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Introduction

Several models of ethnolinguistic vitality have been proposed over 30 years the notion has been in use. Some of these models will be discussed in some detail below. However, as Colin Williams convincingly argues in the introductory chapter of this collection (p. 26) „data inadequacies are a major stumbling block to the understanding of the dynamism of languages in contact.” It is true that for better protection of the world’s linguistic diversity, we need better data, but we also need better understanding of what kind of data is relevant. Such understanding can only be built on a theoretical model of ethnolinguistic vitality. This model should reveal the structural factors involved in ethno-linguistic vitality, be a diagnostic tool to measure the vitality of languages, and to pinpoint the exact nature of endangerment in each particular case in order to find the best protective measures for this particular minority language.

I have argued elsewhere (Ehala, 2005) that cultures function in an information space which the bearers of that particular culture create for themselves. As the information spaces may overlap, people are often living simultaneously within the spread zone of two or even more information spaces. Each such information space has a core that attracts people by satisfying cultural needs and providing a possible social identity. The matter of language maintenance or loss is a competition between two or more ethnolinguistic cultures that are in contact. The outcome of each particular contact situation depends on the choice that individuals make between these competing cultural affiliations and social identities.

I assume that ethno-linguistic vitality is a function of discursive factors such as values, beliefs and attitudes in a particular linguistic community. These discursive factors are only partly influenced by objective vitality factors such as legal status, economic strength and educational system. Although the objective factors are necessary preconditions to vitality, they are not sufficient factors. Thus, vitality should not be measured by objective criteria, but from their reflection in the group’s common knowledge.

In this paper I elaborate a fully operationalised evaluation matrix for measuring ethnolinguistic vitality. The evaluation matrix consists of 60 questions measuring cultural mass, intergroup distance and the extent of utilitarianism.
Theoretical Background

The concept of ethnolinguistic vitality (V) was introduced by Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977, p. 307) as a property ‘which makes a group likely to behave as a distinctive collective within an intergroup setting’. Since then it has been used in many studies and has gone through a considerable evolution. The first V model consisted of three components: status factors, demographic factors and institutional support and control factors (Giles et al.). In the early eighties, researchers started to distinguish between objective and subjective ethnolinguistic vitality (see Figure 1). The first expressed the actual vitality of an ethnic group, the second manifested itself as a perception of the objective ethnolinguistic vitality by the members of the group or the perception of the objective vitality any other group that was in contact with the group studied (Bourhis, Giles and Rosenthal, 1981).

Status factors
- Economic status
- Social status
- Sociohistorical status
- Language status

Demographic factors
- Distribution
- Number
- Birth rate
- Immigration

Institutional support and control factors
- Mass media
- Education
- Government services
- Industry
- Religion
- Culture
- Politics

(Giles, Bourhis and Taylor, 1977) (Bourhis, Giles and Rosenthal, 1981)
Figure 1. The factors of ethnolinguistic vitality

Objective vitality was measured analytically by assessing the factors that have an influence on it. The accounts of objective ethnolinguistic vitality are basically systematic descriptions of the relevant aspects of the demographic and broad social factors which characterise the ethnolinguistic group and the usage of their language. Because of the idiosyncratic nature of these conditions no exact measurement of the objective ethnolinguistic vitality is possible and thus the model remained weakly operationalised. Second, as the social settings can be very different for various ethnic groups, only rough comparisons were possible and this does not allow for the explanatory power of the model to be developed.

The subjective vitality was measured mainly by the subjective vitality questionnaires (SVQ). In the earliest studies (such as Bourhis, Giles and Rosenthal, 1981), the subjects were to assess the factors that were the components of objective vitality. The 22 questions in this questionnaire are relatively straightforward, for example How well-represented are the following languages (English, Greek) in Melbourne business institutions? 1 (not at all) ... 5 (exclusively). Later studies have shown that SVQ differentiates well between the in-group and out-group vitality, but is not able to reflect the vitality differences within the group. In order to refine the questionnaire, Allard and Landry (1986) proposed that it should address a much broader array of beliefs and followed the typology of beliefs elaborated by Kreitler and Kreitler (1976, 1982). They found that there are four types of beliefs that could predict behaviour: 1) general beliefs about how things are, 2) normative beliefs concerning what should exist, 3) personal beliefs about one’s own behaviour, 4) goal beliefs about one’s desire to behave in a particular way. Based on this typology and including Giles et al.’s (1977) structural variables, Allard and Landry (1986) developed a 24-item version of the Beliefs on Ethnolinguistic Vitality Questionnaire (BEVQ). BEVQ has since been applied (with modifications) in different settings (Allard and Landry, 1994; Evans, 1996; Kam, 2002).

At the same time Landry and Allard (1987) proposed a macroscopic model which is to explain the bilingual development of minority group members in an intergroup setting. Based on Lambert’s (1975) conception of subtractive bilingualism, Landry and Allard (1987) argue that the language behaviour of the members of the minority group in various settings indicates the probability of their language survival. The model was elaborated in several studies (Landry and Allard, 1991, 1992) and is replicated here in Figure 2 following Landry and Allard (1996, p. 447):
In this model, (objective) ethnolinguistic vitality is a function of a complex set of social and psychological phenomena that influence language behaviour and get shaped by it in turn. The notion of individual network of linguistic contacts (INLC) is the central environment where one acquires one’s language knowledge as well as attitudes towards...
These psychological factors start to affect one’s linguistic behaviour which in turn influences one’s INLC. INLC forms a part of the larger society and the changes that individuals make in their INLC will eventually affect the ethnolinguistic vitality of the whole group, giving, thus, a feedback to the socio-psychological level.

This model is further elaborated in Landry (2003) where it has two axes: individual-societal and minority-majority axis. At the societal axis the ideological, legal and political framework; institutional and social context, and linguistic and cultural socialization are outlined on the individual level of psycholinguistic development. The values of these parameters are located on the minority-majority axis; for example for linguistic and cultural socialisation, the minority axis has the value of solidarity, the majority one the value of power. The main difference between Landry (2003) and Landry et al. (1996) is that the 2003 model includes more influencing factors. On the other hand the dynamics and interplay of these factors is less explicitly stated than in Landry et al. (1996).

As the notion of V is so closely connected with language maintenance and loss, the models that try to explain these phenomena could be seen as closely related to the models of ethnolinguistic vitality. Clyne (2003) provides a comprehensive overview of the attempts to model the processes of language maintenance and loss over the past half a century. However his final judgement is that ‘no instrument powerful enough to assess language shift adequately on a large scale has yet been devised’ (Clyne, 2003, p. 21).

From among the several models Clyne surveys I look more closely at those that include factors that are relevant for V but have not been incorporated in V models. For example Kloss (1966) stressed the importance of the membership of a denomination with parochial schools and linguistic and cultural similarity with the dominant group. The general influence is that smaller cultural and linguistic difference makes it easier to change towards the majority group and generally the majority group members are less reluctant to accept new members from minorities that are culturally close. Thus, for the model of V to be more adequate it has to include the factor of cultural distance.

Further, Smolicz (1981) draws attention to the importance of core values to ethnic identity. Smolicz, Secombe and Hunter (2001) discuss the collectivist and individualist cultural values which are connected to language maintenance and shift. However, care must be taken in interpreting the influence of culture to behaviour, as attitudes do not often predict behaviour (Smolicz and Secombe, 1989). This notwithstanding, the value system certainly has an impact to V and thus should be included to the model.

Methodology

Scales of ethnolinguistic vitality have been widely used in the studies of endangered languages since the launch of the method. As the framework was designed some 25 years ago, it reflects the dynamics of the world at the time of its creation: the then
prominent communication domain for ordinary people was the state. With information exchange having become global in our own days, the situation has changed considerably. At present more and more ordinary people get involved in global communication -- a trend that was much weaker even 20 years ago.

This changes the linguistic environment drastically not only for minority languages, but for national languages as well. Until the 21st century the national centres of prestige were the main consolidating forces that worked for language maintenance at the national level. At present they have to compete with global centres of prestige. Considering the high mobility of people, prevailing utilitarian discourse (Scollon and Scollon, 1995), loose social networks and floating collective identities, the smaller and not so wealthy national language communities may well find their language threatened by a possible language shift despite the fact that by the objective criteria they could be qualified as having a high V.

Because of these global changes, the traditional scales of measuring objective V may no longer be entirely adequate. All the linguistic infrastructure, institutions, etc., may not guarantee the continuity of a speech community, if its members have acquired the idea that their language has become an obstacle in the mobile and competing environment. Thus ideological and symbolic factors, regional solidarity, high or low cultural self-consciousness, and visions of future created and disseminated in mass media could become far more important factors in language maintenance than they were before. The consequence is that we need more elaborate scales for measuring ethnolinguistic vitality, especially for the languages that by the objective criteria seem to be all equally fit and well.

In addition to this one should also take into account that the social settings are too idiosyncratic to be accounted for in a comparable manner across different linguistic contact situations. The accounts of objective V remain just descriptions of the overall situation that has too many particulars too be described exhaustively. Thus, the main weakness of the objective V lies in the difficulty for operationalising the parameters.

By not denying that the factors of objective V are certainly important, for the two reasons described above, they cannot be the basis for an operational model for measuring V: first, language shift is a consequence of personal choice of numerous people and these people make their choice not according to objective V, but according to their subjective evaluation of their group in comparison with other groups. As objective V could be distorted by the particulars in the societal discourse, its scientific description may not be adequate. And second, no description of objective social reality could ever be formalised to the extent that it would be able to provide standard scale for all possible linguistic environments.

The consequence of this argumentation is that V is better measured by assessing the people’s perception of the V of their language. As many authors have noted the speaker perceptions about the status and well being of their group appear significant in influencing linguistic behaviour (see Williams, p. 177-8 and Chalmers, p. 233-5, this volume). Thus, the perceived vitality may more adequately express the strength of the
group as a socio-symbolic entity; and second, it could be more easily operationalised so that the same procedure could be applied in wide array of linguistic contact situations. One of the best ways to achieve this is to use a multiple choice questionnaire format with standardised Likert scales for answers. This is the approach taken here, just as in the first subjective V studies like Bourhis, Giles and Rosenthal (1981).

The model

In this model, the V of a group G₁ in comparison with another group (G₂) is a function of three parameters: the ethno-cultural mass differential (M) between these two groups; the intergroup distance between G₁ and G₂; and the index of utilitarianism U which expresses some of the core cultural values of the group G₁:

\[ V = \frac{U(M₁ - M₂)}{r} \]

Provided that the questionnaire uses 7 point Likert scales, it would be reasonable to let the values of the parameters vary between 1 and 7. This is, of course hypothetical and adjustments could be made at any point where actual empirical data would indicate the importance of each particular parameter to the overall vitality of the group. For example, as the cultural values expressed by U do not seem to be the major force behind maintenance or shift, it would perhaps be better to let this parameter have values from 0 to 2. Following this, the value scale for the V could be characterised as follows:

\[ V < 0, \text{ the group is assimilating, the more so, the larger the negative value of } V. \]
\[ V \geq 0, \text{ the group is stable.} \]

In practice, the positive or negative value of the V depends on the cultural mass differential (M₁ - M₂). If the cultural mass of the ingroup (M₁) is perceived as larger than that of the outgroup (M₂), the V is going to be positive. If M₁ is smaller than M₂, the V is going to turn out negative.

The intergroup distance parameter r affects the formula in a following way: the smaller the intergroup distance, the more direct effect from the cultural mass differential. Thus, in the case of smallest possible r (r = 1) the cultural mass differential remains unchanged (M₁ - M₂)/1. The larger the r, the smaller the effect of the cultural mass differential.

The index of utilitarianism may have values from 0 to 2. In the extreme case where U is 0, i.e., when the utilitarian principles are not present at all in a given communication space, indicating a totally conservative culture, V becomes equal to 0 for all values of M and r. This means that the group is stable irrespective of its cultural mass differential: the members are too conservative to assimilate. In the case of the maximal positive value of U, the cultural mass differences will be multiplied two times -- such a group does not value tradition but acts purely on utilitarian motives.

It should be mentioned that this formula is only able to express two states -- whether the group is stable (V equals 0 or is positive) or whether it has a tendency to assimilate (V is
less than zero). It is hypothesised that the lower the value of $V$ below zero, the more likely the group is to assimilate, i.e., the lower its ethnolinguistic vitality. Nothing similar can be predicted for the positive values of $V$; a positive $V$ indicates that the group is not assimilating, but there is no assumed correlation between the positive values of $V$ and the relative strength of the group. The reason is that in the case of a positive cultural mass differential, large values of $r$ start to reduce the differential and this is not what could be expected — that the positive differential is lessened if the groups are perceived as culturally distant.

Before I address each parameter separately, I provide a few hypothetical examples to illustrate how the model works.

1. A group with a small ethno-cultural mass ($M_1=2$) living at the vicinity of a group with a large ethno-cultural mass ($M_2=6$). The groups are culturally close ($r=1.5$) and the value system is markedly utilitarian ($U=1.6$). For this group, $V$ is $-4.27$ which is obtained by the following calculation:

   $V = 1.6 \frac{(2-6)}{1.5} = -4.27$

The prediction would be that group has a low $V$ and is very likely to assimilate. To compare: the largest negative value that the formula allows is $12$ ($V = 2(1-7)/1$).

2. A group with a small ethno-cultural mass ($M_1=2$) living at the vicinity of a group with a large ethno-cultural mass ($M_2=6$). The groups are culturally very distant ($r=6.6$) and the value system is very traditional ($U=0.2$).

   $V = 0.2 \frac{(2-6)}{6.6} = -0.12$

The group is almost stable. This is a typical case of a segregated low status group which is also stigmatised by the majority. Despite the large negative cultural mass differential, the group does not assimilate.

3. Two groups with more or less equal ethno-cultural masses. The groups are culturally close ($r=2.2$) and the value system is utilitarian ($U=1.8$).

   $V = 1.8 \frac{(4-4.1)}{2.2} = -0.08$

This is a practically stable group. It could be a typical case of neighbouring nations. It should be noted that the formula only allows assessing the vitality of the group whose members are investigated, not the other group: what $M_2$ expresses is a perception of the cultural mass of the $G_2$ by the members of the $G_1$. 


The variables

M -- ethno-cultural mass

In intergroup settings people compare their in-group (G₁) with the prominent out-group (G₂) with respect to their cultural, political, economic, demographic strength and status M:

![Figure 3. Cultural mass differential](image)

M does not function in isolation but only in comparison with some other group. If there is no other group in the vicinity and G₁ lives in total isolation the notion of V becomes meaningless, and the only one that matters for this group is their biological vitality and sustainability.

Basically, the cultural mass differential in this model is conceptually very close to the early conceptions of V such as those by Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977) and Bourhis, Giles and Rosenthal (1981). As variants of these early models are still widely used (see Yağmur, 2004; Yağmur and Kroon, 2003; Shaaban and Ghaith, 2002; Florack and Piontowsky, 1997; etc.), the cultural mass differential module in this questionnaire was also based on this instrument. Thus M₁ and M₂ are measured in 7 point Likert scales of the following kind: (Not at all _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Very much) and the questions are as follows:

In your opinion,

1) a. How highly regarded is the G₁ culture and tradition in the society?

   b. How highly regarded is the G₂ culture and tradition in the society?
2) a./b. How well is the G1/G2 identity represented in certain aspects of cultural life (festivals, concerts, art exhibitions, conferences) in the society?

3) a./b. How highly regarded is the G1/G2 language in the society?

4) a./b. How highly regarded is the G1/G2 language internationally?

5) a./b. How much control do G1/G2 people have over economic and business matters in the society?

6) a./b. How well represented is the G1/G2 language in the mass media?

7) a./b. How well represented is the G1/G2 language in education?

8) a./b. How do you perceive the change in G1/G2 population size?

9) a./b. How proud of their cultural history and achievements are the G1/G2 people in the society?

10) a./b. How strong and active do you feel the G1/G2 people are in the society?

11) a./b. How wealthy do you feel the G1/G2 people are in the society?

12) a./b. How legitimate is the status of G1/G2 people in the society?

13) a./b. How strong and active do you feel the G1/G2 people will be 20 to 30 years from now?


**r – distance between the groups G1 and G2**

The larger the intergroup distance (r) between the low status G1 and high status G2, the least likely the G1 to assimilate and thus, the smaller the effect on its vitality of the presence of the high status G2.

Measuring r has not been a widely studied field, although there are a few studies and the topic seems to have become more popular. Generally the notion refers to dissimilarities between cultures in respect of a number of parameters, such as language, religion,
values, collectivism, gender roles, food, clothing, types of government, etc.. The first instrument to measure these differences was developed in Babiker, Cox and Miller (1980). Their instrument was based on 10 quite arbitrarily taken social and physical attributes -- climate, clothes, language, educational level, food, religion, material comfort, leisure, family structure and life, courtship and marriage. Their questionnaire, first used in Edinburgh settings, has been later modified and tested on Japanese subjects (Fukurawa, 1997). Both studies showed that particularly food, but also religion and courtship were important determinants for anxiety and depression.

More recent studies have shifted focus from cultural particulars to cultural orientations such as individualism, collectivism and power (Chirkov, Lynch and Niwa, 2005). Applying the scenario questionnaire to measure four cultural orientations, allegedly exhausting the typology of human societal organisation -- vertical collectivism (VC), horizontal collectivism (HC), vertical individualism (VI) and horizontal individualism (HI), they found a significant correlation between the distance in cultural orientations and psychological well-being.

As the previous research has shown, both approaches have been reliable in measuring cultural distance. Thus either of the methods could be applied to build a component of intergroup distance to the model of ethnolinguistic vitality. However, although the notions of cultural orientations are valid determinants of intergroup distances, in an actual minority-majority setting they may be too broad to discriminate the situation. The particular cultural differences between nested groups are often quite clear-cut while their cultural orientations may be similar due to a prolonged co-habitation. These divergent particulars are used as identity markers, drawing the border between the groups whereas the broader cultural orientations, as less salient, are more similar, to help to maintain daily communication. In some sense the cultural particulars make the border between the groups the less permeable, the larger these differences are. For the processes of assimilation or exclusion, these features are likely to have greater importance than cultural orientations. For this reason I decided to take the approach of Babiker et al. (1980). I did not take their questionnaire over completely, but only used some of the items (religion, food, clothes) adding one question which is to capture the more abstract differences in power structure and collectivism: namely, how different are the mentalities of the groups compared. I also added a question about discrimination which could be an important determinant showing how exclusive is the dominant group.

In addition, a good indicator for intergroup distance is the individual network of linguistic contacts (INLC, Landry, Allard and Henry, 1996) discussed in the first section of this paper. INLC shows the extent one is tied to one’s ingroup or outgroup. It is not an exact measure as INLC does not show how much is one attached to one or the other group, nor how much one is accepted by one or the other group. Yet together with the cultural distance questions a more reliable indicator could well emerge.

Similarly to M, r is also measured on 7 point Likert scales and the questions are the following:
In your opinion,
1) How different is the mentality of G\(_1\) people from the mentality of G\(_2\) people?

2) Could G\(_2\) people recognise a G\(_1\) person by his/her visual appearance?

3) Are G\(_1\) people stigmatised by G\(_2\) people?

4) How important are the religious differences between G\(_1\) and G\(_2\) people?

5) To what extent is the food that G\(_1\) people eat the same as the food of G\(_2\) people?

6) How much do you feel that you belong to G\(_1\) community?

7) How much do you feel that you belong to G\(_2\) community?

8) How much would you like to associate yourself with G\(_1\) community in the future?

9) How much would you like to associate yourself with G\(_2\) community in the future?

10) How good is your knowledge of the G\(_1\) language?

11) How good is your knowledge of the G\(_2\) language?

12) With my family, I speak only L\(_1\) -- both -- only L\(_2\)

13) At school with the other students, I speak only L\(_1\) -- both -- only L\(_2\)

14) In social activities, I speak only L\(_1\) -- both -- only L\(_2\)

15) With my friends, I speak only L\(_1\) -- both -- only L\(_2\)

16) When I go shopping and talk to salespersons, I speak only L\(_1\) -- both -- only L\(_2\)

17) When I use community services, I speak only L\(_1\) -- both -- only L\(_2\)

18) The TV programmes I watch are in L\(_1\) -- both -- only L\(_2\)

19) The radio programmes I listen are in L\(_1\) -- both -- only L\(_2\)

20) The books, magazines and newspapers I read are in L\(_1\) -- both -- only L\(_2\)

21) The movies, plays, concerts etc. I read are in L\(_1\) -- both -- only L\(_2\)

22) The books, magazines and newspapers I read are in L\(_1\) -- both -- only L\(_2\)

Questions 6-22 are modified from Landry, Allard and Henry (1996).
Each culture functions as interplay of innovation and tradition. The first one is grounded in what could be called utilitarian discourse in the sense of Scollon and Scollon (1995), the second in identity discourse.

The most important principles in utilitarian discourse for our discussion are the following: 1) humans are defined as rational economic entities, 2) ‘good’ is defined as what will give the greatest happiness for the greatest number, and 3) values are established by statistical (i.e., quantitative) means (Scollon and Scollon, 1995).

The principles of identity discourse are: 1) the essence of humanity is emotional; 2) the notion of ‘good’ is set by the moral authority; 3) values are defined by tradition. The success of identity discourse relies on the emotional attachment of a person to his or her important others and heritage as well as to his or her immediate surroundings -- the cultural landscape. This attachment is created by one’s upbringing and education and thus it is dependent on the structure of family and nature of educational system in this communication space. It must be noted that in a self-sufficient communication space utilitarian discourse and identity discourse are in a modest conflict of innovation and tradition, and this is characteristic of many well-functioning societies.

As all diversity, including cultural and linguistic diversity, has a plain economic cost, utilitarian discourse starts to work towards abandoning marginal cultural practices within its limits. Thus, given utilitarian principles, there would be no need for more than one language in one’s immediate space of communication. The more the new language takes over the functions of the heritage language the stronger becomes the urge to discard the latter altogether. Thus the utilitarian principles favour larger cultural communities and work for the consolidation of values within the single communication space. At the same time these principles also work for reducing cultural and ultimately linguistic diversity.

As utilitarian principles are symbolic, different groups may differ in respect to the salience of utilitarian discourse in their information space. The less salient these principles, the more conservative the culture. For example the Amish and some other religious groups are so conservative that they do not assimilate despite the fact that their objective V could be classified as very low compared to their surrounding linguistic environment. One of the main reasons for this is the fact that the value of U in these groups is extremely low, either zero or approaching it. On the other hand, the higher is the index of utilitarianism, the more likely are the members of the low status group to assimilate into the high status group, provided that they are accepted by this group.

Like the other parameters U is also measured on Likert scales (but then the scale is transformed to 0 to 2 scale). As conservatism and individualism, the values behind utilitarian discourse, are well studied, the questions were adopted from Schwarz’s (1992)
Value Survey and they indicate the ‘conservation and openness to change dimensions’ of Schwartz’s universal values typology, as follows:

Please indicate how much do you feel similar to or different from the people described in the following statements:

1) Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to him. He likes to do things in his own original way.
2) It is important for him to make his own decisions about what he does. He likes to be free and not depend on others.
3) It’s very important for him to help the people around him. He wants to care for their well-being.
4) Being very successful is important to him. He hopes people will recognise his achievements.
5) It is important to him that the government ensures his safety against all threats. He wants the state to be strong so it can defend its citizens.
6) He looks for adventures and likes to take risks. He wants to have an exciting life.
7) It is important to him always to behave properly. He wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.
8) It is important for him to get respect from others. He wants people to do what he says.
9) It is important for him to be loyal to his friends. He wants to devote himself to people close to him.
10) He strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to him.
11) Tradition is important to him. He tries to follow the customs handed down by his religion or his family.
12) He seeks every chance he can to have fun. It is important to him to do things that give him pleasure.

All questions are taken directly from the Schwartz (1992) Value Survey (as used in the European Values Survey, see http://ess.nsd.uib.no/index.jsp).

Conclusions

The problem of measuring ethnolinguistic vitality has attracted researchers over 30 years. Yet still we have not come to a full understanding of the complex nature of the processes of language maintenance and loss. The evaluation matrix proposed in this paper aims to be one step towards a fuller understanding of these phenomena. According to the model, the ethnolinguistic vitality (V) depends on the perceived cultural weight of one’s own community (M₁) in relation to the weight of a relevant other community (M₂); perceived cultural distance between the communities (r) and the extent of utilitarianism (U) in the community under investigation. Thus, the ethnolinguistic vitality can be expressed by a formula V=U(M₁-M₂)/r. As all the variables express the community members’ beliefs, a uniform evaluation matrix could
be developed to empirically to measure the vitality of a linguistic community and to express it numerically.

Two possible lines of research need to be explored. First, the group’s vitality is most certainly influenced also by the perceptions of injustice, unfair domination and illegitimacy of the linguistic situation, all of which may foster opposition and through this enhance ethnic mobilization. Such resistance towards the dominant outgroup may in certain conditions have a very positive effect on vitality – one of the best examples being Faroese that has successfully emancipated from Danish domination (see Benati, p. 284-290, this volume). Yet in other conditions, strong perception of injustice may speed up assimilation. Although the impact of this factor is complex, it is certainly important and thus, the matrix might need one more variable expressing the perceived discordance with the dominant outgroup.

Second, it is very likely that the actual vitality of the minority group does not depend on the attitudes of the minority language speakers only, but it is also influenced by the attitudes of the majority speakers towards the minority. For example Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, and Senecal (1997) have proposed an Interactive Acculturation Model that takes the dynamic interplay of host community and immigrant acculturation orientations into account in predicting the possible acculturation outcomes ranging from segregation to assimilation. This rationale needs to be integrated also to the matrix proposed above. However justified the theoretical improvements seem from the logical point of view, the best criterion for truth remains practice. Although the minorities tend to be very cautious as about being counted, categorised and differentiated as Colin Williams notes (p. 353, this volume), data collection is sine qua non for adequate assessment of the state of any linguistic community. The first tests of the validity of this matrix have already been conducted by the study of ethnolinguistic vitality of the Võro linguistic minority in Estonia (see Ehala and Niglas 2007). As the results were in concordance with the evidence available from other studies of this minority, some confidence about the overall validity of the approach has already been gained. It is hoped that the matrix will be further used in various linguistic environments to get both standardised data as well as to scrutinise the validity of the model even more. The accumulation of such studies would then enable comparative analyses that can be illuminating for the processes governing the ethnolinguistic dynamics in general.
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