

DIGITALES ARCHIV

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft
ZBW – Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Shalaev, Vladimir

Article

Modernization and linguistic cultural policy in modern polyethnic society

Provided in Cooperation with:

Czech journal of social sciences, business and economics

Reference: Shalaev, Vladimir Modernization and linguistic cultural policy in modern polyethnic society.

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11159/568>

Kontakt/Contact

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft/Leibniz Information Centre for Economics
Düsternbrooker Weg 120
24105 Kiel (Germany)
E-Mail: [rights\[at\]zbw.eu](mailto:rights[at]zbw.eu)
<https://www.zbw.eu/econis-archiv/>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieses Dokument darf zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Sofern für das Dokument eine Open-Content-Lizenz verwendet wurde, so gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.
<https://zbw.eu/econis-archiv/termsfuse>

Terms of use:

This document may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes. You are not to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public. If the document is made available under a Creative Commons Licence you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the licence.

Article history: Received 5 July 2015; last revision 27 November 2015; accepted 1 December 2015

MODERNIZATION AND LINGUISTIC CULTURAL POLICY IN MODERN POLYETHNIC SOCIETY

Vladimir Shalaev

Volga State University of Technology

Lyudmila Bukhareva

Volga State University of Technology

Svetlana Shalaeva

Mari State University

Abstract

Our paper focuses on the modernization approach to the relationship and mutual influence of language behavior and language planning in the multi-ethnic society. This relationship is shown as the basic model for the analysis of linguistic situation in the Mari Republic (Russian Federation). Language planning is an important factor in creating favorable conditions for the socialization of small nations into the large society. Language planning is also the factor of regulating ethno-cultural, ethno-national processes in modern multi-ethnic society. Social context allows the authors to analyze this influence in the realization of characteristics of individuals and nations. The relationship of language behavior and language planning is suggested to be the main key factor of national security of the community.

Keywords: multi-ethnic society, the modernization process, language behavior, language planning, language policy, socialization, Mari Republic, Russian Federation

JEL Classification: I28, I29, Y80

Introduction

One can say that the process of globalization has an ambivalent and contradictory character. Globalization as a process of integration of the countries, cultures and peoples in a unified cultural and civilized space of the world actualizes (sharpen) the problems of cultural and national identity of the peoples. Under the influence of globalization, “*a process of fairly rapid destruction of the original ethno-cultural formations manifested in the cultural unification is organized according to the unifying influence of economic life*” (Shalaev, 2004). Several previously published works (see e.g. Shalaev, 2004; 2008; 2013; and 2015) are devoted to different aspects of globalization, postmodern and westernization. This problem is actively gaining momentum in all fields of modern Russian and world social sciences - in economics, political science, sociology, cultural studies, philosophy, comparative history, social psychology, management, ethnology, etc. The interest of scientists to this problem is connected with the ambiguous, but crucially and dominant role of

the processes of globalization which increasingly influence on the development of some countries, cultures and nations. Globalization in a special way affects the fate of the multinational, multiethnic, multicultural countries and nations belonging to the Russian Federation. First of all the actualization of this problem is related to the reaction of these countries and nations on modern unifying processes, the stability of the socio-economic and cultural development of ethnic and cultural regions and countries in the world (Shalaev, 2004; 2008; 2013, and 2015).

An important factor of these protests and processes of social chaos in certain areas in the world is undoubtedly the factor of pre-figurative processes (transformation, changing of children and adults status in the world), liberal (of pseudo) values destroying traditional life and giving spiritual foundations of different societies in the world. Liberal values offered by Western civilization and culture, especially in its mass-cultural form. As some contemporary Russian researchers defined, this culture has become an important factor in the elementary fluff, selfishness and consumerism of the younger generations. Ultimately this could affect (and intensely affects) the negative reaction of many traditional ethno-cultural countries, areas and nations directed against globalization and westernization (Shalaev and Shalaeva, 2015).

The modern world entered the era of globalization with all its positive and negative consequences for many national cultures, actualizing the problems of national and cultural identity of peoples, self-determination in the ways of their further development in the situation of the destruction of many traditional institutions of the society, such as family, education, morality, religion and languages. Preserving the cultural and ethno-national mosaic in terms of global processes unifying cultural and civilized life of the people has become an important issue of our time and it is expressed in the growing protest and anti-globalist movements which are often decorated in ethno-cultural and ethno-religious colors (Shalaev, 2015).

The main concept of language behavior processes in a multi-ethnic society is a modernization approach, which allows us to consider them through the prism of their improvement, renovation and gaining stability. In the second half of the XX century the ideas of T. Parsons and R. Merton greatly influenced the establishment of modernization approach which became one of the theory modernization resources. Some American researchers such as Lipset, Rygge, Enger, Huarte, Huntington and other experts of the so-called "third world" of positivist direction were creators of this theory. They focused on economic and political processes, traditional social order and facilitated the transition of the society to an industrial and democratic format. At the same time, modern Russian sociologist Kravchenko defines two ways of implementation modernization: "from above" - that is, changes in the state economy and policy and "from below" - with the transformation of various forms of social consciousness and culture (so-called "organic modernization") (Dobrenkov, 2005).

Language behavior and language policy in sustainable development of the society

Turning directly to the consideration of the context of the modernization of language behavior, we'll try to clarify what is the modernization of the language? According to Shelestyuk (2012), this term means "becoming more widespread literary standard of the national language, the greater availability of all its spheres for other people, accelerated spreading of linguistic innovations and the status marker". Developing this idea, we note that the language and, consequently, the language behavior, being an integral part of the culture are influenced by all those modern innovations and innovations in the society. The important factor underlying the language behavior of the individual or an entire people is the processes of transformation of the language and developing it.

Our position according evaluation of language behavior (from the modernization point of view) is presented in two ways. The first is characterized by theoretical and methodological dimension, and is connected with the study of theoretical approaches like linguistic naturalism, linguistic synergy and linguistic ecology. Let us briefly discuss their characteristics. Within the framework of the linguistic naturalism doctrine, in fact, created by A. Schleicher (Nelyubin, 2011), the value is the language characteristics and language behavior as an object that has its own structure and laws of development that do not depend on the will of the people. Linguistic synergy concept focuses on the consideration of the communicative “neuro-synergy”, which is closely connected with auto-poietic (self-developing) languages of human communication processes (Haken, 1980), Maturana and Varela. The idea of belonging language to a social system was represented by F. de Saussure. This idea makes it possible to characterize the language behavior from the perspective of modeling of sustainable development processes of “opened modern civil society”, formation of its culture and the ability of the individual to the development, self-development, creative evolution, self-actualization. Linguistic and ecological concept characterizes the language behavior in terms of the impact of the system of social, political, cultural, mental, linguistic and other variables in the formation of a “normalized language”. It is presented in concepts of such researchers as Haarmann (Haarmann, 1980), Haugen, Burrow, Skvortsov, Skovorodnikov, Ivanitski, Savelieva, Shahovsky, Solodovnikova, etc. The spiritual aspect of the language problem is given in the concepts of Milovatsky, Sologub, etc.

A second aspect of language behavior study through the prism of the modernization approach allows us to explore the dynamic and applied characteristics of language behavior, in particular the processes of interaction between the factors of language behavior and language planning in the society in their unity, relationship, mutual influence and interaction. These processes are considered as dynamic ones and as subjected to influence of various internal and external factors. This context defines the role of the modernization approach in a new look at the problem of interaction between language behavior and language planning and their metamorphosis under the influence of social reality. According to this idea, we focus on the upgrade processes, changes in language behavior which are connected with the conditions of social changes and associated with the metamorphoses of social institutions and the possible implications for society and the individual. This context gives our investigation a philosophical orientation. Due to the approach of dynamic interaction and mutual influence of the language behavior and language planning we consider it as an important factor of social development of nations and countries.

In other words, this is the second aspect of the modernization approach which allows us to expand our understanding of the innovative features of language behavior and consider it not only in terms of the literary standard of the national language, the innovative language and the status of markers, but as the subject-and-object with its own structure and laws of development, which causes connection between language and thinking, and ethnic culture. At the same time, there is no doubt that these processes constitute an important factor of socialization of the active personality, able to form socially active person with some knowledge of contemporary reality, values, norms and motives of behavior and understanding of all these factors.

The term “language planning” in modern social and humanitarian literature is often used synonymously with the term “language policy” and “language engineering” and is treated as a conscious influence on the development of social language (both constructed and natural). It’s absolutely clear that the language policy substantially determines the linguistic aspect of the state ethno-cultural policy, which considers the language problem in terms of the formation of unified approaches to language behavior in the country and its regions. Language policy, significantly affects the ability to preservation and development of national

languages, taking into account the needs and interests of its people. The interests of the population for language and behavior problems are an important factor of possible public policy and government planning in a multi-ethnic society.

The influence of language behavior on the language policy is evident and it is considered by Ozaeva (2008) as “linguistic aspect of state ethno-cultural policy as a means of communication for a given territorial unit, ensuring the preservation and development of each language, in accordance with the needs and interests of its people”. In modern social science a discussion on the problem of optimal approaches to language policy has taken place. The author identifies three types of language policy - assimilationist, differential and multi-cultural. She focuses on the last one, due to which “high adaptability to the implementation of human rights standards and to attaining of social integration in multi-ethnic societies, its influence on the active participation of minority languages in the public sphere”. According to the authors’ opinion, this type of policy in comparison with the two others “provides a more viable strategy for the settlement of ethno-linguistic conflicts”.

At the same time we are the witnesses of the collapse of the multicultural policy of Western leaders and politicians. Their points of view “have not worked out”. Social ethno-cultural assimilation of representatives of various ethnic groups in mutual cultural and civilizational space, which led Western Europe to threshold of new challenges have not worked out. Apparently, it is necessary to search for other more appropriate forms of cultural and linguistic planning and regulation of ethno-cultural processes. This fact testifies to the growing role of language planning in the system of modern societies in a global world with its usual unification of multiculturalism, multi-ethnicity, contradictions and dynamism of social mobility (Shalaev, 2015).

Social practice shows the close unity, interrelation and interdependence of language behavior and language planning in modern society. As we noted, the term “language planning” in the contemporary socio-philosophical and social science is often used synonymously with the term “language policy” and “language engineering” and is treated as a conscious influence on the development of social language (both constructed and natural) (Jespersen, 1958). Indeed, the planning of linguistic sphere of society is the primacy of a language policy and its underlying ideology in specific language area (linguistic assimilation, linguistic pluralism and linguistic separatism describe three possible scenarios for most languages of multilingual interaction in society) (Ilse, 2006). Respectively the language policy is defined as the linguistic aspect of the state ethno-cultural policy and a common means of communication for the given territory, while ensuring the preservation and development of each language, in accordance with the needs and interests of its people (Shelestuk, 2012).

The main reason of any language policy, as an important mechanism of state regulation of ethno-cultural region, within certain limits, can be of conscious influence of a state legislation on language structure. Language in this case acts as a tool that can be modified, improved and recreated by the peoples’ will (see Tauli, 1968). This concept allows us to consider language planning as a deliberate exercise of state measures for codifying the rules of language contributing to the formation of ethnic, cultural, educational and other features of the language of human behavior in society. So, the main purpose of lingvocultural policy is the work with national cultural and linguistic material <...> (Shelestuk, 2012).

One of the methodological traditions of the language behavior phenomenon studies in the system of a society is its consideration as a part of the cultural landscape of the individual and society and the processes of their development. This allows us to consider the problem of language behavior, on the one hand, as the problem of the individual, and on the other hand as the problem of the society in general. At first it means self-development, self-realization, self-identity and personal socialization, in the second - the development of society, its stable and safe development. Social approach allows us to follow the mutual influence of linguistic

behavior and society. Moreover, this effect is manifested in the realization of individual and national characteristics of each individual under certain conditions that contribute to the realization of his creativity, identity and successful socialization of the individual, who, in turn, serves as a factor of stable development of the society. Otherwise, there is a reverse process - the destabilization of society and unsuccessful socialization of the individual. As a rule, the differences that exist in the language behavior of the various national sections of society often lead to social conflicts.

Adherence to national and cultural traditions, national and cultural stories, traditional national language of the titular nation (people born in a given territory) is not a sufficient factor in its successful socialization in a large company. An individual has to make a choice: to have a good career and wide socio-cultural development, and therefore to enter the great civilization or the commitment to the national cultural traditions and native language which limit the process of socialization and the development in the modern world.

In general the problem of language behavior is, on the one hand, the problem of the individual, and on the other it's the problem of society. So we can say that for example in multi-ethnic states such as Tatarstan, Bashkortostan, Chuvashia, Mordovia, and Mari Republic and other specific multiethnic regions of modern Russia, legislated national aspect of language behavior take place. At the same time, socio-political, socio-economic and socio-cultural conditions existing in the Russian Federation have a direct impact on the personal characteristics identifying individual and collective features of the language behaviors of people in all spheres of society: professional, informal labor, family and kinship et al., which is mainly used Russian language (especially in the fields of modern civilization processes), but at the same time at least widely accepted is the native language covering the sphere of culture and to a large extent the state activity and workflow (bilingual principle).

The role of language behavior and proper language planning is fundamental for multi-ethnic countries and regions in preserving the multicultural world. A particular type of linguistic behavior being in the midst of social development, in its transition periods of socio-economic and socio-political tensions able to arouse the opposite trend (centripetal or centrifugal) as it was in the "post -perestroika" period for example in the Turkic and Finno-Ugric regions of Russia. We can observe such processes in other multiethnic regions of the world (well-known example of Northern Ireland as a part of the UK or the movement of Basques and Catalans in Spain, etc.).

In such transitional periods in language and linguistic behavior of the inhabitants of these regions such concepts as "self-identity", "an independent state", "the national independence" which has a significant effect on the behavior of the population and the stability of the government area actively exploited. In other words, language behavior influences the functioning of society, stability or instability of the national and cultural development of the state. It is seen the close relationship of language culture and language behavior with linguistic practice, which was subsequently implemented at the regional level in the life of large societies.

Let's consider these processes on the example of the Mari Republic (Russian region), in which linguistic and cultural situation today is quite stable. Mari language is the language of common cultural communication here. But if a representative of the Mari nation strives to carry out his professional activities only in the medium of his language, he deliberately condemns himself to the local, regional narrow existence and development not leading to a real socialization. General situation in Russia is connected with this point, where at the same time Russian language historically got the status of the national state and communicative language all over the world. Russian language has good experience among people of huge global civilization. It is also a great cultural resource among the small nations of Russia. It has the possibility of contact with the world of culture and its life especially in the area of

civilization (practical knowledge, attitudes, and activities). Undoubtedly, Russian language is the language-translator, and at the same time it's the language of modern civilization and culture. For national language policy of the Russian Federation, for its integrated multicultural world and regions both contexts, the culture -regional, national, civilizational and public are important. According to the historical issue the states are unlikely able to create individual conditions for creative development for all members of the small nations of Russia. The objective reasons for it are not only political and economical, but also are the resource of the nations itself. In this way, the compromises are the most appropriate ways for the society and the small communities.

After all, even if we imagine that all population of the Mari Republic began speaking the Mary language, remain vague possibilities for this society to survive in general or to survive separately in the global competitive world. Not clear further historical destiny of this population and its prospects? The reason for that is the resource (e.g. lexical) possibilities of the Mari language, the number of its speakers and the possibility of their outside influence. For these reasons, the Mari language may not be relevant in many areas of modern holistic cultural and civilized public life of great Russian society and of course in the world in science, especially natural-technical, in a specialized vocational education, medicine, engineering, law and etc. This language is more typically realized and thrived in the field of artistic and cultural activities. However, the Mari language is widely involved today in the sphere of education and training, in some areas and narrow professional handicraft, mainly at the household and family level. This situation has historically proved and today a similar situation is common to almost all the national territory of the Russian Federation. And it is natural.

Adherence to national and cultural traditions, national and cultural stories, traditional national language of the titular nation, is not a sufficient factor for successful socialization in a large society. This is a historical question. Representatives of the small nations have always been faced with a choice: either to have vocational, career and wide socio-cultural development, and, therefore, to entry into the great civilization, or commitment to a limited area of residence methods of traditional economic and national-cultural traditions associated with their native language, limiting the broad socialization and development in the modern world. The fact is that the Mari people always had the compromise: either socialization in a large society, or the preservation of their cultural ethnicity. Such situation is developed in many national regions of Russia and in particular today takes place in the Mari Republic. The results of recent studies show that language is no longer a significant marker of ethnicity among representatives of national minorities; it is proved that cultural component of the ethnicity is more stable than the language itself. (Hilhanova, 2009).

So there are both positive and negative aspects in the life of small nations. But in general the situation is as the following: either to have preservation of the national cultural traditions of a small nation in a closed form (closed system), or to access to the wide road of modern cultural and civilizational processes through socialization in a large community. Victims and compromises are inevitable here. Undoubtedly a compromise is beneficial for small nations, and for the large society. For example, a large community is interested in labor, culture and intellectual potential of small nations. Asserting a large Russian society, representatives of small nations make considerable cultural and civilizational contribution to its development: national folklore (choruses, chants), the art of dance, museum, crafts and more. All this is a vivid example of integration of achievements of small nations into the larger society, and with the least damage to it and at the same time a large community gets apparent increase of creative national capacities. Of course, this entering into a large community is beneficial for small nations. After all this exit to the highway of cultural and civilizational development of small nations have got a real opportunity to save, transform and adapt to a large society

realizing their available energy, cultural and civilizational features and resources, achieving recognition and fulfillment of their ethno-cultural forces in the field of the big history (Buchareva and Shalaev, 2015).

As you can see, the preservation of national cultural characteristics in the society, “entering” a small community into a large society satisfies the participants of this process on both sides. Cultural and national mosaic of Russia is, from this point of view, its most important strategic resource, allowing Russia to be a great powerful state which gives small nations (which cultural and civilizational resource is limited) the opportunity to avoid the absorption and to survive in the form of cultural and civilizational compromises.

Conclusions

Ethno-cultural characteristics of language behavior represent a key point for many national regions of modern Russian society and, in particular, for the Mari Republic. The role of the adequate state language policy associated with it and language planning also underlying it is an important factor in promoting tolerance and respect for the representatives of different nationalities for all cultures living in the Mari Republic. N.B. Mechkovskaya notes that “the world is too small; migration is strong, there is intensive mixing of races and nations and there is interdependent environment. Modernization gives people a chance to live side by side, to get along with each other, to develop tolerance and to respect the rights of people living next to them and having another language and another culture” (Mechkovskaya, 2000). Consequently, the way that would be able to provide the future of small nations and minority of their languages, in particular, the Mari people and their language which is the way of a moral unity, strengthening of business and friendly interrelations with all peoples (living in the Mari Republic), have mutual understanding between them, a willingness to cooperate with each other (Soloviev, 1991). Against this background, it is the social context of the modernization approach which allows to expand the understanding of the innovative features of language behavior, which gives unlimited possibilities for the formation of new social technologies based on ethics and a deep rational understanding, the purpose of an adequate linguistic and ethno-cultural policy aimed at an adequate state regulation of language behavior in the interests of all peoples and cultures living in Russia. This linguistic and ethno-cultural policy is considered as an important factor of ethno-cultural and ethno-linguistic harmony and peace in the common cultural and civilizational environment, the existence of peoples in a single multi-ethical society.

References

- Shalaev, V. (2004), Bifurcation people as a basic social type of the globalization era, in: Shalaev, V. (ed.), 8th Vavilov Reading “Worldview modern society in the focus of scientific knowledge and practice, Collection of materials, Yoshkar-Ola: The Mari State Technical University
- Shalaev, V. (2013), *Current synergy: man and society in the era of global transformations*. Yoshkar-Ola: Volga State University of Technology
- Shalaev, V. (2008), World as a national security factor in the conditions of global Western World, *Regional Studies*, Vol. 3, pp. 272-278
- Shalaev, V. (2015), *Man and society in a globalized world*. Yoshkar-Ola: Volga State University of Technology.
- Dobrenkov, V. et al. (2005), *History of Foreign Sociology*, Moscow: Academic Project.

- Shelestyuk, E. (2012), Linguistic and cultural aspect of language policy, *Herald of Chelyabinsk State University*, 36(290), pp. 72-81
- Nelyubin, L. et al. (2011), *History of the science of language*. Tutorial. Univ.: Flint; Science. OSN.
- Haken, Y. (1980), *Synergetics*, Moscow: Mir.
- Haarmann, H. (1980), *Multilingualismus Elemente einer Sprachökologie (Elements of an ecology of language)*, Tübingen: Narr.
- Ozaeva, O. (2008), *Ethno-national dimension of the language of legal policy*: Abstract. Dissertation for the candidate of juridical sciences, 23.00.02, Rostov-on-Don. OSN. Available at: www.law.edu.ru/article/article.asp?articleID, Accessed on: 12.03.2016
- Jespersen, O. (1958), *Philosophy of grammar*, Moscow: Publishing House of Foreign Literature.
- Ilse, A. (2006), Of multilingual society: language policy and education in minority languages (Estonian example), *Questions of Cultural Studies*, 10, pp. 49-51
- Tauli, V. (1968), *Introduction to a Theory of Language Planning*, Uppsala: Uppsala University Press
- Hilhanova, E. (2009). Factors of language shift and the preservation of minority languages sociolinguistic and discursive analysis (based on the language situation in ethnic Buryat): Abstract. Dissertation for Dr. of philological sciences, 10.02.19. - Barnaul. OSN. Available at: www.dissers.ru/avtoreferati-dissertatsii-filologiya/a481.php, Accessed on: 12.02.2016
- Mechkovskaya, N. (2000), *Social Linguistics*, Moscow: Aspect Press
- Soloviev, V. (1991), *Multi-nationality is our wealth*, Yoshkar-Ola: Mari Book Publishing House.
- Shalaev, V. (2015), Liberal (pseudo liberal culture as a factor of global westernization and global governance, *Socio Time*, Vol. 2, pp. 112-122
- Shalaeva, S. L., Shalaeva, A. V. (2015), Axiological analysis of intergenerational relations in a globalized society: myth and reality, *Review of European Studies*, 7(8), 246 pp. 246-252
- Bukhareva, L. (2015), Actual problems of linguistic behavior and linguistic-cultural policy in modern polyethnic society, *Bulletin of Economics, Law and Sociology*, Vol. 4, pp. 276-279.

About the authors:

Vladimir Shalaev (shalaevvvp(at)volgatech.net) is a PhD, Professor, Dean of the Faculty of Social Technologies at Perm State Technical University, Yoshkar-Ola

Lyudmila Bukhareva (milab(at)inbox.ru) is a Senior Lecturer of foreign languages department of PSTU, Yoshkar-Ola

Svetlana Shalaeva (shalaevasl(at)mail.ru) is a PhD, Associate Professor at the Department of preschool and social pedagogy, Yoshkar-Ola.