S. Heidemari[1], G.Yu. Amanbayeva[2], S.A. Shunkeyeva[2]

[1]Institute of Romance Potsdam University, Germany;
[2]Ye.A. Buketov Karaganda State University, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: filtar79@mail.ru)

On the question of interference of «language policy», «language planning» and «language ideology» concepts

The key concepts of modern sociolinguistics: «language policy», «language planning» and «language ideology» can be defined variously and that demonstrates the diversity of scientists' views on their content. In this article, the authors have attempted to analyze existing, often opposing, approaches – how to define the content of these concepts, how to demonstrate the heterogeneity of their terminological field, how to identify and to establish correlations of the analyzed concepts. The article presents an analysis of the above-mentioned concepts of both domestic and foreign linguistic scientists who consider these concepts by the type of relationship between them. As a result, the authors have come to the conclusion that «language policy», «language planning» and «language ideology» are interdependent. The authors used such general scientific methods of research as analysis and synthesis, comparison and generalization, and systems-based approach.

Keywords: sociolinguistics, language policy, language ideology, language planning, linguistic situation, language status, language management, language landscape.

Language from the sociolinguistic point of view must be considered in its social context, since it functions in a society with a certain social structure. The central aspect here is public multilingualism. Currently there are practically no monolingual societies, and conversely, communities where two, three, and more languages function simultaneously prevail. In this case, as the main task, sociolinguistics determines the study of the interaction mechanisms of the several languages functioning. Language processes in society are significantly influenced by the language policy of the state, language ideology and language planning. An important factor in shaping and changing the linguistic situation in the country is the language policy. At the same time, the content and delineation of the terms «language policy» and «language planning» are debatable. In domestic and foreign linguistics there is a variety of approaches of solving this issue, which indicates the heterogeneity of the terminological field of these concepts.

Analysis of content determining approaches of the concepts «language policy» and «language planning» and their correlation in the works of linguists had showed that quite often the term «language policy» is identified with such concepts as «language construction» and «language planning» (A.D. Schweitzer, J. Fishman, J.L. Bianco, M.I. Isayev and others). However, most scientists are of the opinion that the concepts of «language policy» and «language planning», in spite of their similarity, should be delineated. Thus, E. Haugen, L.B. Nikolsky defines language planning as one of the forms or part of language policy; M. Herriman and B. Barnaby, G. Schiffman, R. Bugarski consider language planning as the actual implementation of language policy; R. Baldauf defines the language policy as a large-scale and national planning, usually carried out by the government, in additon, like C. Ferguson considers language policy as a statement of intent, and language planning as the implementation of language policy; the same opinion is shared by Russian sociolinguists N.B. Vakhtin and E.V. Golovko, who define the language policy as part of the overall policy of the state, and language planning as an implementation of language policy.

The opposite opinion in the delineation of the concepts «language policy» and «language planning» is expressed by D. Crystal and R. Kaplan, who consider language policy as a component of language planning; M. Fetts, who argues that language policy is nothing more than the practical implementation of language planning.

Since the definitions of «language policy» and «language planning» vary among researchers, it is important to consider them in details. According to A.D. Schweitzer, the well-known Soviet linguist, the language policy can be understood as «the totality of measures taken by the state, the party, the class, the social grouping to change or preserve the existing functional distribution of languages or linguistic subsystems, to introduce new or preserve the linguistic norms that are being used» [1; 117].

For V.I. Belikov and L.P. Krysin, language policy in the context of multiethnic and multilingual countries represents state's practical measures aimed at maintaining the status of the state language, its functions;

protection of the monopoly use of the state language in the most important social spheres; regulation of the use of «local» languages, etc. One of the main tools of language policy is the laws on languages [2; 263].

French linguist J. Rousseau examines the language policy from two positions: general and private, and identifies it with «any decisions taken by the state or any other eligible social body aimed at using one or more languages in a given territory (from a general position), ..., and the regulation of its or their use (from the position of the private)» [3; 97]. According to a definition provided by V.A. Avrorin, the language policy is a system of measures «conscious regulating the influence on the functional side of the language ...» [4; 28].

The above definitions of «language policy» are consonant with the concepts of «language planning» and «language construction» and are synonymous with them.

Russian sociolinguists N.B. Vakhtin and E.V. Golovko had proposed a definition for «language policy» as part of the overall policy of the state, which adopts the basic principles of the policy regarding the languages functioning on its territory, and implements this policy in the form of language planning [5; 163]. A similar view is held by G. Schiffman, who believes that «linguistic policy refers primarily to the policy of society in the field of language communication, namely the set of views, principles and decisions reflecting the attitude of the community to the speech repertoire and communicative potential» [6; 3].

The broader meaning of «language policy» we might observe in the works of Y. Desheriyev, R. Kaplan, N. Mechkovskaya. Thus, Y. Desheriyev considers the language policy as «a set of ideological principles and practical measures to solve language problems in society, the state» [7; 345]. In this sense, the term «language policy» to a certain extent corresponds to the definition of «language planning». R. Kaplan considers the language policy as a set of ideas, laws, norms, rules and actions aimed at achieving the desired changes in the language situation in society, group or system [8; 4].

N.B. Mechkovskaya views the language policy as all kinds of conscious activity of society aimed at regulating the use of language. At the same time, N.B. Mechkovskaya, like E. Haugen, defines the term «language policy» as a general designation of any practice of conscious influence on the language situation, practices both positive and negative (restrictive and destructive), and the terms «language construction» and «language planning» are considered as a kind of language policy, namely as a positive policy aimed at strengthening the communicative and social capabilities of specific languages [9; 199].

The German linguist K.M. Riehl provides the same definition of «language policy»; he treats this concept as «activities and rules that affect the status and public functions of different languages - especially in multilingual countries and international organizations. Activities and rules are understood to mean all activities designed to modify or influence natural language practice within a certain group. Such impact can occur through simple social intervention (for example, one specific language is established within one organization / firm) or by planning at the political level (language legislation); it is also possible by direct intervention in the language situation» [10; 73].

Domestic linguists E.D. Suleimenova, Z.S. Smagulova, N.Zh. Shaimerdenova actively deal with issues of co-functioning and the relationship of national languages, studying the social essence, development and functions of languages used in Kazakhstan. In their works we find a rather detailed definition of the term «language policy», which means «an integral part of the national, social and cultural policies; the sphere of activity of the state, connected with regulation of language relations in a society. Language policy indicates a strategic course in the development of the language relations of society, usually enshrined in the Constitution and special national programs. At the center of language policy, «..., there are problems of power, its acquisition, organization and use» [11; 72].

Analysis of the language policy's definitions of domestic and foreign linguists demonstrates the unity of all linguists in the fact that language policy is the prerogative of the state and the ruling elite to regulate language relations within a certain society. In its most general form, language policy can be represented as a part of the general policy of the state (national, social) with respect to languages functioning in a multilingual society, which provides for the regulation of language relations in society and the state. The purpose of language policy is to preserve or change the status of the language or the language situation as a whole. This is shown through the adoption of laws and regulations. At the same time, educational institutions and the mass media introducing new language norms, and also disseminating metalinguistic discourses about the correct use of language, are important instruments for implementing language policy.

After thorough consideration of «language policy» concept we adhere to the opinion of such linguists as E. Haugen, L.B. Nikolsky, M. Herriman, B. Barnaby, G. Schiffman, R. Bugarsky, R. Baldauf, G. Ferguson, N.B. Vakhtin, E.V. Golovko, Y.D. Desheriyev, R. Kaplan, N.B. Mechkovskaya, K.M. Riehl, E.D. Suleimenova,

Z.S. Smagulova, N.Z. Shaimerdenov, who differentiate the concepts of «language policy» and «language planning»: the language policy of the state is realized in the form of language planning.

For the first time, the definition of «language planning» was presented by the American linguist Einar Haugen in 1959 in «Planning for Standard Language in Modern Norway». Under the language planning (Language Planning) E. Haugen understood any impact on the language carried out by official organizations or individuals, having an official or unofficial character. The analysis of E. Haugen's works has demonstrated the evolution of the interpretation of the concept of «language planning»: from a rather narrow interpretation of this concept as an activity «for the preparation of normative spelling, grammar and vocabulary, which will be guided in their written and oral speech by members of heterogeneous speech collectives» [12; 8] to a more general definition of language planning as an «assessment of linguistic change», arguing that «people can and do change their language throughout life ...» and, therefore, one can speak of language planning as «an attempt to influence this choice» [13; 467].

In this case, E. Haugen and C. Ferguson define the nation as the object of language planning [13; 467, 14; 25]. According to E. Haugen, language planning means deliberately pushing the language change in the right direction, but its implementation, ultimately, depends on the speakers of the language, which are the last instance in this matter [13; 467]. E. Haugen's conviction is determining: «wherever language problems exist, language planning is required. If the language situation is for some reason felt unsatisfactory, there is a need to implement a language planning program» [13; 443].

Later, in the works of both domestic and foreign linguists, a critical interpretation of the «language planning» concept is observed through the expansion and refinement of its content, objects and subjects. Thus, the German linguist H. Kloss (1969) supplemented the definition of E. Haugen and added a new object of language planning - the status of language - to the language corpus already designated by E. Haugen. The new object of language planning is connected «not with the structure or form of language, but with its position in relation to the national government ... interested primarily in the status of the language ...» [15; 14].

American linguist R.L. Cooper singles out the third object of language planning - mastering the language, he has also defined linguistic planning as «purposeful efforts to influence the behavior of other people with respect to language acquisition, its structure and rational distribution of language codes» [16; 45].

Another interesting point of view proposed by G. Schiffman, who understands language planning as «a set of concrete measures undertaken within the framework of language policy with a view to influencing linguistic communication in the community, usually by influencing the development of languages» [6; 3].

Domestic linguists E.D. Suleimenova, Z.S. Smagulova and N.Z. Shaimerdenov have combined the research objects of E. Haugen, H. Kloss and R.L. Cooper in their definition of «language planning» and put it together and interpreted this concept as follows: language planning is any conscious influence on the language situation, moreover, it is a conscious, concrete action to influence the language behavior of native speakers with the purpose of changing the functioning of the language (status planning), regulating the structure of the language (corpus planning), creating conditions for mastering the language (planning mastery), ... through political, educational, economic, social and linguistic institutions [11; 73].

It is advisable to consider the opposite approaches to the definition of the «language planning» concept. Thus, D. Crystal treats language planning as «the creation and implementation of an official policy regarding which languages and versions of language should be used in the state» [17; 364]. R. Kaplan believes that «the realization of language planning leads to the proclamation of the language policy by the government and it is managed by it» [8; 4]. M.I. Isaev identifies the concept of «language planning» with language policy and treats it as a concept that unites «the theory and practice of active control over the process of language development» [18; 35]. According to M. Fetts, «language planning should be connected with a critical evaluation of language policy, where the first provides standards of rationality and efficiency, and the latter tests these ideas in practice in order to create more advanced models of language planning» [19; 10].

As can be seen from the above according to a number of linguists (D. Crystal, G. Schiffman, R.L. Cooper, D. Blommaert, B. Weinstein, D. Robinson), language planning is the tendency of the authorities and the ruling elites to influence by any means the speech behavior of members of society and state. In other words, language planning is seen as a conscious impact on the part of the state, the ruling elite, individual groups, organizations and even individuals on the language. Therefore, the purpose of language planning is to influence the behavior of members of society through their language. At the same time, the main provisions of language planning are considered from the standpoint: who plans, for whom and how [20; 52].

The term «language planning» in modern sociolinguistic research is often replaced by the term «language management», introduced by the linguists B. Yernudd and Y. Neustupnyi, after that used by

B. Spolsky in his theory of language policy instead of the term «language planning». The achievement of this theory is the unification of language planning at the micro-level (namely, the decision to choose a language and language behavior in individual discourses) with language planning at the macro-level: at the micro-level, the management based on discourse is implemented, and at the macro-level - organized language management. The latter is implemented on the basis of individual social institutions, such as educational institutions, health care institutions, banks, firms and other organizations [10; 77]. B. Spolsky equates vital spheres of our life with social institutions in which language management can be carried out, such as family, religion, work, legal services, public spheres of activity (mass media), army, government level and others.

Language management at the macro-level has an impact on the micro-level. Language management at the individual level (micro-level) begins when a communication problem has appeared. In this case, the speaker tries to solve the problem by repeating what has been said, formulating what has been said in other words or in certain cases using another language. Y. Nekvapil defines such language management as «simple management».

Language management at the micro-level can thus affect both individual formulations and the principle choice of the language of communication (i.e. what language will be the language of interaction). This choice is also stipulated by ideological factors, most often by factors such as prestige, national self-awareness or elite orientation, professional growth, etc. This kind of language management finds its application at the level of social institutions, for example, in the family. In this case, the language policy is implemented within a certain family and is largely determined by the parents. A positive attitude toward language governs linguistic behavior and thus leads to the preservation of the language within this social institution.

Summarizing the above, language planning in general can be defined as the development and implementation of state measures regulating the use of different languages and linguistic varieties. Language planning covers a wide range of issues relevant to a multilingual society, for example, the issue of the position of national minority languages, the role of academies while maintaining linguistic norms, the influence of the media on language use/language practice, the content and appropriateness of spelling reform, stylistic norms of publishing activity, etc.

The questions of language planning are under the jurisdiction of the respective ministries and departments, academies and committees, becoming the focus of non-state organizations; the actions taken have covered both political and legal steps, and unofficial or even illegal actions. The position of population towards these activities varies between absolute approval, reluctant consent, general indifference, soft criticism and total rejection. It is necessary to take into account historical, political, economic, religious, legal and social factors during the process of implementing language planning. Due to the fact that language planning has been the subject of research only since the 60s of the previous century, it is still only in the descriptive stage, and there is a constant need for detailed studies of various situations in individual countries. At present, there are not many studies that reveal the general theoretical foundations of language planning. Coincidently, this issue stirs great interest both from a practical and theoretical point of view.

As it is known, language planning activities are often divided into two types, depending on whether the changes concern primarily the language structure or language use. Corpus planning is aimed at changing the structure (corpus) of the language/variety of the language, for example, in the form of spelling, pronunciation, grammar or vocabulary modifications, up to selecting a specific writing system (accepting a new alphabet, transitioning the alphabet to another font - for example, transition of the Kazakh alphabet from Cyrillic to Latin alphabet). With status planning, on the contrary, the order and conditions in which the language/variety of languages in society are used, i.e., language is given a new status, for example, for the first time it is allowed to be used in court or in official communications [17; 364].

Language status planning covers activities aimed at promoting the language status by encouraging and supporting its use in wider areas of activity, especially by public authorities, to support and to encourage a new nature of linguistic behavior. The purpose of language status planning is to recognize the language of the population, the formation of a positive attitude towards language. If language status planning is aimed at improving the attitude of the population towards the use of language, the planning of language mastering is intended to help population to learn it through the education system and indirectly through its use in the media.

The main participants in the development and implementation of planning programs are language experts, primarily linguists. Language status planning is carried out rather by the representatives of the administration in close cooperation with politicians, while the language acquisition planning is a field of activity, first of all, of teachers and teachers. However, the role of other groups of the population, such as the media,

religious associations, non-governmental organizations, is also important. Eventually, planning of language status and language form depends on political goals.

In other words, language planning is essential and crucial to problems in the field of language policy. The task of language planning is the evaluation of language change [1; 467] and the linguistic situation, as well as consideration of the free choice of the speaker. Language ideology, which means metalinguistic and metapragmatic discourses, language settings, linguistic practices or the regulation of language use, has a significant influence on linguistic policy and language planning. On the one hand language ideology is expressed in laws or linguistic norms, on the other hand in non-written customs and traditions or in relations of power [10; 73].

According to E.D. Suleimenova, language ideology is a system of views and ideas about language / languages for preserving language / languages or changing the language situation, expressing the interests of the nation (ethnos, nationality), social groups, elite, society [21; 10]. Language policy and language ideology determine the strategic course for the development of the language situation in the country, regulate language planning, are fixed in language legislation and state programs for the development and support of language [21; 12].

An important indicator of linguistic ideology is the presence or absence of language in public places. In this case, we are talking especially about the visibility of languages, i.e. about their written demonstration. In this connection, Western linguistics uses the term linguistic landscapes, which means any form of a socially visible written language, not only inscriptions, signs, posters and graffiti, but also mobile inscriptions (for example, on cars) [10; 76].

The language landscape is the most expressive and convincing indicator of linguistic diversity in a certain locality. Therefore, language policy decisions should primarily concern the visibility of languages: bilingual or multilingual inscriptions, as well as the order of languages in these multilingual inscriptions and signs, perform a very important symbolic function for speakers. The observation of linguistic landscapes has the goal to comprehend public multilingualism from the standpoint of language choice, the hierarchy of languages, the phenomenon of language contacts, regulation and aspects of written fixation of languages [22; 191]. At the same time, the focus of sociolinguistic research in multilingual areas is, on the one hand, the use of minority languages, and the presence of English as Lingua Franca along with other / other languages of the country, on the other. Therefore, it is possible to trace the extent to which the language policy with respect to minority languages is expressed in the linguistic landscape. Hence, B. Spolsky includes an analysis of public multilingual inscriptions and signs in his theory of language policy, namely as part of the components of language practices [23; 65].

Linguistic signs perceived in public places are viewed as instruments of language policy that fix ideology in relation to certain languages. It is possible to demonstrate the rejection of certain languages with their help: often occurring cases are painting or erasing the inscriptions or parts of the multilingual inscription on the signs, until their removal.

Consequently, language landscapes demonstrate how and to what extent some language groups are represented in society in comparison with other languages. The installation of two- and multi-lingual pointers of settlements is not done to facilitate understanding of the names of settlements (because, the names of settlements and other toponyms in different languages sound the same: transliteration or transcription is often used for their translation), but as a symbolic act of recognizing languages. The presence of language signs in administrative buildings, libraries, museums, hospitals or educational institutions is considerably important. It is the visibility of languages in educational institutions that plays an important role in shaping the personality of students (schoolchildren, first of all) with different mother tongues, for literal practice [14; 77].

After having studied the concepts of «language policy», «language ideology» and «language planning» for their content and goals, we have analyzed the inter-linkages between these concepts respect to each other. We fully agree with E.D. Suleimenova, who in her work «Language Processes and Politics» notes several important points [21; 15]:

1. The analyzed concepts are interdependent:

– language ideology determines the basis for both linguistic policy and language planning, which in turn have an impact on linguistic ideology;

– language ideology and language policy express the interests of various groups of society and determine the adoption of compromise solutions in the field of language planning;

– language ideology and language policy, in addition to linguistic goals, can pursue both political and social goals, and language planning is in this case an effective and accessible tool for achieving such goals;

– language ideology has a stable and long-term character and, consequently, it can manifest itself for a long time both in the language policy and in the nature of the decisions taken to implement them in the field of language planning.

2. language ideology is inherently exclusive: language ideology as a product of the historical, social and political development of society expresses, to the greatest extent, the interests of power, elites, and subjects of politics, while their interests may conflict with the interests of other groups of society.

3. language ideology is characterized by a pluralistic beginning: several linguistic ideologies can simultaneously co-exist in the state, each of which expresses the interests of a certain group (party, ethnic group, etc.), but only one of them can become the dominant ideology in the country.

References

1 Швейцер А.Д. Введение в социолингвистику / А.Д. Швейцер, Л.Б. Никольский. — М.: Высш. шк., 1978. — 217 с.

2 Беликов В.И. Социолингвистика / В.И. Беликов, Л.П. Крысин. — М.: РГГУ, 2001. — 439 с.

3 Руссо Л.-Ж. Разработка и проведение в жизнь языковой политики / Л.-Ж. Руссо // Языковая политика в современном мире. — СПб.: Златоуст, 2007. — С. 97–121.

4 Аврорин В.А. Проблемы изучения функциональной стороны языка (к вопросу о предмете социолингвистики) / В.А. Аврорин. — Л.: Наука, 1975. — 276 с.

5 Вахтин Н.Б. Социолингвистика и социология языка: учеб. пос. / Н.Б. Вахтин, Е.В. Головко. — СПб.: ИЦ «Гуманитарная академия»; Изд-во Европейского университета в Санкт-Петербурге, 2004. — 336 с.

6 Schiffman H. Linguistic culture and language policy. (The politics of language) / H. Schiffman. — Leningrad: Routledge, 1996. — 364 p.

7 Дешериев Ю.Д. Социальная лингвистика. К основам общей теории / Ю.Д. Дешериев. — М.: Наука, 1977. — 382 с.

8 Kaplan R.B. Language Planning from Practice to Theory / R.B. Kaplan, R.B. Baldauf. — Multilingual Matters, 1997. — 416 с.

9 Мечковская Н.Б. Общее языкознание: Структурная и социальная типология языков: учеб. пос. для студентов филол. и лингв. спец. / Н.Б. Мечковская. —2-е изд. — М.: Флинта; Наука, 2001. — 312 с.

10 Riehl C.M. Mehrsprachigkeit. Eine Einführung / C.M. Riehl. — Darmstadt: WBG, 2014. — 163 с.

11 Сулейменова Э.Д. Новая языковая идентичность в трансформирующемся обществе: Казахстан, Киргизстан, Таджикистан, Узбекистан. Методология исследования / Э.Д. Сулейменова, Ж.С. Смагулова, Н.Ж. Шаймерденова. — Алматы: Қазақ ун-ті баспасы, 2005. — 74 с.

12 Haugen E. Planning for Standard Language in Modern Norway /E. Haugen // Antropol. Ling. — 1959. — No. 8. — P. 8–21.

13 Хауген Э. Лингвистика и языковое планирование / Э. Хауген // Новое в лингвистике. — 1975. — Вып. 7: Социолингвистика. — С. 441–472.

14 Ferguson Ch.A. The language factor in national development / Ch.A. Ferguson // Anthropological Linguistics. — 1962. — No. 4. — P. 23–27.

15 Kloss H. Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report / H. Kloss, A. Verdoodt. — Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism, 1969. — 94 с.

16 Cooper R.L. Language Planning and Social Change / R.L. Cooper. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. — 228 p.

17 Crystal D. Die Cambridge Enzyklopädie der Sprache / D. Crystal. — Berlin: Tolkemitt Verlag, 2010. — 478 с.

18 Исаев М.И. Языковое строительство как один из важнейших экстралингвистических факторов развития языка / М.И. Исаев // Язык и общество. — М.: Наука, 1968. — С. 81–99.

19 Селиверстова О.А. К вопросу о дефиниционных различиях понятий «языковая политика» и «языковое планирование» в отечественной и зарубежной лингвистике / О.А. Селиверстова // Известия ВГПУ. — 2014. — С. 8–12.

20 Гришаева Е.Б. Типология языковых политик и языкового планирования в полиэтническом и мультикультурном пространстве (функциональный аспект): дис. д-ра филол. наук: 10.02.19 – «Социология» [Электронный ресурс] / Е.Б. Гришаева. — Красноярск, 2007. — Режим доступа: http://www.dissercat.com/content/tipologiya-yazykovykh-politik-i-yazykovogo-planirovaniya-v-polietnicheskom-i-multikulturnom-.

21 Сулейменова Э.Д. Языковые процессы и политика / Э.Д. Сулейменова. — Алматы: Қазақ ун-ті баспасы, 2011. — 117 с.

22 Gorter D. Linguistic landscapes in a multilingual world / D.Gorter // In: Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. — 2013. — No. 33. — P. 190–212.

23 Spolsky B. Language Management / B. Spolsky. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. — 309 с.

З. Гайдемари, Г.Ю. Аманбаева, С.А. Шункеева

«Тілдік саясат», «тілдік жоспарлау», «тілдік идеология» түсініктердің өзара шарттылық мәселесі

Қазіргі әлеуметтік лингвистикада ең негізгі түсініктерге «тілдік саясат», «тілдік жоспарлау», «тілдік идеология» жатады. Ғалымдарды әртүрлі көзқарасын көптеген арнайы әдебиеттегі аталмыш түсініктерге анықтамасы әртүрлі. Мақалада жоғарыда аталған түсініктердің көбісі қарама-қарсы мазмұны анықталып, көзқарастары талданған, сонымен қатар олардың терминологиялық өрістерінің біркелкілігін көрсету мен талданған тұжырымдамалар арасындағы қатынастарды орнатуға талпыныс жасалған. Авторлар «тіл саясаты», «тілдік жоспарлау», «тілдік идеология» ұғымдарының өзара шарттылығы жайлы тұжырымдаған. Сонымен қатар мақалада жоғарыда көрсетілген түсініктердің өзара типтерінің қарым-қатынасын отандық және шетелдік ғалымдар мен тіл мамандарының қарастырған саралауы жан-жақты қарастырылған. Қорытындылай келе, авторлар «тілдік саясат», «тілдік жоспарлау», «тілдік идеология» түсініктерінің өзара шарттылығы жайлы тұжырымдаған. Авторлар жалпы ғылыми әдістерді талдау және синтездеу, салыстыру және қорыту, жүйелік тәсілдерді қолданған.

Кілт сөздер: социолингвистика, тілдік саясат, тілдік идеология, тілдік жоспарлау, тілдік жағдаят, тіл мәртебесі, тілдік менеджмент, тілдік ландшафт.

З. Гайдемари, Г.Ю. Аманбаева, С.А. Шункеева

К вопросу взаимообусловленности понятий «языковая политика», «языковое планирование», «языковая идеология»

В современной социолингвистике одними из ключевых понятий выступают понятия «языковая политика», «языковое планирование» и «языковая идеология». При этом множество существующих в специальной литературе определений данных понятий демонстрируют разносторонность взглядов ученых на их содержание. В статье предпринята попытка проанализировать существующие, зачастую противоположные, подходы к определению содержания данных понятий, продемонстрировать неоднородность их терминологического поля, выявить и установить взаимосвязь между анализируемыми понятиями. В статье представлен анализ названных выше понятий как отечественных, так и зарубежных ученых-лингвистов, которые рассматривают данные понятия по типу отношения между ними. В итоге авторы приходят к выводу о взаимообусловленности понятий «языковая политика», «языковое планирование», «языковая идеология». В работе авторами использовались такие общенаучные методы исследования, как анализ и синтез, сравнение и обобщение, системный подход.

Ключевые слова: социолингвистика, языковая политика, языковая идеология, языковое планирование, языковая ситуация, статус языка, языковой менеджмент, языковой ландшафт.

References

1   Shvejcer, A.D., & Nikol'skij, L.B. (1978). *Vvedenie v sotsiolinhvistiku [Introduction to sociolinguistics].* Moscow: Vysshaia shkola [in Russian].

2   Belikov, V.I., & Krysin, L.P. (2001). *Sotsiolinhvistika [Sociolinguistics].* Moscow: RHHU [in Russian].

3   Russo, L.Zh. (2007). Razrabotka i provedenie v zhizn yazykovoj politiki [Development and implementation of language policy]. Y*azykovaia politika v sovremennom mire – Language policy in the modern world, 97-121.* Saint Petersburg: Zlatoust [in Russian].

4   Avrorin, V.A. (1975). *Problemy izucheniia funktsionalnoi storony yazyka (k voprosu o predmete sotsiolinhvistiki) [Problems of studying the functional side of language (on the subject of sociolinguistics)].* Leningrad: Nauka [in Russian].

5   Vahtin, N.B., & Golovko, E.V. (2004). *Sotsiolinhvistika i sotsiolohiia yazyka [Sociolinguistics and sociology of language].* Saint Petersburg: ITs «Humanitarnaia Akademiia»; Izdatelstvo Evropeiskoho universiteta v Sankt-Peterburhe [in Russian].

6   Schiffman, H. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy. (The politics of language).* Leningrad: Routledge.

7   Desheriev, Ju.D. (1977). *Sotsialnaia linhvistika. K osnovam obshchei teorii [Social linguistics. To the basics of the general theory].* Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].

8   Kaplan, R.B., & Baldauf, R.B. (1997). Language Planning from Practice to Theory. Multilingual Matters.

9   Mechkovskaja, N.B. (2001). *Obshchee yazykoznanie: strukturnaia i sotsialnaia tipolohiia yazykov [General linguistics: Structural and social typology of languages].* (2d ed.). Moscow: Flinta; Nauka [in Russian].

10   Riehl, C.M. (2014). *Mehrsprachigkeit. Eine Einführung [Multilingualism. Introduction].* Darmstadt: WBG [in German].

11 Sulejmenova, Je.D., Smagulova, Zh.S., & Shajmerdenova, N.Zh. (2005). Novaia yazykovaia identichnost v transformiruiushchemsia obshchestve: Kazakhstan, Kirhizstan, Tadzhikistan, Uzbekistan. Metodolohiia issledovaniia [New language identity in a transforming society: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan. Methodology of the study]. Almaty: Kazak universiteti baspasy [in Russian].

12 Haugen, E. (1959). Planning for Standard Language in Modern Norway. *Antropol. Ling, 8,* 8–21.

13 Haugen, E. (1975). Linhvistika i yazykovoe planirovanie [Linguistics and language planning]. *Novoe v linhvistike – New in Linguistics, Issue 7,* 441–472. Moscow [in Russian].

14 Ferguson, Ch.A. (1962). The language factor in national development. *Anthropological Linguistics, 4,* 23–27.

15 Kloss, H., & Verdoodt, A. (1969). *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report.* Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

16 Cooper, R.L. (1990). *Language Planning and Social Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

17 Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language.* Berlin: Tolkemitt Verlag.

18 Isaev, M.I. (1968). Yazykovoe stroitelstvo kak odin iz vazhneishikh ekstralinhvisticheskikh faktorov razvitiia yazyka [Language construction as one of the most important extralinguistic factors of language development]. *Yazyk i obshhestvo – Language and Society,* 81–99. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].

19 Seliverstova, O.A. (2014). K voprosu o definitsionnykh razlichiiakh poniatii «yazykovaia politika» i «yazykovoe planirovanie» v otechestvennoi i zarubezhnoi linhvistike [On the question of the definitional distinctions between the concepts 'language policy' and 'language planning' in domestic and foreign linguistics]. *Izvestiia VHPU – News VSPU,* 8–12 [in Russian].

20 Grishaeva, E.B. (2007). Tipolohiia yazykovykh politik i yazykovoho planirovaniia v polietnicheskom i multikulturnom prostranstve (funktsionalnyi aspekt) [Typology of language policies and language planning in a multi-ethnic and multicultural space (functional aspect)]. *Doctor's thesis.* Krasnoyarsk. Retrieved from http://www.dissercat.com/content/tipologiya-yazykovykh-politik-i-yazykovogo-planirovaniya-v-polietnicheskom-i-multikulturnom- [in Russian].

21 Sulejmenova, Je.D. (2011). *Yazykovye protsessy i politika [Language processes and politics].* Almaty: Kazak universiteti baspasy [in Russian].

22 Gorter, D. (2013). Linguistic landscapes in a multilingual world. In: *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 33, 190–212.

23 Spolsky, B. (2009). Language *Management.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.