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Abstract
This paper examines language policy and language use as a feature of identity in the Republic of Tatarstan approximately twenty 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 1998, 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; Yemelianova, 2000).

The focus of this research was to find out how successful the language and education policies as top-down identity technologies have been in post-Soviet Tatar society. Empirical research was carried out in Kazan in 2013 and revealed that asymmetrical bilingualism still prevails in contemporary Tatar society. The Tatar language remains a symbol of identity at both the top-down and bottom-up levels of identity. Furthermore, the results from this research confirm that Tatar was used as part of the in-group phenomenon amongst Tatars and is synonymous with ethnicity amongst the Tatar population (Giliazova in Minzaripov, 2013; Khaben’skaia, 2002; Laitin, 1998). On the other hand, the Russian language is used by everybody in every aspect of communication in everyday life.

Introduction
This paper examines language policy and language use as identity technologies in the Republic of Tatarstan approximately twenty-three 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 spheres and all other spheres of language use. As a result, the non-national languages were regarded as having low prestige due to the increase in Russian language use and because Russian was regarded as the language for socio-economic 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 population or the state or republic in which they resided (Brubaker, 1996; Poppe and Hagendoorn, 2001 and 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; recent events in Ukraine and Crimea for example, 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 is regulated by governments through the implementation of language and education policies in the post-Soviet period, 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 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 towards 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 on Tatarstan**

This section gives some brief background information about Tatarstan to set the context for this research. Tatarstan is a multi-ethnic 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 eight hundred kilometres 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, p.612; Yemelianova, 2000, p.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 practised. 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, p.509). It is closely related to the Bashkir language (Grenoble, 2003, p.69).

According to the 2010 all-population census results, 3.7 million people are residing in Tatarstan of which 53.2% are Tatars, 39.7% Russians, 3.1% Chuvash and 4% is made up of other nationalities, such as Udmurts, Krashens, 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 behaviour of Tatars and Russian-Tatar, which refers to the language behaviour 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 whilst 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

1http://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
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 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 re-election 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 regional 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 1998 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.

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, 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 (Yemelianova, 2000; Veinguer and Davis, 2002).

Despite the implementation of these policies, approximately twenty-three 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 (Khaben’skaia, 2002; Giltazova in Minzaripov, 2013). 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-medium and the Tatar language is taught as a subject. In higher educational institutes there is a clear distinction between subjects which are considered as Russian subjects and those which are considered as Tatar. Science and technology subjects are ‘Russian subjects,’ whereas humanities subjects are considered ‘Tatar’. In an interview with Iskhakova, (pers. Comm. 2010), the Tatar language is not yet ready to be used 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 of this paper, 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. A previous study by Veinguer and Davis (2008, p.193), which examined the subjects taught in Tatar gymnasiums found that teaching staff were more concerned about teaching subjects which promoted the 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 (Iskhakova, 2002; Garipov et al, 2000 and 2008). 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 amongst 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 towards languages in contemporary Tatar society;
- To clarify whether the globalisation 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 analyse the 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 of this paper. The data was collected using a survey which was distributed amongst 187 respondents who were students from the faculties of physics, chemistry and computer programming in Kazan Federal (Volga region) University; the faculty of sociology in Kazan Technical 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 analyse students from this age group because they were the first generation of students to have undergone compulsory Tatar language learning throughout their education. 51% of respondents were male and 49% were female. As far as the nationalities of the respondents were concerned, 41% self-identified that they were Russian, 52% - 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.*

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**

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

---

2 This research was carried out 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. The author of this report would like to thank the staff from the Department for Culture and the Development of Languages of the Peoples of the Republic of Tatarstan for their assistance with the project. This project was kindly financed by CEELBAS (The Centre for East European and Language Based Area Studies).
1. Language test 1 – written proficiency levels of Tatar, Russian and English

The aim of this language test was to find out whether the 1998 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. In addition, article 3.4 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’ was implemented to widen the use of the Tatar language in all educational sectors. 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.

1.1 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 or 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 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 1988 education law. Similarly, if they complete the English proficiency test and not the Tatar proficiency test, this could also show resistance towards 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 Russian and had to be summarized in Russian, another was written in Tatar and had to be summarized in Tatar 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 firstly for grammatical accuracy and style, and secondly 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’. 
In addition, the scores were grouped into two subgroups. The first included all scores from 1 to 5 and the second subgroup included all the scores from 6 to 10. The first subgroup represented 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. The second group represented 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.

1.1.1 Zero scorers
Zero was given for either non-ability or for people who identified themselves as non-performers in Tatar or Russian. This could also be a sign of resistance to Tatar government policies (as per Shevel, 2002). On the other hand, people who scored 1 were therefore analysed 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 given a disproportionate result. The results are based only on scores of 1-10 of the marking criteria.

1.2 Descriptive analysis

Table 1: Levels of Tatar, Russian and English written proficiency of Russian and Tatar respondents in Kazan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Russian reading and writing</th>
<th>Tatar reading and writing</th>
<th>English reading and writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian respondents</td>
<td>Tatar respondents</td>
<td>Russian respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.1 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 Tatar respondents. The results show that the respondents were able to correctly summarize the content of the text whilst maintaining the 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 6-10 marks and 88% of the Tatar respondents who answered the question scored between 6-10 marks. 52% 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 towards the language or they did not want to answer the question.

1.2.2 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 6-10 marks and 68% of the Tatar respondents scored between 6-10 marks. 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 towards it or they did not want to answer the question.

1.2.3 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 the Russian respondents.
A more detailed analysis of the results showed that 36.4% of the Russian respondents who answered the question scored between 6-10 marks and 36% of the Tatar respondents who answered the question scored between 6-10 marks in English. 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 towards the language or they did 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 above mentioned 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.
1.3 Non-parametric tests
In order to examine the influencing factors on language proficiency of the Russian and Tatar populations, non-parametric 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.

1.3.1 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 the Russian and Tatar levels of proficiency for either population, due to the fact that it is compulsory to learn both of these languages in school. Tatar is taught from year one and English is taught from year three or four. As was mentioned above, 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 amongst both populations (table 2):

Table 2: Kruskal-Wallis results of educational subject specialism on levels of written language proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of results for</th>
<th>Russian respondents</th>
<th>Tatar respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian reading and writing levels and educational specialisms</td>
<td>( p = 0.007 )</td>
<td>( p = 0.007 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar reading and writing levels and educational specialisms</td>
<td>( p = 0.04 )</td>
<td>( p = 0.04 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English reading and writing levels and educational specialisms</td>
<td>( p = 0.04 )</td>
<td>( p = 0.04 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages of reading and writing</th>
<th>Reading and writing level of significance ( (p &lt; 0.05) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>( p = 0.008 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of table 3 show that the languages of instruction in higher educational institutes significantly influence levels of Tatar reading and writing of 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.
1.3.2 Sphere of the home

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

The independent variables of nationality, native language\(^3\), nationality of father and mother, 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 table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages of reading and writing</th>
<th>Reading and writing levels of significance ( (p &lt; 0.05))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>( p = 0.00 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>( p = 0.01 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

\(^3\) The term ‘native language’ \((\textit{rodnoi iazyk})\) is generally perceived as being synonymous with ethnicity amongst the Tatar population (Giliazova in Minzaripov, 2013; Khaben’skaia, 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 amongst 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.
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. 93% 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 father and mother amongst 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.

1.4 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.

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 are 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.

2. Language test 2: a study of attitudes towards 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 towards Russian, Tatar and English in the above mentioned 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 towards 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 above mentioned 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 analyse the differences in attitudes towards languages.
2.1 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 towards them.

Table 8: Attitudes towards Russian in the sphere of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>necessary</th>
<th>Chi-squared (χ² = &lt; 0.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian respondents</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar respondents</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Attitudes towards Tatar in the sphere of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>necessary</th>
<th>Chi-squared (χ² = &lt; 0.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian respondents</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>χ² = 8.174, df=2 p = 0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar respondents</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Attitudes towards English in the sphere of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>necessary</th>
<th>Chi-squared (χ² = &lt; 0.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian respondents</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar respondents</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

On the other hand, the results showed a difference in attitudes towards the Tatar language amongst 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 - not useful and the rest - 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 – not useful (table 10).

It is possible to conclude that Russian continues to be prestigious in the sphere of work amongst all respondents, but Tatar is considered as useful, particularly amongst the Tatar respondents. It is highly likely that Tatars use Tatar at work when communicating with other Tatars. According to a study carried out into socio-economic 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 (pers. comm. with doctor). 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 considered 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 (for example, to communicate with foreign businesses and for the Internet).
2.2 Results in the sphere of the home
This sphere was chosen to find out which roles the languages played in the home and attitudes towards them.

Table 11: Attitudes towards Russian in the sphere of the home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>necessary</th>
<th>Chi-squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>(χ² = &lt; 0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Attitudes towards Tatar in the sphere of the home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>necessary</th>
<th>Chi-squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>(χ² = &lt; 0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>χ² = 61.502, df=2 p = 0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Attitudes towards English in the sphere of the home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>necessary</th>
<th>Chi-squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research results show that the majority of the Russian respondents consider 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 towards 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 consider it as necessary as the Tatar language, whereas the Russian respondents consider English to be more necessary than Tatar. Half of the respondents from both groups consider 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.

2.3 Results for the sphere of state institutions
This sphere was chosen to find out which roles languages within this sphere and attitudes towards them.

Table 14: Attitudes towards Russian in the sphere of state institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>necessary</th>
<th>Chi-squared ($\chi^2 = &lt; 0.05$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian respondents</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar respondents</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Attitudes towards Tatar in the sphere of state institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>necessary</th>
<th>Chi-squared ($\chi^2 = &lt; 0.05$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian respondents</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar respondents</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Attitudes towards English in the sphere of state institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>necessary</th>
<th>Chi-squared ($\chi^2 = &lt; 0.05$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian respondents</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 12.169$, df=2 $p = 0.002$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar respondents</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 shows that both Russian and Tatar respondents consider Russian *necessary* for use within state institutions. This could be due to Russian continuing to dominate this sphere of language use.

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

As far as attitudes towards English were concerned, the results showed a significant difference between the Russian and Tatar respondents. The Russian respondents had a neutral attitude towards 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 populations.

**2.4 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 towards language use. The quantity and quality of information within this sphere may strongly influence language use.

*Table 17: Attitudes towards Russian with internet use/working at a computer*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>necessary</th>
<th>Chi-squared $(\chi^2 = &lt; 0.05)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian respondents</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar respondents</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 18: Attitudes towards Tatar with internet use/working at a computer*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not useful</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>necessary</th>
<th>Chi-squared $(\chi^2 = &lt; 0.05)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian respondents</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 14.159, \text{ df}=2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar respondents</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>$p = 0.001$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 towards 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 consider 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. 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.

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.

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

The above mentioned results about the roles of Russian, Tatar and English and the attitudes towards 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 towards 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 non-official situations.

**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 towards 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 seems 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 towards the Tatar language amongst 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 is taught more rather than it being taught as a functional language for everyday use. Therefore, we can conclude that attitudes towards 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 whilst 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 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 towards languages can significantly influence language use. Although the Tatar government may not be able to change the linguistic behaviour of the population through its language programmes, 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.

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 behaviours 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.*
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