictionary. Despite his efforts, many Jews including Theodor Herzl were against using Hebrew as a spoken language as they did not prefer a religious language to be used to converse taboo topics (Singer, 2020). However, this did not stop Ben Yehuda from pursuing his goals and books, magazines and periodicals in Hebrew were developed (Bridger, Wolk & Eban, 1976). Despite limited success in the early stages, they made a remarkable impact whereby hundreds of fluent Hebrew speakers were produced, vocabularies were established, the Yiddish influence was diminished, and the number of the second-generation Hebrew speakers grew tremendously (Lepschy, 2016).

In spite of the arguments between Hebrew teachers on the 'proper' Hebrew language, an official standardisation was formed loosely from the Sephardic accent instead of the Ashkenazi accent. This happened because they considered the Sephardic accent to be the most 'authentic' compared to the others (Halperin, 2022). Hebrew was then adopted by Palestinian Jews during the Mandate period as it was given similar status to Arabic and English. Due to the huge number of Hebrew speakers, it was moved on to the expansion process instead of the revival process (Saulson, 2011). After 1948, the number of Israelis that spoke Hebrew was 80.9% whereas 14.2% of Palestinian-born Jews were either bilinguals or multilingual (Helman, 2014). Since there was an influx of Jews from Europe, North Africa, and other parts of the world to Israel,

the ulpan (Intensive Hebrew-language schools) was established to teach the immigrants Hebrew.

As the number of Hebrew speakers increased due to the ulpan, military conscriptions helped to speed up the process. This was because many learned Hebrew during the military conscriptions as they were required to learn Hebrew. Hebrew was then taught in Arabic schools (Helman, 2014) aiming to achieve that an Arab would be both proficient in Arabic and Hebrew (Amara & Mar'I, 2006). Hence, the Hebrew language has revived and is thriving as there are currently 5 million L1 users in the world and approximately 3.3 million L2 users in Israel (Ethnologue, 2022).

Revitalization

Unlike reclamation which is the process to revive a language that has no speakers at the moment, revitalization occurs in a severely moribund language (severely or endangered). Before the European contact, there were approximately 1500 Karuk speakers in California (Nelson, 2021). However, the declining number of the Karuk language instigated Dr William Bright and Susan Gehr to work on a Karuk language dictionary. This dictionary was aimed to preserve the language (Fox, 2006). Thus, songs, conversations, and poetry of the fluent Karuk speakers were recorded to capture the significance of the language. This was the beginning of the preservation of the Karuk language.

In the 1980s, The Humboldt State University started the American Indian Bilingual Teacher Credential Program whereby teachers that were proficient in both Karuk and English were brought to teach the American Indian children Karuk (Bennett, 1987). The students were given the option to either develop their English language or their native language to preserve their culture. Thus, children could become either bilingual or multilingual. This allowed them to have an American identity without losing their Karuk identity (Bennett, 1987). In the 90s, the Karuk Language Restoration Committee attempted to revive the Karuk language. Thus, a 5-year minimum plan was designed to ensure that the Karuk language does not go extinct. The committee discovered that the decline of the Karuk language was due to a low number of speakers, lack of motivation among youngsters considering the language to be

impractical, and a lack of literacy among tribal members.

Consequently, the Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival started the master-apprentice program to revitalize the Karuk language (Walters, 2011). Students were then paired with a native Karuk speaker and Karuk was spoken throughout the intensive course that lasted for 3 years. In 2011, 20 groups completed the entire program (Walters, 2011).

Reinvigoration

Unlike reclamation or revitalization, reinvigoration is defined as a measure to protect a language where a huge number of speakers are present, but the usage of the language is restricted. One of the prominent cases is the Belarussian language. The Belarussian language is an East Slavic language that is native to Belarus. Currently, it shares the same status as the co-official language with Russian (BBC, 2014).

The Belarussian language was redeveloped from the spoken vernacular Ruthenian language. It was highly influenced by both Russians and Poles in the 19th century. Since the Polish influence was strong on the Belarussian language, the Belarussian language was demoted to a folklore language, especially when Russian and Polish strived in Belarussian towns. Despite the negative connotation of Belarussian as a 'rural' language, the Belarussian identity managed to establish itself. This was due to some Belarussian claims that they were different compared to Russian and Polish. In the 1920s, the Belarussian language was given a similar status to other languages (Ėstraĭkh, 1999) whereas it was mistreated in West Belarus due to the political oppression during the Polish rule. Although Belarussian was given a similar status during Soviet rule, it was then purged from the political, academic and social spectrum of Belarus. This was due to the fear of potential nationalist movements that occurred in the 1930s (Marples & Laputska, 2020).

Despite the crackdown during the 1930s, the Belarussian language was encouraged during the World War II. The Belarussian language adapted the Latin script which was borrowed from the Sorbian script and incorporated both Polish and Czech scripts. However, Belarussian was demoted after the World War as Russian started to be taught in schools which led to

the decline of Belarussian speakers throughout the years. After gaining its independence from the Soviet Union, there were attempts to make the Belarussian language the sole official language whereas Russian was the inter-ethnic language (Bekus, 2013). However, many disagreed as they felt being discriminated against and, consequently, the use of the Belarussian language declined and the Russian language dominance increased (Данейко, 2016). Therefore, Belarussian and Russian were given a similar status in Belarus (BBC, 2014).

Things became worse under Lukashenka's regime as Belarussian minorities were discriminated against for speaking Belarussian (House, 2008). Belarussian speakers were often harassed by academicians, authorities and cultural groups (US Department of State Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, 2017). However, although Belarussian speakers were often treated unfairly, there were various attempts to preserve the Belarussian language. As a consequence, various public services and advertisements use Belarussian and younger generation started developing Belarussian communication skills (Данейко, 2016). Lukashenka's change of stance helped to reinvigorate the Belarussian language as he claimed that the Belarussian language is a national heritage which should be protected (Lowery, 2017). Thus, the reinvigoration of the Belarussian language took place.

Conflicts in Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory. Since Ehala (2015) paved the way for the Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory, Dubinsky (2019) disputes that there are various conflicts that often arise with Ethnolinguistic Vitality. These conflicts usually lead to either language endangerment or/and political violence. Henceforth, the conflicts of Ethnolinguistic Vitality highly correlate with Allport's Scale proposed by Allport, Clark and Pettigrew (1954).

Conflict Amelioration / Exacerbation. Conflict Amelioration / Exacerbation is easily defined as the conflict between groups when they are placed together in a certain region. Thus, groups often feel threatened when they face another (Parens, 1994) that try to promote their own language (Abu-Laban, 2002). As a result, many engage in conflicts that may lead to violence to ensure that their language is protected (Joyce, Vincze & Marton, 2016).

Due to the difference in language which comes from another language family, mutual understanding becomes difficult, especially in the early stages (Albert, Gabrielsen & Landis, 2012). As conflicts progress over time, many groups feel upset when mutual agreement and understanding become unattainable. Therefore, imposing another language towards a group may cause difficulties for both groups and this tends to cause violent reactions, especially from the minority group (Danesh, 2008).

Manufactured Identity. Unlike conflict amelioration/exacerbation, Manufactured identity is a conflict that arises when people from a similar ethnic group are divided by a different belief, history or geopolitical setting (Dubinsky, 2019). Consequently, a new identity is created, and it becomes a marker for the ethnolinguistic group (Moran, 2013).

Although these markers may not be prominent amongst outsiders, they are obvious amongst the related ethnic groups. Therefore, their identity becomes a mark to differentiate themselves, as for this case, their language. Groups may implement various approaches to ensure that the difference is obvious, especially among the out-groupers. Thus, certain policies such as language purism are implemented to differentiate themselves from others (Jernudd & Shapiro, 2011). Irvine, Roberts and Bradbury-Jones (2008) state that once a marker is developed, this divides the community either as a member of the group or an outsider; hence, causing language to be an agent of spreading ethnocentrism.

Language Purism. Language Purism is defined as a method to remove any previous influences of loan words, slang or even accent which was once embedded in the language (Thomas, 1991). This sees various past influences removed and words that were deemed 'original' being used again in daily speeches. With all the past influences removed and the 'authentic' words being brought back, the language is then considered 'pure'. Once a language is considered 'pure', it becomes the group's marker to differentiate itself from others. This method then officially differentiates one group from another (Li & Li, 2007) and is used to distinguish themselves and to create a new identity in the group.

Manufactured identity often employs the language ban. However, it heavily depends on the approach, intensity or goals to purify a language. The approaches employed are often reformist purism and patriotic purism (Dubinsky, 2019). Another goal would be to establish defensive purism either by Evolutionary purism or Revolutionary purism. Reformist purism is defined as a purism whereby past influences are removed. Therefore, it is condoned to set a new identity for the group by removing every foreign influence. Patriotic purism is defined as the elimination of foreign elements in the language. This resembles defensive purism, which often correlates with protecting their language from possible external threats. Evolutionary purism is noticeable during the early stages of the written language. Although radical changes may not be observable, changes are obvious over time. On the other hand, revolutionary purism is defined as an abrupt change of language. Although it may be subtle, its goal is similar to evolutionary purism. However, revolutionary purism takes a radical stance whereas evolutionary purism is a slow process.

As Manufactured Identity usually manifests language purism (Dubinsky, 2019), there are incidents whereby languages from different language families condone the same. Despite most of the language purism being aimed to create new identities, there are also instances whereby language purism acts as a political tool to unify groups *nee* Reformist purism.

Language Ban. A language ban is defined as the usage of language that is prohibited (Spolsky, 2004). Since purifying language takes a lot of effort and/or time, authorities may forbid the use of a certain language to speed up the process. This is because it is easier to be conducted instead of getting language regulators to cleanse the language. Romaine (2007) pointed out that this is a harsher method for a group to establish its dominance. Once this method is practiced, another language (either previously a majority language, or a minority language) occurs on the brink of extinction (Bianco, Hornberger & Mckay, 2010). However, such a situation may cause conflicts as certain groups may rebel.

Although language bans are currently introduced by groups in conflict amelioration/exacerbation (Dubinsky, 2019), they are also condoned by

language groups coming from different language families (Laitin, 2000). At times, certain groups implement both language purism and language ban altogether (Sijs, 2004). This is prevalent in multi-ethnic states which often have a significant number of minorities by which language bans are often introduced by political entities to promote their political goals (Kamusella, 2008) that increase their dominance in the status quo.

The Aftermath. As previously mentioned, language is used to oppress and repress people which causes subjugation towards others. According to May (2018), who states that if a speaker of a language is threatened, it automatically qualifies that the language is also threatened. Despite various methods such as political, economic, and human rights repression that may be applied, language oppression is then confirmed such as the ban of the Slavic languages in Greece (Kitzinger, 1996; Kiouzepi, Kavallari, Staurou & Vamvakidou, 2019).

When the rights of a group to speak in their preferred language are obstructed, it causes the minority group to be overpowered by the other (Côté, 2017). Consequently, groups are oppressed, and inequalities becomes prevalent. Negri (1999) notes that a group becomes threatened with any language policies that hinder their language rights and this may lead to violent responses by the oppressed group. This may also lead to various animosities. For instance, peaceful protests (Gomashie, 2019) up to genocides (Lang, 2020). A group may feel provoked if they believe that their identity is intentionally or unintentionally threatened. Hence, groups will protect their language, regardless of whether the action is morally right or wrong (Gomashie, 2019; Lang, 2020).

Even though these actions may start with something simple, such as a peaceful protest, they may escalate into wars (Stanton, 1999) if their concerns were ignored by the authorities. However, if the authority manages to address their concerns, treaties or agreements are/may be signed whereby their rights are recognized by the state (Negri, 1999). However, if they are still neglected, these groups may take another step further by committing various atrocities to express their concern (Semelin, 2007). Thus, the repressed group may commit crimes to challenge the dominant group. If the oppressed group

manages to establish their dominance, it can dominate the other party. Although these actions are often condemned, they are often overlooked by the dominating group who believe that their actions are justified (Levene, 2002).

If the situation persists, the language will face extinction. Despite efforts in preserving the language and heritage, not everything can be settled peacefully. Thus, groups with poor military strength and power will be defeated. Once they are defeated, the victorious group will implement their policies onto the losing group (Ager, 2001). Although certain agreements can be made to prevent future complications between the majority group and the minority group, the winning party will often coerce the losing party to accept their demands.

One of the demands would be permission to use the language within a specific region. Although this may seem like a fair trade, it has negative consequences in the future (Muñiz-Argüelles, 1989). As the dominant language becomes more prevalent in the region, the losing language will slowly face death as the 2nd generation speakers and the upcoming generations tend to favour the mainstream language (Tran, 2010). Once the predominant language is chosen as their preferred language, the practice of the native language will deteriorate and be unaccustomed by the younger generation. Hence, the language will face death (Crystal, 2000) due to a lack of interest among the younger generation. Thus, language preservation plays an important role in combatting language death.

Conclusion

In conclusion, ethnolinguistics plays an important role in determining the survival of a language. The vitality of a language depends heavily on two aspects: the sustainability of the language and the strength of the group. If either of the aspects is not met, the language will eventually face death. Therefore, the Etholinguistic Vitality Theory relates to both language death and revitalization. Hence, the motivation of the group plays a vital role in ensuring that a language can survive throughout time.

Although maintaining a language highly depends on group's motivation

to ensure its survival, conflicts between groups are bound to happen, either in an inter-ethnic or intra-ethnic setting. The survival of a language will cause friction between groups which may lead to various conflicts, discrimination as well as language death. Although most of these conflicts happen in an inter-ethnic setting, there are instances whereby conflicts can escalate even worse in an intra-ethnic setting.

Thus, future researchers can identify the factors – either socio-political or historical that can influence one's desire to preserve their language. This is because other factors may cause certain groups to take certain violent and hostile measures to ensure the survival of their language. Thus, the Ethnolinguistic Vitality Theory suggests that the interest of a group is important to ensure the survival of a language that is linked to their ethnicity and identity.

References

Anderson, L. (2020). Catalan Language and Literature: "All the eloquence, elegance, and learning of the Greeks". *Essays on Early Modern European Popular Culture and the Formation of Nationalism* (p. 4).

Abu-Laban, Y. (2002). Liberalism, multiculturalism and the problem of essentialism1. *Citizenship Studies*, *6*(4), 459–482.

Ager, D. E. (2001). *Motivation in language planning and language policy* (Vol. 119). Multilingual Matters.

Albert, R. D., Gabrielsen, S., & Landis, D. (2012). Ethnic conflict from an interdisciplinary perspective: Lessons learned, policy implications, and recommendations for conflict amelioration and peace building. In *Handbook of Ethnic Conflict* (pp. 587–630). Springer.

Allport, G. W., Clark, K., & Pettigrew, T. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*.

Amara, M., & Mar'i, A. A. R. (2006). *Language education policy: The Arab minority in Israel* (Vol. 1). Springer Science & Business Media.

Baaij, C. J. (2012). The EU policy on institutional multilingualism: Between principles and practicality. *JLL*, *1*, 14.

BBC. (2014, October 14). *Belarusian, Belarusan*. www.bbc.co.uk/languages/european_languages/languages/belarusian.shtml

Bennett, R. (1987). Integration of Bilingual Emphasis Program into University Curriculum. *Multiple Subjects Credential Program*: *Hupa, Yurok, Karuk, or Tolowa Emphasis*.

Bianco, J. L., Hornberger, N. H., & McKay, S. L. (2010). Language policy and planning. *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*, *18*, 143.

Beer, W. R., & Jacob, J. E. (1985). *Language policy and national unity*. Government Institutes.

Bekus, N. (2013). *Belarusian Language Policy in the Context of Linguistic Human Rights*. http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~postcomm/papers/2012-2013/

Bensadoun, D. (2015). This week in history: Revival of the Hebrew language. *The Jerusalem Post.* jpost.com/Jewish-World/Jewish-News/This-week-in-history-Revival-of-the-Hebrew-language

Bolinger, D. (2014). *Language-the loaded weapon: The use and abuse of language today*. Routledge.

Bonfiglio, T. P. (2010). *Mother Tongues and Nations*. The invention of the native speaker (Vol. 226). De Gruyter MOUTON.

Bonfiglio, T. P. (2017). Language, Thought, and Economy. In *The Psychopathology of American Capitalism* (pp. 115–145). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Bosch, L., & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2001). Evidence of early language discrimination abilities in infants from bilingual environments. *Infancy*, *2*(1), 29–49.

Bourhis, R. Y. (2019). Evaluating the impact of Bill 101 on the English-speaking communities of Quebec. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, *43*(2), 198–229.

Bowman, G. (2021). Xenophobia, fantasy and the nation: The logic of ethnic violence in former Yugoslavia. In *The anthropology of Europe* (pp. 143–171). Routledge.

Bridger, D., Wolk, S., & Eban, A. (Eds.). (1976). *The new Jewish encyclopedia*. Behrman House, Inc.

Calvet, L. J. (2006). *Language wars: Language policies and globalization*. Nanovic Institute for European Studies.

Chiti-Batelli, A. (2003). *Can anything be done about the "glottophagy" of*

English? A bibliographical survey with a political conclusion. Language Problems and Language Planning, 27(2), 137–153. https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.27.2.03chi

Côté, F. (2017). Human Rights and the Judicial Subjugation of a Nation's Legal Language: A Case Study on the Impact of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms on the Dynamics of Québec Private Law. *Proceedings of The Fifteenth International Conference on Law and Language of the International Academy of Linguistic Law (IALL2017): Law, Language and Justice* (p. 141).

Crystal, D. (2000). *Language death*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Dalby, A. (2003). *Language in danger: The loss of linguistic diversity and the threat to our future*. Columbia University Press.

Danesh, H. B. (2008). Creating a culture of healing in multiethnic communities: An integrative approach to prevention and amelioration of violence-induced conditions. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *36*(6), 814–832.

David, A. E. (2018). The Relation between Language and National Conscientiousness, as an Aspect of Cultivation of the Romanian Language, Debated in the 19th Century Publications from Transylvania. *Revista Transilvania*, 2.

Dogaru, V. (2004). Not finding a common tongue. *Transitions Online*, *7*, 9.

Dubinsky, S. (2019, December 11). Mapping ethnolinguistic identity and conflict in a post-colonial, post-cold War world. https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc1475531/

Ehala, M. (2015). Ethnolinguistic Vitality. In K. Tracy, T. Sandel & C. Ilie (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction* (pp. 1–17). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi046

Ėstraĭkh, G. (1999). *Soviet Yiddish: language planning and linguistic development*. Clarendon Press.

Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F. & Fennig, C. D. (Eds.) (2023). Ethnologue: Languages of the World. Twenty-sixth edition. SIL International. http://www.ethnologue.com.

Evason, N. (2017). *Communication.* https://culturalatlas.sbs.com.au/polish-culture/polish-culture-communication

Faltis, D. (1993). Language Policy and Language Repression: The Case of

Spanish Basques and Mexican Americans. *Explorations in Ethnic Studies*, *16*(2), 165–178.

Ferraro, G. (2006). *Cultural Anthropology: An Applied Perspective. Cengage Learning.*

Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (2001). *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective*. Multilingual Matters.

Fox, M. (2006, October 23). *William Bright, 78, Expert in Indigenous Languages, Is Dead*. https://www.nytimes.com/2006/10/23/books/23bright.html

Gabrič, A. (2020, January 20). Slovenian language and the Yugoslav People's Army. *Sistory, 13.* https://sistory.si/cdn/publikacije/36001-37000/36297/ch13.html

Giles, H., & Johnson, P. (1987). *Ethnolinguistic identity theory: A social psychological approach to language maintenance*. DeGruyter.

Gomashie, G. A. (2019). Kanien'keha/Mohawk Indigenous language revitalisation efforts in Canada. *McGill Journal of Education/Revue des sciences de l'éducation de McGill*, *54*(1).

Grejdeanu, T. (2014, February 19). *Limba moldovenească, limba română și Curtea Constituțională de la Chișinău*. https://moldova.europalibera.org/a/25270022.html

Grondelaers, S., Speelman, D., Lybaert, C., & Van Gent, P. (2020). Getting a (big) data-based grip on ideological change. Evidence from Belgian Dutch. *Journal of Linguistic Geography*, *8*(1), 49–65.

Halperin, L. R. (2022). Metaphors of the sacred and profane in pre-state Zionist Hebrew discourse. *Hebrew between Jews and Christians*, *77*, 337.

Han, C. M., & Guo, C. (2018). How consumer ethnocentrism (CET), ethnocentric marketing, and consumer individualism affect ethnocentric behavior in China. *Journal of Global Marketing*, *31*(5), 324–338.

Hiene, B. (1997) *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar.* Oxford University Press.

Helman, A. (2014). *Becoming Israeli: National ideals and everyday life in the 1950s*. Brandeis University Press.

House, Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Senate, Committee on Foreign

Relations [House]. (2008). Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2007, Report. Government Printing Office.

Hughes, J. (2005). 'Exit'in deeply divided societies: regimes of discrimination in Estonia and Latvia and the potential for Russophone migration. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, *43*(4), 739–762.

Irvine, F., Roberts, G., & Bradbury-Jones, C. (2008). The researcher as insider versus the researcher as outsider: Enhancing rigour through language and cultural sensitivity. In *Doing cross-cultural research* (pp. 35–48). Springer, Dordrecht.

Jernudd, B. H., & Shapiro, M. J. (Eds.). (2011). *The politics of language purism* (Vol. 54). Walter de Gruyter.

Jovanović, O., Vladisavljević, M., Branković, M., & Žeželj, I. (2017). Methods section: Quantitative and qualitative examination of social identities and their mutual relations. In *Shaping Social Identities After Violent Conflict* (pp. 53–67). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Joyce, N., Vincze, L., & Marton, E. J. (2016). Crossing the communication divide: Intergroup contact and the desire to learn the outgroup's language. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, *9*(4), 295–311.

Kamusella, T. (2008). *The politics of language and nationalism in modern Central Europe*. Springer.

Kiouzepi, M., Kavallari, D., Staurou, A., & Vamvakidou, I. (2019). Historical Documentary Gender Identities in Goumenissa of Greece Multimodal Research Material. *Rev. Eur. Stud.*, *11*, 59.

Kitzinger, C. (1996). Speaking of oppression: Psychology, politics, and the language of power. *Preventing heterosexism and homophobia*, 3–19.

Klein, G. R., & Tokdemir, E. (2019). Domestic diversion: Selective targeting of minority out-groups. *Conflict management and peace science*, *36*(1), 20–41.

Kon, I. S. (Ed.). (1989). *A history of classical sociology*. Firebird Pubns.

Koneska, C. (2016). *After ethnic conflict: Policy-making in post-conflict BiHand Macedonia*. Routledge.

Koort, K. (2014). The Russians of Estonia: Twenty years

after. *World Affs.*, *177*, 66.

Kraus, P. A. (2015). Language policy and Catalan independence. In *Catalonia in Spain and Europe* (pp. 128–139). Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG.

Lang, B. (2020). Language and genocide. In *Writing and the Moral Self* (pp. 155–179). Routledge.

Laitin, D. D. (2000). Language conflict and violence: The straw that strengthens the camel's back. *European Journal of Sociology/Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, *41*(1), 97–137.

Lepschy, G. (2016). *Mother tongues and other reflections on the Italian language*. University of Toronto Press.

Levene, M. (2002). The changing face of mass murder: Massacre, genocide, and postgenocide. *International Social Science Journal*, *54*(174), 443–452.

Li, X., & Li, X. (2007). Identity puzzles. *Identity and second language learning: Culture, inquiry, and dialogic activity in educational contexts* (p. 23).

Liu, Y. (2018). *National Identity, Ethnocentrism and Consumer Ethnocentrism, and Effects of Language Choice in Advertising* (Doctoral dissertation, Auckland University of Technology).

Lowery, A. (2017, February 20). *Belarusian on the road to revival.* http://eucenterillinois-language.blogspot.com/2017/02/belarusian-on-road-to-revival.html

Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). Communication: The process, barriers, and improving effectiveness. *Schooling, 1*(1), 1–10.

Marples, D. R., & Laputska, V. (2020). Kurapaty: Belarus' continuing debates. *Slavic Review*, *79*(3), 521–543.

May, S. (2018). Language rights and language repression. *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*, 236–256.

McCormack, S., & Ortiz, J. (2017). *Choices and Connections: An Introduction to Communication* (p. 109). Bedford/St.Martin's.

Minga, K. J. (2017). Between linguicide and lingua-hatred: A provisional linguistic performativity model for Africa. *Africology: The Journal of Pan African Studies*, *10*(3), 196–216.

Mocanu, G. D. (2020). The evolution of the political objectives of creating and

imposing the Moldavian language in the former Soviet Union. *Identities in globalisation. Intercultural perspectives* (p. 166).

Moran, M. H. (2013). *Liberia: The violence of democracy*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Muñiz-Argüelles, L. (1989). The status of languages in Puerto Rico. *Langue et droit* (pp. 457–472).

Nameni, A. (2020). Research into ethnocentrism and intercultural willingness to communicate of Iraqi and Iranian medical students in Iran. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *49*(1), 61–85.

Negri, A. (1999). *Insurgencies: Constituent power and the modern state* (Vol. 15). U of Minnesota Press.

Nejjari, W., Gerritsen, M., Van der Haagen, M., & Korzilius, H. (2012). Responses to Dutch-accented English. *World Englishes*, *31*(2), 248–267.

Nelson, P. (2021). Where have all the anthros gone? The shift in California Indian Studies from research "on" to research "with, for, and by" Indigenous Peoples. *American Anthropologist*, *123*(3), 469–473.

Neuliep, J. W., & Speten-Hansen, K. M. (2013). The influence of ethnocentrism on social perceptions of nonnative accents. *Language & Communication*, *33*(3), 167–176.

Nye, A. (1987). The unity of language. *Hypatia*, *2*(2), 95–111.

Ogiermann, E. (2012). About Polish politeness. In *Speech acts and politeness across languages and cultures* (pp. 27–52). Peter Lang.

Ognjenovic, G., & Jozelic, J. (Eds.). (2021). *Nationalism and the politicization of history in the former Yugoslavia*. Springer International Publishing.

Onuch, O., & Hale, H. E. (2018). Capturing ethnicity: the case of Ukraine. *Post-Soviet Affairs*, *34*(2–3), 84–106.

Paaw, S. (2019). "One Land, One Nation, One Language: An Analysis of Indonesia's National Language Policy". *University of Rochester Working Papers in the Language Sciences 5*(1), 2–16.

Parens, J. (1994). Multiculturalism and the problem of particularism. *American Political Science Review*, 169–181.

Permanent Committee on Geographical Names [PCGN]. (2013, June 24). *Moldovan: An identity but not a language*.

http://www.pcgn.org.uk/Moldovan.pdf

Perry, R., Priest, N., Paradies, Y., Barlow, F. K., & Sibley, C. G. (2018). Barriers to multiculturalism: In-group favoritism and out-group hostility are independently associated with policy opposition. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *9*(1), 89–98.

Pine, A., & Turin, M. (2017). Language revitalization. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*.

Piulats, M. C. (2007). Media policy and language policy in Catalonia. *Multilingual Matters, 138,* 168.

Pool, J. (1991). The official language problem. *The American Political Science Review* (pp. 495–514).

Poshka, A. (2018). Language and Hate Speech Aspects in the Public Sphere Case Study: Republic of Macedonia. *Seeu Review*, *13*(1), 90–96.

Puddington, A., Piano, A., Eiss, C., & Roylance, T. (2007). "Estonia". *Freedom in the World: The Annual Survey of Political Rights and Civil Liberties*. Freedom House. Rowman & Littlefield.

Rausing, S. (2004). *History, memory, and identity in post-Soviet Estonia: The end of a collective farm*. Oxford Studies in Social and C.

Romaine, S. (2007). The impact of language policy on endangered languages. *Democracy and human rights in multicultural societies* (pp. 217–236).

Saint-Jacques, B. (1979). Language and ethnic relations*. Oxford: Pergamon*, *1*, 13.

Saulson, S. B. (2011). *Institutionalized language planning*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Schweigkofler, A. (2000). South Tyrol: Rethinking Ethnolinguistic Vitality. *German minorities in Europe* (pp. 63–72).

Scrutton, A., & Mardiste, D. (2017, February 24). *Wary of divided loyalties, a Baltic state reaches out to its Russians*. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-baltics-russia/wary-of-divided-loyalties-a-baltic-state-reaches-out-to-its-russians-idUSKBN1630W2

Sebastian, R. J., & Ryan, E. B. (2018). Speech cues and social evaluation: Markers of ethnicity, social class, and age. In *Recent advances in language, communication, and social psychology* (pp. 112–143). Routledge.

Semelin, J. (2007). *Purify and destroy: The political uses of massacre and genocide*. Columbia University Press.

Sijs, N. V. D. (2004). The role of purism in language development-historical and political aspects. *The role of purism in language development-historical and political aspects*.

Singer, S. J. (2020, November 11). *The Hebrew-Based Judaism and Zionism of Eliezer Ben Yehuda*. jewishpress.com/sections/features/features-on-jewish-world/the-hebrew-based-judaism-and-zionism-of-eliezer-ben-yehuda/2020/11/11/

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Phillipson, R. (1996). Linguicide and linguicism. *Kontaktlinguistik. Contact Linguistics. Linguistique de contact. Ein Internationales Handbuch zeitgenössiger Forschung. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research. Manuel international des recherches contemporaines*, *1*, 667–675.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Dunbar, R. (2010). *Indigenous children's education as linguistic genocide and a crime against humanity? A global view* (pp. 1–128). Gáldu.

Sotirović, V. B. (2018, May 24). The idea of the Yugoslav unification. *Oriental Review*. https://orientalreview.org/2018/05/24/the-idea-of-the-yugoslav-unification-i/

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

Stanton, G. H. (1998). The eight stages of genocide. *Genocide Watch*.

Tabouret-Keller, A. (2017). Language and identity. *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 315–326).

Thomas, G. (1991). *Linguistic purism*. Longman Publishing Group.

Tran, V. C. (2010). English gain vs. Spanish loss? Language assimilation among second-generation Latinos in young adulthood. *Social forces*, *89*(1), 257–284.

Tsunoda, T. (2006). *Language endangerment and language revitalization: An introduction*. De Gruyter MOUTON.

Turner, J. C., & Oakes, P. J. (1986). The significance of the social identity concept for social psychology with reference to individualism, interactionism and social influence. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*(3), 237–252.

US Department of State Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor. (2017, November 27). *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2016*. https://www.state.gov/reports-bureau-of-democracy-human-rights-and-labor/country-reports-on-human-rights-practices/

Walters, H. (2011, October 27). In Karuk: A family struggles to bring its ancestral tongue back to life. *North Coast Journal of Politics, People & Art*. http://northcoastjournal.com/humboldt/in-karuk/Content?oid=2132629

West, J., & Evans, R. (2021). Measuring preservice teachers' ethnocentrism: A South African case study. *Journal of Education (University of KwaZulu-Natal)*, *85*, 163–187.

Wierzbicka, A. (2013). *Imprisoned in English: The hazards of English as a default language*. Oxford University Press.

Yagmur, K., & Ehala, M. (2011). Tradition and innovation in the Ethnolinguistic Vitality theory. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *32*(2), 101–110.

Zuckermann, G. A. (2012). Stop, revive and survive. *The Australian Higher Education*.

Zuckermann, G. A. (2020). *Revivalistics: From the genesis of Israeli to language reclamation in Australia and beyond*. Oxford University Press.

Zwisler, J. J. (2021). Linguistic genocide or linguicide? A discussion of terminology in forced language loss. *Apples: Journal of Applied Language Studies*, *15*(2).

Žižek, S. (2016). Language, violence and nonviolence. *International Journal of Žižek Studies*, *2*(3).

Данейко, О. (2016, February 21). Білоруська мова в Білорусі: державний статус чи декорація?

Уставот на Република Македонија (2022). Уставот на Република Македонија. https://www.sobranie.mk/content/Odluki%20USTAV/UstavSRSM.pdf

Syed Harun Jamallullail
PETRONAS technologijų universitetas, Malaizija
Zagrebo universitetas, Kroatija
syed_19001384@utp.edu.my
Shahrina Md Nordin
PETRONAS technologijų universitetas, Malaizija
shahrina_mnordin@utp.edu.my

GYVYBINGUMO TEORIJA: PASKUTINĖ KALBOS IŠLIKIMO POZICIJA

Santrauka. Kalbos išlikimas yra grupės kultūrinio identiteto dalis, todėl grupės dažnai stengiasi apsaugoti savo identitetą nuo išnykimo. Taigi tai skatina suprasti, kaip etninė grupė bando apsaugoti savo kalbą tarpetninėje aplinkoje ir etninės grupės viduje remdamasi etnolingvistinio gyvybingumo teorija, pagal kurią svarbūs du pagrindiniai aspektai: kalbos tvarumas (Su) ir stiprumas (S); ir jie turi būti pasiekti, kad kalba išliktų. Autorius parodo, jog abu šie aspektai yra labai svarbūs kalbai išlikti arba išnykti. Dėl „Konflikto švelninimo / aštrinimo" ir „Sukurtos tapatybės" susidūrimų vienos grupės pateisina smurtą siekdamos dominuoti, o kitos grupės – išvengti kalbos mirties. Straipsnyje aptariama etnolingvistika ir etnolingvistinio gyvybingumo teorija bei jos problemos, kalbos mirtis dviem formomis, pavyzdžiui, lingvicidas ir glotofagija, ir procesai, galintys užtikrinti kalbos išlikimą, pavyzdžiui, melioracija, revitalizacija ir atgaivinimas, taip pat pateikiama konkrečių pavyzdžių iš įvairių pasaulio dalių, iliustruojančių aptartus procesus. Tyrimo pabaigoje teigiama, kad įvairūs tarpetniniai ir (arba) vidiniai konfliktai yra neišvengiami ir gali lemti kalbos gyvavimą arba mirtį, tačiau grupės motyvacija išsaugoti savo kalbą ir tapatybę gali lemti kalbos išlaikymą ir išlikimą.

Pagrindinės sąvokos: konfliktas; smurtas; diskriminacija; lingvistika; mirtis; etnocentrizmas.