Nationalities Papers, 2016
Vol. 44, No. 1, 20–37, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Language policy and post-Soviet identities in Tatarstan

Teresa Wigglesworth-Baker*

Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies, The University of Sheffield, Jessop West, 1 Upper Hanover Way, Sheffield, S3 7RA, UK

(*Received 28 November 2014; accepted 6 February 2015*)

This paper examines language policy and language use as identity technologies in the Republic of Tatarstan approximately 23 years after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Although Tatarstan is an autonomous republic politically situated within the Russian Federation, it has its own language policy which was implemented in 1992 and which declares Russian and Tatar as the official state languages having equal status in all spheres of language use. Additionally, as a result of an education policy implemented in 1997, Tatar language learning was made a compulsory subject in schools for all nationalities. This research examines how these policies have legitimized the Tatar identity alongside Russian from the top-down perspective, but how these legitimacies are not reflected from the bottom-up perspective [Graney 1999. "Education Reform in Tatarstan and Bashkortostan: Sovereignty Projects in Post-Soviet Russia." *Europe-Asia Studies* 51 (4): 611–632; Yemelianova 2000. "Shaimiev's 'Khanate' on the Volga and its Russian Subjects." *Asian Ethnicity* 1 (1)]. The focus of this research was to find out how effective these language and education policies as top-down identity technologies have been in post-Soviet Tatar society. An empirical research was carried out in Kazan in 2013 and revealed that asymmetrical bilingualism still prevails in contemporary Tatar society: Russian is used for everyday purposes by all nationalities, whereas Tatar is used as an in-group marker among Tatars within informal settings.

Keywords: language policy; post-Soviet identities; Tatar; Russian; Tatarstan; quantitative research

Introduction

This paper examines language policy and language use as identity technologies in the Republic of Tatarstan approximately 23 years after the collapse of the Soviet Union. During the Soviet period, Soviet nationality and language polices were extrinsically linked as part of the Soviet government's plan to assimilate all nationalities into a "Soviet" nationality which used Russian as the "Soviet" language. This resulted in the Russian language having high prestige, because it was used in the sphere of the government and all other spheres of language use. As a result, the nonnational languages were regarded as having low prestige due to the increase in Russian language use and because Russian was regarded as the language for socioeconomic advancement. During the Soviet period, Russians rarely assimilated into the indigenous societies of the independent states or republics. Therefore they never learned the titular language nor identified with the titular

*Email: rup07tjw@sheffield.ac.uk

© 2015 Association for the Study of Nationalities

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

population or the state or republic in which they resided (Brubaker 1996; Poppe and Hagendoorn 2001, 2003; Tolz 1998). After the collapse of Communism, many independent states and republics of the former Soviet Union implemented language policies as a way to establish the titular identity and to increase the prestige of the titular language. These policies have created many tensions within the post-Soviet space; for example, recent events in Ukraine and Crimea have revealed that language policy can be used by governments to try and establish political loyalties and identity in attempts at nation-building.

Many studies about the post-Soviet space have explored the top-down aspect of identity technologies which are regulated by governments through the implementation of language and education policies, but only a few studies actually explore the effects of these identity technologies from the bottom-up perspective. Some recent studies have challenged the top-down perspective by demonstrating that policies implemented from a top-down perspective are negotiated and contested at the citizen level (Kuzio 2001; Polese 2011; Polese and Wylegala 2008; Rodgers 2007; Shevel 2002). This paper contributes to the bottom-up perspective by examining how citizens in the Republic of Tatarstan have adapted to these top-down identity technologies, what their attitudes are toward them by examining proficiency levels of Tatar written language compared to Russian and English levels of proficiency, and the roles these languages play in contemporary Tatar society.

Background of Tatarstan

This section gives some brief background information about Tatarstan to set the context for this research. Tatarstan is a multiethnic autonomous republic which is politically situated within the Russian Federation. Kazan, the capital city of Tatarstan, is situated at the convergence of the Kama and Volga rivers approximately 800 kilometers east of Moscow, and Tatarstan is situated on the west side of the Ural Mountains and on the eastern edge of the European part of the Russian Federation (Garipov and Faller 2003; Graney 1999, 612; Yemelianova 2000, 37). It shares its borders with the republics of Mari El, Udmurtia, Bashkortostan, and the *oblasts* of Samara, Kirov, Orenburg, and Ulyanovsk. Tatarstan is a non-Russian republic and both the Russian-Orthodox and Sunni Muslim religions are practiced. The Tatar language is a western Turkic-Altaic language and is the result of complex linguistic contact from Kipchak Turkic, Volga Bulgar, Volga Finnic, and Mongolic (Brown 2006, 509). It is closely related to the Bashkir language (Grenoble 2003, 69).

According to the 2010 all-population census results,[1] 3.7 million people are residing in Tatarstan, of which 53.2% are Tatars, 39.7% are Russians, 3.1% are Chuvash, and 4% are made up of other nationalities, such as Udmurts, Kriashens, Bashkirs, Bulgars, and Azeris. Tatars and Russians have coexisted with each other over many centuries. As a result of this coexistence, two types of bilingualism have developed: Tatar-Russian, which refers to the language behavior of Tatars, and Russian-Tatar, which refers to the language behavior of Russians (Iskhakova 2001). However, bilingualism in Tatarstan is considered to be asymmetrical due to the developments and dominance of the Russian language during the Soviet period. Asymmetrical bilingualism means that Russians are monolingual in Russian only, while non-Russians are bilingual in their native language and Russian. In Tatarstan Russians speak Russian and Tatars may speak both Tatar and Russian. Furthermore, during the Soviet period Russian was used as the functional language in all spheres of language use, including spheres of government, industry and commerce, medicine, transport, school, and in the training of specialists. Tatar was only used within the home.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russian is still used as the functional language in all spheres of language use in many post-Soviet states and republics, even though many

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have introduced language policies to try to increase the functional use of the titular language.

Top-down policies as Tatar identity technologies

After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, a declaration of sovereignty was signed between the government of Tatarstan and the central government in Moscow, after the leaders of the Tatar government took Yeltsin at his word in 1990, to "swallow as much sovereignty" as they could. Many nation-building projects, which included the development of social, economic, and cultural policies, took place which aimed to promote Tatarstan's sovereign status. However, after Yeltsin's reelection in 1996, moves were made to bring Tatarstan's constitution and legislation in line with Russian federal laws. By 2002, under Putin's pursuance of vertical power, Tatarstan's status as a sovereign republic was changed to being a "subject" of the Russian Federation in the Tatar constitution.

Many changes to Tatarstan's linguistic policies can be linked to the political changes which have occurred since the collapse of the Soviet Union. The Tatar language policy was implemented in 1992 which declared both Russian and Tatar as the state languages in all spheres of language use within the republic, and in 1997 an education law was implemented which declared Tatar language learning as a compulsory subject for all nationalities in schools. Furthermore, during the early 1990s work began on the establishment of an official Tatar Latin alphabet, which would have come into force in 2001. However, in 2002 the Russian government made an amendment to the Law on Languages of the Peoples of the Russian Federation in clause 6 of article 3 that states that the state languages of the republics of the Russian Federation are to be based on Cyrillic graphics. Tatarstan made an appeal to the Federal Constitutional Court in respect to this amendment in 2004 and lost the case. This amendment has been regarded as Putin's way of curtailing what he considered as "separatist tendencies" (Graney 2009).

Even though the use of the Tatar Latin alphabet was banned, Tatar language and educational developments have continued, much to the discontent of Russian citizens residing within the republic, namely parents whose children have to study Tatar language in schools. The language policy and compulsory Tatar language learning law are considered to be symbols of Tatar identity which have been imposed on the republic's citizens from a top-down position by Tatar political elites (Alvarez Veinguer and Davis 2007; Yemelianova 2000).

Despite the implementation of these policies, approximately 23 years after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russian is still the prevalent functional language in all spheres of language use in Tatarstan, and the Tatar language still seems to be used as a collective symbol of Tatar identity as well as in the sphere of the home as a means of communication between Tatar family members or with other Tatar speakers as part of the in-group phenomenon (Giliazova in Minzaripov 2013; Khabenskaia 2002). This language use does not appear to have changed since the Soviet period. One of the main reasons for this is that Russian is the official language of the whole territory of the Russian Federation, whereas Tatar only has official status within the boundaries of its own territory, even though it has been developed for use in several spheres of language use such as education.

Other important reasons which may have contributed to the slow progress of Tatar language use as a functional language in society could be due to globalization processes, particularly the mass spread of English and the view that it is an important resource for social advancement. In addition, only Tatar cultural aspects are taught within the educational curriculum in schools: Tatar literature and history are taught through Russian

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

medium and the Tatar language is taught as a subject. In higher educational institutes, there is a clear distinction between subjects which are considered Russian and those which are considered Tatar. Science and technology subjects are "Russian subjects," whereas humanities subjects are considered "Tatar." In an interview with Iskhakova (personal communication 2010), the Tatar language is not yet ready to be used as a medium of instruction for all subjects. She is a prominent language planner and said that when Tatar language development was complete, they would be able to teach Tatar history in Tatar. However, during this interview with the author, she only mentioned the cultural aspects of the subjects which could be taught in Tatar in the future and not the functional, practical ones, which only highlights the symbolic side of Tatar education policy. A previous study by Veinguer and Davis (2007, 193), which examined the subjects taught in Tatar gymnasiums, found that teaching staff were more concerned about teaching subjects which promoted Tatar culture and included instruction in Tatar wrestling and Tatar craft workshops as additional subjects in the school curriculum than its functional use for everyday life.

Bottom-up perspectives on Tatar identity policies

Many studies have focused their interests on the Tatar population and how far the language policy has been successful in the development of Tatar-Russian bilingualism, that is to say, how Tatars are using languages in their everyday lives (Garipov et al. 2008; Iskhakova, Minnullin, and Musina 2002). However, very little research has been carried out into *Russian-Tatar* bilingualism (how Russians are using the Tatar language in their everyday lives). What is more, most research focuses on the spoken language among the Tatar population. This research therefore focuses on the Russian population, *Russian-Tatar* bilingualism and *written* language use.

The aims of the quantitative testing for this paper are as follows:

- To find out the impact of compulsory Tatar education in schools on the Russian and Tatar populations. Particular emphasis was put on whether or not there had been any changes in written Tatar language use of both populations;
- To examine attitudes toward languages in contemporary Tatar society;
- To clarify whether the globalization of English had had any effect on Tatar language use within Tatar society.

This paper is divided into three parts: the first part describes the research methods and hypothesis; the second part examines the results of test one, which aimed to define levels of written language proficiency for Russian, Tatar, and English. Statistical methods of analysis were used to analyze written language proficiency for both Russian and Tatar respondents. The third part examines the results of a second language test which focused on the respondents' attitudes to languages in the spheres of work, official institutions, the home, and information technology. The conclusion will discuss how far top-down identity technologies are reflected in bottom-up language practices.

Research methods

This research was based on empirical methods and was carried out in Kazan in May 2013 by the author.

The data were collected using a survey which was distributed among 187 respondents who were students from the faculties of physics, chemistry, and computer programming in Kazan Federal (Volga region) University; and the Faculty of Sociology in Kazan Technical

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

University and the Kazan Institute of Law. These faculties were chosen to obtain a wide spectrum of future professions among the students. The response rate was 93% and the students were between 17 and 24 years of age. The decision was taken to analyze students from this age group because they were the first generation of students to have undergone compulsory Tatar language learning throughout their education. Fifty-one percent of respondents were male and 49% were female. As far as the nationalities of the respondents were concerned, 41% self-identified as Russian, 52% as Tatar, and the remaining 7% were from other republics in the Russian Federation.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis for this study is the following:

> Russian and English are used as functional languages. Tatar is used in the cultural sphere.[2]

In order to test the hypothesis, two types of data were collected from two tests which are described in this report. Each test is based on the following assumptions:
Test 1:

1.1 Compulsory Tatar language learning in school influences the proficiency of written Tatar of the Russian and Tatar populations;

1.2 English is having an influence on Tatar language use.

Test 2:

The functional use of Russian, Tatar, and English differs between the Russian and Tatar populations.

Language test 1 – written proficiency levels of Tatar, Russian, and English

The aim of this language test was to find out whether the 1997 educational reforms on compulsory Tatar language learning were having an effect on the levels of Tatar proficiency of the Russian population. Since this law was passed, Tatar language learning has been a compulsory subject in secondary education for all nationalities in Tatarstan. Furthermore, the widening of Tatar language use in all educational sectors was brought into force with the implementation of the "State Programme of the Republic of Tatarstan for the Preservation, Study and Development of the State Languages of the Republic of Tatarstan and Other Languages of the Republic of Tatarstan 2004–2013" under article 3.4. The acceptance and support of this language policy and education law by both Russian and Tatar citizens would suggest the "acceptance of rules of engagement set by the state" (Shevel 2002) and therefore would show that these top-down identity technologies are reflected from the bottom-up aspect.

Methods of language test 1

The aim of the first language task was to measure the Tatar, Russian, and English reading and writing levels of proficiency of the Russian and Tatar respondents. This task was chosen in order to have an objective view of written proficiency levels, rather than a subjective view of language preferences.

Furthermore, another reason for carrying out this type of test was that if Russians say they do not use Tatar or English, then it is necessary to know whether this is because they have no functional knowledge of Tatar or English (in other words, the ability to

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

understand and compose texts) or whether they have this knowledge, but simply do not exercise it for various other reasons. Shevel (2002), for example, suggests that people's belief about their own language use could be seen as either a declaration of political support or resistance. Therefore if the respondents do not attempt to answer the question, this may be due to their resistance of compulsory Tatar language learning or resistance against the Tatar government who brought in the 1997 education law. Similarly, if they complete the English proficiency test and not the Tatar proficiency test, this could also show resistance toward the Tatar government identity technologies.

First of all, it is important to explain the task the respondents were asked to carry out and how it was evaluated. The respondents were asked to read three short texts and to briefly summarize the content of each one. One text was written in Tatar and had to be summarized in Tatar, another was written in Russian and had to be summarized in Russian, and the third was written in English and had to be summarized in English.

The marking system of this particular analysis is as follows: a score of 1 means "fail," 2 "unsatisfactory," 3 "satisfactory," 4 "good," and 5 "excellent." Each answer was marked first for grammatical accuracy and style, and second for understanding of the text. The criteria were applied to each of these aspects and then a total was given out of 10 by adding the two together. This means that a score of 6 was considered as "satisfactory" and anything below this would be "unsatisfactory."

Furthermore, the scores were grouped into two subgroups. The first subgroup represented an incomplete acquisition of written language because of the ability to understand the text, and therefore this subgroup would be classified as having *passive* language proficiency. This subgroup included all scores from 1 to 5. The second group represented a more complete acquisition of written language because of the ability to write grammatically correct language and use an appropriate style, so this group would be classified as having more *active* language proficiency. This subgroup included all scores from 6 to 10.

Zero scorers

A score of zero was given to respondents who identified themselves as nonperformers in Russian, Tatar, or English or for nonability. This could also be regarded as a sign of resistance to Tatar government policies (as per Shevel 2002). On the other hand, people who scored 1 were therefore analyzed differently. A score of 1 indicated that *some* attempt had been made, even though the answer was very limited in terms of understanding, grammar, and style. The score of zero was not included in the calculations for the descriptive statistics of the mean or median because it would have disproportionately affected the results. The results are based only on scores of 1–10 of the marking criteria.

Table 1. Levels of Tatar, Russian, and English.

	Russian reading and writing		Tatar reading and writing		English reading and writing	
	Russian respondents	Tatar respondents	Russian respondents	Tatar respondents	Russian respondents	Tatar respondents
Mean	9.68	9.88	6.76	7.93	5.68	6.49
Median	10.00	10.00	6.00	8.00	5.00	6.00

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Descriptive analysis

Russian reading and writing

According to the results in Table 1, it is evident that Russian proficiency levels are almost identical for both the Russian and the Tatar respondents. The results show that the respondents were able to correctly summarize the content of the text while maintaining style and grammatical accurateness. The medians of the Russian and Tatar respondents confirm that both groups of respondents have an *active* level of understanding and literacy in Russian because they fell within the second subgroup of the marking criteria. These results were expected due to the fact that Russian is the only language of instruction used in the education system.

A detailed study of the results revealed that 91% of the Russian respondents who answered the question scored between 6 and 10 marks and 88% of the Tatar respondents who answered the question scored between 6 and 10 marks. Fifty-two percent of the Russian respondents and 28.4% of the Tatar respondents did not answer the task in Russian, the reasons being either that they did not know Russian, they had a negative attitude toward the language, or they did not want to answer the question.

Tatar reading and writing

On the other hand, the results showed a significant difference in the means for levels of Tatar written language proficiency between the Russian and Tatar respondents. The medians show that both groups of respondents have an *active* level of reading and writing proficiency of the text. The tests' results show that the Russian respondents have a lower level of proficiency than the Tatar respondents.

A closer analysis of the results showed that 24% of the Russian respondents who answered the question scored between 6 and 10 marks and 68% of the Tatar respondents scored between 6 and 10 marks. In all, 71.6% of Russian respondents and 28.4% of the Tatar respondents did not answer the question. This could have been either because they did not know the language, they had a negative attitude toward it, or they did not want to answer the question.

English reading and writing

According to the results of English reading and writing levels of proficiency, a difference was revealed between the Russian and Tatar populations. The median results for the Russian population who answered the question indicated that they have a lower level of English proficiency than Tatar proficiency. The median results for the Russian respondents showed that they have a *passive* level of written proficiency in English and an *active* level of written Tatar proficiency.

The medians for the Tatar respondents who completed the exercise show that they have a lower level of English written proficiency than Tatar written proficiency. The median for English language indicates that the Tatar respondents have an active level of English as well as Tatar. These results therefore show that the median for English of the Tatar respondents is higher than that of the Russian respondents.

A more detailed analysis of the results showed that 36.4% of the Russian respondents who answered the question scored between 6 and 10 marks and 36% of the Tatar respondents who answered the question scored between 6 and 10 marks in English. In all, 45.8% of the Russian respondents and 54.2% of the Tatar respondents did not answer the question due to either lack of English knowledge, a negative attitude toward the language, or they did

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not want to answer the question. More of the Russian respondents answered the English reading and writing question than the Tatar reading and writing question.

The aforementioned results therefore show that the level of written English proficiency of those who completed the exercise was lower than that of written Tatar proficiency for both groups of the population. The next section of this analysis will examine the factors which have influenced written Tatar and English levels of proficiency.

Nonparametric tests

In order to examine the influencing factors on language proficiency of the Russian and Tatar populations, nonparametric tests were carried out in the spheres of education and the home. The Kruskal–Wallis test was used. This test is used to measure the medians between several different variables.

The sphere of education

Language of instruction in primary and secondary schools and institutes of higher education. First of all, the independent variables of language of instruction in primary and secondary schools, institutes of higher education, and different subject specialisms were examined. The dependent variables were the levels of written Tatar, English, and Russian proficiency.

The Kruskal–Wallis test did not reveal anything significant for either population for the independent variables of the language of instruction in primary or secondary schools. These results were expected due to the fact that 84% of the respondents claimed that Russian was the language of instruction throughout their schooling.

However, the Kruskal–Wallis test revealed interesting results for the independent variable "languages studied" in schools and in higher educational institutes with the dependent variables of levels of written Tatar, English, and Russian proficiency of the respondents.

Languages studied in school. As far as "languages studied" was concerned, there was no difference between Russian and Tatar levels of proficiency for either population, due to the fact that it is compulsory to learn both these languages in school. Tatar is taught from year one and English is taught from year three or four. As was mentioned earlier, approximately one-third of the Russian population and two-thirds of the Tatar population who completed the exercise showed that they were proficient in Tatar.

However, the Kruskal–Wallis test indicated a significant difference in the results for English language: Russian population $p = 0.038$; Tatar population $p = 0.021$.

Higher educational subject specialisms. The results showed that subject specialisms had a significant influence on the levels of writing proficiency among both populations (Table 2).

The results showed that educational subject specialisms had a significant influence on the levels of Russian and English written proficiency for both populations. This could be due to the fact that science and technology subjects are considered as Russian and English subjects. The results are also significant for the levels of Tatar written proficiency. During informal discussions with students, it was revealed that Tatar was a necessary subject for those who were studying business and management as well as Tatar pedagogical disciplines. This therefore confirms that Tatar is only necessary for humanities subjects.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2. Kruskal–Wallis results of educational subject specialism on levels of written language proficiency.

	Russian respondents	Tatar respondents
Distribution of results for Russian reading and writing levels and educational specialisms	$p = 0.007$	$p = 0.007$
Distribution of results for Tatar reading and writing levels and educational specialisms	$p = 0.04$	$p = 0.04$
Distribution of results for English reading and writing levels and educational specialisms	$p = 0.04$	$p = 0.04$

Language of instruction in higher educational institutions. The results of Table 3 show that the languages of instruction in higher educational institutes significantly influence levels of Tatar reading and writing in the Tatar population. This gives reason to believe that if Tatar was necessary in higher educational institutes for all subjects and the language of instruction was in Tatar, then levels of Tatar proficiency would increase and it would be used more.

Sphere of the home

This is an important sphere because it is where language acquisition first begins and where language behavior is determined. Iskhakova, Minnullin, and Musina (2002) claim that language use within the home is more important than language use in any other sphere because the home is where behavior is first learned and where attitudes are first formed.

The independent variables of nationality, native language,[3] nationality of father and mother, and language spoken with father and mother, with friends, and with colleagues at work are examined in this section as well as languages first learned to speak, languages used for reading newspapers, and languages in which people watch TV. The dependent variables were the levels of Russian, Tatar, and English written proficiency between both groups of the population.

The research results did not show anything significant for the Russian population, due to there being a strong correlation between Russian nationality and Russian language. These results were expected because the majority of Russians are monolingual and use only Russian in the home with members of their family.

On the other hand, the research results showed significant differences in the following variables shown in the following tables:

The results in Table 4 show that being of Tatar nationality influences levels of Russian and Tatar reading and writing proficiency to a large extent, which could be due to a high proportion of the Tatar population being bilingual.

The results of Tables 5 and 6 show that the nationality of both the father and the mother influenced the level of Tatar reading and writing proficiency of the Tatar respondents.

Table 3. Language of instruction in higher educational institutions and levels of reading and writing of the Tatar population.

Languages of reading and writing	Reading and writing level of significance ($p < 0.05$)
Tatar	$p = 0.008$

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 4. Tatar nationality with levels of reading and writing.

Languages of reading and writing	Reading and writing levels of significance ($p < 0.05$)
Russian	$p = 0.00$
Tatar	$p = 0.01$

Table 5. Tatar nationality and nationality of father with levels of reading and writing proficiency.

Languages of reading and writing	Reading and writing levels of significance ($p < 0.05$)
Tatar	$p = 0.001$

Table 6. Tatar nationality and nationality of mother with levels of reading and writing proficiency.

Languages of reading and writing	Reading and writing levels of significance ($p < 0.05$)
Tatar	$p = 0.002$

Ninety-three percent of the Tatar respondents revealed that they had a Tatar father and 86% revealed that they had a Tatar mother. This suggests that nationality plays an important role in a child's upbringing and language literacy.

The results of Table 7 show that language use within the home significantly influences levels of Russian and Tatar written language proficiency of the Tatar respondents.

As far as the variables for languages spoken with the father and the mother among the Tatar respondents were concerned, the results showed that the majority of respondents spoke in Russian. Therefore, the Tatar respondents revealed that in the home, they use both Russian and Tatar bilingually. The use of Tatar in the family increases the proficiency of the Tatar language.

Summary of language test 1 – influences on Tatar, Russian, and English writing

It can be concluded from the above results that compulsory Tatar language learning influences Tatar written *active* proficiency for both groups of the population. The results have additionally shown that compulsory Tatar language learning for certain subject specialisms in higher educational institutions significantly affects the levels of Tatar written proficiency for both groups of the population. The above results therefore prove that if Tatar language learning is compulsory in higher educational institutes as well as in secondary education, the level of Tatar language proficiency will be higher. However, the use of Tatar needs to be developed for science and technology subjects and it needs to be used more as a language of instruction.

Table 7. Tatar nationality and native language of close relatives with levels of reading and writing.

Languages of reading and writing	Reading and writing levels of significance ($p < 0.05$)
Russian	$p = 0.034$
Tatar	$p = 0.004$

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As far as English is concerned, the results have shown a *passive* level of written proficiency for both groups of the population. Therefore, it can be concluded that the globalization of English is not having an effect on Tatar written language proficiency at the moment.

As far as the results in the sphere of the home were concerned, the use of Tatar in the home significantly influenced the levels of writing proficiency of the Tatar respondents. The results showed that Tatars are bilingual in the home and Russians are monolingual. However, if the Russian population is frequently exposed to the Tatar language, such as in schools or higher educational establishments, then they will acquire a certain level of proficiency in this language.

Language test 2: a study of attitudes toward Russian, Tatar, and English in the spheres of work, the home, state institutions, and information technology

The aim of this second test was to define attitudes toward Russian, Tatar, and English in the aforementioned spheres of language use to find out which roles these languages play in contemporary Tatar society. Both groups of the population have the freedom to choose which they will use in these spheres, but their choice could influence how these languages are used. These spheres were chosen to reflect areas of language development and maintenance in the Tatar language policy and the measures of implementation which were set out in the "State Programme of the Republic of Tatarstan for the preservation, study and development of the state languages of the Republic of Tatarstan and other languages of the Republic of Tatarstan 2004–2013." The Russian and Tatar populations' experiences within these spheres pertained primarily to *written* language because if a language is used for official documents, it is considered to have more status and prestige (Fishman 1991).

Everybody has the same opportunity to use Russian, Tatar, or English for activities such as form filling and the Internet, but the choice of language from the respondents can reflect attitudes toward language use regarding how useful or necessary they believed the languages to be. Both groups of the population have the freedom to choose which language they will use in these aforementioned spheres, but their choice could influence how these languages are used.

Method

The Russian and Tatar respondents were asked to fill in a table in which they had to mark whether they considered Russian, Tatar, and English as *necessary* or *useful* in the spheres of work, home, state institutions, and information technology. A third category of *not useful* was created where no answer was given. The term *useful* means that the language marked existed within that particular sphere of language use, but was not used often or it was used by members of a defined social group. *Necessary* means that the language is always used. Cross-tabulation and Chi-squared tests were used to analyze the differences in attitudes toward languages.

Results for the sphere of work

This sphere was chosen to find out which roles languages played within the workplace and to find out what the attitudes were toward them.

In the sphere of work, the majority of respondents considered Russian to be *necessary* (Table 8). The results showed that Russian was used more than any other language in the sphere of work.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 8. Attitudes toward Russian in the sphere of work.

	Not useful (%)	Useful (%)	Necessary (%)	Chi-squared ($\chi^2 = < 0.05$)
Russian respondents	7.8	5.6	86.7	–
Tatar respondents	6.2	6.2	87.6	

Table 9. Attitudes toward Tatar in the sphere of work.

	Not useful (%)	Useful (%)	Necessary (%)	Chi-squared ($\chi^2 = < 0.05$)
Russian respondents	45.6	48.9	5.6	$\chi^2 = 8.174$, df = 2 $\boldsymbol{p = 0.016}$
Tatar respondents	26.8	60.8	12.4	

On the other hand, the results showed a difference in attitudes toward the Tatar language among the Russian and Tatar respondents. Half of the Russian respondents considered Tatar to be *useful*, and the other half considered it as *not useful*. As for the Tatar respondents, 60.8% considered Tatar to be *useful*, a quarter as *not useful*, and the rest as *necessary* (Table 9).

As far as English was concerned, the results were approximately the same for both groups of the population: Just under a half of the respondents had the opinion that English was *useful*; one-third considered it as *necessary* and the remaining number of respondents as *not useful* (Table 10).

It is possible to conclude that Russian continues to be prestigious in the sphere of work among all respondents, but Tatar is considered as *useful*, particularly among the Tatar respondents. It is highly likely that Tatars use Tatar at work when communicating with other Tatars. According to a study carried out on socioeconomic status by Stoliarova (in Garipov et al. 2008), there are both Russian- and Tatar-run companies and businesses within Tatarstan. She mentions that in Russian-run companies, of which the majority incidentally are state run, the spoken language used by all employees is Russian. Tatar-run companies use both Tatar and Russian for spoken language. Some knowledge of Tatar is required in these companies. In Kazan it is usual to have places of work which are either only Russian or only Tatar. Even within the state hospitals some departments may be Tatar and others Russian (personal communication with doctor 2010). Whatever the dominant nationality is in the place of work, this will be the expected language of communication. Therefore Tatars consider Tatar *useful*, whereas the Russian respondents manage fine without it.

All respondents consider English as more necessary than Tatar within the sphere of work. This may be because English is the leading language in the sphere of work and many businesses use it (e.g. to communicate with foreign businesses and for the Internet).

Results in the sphere of the home

This sphere was chosen to find out which roles the languages played in the home and attitudes toward them.

Table 10. Attitudes toward English in the sphere of work.

	Not useful (%)	Useful (%)	Necessary (%)	Chi-squared ($\chi^2 = < 0.05$)
Russian respondents	21.1	42.2	36.7	–
Tatar respondents	17.5	44.3	38.1	

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 11. Attitudes toward Russian in the sphere of the home.

	Not useful (%)	Useful (%)	Necessary (%)	Chi-squared (χ^2 = < 0.05)
Russian respondents	5.6	12.2	82.2	–
Tatar respondents	6.2	24.7	69.1	

The research results show that the majority of the Russian respondents considered Russian as *necessary* in the sphere of the home (Table 11). After examining the previous results from test 1 in the first part of this report, it is evident that there is a strong correlation between people who use Russian in the home and people who are of Russian nationality. Russian respondents are monolingual. Furthermore, half of the Russian respondents considered Tatar as *not useful* (Table 12).

As far as the Tatar respondents were concerned, they considered Russian as *necessary* and half of them also considered Tatar as *necessary* within the sphere of the home. The results of the first test from the first section of this report show that the Tatar respondents use both Tatar and Russian within the home with their relatives.

These results reveal that the family may significantly influence attitudes toward languages and their use. In the sphere of the home, the Russian respondents are monolingual and the Tatars are bilingual.

As for English (Table 13), the Tatar respondents considered it as necessary as the Tatar language, whereas the Russian respondents considered English to be more necessary than Tatar. Half of the respondents from both the groups considered English to be useful. It is highly likely that this is because they use English for the Internet to download music and other online activities. English has a different function in comparison with the Russian and Tatar languages.

Results for the sphere of state institutions

This sphere was chosen to find out which roles languages within this sphere and attitudes toward them play.

Table 14 shows that both Russian and Tatar respondents considered Russian *necessary* for use within state institutions. This could be due to Russian continuing to dominate this sphere of language use.

Table 12. Attitudes toward Tatar in the sphere of the home.

	Not useful (%)	Useful (%)	Necessary (%)	Chi-squared (χ^2 = < 0.05)
Russian respondents	51.1	43	5.6	$\chi^2 = 61.502$, df = 2 $\boldsymbol{p = 0.000}$
Tatar respondents	8.2	42.3	49.5	

Table 13. Attitudes toward English in the sphere of the home.

	Not useful (%)	Useful (%)	Necessary (%)	Chi-squared (χ^2 = < 0.05)
Russian respondents	21.1	42.2	36.7	–
Tatar respondents	17.5	38.1	44.3	

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 14. Attitudes toward Russian in the sphere of state institutions.

	Not useful (%)	Useful (%)	Necessary (%)	Chi-squared ($\chi^2 = < 0.05$)
Russian respondents	7.8	6.7	85.6	–
Tatar respondents	5.2	6.2	88.7	

The results in Table 15 reveal that Tatar is considered *useful* by both groups. This could be due to Tatar having an equal status to Russian as an official language.

As far as attitudes toward English were concerned, the results showed a significant difference between the Russian and Tatar respondents (Table 16). The Russian respondents had a neutral attitude toward English, but the Tatars considered it as *useful* as the Tatar language.

It can be concluded that Russian is considered as *necessary* to use within state institutions, whereas Tatar is considered as *useful* by both the populations.

Results in the sphere of Internet use/working on a computer

This sphere was chosen to find out which roles languages play in the sphere of information technology, such as Internet use and working on a computer, and attitudes toward language use. The quantity and quality of information within this sphere may strongly influence language use.

The results in Table 17 reveal that Russian is considered as necessary by both groups of the population within the sphere of information technology for activities such as using the Internet and working on a computer. This could be due to information on the Internet and searches being in Russian.

However, the results for attitudes toward the Tatar language show a significant difference between groups (Table 18). More than half of the Russian respondents considered Tatar *not useful*; the remaining number considered it *useful*.

The survey results for the Tatar respondents show that one-third of them considered Tatar *not useful*, whereas two-thirds consider it *useful*. Almost all of the respondents did not consider Tatar *necessary*.

As far as English was concerned, the results indicated a slight difference between the groups. Half of the Russian respondents considered it *necessary* and slightly more than half considered it *useful*.

Table 15. Attitudes toward Tatar in the sphere of state institutions.

	Not useful (%)	Useful (%)	Necessary (%)	Chi-squared ($\chi^2 = < 0.05$)
Russian respondents	37.8	51.1	11.1	–
Tatar respondents	23.7	60.8	15.5	

Table 16. Attitudes toward English in the sphere of state institutions.

	Not useful (%)	Useful (%)	Necessary (%)	Chi-squared ($\chi^2 = < 0.05$)
Russian respondents	27.8	36.7	35.6	$\chi^2 = 12.169$, df = 2 $\boldsymbol{p = 0.002}$
Tatar respondents	14.4	61.9	23.7	

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 17. Attitudes toward Russian with Internet use/working on a computer.

	Not useful (%)	Useful (%)	Necessary (%)	Chi-squared ($\chi^2 = < 0.05$)
Russian respondents	3.3	11.1	85.6	–
Tatar respondents	5.2	7.2	87.6	

Table 18. Attitudes toward Tatar with Internet use/working on a computer.

	Not useful (%)	Useful (%)	Necessary (%)	Chi-squared ($\chi^2 = < 0.05$)
Russian respondents	54.4	42.2	3.3	$\chi^2 = 14.159$, df = 2 $\boldsymbol{p = 0.001}$
Tatar respondents	27.8	63.9	8.2	

Table 19. Attitudes toward English with Internet use/working on a computer.

	Not useful (%)	Useful (%)	Necessary (%)	Chi-squared ($\chi^2 = < 0.05$)
Russian respondents	6.7	37.8	55.6	–
Tatar respondents	9.3	51.5	39.2	

Half of the Tatar respondents considered English *useful* and slightly more than a third considered it *necessary*. In the sphere of information technology, the Tatar respondents considered English as more *necessary* than Tatar (Table 19).

The results in the sphere of information technology could be due to the fact that information is more widely available in Russian and English than it is in Tatar. Russian is considered necessary in view of the fact that it is the main language used in society, and English because it is a global language.

Summary of language test 2 – attitudes toward Russian, Tatar, and English in the spheres of work, the home, state institutions, and information technology

The aforementioned results about the roles of Russian, Tatar, and English and the attitudes toward them in contemporary Tatar society conclude that Russian is considered as *necessary* in all spheres of language use by both groups of the respondents.

According to the research results, the majority of the respondents consider Tatar to be *useful* in all spheres of language use. However, the results show that there is a significant difference in the opinions toward language use within the sphere of the home between the Russian and Tatar respondents. Although the majority of respondents considered Russian *necessary*, half of the Tatar respondents also considered Tatar *necessary*. It is highly likely that Tatar respondents use Tatar when they are in contact with other members of the Tatar population; therefore Tatars consider Tatar *useful*, whereas Russians manage perfectly well without it.

As far as English is concerned, both groups of the population considered it as both *useful* and *necessary* in all spheres, particularly in the sphere of information technology for carrying out Internet searches and working on a computer. This could be due to the fact that English is a global language and there is significantly more information available in English than in Tatar.

It can be concluded from the results of language test 2 that both nationalities consider Russian *necessary* if the situation is *official*. There is evidence to suggest that Tatar is considered as *useful* in *nonofficial* situations.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Conclusion

The first language test of this study showed that many Russians are able to use the Tatar language with varying degrees of facility. Compulsory Tatar language learning at school and in higher educational institutes in areas of the humanities is the only possible reason for these results. Therefore if there is a *requirement* to use Tatar, then all groups of the population will be able to demonstrate a high level of Tatar written language proficiency. In this respect, the law on education for compulsory Tatar language learning in schools seems to have been successful as a measure of language policy implementation from a top-down angle. On the other hand after having seen that a large number of Russian respondents did not complete the reading and writing task, it can be concluded that this was due to an indifferent attitude toward languages, particularly Tatar. One reason why they chose not to answer the question may have been a demonstration of resistance to top-down identity technologies of the Tatar government (Shevel 2002). This attitude and resistance to the linguistic policies in Tatarstan by many of the Russian population seem to stem from the fact that Tatarstan is situated within the political framework of the Russian Federation and they feel that they should not have to learn the titular language because they already speak the official language of the Russian Federation.

If Tatar language learning within other spheres is not compulsory, then Russians will choose not to use it because they do not need to use it.

Despite some success in the sphere of education, these top-down identity technologies do not seem to have changed attitudes toward the Tatar language among the Russian population since the collapse of Communism. The second test revealed that all of the respondents considered Russian *necessary*; Tatar was considered *useful* – the Tatar population considered it *necessary* due to their cultural upbringing and Tatar language use within the sphere of the home; English was considered *useful* and more *necessary* than Tatar by both groups of respondents. Perhaps there is more motivation to learn English than Tatar, which may be due to the fact that the cultural and historical aspects of Tatar are taught more rather than it being taught as a functional language for everyday use. Therefore, we can conclude that attitudes toward languages depend on the situation and to what extent the situation is considered official or unofficial. Official situations seem to occur in professional spheres, such as work, while unofficial situations seem to be more personal. English was considered to be both *necessary* and *useful*. Consequently, in contemporary Tatar society there appears to be more motivation to use Russian and English than there does to use Tatar.

Tatar is therefore in a difficult situation because it does not provide as many advantages for career advancement in comparison with Russian or English, particularly from a global perspective. Tatar only seems to be necessary in the sphere of culture, the home, for careers in business management, and Tatar language teaching in educational institutes within Tatarstan. It needs to be developed as a language of the future for functional use in all spheres of everyday life and communication.

If a government policy does not address the issues surrounding the globalization of English and does not promote Tatar from a more global perspective, then English may displace Tatar in time due to English being a more popular language to learn. Therefore this research has proved that attitudes toward languages can significantly influence language use.

Although the Tatar government may not be able to change the linguistic behavior of the population through its language programs, it may be able to motivate non-Tatar groups into studying the Tatar language if it is more pragmatic in its approach. Tatar needs to be developed as a language for the future.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This research has shown how the Tatar government has legitimized the Tatar language and identity alongside Russian through the implementation of the Tatar language and education policies. However, the results of the tests carried out for this study have revealed that these identity technologies are not reflected in the language behaviors and practices of the citizens of Tatarstan from a bottom-up perspective. The hypothesis of this research can be confirmed, due to the above results: *Russian and English are used as functional languages. Tatar is used in the cultural sphere.*

Funding

This work was supported by The Centre for East European and Language Based Area Studies (CEELBAS) under the CEELBAS Internship scheme with the cooperation of the Department for Culture and Development of the Languages of the Peoples of the Republic of Tatarstan within the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Tatarstan.

Notes

1. 2010 Census Information http://www.tatstat.ru/VPN2010/DocLib8/%D0%BD%D0%B0%D1%86%20%D1%81%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%82%D0%B0%D0%B2.pdf
2. The cultural sphere in this paper is defined as incorporating features of shared Tatar identity such as Tatar history, myths, legends, art, ethnography, and language which symbolize Tatar ethnic belonging. These features can be seen on display in public places, for example on multilingual street signage around Kazan, through the presence of monuments of national Tatar heroes, Tatar cuisine in restaurants, and in the Tatar National Museum near the Kremlin complex. The Tatar culture is promoted through these physical displays of Tatar national identity, but it is not so visible in spheres of work and officialdom.
3. The term "native language" (*rodnoi iazyk*) is generally perceived as being synonymous with ethnicity among the Tatar population (Giliazova in Minzaripov 2013; Khabenskaia 2002; Laitin 1998; Shevel 2002). It is used as a symbol of ethnic identity. This does not have anything to do with fluency or how it is actually used. Tatar is often reported as the native language by Tatars when filling in census forms. It is used as a way to strengthen their identity and set themselves apart from the Russian population. On the other hand, Russians perceive it differently; although it is still a part of their ethnicity, it does not seem as big an issue as it is among the Tatar population. According to the 2010 census results, 92.4% of Tatars reported that Tatar was their native language and 99.9% of Russians claimed Russian to be their native language.

References

Alvarez Veinguer, Aurora, and Howard Davis. 2007. "Building a Tatar Elite: Language and National Schooling in Kazan." *Ethnicities* 7 (2): 186–208.

Brown, Keith, ed. 2006. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Vol. 12, Spe-Top*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Brubaker, Rodgers. 1996. *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fishman, Joshua. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Garipov, Iagfar, and Helen Faller. 2003. "The Politics of Language Reform and Bilingualism in Tatarstan." In *Nation Building, Ethnicity and Language Politics on Transition Countries*, edited by F. Daftary, and F. Grin, 163–184. Budapest: LGI/ECMI.

Garipov, Iagfar Z., Raushaniia I. Zinnurova, Minnullin Kim, Rozalinda N. Musina, Rafik M. Mukhametshin, and Lilia V. Sagitova, eds. 2008. *Sovremennye Etnokul'turnye Protsessy v Molodezhnoi Srede Tatarstana: Iazyk, Religiia, Etnichnost'*. Kazan: Ministry of Education.

Graney, Katherine. 1999. "Education Reform in Tatarstan and Bashkortostan: Sovereignty Projects in Post-Soviet Russia." *Europe-Asia Studies* 51 (4): 611–632.

Graney, Katherine. 2009. *Of Khans and Kremlins: Tatarstan and the Future of Ethno-Federalism in Russia*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Grenoble, Lenore. 2003. *Language Policy in the Soviet Union*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Iskhakova, Zaituna. A. 2001. *Dvuiazychie v gorodakh Tatarstana (1980–90-e gody)*. Kazan: Fiker.
Iskhakova, Zaituna A., Kim M. Minnullin, and Rosalinda. N. Musina, eds. 2002. *Iazyk i Etnos na Rubezhe Vekov: Etnosotsioloicheskie Ocherki o Iazyovoi Situatsii v Respublike Tatarstan*. Kazan: Magarif.
Khabenskaia, Elena. O. 2002. *Tatary o Tatarskom*. Moscow: Natalis.
Kuzio, Taras. 2001. "'Nationalizing States' or 'Nation-Building?' A Critical Review of the Theoretical Literature and Empirical Evidence." *Nations and Nationalism* 7 (2): 135–154.
Minzaripov, Riaz. G., ed. 2013. *Ethnichnost', Religioznost' i Migratsii v Sovremennom Tatarstane*. Kazan: Kazan University.
Polese, Abel. 2011. "Language and Identity in Ukraine: Was it Really Nation-Building?" *Studies of Transitional States and Societies* 4 (1): 36–51.
Polese, Abel, and Anna Wylegala. 2008. "Odessa and Lvov or Odesa and Lviv: How Important is a Letter? Reflections on the 'Other' in Two Ukrainian Cities." *Nationalities Papers* 36 (5): 787–814.
Poppe, Edwin, and Hagendoorn, Louk. 2001. "Types of Identification among Russians in the 'Near Abroad.'" *Europe-Asia Studies* 53 (1): 57–71.
Poppe, Edwin, and Hagendoorn, Louk. 2003. "Titular Identification of Russians in Former Soviet Republics." *Europe-Asia Studies* 55 (5): 771–787.
Rodgers, Peter. 2007. "Compliance or Contradiction? Teaching 'History' in the 'New' Ukraine. A View from Ukraine's Eastern Borderlands." *Europe-Asia Studies* 59 (3): 503–519.
Shevel, Oxana. 2002. "Nationality in Ukraine: Some Rules of Engagement." *East European Politics and Societies* 16 (2): 386–413.
Tolz, Vera. 1998. "Forging the Nation: National Identity and Nation Building in Post-Communist Russia." *Europe-Asia Studies* 50 (6): 993–1022.
Yemelianova, Galina. M. 2000. "Shaimiev's 'Khanate' on the Volga and its Russian Subjects." *Asian Ethnicity* 1 (1): 37–52.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2015.1046425 Published online by Cambridge University Press