Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (2013), **33**, 238–257.
© Cambridge University Press, 2013, 0267-1905/13 $16.00
doi: 10.1017/S0267190513000093

Language Policy and Education: Space and Place in Multilingual Post-Soviet States

Kara D. Brown

This article surveys recent English-language research on language policy and education in the 15 countries that are now two decades removed from Soviet hegemony. I examine how researchers employ geometric concepts such as asymmetry, parallelism, and trajectories to analyze multilingualism in this region. I then discuss the spatial turn in post-Soviet scholarship on language policy and schooling through attention to the ways language is produced in and through place, the management and experience of language in particular places, and the production of place through language and schooling. In conclusion, I argue that states have inherited schools with a Soviet-era commitment to multilingualism, but have been challenged to transform them into new types of post-Soviet plurilingual institutions—ones that generally promote the titular language, create space for instruction in minority languages, and educate in a foreign language. Evidence from these countries also speaks powerfully to the ways teachers, students, and parents use school space in dynamic ways to negotiate community boundaries and cultivate particular national identities through deliberate language practice.

This article synthesizes research at the nexus of language policy and schooling in post-Soviet states. This regional collection of countries, encompassing six different language families (i.e., Indo-European, Caucasian, Uralic, Altaic, Paleosiberian, and Korean) and close to 150 different ethnicities, presents an array of practices and strategies for education in a multilingual, post-colonial context. In this review, I focus on language policies and practices directly connected with schools and their related populations. I examine the policies attempting to transform Soviet-era institutions into new types of plurilingual schools—ones that generally promote the titular language, create space for instruction in minority languages, and educate in a foreign language (or two). I also focus on the ways teachers, students, and parents navigate school space in dynamic, deliberate ways to promote particular language-based identities and outcomes.

This massive, diverse, and linguistically rich collection of successor states to the Soviet Union requires a brief synopsis. The small Baltic (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) and Caucasian (Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan) countries together with Central Asian (Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Uzbekistan) states join Ukraine, Russia, Belarus, and Moldova in the region. The Baltic states and Moldova experienced about a half-century of Soviet hegemony, while the others were part of the Soviet Union for approximately 70 years. Together, the 15 states encompass at least 200 different languages. These languages range from Russian, the mother tongue of scores of millions and a language spoken, either as the mother tongue or a second language, by a large majority of people in the region, to languages like Barabinian that are on the verge of extinction with just a few surviving, elderly speakers (Ulasiuk, 2011). The national languages have official status and state support, while most of the other languages do not. Russian, the state language of the Russian Federation and Belarus, is the official language of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan and the language of interethnic communication in Tajikistan.

Public schooling both during and after Soviet rule introduced the population of these states to at least two languages, though with varying degrees of quality. Soviet authorities were committed to universal schooling; within this context, Soviet policies at times (especially in the 1920s) supported, targeted, and invested in the development and use of languages in addition to Russian in schools. A stronger focus on Russification and Russian-language instruction emerged after the late 1930s. In the post-Soviet era (i.e., after 1991), most states have attempted to expand the functions and raise the prestige of the titular language. These governments have also allowed for and encouraged plurilingual schooling with requirements that the official language(s) be taught as well. Kreindler's (1997) and Pavlenko's (2008b) reviews of multilingualism in the post-Soviet states are helpful for anyone seeking a broader introduction to this regional context.

This article is divided into four sections. I open with an introduction to the comparative parameters and methodological approaches of the research reviewed. Next, I consider the geometric conceptualization of language and school policy in the post-Soviet region: the asymmetries both in policy content and outcomes, the parallel (and intersecting) school worlds of language-based communities and schools, and the trajectories of policy development. Third, I review the emphasis on the role of language in place-based research in the region. I conclude with suggestions along theoretical, methodological, and topical lines for future research.

KEY CONCEPTS AND METHODS

While high-quality scholarship focuses exclusively on either language policy in the region (Cashaback, 2008; Ciscel, 2007; Fierman, 2009b) or on developments within the sphere of schooling (Blum, 2007; Johnson, 2010; Silova, 2010a), the interface between language policy and schooling merits its own treatment. Schooling is the primary state institution for reproducing (or interrupting) sociocultural and historical identities and knowledge. Language policy and use in schools influences, in sometimes unexpected ways, the vitality of languages. As Besters-Dilger (2007) noted, instruction is understood to be a "crucial area" that "will decide the fate of the Ukrainian language, since as many are convinced, the use of the language . . . will have a decisive impact on the language preferences of Ukrainian youth" (p. 258). I adopted a broad conception of language policy

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to guide the selection of research for this article. It includes the sociocultural appropriation of policy, that is, the ways that "normative policy discourse get[s] negotiated into some politically and culturally viable form" (Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead, 2009, p. 778). It also considers policy as a "legally backed mechanism to organize, manage or manipulate language behaviors" (Bulajeva & Hogan-Brun, 2010, p. 80).

In conducting a review of research published about a region in which 200 languages are used, one inevitably faces the politics and inequities of the language(s) of publication, research, and access (Altbach, 1989). Any such project requires clear parameters. To cover such a broad region over a long historical period in all of the relevant languages would require a monograph. To work broadly across space, I needed a focused approach to both time and language. In an effort to avoid privileging research in the author's regional languages (i.e., Estonian and Russian), I confined this review to research published in English by scholars who have drawn on sources in the languages of the post-Soviet state(s) of focus. I incorporated (primarily) peer-reviewed research, and at the editor's request, I focused on research published within the last 5 years (since 2007). Such decisions involve trade-offs, and I hope that the productive scholars in the field will undertake some of the alternative possibilities.

A focus on language policy and schooling in post-Soviet states invites the question: Why continue to group and consider these countries together more than 20 years after the collapse of the Soviet Union? Researching language policy and education in this region, whether this particular space is labeled post-Communist (Bulajeva & Hogan-Brun, 2010), post-socialist (Silova, 2010b), or post-Soviet (Ciscel, 2008; Kulyk, 2013), points to strong links between the Soviet past and the post-Soviet present. The territory defined by the former Soviet Union continues to be meaningful in researchers' geographic frames, and their exploration of the changing ways "post-Soviet" is constituted and contested. That said, it is important to acknowledge that the post-Soviet space hardly constitutes a coherent whole. Rather, the post-Soviet states "compose a cluster of disparate cultural and historical experiences and, no less importantly, a set of separate languages" (Annus, 2012, p. 25). This territory includes a diversity of cases: countries with histories of varying periods of independence in the early 20th century (e.g., Azerbaijan, the Baltic states, Georgia, and Ukraine), others with only 20 years of state-building experience concentrated exclusively in the post-Soviet period, some that are closely aligned politically and culturally with Russia (e.g., Belarus), others that are part of the European Union (e.g., Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania), many that have culturally and ethnically bifurcated populations in certain regions (e.g., Ukraine, Estonia), several regions (e.g., the Chuvash Republic within the Russian Federation) and states (e.g., Kazakhstan) that were highly Russified, and many others where the national language dominates. Given these deep differences, researchers claimed, in the late 1990s, that the new post-Soviet states "need no longer be treated 'under the same roof'" (Kreindler, 1997, p. 102).

Despite these diverse profiles, as we move swiftly past the 20-year anniversary of the breakup of the Soviet Union (in 1991), research suggests that the Soviet experience continues to play a formative role in current developments in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

language policy and education. Post-Soviet states all contend, in varying ways, with the enduring legacy of Soviet language policies that privileged Russian. Once the dominant and official language of the Soviet Union, Russian continues to play some type of influential role in the policies of these countries. As Verschik (2009) noted, "all languages spoken on post-Soviet territory have been or still are in contact with Russian" (p. 299). Many scholars researching post-Soviet language policy and schooling have argued that current developments can be understood either as a reaction to or an extension of Soviet-era policies promoting Russian. Besters-Dilger (2007) posited that Ukrainian-language policy "can only be understood from an historical perspective, as a reaction to the Russification policy of the twentieth century" (p. 283). In contrast, in Belarus, Woolhiser (2007) found that "there is undeniable continuity with late Soviet-era language policies . . . under Lukashenka" (p. 379).

Systemically, all post-Soviet states also inherited school systems that worked in deliberate ways to promote certain languages (i.e., Russian and/or the titular language, depending on the era). Schools also had a history of marginalizing and undermining languages (i.e., titular language, depending on the era, and regional and many minority languages). Post-Soviet states were left with an educational infrastructure of separate schools where the primary medium of instruction was the titular language, a minority language or Russian. The extent of the division depends on the state. Latvia and Estonia, for example, were left with a bifurcated or "dual school system" (Silova, 2006, p. xii) with separate schooling provided in the titular language and in Russian. Ukraine, however, inherited schools using Hungarian, Polish, Russian, and Romanian/Moldovan as the medium of instruction (Kulyk, 2013), a practice that has strongly influenced the development of minority (or nondominant) language instruction in the post-Soviet period. I return to the theme of minority-language schooling in the next section.

Researchers continue to make sense of the region by comparing within and across former republics. Although the bulk of the research on language policy and education in post-Soviet states continues to focus on one country, scholars have directed their comparative lens across the whole post-Soviet region to generate meaning and understanding. Examinations of the continued role of Russian generally compare across the post-Soviet sphere. Examples of this approach are Fierman's (2012) exploration of this topic in Central Asia, the South Caucasus, and the Baltic states, as well as Pavlenko's (2008c) research on Russian in all the post-Soviet states. Other comparative examinations focusing on select states within this region result primarily from the linguistic and area-studies expertise of a distinct team of researchers. This select comparison of post-Soviet states is evidenced in Silova, Mead, and Palandjian's (in press) analysis of place-making in Latvian-, Armenian-, and Ukrainian-language primers, and in Nedelcu, Iucu, and Ciolan's (2010–11) examination of student perceptions of the "other" in linguistically separated schools.

Notably, research has begun to shift away from *transitology*, or "the perspective that continued to organize the world in flat Cold War binaries of capitalist West and Communist East" (Chari & Verdery, 2009, p. 9). Researchers now extend their comparisons beyond the former Soviet Union. The basis of these

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

comparisons ranges tremendously. In some cases, countries have "two related languages and correlated identities" that influence the sociopolitical dynamics, like that between Ukrainian and Russian (in Ukraine), Catalan and Castilian Spanish (in Spain), and Corsican and French (in France) (Bilaniuk & Melnyk, 2008, p. 343). In other cases, language relationships, like that in Belgium between the Flemish and Dutch, serve as potentially analogous to the tension between Moldovan and Romanian in Moldova (Ciscel, 2008, p. 377). Researchers have found that comparisons based on the geographic positions and aspirations of neighboring powers also are instructive. For example, Bilaniuk and Melnyk suggested Taiwan as a compelling comparative case for understanding the language situation in Ukraine. In drawing this parallel, Bilaniuk and Melnyk highlighted the high status of Russian and Mandarin vis-à-vis Ukrainian and Taiwanese, and they argued that that both Russian and Mandarin are the primary languages of geographically large neighbors that have broad geopolitical aspirations. Finally, researchers have focused on comparing the policies and practices around languages, such as for Catalan and Estonian, which were once repressed under authoritarian regimes but now experience support from democratic governments (Soler, 2013). Post-colonial countries, like India, Peru, and Nigeria, have also emerged as points of comparison with post-Soviet states because they also contend with "standardization and the status of precolonial language(s) and with the inertial status of the colonial standard language and its speakers" (Ciscel, 2008, p. 376).

Researchers have applied post-colonial theories to understand language and education policy and practice in post-Soviet countries. Scholars continue to grapple with post-socialism as an analytic construct and the relationship between post-socialism and post-colonialism. Silova (2010b) advocated employing the term "post-socialist" not only on a geographic basis to depict the former socialist states, but also to describe a "condition" (p. 4). Tulbure (2009) argued that a "parallel between postsocialism and postcolonialism is not only possible, but necessary for understanding the practices of dominance around the world" (p. 6). Scholars have noted the differing regional applicability of colonial models given the vastly different language histories and policies across the former Soviet Union. Even within one post-Soviet state, as research on Ukraine reveals, one can find differences and similarities with other post-colonial countries. Ukraine is distinct from other post-colonial cases because the "languages and cultures of the colonizing regimes (most notably, Russia and Poland) were closely related to those of Ukraine" (Bilaniuk & Melnyk, 2008, p. 341). Ukraine was similar, however, in the domination experienced and the forcible extraction of resources. Ciscel (2008) presented Moldovan language policy and education in a post-colonial frame, noting that as in other post-colonial nation-states, "the role of language education is often complicated by competition among local languages and the language(s) of recent colonial domination" (p. 373).

Research voices and methods have continued to diversify over the past 5 years. In addition to contributions of long-standing scholars on language policy and education in the former Soviet Union (e.g., in particular, Fierman 2009a, 2009b, 2012; but also Hogan-Brun, 2010; Pavlenko, 2006, 2008b, 2008c, 2010), a new generation of language policy and education researchers is emerging (see,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

e.g., Cara, 2010; Chevalier, 2010; Pauly, 2009). They bring a range of disciplinary expertise to their analyses of language policy and schooling. Scholarship also reflects new collaborative efforts between researchers from within and outside their countries in question (see Bulajeva & Hogan-Brun, 2010; Orusbaev, Mustajoki, & Protassova, 2008). There are significant contributions from so-called insider/outsider scholars, such as Alvarez Veinguer, who had a Russian education but is from Western Europe, and Silova, who was educated in Soviet-era Latvia but received her advanced training in the United States. These complex perspectives bring multiple frames of understanding and a range of local language skills to research endeavors.

In addition to these new voices, the research methods that are used to explore language policy and education in the post-Soviet states have also grown in sophistication. Part of this methodological growth may be linked with the theoretical attention given to post-colonial approaches. On this point, Chari and Verdery (2009) argued that the marriage of post-socialist and post-colonial studies "raises ... methodological parallels" including the use of once-closed archives and "new forms of ethnographic engagement" (pp. 11–12). In addition to the use of ethnography (Alvarez Veinguer & Davis, 2007; Brown, 2010), researchers have turned to historical analysis through archival investigations (Pauly, 2009), participant observation and interviews in schools (Friedman, 2009; Polese, 2010), and critical discourse analysis (Silova et al., in press). For these researchers, attention to the "micro-sociolinguistic" context provides rich insights into "the forces that shape language use, and the social and political impact of language use" (Bilaniuk & Melnyk, 2008, p. 357). These qualitative research methods can help draw attention to and unpack the intricacy of language, identity, and school categories. For example, Bilaniuk and Melnyk noted that in Ukraine "identity and language labels that subsume a great deal of complexity" (p. 357) may not be captured in statistical data. Ciscel (2008) echoed this concern with his note about Moldovan language norms: "care should be taken to recognize the linguistic complexity that underlies the notion of the standard" (p. 376). Together with new methods and voices, new metaphors are brought to bear on the challenges of language, policy, and education across time, space, and place. In particular, scholars have drawn on geometrical references to characterize the evolving dynamics of language across the region.

GEOMETRIC CONCEPTS

Geometric concepts have become indispensable to scholars who seek to explain the workings and outcomes of language policy and education in post-Soviet states. Terms like asymmetry, parallel, and trajectory are regularly invoked and applied to language policy and school-related practices. Such concepts help scholars organize a diverse region conceptually and make sense of commonalities and unique dynamics across the region. These geometric perspectives highlight the legacies of Soviet-era policies, persistent power imbalances, and paths of future development.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Asymmetry

Scholars first identified and invoked the notion of sociolinguistic asymmetry during the Soviet period (see, e.g., Kreindler's [1985] edited volume). Recent research on post-Soviet language and schooling has found that several Soviet-era patterns of asymmetry—from asymmetrical bilingualism to the uneven availability of instruction in titular and minority languages—persist well into the 21st century. Efforts to address and disrupt these dynamics are ongoing and have resulted in the cultivation of new sociolinguistic practices and identities.

Historic asymmetrical bilingualism—what Dilans (2009) labeled as "Soviet-era bilingualism" (p. 7), with the so-called local (i.e., nonethnic Russian) populations bilingual in Russian and their mother tongue (and/or national language) and the Russians lacking skills in the local language—continues to exist in the post-Soviet period. Researchers have highlighted how this "one-way process" of asymmetrical bilingualism "reinforces feelings of injustice, unfairness, inequality, cultural domination and discrimination" (Alvarez Veinguer & Davis, 2007, p. 202). Recent research attests to the new language practices developing in response to this linguistic asymmetry and the emerging symmetrical bilingualism. Bilaniuk and Melnyk (2008) noted the phenomenon of "non-accommodating bilingualism" in Ukraine, in which "each speaker uses their preferred language (Ukrainian or Russian) regardless of the language others are speaking" (p. 358). Giger and Sloboda (2008, p. 320) introduced the concept of "non-parallel bilingualism" based on their research of Belarus, where texts (i.e., signs, textbooks, etc.) are published only in one language and without translation into Russian or Belarusian.

In other cases, researchers have highlighted evidence of increased bilingualism among Russians and a reversal of linguistic asymmetries. Dilans (2009) suggested that a post-Soviet language ideology may be developing in Latvia where Russian speakers are the "new bilinguals . . . which may subsequently help them to balance the new enforced type of bilingualism with personal and group confidence in light of the experienced power shift" (p. 8). Likewise, Verschik (2008) pointed to the increased numbers of Russians in Estonia learning and speaking Estonian. Recent scholarship also points to the development of a distinct, post-Soviet bilingual asymmetry with the local, non-Russian population speaking a second language other than Russian, while the Russian population speaks the titular language. On this point, Ciscel (2008) notes that more Russians in Moldova speak the local language, while Moldovan/Romanian children are less likely to be able to speak Russian (p. 384). School policies cultivate opportunities for this pattern to establish itself more deeply. For example, decisions to increase hours dedicated to English instruction and eliminate or reduce Russian hours, in countries like Uzbekistan, generate greater opportunities to hone English skills for those students learning in Uzbek-medium schools (Hasanova, 2007).

Post-Soviet governments, in their attempt to address the historic asymmetries evident in the curriculum, have utilized schools to promote language competencies in the titular and minority languages. Titular-language learning, particularly in schools serving minority populations, has emerged as an integral aspect of the promotion of stronger national and civic identities. Hogan-Brun (2010) observed that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> education has been used as an important means of re-centering the cultural capital of a now dominant group (the originally resident population) upon the sizeable Russian-speaking section of the school population, with the political aim to transfer social capital through objects such as books, qualifications and, symbolically, the titular language. (p. 5)

Researchers working in post-Soviet Ukraine have noted, for example, the dramatic increase in the percentage of schools using Ukrainian as the language of instruction—from 45% in 1991 to 78% in 2005 (Bilaniuk & Melnyk, 2008; see, though, the discussion later in this article about the challenges of counting schools as Ukrainian).

Post-Soviet developments also include government commitments to expand opportunities to learn (in) national minority languages as noted, among others, by Ulasiuk's (2011) review of the increase in minority-language language schools across the Russian Federation in the early 21st century, and by Kalynovs'ka's (2009) report of a growing number of schools in Ukraine using Crimean Tatar, Hungarian, and Polish as the languages of instruction. These post-Soviet developments echo historic commitments to utilize schools in the early 20th century to develop minority identities and languages; several researchers have drawn attention to this historic continuity between past and present language policy developments in schools. Alvarez Veinguer and Davis (2007) pointed to the central role schools play in the Tatar renaissance in Tatarstan (in the Russian Federation) and found the Tatar-language gymnasia to be "dedicated to monocultural and monoethnic transmission, echoing the institutions created during earlier stages of Tatar cultural revival. Their clear objective is to provide education based on national ethnic culture, and popular traditions" (p. 190). The reengagement with historic efforts to use schools to promote minority identity is also echoed in Chevalier's (2010) research on bilingualism in the Tyvan Republic in the Russian Federation, highlighting the important role that schools played in cultivating Tuvan literacy and identity in the 1920s.

Yet, asymmetries persist in the availability and quality of instruction in the titular language. In some cases, geography dictates availability. Research from Ukraine (Besters-Dilger, 2007; Kalynovs'ka, 2009) points to a regional underrepresentation of Ukrainian-medium schools in the southern and eastern regions of the country as well as in Crimea. This imbalance led Besters-Dilger to be concerned that one potential development in Ukraine could be a "west-east polarization (or Ukrainian-Russian segregation)" with an absence of Ukrainian-medium schools in the eastern part of the country and of Russian-medium schools in the western region (Besters-Dilger, 2007, p. 282).

The problem of low-quality titular language education in the Russian-language track schools extends a similar pattern from the Soviet era. Rannut (2008) noted that Estonian-as-a-second language teaching strategies have failed to bring about "the required returns" as evidenced by the lack of Estonian-language skills of Russian-medium school students (p. 435). Among Russians in several Central Asian countries, the rising prestige and interest in learning English, and in some areas increased attention to Turkish and Arabic instruction (see Orusbaev et al.,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2008, on Kyrgyzstan), forecloses opportunities to learn the local language, a dynamic that compounds the Soviet-era marginalization of local language instruction in Russian-track schooling. Finally, the expansion of innovative titular language programming within Russian-medium schools is hampered by teacher shortages. Scholars from Estonia have reported facing a shortage of qualified teachers for their content and language integrated learning (CLIL) programs (Mehisto & Asser, 2007). Thus far, this successful approach delivers about half of the subjects in the Estonian language to participating Russian-medium schools (in 48 Russian-language schools and kindergartens); further expansion of the program rests on the availability of qualified Estonian-language teachers.

Despite the general shift in state support for instruction in the national language, significant forces work to maintain and advance the important role of Russian in schools within many post-Soviet states. First, demographic patterns support the prominent role of Russian in education. Governing elites, who need constituent support among both the majority ethnic and the Russian population in places, for example, like the Chuvash Republic (in the Russian Federation), strike a balance between enhancing national awareness and not disturbing the Russophone population (Marquardt, 2012). Maintaining a commitment to Russian-language education is one way to maintain this harmony. In several countries, Russian continues to be the lingua franca or, at least, the language of interethnic communication. In Georgia, for example, linguistic minorities use Russian for interethnic communication with the state (Pavlenko, 2008c). The Tajik government, likewise, supports the improvement of teaching Russian in schools, in part, to develop Russian as the language of interethnic communication with other former Soviet republics (Nagzibekova, 2008).

In addition to a multiethnic population potentially working to secure a place for Russian in schools, urbanization acts as a force leading to the continued dominance of Russian-language education. The concentration of Russian speakers in city centers in several post-Soviet states has resulted in an abundance of Russian-track schools in these locales. Researchers have pointed to the historic effects of the Russian-dominant urban environment. In select states, like Kazakhstan, the "asymmetrical distribution of power in society" during the Soviet era resulted in language assimilation (i.e., linguistic Russification) of urban Kazakhs (Smagulova, 2008, p. 445). In post-Soviet Chuvash Republic, the continued predominance of Russian schools in urban centers leaves few options available for city-based ethnic Chuvash parents who want instruction in Chuvash. Thus, rural-to-urban migration results in the ethnic Chuvash population having access only to Russian-medium schools with one course in their mother tongue (Marquardt, 2012).

Governments in Russian-oriented countries, like Belarus, and in heavily Russified regions, like Transnistria (in Moldova), also work to secure a role for Russian. Research suggests that Belarus has perhaps shifted most dramatically (out of all the former Soviet republics) in support of Russian in schools. For example, in 2006 the Ministry of Education decided to allow Belarusian history and geography to be taught in Russian (previously it had been in Belarusian only) in Russian-track schools (Giger & Sloboda, 2008). Ciscel's (2010) research highlights the ways schooling in the Transnistria region of Moldova

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

secures a role for Russian through "Soviet-style policies of soft Russification" (p. 24).

Several post-Soviet states also support Russian-language education in an effort to develop potential political and economic capital. Post-Soviet governments have had to scramble to reverse trends leading to the decrease in their population's Russian-language abilities. Pavlenko (2008c) noted that in Armenia the reduction of hours allocated to Russian-language learning and the resulting decrease in Russian-language competence had leaders actively working to develop better quality Russian instruction. To address this issue, the teaching of Russian has been made obligatory in both Armenia and Tajikistan in the 21st century, and Armenia now also provides support for the professional development of Russian-language teachers in Russia.

Navigating Parallel Worlds

Recent research draws attention to the maintenance and development of parallel language- and school-based communities. These parallel worlds result from particular Soviet systems as well as post-Soviet language policies and generate opportunities for language maintenance and shift. In this section, I highlight the theme of parallelism and the ways these communities alternatively challenge and promote integration and marginalization in post-Soviet states.

Post-Soviet scholarship has drawn attention to the ways parallel communities work to maintain and enhance linguistic diversity. Woolhiser (2007, p. 371) explores, for example, language innovation as part of the "parallel Belarusophone community's" opposition to government policies that actively embrace a prominent role for Russian in Belarus since the mid-1990s. This community, constituted primarily of young university students, has taken up the revival of certain nonofficially sanctioned elements of an earlier Belarusian standard and deliberately uses this form in oppositional venues and discourses. Woolhiser (2007) underscored the range of language practices within this student-age group, finding that the younger generation's use of Belarusian can be represented "as a continuum, ranging from the 'hard core,' consciously Belarusian-dominant speakers . . . to the Russian-dominant 'casual users,' . . .. [to]the 'in-betweens' . . . whose language use though influenced to some extent by the recent innovations in usage in oppositional circles, reflects the influence of the codified norms" (p. 396).

Minority-language schools generate a second parallel set of linguistic circumstances that present a challenge to civic integration. The expanding number of schools using national-minority languages in post-Soviet states increases opportunities to gain fluency and strengthen group identities. Recent research has built on scholarship from early in the 21st century that explored the ways separate minority schools also work, however, to foreclose opportunities for integration. In Kyrgyzstan, for example, the division of schools based on medium of instruction (i.e., in Kyrgyz and Russian) has led to linguistic segregation and inequality of educational opportunity (Korth, 2005). In a comparison of the Hungarian and Crimean Tatar minorities in Ukraine, Kulyk (2013) found that the well-established Hungarian-language school system has provided

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

long-standing opportunities for the promotion of ethnocultural identity and language learning. The exclusive instruction in Hungarian has, however, also unexpectedly "perpetuate[d] their inability to communicate in the majority language and thus limits their social mobility" (p. 1). This outcome has encouraged some in the government and the Hungarian-language community to rethink the role of the Ukrainian language in schools and introduce it into the curriculum.

Segregated language environments in schools also contribute to particular patterns of ethnic socialization among students. Separate language tracks help to generate prejudiced images about students who attend schools with a different medium of instruction. Nedelcu et al. (2010–11) observed that students in linguistically segregated schools positioned themselves in "parallel worlds" in "symbolic 'opposition'" to each other (p. 77). For example, a Russian student in Estonia claimed, "In an Estonian school, we would have felt ourselves as 'others'" (Nedelcu et al., 2010–11, p. 77). Alvarez Veinguer and Davis (2007) highlighted the identity outcomes maintained and generated by the bifurcated Tatar- and Russian-language schools. The "asymmetry of the language policy" in Tatarstan (in the Russian Federation) "encourages young Tatars to develop a unified 'national' identity, combining language, ethnicity, religion and other elements, which is not matched by the policy as it affects young Russians, who neither expect to speak Tatar nor are likely to express their identities in these terms" (Alvarez Veinguer & Davis, p. 187). The development of bilingual and immersion-language programs housed within Russian-track schools has opened the possibility for the creation of intersecting rather than parallel worlds. Cara's (2010) research on the linguistic acculturation of Russian students in Latvian Russian-track schools with bilingual education programs concludes significantly that Russian students' proficiency in Latvian had statistically significant correlations with positive and high acculturation attitudes.

In addition to analyses focusing on the students' experience in parallel language schools, researchers have explored the ways parents navigate this system. In some post-Soviet states, parental impressions of school quality shape school choice. In many Central Asian countries, Fierman (2012) noted, parents who speak the titular language may decide to enroll their children into Russian-language schools since these are understood to be of better quality than the ones using local languages as the medium of instruction. In other cases, such as Estonia, the minority parents' ability to speak the titular language influences their decisions. Kemppainen, Frerrin, Hite, and Hilton (2008) found in their research on parental choice and language of instruction in Estonia that the parents' proficiency in a second language shaped their choice among bilingual, Russian- and Estonian-medium schooling. Surveys of more than 300 Russian-speaking parents in three Estonian towns revealed that the higher the parents' proficiency in Estonian, the more they opted for Estonian- over Russian-medium schooling (Kemppainen et al., 2008).

Several studies underscore parents' pragmatic reasons for opting into titular language schools. Rannut (2008, p. 435) pointed to Estonia's Russian parents' "instrumental desire" to enhance their children's competitiveness and opportunities for future jobs through immersing them in education in the official language (i.e., Estonian). These findings point to the impact of the expanded

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

function of the titular language both within and beyond school. In the case of Tatarstan, despite Russian being the language of opportunity in the Russian Federation more broadly, Tatar parents opt for participation in Tatar national schools, and voice strong support for their child's increased knowledge of the Tatar language since they understand this option will open access to the national elite (Alvarez Veinguer & Davis, 2007).

Trajectories

Research published over the last 5 years points to diverging trajectories of language policy in post-Soviet states. The guideposts and broad goals of these governments suggest differing policies to support the titular languages and the range of languages within their borders. Though rooted in the Soviet experience, policy developments have diverged over the last two decades. Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, are, as Bulajeva and Hogan-Brun (2010) argued, "following similar trajectories of language policy development and implementation within the post EU accession period moving from the policy of ethnolingualism to a policy of plurilingualism" (p. 93). These policies are dynamic and evolve in "fits and starts" (Ciscel, 2010, p. 13), and Moldovan language policy takes shape between the "competing orbits of influence" of the European Union and the Russian Federation (Ciscel, 2008, p. 386). The direction of Belarusian policy differs tremendously from in the Baltic states as evidenced by the shift in the mid-1990s toward supporting Russian over Belarusian. Giger and Sloboda (2008) suggested that the government has embraced a policy to "achieve freedom from Belarusian" (p. 333).

Greater convergence across the post-Soviet states is found in policies concerning foreign-language learning and the population's common interest in learning English. Overall, the governments express support for a plurilingual population by including foreign-language learning in national curricula. Bulajeva and Hogan-Brun (2010) noted the ways the Soviet emphasis on early foreign-language instruction—which was required to be in Russian (in a non-Russian-track school) and considered as a second rather than a foreign language—inadvertently laid the expectation and curricular space for an alternative foreign language, like English, to take the place of Russian after 1991. The post-Soviet interest in learning English as a foreign language extends its position from the Soviet era as the most popular foreign language in schools (Hasanova, 2007). Although English was taught throughout the former Soviet Union, post-Soviet approaches seek to transform methodologies from those focusing on grammar and translation to ones emphasizing active communication (Hasanova, 2007; Smotrova, 2009). Outside agencies, like the Open Society Institute (OSI), the British Council, and the various programs of the U.S. Departments of Education and State, have played vigorous roles in investing and developing English-language instruction in the post-Soviet states (Hasanova, 2007; Smotrova, 2009).

A general imbalance exists, however, between the sharp increase in the interest in learning English (and other languages) and the uneven availability and quality of the language classes. In Kyrgyzstan, researchers have observed a rise in interest in learning Arabic, Turkish, and English, but limited resources and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

facilities (Orusbaev et al., 2008). Access to English instruction, or high-quality teaching, may increasingly be limited to families willing and able to pay for it. Hasanova (2007) reported that the preschools in Uzbekistan that offered some lessons in English cost about double of what regular preschools charged. Finally, across the post-Soviet states steady demands for instruction in English have left schools scrambling to provide in-service teacher education, produce new textbooks, and retain skilled English teachers (Smotrova, 2009).

FROM SPACE TO PLACE

Many of the key contributions to the study of language policy in the former Soviet Union examine its dynamics in one specific (usually national) setting, attentive to what is meaningful about the context, but always with the rich implications that the policies, practices, and concepts that emerge from a particular case may be transferable to similar contexts. Scholarship on language policy and education in the former Soviet Union reflects the spatial turn associated with various disciplines in the humanities and the social sciences (Withers, 2009). An array of place-based topics appear in post-Soviet language and education investigations: the ways language is produced in and through place, the management and experience of language in particular places, and the production of place through language and schooling.

The first place-based theme in recent post-Soviet research centers on language practice and identity within the dynamic environment of separate language-tracked schools. Language practices endure in post-Soviet schools and do not easily or quickly change with new policies. Evidence from Ukraine (Besters-Dilger, 2007; Bilaniuk, & Melnyk, 2008; Kalynovs'ka, 2009; Polese, 2010), Belarus (Giger & Sloboda, 2008), and Moldova (Ciscel, 2008) suggests that the categorization of a school by medium of instruction (e.g., a Ukrainian-, Moldovan- or Estonian-language school) can camouflage language dominance and practice within schools. Scholars have found that several post-Soviet schools, or at least certain subjects, remain Russian-language-dominant spaces although officially categorized as other. Giger and Sloboda (2008) highlighted the problematic categorization of schools (e.g., as Belarussian- or Russian-language) as "isomorphous in various statistics" when research has found the limited use of languages, like Belarusian, in Belarusian-track schools (p. 328). Besters-Dilger (2007) identified a similar dynamic in Ukraine where some schools are categorized as Ukrainian-medium institutions, when, in fact, Russian dominates as the language of instruction. Kalynovs'ka (2009, p. 209) labeled the educational environment in some Ukrainian schools as "hidden bilingual," with Ukrainian as the medium of instruction and Russian used for the language of communication outside of class (particularly in the eastern and southern regions). Within schools in other states, teachers deem the titular language appropriate for only certain subjects. Chevalier (2010) noted that language use changes in rural schools based on the subject; Tuvan (a language spoken in the Republic of Tyva of the Russian Federation) is rarely used as the medium of instruction for math and science classes in Tuvan-language schools. Among the reasons interviewees provided

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for this in-school dynamic were the teachers' desire to prepare students for their future study, which would be entirely in Russian (starting in 10th grade), as well as the lack of Tuvan-language pedagogical resources (Chevalier, 2010).

A second theme within this spatial turn of language-related research concerns the ways teachers mediate place and policy. In this scholarship, teachers emerge as professionals who relax or enforce borders between language and national identity. Schools provide a relatively free space to make pedagogical and ideological decisions around language. Polese (2010) explored the ways that teachers in Odessa act "as mediators" of national-level discourse on language (p. 50). Polese looked at the "dilemma of agencies" in Ukraine, "for state actors and agents have to mediate between the Ministry and the citizens" (p. 50), and found that in Odessa educators experience relative freedom from complying "with official instructions [which] allows for the development of a Ukrainian identity in timing and modalities that vary from teacher to teacher, and from one student to another" (p. 58). Recent research has confirmed that language ideologies and policies inform teachers' pedagogical practices in the post-Soviet context. Friedman's (2009) detailed ethnographic research in Ukraine concluded that an ideology of "pure language" inspired Ukrainian teachers to deliver corrective feedback to elementary-age students' use of Russian forms when speaking Ukrainian (p. 347). As students responded to teachers' correction or self-initiated corrective practices,

> they displayed allegiance to ideologically mediated standards of correctness that proscribe language mixing as a violation of the natural boundaries between languages, thereby reifying and naturalizing pure Ukrainian as the standard upon which all Ukrainian-language practices can be evaluated. (Friedman, p. 364)

Finally, in her ethnographic research on teachers as language policy actors in Estonia, Brown (2010) found that the historic (i.e., Soviet and pre-Soviet era) exclusion and discrimination against the regional language of Võro limited the teachers' options to use their classrooms as a base for language revitalization. The highly decentralized and voluntary regional language policy allowed teachers to "reinscribe" or reincorporate Võro in site-specific ways, including adding it as an after-school class (Brown, 2010, p. 301).

A third, and final, place-based theme focuses on the role of place and language in the formal curriculum and the way curriculum functions to naturalize the connections among a people, their language, and their country. This research focuses both on historic and contemporary cases in the post-Soviet sphere. Pauly (2010) contributed to the discussion of the many ways language enters into a school's formal curriculum and serves to promote broader political agendas, through a detailed historical analysis of the promotion of language and local studies (*kraieznavsto*) in Ukraine during the 1920s. Silova et al. (in press) developed the idea of "pedagogies of space" to highlight the textual social and cultural construction of place in contemporary primers in Armenia, Latvia, and Ukraine. As part of their critical discourse analysis of these introductory language textbooks, Silova et al. concluded, "Pedagogies of space, as part of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

broader national education system, appear as especially crucial cogs in the discursive system that builds and maintains a linkage between particular spaces and territories and particular peoples and cultures." Brown (2012) contributed to the growing tradition of linguistic landscape research (Gorter, Marten, & van Mensel, 2012; Pavlenko, 2010; Shohamy & Gorter, 2009) in an examination of place-claiming and language revitalization in rural Estonian school spaces. Brown's (2012) research on the school-based attempts to be more inclusive of lesser-used languages points to the "gradual pace of cultural change especially in schools" (p. 294).

FUTURE SCHOLARSHIP

The scholarship on language policy and education of the last 5 years suggests several theoretical, methodological, and topical areas for growth. As mentioned in this article, an increasing number of researchers are exploring both the relevance of post-colonial theories for understanding the transformations and processes in the post-Soviet region and the productive confluence of post-socialist and post-colonial interpretations for these countries (Chari & Verdery, 2009; Silova, 2010b). Robust areas for future development are in refining and advancing these theoretical explorations in the post-Communist world and exploring the potential applicability of neo-colonialist perspectives. Several of these theoretical frames could be used, for example, to situate and analyze the new federal law on education in the Russian Federation—one that, in part, aims to standardize education and do away with any national components of regional schooling. Additionally, few researchers analyze language and education policy formation, practice, or appropriation as a neoliberal development, which would be an additional fruitful area for investigation.

Methodologically, research on language policy and education has benefited from the micro-sociological and anthropological insights on language choice and practice. The increased use of qualitative research methods including school-based ethnographies, interviewing, and participant observation (Brown, 2010; Friedman, 2009; Polese, 2010) has assisted in this development. That said, a minority of researchers who are exploring issues related to the interface of education and language are engaged in extended qualitative research in the region. The fields of applied linguistics, comparative education, and post-Soviet studies could also benefit from directing some of the current interest in linguistic landscapes—evident in the areas of language of advertising (Ciscel, 2008; Orusbaev et al., 2008); and language and urban centers (Giger & Sloboda, 2008; Pavlenko, 2010)—to language use in the educational sphere (both informal and formal schooling).

Topically, an imbalance exists in the regional and linguistic focus of current research. Reflected in this article is the geographic asymmetry of case studies—more researchers are focusing on language and schooling in Ukraine and the Baltic states than any other post-Soviet country or region. The linguistic diversity of the Russian Federation, for example, is underresearched or underpublished in English, though Dowler's (2001) historic investigation of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

schooling in Russia's eastern nationalities and Bloch's (2004) research from the 1990s on the Evenki set the groundwork for 21st-century scholars. The schooling of national minorities in other post-Soviet states likewise remains an underinvestigated topic. An enhanced understanding of the ways Russian is used, and protected, in schooling in the Russian-dominant areas of the countries of the former Soviet Union (e.g., northeastern Estonia, Crimea, and the Transnistrian Republic) also awaits research.

The policy response to the rise in popularity of and demand for education in multiple global languages (e.g. English, Turkish, and Chinese) presents a fascinating comparative opportunity to explore state policies and the on-the-ground response to available choices. Research into bilingual and immersion strategies in post-Soviet states as a way to promote the titular, minority, or global languages offers an additional fruitful arena for exploration. Finally, researchers have yet to delve into the role of class and (un)equal access to certain types of language instruction. The language and education decisions of the wealthy as well as the more underprivileged populations offer potentially fruitful topics for research.

In conclusion, the research reviewed in this article expands our understanding of the legacies of the Soviet-era language and education policies 20 years after the collapse, while bringing to the fore the new directions and commitments. The use of geometric concepts like asymmetry, parallels, and trajectories as well as the attention to place in research on recent developments underscore several points. First, states inherited schools with a Soviet-era commitment to multilingualism, but have been challenged to transform these institutions into new types of post-Soviet plurilingual institutions—ones that generally promote the titular language, create space for instruction in minority languages, and provide education in a foreign language (or two). As research reveals, this transformation occurs in a context where Russian retains significant influence and prestige even two decades after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Second, evidence from these countries speaks powerfully to the ways teachers, students, and parents use school space dynamically to negotiate community boundaries and foster particular national identities through deliberate language practice. The complex sociolinguistic space of post-Soviet schools helps to cultivate outcomes that shape civic and national integration. The ways in which sociopolitical reconfigurations, education reforms, and regional demographic change shape and are shaped by language and school policies present promising opportunities for new research in the post-Soviet sphere.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hogan-Brun, G. (Ed.). (2010). *Comparative Education* [Special issue], *46*(1).

This special issue of *Comparative Education* focuses particularly on language in education in select countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Importantly, this collection reflects the shifting geopolitics of the region; countries that may be of interest to readers of this review article (e.g., Moldova, Ukraine, and the Baltic states) are included in the issue together with other European case studies rather than with those pulled exclusively from the post-Soviet sphere. In addition to Hogan-Brun's

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

useful introductory article, the issue includes country-specific examinations of language and education policies during a period of intense transformation.

Friedman, D. A. (2009). Speaking correctly: Error correction as a language socialization practice in a Ukrainian classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 346–367.

This article offers a compelling example of the possibilities for researchers to use ethnographic methods to contribute to our understandings of classroom-based language practices and identity formation. In her analysis of data collected during the 2003–2004 academic year in two fifth-grade classrooms, Friedman drew on insights from language ideology and socialization to make sense of language classroom practices such as error correction. The article provides detailed linguistic evidence of the way micro-classroom interactions can contribute to the development and maintenance of broader language ideologies and identities.

Pavlenko, A. (Ed.). (2008). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* [Special issue], *11*(3/4).

The special issue contains the most comprehensive and significant overviews of language developments and policy in post-Soviet countries. Collectively, the included scholars advanced efforts to situate these developments within sociolinguistic theory. The collection features Pavlenko's introductory article, which provides a sociohistoric background to the region and its language policies, as well as eight cases studies of countries ranging from several in Central Asia (e.g., Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan) to those along the western border of the former Soviet Union (e.g., Estonia, Lithuania, Moldova, Belarus, and Ukraine). All articles include some examination of language and education policies with various degrees of emphasis. The articles in the special issue also appear in Pavlenko's (2008a) book, *Multilingualism in Post-Soviet Countries*.

Pauly, M. D. (2009). Tending to the "Native word": Teachers and the Soviet campaign for Ukrainian-language schooling, 1923–1930. *Nationalities Papers*, *37*, 251–276.

As evidence of the continued interdisciplinary contributions to language and education policy, Pauly's research represents a significant historical contribution to our understanding of the development of Soviet-era language in education policy and the development of non-Russian schooling. By drawing on archival and newspaper sources from the 1920s and 1930s, Pauly explored educators' daily implementation of Ukrainization in order to better understand this policy's appropriation and impact. The research presented in this article will also be included in Pauly's forthcoming book, *Breaking the Tongue: Language, Education, and Power in Soviet Ukraine, 1920–1934*.

REFERENCES

Alvarez Veinguer, A., & Davis, H. D. (2007). Building a Tatar elite. *Ethnicities*, *7*, 186–207.

Altbach, P. G. (1989). Servitude of the mind? Education, dependency and neocolonialism. In P. G. Altbach, R. Arnove, & G. Kelly (Eds.), *Comparative education* (pp. 469–484). New York, NY: Advent Books.

Annus, E. (2012). The problem of Soviet colonialism in the Baltics. *Journal of Baltic Studies*, *43*, 21–45.

Besters-Dilger, J. (2007). The Ukrainian language in education and mass media. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, *29*, 257–293.

Bilaniuk, L., & Melnyk, S. (2008). A tense and shifting balance: Bilingualism and education in Ukraine. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *11*, 340–372.

Bloch, A. (2004). *Red ties and residential schools: Indigenous Siberians in a post-Soviet state*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Blum, D. (2007). *National identity and globalization: Youth, state, and society in post-Soviet Eurasia*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
Brown, K. D. (2010). Teachers as language-policy actors: Contending with the erasure of lesser-used languages in schools. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *41*, 298–314.
Brown, K. D. (2012). The linguistic landscape of educational spaces: Language revitalization and schools in southeastern Estonia. In D. Gorter, H. Marten, & L. van Mensel (Eds.), *Linguistic landscapes and minority languages* (pp. 281–298). New York, NY: Palgrave.
Bulajeva, T., & Hogan-Brun, G. (2010). Introducing early foreign-language learning in the Baltic context. *Comparative Education*, *46*, 79–97.
Cara, O. (2010). The acculturation of Russian-speaking adolescents in Latvia. *European Education*, *42*, 8–36.
Cashaback, D. (2008). Assessing asymmetrical federal design in the Russian Federation: A case study of language policy in Tatarstan. *Europe-Asia Studies*, *60*, 249–275.
Chari, S., & Verdery, K. (2009). Thinking between the posts: Postcolonialism, postsocialism, and ethnography after the Cold War. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *51*, 6–34.
Chevalier, J. F. (2010). Bilingualism and literacy in the Republic of Tyva. *Sibirica*, *9*, 1–22.
Ciscel, M. H. (2007). *The language of the Moldovans: Romania, Russian, and the identity of an ex-Soviet Republic*. Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.
Ciscel, M. H. (2008). Uneasy compromise: Language and education in Moldova. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *11*, 73–395.
Ciscel, M. H. (2010). Reform and relapse of bilingual policy in Moldova. *Comparative Education*, *46*, 13–28.
Dilans, G. (2009). Russian in Latvia: An outlook for bilingualism in a post-Soviet transitional society. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *12*, 1–13.
Dowler, W. (2001). *Classroom and empire: The politics of schooling Russia's eastern nationalities, 1860–1917*. Montreal, Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Fierman, W. (2009a). Identity, symbolism, and the politics of language in Central Asia. *Europe-Asia Studies*, *61*, 1207–1228.
Fierman, W. (2009b). Language vitality and paths to revival: Contrasting cases of Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *198*, 75–104.
Fierman, W. (2012). Russian in post-Soviet Central Asia: A comparison with the states of the Baltic and South Caucasus. *Europe-Asia Studies*, *64*, 1077–1100.
Friedman, D. A. (2009). Speaking correctly: Error correction as a language socialization practice in a Ukrainian classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 346–367.
Giger, M., & Sloboda, M. (2008). Language management and problems in Belarus: Education and beyond. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *11*, 315–339.
Gorter, D., Marten, H., & van Mensel, L. (Eds.). (2012). *Linguistic landscapes and minority languages*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
Hasanova, D. (2007). Broadening the boundaries of the expanding circle: English in Uzbekistan. *World Englishes*, *26*, 276–290.
Hogan-Brun, G. (2010). Language, education policy, and transformation in Central and Eastern Europe. *Comparative Education*, *46*, 3–12.
Johnson, D. (Ed.). (2010). *Politics, modernisation, and educational reform in Russia: From past to present*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Kalynovs'ka, O. (2009). Language situation in education. In J. Besters-Dilger (Ed.), *Language policy and language situation in Ukraine* (pp. 201–241). Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang.
Kemppainen, R. P., Frerrin, S. E., Hite, S. J., & Hilton, S. C. (2008). Sociocultural aspects of Russian-speaking parents' choice of language of instruction for their children in Estonia. *Comparative Education Review*, *52*, 93–119.
Korth, B. (2005). *Language attitudes towards Kyrgyz and Russian: Discourse, education and policy in post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
Kreindler, I. (Ed.). (1985). *Sociolinguistic perspectives on Soviet national languages: Their past, present, and future*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kreindler, I. (1997). Multilingualism in the successor states of the Soviet Union. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *17*, 91–112.
Kulyk, V. (2013). Combining identity and integration: Comparative analysis of schools for two minority groups in Ukraine. *Compare*, *43*, 622–645.
Levinson, B. A. U., Sutton, M., & Winstead, T. (2009). Education policy as a practice of power. *Educational Policy*, *23*, 767–795.
Marquardt, K. L. (2012). Stabilization and symbolism: Language and regional politics in the Chuvash Republic. *Nationalities Papers*, *40*, 127–147.
Mehisto, P., & Asser, H. (2007). Stakeholder perspectives: CLIL programme management in Estonia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *10*, 683–701.
Nagzibekova, M. (2008). Language and education policies in Tajikistan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *11*, 501–508.
Nedelcu, A., Iucu, R., & Ciolan, L. (2010–11). Students' perception of the "others" in ethnic separated school systems. *European Education*, *42*, 69–86.
Orusbaev, A., Mustajoki, A., & Protassova, E. (2008). Multilingualism, Russian language, and education in Kyrgyzstan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *11*, 476–500.
Pauly, M. D. (2009). Tending to the "Native word": Teachers and the Soviet campaign for Ukrainian-language schooling, 1923–1930. *Nationalities Papers*, *37*, 251–276.
Pauly, M. D. (2010). Teaching place, assembling the nation: Local studies in Soviet Ukrainian schools during the 1920s. *History of Education*, *39*, 75–93.
Pavlenko, A. (2006). Russian as lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *26*, 78–99.
Pavlenko, A. (2008a). *Multilingualism in post-Soviet countries*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Pavlenko, A. (2008b). Multilingualism in post-Soviet countries: Language revival, language removal, and sociolinguistic theory. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *11*, 275–314.
Pavlenko, A. (2008c). Russian in post-Soviet countries. *Russian Linguistics*, *32*, 59–80.
Pavlenko, A. (2010). Linguistic landscape of Kyiv, Ukraine: A diachronic study. In E. Shohamy, M. Barni, & E. Ben Rafael (Eds.), *Linguistic landscape in the city* (pp. 133–150). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Polese, A. (2010). The formal and informal: Exploring "Ukrainian" education in Ukraine, scenes from Odessa. *Comparative Education*, *46*, 47–62.
Rannut, M. (2008). Estonianization efforts post-independence. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *11*, 423–439.
Shohamy, E., & Gorter, D. (2009). *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*. New York, NY: Routledge.
Silova, I. (2006). *From sites of occupation to symbols of multiculturalism*. Greenwich, UK: Information Age.
Silova, I. (Ed.). (2010a). *Globalization on the margins: Education and post-socialist transformations in Central Asia*. Greenwich, UK: Information Age.
Silova, I. (2010b). Rediscovering post-socialism in comparative education. In I. Silova (Ed.), *Post-socialism is not dead: (Re)reading the global in comparative education* (pp. 1–24). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
Silova, I., Mead, M. A., & Palandjian, G. (in press). Pedagogies of space: (Re)mapping national territories, borders, and identities in post-Soviet textbooks. In J. H. Williams (Ed.). *Textbooks, identities, nation, & state*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.
Smagulova, J. (2008). Language policies of Kazakhization and their influence on language attitudes and use. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *11*, 440–475.
Smotrova, T. (2009). Globalization and English language training in Ukraine. *TESOL Quarterly*, *43*, 728–733.
Soler, J. (2013). The anonymity of Catalan and the authenticity of Estonian: Two paths for the development of medium-sized languages. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *16*, 153–163.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Tulbure, N. (2009). Introduction to special issue: Global socialisms and postsocialisms. *Anthropology of East Europe Review*, *27*, 2–18.
Ulasiuk, I. (2011). Legal protection of linguistic diversity in Russia: Past and present. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *32*, 71–83.
Verschik, A. (2008). *Emerging bilingual speech: From monolingualism to codecopying*. New York, NY: Continuum.
Verschik, A. (2009). Introduction. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *13*, 299–307.
Withers, C. W. J. (2009). Place and the "spatial turn" in geography and in history. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, *70*, 637–658.
Woolhiser, C. (2007). Communities of practice and linguistic divergence: Belarusophone students as agents of linguistic change. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, *29*, 371–404.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093 Published online by Cambridge University Press