Kovalova T. V.,
PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of Law and European Integration Department,
Kharkiv Regional Institute of Public Administration
of National Academy of Public Administration,
Kharkiv
ORCID 0000-0003-2079-7101

THE TYPOLOGY OF THE LANGUAGE POLICY IN THE CONTEMPORARY CONDITIONS OF THE STATE DEVELOPMENT

The article gives a definition of the typology of the language policy, studies the typologies of the language policy represented in the works of science of native and foreign scientists, makes the generalization of the existing typologies. It also clarifies that the introduction of a certain type of the language policy depends on the range of factors, that is why it is necessary to research the current language situation in Ukraine as a set of demographic, social-linguistic and political parameters and define its similarity on each one to the countries where this policy was successful to make any conclusions about any type of it being appropriate for the Ukrainian situation.

Keywords: language policy, typology of the language policy, the language situation.

Target Setting. The issues of classification and typology are extremely important to execute any scientific research. Learning the types of the language policy developed with the influence of different factors like historical, political, ideological, demographical ones, has practical meaning when forming the language policy, especially at the stage of state development.

Analysis of the latest research and publications. The typology of the language policy was researched by O. Gryshayeva, V. Klokov, Y. Kobenko, V. Kulyk, L. Nikolsky, I. Popesku, J. Fishman, J. Leclerc, R. Philipson, H. Shiffman and others.

The Objective of the Article. To give, based on the analysis of the types of the language policy by the native and foreign researchers, the definition of the typology of the language policy and generalize the typologies of the language policy represented in the national and foreign works of science, to define the type of the language policy appropriate for Ukraine.

Description of the basic material. Typology increases the content meaning of scientific information, as it allows to judge about the features and properties of the object dependently on its place in this system [11, p. 37].

Typology is defined as "a kind of scientific systematization, classification of something according to the common features" [10, p. 118].

It's necessary to admit, that there is no single-valued opinion among the scientists about the interpretation of the typology and its difference from classification. Some of them think that classification is a structural component of the typology, the others, using the systematization in their research, mix these learning methods recognizing their identity [9, p. 94], the third ones think that the typology is a special type of scientific classification, its separate case, it an essential, contentful classification [6, p. 44].

We can define, based on the defined features of the typology and the differences between it and the classification, the typology of the language policy as a scientific systematization of the models of the language policy, which are different in the

quality features, in particular, in the methods and means of regulation of the language relationships in a state.

One of the first researches who proposed the typification of the language policy is J. Fishman. He attempts to give the extended typology of possible ways to solve the problem of choosing the language for the state communication in different countries, which are developing, dependently on the language situations existing there [12]. At this, the researcher comes out the concept of "the great tradition" foreseeing presence of the set of the cultural signs: common history, customs, values, religion, the government which assist the integration of the citizens into a community (nation), and the official language is the main mean of its expression.

So, the scientist brings to the policy of type A the cases of choosing the language of the former metropolis on the role of the state one, which is connected to the absence of the feeling of social and cultural integration at the national level (the absence of "the great tradition", which can be relied upon to unite the nation) [12, p. 30]. Such a language is used in the basic administrative areas, such as the state documentation, court proceeding, educational area and also in industry and trade, and it is possible only in the multi-tribal states with huge language diversity. In situations like these we can follow the prevalence of the state language on the cost of the local languages, and the possibility to get well-paid positions and moving to the elite class becomes the moving factor to learn the official language, but the awakening of the national self-awareness in different ethnic groups, especially in the areas of compact inhabitance, can cause language conflicts.

Type B is opposite to type A and is provided in a case, when the elite or the main part of the people concludes that there is "a great tradition" existing in the state together with the corresponding language [12, p. 39]. Choosing this type is possible at the considerable social and cultural and political integrity, which gives the authentic language a possibility to be chosen as a state one. At this, the language policy may have to objectives at the same time, which are "nationalism" and "state development", and successfully exist in mono-lingual states, as the national official or state language is authentic and acceptable for absolute majority of the population. While using the leading language, it is possible, at the same time, to keep the local language as the national symbol. Some minor European peoples do like this, in particular, the Welsh (inhabitants of Wales) in the United Kingdom. They learn their national language at school as the foreign language is usually learnt, speak and sing it at the celebrations, organize the competitions on the best knowledge of the Welsh language, but, in general, the Welsh speak and communicate in English.

According to this type of the language policy, O. Gryshayeva gives an example with the Swahili language in Tanzania: the colonial era made a big number of Tanzanians refuse their native language and consider English as its substitute. Now the mistake is being corrected and Swahili takes its legitimate position as the mean of political and economic communication, social life, educational area. Moreover, there is the trend appeared to call the Africans "swahilis", independently on the fact, that the Swahilis belong to different groups historically [2, p. 132].

Type C is a result of existence of two or more "great traditions" competing, each of them having its own social, religious or geographical basis and language tradition. The main problem of the situations like those is reaching the balance between the general nationalism (or "state nationalism") with the regional or group nationalism. Under these conditions, to avoid the threat of the state division on separate independent regions, the language policy should constantly keep "nationalism" and "state development" balance.

J. Fishman appoints, that the regional, religious, ethnic, language and social groups should receive a certain autonomy from the state, but not on the cost of the national unity. The most frequent way to solve it is to keep the language of ex-rulers as the national official language together with one or more local languages, and local languages get the official status in corresponding regions.

The language policy of type C is the most acceptable policy within a multi-language state, though the demands made by the state to its citizens are too big, that is why it allows speaking at least two languages, and three languages at the regional level.

R. Phillipson defines three types of language policy: 1) status planning, 2) corpus planning, 3) implementation planning.

Status planning is mainly the competence of the state institutions and concerns the issue of separate languages to obtain defined functions with help of constitution and/or other legal acts. Corpus planning is made by the institutions created especially for this purpose, which are aimed to define the correct usage of vocabulary, grammar and spelling of the language. Implementation planning is connected to teaching the languages within the educational system. State institutions directly impact the educational process within the educational system in educational institutions, for example, via the implementation of obligatory teaching of a certain language [15, p. 14].

H. Schiffman defines the language policy of tolerance and the language policy of promotion dependently on the type of the language rights of national minorities [16].

The policy of tolerance may be hidden and open. The open one defines the rights of any or all linguistic groups to use their language in any areas chosen by them. The language of the majority has no exceptional rights. The open policy guarantees the safest policy of tolerance.

If we observe the hidden language policy, then any language is mentioned in any law or legal act. The warrants of language rights must follow other policies, constitutional provisions, the spirit of law etc. [16].

The policy of promotion appears, when the language of a dominating group (for example, the language majority) is fixed by certain regulations and almost all the resources are devoted to promote this language. This language can also be hidden or open. The policy of hidden promotion promotes one (or more) languages without any clear definition of them. The policy of open promotion actually promotes a language/languages according to the legislation [16].

The most detailed typology of the language policy was developed by J. Leclerc. It describes the existing language policies in many countries in the most complete way. On the grounds of studying language policies of 400 countries of the world, the researcher defines 9 types of language policy, mentioned below [14].

1. The assimilative policy defined with the usage of planned actions to fasten minimization or liquidation of certain language groups (prohibition, social devaluation, repressions or genocide in marginal cases). This type of policy is used in Transdniestria.

2. The hands-off policy defined, first of all, by choosing the way of "laissez-faire" (when everything follows its way and develops objectively), ignoring the problems appearing and letting the balance of powers develop normally. Practically it means the choice on the benefit of the dominating language, while the principles of free choice, tolerance or accepting the differences are declared (this policy is a feature of Czechia).

3. The policy of the official language improving is, actually, the policy of a single language which is in promoting a single language in political, legal, social, economic and other areas.

4. Branch-wide (sector-wide) policy, as a rule, is limited with one language aspect, sometimes, as maximum, two or three. It is in approval of one or two more or less developed legal measures in one, two or three areas according to the usage of languages of national minorities or immigrants. The final evolution of the branch-wide approach is reaching the differentiated legal status of the language (for example, the French language got the official status in Canada on demand of French-speaking population, but French native speakers are mainly concentrated in the province of Quebec).

5. The policy of two or three languages. According to the official bilingual policy, the constitution or the law defines the equality of two or more languages. As a rule, it's the right of legal equality, but the real existing equality is not obligatory. The policy of two languages grounded on personal rights is used to all the members of the language community independently on the place of inhabitance on the national territory or is spread not to the whole territory, but to a part of it (for example, for the Swedish language in Finland).

6. The policy of differentiated legal status of languages. It is grounded on the suggestion, that, one hand, the majority of the country has all the language rights, on the other hand, the minority or minorities have less rights, and it is recognized both legally and officially. In other words, these rights, always supported by the legislation or provisions of the constitution, are obligatory of a wide range for the majority and limit the minorities.

7. The policy of strategical multi-language usage is grounded on a pragmatic choice. The state, even with a single language officially, can use two or more other languages, if it is conditioned with the needs of communication, political, social, economic situation etc. Not giving any privilege to any language, the policy of strategical multi-language usage considers one language as an addition to another one and aims to use all the language resources of the country in the most positive way (this policy is usual for Singapure).

8. The language policy of internationalization is used when the state, as a rule, it's an ex-colony, supports the preference of its language beyond political borders. This type of the policy can be used just to spread the spoken language which has already obtained a considerable prestige and the state is afraid to lose it (this policy is provided by Portugal according to Portuguese language).

9. The mixed language policy, when the state uses different types of intrusion at the same time. As a rule, the mixed language policy combines, for example, 1) hands-off policy according to the language of a minority; 2) hands-off policy according to an official language and assimilative policy according to minorities; 3) promotion of the official language and differentiated status of minorities languages.

There is also a classification, known in the theory of the language policy, proposed by H. Kloss [13]. He differentiates the kinds of language policy according to the range of features:

– according to the promotion ability: promotive, tolerating and mixed kinds of language policy. So, the promotive policy encourages the usage of a certain language (languages) with help of constitutional, administrative and legal instruments; at the same time the state gives or assures the means (money, staff, space) for the language; makes more accurate and reserves the areas of survival (schools, courts, administration) for the language; it can promote one or several

languages without any declaring. The tolerating policy allows using the language without any definition of means, time and place. The mixed policy may tolerate a language (languages) of minorities, maintain the chosen administrative aspects: for example, warning signs in four languages in Singapore, providing the court translation in courts, paid education in other languages (for example, in Czechia);

– according to the legal limitations, the language policy may also tolerate/ promote certain measures in chosen areas (branch-wide language policy) or on certain territories (territorial policy). The right to use the language may be limited, for example, with religion, army, bureaucracy;

– according to the language's interpretation, there are equal rights and restricted (limiting) language policies. At this, the languages of small minorities can be considered as those with equal rights with the numerous ones and, vice versa, the rights of communities of many millions may be ignored.

I. Popesku also defines several types of language policy [8]. Dependently on the objective of the language policy he defines the following ones:

– the constructive language policy aimed to widen the functions of the languages, the areas of their usage, social and communicative roles, to develop and create standard languages (a classical example of such a policy exists in Switzerland, where all the languages of the authentic population received the status of official languages);

– the destructive language policy (an example is the language policy of Russian tsarism of the end of XIX-the beginning of XX centuries, aimed to destroy any springs of the state development within national minorities, collapse their languages and, when possible, make them Russified [8].

According to the subject of forming the language policy, he defines:

– the centralized language policy on the level of the state, which foresees the system of common and obligatory for all the regions and ethnic groups measures according to providing the political course defined by the state at the local level;

– the non-centralized policy, which is the policy of the local authorities, which doesn't have any obligatory powers outside the region and doesn't have any state support, it's the policy of separate parties and public movements. As an example, he takes the program of so-called League of Nations, fighting for the rebirth of the Irish language and transforming it to become the national one within Irish national liberation movement [8].

The other approach to classify the language policy is to divide it on endogloss and exogloss types, which is proposed by V. Klokov, R. Bell, Y. Kobenko [1; 3; 4]. According to the point, which language – the authentic or the "imported" one – will obtain the preference, they define the exogloss or the endogloss language policies, and, at the same time, the one or another definition of the strategy of the language policy is, as a rule, considered from the position of the authentic language culture, and the form of the language itself gets the status of the official or the national language.

Y. Kobenko describes this types of the language policy as follows: according to the belonging of the chosen communicative mean to the authentic language culture, a certain administrative-territorial formation may provide the exogloss or the endogloss language policy. The exogloss policy of the recipient language, when it's keeping its national language territory, is orientated to be developed with help of language means of the donor language and is permissive, which means that it allows a considerable amount of xenomorphic materials of the donor language to its content. The merged form of the explication of such a policy is mixing the

languages and the loss of the language identity [4, p. 51]. So-called autarchy (self-sufficiency) as a feature of the endogloss policy, excludes or prohibits word-formation with the means of another language. As a result of this radicalisation with the means of the endogloss language policy comes exhausting of the internal language resources of the language, and it's not able to form the words by itself any further.

The ideal vector of the language development is the balance between the exogloss destination of the language development and the desire to keep the richness of the language (endoglossy), which is reached with the moderate language policy that assists the natural development of the language as the system.

L. B. Nikolsky relied on the understanding of the language policy as a mean of reaching the interests of certain social classes. According to the main parameters, the researcher defines several types of language policy:

– according to the destination: the retrospective one (aimed to keep the existing situation or rebirth of the language, as, for example, in Israel) and the perspective one (which foresees the change of the existing functional charge of the language and the language situation, as, for example in Baltic countries after the USSR collapse);

– according to the class content: the democratic one (in the interests of the wide range of society) and anti-democratic (in the interests of a narrow range of society);

– according to the ethnic orientation: the international one (which foresees the legal equal rights for all the languages, shows its tolerance to the elements of another language) and the national one (which is orientated on the language of one ethnic group, and is turned against the usage of the elements of another language, as, for example, Urdu in Pakistan, which was the native language for 7 % of the population of the country) [7, p. 118].

The Ukrainian researcher V. Kulyk defines several types of language policy [5]. Dependently on amount of groups, which the language policy is aimed to, he defines 2 types.

The first type is grounded on the division of the policy on the one which is aimed to satisfy the rights and/or needs of all the citizens, and the one, which cares just of one group and language, which are usually the title ones. At the same time, this care of just one language may aim not just to limit the usage of other languages and discriminating of their native speakers, but also providing the unity of all the social groups based on one single language [5, p. 312].

The other type of language policy is grounded on providing the rights or satisfying the needs of the citizens to use their language during certain practice. In this situation 2 approaches may be used: the first one foresees respect to the choice of the citizen in the matter which language of those used in the country he chooses to communicate with authorities and to obtain their services. When the second type is used, there is no choice for such a person, as he/she doesn't know enough languages which are settled in a certain practice (in communicating with the authorities, health care etc.). The authorities allow the person, mentioned above, to use his/her language, giving him/her an official knowing this language or an interpreter, but it is considered as the humane treatment, not as the responsibility risen from the guaranteed right. [5, p. 313]

Also V. Kulyk defines the territorial and personal types of the language policy. The territorial type foresees, that the guaranteed right to use a certain language is limited with a certain part of the territory of the state, where this language only is used officially. As an example of this policy, V. Kulyk gives Switzerland and Belgum,

where in each part of the country only one of official languages is used (in Brussels and in some Swiss canons the official status is given to two languages used by the population) and they have equal rights just on the federal level [5, p. 316].

As an alternative to the territorial type of the language policy, V. Kulyk defines the personal type, according to which the law gives equal rights to persons or groups without any relation to the territory where they are located, as they say, to "transfer" their rights with themselves, independently on the territorial concentration of the members of language groups. This principle is the most appropriate in the situations when the borders between the groups and the languages are smooth and are in constant movement.

Conclusions of the research given and the prospectives of further studies. The conducted research of the types of the language policy doesn't lay any claim to be compendiously right, but it gives a possibility to generalize theoretical studies of national and foreign scientists in this area. On the grounds of the typologies analysed it can be defined, that today Ukraine has the language policy of type B (according to J. Fishman), promotion of the state language and differentiated legal status of the languages, centralized, constructive, mainly exogloss. Success or failure of providing of a certain type of the policy depends on the range of factors, that is why, to make any conclusions about appropriateness of any certain type for Ukrainian situation, it is necessary to research the current language situation in Ukraine as a set of the demographic, social linguistic and political parameters and settle its similarity according to each of them to any other country, where this policy was successful.

References

1. Bell, R. (1980). Sotsiolingvistika: tseli, metody i problemy. Moscow [in Russian].
2. Grishaeva, E.B. (2007). Tipologiya yazykovyh politik i yazykovogo planirovaniya v polietnicheskom i multikulturnom prostranstve (funktsionalnyiy aspekt). *Doctor's thesis.* Krasnoyarsk [in Russian].
3. Klokov, V.T. (1994). Yazyikovaya politika vo frankoyazychnyh stranah Afriki. Saratov : Izd-vo Saratov. un-ta [in Russian].
4. Kobenko, Yu.V. (2010). Ekzoglossnyiy i endoglossnyiy tipy yazykovoy politiki. *Vestnik TGPU, issue 7 (97), 51–54* [in Russian].
5. Kulyk, V. (2008). Zakordonnyj dosvid rozvyazannya movnyh problem ta mozhlyvist jogo zastosuvannya v Ukrayini. *Movna sytuaciya v Ukrayini: mizh konfliktom i konsensusom.* Kyiv: IPiEND imeni I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrayiny, *299–334* [in Ukrainian].
6. Malikov, A.V. (1998). Netraditsionnye teorii obschestvennogo razvitiya i tipologii gosudarstva. Moscow : Yurist, *6, 43–47* [in Russian].
7. Nikolskiy, L.B. (1976). Sinhronnaya sotsiolingvistika (Teoriya i problemy). Moscow : Nauka [in Russian].
8. Popesku, I.V. Teoreticheskie osnovyi yazyikovoy politiki. *Russkaya obschina.* URL: http://www.russian.kiev.ua/material.php?id=9001564 [in Russian].
9. Rakitov, A.I. (1982). Istoricheskoe poznanie: sistemno-gnoseologicheskiy podhod. Moscow: Politizdat [in Russian].
10. Slovnyk ukrayinskoyi movy. (1980). (Vols. 1–11). Kyiv: Nauk. dumka, vol. 10: T–F [in Ukrainian].
11. Shapiro, S.I. (1973). Ot algoritmov – k suzhdeniyam. Moscow: Sov. radio [in Russian].
12. Fishman, J. (1970). Socioliftguistics, a Brief Introduction. Rowley.
13. Kloss, H. (1977). The American Bilingual Tradition. Rowley.
14. Leclerc, J. Index par politique linguistique. URL: http://www.axl.cefan.ulaval.ca/monde/index_politique-lng.htm.
15. Philipson, R. (2003). English-only Europe?: Challenging language policy. London; New York: Routledg.
16. Schiffman, Harold F. Language Policy Theory: Types of Linguistic Minority Rights. URL: https://www.sas.upenn.edu/~haroldfs/540/theory/ lgpolthr.html.

Ковальова Тетяна Володимирівна,
к.філол.н., доц., доцент кафедри права та європейської інтеграції,
Харківський регіональний інститут державного управління
Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України,
м. Харків
ORCID 0000-0003-2079-7101

ТИПОЛОГІЯ МОВНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ В СУЧАСНИХ УМОВАХ ДЕРЖАВОТВОРЕННЯ

У статті дається визначення типології мовної політики, вивчаються типології мовної політики, представлені в працях вітчизняних і зарубіжних учених, робиться узагальнення існуючих типологій.

Здійснення типології в наукових дослідженнях необхідне з огляду на те, що остання підвищує змістовність наукової інформації, оскільки дозволяє вивчати ознаки і властивості об'єкта залежно від того, яке місце він посідає в цій системі. Слід зауважити, що серед учених немає одностайної думки щодо інтерпретації типології та її відмінності від класифікації. На підставі встановлених характеристик типології та відмінностей між нею і класифікацією у статті визначено типологію мовної політики як наукову систематизацію моделей мовної політики, які відрізняються між собою якісними ознаками, а саме – методами та засобами регулювання мовних відносин у державі.

З'ясовано, що запровадження певного типу політики залежить від низки чинників, тому щоби зробити висновки про придатність певного типу для української ситуації, необхідно дослідити сучасну мовну ситуацію в Україні як набір демографічних, соціолінгвістичних і політичних параметрів й установити її подібність за кожним із них до тих чи інших країн, де така політика проводилася успішно.

Ключові слова: мовна політика, типологія мовної політики, мовна ситуація.

Список використаних джерел

1. Белл Р. Социолингвистика: цели, методы и проблемы / пер. с англ. Москва, 1980.
2. Гришаева Е. Б. Типология языковых политик и языкового планирования в полиэтническом и мультикультурном пространстве (функциональный аспект) : дис. … д.филол.н. Красноярск, 2007. 592 с.
3. Клоков В. Т. Языковая политика во франкоязычных странах Африки. Саратов : Изд-во Саратов. ун-та, 1994. 130 с.
4. Кобенко Ю. В. Экзоглоссный и эндоглоссный типы языковой политики. *Вестник ТГПУ.* 2010. Вып. 7 (97). С. 51–54.
5. Кулик В. Закордонний досвід розв'язання мовних проблем та можливість його застосування в Україні. *Мовна ситуація в Україні: між конфліктом і консенсусом.* Київ : ІПіЕНД імені І. Ф. Кураса НАН України, 2008. С. 299–334.
6. Маликов А. В. Нетрадиционные теории общественного развития и типологии государства. Москва : Юрист, 1998. № 6. С. 43–47.
7. Никольський Л. Б. Синхронная социолингвистика (Теория и проблемы). Москва : Наука, 1976. 168 с.
8. Попеску И. В. Теоретические основы языковой политики. *Русская община.* URL: http://www.russian.kiev.ua/material.php?id=9001564 (дата звернення: 11.02.2020).
9. Ракитов А. И. Историческое познание: системно-гносеологический подход. Москва : Политиздат, 1982. 303 с.
10. Словник української мови : в 11 т. / АН Української РСР, Ін-т мовознав. ім. О. О. Потебні ; редкол. : І. К. Білодід (голова) [та ін.]. Київ : Наук. думка, 1970–1980. Т. 10: Т-Ф / ред. тому: А. А. Бурячок, Г. М. Гнатюк. 1979. 658 с.
11. Шапиро С. И. От алгоритмов – к суждениям. Москва : Сов. радио, 1973. 288 с.
12. Fishman, J. Socioliftguistics, a Brief Introduction. Rowley, 1970. 126 p.
13. Kloss, H. The American Bilingual Tradition. Rowley, 1977. 347 p.
14. Leclerc, J. Index par politique linguistique. URL: http://www.axl.cefan.ulaval.ca/monde/index_politique-lng.htm (дата звернення: 11.02.2020).
15. Philipson, R. English-only Europe?: Challenging language policy. London ; New York : Routledge, 2003. 256 p.
16. Schiffman, Harold F. Language Policy Theory: Types of Linguistic Minority Rights. URL: https://www.sas.upenn.edu/~haroldfs/540/theory/ lgpolthr.html.