DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 035 FL 012 199

AUTHOR Lewis, E. Glyn
TITLE Research Survey of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education in the Soviet Union.
INSTITUTION Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 80
CONTRACT 400-77-0049
NOTE 122p.; Some reproduction problems, especially in appended materials. Best copy available.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Bilingualism; *Comparative Education; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Policy; Ethnography; Foreign Countries; Language Acquisition; Learning Theories; Psycholinguistics; *Public Policy; Russian; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Sociocultural Patterns; *Sociolinguistics
IDENTIFIERS Bilingual Programs; *USSR

ABSTRACT

The state of the art of bilingual education in the Soviet Union is surveyed. The social context of Soviet bilingualism is discussed with reference to sources of heterogeneity, modernization as a motivating factor, political dimensions, and Soviet bases of research. The sociolinguistic paradigm of Soviet society is viewed as a function of the need to develop literacy, a need which is intimately tied to the status of Russian as the dominant language. The ethnological issues encompass the diverse ethnicity of the Soviet Union, aspects of demography, urbanization, and inter-ethnic marriages. The ideologically colored assumptions regarding language acquisition processes are set forth. These have implications for the development of a Soviet theory for language pedagogy, for the use of the native language in learning second languages, and for a psychology of language acquisition and bilingualism. Various types of programs for bilingual education and Russian as a second language are described. A bibliography and a variety of statistical tables are appended. (JB)

RESEARCH SURVEY OF BILINGUALISM AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE SOVIET UNION

E. Glyn Lewis

January 1980

Center for Applied Linguistics
3520 Prospect Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Performed pursuant to National Institute of Education Contract No. 400-77-0049

Research Survey of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education in the Soviet Union

(I) The Social Context of Soviet Bilingualism
- a) Sources of heterogeneity in the Soviet Union
- b) Modernization as a motivating factor in Bilingual Education
- c) The Meaning of Bilingualism in the Soviet Union
- d) Explicit recognition of the political dimensions of bilingual education
- e) Bases of research in the Soviet Union

(2) The Linguistic Paradigm
- a) Socio-linguistic background
- b) Development of Literacy in the Soviet Union
  - i Code selection
  - ii Terminology
  - iii Alphabetic reform
- c) The status of Russian vis a vis nationality languages

(3) Elements of the Ethnological Paradigm in research
- a) Ethnicity in the Soviet Union
- b) Demographic aspects
- c) Urbanization
- d) Inter-ethnic marriages

(4) Language Acquisition as envisaged in the Soviet Union
- a) Epistemological arguments
- b) Identification of thought and speech
- c) Interaction of first and second languages

(5) Implications of Soviet theory for language Pedagogy
- a) The Use of the mother tongue in learning the second language
- b) Psychology of Language acquisition and bilingualism

(6) The organization of bilingual education -types of schools and programmes
- a) Soviet definition of bilingual education
- b) Teaching Russian as a second language
- c) Russian language schools for non-Russians
- d) The Integrated school or parallell medium instruction
- e) Extent of provision for national languages in education
- f) Schools for non-Russian minorities
- g) Training teachers for nationality schools

(7) Linguistic map of the Soviet Union

(8) Appendices
- a) References
- b) List of Russian Language Periodicals and references to bibliographies of non-Russian literature on the subject
- c) Select English language references incorporated in text

E. Glyn Lewis

Research Survey of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education in the Soviet Union

(I) The Social Context of Soviet Bilingualism

(a) Sources of heterogeneity in the Soviet Union

In considering the education of bilingual children we are concerned by definition with aspects of social heterogeneity. The Soviet Union is an ideal area to study multilingualism and multiculturalism because of the variety of the sources, and the degree of difference between units in any one category of heterogeneity. The most immediately relevant aspect of this phenomenon, which a bilingual education seeks to accommodate is linguistic and in this respect the Soviet Union offers a high level of heterogeneity. One hundred and six nationalities and nations were listed in the Census of 1970, although small but linguistically separate tribes bring the number up to nearly 180. (Table 1). Such language groups are not only numerous but vary enormously in size. In a total population of 241,749,000 one nation (Russian) has a population of 114 million; there is one with a population of 37 million (Ukraine), ~~4 with~~ with totals between 5 and 10 million, 8 between one and 5 million, 5 between half a million and a million, 3 between 100,000 and 250,000, 10 between 50,000 and 100,000, 19 between 10,000 and 50,000, 14 between 5,000 and 10,000 and the rest below 5,000. Some like the Yukagirs are as small as 600.

The languages spoken by these populations belong to five major families, each of which has important and distinct subgroups. They include Indo-European languages such as Slavic (including Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian); Iranian (including Tadjik, Ossetian, Kurdish, the Pamir subgroup which includes Shugni and Rushanii); Baltic languages (including Lithuanian and Lettish); Romance, like Moldavian; Armenian, the sole representative of this subgroup; Germanic (including German and Yiddish). The second major family of languages is the Altaic with three subgroups: Turkic (including Uzbek, Kazakh Kirgiz, Tatar and smaller groups like Kumyk and Nogai); Mongolian (including Buryat and Kalmyk); and the Tungus-Manchurian family (including Evenki, Nanai, Orok etc.). The third main family is the Uralic with the following subgroups - Finno-Ugrian -Baltic groups (including Estonian and Kerelian); the Volga subgroups (including Mordovian and Mari); Perm subgroup (including Udmurt and Komi; the Ob-Ugric subgroup (including Khanty and Mansi); Saamic subgroup (including Saami) and the Samodic subgroup (which includes Nenets, Nganasan etc.) The fourth major family is the Iberian-Caucasian with the subgroups Kartvelian (including Georgian, Zan

and Svan); the Abkhaz-Adyghe group (including Abkhaz, Abaza, Adygei etc.) the Dagestan subgroups consisting of nearly 30 languages including Avar, Lezgin, Dargin, Lak etc; the Nakh subgroup represented by Chechen, Ingush etc. The fifth main family is the Paleoasiatic which includes the small groups of speakers of Chukchi, Koryak Itelmen, Eskimo and Aleut. There are some isolated or uncategorised languages like Nivkh, Ket, Yukagir, Aisor and Dungan (Isayev: 1977).

The languages we have referred to differ in levels of linguistic development, normalization or codification.* Most, if not all of them have been alphabeticised, many only after the Revolution. Within the linguistic pattern there are instances of dialects which because of contact with other languages or dialects have become separated from their original family and assumed a separate existence. Dolgan for instance is no longer regarded as a dialect of Yakut or Evenki but in one locality is the result of the integration of both. There are also dialects at various points of emergence as fully standardized languages. Khakass with its congery of dialects (Sagay, Kachin, Kaybul, Beltir and Kuzyl) is a case in point. On the other hand Eskimo has three dialects none of which has advanced far towards a stabilised structure. Mordvin has two dialects, Erzya and Muksha both of which separately have achieved written status. Among the best example of groups of dialects in which the members are at considerably different levels of development are the Pamiri group consisting of four categories of dialects, and the Tatar group consisting of two branches, North West and South West while Volga Tatar serves as the literary language. Contacts between speakers of different dialects of the same language or of different languages, give rise to a form of bilingualism or bidialectalism which is particularly prevalent in the Soviet Union, where so many languages are not completely standardised. This lack of complete standardization and the existence of strong dialects spoken by large numbers gives rise to bilingualism involving the interaction of various subsystems of the same language, more specially the standard and the dialects. To some extent this gives rise to diglossia. It occurs in the case of Tadjzhik where the standard literary language is based largely

* The terms 'normalization' and 'codification' are distinguished in contemporary Soviet linguistic studies as follows: normalization is "an active interference in the linguistic process" and in this way it becomes an aspect of language policy". Codification is an explicit setting out of the rules which govern the use of the language." (See Aktualnye problemy 1970; Voprosy 1973; Voprosy Kultury rechi i-viii; Norma (1969), as well as Kostomarov, Leontav and Shvareckoff 1974: 205).

on the classical language while there exist clearly identifiable groups of regional dialects among which are 'high' and 'low' variants. Though there exists a standard spoken language, said to be the same as the written form, it is certain that most of the intelligentsia, even those who are proficient in both written and spoken standards revert to one of the other dialects in intimate conversation. Another interesting case of diglossia occurs in Armenian where, in addition to the two dialect varieties there is also Church Armenian, an 'archaic standard' currently in limited use.

Linguistic differences are only one source of heterogeneity affecting the provision of bilingual education. Group contact introduces at least eight other sources. The groups may differ in levels of economic development as is the case with the Yakut and Russians, or Daghestanis and Georgians. The provision of general education may be at different levels as is the case with language groups which are predominantly rural and those which are highly urbanised. Group cultural traditions, which may not always be identical with language affiliation to the same degree in every case, may differ. Religious differences (clearly allied to language in the case of Muslims) may distinguish groups in contact; and the degree of political participation varies considerably, first of all between Russians and non-Russians, and (where non-Russians are concerned) between the major nationality inhabiting a particular Union or Autonomous Republic and minorities, either indigenous or immigrant within the same Republic.

Among the most important sources of heterogeneity is the variation in the territorial disposition of the interacting groups. The ethnic/linguistic territory may be continuous as is the case of the Belorussians and Turkmen, or divided as among Mordvin and Buryats. Ethnic territories may coincide closely as is the case of Udmurts and Chukchi or coincide only in part as is the case of the Evenki and Tatar. Another factor is the percentage of the nationality who are dispersed outside their native territory. (Table 2) This factor has a significant influence on the language pattern of the groups concerned, more especially according to whether they establish contact in rural or urban areas outside their own Republics (Table 3).

The type of community settlement is another factor conducing to heterogeneity: whether for example the groups are sedentary, unmixed, associated with agriculture; or mobile associated with nomadic pastoralism; or again commuting from rural to neighbouring urban areas. Thus the Eveny, hunters and reindeer herders, almost equal in numbers to the compact pastoral Rutultsy live in dispersed groups in extremely large areas of the Far East tundra and forests. Taking all these differences into account it is possible to establish a typology of ethnic groups in the USSR as a basis for studying the relevance of the type of bilingual education they experience or require:

a) The Russians constituting nearly half the total Soviet population inhabit compactly a considerable territory and are represented in all the territories of the major ethnic groups. At the same time they embrace enclavic ethnic groups within their own native territory, for instance Mari and Yakut as well as the North Caucasian groups.

b) Major peoples with compact territories like Uzbek and Armenians who represent the overwhelming majority in their native territories but at the same time are represented by immigrant groups in several other neighbouring or distant territories.

c) Major peoples like Tadjiks concentrate chiefly within their own Republics but living there in complex interaction with other peoples.

d) Major peoples like the Chuvash, a proportion of whom inhabit their national territories in compact groups but who are represented by large proportions of their populations outside their native Republics.

e) Peoples like Kazakhs, Karakalpaks and Bashkirs who are minorities in their own territories, intermix freely with other peoples within but are represented by only small groups outside their territory.

f) Peoples like Tatars and Mordvin, only a small proportion of whom inhabit their own territories but who exist in complex interaction outside their territories with several other groups.

g) Minor but compactly settled peoples with their own ethnic organisations, like the Circassians, or without such a characteristic organisation like the Abazin.

h) Minor, geographically dispersed peoples like the Chukchi and Koryak only slightly intermixed with other peoples.

i) Minor, territorially scattered peoples like Yukagirs, Kets and Itelmen intermixing considerably with other peoples.

j) Enclaves of what are in effect 'foreign' elements like Germans, Poles, Bulgarians, Jews, Gypsies and Assyrians, who have no titular territory similar to the major groups we have referred to or many of the smaller ones like Itelmen.

All these are extremely important factors in determining the pattern of bilingual education within the Soviet Union. Thus it is claimed that "a mutual andideal process is developing in the linguistic life of the peoples of the USSR: a further development and improvement of the national languages and intensive spreading of cross-national communication". (Sov. Soc 1977. Vol 2: 26 The claim is that this is a new socialist type of bilingualism. But the proposition that there is a necessary difference between all types of bilingualism in the Soviet Union on the one hand and all types in non-socialist countries on the other, is manifestly absurd, partly because the typology within the USSR and outside it is so complex. What is happening in the Soviet Union is no different, in general terms, from what is happening and has happened in other multinational countries or empires where a lingua franca exists and is current in most if not all the territories, co-existing with the local languages as is the case in Nigeria, and other African states, in India as well as in the United States. Further more like the other multinational countries contact of a powerful lingua franca whether indigenous, like Russian or Swahili or foreign as is the case of English in Africa leads to language shift and a diminution, however gradual in the numbers of native language claimants. This process affects all language groups but especially the smaller groups of the Soviet Union. For instance the level of native language maintenance among the Mansi declined from 88.9% in 1926 to 59.8% in 1959 and to 52% in 1970. Similarly the Nivkh (4.4 thousands) had a language shift of 21% between 1926 and 1959 and 47% by 1970. Other small nations like the Tati (17,000), Evenki (25,000) had a percentage language shift of 14% and 12%, respectively, in thirty years. The very small nations, not greatly exceeding a thousand, like the Udigei and Saami have a percentage shift of 30% each (Table 4).

(b) Modernization as a motivating factor in Soviet Bilingual Education

Though bilingualism and bilingual education in the Soviet Union has to be considered from several angles - linguistic, cultural, psychological, pedagogic and political - perhaps the most important aspect is the contribution which bilingual education is meant to make to planning Soviet society, through the consciously guided interaction of its many languages and language groups (Deseriev, 1978). The planning processes in turn reflect the impact of the extraordinarily rapid impact of modernization on Soviet society. Consequently bilingualism and especially its institutionalisation in the system of education and other social subsystems like law, and administration must be viewed within the context of modernization, without an understanding of which it is difficult to realize the significance of the changes in the language pattern of the Soviet Union, or the policies which have been adopted to bring them about. Modernization in the Soviet Union differs from that of the United States and Western countries and unless we understand these differences we may be apt to draw completely erroneous conclusions about the Soviet Union as well as the United States. It is true that modernization wherever it occurs involves mass political mobilization leading to mass participation and that these processes if they are to bear fruit depend on and create the need for mass literacy. Modernization involves industrialization based on science, technology and a secularization of sensibility among the leaders, and ultimately among the mass of the population. These aspects of modernization, in turn determine the use to which literacy is put, why people become literate. Modernization also involves increased urbanization which is the typical ambience of the literate community as well as of the ethnically and linguistically heterogenous society (Pokshishevsky) 1971.

All these characteristics are reflected in the countries of the Western World including the United States no less than in the Soviet Union, but for historical reasons they are reflected differently in the Soviet Union. Although the pace of modernization has been uneven in the West those nations have experienced the process since the 16th century. Because of its gradualness the modernization of the ~~languages of the~~ different groups and languages within any multi-national society, for example the Celts and the English in Britain, the Flemings and Walloons of Belgium and the several languages of Switzerland had time to adapt to and reflect social changes without any considerable perturbation. This was apparent to observers of the modernization of South Wales, where it was noted that when the

pace of industrialization was relatively slow 'the inhabitants in many respects showed a marked capacity for stamping their own impress on all newcomers and communicating to them a large measure of their own characteristics' including their Welsh language. With the acceleration of the process of social change 'the process of assimilation was unable to keep pace with the constant influx of migrants' (Commission of Enquiry into Industrial Unrest, 79). Pokshishevskiy (1971: 123) corroborates the characteristics of the second phase of this phenomenon in respect of migration in the USSR and generalizes it as a regular feature of ethnographic processes: "when industrial growth is very rapid the influx of Russian population tends to exceed the influx of indigenous (rural) populations to the cities of ethnic territories", with consequent qualitative changes in the character of those urban centres. During the period of gradualness there was little need for deliberate planning either of society or language. The modernization of the USSR, especially in those areas which contribute most to its linguistic heterogeneity, occurred much later than in the West. The pace of industrial development and economic advance, if the Soviet Union was to compete on any kind of equal terms with the West had to be accelerated. Furthermore modernization of the USSR did not coincide with the gradual development of science and technology but occurred at the peak of those developments, so that social scientists in the USSR have been influenced far more than social scientists in early modernizing societies by the example of the planning of scientific research.

Implicit in what has been said is the concept of the existence of a close if not a necessary relationship in the USSR between language planning (of which bilingual education is one aspect) and social change. Another assumption is that the rate of social change influences the degree of insistence on planning. Variations in the rate of change differentiate the forms which bilingual education have taken in the two sets of societies - early and late modernizers. Another factor distinguishes their attitudes. The societies which have modernized gradually over four centuries have enabled their languages to adapt to changes with little deliberate or conscious intervention on the part of linguists or others. A society like the Soviet Union cannot afford the time for such unenforced linguistic change to appear. If social change is to be reflected in the necessary instrument of social communication, and of the dissemination of the knowledge necessary for such social change deliberate intervention had to be encouraged. Thus the modernization of some of the relatively simple and traditionalist societies of the Soviet Union

involves their progressive structural differentiation with consequent differentiation of socio-linguistic styles. Moreover as a nation moves along the path from traditionalism to modernity the problem of integration within a particular society as well as between several such societies becomes a major focus of struggle in the political arena. Integration involves the interaction of the languages which belong to the societies undergoing this process. This is what the early leaders of the revolution realized: if Bashkir, Mari, Yakut, Uzbek and Tadzhik were to be adequate languages for communicating in a society undergoing revolutionary change they had to be planned and their interaction monitored.

(c) Explicit recognition of the political dimensions of bilingual education

The modernization of the Soviet Union has created tensions which are expressed in attitudes to the relationship between the 'centre' (the Soviet government apparatus including the Party) and the 'periphery' represented by the non-Russian ethnic groups. Several models of the relation of the centre and periphery have been presented in the USSR. One group of scholars emphasise that the whole of Soviet society is 'directed' from the centre without much regard for individuals or diverse ethnic groups. A second school emphasise the dominant role of party officials, the concept of a hierarchy and the continued importance of a uniform ideology, without however unnecessarily limiting the development of diverse groups. The third model may be called Institutional Pluralism which envisages movement away from the constricting first and only slightly more liberal, second model. This third phase has been taken farther by L. Brezhnev, who though he does not depart from the concept of a uniform Soviet society and indeed continues to emphasise the drawing together of classes and nationalities with their different languages, refers frequently to "a developed stage of socialism" which goes beyond the historical past. In November 1971 (Kommunist - "The Socio-political structure of developed socialism" No. 17, p.2) he first put forward his ideological views and elaborated them in 1972. He claimed as a major fact of Soviet life the existence of a new historical community of people (Novaya istoricheskaya obschnost Lyudei), the Soviet people (Sovetskii narod). The General Secretary declared that the "nationalities question (and by definition the problem of bilingualism) had been resolved completely, definitely and irrevocably" (Kommunist, 1974, Vol. 4, 57). These views were taken up by A. Lepeshkin in 1975 (Sov. gos. i. pravo, 8.75: 3-12).

On the one hand the processes of linguistic, cultural as well as economic convergence are being promoted from the 'centre', while 'ethnic antagonism' from the periphery has been singled out as one of the Soviet Union's major conflicts (Suslov 1972: 24). By bringing into focus the uniqueness of the national groups and by creating or revitalizing the means of expressing national sentiments modernization has intensified the desire to assert cultural autonomy on the periphery. Support for the nationalities in this respect comes from writers like M.D. Mattskanyan (Natsiya i natsional'naya gosudars Evennost, Vol. 9. 27-36) who claims that the process of developing and strengthening the nationalities and even smaller ethnic groups is most important, and "by belittling the role of nationalities in general .. one does not aid the consolidation of the USSR". Thus tensions between this 'periphery' and the 'centre' is apparent in criticisms of such tendencies towards autonomy which are regarded by the centre as 'nationalistic deviations' (Yakovlev, A 1972.) The revitalized nationalism reflected in some of the nationalities has resulted in the formation of indigenous modern elites whose sources of legitimacy are their traditional national heritages (including their national languages). These elites are foremost in voicing demands for recognition of the national languages in education. The fact that such elites possess large, strong and closely knit territorial bases enable them to exert considerable pressure, while the complexity of the federal system ensures ample opportunities to evade demands from the 'centre'.. Such considerations point to the fact that bilingual education is an aspect of the struggle to maintain the existing distribution of power or to redistribute it as between the 'centre' and the 'periphery'. In this respect the Soviet Union is no different from the United States, apart from the fact that the former consists of a large number of clearly defined and extensive ethnic territorial units possessing fairly autonomous though subordinate administrativa machinery. In the United States, apart from the Amerindians (principally the Navajo) and the Spanish Americans of the South West the ethnic groups are dispersed throughout the North American continent, and do not possess stable historical, territorial bases from which to exercise power.. (Lewis, E.G. - COMPARATIVE STUDY of Bilingualism. In press.)

The discussion of the political context of bilingual education in the Soviet Union may be summarised as follows:

(i) Language planning in the USSR, of which bilingual education is one aspect is revolutionary since it seeks to establish an immediate relationship between social and linguistic change - it seeks to accelerate changes in the language

pattern of the Soviet Union.

(ii) Consequently such planning is rationalistic rather than empirical in its approach - it sets out previously determined goals of change and adopts preconceived mechanism for bringing them about.

(iii) Unlike the United States and other Western countries, which are seeking ways to devolve power from the centre (undergoing a process of decolonization) the Soviet Union is expansionist: so far as languages are concerned its aim is to ensure that all languages subserve the interests of one political system.

(iv) It is centralist since it seeks to ensure that all languages develop so far as possible in a uniform fashion and according to the model of the Russian language.

(v) It is authoritarian since the goals which are set and methods which are adopted are imposed throughout the Soviet Union with little opportunity for effective consultation or modification by the nationalities.

(vi) Above all it is totalitarian: language planning and therefore the planning of bilingual education is an integral part of total Soviet planning, embracing defense economics, demographic as well as ethnographic processes. In other countries such as the United States and Britain only some areas of society are planned, for example the Health Service in Britain, and Defense in the United States while most of the other aspects of social life are open to the enterprise of free agents and are unplanned. In the Soviet Union there are no unplanned areas. Furthermore, the planning of the separate areas is co-ordinated. Economic planning determines the planning of population mobility and to some extent the natural growth rates of the nationalities. These processes in turn determine changes in the status of the languages as well as changes in the linguistic corpus, since the corpus of the language is modified to meet the requirements of its improved or subordinated status.

(d) The Meaning of Bilingual Education in the USSR

Such considerations as we have outlined determine what is meant by bilingualism and bilingual education in the Soviet Union.

There is no lack of interest in the teaching of foreign languages in that country and the standard of achievement in those languages where they are taught (and used at certain points in the curriculum) is as high if not higher than in most Western countries. In 1954 several large cities in the Ukraine and Russia began introducing a foreign language (usually English) to children of 7 years of age. They were expected to teach about 200 words in the first year. Following the establishment of these classes and in order to facilitate the work for the 7 year olds a number of kindergartens introduced a foreign language at the age of 6 (some at the age of five or even four). There was some opposition from researchers like Ginsberg (1959, 1960) but in spite of the expressed reservations, within 8 years Moscow alone had 500 such kindergartens in which 20,000 children of five years or under were introduced to English. A smaller number of schools introduced German and French. In 1961 the Union Republic Council of Ministers were instructed to introduce a foreign language as a medium of instruction in 700 General Education schools: a subject like Geography was taught in a foreign language at the 6th grade (13 years), contemporary history at Grade 7 or 8 and in the 11th (pre-university) grade science and technology were taught for 3 hours a week partly in a foreign language. The teachers of foreign languages are well trained in many Foreign Language Institutes across the Soviet Union, the most prestigous being the Hertzen Institute of the University of Leningrad, and the 1st Moscow Pedagogical Institute for Foreign Languages. The Tbilisi Institute for Foreign Languages was founded in 1948 and is typical of such institutes in other Union Republics like that at Alma-Ata and Erevan. Among the students at the Tbilisi Institute are representatives of over fifty nationalities of the Soviet Union. English, German and French were the languages taught originally; later Spanish, Italian and several Eastern European languages like Bulgarian were introduced as secondary languages. The students devote 80% to 90% of their curriculum time to the academic pursuit of their foreign language, the remaining 10% or 20% being devoted to aspects of methodology, the psychology of language acquisition, sociological studies and ideological indoctrination. In 1961-2 the USSR Council of Ministers determined that courses should be organised at Universities and Pedagogical Institutes where intending teachers of non-linguistic subjects, like Physics or Mathematics should be trained to teach their specialist subject in a foreign language (Pravda 4.6.61). Nevertheless the situation of foreign

languages in the USSR as a whole and especially in Rural schools is far from satisfactory. In 1973 many students were reported to be disillusioned because of their failure to gain university entrance on account of the fact that 'my school did not teach a foreign language' (Quoted in CDSP 1975 XXV 31) Even when Foreign languages are taught, in very many schools as the USSR Ministry of Education acknowledges 'foreign languages are still being taught by people who have no special knowledge' (Ibid). In rural schools only about one third of the teachers of foreign languages have a specialized higher education qualification (Ibid)

Although a large number of students attain a bilingual proficiency in their particular foreign language at the age of 19, the teaching of foreign languages is not what is meant by a bilingual education in the Soviet Union. The definition of bilingualism as given in the Great Encyclopaedia is very short:

> "One person's or group's fluent command and ability to use 2 different languages or two dialects of one language(e.g. a local language dialect and the literary language).Mass bilingualism occurs in history as the result of conquests,peaceful migration of peoples and contacts between neighbouring groups speaking different languages.
>
> In bilingualism the degree of fluence in each language,the ways in which the various spheres of communication are distributed between the languages and the attitudes of the speakers to them depend on many factors in the social,economic,political and cultural life of the group." (Vol 3)

Bilingual education is acquiring the ability to speak two or more Soviet languages and this is agreed by all Soviet commentators on the subject. The leading Soviet linguists V.V. Vinogradov, Iu, D. Desheriev, U.U. Reshetov and V.A. Seribrennikov in a joint report of the Alma-Ata Conference on "Problems of the Development of Literary Languages of the USSR" (Voprosy 1962) defined bilingualism as "possessing a knowledge of both one's own language and another, most often Russian". Desheriev and his associates writing in 1966 are even more emphatic on the necessity to include Russian. They speak of bilingualism as 'the cultivation of the Russian language among non-Russian populations of the Soviet Union' (Kommunist: XIII -). In a multi-national country the second language, serving most often as the language of cross national communication is Russian and a knowledge of that language plus the language of one's own ethnic group constitutes bilingualism. The supremacy of Russian over other possible second languages

is emphasised in the Programme of the C.P.S.U. which states: "The process occurring in life of the voluntary study not only of one's native language but of Russian has a positive significance as it permits mutual exchange of experience and familiarization of each nation and nationality with the cultural achievements of all other people of the USSR and world culture" (Programma Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza: 115).

In 1972 P.A. Azimov and others (1972) published a report on a conference held at Ashkabad on "Trends in the Development of the National Languages in Relation to the Development of Socialist Nationalities". They concluded that "the intensive process over the last fifty years or so of learning Russian alongside the vernacular in all Soviet Republics has led to the situation where bilingualism acquires not only linguistic but also increased social significance. Knowledge of Russian as the common (major) language makes it possible for all Soviet Nations to communicate freely with one another" (p.320). The emphasis on Russian as the necessary second language component of bilingualism has led many Soviet linguists like Baskakov to claim that "in the new Socialist regime ... Russian is now recognised by all as a second Native language" (1960:32). Baskakov returned to this theme in 1973 when he made the distinction between 'bilingualism' and what he refers to as 'more complicated interlingual relations ... of minorities who in addition to the Russian language also know the language of the basic indigenous Republic they reside in' (1973 Equally explicit in identifying bilingual education with the learning of Russian as a second language is the statement in Vestnik AK Nauk SSR 1972 where the desired integration of the peoples of the USSR is referred to as "the development of bilingualism, i.e. the non-Russian mastering Russian". Naturally within any one Union Republic the extent (Table 5) to which Russian has been learned as a second language varies. "In surveys of a number of districts in Belo-Russia 76.7% used Russian in addition to their native language (Ukrainian or Belorussian). Practically all the Gagauz people of the Karrat Raion of the Moldavian Republic had acquired Russian and many would also have learned the official language of the Republic, Moldavian" (Kholmogorov, 1972) Kholmogorov (1970-2) found that the average of Russian related bilingualism in Latvia was 84% and among the minorities inhabiting that Republic 98% of the Belorussians, 85% of the Poles, 96% of the Ukrainians, 98% of the Jews but only 52% of the Lithuanians and 62% of the Estonians had acquired Russian. The percentage among the Letts was 78% (Kholmogorov, 1964:2). At the same time a high percentage of the non-indigenous population of Latvia had learned Lettish: among the Belorussians 67%, Estonians 53%, Poles 50% and Jews 43%. Only the Russians (31%) have a low level of Lettish

bilingualism (Kholmogorov 1962). It is noteworthy that in Lithuania and Latvia the percentage of the non-indigenous bilinguals living in rural areas is much lower than it is in urban areas - in Latvia and Lithuania the respective figures are approximately 18% and 35% in both cases.

The extent of bilingualism varies considerably from one nationality to another according to the level of economic and educational development For example it is low among Uygurs, Mansi, Itelmen, Yukagirs and Tuvin. The nature and the length of the nationality's contact with Russia is important. Thus the numbers claiming Russian is high among the Nogai, Cherkess, Adygei of the Caucusus as well as among the Komi-Permyak and Mari within the Russian Republic, and the Ossettes and Chuvash who have mixed freely with the Russians. A third factor prompting Russian as a second language is Russian penetration by immigration, as in the case of Kazakhstan. Finally the possession of a native language which has been standardised and is the medium of a developed literary culture tends to discourage the acquisition of Russian, especially if the nation in question is relatively large. Such is the case of the Ukrainians, Uzbeks, Armenians, Azerbaydzhanis, Georgians, Tadzhiks, Kirgiz and the Baltic nations where the percentage claiming Russian in each case is under 40%.

The extent of Russian related bilingualism also varies according to age though the age factor varies from Republic to Republic. (Table 6). Fewer than a third of those born before the Revolution are fluent in Russian as a second language. Taking the whole of the Soviet Union the 20-29 age group is the most extensively bilingual. Those under ten have the lowest percentage. The graph rises to age thirty and falls gradually to 23.2% at 60 years and over. The average percentage for all ages is 32%.

The identification of bilingualism with the acquisition of Russian should not blind us to the considerable degree of non-Russian related bilingualism in the Soviet Union (Table 7). In considering whether in any particular Republic the degree of non-Russian bilingualism is high or low we should take into account the fact that the maximum percentage is 45% (Tsukhurs) followed closely by Kurds (36.2%). The lowest level is among the Tuvin (0.4%) and Ingush (0.9%). Between these two extremes non-Russian bilingualism varies considerably. Of the 106 nationalities listed in the Census, in 35 ethnic groups a non-Russian language was claimed as a second language by up to 5% of the population; in another 22 nationalities such a second language was claimed by between 5% and 10%, in another 15 the percentage was

between 10% and 20% and in three more the percentage rose to between 20% and 30%. In 5 nationalities over 30% claimed a non-Russian language as an element in their bilingualism. It should be noted that many in these nationalities have learned Russian also. This is particularly so in Kazakhstan where most of the dispersed Turki live. The majority of these are trilingual (Turkish, Kazakh and Russian) or quadrilingual, possessing Uzbek in addition to the languages we have mentioned. At the same time their speech shows the influence of prolonged Turkish-Georgian bilingualism (Iz. AN. Kaz. 5:72). The lower percentage of non-Russian than Russian bilingualism is due not simply to the fact that speakers of the major national languages, especially Georgians, Lithuanians, Uzbeks and Azerbaydzhanis do not learn a second language other than Russian. Members of some nationalities have high levels of Russian acquisition often because they are dispersed populations. This is the case of the Poles, and Jews. High levels of non-Russian bilingualism characterise small nationalities especially if they are minorities within larger national entities. This is the case of the Gagauz in Moldavia, the Tati of Azerbaydzhan and the non indigenous ethnic groups which constitute enclaves within larger linguistic groups, like the Kurds and Aisors. From whatever angle we look at languages in the Soviet Union the pattern of their inter-relationship is highly complex. The main pull continues to be exerted by the native language whose claims upon the loyalty of its speakers has been diminished only slightly over several decades (Table 4). At the same time as we have seen the Russian language is increasing its hold as a second language and then by the normal process of language shift it is claimed as the native language of those whose second language it had been previously. Many immigrants have learned the official language of the Republic into which they have moved and indigenous minorities have done the same.

The tensions between affiliations to the various languages are increasing but such tensions do not lead to open conflict nor do they need to do so provided the system of education is geared to meeting the problems that undoubtedly arise. SMIRNOV (1970:1) refers to four kinds of "non-antagonistic contradictions": first those between innovation and conservatism which have particular relevance to the relationship of the traditional native and the intrusive Russian language. Another expression which is ometimes used in this connection is that the Soviet Union is pursuing 'two paths (dva potoka) - the path leading to convergence of languages and ethnic groups (possibly to their merging (zblyzhennja and sliyanie) and that leading to the maintenance of national languages and their cultures. Filin, the

chief editor of Voprosy Jazykozonanija and Director of the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences wrote (Vop Jaz. 1973, 3): "We face the task of enormous importance: each Soviet citizen of non-Russian extraction while having command of his mother tongue and contributing to its blossoming and spread, must also freely master the language of international communication - the Russian language ... Harmonious bilingualism and multi-lingualism free from even a shade of antagonism, this is our programme". It is noteworthy that nothing is said of those of Russian extraction who might also become bilingual or multilingual. 'Non antagonistic contradiction' is of particular interest in the Soviet Union because the balance between the contradictory elements is manipulated deliberately, consciously and according to a preconceived political philosophy which envisages the dominance of Russian.

(e) Bases of Research

The guiding principles of scientific research in the social sciences are radically different from those of non-socialist countries and especially of the United States. No education or academic system exists in a philosophical vacuum; it reflects the interests of the dominant group or class and tries to meet what are considered to be necessary and urgent national demands. Some of the characteristics of the modernizing Soviet state have been referred to already and we have also stated the basic philosophy which is supposed to guide the multinational state in its attempt to produce a stable linguistic pattern. Theoretically at least, and in the medium term the state is devoted to a pluralistic linguistic and ethnic society. But that pluralism is always to be guarded against the threat of segmentation ('bouregois nationalism'). The ethnic/linguistic groups while maintaining their traditional languages and cultures are also meant to contribute to the creation of an overarching 'Soviet Culture', and an overarching Soviet ideological and political system. At times the contributing ethnic groups have more freedom to develop independently than at other times but at no time is there any disguising the intention of creating the 'Soviet man', 'Soviet culture' and possibly a Soviet language though this last may be only a dream in the eye of the most extreme collectivist. It is possible to pursue pluralism in other countries too, the United States for instance, knowing that it does not necessarily require a doctrinaire unity to enable the separate groups to survive, and contribute at the same time to the survival and enrichment of the nation as a whole. At the level of academic research Sidney Hook claimed that only one kind of unity was compatible with the freedom of scientific research and the development of sound scholarship: "it is not a unity of doctrine but a unity of discipline which expresses itself in an uncoerced convergence of interests from various disciplines working on a common problem" (Hook, 314).

This is far from being the case in the Soviet Union. Perhaps the most frequently recurring theme in even the most scholarly and important research reports is the affirmation of conformity to Marxist-Leninist principles. It is a ritualistic concession to an omnipresent authority, embracing all disciplines. Desheriev writes (1973: 3, 5-40) "Methodological and ideological concepts play a considerable part in determining the paths, aims and tasks in the development of the social functions of languages and also their interaction". (p.9). P.O. Sor (1926) and Lafargue (Russian translation of "La Langue Français, 1930) based socio-linguistics firmly on Marxist methodological concepts of the social nature of language. The foundations were laid by Marx and Engels in their 'German Ideology'. Scerbyc'ky, the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukrainian, in a speech published in Radjans'ka Ukrajina (2.2.76) Wrote: "In our work we entirely proceed from the Marxist-Leninist thesis that further unification (zblyzennja) of nations and nationalities of our countries constitutes an objective process ... The party considers inadmissible attempts to restrain the process of the unification of nations and put obstacles in its path, artificially to consolidate the national isolation". This authority does not rest with those institutions which we normally accept as its repositories - the family, the school and the system of further education, but is determined to a considerable extent by the Communist Party and its leaders: "In our country it is not only the family and the school that are in charge of upbringing but also the entire party educational system" (Khoslov, 32). This is emphasised even more explicitly by the Academician A.G. Yegorov, Secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences (Division of Philosophy and Law) in a paper 'Raise the Level of Sociological Research' when he wrote: "Our association should help all its members to master Marxist-Leninism in order that all sociological problems may be treated from the Marxist-Leninist point of view. All methods of sociological research, surveys, modeling, the latest mathematical methods should be used in accordance with Marxist-Leninist methodology" (Sotsiologischeskiye issledovania, 3 1977: 4-8). Because of its Marxist-Leninist orientation the scientific criteria they adopt in research are heavily weighted towards historical, materialist-sociological interpretations of the nature of education and language.

Though they find a place for 'consciousness' in their view of educational psychology, their fundamental tenet is summed up in Marx's notion that the individual's psychology is the sum total of his social relations. "The orientation of people's activity" wrote Alekseev (1965:246) "is determined by their social existence and by the objective needs and position of the class of which they are

members as well as by the conditions of life of every concrete individual". This strict materialist point of view prevails so that although to some extent education becomes a branch of biology the determinative conclusion of the educational research worker is that one "can hardly contradict I.P. Pavlov's contention that the laws of upbringing and development must be based on physiology" (Khostov, 1965). Nevertheless since social processes are conceived as determining all other aspects of a child's development the aspect of materialist philosophy which receives most emphasis is the sociological. For instance a Georgian research workers' criticisms are directed against "those idealist conceptions which present human consciousness as a collection of elementary sensations and impulses". They claim to show that it is not the study of the nervous system and the brain that can explain thought processes. The answer to the problem must be sought in those social conditions that cause the brain to conceive reality in a certain way in some circumstances and in another way in different social conditions. The prevalent social conditions mould and determine the reactions of the nervous system and the brain" (Khostov 1965). Since social conditions change according to the laws of historical materialism it is equally important that "an adequate analysis of any scientific or practical problem must be based on knowledge of its history" (Khoslov).

The basic tenets of those engaged on educational research, including research on bilingual education can be summed up as scientific within the framework of Marxist-Leninist ideology. This implies a strictly materialist attitude, the most important aspect of such materialism being the objective conditions of society. These determine the individual's and the group's development, the history of which must be studied in order to come to a full understanding of the process. "For the process of internationalization of Soviet nations and nationalities is objective. It can be neither slowed nor accelerated because it is a function of historical development. But this does not mean that it is spontaneous and uncontrollable" (Kholmogorov, 189). Knowledge of the history of a process enables one to plan for its most appropriate development. Thus a consideration of the context of research on bilingualism and bilingual education suggests the existence of four paradigms which have received varying degrees of attention in all countries according to the level of their social development. In countries like Wales, Belgium and other western countries which possess mature systems of bilingual education the paradigms have succeeded each other uniformly. The emphasis on literacy was necessarily the first paradigm since without literacy there was no possibility of mobilizing the total population to participate in the processes of modernization. Consequently the linguistic aspects

of bilingual education were the first to receive attention in Western Europe and North America. Once a sufficient degree of literacy and linguistic assimilation had been achieved by means of the dissemination of the lingua franca attention shifted to cultural assimilation of the divers ethnic populations. For these reasons the second paradigm is determined by ethnological/cultural considerations. Cultural assimilation, since it involves an awareness of ethnic and cultural differences encourages the development of an awareness of ethnic identity so that there was a new, a second paradigm shift to psychological considerations (witness the work of Lambert). This third research paradigm is heavily weighted towards the study of individual children, and to discovering individual types of bilingualism like 'co-ordinate and compound bilingualism'. In the Soviet Union, as we shall have occasion to note, although important work has been done on the psychology of individual bilinguals the main emphasis is on social-psychology. We have recently witnessed the third paradigm shift where because previous developments in literacy, cultural assimilation and the psychology of social groups is conceived as leading directly to a consideration of the pedagogical-political consequences of diversity and assimilation the emphasis has been moved to social or political pluralism.

Whereas in the early-modernizing bilingual countries the paradigm shifts could be clearly distinguished and identified and were separated by periods which approximated to between twenty and thirty years (a generation), in the rapidly modernizing countries like the Soviet Union these paradigms operated almost simultaneously - literacy, assimilation, the promotion of convergence and political-pedagogical considerations all operated together within the framework of a political ideology. It is noteworthy that the Ashkabad Conference on Bilingualism and Multilingualism in 1969 considered the subject according to linguistic, sociological, psychological and pedagogical aspects in that order, confirming the succession of paradigms to which we have referred. The United States in this respect stands mid way between the early and late developers of bilingual education. There the time scale of paradigm shift is not so clear as it is in Wales or Belgium, with the consequence that the attention paid to second language learning (the linguistic paradigm) is still considerable although the emphasis has moved first to a consideration of cultural assimilation, later under the influence of Lambert and Tucker to psychological considerations. More recently still, while the other paradigms are still effective, the move to a pedagogical political paradigm in terms of 'segmented pluralism' has gained ground.

(2) The Linguistic Paradigm a) Socio-Linguistic Background

We have excluded the teaching of foreign languages as an integral element of bilingual education in the USSR though it is not always clear how a 'second language' distinguishes itself at one end of the scale from the mother tongue or native language and, at the other extreme from a foreign language. Not all languages acquired in addition to the mother tongue constitute a uniform set. Learning a second language in a 'mass' bilingual situation, like Armenian as a second language in Tbilisi or Moscow is different from the acquisition of the same language where there is little demographic support for it like Armenian in Washington or London. And learning Russian in Eervan is different from its acquisition in Paris or Bonn. Marckwardt favoured the distinction between a second and a foreign language (1955:66) but American linguists were slow to adopt his suggestion which was already accepted by Soviet and British linguists and teachers. Some linguists concealed the problem by speaking of the two mother tongues of the bilingual child (Weinreich 1953), a proposal which some Soviet linguists found acceptable (Baskakov (1960)). Ordinarily the clearest distinction between the second and a foreign language is based on the context of acquisition of either language. For instance in Wales English is learned as a second language because of its prevalence throughout the country, whereas no matter what level of proficiency in Russian a Welsh child acquires in Wales it is still a foreign language. The second language is acquired under pressure or with strong support from the social environment in which the language is freely used. (Lewis, 1974).

It is recognised in the Soviet Union that in spite of the considerable advances made in other aspects of linguistics, until recently the development of sociolinguistics has been backward, hampered by the fact that insufficient support has been forthcoming from the discipline of sociology. Consequently any contribution sociologists could make to the understanding of the sociology of language was limited. This degree of retardation among sociologists, especially those interested in language is due, it is claimed, partly to the fact that the "conceptual framework of Marxist Sociology still needs clarification .. Secondly, applied sociological research is conducted by small groups and is sometimes haphazard, narrowly empirical, trivial in its aims and not worth the money or effort". Furthermore, "the inadequate training of Soviet sociologists is the main reason we have been slow to overcome our shortcomings ... The Soviet Union has only the rudiments of a sociological education" (RUTKEVICH, 1975) However, the author is far too critical of Soviet developments, mainly because his concept of sociological studies

is narrower than very many sociologists would wish it to be. It would have been impossible to be so critical if students of the nature and structure of society like ethnologists (ARUTIUNIAN) for example) and demographers like Pokshishevskii or Perevedentsev, equally concerned with the working of society, although within limited fields of interest, had been accepted as representative of Soviet studies of the working and structure of society.

The socio-linguistic approach to bilingualism has become more pronounced during the last decade, in the words of U.A. ARVORIN N.A. Baskakov, I.K. Beloded, Yu.D. Desheriev, S.K. Kenesbayev, N.G. Kortelyanu, U.G. Koztomarov, M.Sh. Shiraliyev as well as those on the interface between linguistics and philosophy like A.G. Agayev, M.S. Dzhunusov, S.T. Kaltakhohyan, K.Kh. Khanazarov, A.I. Kholmogorov and I.P. Tsameryan. In fact the range of socio-linguistic studies is comprehensive, including theoretical problems, the study of socially determined changes in Soviet languages, the study of the development and interaction of the languages of USSR, the interaction of standard Soviet languages and dialects of those languages, as well as most of the aspects of language planning, including language policy (Nikolsky 1974). Soviet students maintain the clearest distinction between linguistic sociology, concerned with linguistic aspects of social phenomena, e.g. linguistic characteristics of small groups (Panov 1968, b, Vol.1) and socio-linguistics concerned with research into the language changes which are determined by social factors as well as socially marked linguistic differences in the speech of different individuals (Krysin)

Such researches have been conducted in many centres including the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR; the Russian Language Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR; the Institute of Eastern Studies of the Academy; the Pushkin Institute of the Russian Language; the Saratov University; the Novosibirsk Institute of the Siberian Division of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR etc. Since 1972 the number of sub-divisions of the Soviet Sociological Association has been increased from 5 to 15. As a result of the co-operation of scholars belonging to these various institutes the proceedings of many conferences which have to do with bilingualism and bilingual education have been published including Vzaimodejistie (1969), Voprosy (1964), Voprosy (1969), Norma (1969), Osnovnye problemy (1966), Problemy (1970), Problemy (1972), Razvitie literaturnyx jazykov (1965), Sociolingvicheskie problemy (1971), Jazyk i obschestvo (1968) and several others. In Azimov's collection (1972) many of the papers dealt with theoretical questions of

bilingualism and multilingualism, especially the phenomenon of interference or mutual influence of languages in contact. This aspect of the subject is dealt with on the level of phonetics, morphology, syntax, stylistics, lexis and semantics. Several articles deal with the contact of Russian with Azerbaydzhani, Turkmen, Lithuanian, Georgian and Ossetian. It is noted that the Russian language in spite of its dominance and superior status is not immune from such interference: "It is being constantly enriched with new words and expressions borrowed from the languages in contact with it but more directly in the colloquial speech of the Russian people living among non-Russian populations than in the national written literary Russian Language" (Sanzheev 1966). In view of the prevalence of this phenomenon the report concludes that the best method of teaching the second language, whichever it may be, "is continuous contrastive comparison of languages in contact. But whatever method is used to deal with aspects of contact it is acknowledged that "language contact often needs conscious control by society". That is, there is a constant and continuing need for language planning (Desheriev 1973).

(5) Development of Literacy (Table 8)

It cannot be repeated too often that the ultimate purpose of bilingual education as an aspect of socio-linguistic studies in the Soviet Union is increased and improved literacy mainly in Russian but not necessarily limited to that language. Wherever different languages are in contact some degree of bilingualism is inevitable, especially along the language frontiers. Prior to the fairly advanced level of modernization, requiring more than an elitist, minimal literacy, such bilingualism was oral and fortuitous - it was generally restricted to the uneducated speakers of the areas of contact. It was also fortuitous in the sense that it was unplanned and derived mainly from the normal contact of friends, acquaintances and others across the borders. Such oral and fortuitous bilingualism characterises most of the bilingualism revealed in Table 7 concerned with non-Russian related bilingualism. This does not imply that Russian, in areas where extensive Russian populations embraced a variety of minority groups was not also an element in oral and fortuitous bilingualism. But by the present time nearly 99% of the populations of the Soviet Union are literate in at least one language and to a great extent in two or more. The lowest level of literacy in Tadzhikastan is 96.5% and Turkistan 94.5%. In less than 80 years some of the nationalities have improved to their present level from a base of 2.3% literacy (Tadzhikastan), 3.1%

(Kirgizstan), 3.6% (Uzbekistan) and others like the Kazakh, Azerbaydzhani, Armenian and Turkmen from below 10%.

This level of literate bilingualism (in Russian and non-Russian languages) is distinct from the limited literate bilingualism among elitist groups of the Tsarist regime although efforts had been made by pioneers like Ilminsky to develop such mass literacy before the Revolution. The present position however could not have been achieved without considerable deliberate, conscious and scholarly intervention with the corpus of the languages, for the possibility of universal as opposed to elitist literacy depends on the development of 'national" as distinct from what is termed 'folk languages' (GUXMAN, 1960). The fundamental characteristic of a developed national language compared with the folk language is that it is 'a single standerdised literary language (a common literary norm, which is shared by the entire nation and which functions in all aspects of communication and which is formed from a folk base' (1964). Such a development, it is claimed by Soviet linguists cannot be matter of chance but is the result of careful linguistic planning of the structure of the language (in all its aspects), its lexis and if necessary its alphabetisation.

(1) Code Selection

Paul Garvin postulates two requirements for a standard language, namely flexible stability of the code and intellectualization: "The codification needs to be flexible enough to allow for modification in line with culture change ... and it should allow the possibility of developing increasing variety along an ascending scale of functional dialects from conversation to scientific" (GARVIN, 1973). In Shevelov's words (1977) standard languages need to be "omni-functional" in order to fulfil all the demands made upon a contemporary language in a modernized society. It is questionable whether any but the most developed languages like Georgian or Armenian (apart from Russian and Ukrainian have been able to maintain their original, flexible stability on an ascending scale of dialect and style variation. Nevertheless a large number of hitherto 'unstandardised languages' have been enabled to become fully fledged literary languages, thus perhaps compensating somewhat for the functional limitations which the planners have imposed upon previously standard languages.

Very many of the Soviet languages like Uzbek and Tadzhik have a complex system of dialects and all we can do in this study of 'code stabilization' is to exemplify the processes which one or two languages experienced. The first criterion employed in the normalization of Soviet languages is adherence to a continuous historical tradition of speaking the dialect which has been selected as the single or the principal base and focal point of standardization. For example the choice of the Tashkent-Ferghana dialect as the base for standardised Uzbek was determined partly by the fact "that it can be traced back to the linguistic community of Karkhanid period and which genetically speaking is related to the Uygur language. Together they form a single unbroken line of development" (RESETOV 1956) But the historically authentic dialect may not be the most pure. In the case of Uzbek this is the South Kazakhstan dialect which because of its possession of full vowel harmony was the ultimately agreed choice as a base for the Uzbek language. Next to purity and historic authenticity the third criterion in codifying a standard language is that the chosen dialect should be the most widely representative not only geographically but also in its affinity with other dialects. The Kuvakan dialect of Bashkir was rejected as a base because it was found unrepresentative of other dialects. Instead, characteristics of both the Kuvakan and the Juriatin dialects were combined to provide a stable base for Bashkir and these together had affinities with most other dialects of Bashkir. Literary Kalmyk is a similar synthesis, as is Ashkarbar the historical literary base of contemporary Armenian (GARIBJAN 1960) But the most important criterion of all those used in code selection, according to Soviet linguists, is the degree to which a selected dialect represents the spoken language.

(ii) Terminology

The current process of relexification of the national languages were initiated early during the present Soviet period and can be understood only in the context of those early developments. Terminology bulked largely in the considerations of language planners and was given great prominence by the pioneer Soviet linguist N.Y. Marr "as the linguistic aspect of the future". Changes in terminology were introduced partly to enrich the languages with the lexical items required by the economic and cultural revolution, partly by the politically motivated desire to eliminate from the Soviet languages vestigial lexical items which linked them to pre-revolutionary and genetically related languages, like Arabic and Persian. A third cause for the insistence on encouraging such changes was the wish to ensure that the national languages were able to cope with translations

of Marx-Leninist and Stalinist literature. Vinogradov (1945: 165-66) pointed out that "similarities and correspondences between the different languages of the USSR that are attributable to the influence of Russian are manifested in the following processes:

i) an extension of the sphere of influence of Russian expressions and especially the new Soviet expressions and their loan translations;

ii) a rapid dissemination of Sovietisms and their movement from one language to another;

iii) the acquisition through Russian of a basic international vocabulary".

These issues were raised very much earlier at the Congress of Workers' Education in 1924. Following the congress of Turkology at Daku in 1926 a special commission was set up to initiate work on dictionaries and lexicons for new political and scientific developments. By 1933 this Commission had produced several minimum lists for science and technology.

Apart from Soviet-wide commissions on terminology many Union Republics created their own commissions. In Armenia, the Special Terminology Commission had, by 1950, approved over 18,000 medical terms and 13,000 legal terms. In Latvia 40,000 terms were approved between 1947-49. A permanent Terminology Commission of the Soviet Ministry of the Bashkir ASSR was created in the 1940's and its efforts were subsequently continued by the Bashkir Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (JULDASEV 1960). It produced the first normative dictionary which included sociological and philosophical terms as well as lexicons for botany, chemistry, mathematics, physics, linguistics and medicine. A second series, concerned with some additional subjects, including forestry was published later. (Similar work was conducted in other languages, for example, The Terminology Commission of the Kirgiz Academy of Sciences which has been systematizing the lexicon of nearly all branches of sciences and has produced nearly 70 lexicons. (Sov. Kirg. 10.4.73).

Such advances in lexicology have been governed by clearly defined theoretical principles, the first of which is that the maximum possible use be made of native resources (SHEVELOV 1977). But though clearly formulated the principle was abandoned in the thirties. Instead the main sources for developing vocabularies were to be Russian. This could be by direct borrowing from Russian with the minimum of phonetic adaptation, or it could be by loan translation

and calquing. Originally the maximum use of native resources meant the introduction into the new literary languages of elements of dialects or sub-dialects of those languages. In Uzbek for example 'archaic words and expressions were gradually deleted and replaced with words and expressions in the spoken language' (Reseteu). The same was true of Ukrainian, but very soon the collection of materials from Ukrainian dialects and the spoken language was called 'kulackie dialekty' (the language of rich peasants) although the material which was thus condemned was used in the dialects of all classes of peasants and others (Shevelov, 256).

Rather than use the spoken indigenous language as a source Russian was used as the means of enriching the languages, but in this respect the practice was ambivalent. All sorts of propaganda were used to encourage the use of Russian sources but Filin objected strongly to the importation of foreign borrowings: "Anglicisms, more precisely Americanisms enter our scientific and technical terminology and nomenclature not by hundreds or by thousands but by hundreds of thousands, if not more" (Vop. Jaz. 1955:3). Consequently it was necessary to emphasise the use of Russian sources although that language is foreign to many of those whose languages might be involved: "Special attention should be given to the struggle against the disregard of Russian by the unjustified loans from the English language" (Ibid.). This new enthusiasm for Russian was not reflected in the practice of the early planners for in the 1920's and 30's there w a disinclination to allow the importation of Russian terms similar to the importation from other languages. The reasons given for the change was that "the experience of the peoples of the USSR has shown that the Russian language has played and will play a historically important role in the development of national languages. Thanks to its richness the Russian language is the main source of borrowing ... In most languages of the USSR 70-80% of the new terms have been borrowed from Russian (Mordinov 1950). Isayew (302-5) analyses the main categories of such borrowings as socio-political terms like 'kommunizm'; terms that are related to industrial and agricultural production, like 'brigada' and 'sortirovka'; the names of institutions like 'institut' and 'technikum'; terms that refer to transportation like 'autobus' and 'taksi'; military terms like 'katyusha' (multiple rocket launcher) measures of weight and length like 'tonna' and 'gramm', 'metr ' and 'santimetr'; names of professions like 'shofer', 'letchik' (pilot), 'kombainer' (combine operator); and verbs that relate to the development of industry.

An analysis of a sample of Uzbek periodicals shows that while the percentage of Arabic and Persian words declined from 37% to 25% the Russian element increased from 2% to 25%. Eighteen percent of the items in a Uzbek/Turkic dictionary were of Russian origin while a Tatar dictionary contained twice as many Russian loan words in the 1958 edition as there were in the 1929 edition (KIZIL UZBEK 14.4.69) Because of the extent of Russian penetration of all nationality languages "a merging of the lexicon content of the national languages has occurred and through this a merging of the lexicons of the national languages themselves" (MORDVINOV 1950)

The Russian influence is more pervasive than this direct contribution suggests, since the Russian language has become the accepted model as the main source of lexical innovation. First, Russian is the intermediary for most words introduced from non-Soviet sources like English or German. Second, calquing mainly from Russian sources has increased considerably. For instance in Bashkir we have now on the Russian model 'kultura-ayarti ese' (culturally instructive work), 'kultura-politik-ayarti (cultural-political education) etc. In Ukrainian we now have 'blyskavka' for 'zipper'. It is a loan translation of the Russian 'molnija' which literarily means 'lightening'. This is the original and basic meaning of the Ukrainian term, a/160. Third, derivatives are formed from Russian by the addition of native affixes; for instance we have in Bashkir 'kulturahid' (uncultured) and 'novatorliq' (innovation), the words being combinations of Russian stems and Bashkir affixes.

Another form of Russian usurpation of the national processes of development of native languages is to have exclusive Russian and national language dictionaries. For instance, of the important Ukrainian dictionaries published recently they are all either Russian-Ukrainian or Ukrainian-Russian. In principle no publications of full dictionaries from Ukrainian to other languages or vice versa are issued. Occasionally one finds some slim dictionaries designed for high school pupils with the minimum basic vocabulary, in German, French and slightly more bulky in English. (Shevelov: 258). On the other hand a new tri-lingual Gagauz-Russian-Moldavian dictionary, serving the 160,000 Gagauz of S. Moldavia has been published by the Academy of Sciences incorporating 11,000 Gagauz terms. (Sov. Mold. 19.7.43).

Changes in the corpus of the national languages have meant changes in their stylistic characteristics. These stylistic characteristics are indissolubly related to the structural characteristics of the languages and their lexical content. (Deseriev, 1973: 19). Consequently the national languages approximate more and more to the Russian language

in stylistic character. In fact every effort is made to ensure that the educational and publishing practices of the Republics, for example the Ukraine, implement Russian models. Every Ukrainian publication has a style editor whose function it is to see that all the official prescriptions are applied. The results are unfavourable to variety in the national language. For instance Literaturna Gazeta reported in 1958: "It is the activity of the style editor to require the implementation of what they find in the two official models - the Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary and the Ukrainian spelling system, and this results in excessive standardization, excessive stereotyping of the literary language and the suppression of any personal peculiarities in the author's language" (Pljusc, Lit. Gaz. 1958). This insistence on tha use of Russian stylistic models is not surprising in view of the enthusiasm of Russian propaganda for the Russian language. The Russian linguist Kostomarov, reviewing for Voprosy Jazykoznanija (1976, i) a work by the eminent linguist Protchenko complains that the latter "does not say anything about the outstanding linguistic quality of the Russian language, an extraordinary phenomenon in the linguistic creativity of mankind. It would be wrong to adduce the perfection of the language as a reason for the international advance of Russian characteristics but it is equally wrong to ignore this perfection".

Furthermore, because of increasing social and cultural convergence, the stylistic differentiations within each of the many national languages brought about by the need to adapt to new roles, tend to follow a uniform pattern across languages because of the omni-presence of the Russian influence. "Common trends and laws of development and mutual enrichment of languages (which) are clearly manifested in the formation of a special style of socio-political and publicistic literature of the Soviet epoch, took shape under the influence of the Russian language" (Deseriev, et al, 1966, pp. 16-17). These developments are governed by the "principle of minimum discrepancy" between national languages and between them and Russian (printsip minimal 'nykh raskhozhedniy) (Deseriev and Prochenko).

(iii) Alpahebtic reform

The Soviet Union is not simply a multilingual but also a multigraphic or multi-alphabetic country, and was even more so at the commencement of the present regime. At one time the two main alphabets were Arabic and Cyrillic with some examples of Latin scripts especially in the Baltic countries. Georgian and Armenian had their own unique alphabets. The motives for alphabetic reform were several: it was claimed that Arabic was unsuited to some of the Central Asian nationalities but in these cases a stronger motive

was the intention to separate them from the related languages spoken outside the USSR. Second there was the strong desire to diminish the degree of heterogeneity which existed in the USSR. Third, even if radical changes in the alphabets had not been contemplated for political reasons there was the conviction that the alphabets of several languages like Armenian needed reform in any case. With the inauguration of the Soviet Regime the demand for reform became widespread and it was agreed that such reforms should follow certain principles. First alphabets must reflect the structure of the languages, especially their phonemic composition. Extra symbols and inadequate phonemic distinctiveness should be avoided. Second, identical or similar symbols should not be used to express different sounds. Third, the language's grammatical system should be reflected in the graphical system. Fourth the use of a combination of two letters for a single sound should be discouraged. Finally, from the linguist's standpoint, those phonemes which occur most frequently should be represented by the simpler symbols, while those that occur less frequently might be represented by more complex symbols. From the teacher's standpoint it was stressed that the extent to which the letters lent themselves to cursive writing was important since the cursive form facilitates the speed and ease of forming both separate and systems of letters. (Artemov,1969).

In 1919 a special section of the Department of National Minorities of the USSR Commissariat of Education was created to develop textbooks and literature and this involved serious consideration of alphabetic reform. By 1922 the Latin script was receiving approval exemplified by the Report of the Second Conference of Uzbek Education Workers who strongly opposed the use of Cyrrilic. Between 1922 and 1926 the latinised script had been accepted with some reservations all over Central Asia. The new Latin alphabet was named the Unified New Turkic Alphabet (Novogo Tyurkskogo Alfavita-NTA). A permanent organisation was formed to undertake linguistic research in promoting the new alphabet - The All Union Central Committee on the New Turkic Alphabet. However the promoters of this alphabet were already in difficulties because the Russian Cyrillic script was preferred by some nationalities and by 1937 there were clear indications of a radical switch of policy. In 1939 Daghestan adopted Cyrillic and by 1940 it had spread to most Republics, more than 68 languages having been supplied with scripts and over 25 millions able to use them.

In all these developments which are basic to the existing linguistic situation of Soviet literacy and education at least

five different but related aspects have to be distinguished. In the first place there was for many languages the creation of alphabets of any kind and this, in the abstract was the main contribution which linguists made to the development of literate bilingualism and the possibility of bilingual education. Second, there was the decision to have a unified base so far as possible whether this was Latin or Cyrillic. This had conduced to the gradual homogenization of Soviet society by means of bilingual education. Third, the choice of Latin meant severing some languages from related variants of the same languages outside the USSR. Fourth, the change from Latin to Cyrillic was brought about not so much to improve and extend literacy in any national language but to facilitate the acquisition of the second language, Russian. Finally, whatever alphabet was used, Russian or Latin, it meant that for the first time many languages given equal opportunities, were able to compete in promoting literacy with the major languages, whether Russian or the official languages of the Union Republics in which they might be minorities.

(c)
(i) Status of Russian vis a vis Nationality languages

The success of any form of bilingual education depends in the last resort on the status of the respective languages and this status is determined partly by the degree of standardisation of the languages, its lexical content and its literary productivity. Status is determined therefore by language policy which decides which languages to advance and the manner in which they do so. We have dealt with the advancement of the corpus of the languages and we now turn to the social functions which the languages are encouraged or allowed to fulfil. The idea of consciously influencing this aspect of linguistics was expressed as early as the 20's (Vinokur, 1929, Jakubinski, 1931, 193) but it remained for Vingradov to include these processes within the concept of planning and language policy - namely the conscious efforts of society aiming at the regulation of the inter-relationship of languages' (Vingradov, 1961, Grigor'ev 1963, Nikolsky 1968). Such a language policy is based on the study not only of the corpus of the languages but also on psychological, demographic, ethnographic and other aspects of society (Nikolsky 1970). We have already referred to the fact that a language can attain a satisfactory status only if it is a suitably developed medium of communication. This includes functional and genre-stylistic differentiation of a language including the variety of genre features of literature that has been published systematically over a length of time; on the extent of the social functions exercised by the language and by the lexico-semantic differentiation within the vocabulary (Deseriev 1973: 19). However the Soviet Union insists that all languages cannot hope to attain complete coverage of social functions (i.e. be omnifunctional) they

have to be differentiated according to their ability to fulfil different functions. "The concepts of the 'sphere of social life' and the 'social functions of language' are not commensurable or isomorphous magnitudes. Various languages can perform social functions of different extent in one and the same environment". (Deseriev 1973, 22). Another less well known linguist claims that in a multi-national Soviet state though there is complete freedom for all languages to develop, the equality of a language should not be confused with its social functions, which cannot be the same and equally comprehensive for all languages (Cina, 8.9.72). In every state there is an objective need for a common language and in the Soviet Union this means that Russian tends to expropriate all the most prestigous social functions, and this is prefectly justified since society is entitled to regulate processes of interaction between languages. (Nar.obrzovanie v SSSR, 1967, 484). The policy has been vacillating if not unpredictable for over three quarters of a century. In pre Soviet times Ukrainian for instance was severely restricted functionally - in printing, in schools and all public occasions, although on the lower levels of person-to-person conversation there was little interference. Between 1917 and 1930 Ukrainian succeeded in becoming the language of public education including in part college and university education. It became the acknowledged language of research in the humanities, the language of public gatherings in the countryside and even in towns, as well as the language of the theatre and more limitedly the language of administration. But since 1932 it is not Ukrainian which is so encouraged but Russian. The most favourable situation in which Ukrainian may find itself in the Ukraine at the present time is one of parity with Russian. If in any city there is a Ukrainian newspaper there must be a Russian one; a Ukrainian theatre must be complemented by a Russian theatre. However, where it is inconvenient to have such duplication, as in the Army, administration and scientific research Russian is granted precedence. In schools where Ukrainian is the teaching language the teacher may use the language in the classroom but during intervals between lessons the tendency is to use Russian even with Ukrainian speaking students and among Ukrainian speaking teachers.

In industry the more sophisticated operations involve the use of Russian rather than e local language, the latter operating at the level of casual discourse unless the degree of ethnic heterogeneity in the locality make the use of the lingua franca necessary. In literature two trends are dicernible among the smaller nationalities. When Buryat literature first made its appearance in this century the main genre was folk lore. This soon became out of date and authors turned for models to developments in Russian and world literature. Nevertheless folk lore can still ba found among the literature, but mainly in children's books (Baikal, 4.73:137-46). In science and technology as well as State Administration Russian is asserting itself more and more. National

languages are used in newspapers and periodicals published locally and are used also on Radio and Television. But since the content of these local language programmes is localised there is a tendency to turn more and more to Russian programmes. However Courts of Law must use the language of the respective republic or administrative district, or else the language of the majority of the population of the area. The Union Republics have resolved the problem of language differentiatic and consequent status in different ways in the administration of justice. Those with homogenous populations like the Ukraine have prescribed the Republic's language. Others, with autonomous components prescribe the official language of the Union Republic outside the autonomous areas, and the local languages within those areas. Republic with mixed indigenous and Russian populations provide for the use of both languages, as is the case in Karelia.

Before we move to consider another paradigm which helps to determine research into bilingualism and bilingual education we should summarise very briefly the most salient features of the contribution of socio-linguistic studies to bilingual education. In the first place formerly unwritten and recently alphabeticised languages have been able to acquire new functions which were not open to them while they remained unwritten; they have become possible languages of instruction in schools and a means of written communication in other spheres of social life. The fact of the simultaneous strengthening of the influence of Russian should not lead us to underestimate the value of this development of nationality languages. On the other hand it is a fact that Russian has been exerting an enormous influence on the structural and lexical development of non-Russian languages and has tended to expropriate the most important social functions. Perhaps one of the most important factors to take into account is that these developments are planned with considerable care. Soviet linguists emphasise the necessity of differentiating between the spontaneous influence of social factors on the development of the corpus and status of languages, and the planned development of the same languages. This planning has especially affected questions of the normalization of national standard languages, the creation of alphabets, the relexification of non-Russian languages and the regulation of the functional interaction of those languages (Abaev et a 1971; Beloded 1969; Desheriev, 1966, 1970, Desheriev and Protchenko 1968; Isayev 1968; Filin, 1966; Filin et al 1969; Khanazarov, 1963).

In pursuing these aims contemporary socio-linguistics in the Soviet Union has elaborated several methods and procedures for accumulating and testing concrete data and for testing stated hypotheses etc. Great importance is attached to methods of mass investigation as well as to the various aspects of controlled experimental studies. As is to be expected several methods have been adopted from sociology-- written and oral questionnaires, interviews and various types of tests. Among the most significant investigations have been those of the peoples of Siberia and the North carried out to study the functional interaction of Russian and the native languages. A special questionnaire was devised (Avrorin 1970 a) b); Gubolgo 1973 Strakach and Tugolukov 1969). A significant contribution to the elaboration of the methodology of social linguistic research was made by Panov (1960).

(3) Elements of the Ethnological Paradigm in Research

a) Ethnicity in the USSR

Soviet ethno-linguists are critical of the conceptual approach to ethnicity adopted by American scholars like Shibutani and Kwan (1965). Their main criticism is of their limitation of 'ethnics' to immigrant groups: that such groups are regarded in the U.S.A. only as "a recognised socio-cultural unit based on some form of national or tribal distinction and living in a country other than their own (HULSE, F.S). They are also criticised for including in the category of ethnic group "not only individuals possessing the corresponding ethnic personality characteristics in full but others retaining only the memory of their ethnic-affiliation" (BADALIAN 1976). In the eyes of Soviet ethnologists the ethnic group identified by American researchers is unreal. But the main attack is directed against the subjectivity of ethnicity as it is seen by American scholars. This "has the obvious fault that it does not permit sufficiently dependable determinations of different forms of ethnic units proper from other forms of socio-cultural unity" (Ibid) The Soviet ethno-sociologists recognise two main types of such groupings": ecological-economic types which are determined by similarities of ecological adaptation and are not necessarily contiguous; and historico-ethnographic groups which derive from a common origin and reflect mutual influences among the peoples involved" (ANDRIYANOV & CHEBOKSAROV). In either case the criterion of identification is entirely objective.

In turn an ethnic group may develop into a 'narod' (people), then into a 'narodnost' (a nationality) and then become a 'natsiya' (nation). "A nation differs from a nationality not only in the degree of development of the hall marks of stability, community of language, of territory, of economic life and of psychological make up manifest in a community of culture" (STALIN). The ethnic

is therefore only one aspect or phase of possible development together with additional economic and social-structural features. The ethnic aspects apply mainly to language and culture, especially those which are traditional. The "direct relationship of the development of linguistic and at the same time of ethnic processes to the special characteristics of population settlements of the peoples of the USSR" (Sov. Soc. 1972:2) is extremely important to the development of bilingualism and the provision of an appropriate type of bilingual education. In this connection what is of greatest significance is first of all the density and complexity, or on the other hand the lack of communication facilities. This is particularly the case in the North Caucusus and the Altay Mountains, for instance. On the other hand in less mountainous and isolated areas communication facilities result in complex interaction of ethnic/linguistic groups. In Moldavia for example there are at least 6 such different types of interacting groups: homogenous Moldavian; Moldavian mixed but predominating; Moldavian-Gagauz; Moldavian-Russian-Ukrainian, Ukrainian-Moldavian and Gagauz-Belorussian (Izv. AK. NAUK MOLD. SSR 1972)

In considering ethnic/linguistic processes Soviet ethnologists stress that such processes are of two types: division and unification. The former is not a particularly significant problem at present although at the outset of the Soviet regime divisions between variants of what had previously been regarded as the same language were encouraged. The degree of mutual comprehensibility of Kazakh, Kirgiz and Karakalpak is high; their common origin is recognised and they share the same traditions. Administrative changes between the three groups ensured that the three variants developed as separate languages (Tarkestnskaya, Pravda, 24/8/1974). Nowadays division, as an ethnic/linguistic process is interpreted more freely to include a local insistence on the maintenance of the national language and associated culture. For instance there is little welcome for the interest which Tatars show in the Tatar language because it is regarded as a form of divisiveness. Tatars listen to Tatar programmes on the Radio (46% claim to do so); Tatar music and traditional folk music is popular among even professional classes who might be considered Russian orientated (Sovoskul 197). Another aspect of this alleged divisiveness, reflected in attachment to national languages and cultures, is that even when members of the ethnic groups take to Russian their attitude to features of the new style of life lacks emotional attachment, as research among the Letts has shown (Kholmogorov : 78). The converse of this, namely attachment to their native traditions and language is invariably condemned especially when it occurs among creative and powerful

nations like the Georgians. "Not all of whose scholars and workers in literature and the arts clearly realize the harm that can be done by even insignificant deviations from socialist internationalism" (ZARYA VOSTOKA 28.2.73

Of the two processes, division and integration the latter is, therefore, obviously dominant in the Soviet Union in the shape of the consolidation of nations and nationalities, the assimilation of small ethnic/linguistic groups and the ultimate integration it is hoped, of all Soviet peoples in forming the 'sovetskii narod' (Soviet people). It is the process of integration which is most clearly emphasised in the sphere of ethno-linguistic theory: "The tendency is for the gradual transformation of the Soviet people into a single Soviet socialist nation". The cultural-linguistic aspects of such integration is also especially stressed: "within the bounds of a new historical community a common international Soviet socialist culture has taken shape. It has emerged as an organic whole constituted of the cultures and languages of the Soviet nations and nationalities" (KHOLMOGOROV). Concomitant with this process of integration there has been considerable growth in Russian related bilingualism. For instance 27.5% Estonians, 34.8% Lithuanians, 45.3% Letts in their respective Republics claim Russian as a second language. In Lithuania there was some reciprocity by the Russians in so far as 30.7% of that nation's immigrants to Lithuania claimed to be able to speak the Lithuanian language, though only 15.6% of Russian immigrants to Latvia and 12.5% in Estonia claimed to be able to do so. (Ibid.) "The integrative tendency is evident in the development of bilingualism, that is the non-Russians learning Russian elsewhere ... The interaction of the two trends of the ethno-linguistic process is still of a dialectically contradictory though not antagonistic nature. Thus the spread of Russian is accompanied by the strengthening of national languages" (VESTNIK AK. N. SSSR 1972).

The process of integration has meant a decline in the number of languages and the conditions of the Soviet regime have been favourable to rapid ethnic/linguistic consolidation: "this is how many Central Asian nations were formed, particularly the Turkmenians .. In Siberia, the Altais were formed from the Altai-Kizhi and other groups ... Consequent on this process of unification the number of ethnic groups figuring in the national censuses fell from 178 in 1926 to 106 in 1970. Thus integration tends to bring into being bidialectal forms of contact and ultimately to strengthen a linguistically homogenous group which is able to relate to other groups on a fairly equal basis in the matter of status. Nevertheless some small linguistic groups because of the same process are lost. For example the Buduck and Khinalug languages of Azerbaydzhan have been lost to dominant language of the Union Republic. Batsbi is a similar case within Georgia. (DESERIEV 1953) The interaction we have referred to and what is conducive to forms of bilingualism should be distinguished

from assimilation. The former does not entail the abandonment of ethnic and cultural traditions; the latter means 'rejecting what are considered to be archaic, primitive elements of a culture (which usually includes the language). "The prevalence of bilingualism i.e. imparting the Russian language to non-Russians and Soviet culture, does not mean, as Western sociologists mistakenly claim that cultural integration equals Russification. The status of Soviet culture based on the Russian language is not the same as Russian culture. Soviet culture as a whole is much broader since it incorporates the cultural achievement of all the peoples of the country" (BROMEI 1977)

Such a process of ethno-linguistic integration is not to be regarded simply as the operation of a spontaneous process. Many factors conduce to facilitate it, among the most important of which is the attitude of the members of a particular ethnic group. Thus Ariutuniyan (ARUTIUNYAN, 1969) points to the fact that members of the Tatar population "retain preferences for their own nationality and have negative attitudes to cross national relations, women being the most conservative" (ibid) Other factors which he selects as affecting the process of integration are religion, knowledge of Russian and levels of education (ibid) However such factors are less important than the immense influence of aspects of demographic processes, particularly population movement or migration and interethnic marriages.

(b) Demographic Aspects

Demographic aspects of sociological-linguistic studies are usually reduced to the study of the effect of levels of reproduction and changes in the age - sex structure of the populations. However, Soviet scholars (Larnin et al 1971) include within 'demography' migration as well as changes in settlement patterns, together with the relationships between ratios of urban and rural populations. All these have important implications for the growth of bilingualism in the Soviet Union. Migration enters inevitably into our calculations because ethno-linguistic processes are 'directly related to the characteristics of population settlements (ibid.). Thus, while in 1970 the general level of Ukrainian linguistic assimilation to Russian was 12.3% dispersed Ukrainians assimilated more easily - 48.8%. The comparable figures for Belorussians were 27.8% (stable population) and 58.1% (emigrant populations). For Latvia the figures were 4.9% and 46.8%, Estonia 4.8% and 43.4%, Moldavia 4.8% and 22.3% and Georgian 1.4% and 26.6%. The degree of assimilation has a direct bearing on, even if it is not entirely coincident with the level of bilingualism (Table 4

Differential natural growth rates sometimes help to counteract the process of dispersal since urban areas to which the migrant populations are apt to move usually have lower growth rates than the rural areas in which the level of language maintenance is higher. Some of the territories to which the Russians (and other Slavs) emigrate, for instance the Union Republics of Central Asia have higher growth rates than the Russians and so they tend to neutralize so far as language maintenance is concerned, the effect of Russian penetration (p.94). This does not mean any diminution in the extent of Russian-related bilingualism but it does mean that the resources of the native language are maintained and the threat of linguistic shift to Russian is limited or delayed. However in spite of the effect of differential natural growth rates it is migration which stands out as the basic factor in the acceleration of recent language contact.

Earlier in this survey we suggested that the incidence of bilingualism was no longer due mainly to the fortuitous contact of peoples but was the result of planning. One aspect of such planning is exemplified in the handling of migration by State Committees for the Utilization of Labour Resources set up in all Union Republics in 1966, with a mandate to organise agricultural settlements and to recruit workers for the new industrial centres in the 'Virgin lands'. (Perevedentsev 1970

In 1973 3 important monographs and collections of studies on issues of migration were published (Misevich and Chudova; Onikiuenko and Propovkin; and Rybakovsky). Misevich and Chunova examine in detail the dynamics of populations in the Khanty-Mansi and Yamal-Nenets ethnic-linguistic regions up to 1972. They point to the great mobility of the population and high levels of migration. They also emphasise the importance of age and sex factors in determining the character of the migrating groups. People between 20 and 40 predominate and men far exceed women in the mobile population. These groups are the least conservative in their attitudes to language maintenance and most likely to become bilingual. Other factors not referred to by these authors are the level of education and the existing degree of bilingualism in the reception areas (MUSTAFINA 1977. A third factor is that migration is generally phased. Many small segregated systems of habitation exist in the North Caucusus or the Altay Mountains for instance and when the natural resources of those areas, gold or coal, are exploited they tend to be transferred into second phase settlements involving linkages with or drawing upon the human resources of neighbouring and linguistically related areas. As the process of industrialization develops the linkages become more complex and more distant, and heterogenous linguistic communities are usually drawn upon. The third phase is long distance migration involving recruitment from other Union Republics.

Such movements have a major impact on the development of bilingualism. Moldavians who have migrated from rural areas to cities in the last 5 years are more than twice as apt as their former neighbours in the countryside to indicate a desire to see their children go to Russian schools. For those who moved to the cities more than 5 years ago the index is more than three times that for the rural people. In line with this progression the attraction to Russian language schools is not as great among recent immigrants as it is among the urban population as a whole (Gvozdev 1972) Thus the speed of industrialization (the motivation for migration) determines the fate of the indigenous languages in the schools: a rapid industrialization may not be possible without an 'alien' linguistic population. Such rapid industrialisation occurred in the Nurek Combine of Tadjikstan where only 27.8% of the work force are native to the area compared with 51.8% Russians. The same is true of the Dushanbe Industrial Combine where native Tadzhiks represent only 15.7% of the work force and the Russians 55.7%. Not only so, but the composition of the two industrial areas is now so heterogenous that they represent over twenty different linguistic groups. (Perevedentsev 1968) The population of Western Yakutia increased rapidly in connection with the discovery and development of diamond mining, that of Chukotka in connection with the mining of gold, and the Central Ob region was industrialized rapidly because of the exploitation of oil deposits. The Khanty-Mansi region had increased by 219% in ten years between 1960 and 1970, the Chukchi linguistic area by 215% and the Guryev province by 173%. (Perevedentsev 1970) Between 1959 and 1964 which were crucial years in respect of migration the Union republics experienced net gains or losses of the following order as a result of migration alone: Russian Republic minus 1,229,000; Ukraine plus 142,000; Belorussia minus 263,000; Azerbaydzhan minus 6,000; Georgian plus 9,000; Armenia plus 16,000; Kirgizstan +109,000; Uzbekistan +135,000; Tadzhikstan +66,000; Turkmenistan +9,000; Kazakhstan +920,000; Moldavia +37,000; Latvia +61,000; Lithuania +11,000 and Estonia 28,000 (Perevedentsev 1966) An analysis of these figures reveals a high and steady increase in the influx of Russians into nearly all the Union Republics. In Kazakhstan the number of Russians rose from 1 million to 5 million in less than fifty years. In smaller areas like the Komi ASSR the number increased from 13,700 to 512,000 during the same period. In North Ossetia the numbers increased from 10,000 to 202,000. Table indicates the degree of heterogeneity which has resulted from such movements in all Union Republics (Table 2)

(c) Urbanization (Table 9)

The main impact of this level of migration has been felt in the existing towns and cities as well as in the development of new urban areas. In the 11 years prior to the last Census (1970) the number of

urban residents increased by 36 millions (36%) while the rural population decreased by 3,100,000 (2.8%). Migration from rural areas accounted for 16,000,000 of the increased urban population, while 5 millions living in hitherto suburban areas are now incorporated into the cities. Fourteen millions new urban residents were due to the natural growth rate within the urban areas. Thus the growth of the urban areas has depended up to the present time mainly on the incorporation of rural residents. The rural to urban exodus produces the basis for further migration because the movement of the original rural migrants acts as a pull upon those who remain. Furthermore by retaining links with their former neighbours the new city dwellers familiarize the rural population with an urban way of life which becomes attractive to them whether they move or not. "The progressive impact of migration on personality, in the sense of fostering new... cultural needs" which can be satisfied mainly in the Russian language is important from the standpoint of bilingualism (Larnin et al 1971

Urbanization at the level revealed in Table 9 together with the considerations we have already outlined ensures increased linguistic heterogeneity in relatively limited areas. This in turn forces the conclusion "that the increasing uniformity of the cultural composition of the Soviet nations is greatly promoted by urbanization ... The development of inter-national characteristics is more rapid where the population are ethnically and linguistically mixed. For instance in Kazakhstan, Daghestan, eastern Latvia and Lithuania and the nearer areas of Belorussia." (Kholmogorov: 31, 36.) Ethnic heterogeneity leads to uniformization of life in the cities, "a cultural homogenizatio of society as a whole and reduction of differences between town and country" (Tetevosaayn 1971 106). Internationalism as interpreted by writers like Kholmogorov implies greatly increased Russian related bilingualism. This is confirmed by Gubolgo (1972)

Nevertheless while in purely objective terms urbanization and heterogeneity level out ethno-linguistic differences the same processes have led to the center of gravity of ethnic consciousness shifting from the countryside to the cities as those cities develop as centres of indigenous cultural interests. The traditional view is that it is villages that tend to preserve distinctive ethnic features (while the cities with their standardized material culture and mixing of ethnic components are viewed as 'anti-ethnic'). However the study of Soviet ethnic consciousness has led to the conclusion that "urbanization does not mean simply change in the statistical structure of the population and does not only involve a spread of the urbanized way of life to the rural areas. In view of the greater mobility and increased information contacts in urban as their role in ethnic self awareness may actually

be far greater than their quantitative share of the total population" (Porshnishevsky, 1971) The cities become the centres of national culture and ethnic consciousness with educational institutions that train ethnic personnel, and with other agencies that foster the ethnic culture. For instance cities become the centres of ethnic publishing and broadcasting" (ibid) The center of gravity of the ethnos is transferred from the countryside to the town and this applies to consciousness of the native language and its associated cultural traditions (ibid with a consequent encouragement of the native language component of Russian related bilingualism.

d/. Interethnic Marriages

Inter-ethnic marriages are an important consequence of population mobility and a significant influence in developing bilingualism and particularly in facilitating shift to Russian as the native language of a hitherto non-Russian speaker. Nevertheless we should not over-estimate its influence. Most ethnic groups are virtually endogamous, 90% of their members limiting their choice of marriage partner to members of their own ethnic/linguistic group. This is as important a fact in producing a stable bilingualism as is inter-ethnic marriage since endogamy in combination with other forms of social isolation tends to stabilize the composition of the group as a reservoir for future generations within the same cultural and linguistic mould. At the same time in a revolutiona and highly mobile society like the Soviet Union one cannot ignore the contribution of inter-ethnic marriages to the development of bilingualism and the choice of language spoken by the offspring.

The Second World War brought such areas as Turkestan much closer to Europeans and other nationalities. Of the 5.2 million householders in the USSR in 1959 10.4% were members of inter-ethnic marriages; 15% of these were in urban areas while 6% were in large towns and cities. The comparable figures for Central Asia alone were 11.6% overall, 8% rural and 17% urban (Isupov, 1964, 38). In the city of Ashkabad the war brought the rate of such marriages up to 34%. The settlement of nomads increased the possibility of stable contact between groups which had previously been isolated. Mixed marriages became more frequent among very isolated groups such as Kurds among whom there came to be increasing numbers of marriages with Russians, Tatars, and Turkmen wives or with Azerbaydzhani husbands (Aristova and Vasilyena, 1965). Borzykh (1970, 89, 92) has shown that minorities within a larger population, especially within a large Union Republic have a greater frequency of inter-ethnic marriages than the members of the dominant group; and smaller nationalities like the Uygurs, Iranians, and Turki

have a higher proportion than large nationalities like Ukrainians and Georgians.

In the cities the rate of mixed marriages have increased rapidly. In Ashkabad of the 381 marriages registered there in 1920, 81% were between members of different nationalities: by 1940 the number had grown to 400 and the percentage to 31%. In the extremely heterogenous city of Tashkent (Russians 43%, Uzbeks 33% and other nationalities including Tatars, Ukrainians, Jews, Armenians, Kazakhs, Tadzhiks, Mordvins, Uygurs, Belorussians, Azerbaydzhanis, Bashkirs, Chuvash and Poles) the rate of inter-ethnic marriage was higher than in other large cities - amounting to 35%. Such marriages have become more frequent among the Slavs also for in 1965 the figures for the Leningrad district amounted to 17% of all marriages (Trud, June 1965). The same is true of the Baltic countries. Terenteva (1969) showed that the proportion of mixed marriages rose in Riga (Latvia) from 29.5% in 1948 to 35.5% in 1963 and Vilnius (Lithuania) from 34.4% in 1948 to 37.6% in 1963 . While the smallest increase occurred in Tallinn (Estonia) from 21.2% in 1948 to 22% in 1963 (Ika)

However it is not so much the extent of mixed marriages that is important to students of bilingualism as the choice of language made by the offspring and to some extent by the parents after marriage. It has been estimated that the reduction of language maintenance in Kazakhstan can be attributed to such marriages. There we find 14% mixed marriages, 18% in urban and 12% in rural areas "the offspring of which pass through a stage of bilingualism to a shift of language, most often Russian". Evstigeneev (Vestnik MGU, ser.ist. 6/1972:72-82) concluded from studies in Kazakhstan that even though children adopted the father's nationality (which might be Kazakh, Belorussian, Tatar or Korean, if the mother was Russian that language was chosen by the children. In Kazakh-Tatar marriages 18-47% of the children chose Tatar, and 36-47% Kazakh-Russian offspring chose Russian. In Tadzhikstan when the father is Tadzhik and the mother Russian Tadzhik is adopted by 82% of the children as their native language while 74% of the children of marraiges where the father was Tadzhik and the mother Uzbek, chose Tadzhik.

The children of the mixed marriages tend to enrol at Russian schools rather than in one or other of the 'nationality schools'; normally the father has acquired a command of Russian in the course of his education and work; and Russian is spoken increasingly in the home, especially in the urban districts. From the time they go to school, or even to kindergarten, the children are known by Russian names. Some of the parents may be teachers or engaged in

other occupations which bring them into close contact with the local population. In some such families there is usually a form of functional or complementary bilingualism, one language being employed for some purposes and another for the remainder. However the families in the urban areas pass rapidly through a bilingual stage and become completely Russian. An analysis has been made of the consequences, for the language of the children of such mixed marriages. In the town of Karasuk, the centre of an ancient culture in Novosibirskaya, marriages among Ukrainians and Russians were found to be common, and the overwhelming majority of the children of such marriages were regarded as Russians. Table 10 shows the correlation between the nationality and mother tongue of the parents on the one hand and the nationality and mother tongue of the children on the other.

TABLE 10

Distribution of children by nationality and native language in mixed Russian-Ukrainian families a

Parents				Children %		
Father		Mother		Language and nationality Russian	UKR nationality and Russian language	Language and nationality UKR
Nationality	Language	Nationality	Language			
Russian	Russian	Ukrainian	Ukrainian	100	-	-
Ukrainian	Russian	Russian	Russian	97	3	-
Russian	Ukrainian	Ukrainian	Ukrainian	82	15	3
Ukrainian	Ukrainian	Russian	Russian	88	7	5
Russian	Russian	Ukrainian	Russian	49	51	-

a Source: Perevedentsev 1965a, 516.

Frequently parents who are both of Ukrainian stock and regard Ukrainian as their native language bring up their children to regard Russian as their native language and often to identify themselves as Russian in general ethnic character. The same process has been observed in the two districts of Tashkent. There in 1963 marriages between non-Russian speaking people where Russian became the common language constituted 10.5% of the total of intermarriages in one district and 7.9% in the other. Where Russian was already the language of one partner the percentage of marriages in which that language became the normal means of communication with the children was 79% and 47% in the two districts. All in all during 1963 in the old and the new towns of Tashkent over 54% and 86% respectively of the mixed marriages saw Russian adopted as the native language of the children.

An examination of the choice of nationality by children of mixed marriages between Russians and Ukrainians or Belorussians in Petropavlovsk and Tselinograd showed that 85%-100% chose Russian; in the case of marriages between Russians and Tatars 29% of the children in Petropavlovsk and 42% in Tselinograd chose another language than Russian. Where the father was a Kazakh and the mother Russian or Tatar 67-90% of the children chose Kazakh. In any case the degree of bilingualism is considerable though the pattern of language dominance within the family may vary.

4) Language Acquisition

The following conception of language is quite common in Soviet linguistics: Language (in the sense of a national language) is a socially determined system of signs. Such language exists as a set of 'sub languages' (pod'-jazyk) i.e. is a standard (literary) language with its various forms, dialects etc. The study of language and its 'sub-languages' as well as their acquisition requires a socio functional approach, i.e. explanations of concrete manifestations of linguistic performance taking place within various social groups and pursuing various functions. Human psychological processes develop in society and are the product of mainfold reflex physical activity. This is the only foundation, it is argued, on which we can understand scientifically the acquisition of language and its functioning. Human mind is a special attribute of highly organized matter, and this mind is socially and historically conditioned. Between the functions performed by the human mind there are consistent and mutually determined relations. These functions are related to the surroundings in which they are performed. There is therefore a complete unity between psychical and physiological functions in the behaviour of any human being. Language is a socially determined second signal-system, standing in for the immediate signals received from the environment through the child's sensory receptors. To that extent language is one step removed from reality and reflects the aspects of the physical and social environment impinging on the organism in only a generalised form. If the child is to grow up normally this generalized character of the language has to be fed by, remain rooted in the immediacy of concrete activity and be confirmed by it. Though this second signal system is unique in that it possesses very great powers of self-regulation it is still subject to the same material forces and laws which govern the first signal system.

Investigations show how very gradually and according to precisely defined stages speech comes to take over from immediate physical stimuli the task of regulating behaviour. Soviet psycho-linguistics is tied

to the principles of dialectical materialism, and the 'Leninist Theory of Reflection', which argues that learning takes place through the action of the human organism on society, and through the active manipulation of the environment. The child's earliest speech utterances are directly related to his actions upon the real world. As the child's activities grow more complex so does language become increasingly involved in the co-ordination of the various aspects of those activities. It is his action upon the variety of objects by which he is surrounded that sets in motion and shapes his linguistic and intellectual development (Vygotsky 1934, 22). It is in social activity, above all social play going beyond the narrow limits of the random or fortuitous manipulation of objects, that the child develops language (Rahmani, 1966, 157). In the context of this view of language, its acquisition and functions the following areas of interest emerge as centres of theoretical and empirical research - experimental and survey work:

1. The study of the relation of speech and thinking - particularly the processes of 'inner speech'.
2. Research of neurophysiological, neuro-psychological and pathopsychological aspects of speech activity
3. The study of language acquisition
4. The study of psychological aspects of first and second language learning and teaching

There are interesting parallels between the views of Soviet psycho-linguists and those of the 'transformationists' concerning some aspects of language learning. Soviet workers frequently refer to the work of Piaget also with respect. But though they find it possible to agree with some aspects of both 'transformationist theory' and the genetic-epistemological theories of Piaget they differ from them on two related issues, namely the possible innateness of language and the role of experience in learning. These two differences are crucial to the Soviet justification of psychological and linguistic engineering. Soviet psycho-linguistic theories, though they tend more and more to postulate mediating cognitive factors in the learning of language, differ from transformational theory because Soviet linguists subordinate the innate, internal factors to the social and historical processes. The structures, the existence of which Soviet psycho-linguists are prepared to accept, are not <u>given</u> but the product of the psycho-genetic process. They do not determine ab initio the whole of the processes which produce language. Rather they provide, simply, a point of departure on which the environmental and developmental cognitive processes work. The possibility of internalizing linguistic structures so as to ensure the more developed and abstract kinds of thinking lies in the existence of antecedent structures, possibly in the genetic code itself.

The relation between the organism and the environment so far as language development goes may be seen as a cybernetic loop ensuring that individual language development both selects and is conditioned by the environment (Saumian, 1965, 142 ff.)

As early as 1926 he criticized the hypothesis of innate linguistic factors or a special capacity for language learning, which has come to characterize Chomsky's system. "It is not upon inborn capabilities but on anatomical and physiological characteristics (...) that capacities are built" (Menchenskaya, 1967, 12). True there are very deeply embedded innate factors, but these undergo qualitative changes in the course of development. The innate internal conditions are "themselves the result of a socio-historical process and have been formed as a result of external action". Consequently the creative role is assigned not to the inherited characteristics exclusively, as Chomsky tends to suggest, any more than to the external forms exclusively as is implied by Skinner, and other empiricists, but to the central processes activated and operated by the interaction of these two factors. Vygolsky's ideas were later recognised by a number of Soviet psycholinguists like Elkonin (1958), and were elaborated by his fellow workers A.N. L'eontev and A.R. Luria, the two who represent Soviet psycholinguistics at its best. Others who are represented in the same school are Sokolov, Zinkin, Galperin, Smirnov and Anan'jev. Chomsky's idea of innate linguistic universals producing a pattern of linguistic features to which the child's acquisition of language conforms is contrary to the standpoint of the researchers who insist that the central structure which is the base for the development of language ability is "produced not postulated". Internal schemas or structures are formed during development in society, though the effect of external social agents can never be actually to create the central schemas. "There is always a mobilization of the cognitive processes, a fresh analysis leading to change and development" (Leontev, 1957a, 234). Even Leontev who goes as far as any Soviet psychologist in emphasizing that development and learning are independent in some circumstances, regards the processes of 'spontaneous' development as themselves in the long term the results of social evolution (Leontev, 1957b, 243). Soviet thinking stresses the specific and irreducible character of the social-historial level and consequently it has no place for innate entelchies, immanancies or innate mental functions. The whole process of learning a language changes with time and is an essentially public, social and active process (Vygotsky, 1934, 22).

The Identification of Speech and thought

The adult's behaviour is so completely under voluntary control that it is difficult to analyse the processes by which that control comes to be exercised. In the young child however it is possible to

trace behaviour from the point where it is dominated by external stimuli, through the stages of its dependence first on adult verbal commands, subsequently on the child's understanding of his own spoken commands, to the point where behaviour is almost entirely regulated by internalized or inner speech. Complex research into inner speech has been carried out for a number of years by the Moscow psychologist A.N. Sokolov (1968). The speed with which a child acquires the ability to understand and use words is rightly emphasized by teachers and psychologists, but it is deceptive. In the present climate created only partly it is true by transformation theory, with its nervous insistence on the speed with which language is acquired, it is not as clearly recognised that it takes a relatively long time for the language which the child has learned to function, or that acquisition and functioning are different parts of the same process.

The relation of mastery of the system and the functioning in regulating behaviour is central to the consideration of the relationship of the first and second languages. The relationship is influenced not only by how much of the first language has been acquired before the second language is introduced but also by the extent and the direction of the influence of the first language on important cognitive operations which inevitably affect the ease with which the second language is acquired and its effective functioning in social contexts. When it is appropriate to introduce a second language and how a first and second language, acquired simultaneously, should be handled in school or in the home, are questions which can be answered only in the light of investigations into how the primary language, the mother tongue, operates in general development, especially up to the age of puberty. This is an area to which Luria has contributed greatly. Luria has applied the term 'nejrolinguistika' (neurolinguistics) to his branch of psycholinguistics. It represents a complex research of speech activity, combining knowledge of neurology, psychophysiology, and linguistics. Neurolinguistic models are concentrated on latent internal mechanisms of speech activity that are not subjected to direct analysis, of course. The only sufficiently adequate way of investigation of these mechanisms is by the study of the pathology of speech activity, to which we return in studying second language acquisition.

In the area of concept formation Vyotsky and Luria distinguish those which are acquired very early and owe nothing to words; those, the formation of which language facilitates and which in any case language is required to explain; and those that are fundamentally and essentially verbal - their core is a word without which the concept could no longer be an element in thought. In so far as the mother tongue enters into concept formation, therefore, it does so at various levels which extend over several years of the child's

development, from the ages of 6 or 7 (Luria 1961b, 12) ripening to make its main contribution somewhere around 12 years (Vygotsky, 1934, 58). These processes therefore are continuing at the same time as very many thousands of Soviet children are probably being exposed to the second, though not necessarily a foreign, language. That second language is not an independent functioning system as a game of chess for instance might be, but draws upon the same range of experiences and the same social context as the first language.

Language moves from having interpersonal functions mainly, being simply a form of communication, to having intra-personal directive functions - participating in the interpretation of the social and physical environment, regulating actions, then securing the transition to complex forms of meaningful play and ending by becoming the most important factor in the development of conscious behaviour" (Luria and Yydovich, 1959, 47). In Soviet thinking it is true that ontogenetica thought and speech have two genetically different origins, with a pre-speech phase of intelligence reflected first in sensory motor activity, and at a later stage in imagery. It is also their belief that speech and intelligence continue along parallel and separate lines until about the age of two when the curves of speech and cognitive development begin to converge. Thereafter comes a close integration between speech and motor intelligence (the enactive phase) and between speech and imagery (the ikonic phase) (Bruner, 1966). Progressively the vital aspects of behaviour are represented by verbal thought (Vygotsky, 1934, passim). In other words, so far as the most important areas of every day life are concerned thought and intelligent behaviour become identified with the use of words.

Soviet psychology explains this gradual identification of thought and speech by the process of internalization. This is not a peculiarly Soviet contribution nor is it a recent theory in Soviet studies of intellectual and speech development. It was put forward by Pavlov nearly 40 years ago and it is well over a century since Sechenov maintained that when a child thinks he invariably talks at the same time. Thought in five-year-olds is mediated through words or whispers, silently through movements of tongue and lips, and this is frequently true though perhaps in different degrees, of the thinking of adults. "On the basis of psychological and electromyographic investigations of internal speech it may be concluded that the real process of thought in individuals who are able to speak is always connected with the language though at certain moments or phases of thinking the speech action may be inhibited (...) The internal speech which manifests itself in the thinking process is not an epiphenomenon, but a really acting mechanism of human thought. Internal speech organizes and

directs this thought, maintains its purposive character and leads to a logical completion of the whole process. It is a form of speech which possesses a highly dynamic and changeable structure and is adapted to the performance of the functions of thinking. At the moment when thoughts arise it may be reduced only to a few hints of some of the most general or 'key words' (Sokolov, 1961, 90). As the child begins to move away from using speech in order to direct attention to an object, from simply orienting himself to the environment, and more and more to understanding the environment and to making statements about it, the language he uses concentrates almost exclusively on the predicative element. The subject and all words qualifying it are omitted, the predicate alone being retained, and "a single word is saturated with the meaning which many words in social, adult speech would be required to convey" (Vygotsky, 1934, 148).

Thus every intellectual operation begins with external action and is then gradually transformed by a process in which external, extended speech participates. It is finally linked with internal speech, and this internal speech, based on condensed verbal kinesthesia, is the mechanism responsible for the performance of complex mental actions. A study of the function of inner speech in the acquisition of a second language recorded electrical disturbances from the tongue and lips while students were learning English, and greater muscular movements when subjects were reading English than when they read their mother tongue, Russians "For example, during reading texts in foreign languages micro-movement of the speech organs may be recorded" (Sokolov, 1961, 89). This muscular activity increased as the text became more difficult, being most pronounced among students with poor command of the second language. As the students' competence in English approached their ability in Russian differences in the amount of subvocal activity declined. The conclusion is that motor-activity feedback is necessary in learning any language and especially the second language.

The cognitive structure created by, or identified with speech, is given a variety of names. Pavlov refers to a certain impetus towards the creation of a 'dynamic stereotype' (Pavlov, 1926, Vol. II), which provides the possibility for the creation of whatever habits have to be acquired in learning a language, the habits being only the realization of a more general competence or 'skill'. All the possible variations of the child's linguistic performance stem from this competence, gotovnost 'disposition'. This fundamental precondition or presupposition of actual performance is called a 'set' by the Georgian school of psychologists a term which Luria had employed very much earlier to refer to the abbreviated internal schema which become identified with speech and which determine the acquisition of language through an understanding of the laws which govern it. (Luria, 1932, 68 et seq.) For the Georgian psychologists the 'set' is a 'facility for correct speech' (Natadze, 1957, 308) and constitutes the basic form of a language, and determines its

acquisition. Within the framework of this complex of problems the theory of set (ustanovka) has proved very fruitful (see Prangisuili 1968). According to this theory all forms of human behaviour (including language) are realized on the basis of 'set', i.e. "the psychological state of readiness of the individual for an immediate regulation of behaviour" (Kecxvasvili, 1970, 21). The role of set in language behaviour has been illuminated by Naladze (1966). 'Set' has been used in studying continually conditioned readiness of the organism for the operation of a certain stimulus" (Zimnjaja, 1970) for instance in the first or second language. The choice of first or second language stimuli (as a function of linguistic tactics of behaviour, has been studied by Frumkina and Dobrovic 1970).

(c) Interaction of first and second languages

As we have seen the whole of Soviet linguistic theory tends to the postulation of deep seated cognitive, as opposed to peripheral, associationist processes. It is because the learning of language involves these that the learning of a second language and its interaction with the first language have such profound implications not only for the linguistic but for the more general development of the child as well. Interesting work on the psychology of bilingualism was initiated in Georgia by Uznadze (1966) and Imedadze (1960, 1967). In their view the two languages of a bilingual child, to begin with, constitute a single verbal repertoire, and components of both languages are used indiscriminately in the young child's communication with adults. After a short period, at about 1.8 years, the two systems begin to separate until at about 2 years independent vocabularies are recognised by the child, and two independent grammatical systems are gradually formed. Nevertheless though in appropriate settings or speech situations the two languages operate independently, the interaction between them is significantly complex (Luria, 1932, 213). Such observations are not new, and several psychologists especially in North America have refined the concept of two related but independent systems. Nevertheless little has been done by these researchers to analyse the deep psychological as distinct from linguistic consequences of the interaction. It is as if they had been content simply to investigate the separate but related levels of performance without considering the reaction upon the deeper levels of competence common to performance in each language.

Well before 1934, when the first edition of his 'Thought and Language' was published in Moscow, Vygotsky had pointed to the dependence of the second language on the processes which had led to the acquisition of the mother tongue. He had also made suggestions about the nature of that dependence, using what is to all intents and purposes the twin ideas of competence and performance. Vygotsky

makes the point that the second language belongs to the 'exterior, social, physical aspects of verbal thought', akin to acquired scientific concepts: while the native tongue is identified with the development of spontaneous concepts, those mental structures which are dependent on the unfolding or maturing of the inherent possibilities of the organism's endowment. In learning the mother tongue the child unconsciously develops his competence without explicit awareness of phonetic, grammatical forms because the mother tongue develops naturally and necessarily with the gradual evolution of the neurological system, which makes any kind of learning possible. There is an essential difference when it comes to learning the second language. "The later stage does not repeat the course of the earlier one (...) analagous systems develop in reverse direction at the higher and lower levels, each system complementing the other and benefitting from the strong points of the other." The gradually acquired complex system essential to the working of the mother tongue can be assumed to exist when the second language is introduced. Competence can be assumed in learning the second language and the area of language acquisition which is peculiar to the latter is that of performance: 'the exterior, social and physical aspects of verbal thought are acquired in the reverse order to the mother tongue, that is by conscious employment of linguistic rules and strategies" (Vygotsky, 1934, 110). In the eyes of Soviet psychologists the understanding of the relationship of these two levels of language acquisition has considerable relevance to the teaching of a second language as well as to the observation of first language development. This understanding of the importance of the mother tongue in learning the second language is part of the concept of rule governed language learning which leads to an emphasis on 'consciousness' in learning.

In their insistence that the bases of language learning need to be acquired only once, subsequent languages being built on a common foundation of competence, Soviet psycho-linguists, like the generative theorists, turn away from traditional associationism. Traditional associationism is rebutted by Imedadze's account of the bilingual child's acquisition of the two languages. The first stage of the child's language development, characertized by the undifferentiated use of elements from both languages indicates that what the child is concerned to do is by using materials from both languages without restraint to create one system, which only later becomes differentiated into separate languages. The undifferentiated stage corresponds to the development of competence, the differentiated stage corresponds to the level of performance, in either language.

At this later stage of performance the two languages interact with advantages to both as Vygotsky argues, sharpening the consciousness of the rule governed process in both languages. The interaction affects the level of performance by sharpening the student's consciousness of the regularities of both languages and so refining his control of all

aspects of the two languages. The interaction can also have considerable retro-active influence on the deeper level of competence. Interaction on the performance level can influence the deep seated mechanisms which are the precondition of performance in either language. Both languages reflect the existence of basic common competence or set, the non-conscious factor in cognitive behaviour. If there is a conflict in the situations in which the two languages are used, or where performance is relevant, there is a very profound emotional disturbance which produces a deterioration in the child's verbal responses. This is of considerable importance in the Soviet Union since it affects the learning of Russian as a second language by all those for whom this language is virtually compulsory from an early age, and other indigenous second and even third languages, learned by many thousands of immigrant children moving from one national and linguistic community to a very different one, as it might be those moving from the West into Central Asia. Such children are inevitably brought up against very considerable differences not only in language but in the social contexts in which the languages are spok

Much of what has been learned about the psychology of bilingualis has been the result of research into language pathology - not that bilingualism itself is a pathological phenomenon. Experiments by Lurie, Cuetkova, Lebskaya and Vinarskaja (1967) Ryabova (1967); as well as Rjabova and Stern (1968) establish the fact that the study of pathological language behaviour, including aphasia, may produce evidence in support of proposed explanations of processes of normal language behaviour. However Soviet workers emphasise that there is no necessary or inevitable conflict between the use of the two languages of a bilingual, but conflict may arise from the incompatibility of the settings of the two languages, and the way a child is able to handle the transfer from one to another. "These disturbances are referred not to the difficulty of associating ideas in a foreign language but exclusively to the necessity of transferring from one established setting to another." (Lurie, 1932, 216). Speaking a certain language, an individual becomes habituated to a particular setting and "transfer to a new setting with the removal of the former setting is evidently sufficient to create neurodynamic disturbances". (Luria, 1932, 213). It should be sufficient to bring into collision such language settings in order to create a conflict of two very complicated structural systems. Luria has shown that when such a transfer occurs suddenly or where there is no predictability about the way in which such transfers are organised "a series of very interesting and serious disturbances occur (...) Sudden transfer to another language is combined with a very great destructive process." (Luria, 1932, 215).

The danger is characterized by Soviet psycho-linguists as a reversion to more primitive mechanisms of thinking such as those which Piaget has named syncretism. In such cases an individual will adopt capricious linguistic responses in both his first and second languages. This is consequent on the lowering or destruction of the 'functional barrier' which normally enables the child to exercise an inhibitory, restraining influence - to interpose a barrier between stimulus and response. One form of the distortion which the lowering of the 'functional barrier' produces is spasmodic speech behaviour and hesitancy. Luria has pointed out that the time expended in speech responses in situations of language conflict fluctuated, and together with rapidly flowing associations he had very slow ones. The individuals were unable to produce reactions with a degree of stability. The phenomenon relates to sudden transfer of language "the subject when exposed suddenly to an unfamiliar word or one with which he is only slightly familiar attempts to think it out, assimilating it to words whose meaning is known to him in the other language." (Luria 1932, 52). Thus when confronted with the need to interpret the English word letter a speaker of Russian responds with the English association summer because of the association of the Russian leto which means summer.

Implications of Soviet Theory for Language Pedagogy

The use of the Mother Tongue in Learning the second language

From what we have seen Soviet theory proposes language as a crucial factor in intellectual development, and for that reason, pedagogy ensures that the mother tongue is recognized as the basis for the acquisition of any subsequent languages. Any general educational programme therefore has to be built around language teaching. Not only is the mother tongue central to general education it is also the basis on which the second language is acquired. Therefore general national development relies for a great deal of its success on the establishment in the classroom as well as in society at large of a right relationship between the several languages individual children are required to learn.

Observation of the speech formation of pupils in non-Russian schools shows that this process is now following two distinct paths. The first is under the influence of the linguistic environment and the mass media, and the second under the influence of Russian lessons in school. At school pupils spend 4-6 hours a week learning Russian, and they watch 9-12 hours of Russian-language television programmes. To all this should be added the influence of the linguistic environments, radio programmes, films, etc. In schools the media influences are almost totally ignored. By the 7th and 8th classes pupils in many Kazakh schools have retained and started to use many words and expressions taken from television programmes, and yet the dictionaries on which their textbooks are based often do not have these words. The fact that no solution has been found to the problem of relating the

teaching of Russian to the influence of the linguistic environment and the mass media explains the limited nature of a pupil's vocabulary in the national school. What is needed is an effective bringing together of these two diverse tendencies.

The educational theories we have so far discussed reflect the general emphasis in the USSR on the child's consciousness of language processes and consequently on a language pedagogy which justifies intense adult intervention to promote those processes. Language teaching is based on a concept of language as rule-governed behaviour in preference to the establishment of habits; the student is to be made consciously aware of the theory which ties together these rules and of the structure of the language he is acquiring. Explicitness and consciousness are guiding considerations, and this means that the teacher is central to the language acquisition process. Very much the reverse of the situation in Britain, though perhaps not so far removed from trends in the USA, the teaching rather than the learning of language is the principal point for consideration, adult direction of acquisition rather than an emphasis on personal discovery of the characteristics of the language.

The information which forms the theoretical foundation for second language learning may be given in the student's mother tongue. Translation also gives to the mother tongue a prominent place in second language learning. The Marrist inability to conceive of a necessary relation between linguistic and cognitive development resulted. Vinogradov maintained, in errors concerning the relation that should exist between the pupil's native language and the second language. It "led Marrists to underestimate the role played by the mother tongue in learning the foreign language and to belittle the importance of the theory and practice of translation" (Vinogradov, 1950, 22). Shcherba had offered a theoretic justification of the use of the native language but it was not until the development of psycho-linguistics in the hands of Leontev, Galperin, and Luria following the lines laid down by Vygotsky that it was realized fully how important was the mother tongue in producing linguistic competence, and so providing the necessary basis for second language learning.

A combination of the principles of conscious theoretical learning and a sympathetic attitude towards the possibilities of using translation-comparison methods meant that Soviet linguists developed their own theory of 'contrastive analysis'. The theoretical information communicated to the student need not duplicate what is already known to him from his acquaintance with his mother tongue, but should refer only to what is uniquely characteristic of the

second language. "It assumes that the explanations and exercises should take into consideration the difficulties encountered by pupils because of differences between the language they are studying and their native language. Comparisons should be made only when they help the pupils master the phenomenon being studied." (Galazov, 1965, 51). Though developed from a different angle, the use of contrastive analysis is as theoretically well founded in the Soviet Union as it is in the U.S. However there is only a limited acceptance of the pedagogic value of that theory and the approach is adopted much more selectively than in the U.S.A. Nor does it depend to the same extent as in the U.S. on exhaustive comparative analyses of the relevant languages.

Another difference between the development of contrastive analysis in the USSR and the US is that whereas in the case of the latter, until very recently, it has been related mainly to foreign languages, in the USSR it has developed from the beginning out of the study of the problems of interference between the great variety of indigenous languages all of which to some extent are taught as second languages. Such problems of interference have received considerable attention in the USSR. Serdyuchenko (1955), Rastorgueva (1952), Grunberg (1960) and Ubryatova (1956) in particular have drawn attention to this linguistic problem. Stress is laid on the advisability of studying Russian in texts prepared locally "because they take into account the specific features of the national language and are a great help in mastering those aspects which are difficult for the Ossetian children" (Galazov, 1965, 52). Linguistic investigations relating to Uzbek were used to identify phonetic difficulties encountered by students; and these "showed for instance that Russian listeners heard the length and volume of the stressed vowels as the basic component of stress while the Uzbeks hear the volume and pitch of the fundamental tone" (Artemov, 1960, 44). Mirtov (1952) has worked on the linguistic problems arising from differences between Uzbek and Russian, as well as Azerbaijani and Russian (1956); Purtseladze on Russian and Georgian (1960-1966); Kudriatsev on Russian and Buriat (1965); and Cherednichenko on Russian and Ukrainian (1957). Similar work has been done for Armenian. The work on indigenous languages has been extended to cover some of the more important foreign languages. Lithuanian linguists have made a study of the contrasts between Lithuanian and English (Schmalstieg, 1963) and there are several approaches to the comparison of Russian with French, German and English.

However Soviet teachers are reluctant to rely on theoretical contrastive analysis exclusively and they are encouraged to supplement linguistic analysis with observation of actual difficulties and error analysis. Furthermore the use of comparison, translation and the

mother tongue during the language lesson is not allowed to dominate classroom practice nor to create a too intellectualist approach to teaching. 'Consciousness', on which all these approaches are based, is not only intellectual awareness, it is also an attitude. Knowledge, as Leontev is fond of stressing is meaning, and an understanding of meaning or the significance of the linguistic features being presented depends as much on attitude and the student's motivation as upon the objective nature of the knowledge to be acquired.

b) Psychology of Language Acquisition and Bilingualism

A clue to the attitude of Soviet research workers to the significance of psycholinguistic studies is the criticism which is advanced against the work of Uriel Weinreich. Isayev points to Weinreich's interest in social and cultural factors but concludes that he exaggerates psychological factors (p 329). Another Soviet student of bilingualism Daurova maintains that "psychological factors do not explain the appearance of bilingualism and they may only be called factors that contribute to its speech to a greater or lesser degree". The general line Soviet students of bilingualism take is that "bilingualism should be understood as a person's belonging to two linguistic societies to such an extent that it is difficult to establish which language is closer to him, which one should be viewed as his mother tongue, which one he prefers and in which language he thinks" (Isayev 1977, 329). There is relatively less interest in the psychological process of bilingualism - whether of acquisition or expression, than in the context of acquisition of the two languages. Nevertheless the psychology of bilingualism has benefitted from the renewed interest in social psychology and the recognition that every form of individual development cannot be explained in terms of 'collective ownership if the means of production' and the consequent emphasis on the material, condition of the bilingual society. It is recognised that historical materialism though still the fundamental ideology cannot serve as a substitute for concrete studies in social psychology, and perhaps equally significant, there is the concession that social psychology is not necessarily a tool of 'imperialist ideology'.

At least two practical applications of investigations in social psychology have been stressed. Such investigations are a means of overcoming the conservative traditionalist elements in the behaviour of ethno/linguistic groups, which are regarded as stereotypical aspects of behaviour leading from the formation of habit to at the most elementary level to national traditions transmitted from one generation to the next (Fomina, 1946). The second benefit of such studies is the possibility of using a knowledge of the people's frame of mind ('Nastroenie') as an index which no student of social and political (including ethno/linguistic phenomena can ignore. Consequently one

of the most important areas of interest in Soviet psychological studies of language behaviour is the study of attitudes to language, to the contact of language and of the speakers of those languages. Such studies are conducted usually by means of questionnaires which are directed to discovering objective reflection of attitude in language use or language preference. Such objective studies tend to be designed within the framework of such dichotomies as "home and work", "manual and intellectual work" and within the total age group spectrum. In 1973 (Sov. Etn. 4: 73 3-13) was reported a study aiming to discover national and international attitudinal trends. It was found that closeness of attachment to aspects of one's 'nationality' like cultural traits and language decreases with education and level of professionalism in employment, while inter-national attitudes (mainly attitudes to Russian) were less favourable among the less well educated and the less skilled. The following table summarises the findings.

TABLE II

% of International Connections

Group	Mixed Marriages	Close trends outside own ethnic group	Relatives in other ethnic group
Engineers	12	33	63
	8	45	72
	2	21	48
Farmers	2	18	45

L.M. Drobizheva (1969) found that among the unspecified number of Belorussians and Ukrainians who read newspapers and books both in their own language and in Russian respectively 99.3% and 90.9% approve of the 'joint' work of people of different languages and nationalities. Among those who read only in Belorussian or only in Ukrainian the corresponding figures are 90.5% and 80.7%. The conclusion drawn from this study of attitude was that the Russian newspapers should be circulated more widely.

The most unequivocal index of the relation of attitude to and competence in a particular language is "language shift". The latter does not mean that knowledge of the forsaken language has disappeared but that relative competence in the two languages has switched. For this reason the Census data concerning the lack of consistency between ethnic affiliation and choice of language - the choice, usually of Russian, as the first language of a member of a non-Russian nationality

reflects a shift both of attitude and competence. According to the 1970 Census (Lewis, 1972, 133-9) in 32 of the 100 nationalities numbering over a thousand 5% though retaining their ethnic affiliation claimed Russian as their first language. In seven nationalities the percentage language shift was between 20% and 30%, and in 9 the percentage was over 50%. The speed and extent of this process is determined by several factors - age (the younger are more prone) urbanization, inter-marriage etc. And these factors, as we shall note influence not only the ultimate shift but the level of competence in the intermediate stages as is to be expected.

More detailed investigations have been conducted in specified localities. Perhaps the major issue which interests the researchers is the level of attainment in Russian among non-Russian nationalities. It is not insignificant that Georgia which is usually the most reluctant of nations to conform to Russification and whose attitude to Russian is lukewarm is constantly being criticised for the quality of its Russian. In 1973 (Zarya Vostoka, 10.7.73) a sharp rebuke was administered: the quality of Russian had declined, its teachers were inferior, and the University of Tbilisi (the capital) "had opted out altogether. Even people with higher education, scholars, scientists, engineers, University and school teachers and party leaders even, have a very poor knowledge of Russian". A survey conducted by Arutiunian (1973) investigated the competence of 4 groups in Tbilisi drawn from two academic institutions, a factory and a collective farm.

TABLE 12

Level of Competence in Russian and Georgian

Sample	Competence of % of Samples		
	Not fluent in Russian	Russian inferior to Georgian	Fluent in both languages
1 Mechanics Institute	15	37	48
2 Linguistics Institute	24	52	24
3 Factory	50	40	10
4 Collective Farm	60	30	10

Source: Arutiunian 1973: 8

Those in the sample all claimed a knowledge of Russian but it is noteworthy that in no group was there a 50% fluency in Russian, and that Georgian was by far the superior language among all but the scientists of the Mechanics Institute: the great majority of the total sample remained Georgian Dominant bilinguals. Similar results were obtained in an investigation of bilingual Tatars. Gubolgo (1972: 27) found that among those corresponding largely to the third and fourth groups in the sample in Table 12 (Manual workers) only approximately 16% spoke Russian competently, while among those employed in mental work fewer than 40% were fluent bilinguals. Similar results were obtained among Karelians (Klement'ev 1971: 41). Among members of the highest socio-occupational groups over 37.1% admitted to not being fluent in Russian. Among the intermediate occupational groups nearly 60% did not claim to be fluent in Russian while among manual workers the figure was 79.8%. The percentage of the total sample who claimed to be fluent in Karelian was over 90%. Among the Letts (Kholmagorov 1970) acquaintance with the Russian language (judged on the minimal base of 'acquaintance') is relatively high - 78% claimed to be acquainted with the language. There is here, too, a great disparity between occupational groups. Only 48% of manual workers compared with 98% of professionals claiming to know Russian. Because of the low standard of Russian great concern has been expressed. Pravda Vostoka (23/10/75: p 1-3) reported on all Union scientific and practical conference at Tashkent on the study and teaching of Russian in primary schools as well as secondary specialized and higher educational establishments. Various methods of teaching Russian in non-Russian schools were discussed.

The Soviet studies on attitude to which reference has been made tend to work in the framework of such dichotomies as "home and work", "manual and intellectual" activities. But before we refer to some of the data one important point must be stressed. So far as Britain and the United States are concerned the main interest lies in attitudes to and the use made of ethnic or minority language - Welsh or Spanish, or other minority languages in the United States which are the emerging languages. The situation of the world language, English, is almost the measure of the use of the minority language and the interest in it. The reverse is the case in the Soviet Union: there what may be taken for granted in bilingual areas are the ethnic languages and their situation is the measure of the intrusion both in attitude and use of the world language Russian which is the locally emerging or intrusive language. How far such a fundamental situational difference affects attitude - that is, to what extent intrusiveness (measured by increasing numbers of native speakers of a particular language, whether it is the lingua franca like English and Russian, or a minority language like Welsh or Spanish) affects attitude to the languages in contact has not been studied. It is undoubtedly a suitable and possibly valuable area for comparative research.

Terent'eva (1972) studied the differential use of Tatar and Russian among the Tatars of Kazan either in the home or at work. 46% spoke Tatar exclusively in the home compared with 17% who spoke Russian exclusively and 37% who spoke both. At work the proportion speaking Tatar and Russian were reversed - only 5% spoke Tatar exclusively as against 48% who spoke Russian and 47% who spoke both languages. When attention was confined to the home and the sample was drawn from both Tatars and Russians, the former, irrespective of whether Russian or Tatar was their first language used Russian predominantly - 93% of Russians who were native Russian speakers and 83% of Russians who were native Tatar speakers, as against 0.36% and 16% respectively who used Tatar. When those of Tatar nationality are considered, of those who spoke Russian as their native language 54% used Russian, and 19% used Tatar and 20% used both languages; while of those who spoke Tatar as their native language only 12% used Russian as against 46% who used Tatar and 35% who used both languages in the home. From this it is evident that the main determinants are the advantageous associations (political, literacy, scientific etc.) of the Russian language, and not the ethnic affinity of the speakers nor the traditional association of language and ethnicity. The same is true in Wales and in the United States (frequency of usage and favourable attitude are the preserves of the "big battalions".)

The dichotomy between "home" and work interested Kholmagarov also in his studies of the Letts. He found that whereas 78% of the Letts claimed to know Russian the use of that language in the home of native speakers of Lettish was negligible - an average of 7.4% claimed to do so. The difference between the Letts and the Tatars may be explained largely by the urban characteristics of the Tatar sample and the very long and intense Russian influence on Kazan and Tataria generally. History and urbanization as they are in the United States and Britain were influential factors.

Of the Letts who did use Russian in the home the highest proportion was among seamen (mobile workers) 9.8%; semi-skilled farm equipment operators (9.7%) and government employees (8.2%). Of the Letts who used Russian simply as a tool or for their intellectual satisfaction whether at work or at home, the highest proportion who used it on the job were found among professionals in the arts, teachers and physicians (70%). Those who used Russian almost the least frequently at work were Government employees, presumably because their work involved contact with the majority of Letts. The average use of Russian for intellectual satisfaction was lower than at work. Here greatest use of Russian was made by students (64%), government employees (60%), engineers and technicians (58%). Here again the association between type of work and the use of the languages in contact is not dissimilar to that which we discovered in Wales.

Two other variables, both of which we have referred to in respect of Wales, age and level of education, have been studied - in this case among the Karelians. Klement'ev (1971) established the tendency for the younger group (16-19) and the older (35-39) to polarize in respect of knowledge of Karelian, and use of the language at home, compared with the intermediate age group who recorded lower percentages than either the two polar groups.

TABLE 13

Linguistic Characteristics of age groups

Characteristics	16-19	25-29	40-49
Fluent in Karelian	39.1	31.7	75.3
Speak at home -			
Karelian only	45.3	31.2	44.2
Russian only	31.9	36.1	19.6
Both	22.8	33.5	34.4
Speak at work -			
Karelian only	8.8	4.5	22.0
Russian only	58.3	67.6	34.5
Both	32.9	26.9	42.8

Source: Klement'ev - Table I

The youngest and oldest groups, compared with the intermediate group are more fluent in Karelian, they speak Karelian more frequently at home and Russian less frequently; they use Karelian more often at work whether exclusively or with Russian.

Kholmagorov also established a close association between age and knowledge of Russian among Letts. The number of persons knowing Russian is in reverse proportion to their ages - 90% up to age 20, and then declining uniformly almost, to 47% at ages 51 and over. (Kholmagorov from Figure 3.6).

Level of education is also an important factor as it is in Wales. The percentage who spoke Karelian fluently declined and those who spoke Russian increased with the number of years of education they had received. The same is true in respect of the frequency with which they spoke Karelian or Russian at home, or at work.

TABLE 14

Level of Education and Linguistic Processes - in Percentages

Linguistic Characteristics	Education		
	Up to 4 years	4-6	7-9
Fluent in Karelian	85.2	77.7	57.6
" " Russian	4.7	9.1	20.2
" " Both	10.1	13.2	22.2
Karelian only at home	50.7	50.3	41.3

Cont'd.

Linguistic Characteristics	Education		
	Up to 4 years	4-6	7-9
Russian only at home	10.5	15.3	26.1
Both languages at home	36.4	32.6	32.0
Karelian only at work	27.6	20.2	14.0
Russian " " "	27.0	32.0	43.3
Both languages " "	44.9	47.4	41.5

Source: Klement'ev - Table 3

(b) The Organisation of bilingual education - types of schools and programme.

(a) The Soviet definition of bilingualism

According to the "Statutes of the Secondary General - Education School - USSR Council of Ministers Resolution Sept. 8 1970 (Uch. Gaz. 15.9.70) "pupils are given the opportunity to receive instruction within native language. Their parents or guardians have the right to select for their children a school of their choice with the appropriate language of instruction. In addition to the language in which instructic is carried on pupils may choose to study the language of another people of the USSR". However the demographic composition of towns, cities and even small villages makes it difficult to allow such freedom of choice as this Resolution implies. For instance people belonging to more than 100 nationalities live in the Georgian Republic and there are schools where the instruction is organised in separate tracks to provide for Armenian, Azerbaydzhan, Greek and Ossete speaking children, and where in addition the different groups all learn Georgian and Russian. The children in some Bashkir schools are taught in six languages, Russian, Tatar, Bashkir, Chuvash, Mari or Udmurt according to their ethnic origin. In the city of Kzyl-Orda (Kazakhstan) the Saken Seifullin School is attended by representatives of 30 nationalities while School No. 23 in Frunze has 18 different language groups. In 1974 there were 317 such multinational schools in Kirgizia.

All the schools in the cities of Daghestan recruit children from five to 25 naticnalities. One school in Maikop (Krasnodar region) is attended by children from twelve linguistic groups. In the 1976-7 school year there were at least 400 such schools in Daghestan, some of them in relatively small villages like Tataiurt in the Babaiurt region. The 508 children of the village represented 16 nationalities and every class in the village school was a complete cross section of the heterogenous village community. The school in the Daghestanie Ogni settlement was attended by Ossetians, Avars, Laks, Tatars, Ukrainians, Kumyks, Mountain Jews, Rutuls, Armenians, Bellorussians, Greeks and Aguie as well as by the native Dargin children. Such complexity not only makes a bilingual/multilingual education necessary but puts a

premium on the use of the lingua franca as the teaching language, as was the case in Darbent, School No. 4 (Garunov, 1970). It is not surprising therefore that bilingual education in the Soviet Union results in promoting a lingua franca, the Russian language, although nationality languages are taught and used. However in most of the literature concerned with the subject it is the Russian aspect which attracts most attention, to the extent that bilingualism tends to be limited to the promotion of Russian which is most carefully planned. One effect is the elimination of other languages from the system of education. For instance, according to the 1927 Belorussian School Census there were 213 Jewish schools in the Republic - 202 in which Yiddish was the only language used, 7 in which Yiddish and Russian were used and 4 where Yiddish and Belorussian were the languages of instruction. In the Ukraine in 1930 there were 786 Yiddish schools, and over 830 in 1931. The numbers increased everywhere, except in the Russian Republic, until the middle of the 1930's. Nevertheless Yiddish is not used or even taught in any part of the USSR at present although the total number of Soviet Jews in 1970 was 2.15 million of whom 18% claimed Yiddish or another Jewish language as their native language. In the Russian Republic there were over 800,000 Jews of whom 12% claimed Yiddish or another Jewish dialect as their native tongue, while 9.6% claimed it as their second language. The very great majority of these receive their education in Russian and the rest in a local language. There are of course several reasons for the elimination of Yiddish from the schools, some of them connected with divisions among the Jews themselves about the acceptability of secular schools and the relative importance of Yiddish and Hebrew.

(b) Teaching Russian as a second language

Twenty years after the resolution of the 7th Russian Conference of the Communist Party in April 1917 had called for the "abolition of a compulsory state language" it was decreed that Russian should be taught to all students of the Soviet Union whatever their nationality. For some time after 1938 the teaching commenced in the 3rd grade but it has been common practice for a long time for Russian to be introduced in the middle of the first class, and not later than the second. In spite of this early introduction the professional journals as recently as 1972-3 have given space to considerable criticism of the quality of Russian among students who are non-native speakers of the language. The Minister of Education for the Uzbek SSR having stressed the fact that Russian is taught from the first to the tenth grade in all schools, that 14% of school time is devoted to the language and that there were nearly 12 thousand Russian language teachers in the Republic, concludes that a great deal remains to be done to raise attainment in Russian to even a moderately satisfactory standard (Pravda Vostoka, 19.3.73). The

Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Education criticised the quality of the results in Estonia. It was reported in 1975 that all pupils in the schools of Estonia learn Russian, though officially it is an optional subject. Aids to teaching had improved but it was agreed "that the position is still unsatisfactory in grades 4-8. Not all teachers are capable of inspiring their pupils", and it was stressed that the 'international character of the Russian language should be explained to the children to stimulate their interest". (Koukagede Sovetaja 19.4.75 p.3). In Turkestan it instructed all non-Russian schools to broaden the use of Russian in school work and extra curricular activities (Nar.Obraz.6.1972, pp. 114-5). The same criticism was voiced in Azerbaydzhan where the teachers are criticised for their reluctance to attend refresher courses in the language (Uch.gaz. July 18.1972. p.2). In Turkmenistan, though methods and aids had improved in 1975 the actual quality of the teachers was criticised. Yet in spite of existing differences it was decided that Russian should be taught in all classes (1-10) from 1975 onwards (Uch.Gaz.27.7.75. p1-2). #More than 50% of the girls (Kirgiz, Uzbeks, Uigurs, Dungans and Tatars) entering the first year of the language faculty at the Kirgiz Pedagogical Institute for Women for training as teachers of Russian in Kirgiz schools could only at a pinch be described as having a command of Russian. In the first year 330 hours are devoted to Russian grammar and conversation by each teacher. But in the fourth-year exams it was mainly those who had completed their secondary schooling in Russian who showed up well. The position is less good with those who come from remote mountain areas and did their schooling in Kirgiz. In view of the importance of conversational opportunities it was suggested that there should be one girl with an excellent knowledge of Russian in each room in the hostel, but this was not always the case, and not surprisingly a fairly sizeable number of fourth-year students were unable to construct a Russian sentence correctly. A lack of contact between the Kirgiz Women's Pedagogical Institute and institutes in Michurinsk, Kalinin, Leningrad, Khar'kov, Voronezh and Rostov, which are also training Kirgiz students to teach Russian in Kirgiz schools, means that they do not benefit from each others' experience and affects the quality of their work. (Uch. gaz., 1/2/72, p.2) # The first regional conference on the national organisation of the teaching of Russian to Tadzhik students took place in the Tadzhik State University in 1972. An experimental 280 hour course in Russian was suggested together with a common curriculum for Russian in all Soviet schools . common textbooks (Kom. Tadzh. 26.11.72) Such conferences were common in 1972, one held at Kishinev dealt with Russian throughout the Soviet Union (Uch.Gaz. 31.10.72). A three-day All-Union Conference on Perfecting the Teaching of Russian in national schools, took place in Tashkent from 21-23/10/75. It was held within the context of a quotation from Brezhnev, in his report on the 50th anniversary of the USSR, declaring that 'the quick

growth of communication and collaboration between nationalities leads to a growing importance of the Russian language, which has become the language of mutual intercourse of all the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union'. (Pravda Vostoka 24.10.75).

The six year old children began their schooling in an experimental preparatory class, which spread to other urban and rural schools. As a result the Georgian Council of Ministers prepared for such classes in all the general educational schools. Such early introduction to Russian was felt necessary because pupils from more than 100 nationalities live in Georgia - including Armenian, Azerbaydzhanis, Greeks and Ossetians, each group, like the Georgian majority possessing their own native language medium schools. Consequently it is not uncommon for children to enter grade 1 without a word of Russian. (Izvestia 24.4.75

The attitude to Russian studies in the Georgian SSR lends itself to the most sustained attack of all. An editorial in Zarya Vostoka (10.7.73) follows a report of the February meeting of the Central Committee of the Georgian Communist Party in which a long list of shortcomings were itemized. The editorial maintains that the quality of Russian teaching has deteriorated in the last fifteen years and the training which the teachers receive is unsatisfactory. The University of Tbilisi has ceased to take an interest in the problem and other measures are called for to retrain (perepodgotovka) the teachers of Russian and Russian literature. New text books and ancillary materials are called for. So bad is the position of Russian in Georgia, it is maintained, that members of the highest professions, leaders of the Komsomol and experts in economics have a very poor knowledge of Russian. The effect of this kind of situation in Georgia and other Republics is that the planned programme of transfer from national language instruction to Russian medium is delayed because knowledge of the language does not reach the minimum standard necessary. Desheriev (1968, 60-1) criticises efforts that were made in the Volga and North Caucusus regions to transfer pupils from classes where teaching was in the native language to Russian medium classes not because this step was undesirable but simply because it was impracticable - the 'level of bilingualism in Russian and the national language was too low to make the transfer a practical proposition'.

Partly because of this unsatisfactory position at the end of even higher education the teaching of Russian has been brought fowward into pre-school classes; six year old children are introduced to Russian in informal ways but before they receive formal instruction in the mother tongue. In 1946 the establishment of these classes was approved in Dachestan as well as among Buryats, Kabardins, and Yakuts. In 1965 Tbilisi saw the establishment of the first of these classes in Georgia. In Kirgizia classes in Russian for non-Russians

have been established since 1965. Although pre-school nursery classes for children between 2 months and 3 years, and kindergarten for those between 3 years and 7 are voluntary they are an important part of the preparation for bilingual education. In 1975 there were nearly 11 million places. Nevertheless the provision is said to be inadequate.

The intention is that they should enable a language other than the mother tongue to compete with the influence of the home and the immediate neighbourhood in establishing which language is dominant in a child's linguistic repertoire and they 'help to avoid failure later in the school course. Teaching occurs during 35 weeks of the year and the Russian classes last 35 minutes daily' (Uch. Gaz. 15.2.73). In October 1971 at a conference held at Frunze teachers reported on their experience of these preparatory classes and it was evident that many teachers objected to what they conceived to be one of the results of such classes, namely the increasing tendency to transfer from the national to the Russian language as a medium of instruction. (Sov. Ped.6.72.p.148-50). One variant of the pre-school provision is adopted by very many if not most rural schools. They organise courses of about 6 weeks duration immediately prior to entry to the elementary school so that the children may familarize themselves with a basic Russian vocabulary and the sounds of the language (Russ.yaz.v.nats.schk.4.65.p.45-7

(c) Russian language schools for non-Russians

Even during the period when the national languages were favourably regarded in education schools where Russian was used as the sole medium of instruction for non-native speakers of the language were popular and formed one of the most important strands in the pattern of bilingual education. Theoretically, nevertheless, 'the tendency to make Russian the language of teaching rather than the subject of study... is harmful and wrong' (Sovetskin, 36). In spite of this caution the percentage of Russian medium schools for non-Russians increased so that by 1956 14% of all Ukrainian schools, 27% of Moldavian schools, 27% of the schools in Latvia and over 40% of Kazakh schools were of this character. In the Transcaucusus and Central Asia the proportion tended to be much lower, averaging 3%. In the Tadzhik SSR although these schools constituted only 2% of the total they accounted for 16% of the pupil enrolment in the Republic. Among Turkmens the number of children attending Russian medium schools for non-Russians constituted 20% of the total in 1964 and among Azerbaydzhanis 24%. In the cities the proportion of non-Russians attending Russian medium schools tended to be higher than the average. In Ashkabad in 1964 87% of the schools belonged to this category. Naturally, they tended to attract most if not all the children of Russian immigrants but very often the percentage of non-Russians was equal to them. In Georgia and Azerbaydzhan the number of children attending Russian medium schools was twice as high as the number of

Russians in the Republic would appear to justify. In Lithuania 11% of all students were taught in Russian though the percentage of Russians in Lithuania in 1959 was only 8.5%. In Latvia the respective percentages were 33% and 26% and in Estonia 22% and 20%.

Even if students begin attending elementary schools where they are taught in their native tongue the tendency is for them to transfer to Russian medium instruction, sometimes in the elementary school but most frequently when they enter or during early grades in secondary school.. In 1958 the majority of minority children in the Russian Republic transferred at some stage from national language instruction to Russian. The only exceptions were Tatars and Bashkirs. Generally speaking the children of nationalities living in autonomous oblasts did not receive any secondary instruction in their own language. Smaller nationalities usually transfer to Russian after the first two years of elementary school (Sovetskin, 1958, 23). In 1965-66 the transfer of all teaching from the native language to Russian was decreed in the Kabardin-Balkar ASSR and this began with the transfer of fifty percent of the second grade in all schools (Russ.yaz. v nat. schkole, 4.65). In North Ossetia all students transfer to Russian medium instruction in the Fifth Grade (Nar.Obraz.12, 1962; 6,1964). In some Autonomous Republics the transfer begins in the third grade although the practice in most areas is to arrange the transfer in Grades 4-8 (Sov.Ped.6.72).

The exclusively Russian medium schools for non-Russians and the schools where transfer to Russian at some point is a regular feature of the organisation tend to be in the urban areas. This is true of the Tatar ASSR (Russ.yaz v.nat.schkole, 6 1963) and Daghestan (Sov. etn. 6.1965, 98-9). Therefore the students who are taught in Russian profit from the advantages of equipment and teaching facilities which urban schools enjoy whatever their language of instruction may be. This purely urban advantage appears to parents and administrators to have a necessary association with Russian and this impression is fostered. The Minister of Education for North Ossetia, for instance, claimed that "children having instruction in Russian from the first grade onwards receive a better general education" (Narad.Obr. 1965, 38). The main advantage derives from the reluctance of teachers to go into the rural and national language schools. In 1973 it was complained that teachers trained to teach Russian used every subterfuge to avoid going outside the urban areas.

(d) The 'integrated school' or parallel medium instruction

In countries where the main thrust of bilingual education is exerted by minorities seeking to safeguard their language against the penetration of a major language which is already entrenched, the dynamics of bilingual education is reflected in nationality schools. In the Soviet Union where outside the Russian Republic and the Ukraine the national languages are maintained very strongly by the vast majority of the people the main thrust is towards the establishment of Russian as a subject and as the language of instruction. In this case the dynamism of bilingual education is most characteristic of the rapid expansion of Russian medium schools and classes for non-Russians, and more recently in the expansion of integrated schools where Russian and one (sometimes as many as four or five other languages) may be used to teach the different nationalities.

The rationale which is offered for the integrated school is complex. In the first place these schools bear the hall mark of Lenin's approval. In 1913 with reference to the Jews of Odessa he opposed separate schools, whether Russian or nationality schools. "It is in the interests of the working class to unite children of all nationalities in integrated schools" (Soch. XVII, 168-9). Following this lead parallel medium schools were popular in the 1920's. In the Ukraine 7% of the children attended such schools and in Kharkov province the figures were as high as 49% (Stat.Ukr., 1928). These schools were and still are regarded as the cradles of international understanding. Secondary school No. 55 in Riga was reported in 1966 as having provided parallel Latvian and Russian classes for over six years with the result that "more than 1,000 Latvian had learned to live as one family". This estimate of their achievement is confirmed by the experience of foreign observers. One of these, visiting Central Asia in 1965, agreed that the "multi-national co-education/integrated school apart from its primary aim of Russification and ablizhenia, in practice means that from their earliest years young Slavs, Kazakhs, Kirgiz, Tadzhiks and many other Asian nationalities ... are working together and playing together. This co-education may go far to destroy the racial and linguistic barriers among Central Asian nationalities which were formerly endemic here" (Central Asian Rev., 1965, 13).

Other reasons than the promotion of international understanding are held to justify the establishment of integrated schools. Some schools carry instruction in three or more languages and in those cases, where the numbers in any one ethnic or linguistic track are too small to make separate schools possible and where the parents are

disinclined to opt for the lingua franca there is no option but to organise parallel classes. This is one of the main reasons for the establishment of such schools in Lithuania where, in 1964, the Minister of Education stated that in "every Lithuanian and Polish school ... the children are taught in one of three languages - Polish, Russian and Lithuanian" (Izvestia, Feb. 1964). Children in some Bashkir schools are taught in one of six languages - Russian, Tatar, Bashkir, Chuvash Mari and Udmurt. However, although it may be administrative difficulties which make the establishment of integrated schools necessary it is not denied that the result is to promote the Russian language, and that this is one of the aims. It was reported in 1965 that though the children may not be taught in Russian yet since the language of play is Russian and Russian is also the language of the school administration and of extra curricular activities the integrated school is a useful instrument in the advancement of Russian related bilingualism. (Narod. Obrez, 1965).

The Baltic Republics, especially Latvia are the areas where integrate schools have flourished most successfully. They were started there in 1946 when approximately 30,000 school places were provided. By 1965-6 the number had been more than trebled, representing over a third of the total school population. The number of integrated schools in the Republic during the same school year was 240 (Pravda, 1966, 5, 4). However there was considerable difference in the treatment of Russian and Lettish as second languages in these schools in the Lettish medium classes Russian was taught for 1,685 hours annually while Lettish in Russian medium classes was taught for less than half that time, 830 hours annually. In spite of these differences over 80% of the Letts surveyd in [redacted] olnogorov, 1970) approved of integrated schools in preference to other types of bilingual schools. Among the non-Letts surveyed the percentage who approved was even higher, 84.5%. Only 3.8% expressed their disapproval of the integrated school.

In the thirties in Turkestan 12% of the pupils attended integrated schools but by 1965 the percentage had dropped to 7% (Kulturnaya Strana 1956, 186). The number of parallel Azerbaydzhan and Russian schools increased from 158 in 1940 to 183 in 1953, 231 in 1959 and to over three hundred at present (Azer v. tsifrakh, 1970). In Uzbekistan the proportion of pupils in such schools was nearly 20% in 1963 (Voprosy filologii, 6,11). In the Tashkent Oblast 50% of the children attended integrated schools, while in Kirgizia there were over three hundred such schools in 1964 (Kommunist, 1964, 12, 19). Kazakhstan in 1962 had nearly 2,000 schools with classes which were taught in Russian and one or more of the national language. The boarding schools were very often similar to integrated schools (Pravda, 1962, 29, 5). In the

schools of the Nenetz National District of the Northern Territories "parallel primary grades have been established in schools with a mixed national composition. In classes with Nenetz or Komi children teaching is conducted in the languages of these nationalities. From the third grade on children of all nationalities are no longer educate in parallel classes but together." (Narod. obraz. 1957, 6).

(e) Extent of provision for national languages in education

At present 57 languages are used at different grade levels of education in the Soviet Union. The number of nationality schools in the Russian Republic in 1955-6 was 11.8 thousand and these were attended by approximately ⅓ of the non-Russian population of the Republic. In the Russian Republic in 1972, of the 42 indigenous ethnic groups 16 did not have schools which used the nationality language at any stage. These included Kabardin, Balkar and Kalmyk, smaller groups like Adyged and Cherkess, and very small ones like Mansi, Eskimo etc. Of the rest only the Bashkirs and Tatars had schools where the national language was used from elementary through all secondary grades. Some, like Yakut schools used the language through Grade 8 or Grade 7 (Tuvin) or Grade 6 (Buryat). The remaining nationalities, where they did make use of their national language in education confined them to the elementary grades, and some only to the first grade. Two groups which are not indigenous to the Russian Republic, Armenian and Kazakh, have their own schools where the national language is used through Grade 10. The situation has deteriorated since 1958 mainly in the sense that transfer to Russian medium instruction occurs earlier in all schools except those of the Bashkirs, Tatars, Armenians and Kazakhs, where there is no transfer at any point, and in the Yakut schools where the use of Yakut in 1972 occurs a grade later than in 1958. In all other national schools the use of the nationality language in 1972 ceased two or three grades earlier than in 1958 (Sovetkin, 1958 and Danilov 1972

TABLE 15

Languages of Instruction in 1969

Republic	Language used	Total
Russian SFSR	Russian, Tatar, Chuvash, Mordvin, Bashkir, Udmurt, Mari, Komi, Komi-Permyak, Avar, Buryat, Ossetian, Yakut, Lezgin, Kabardin, Dargin, Kumyk, Adygei, Azerbaydzhani, Lak, Khakas, Altai, Nenets, Evenki, Khanty, Chukchi, Koryak, Abazin, Nogai, Tabasaran, Balkar, Kalmyk, Karachai, Ingush, Mansi, Tuvinian, Finnish, Chechen and Even.	39
Ukrainian SSR	Ukrainian, Russian, Moldavian, Hungarian, Polish.	5
Belorussian	Belorussian, Russian.	2
Uzbek SSR	Uzbek, Russian, Kazakh, Tadzhik, Kirgiz, Karaknlpak, Turkmen.	7
Kazakh SSR	Kazakh, Russian, Uzbek, Tadzhik, Uygur, Dungan.	6
Georgian SSR	Georgian, Russian, Armenian, Azerbaydzhani, Ossetian, Abkhaz.	6
Azerbaydzhan SSR	Azerbaydzhani, Russian, Armenian, Lezgin.	4
Lithuanian SSR	Lithuanian, Russian, Polish.	3
Moldavian SSR	Moldavian, Russian, Ukrainian.	3
Latvian SSR	Latvian, Russian.	2
Kirgiz SSR	Kirgiz, Russian, Uzbek, Tadzhik, Kazakh, Turkmen	5
Tadzhik SSR	Tadzhik, Russian, Uzbek, Kirgiz, Kazakh, Turkmen	6
Armenian SSR	Armenian, Russian, Azerbaydzhani	3
Turkmen SSR	Turkmen, Russian, Uzbek, Kazakh.	4
Estonian SSR	Estonian, Russian	2

During the early years of the Soviet regime the national languages had a very prominent place in education. In 1927 over 93% of the Ukrainian speaking children received their elementary education in that language, 83% received their secondary education in Ukrainian, accounting for 73% of the total child population of the Ukraine (Bilinsky, 1968, 418). Since 1959 the number of schools using Ukrainian has declined from 84% to 82% in 1968 (Pravda Ukr. 1968, 3.11.20), but not all these schools made use of Ukrainian for more than two or three grades. The decline has been greater in urban schools. In 1965 there were only 56 schools in L'vov in which Ukrainian was used for some part of the course and these constituted only 65% of the total. In Kiev although speakers of Ukrainian represented 60% of the total population the schools in which Ukrainian was used provided for only 41% of the child population. In Belorussia in 1927 the situation was very similar to that of the Ukraine - 90% were taught in their national language. In Georgia and Armenia 98% and 98.5% respectively were taught in their native tongue. Among the Azerbaydzhanis (93.8%), Tatars (77%), Tadzhiks (54%) the percentages tended to be lower but higher than they are at present if we take into account the fact that the schools which employ the national language for some grades at present transfer to Russian very much earlier than they did. The decline is apparent also in the number of national languages that may be used in a Union Republic. Thus, in the Uzbek SSR Russian, Tadzhik, Kazakh, Tatar, Korean, Armenian, Yiddish and several other languages were used as well as Uzbek in 1935. In 1960-1 only Uzbek, Russian, Tadzhik, Kirgiz, Turkmen and Karakalpak were used and this is the present position.

(f) Schools for Non-Russian Minorities

Some of the nationality languages are not indigenous to a particular Union Republic and they may be spoken by groups of immigrant populations of varying sizes. We have referred to some of these already, for instance Armenians and Kazakhs in the Russian Republic. The following languages, whatever proportion of their speakers may be dispersed outside their eponymous Republics are taught and used only within those Republics - Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Belorussian. In some cases, like those of the Autonomous Republics they may be minority languages when considered against the total population of the Union Republic but within their own limited areas or Autonomous Republics they tend to be the major language. Where this is the case the use of the language is confined to the Autonomous Republic of which it is the basic language. Russian is t only language where the immigrant Russian minority has its own language schools in every Republic. Of equal significance are the number of nationalities with very considerable dispersed populations constituting minorities who have no schools in which the language of the dispersed

minority is either taught or used. For instance according to the 1970 Census there were 578 thousand Tatars in the Uzbek SSR, 284 thousand in Kazakhstan, thousand in Kirgizia and 71 thousand in Tadzhikstan but they ceased to have minority schools before 1959. The same is true of Uzbeks (50 thousand), Kirgiz (21 thousand) and Azerbaydzhanis (96 thousand) and Turkmens (23 thousand) in the Russian Republic. The position was summed up, with barely disguised critical overtones by Khanazarov (Voprosy razvitiya, 340 1960). "During the period of developing Socialist construction in 1938-9 Uzbekistan provided schools where instruction was offered in 22 languages ... The provision even made it possible for a single Polish family to have its child taught in the mother tongue. The change of policy has recently led to parents sending their children not to minority schools but to Russian medium schools which may also be minority schools. In Uzbekistan at present there are schools for only 7 language minorities and these are limited to Central Asian languages in addition to Russian. At the same time 50% of the children in schools for the Russian minorities consist of Ukrainian, Belorussian, Jewish, Armenian, Mordvin, Kazakh and other minorities.

There is only a small amount of reliable and concrete evidence concerning the relation between choice of type of school and variables such as the linguistic characteristics of the locality, as well as the family. The following Table gives some evidence that the degree of language maintenance in the locality determines choice of school, and that on the whole the wives in ethnically mixed marriages have the greater say in choice of school.

TABLE 16

Language in which urban Moldavians and Russians wish their children to be taught in schoo
(According to ethnic environment)

A Nationality make up of collectives in which Moldavians work	Moldavian	Russian	Both
a) Primarily Mold.	55.3%	18.8%	11.3%
b) Half Mold.	49.5%	23.7%	14.2%
c) Few Mold.	42.0%	36.0%	18.0%
B Nationality make up of families			
a) Russian women			
-Mold. husbands	11.1	55.9	15.2
-Russians "	9.0	69.0	6.9
b) Russian men			
-Mold. wives	15.0	62.0	12.0
-Russ. wives	6.2	72.1	10.8
c) Moldavian women			
-Russ. husbands	28.0	2.0	19.8
-Mold. husbands	63.3	15.5	13.8
dd) Moldavian men			
-Russ. wives	30.2	36.8	15.1
-Mold wives	63.9	18.2	10.2

Source: The Current Digest of the Soviet Press (CDSP) Vol. 30 no. 7

The choice of type of school affects the child's level of attainment in his two languages, as well as his differential use of them for various social functions and by implication attitude towards them. Kholmagorov discovered that the different social functions for which Lettish and Russian were employed by 17-19 year old bilinguals were closely associated with type of school.

TABLE 7

Use of Lettish and Russian according to type of school (percentages)

Students	Social functions							
	Lett.	Russ.	Lett.	Russ.	Lett.	Russ.	Lett.	Russ.
Studies taught in Lettish	100	89	100	6.2	100	67	100	100
Students taught in Russian	53	100	14.5	100	20	100	20	100

Source: Kholmagorov - Table 3.1 (extracted)

The one important point to notice is that while the type of school does have an association with differential social-functioning of the languages the influence of the Lettish medium school is far less effective than the Russian medium school especially on the choice of language for Reading, Radio/TV and use in the school. Only the home use of either language coincides with type of school. Drobizheva (1971) in her study of Tatars attempted to correlate type of school to attitude towards aspects of ethnicity including language. She found it "characteristic that Tatars who have graduated from a mixed or Russian school have more favourable attitudes and enter into personal inter-ethnic contacts (involving language) more often" than those attending Tatar medium schools.

Choice of school itself is an index (however partial, and however affected by official pressure) of attitude to the language which characterises the school. In other words the effect of the type of school is not to create attitudes but to reinforce those which helped to determine the original choice. Of such schools we can identify first those where the teaching language in the native tongue and those in which Russian is used. Where Russian is the teaching language in the first grade it follows that it continues to be so to the end. The minority language school may shift to Russian medium instruction at any stage, and in the majority of cases this occurs when students enter secondary schools.

It does not always follow that verbal expression of a favourable attitude to Russian medium schools coincides with the actual choice of such a school by parents. For instance Arutiunian (1969) found that among village Tatars though 60% of the parents favoured such a school only 25% of them chose it for their children. Furthermore the attitude to Russian or native language school is associated with attitude to other ethnic indices as Terent'eva claims: "There is a definite relationship between the relative number of schools with instruction in the language of the indigenous nationality and all other indices defining the direction of the ethnic processes" (1972:46). The choice of school and other ethnic processes are influenced very considerably by attitudes of parents, the ethnic composition of the area and especially the degree of ethnic hetergeneity. Schools may be situated in areas inhabited by several ethnic/linguistic groups and here it would be possible to establish separate ethnic/language schools. However neither exclusively Russian nor exclusively single ethnic schools are favoured either by the administration or parents in such areas, if they have a choice of "multi national schools". Where many groups attend the same school there is a great likelihood that the language of instruction is Russian, though there are many instances of multi-lingual instruction. The attitudes of the administration favours multi-ethnic as opposed to separate schools, being influenced by Lenin's insistence "that we must strive for a merging of children of all nationalities into one school in a given area ... we must decisively oppose any movement to divide the school in terms of nationalities" (Lenin, 1923). It is for this reason that though the 917 Azerbayani children attending a school in Daghestan could very easily be organized in a separate single-ethnic school they are nevertheless part of a school of 1,400 students comprising 8 other nationalities.

Such bilingual schools, therefore, are not forced upon administrators or parents simply because of the degree of local heterogeneity they are preferred even when an alternative organization is available, since they safeguard the native tongue (which is the teaching language for students who opt for it) as well as offering an opportunity to acquire Russian and to be taught in it if that is the choice. Attitudes to bilingual teaching is very favourable but not uniformly so. Of the different occupational groups in Latvia (Kholmagorov op.cit. Table 5.2) the best favourable were Physicians (66.2%) and Government Workers (76.2%) and the most favourable Engineers and Technicians (100%) and Teachers (91%). It is impossible to obtain any information about whether those who are least favourable would prefer separate Lettish medium schools, or schools where the medium of instruction is the second language - Russian. On the one hand Government workers and

Physicians is their preference for Russian (in spite of low attainment) because they are the highest among all occupational groups in favouring friendly relations with Russians in the localities. (Kholmogarov). Generally speaking however the degree of favour with which bilingual schools in Latvia are favoured is high and characterises all nationalities in that Republic - Letts - 81.2% approval, other nationalities 84.5%. Opposition was limited to 3.8% among Letts and other.

(9) Training teachers for nationality schools

We have referred to the fact that most of the nationality schools are in the rural areas and suffer from the disinclination of teachers to work there. But the question is not simply a matter of a sufficient number of teachers but of teachers who know the language of the nationality, have been trained to teach it and to use it in teaching other subjects. This is exemplified in the case of Abkhaz. In 1945 it was decreed that elementary schools in which Abkhaz was used should be closed. In 1953 it was announced (Zarya Vostoka, 20.10.53) that this decision had been reversed and that Abkhaz could be used in elementary schools, with either Russian or Georgian after the first four years. However, this reversal of policy had little effect because few teachers could be recruited who were competent to teach and use the language. (Bennigsen 1961, 51). The Collegium of USSR Ministry of Education examined the question of training of teachers in Nationality Schools and found that only 70% have higher education, and that the numbers enrolled were not sufficient to meet the demands (Uch.Gaz.31.7.73). In 1976 it was reported that 'nationalities divisions' had been set up in the Universities of Kurbyshev, Saratov, Minsk and in many others in the European and Asian parts of the country. The number of nationalities represented in these 'divisions' which are designed to train teachers for 'nationality schools' using the nationality language as a medium of instruction has increased greatly to include students from the Transcaucasian and Baltic republics as well as from Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kirgizia, Tadzhikstan and Turkmenia (Uch. Gaz. 5.7.76).

The same is true of the nationalities of the Far North. It was reported in 1949 that 60% of the teachers in those schools were recruited from outside the area and special bonuses were paid to attract teachers (Nar.Obraz. 1966, Sept). In the schools of the Evenki there were very few more teachers who spoke the language as

their mother tongue in 1947 than the 12 who were there in 1935. Because of this shortgage of qualified teachers The Institute of the Peoples of the North was established on the foundations of the Leningrad Institute of Geography. The Institute became incorporated into the Harzen Institute which has been the prototype for other institutes concerned with training teachers of nationality languages. By 1960 the Institute was able to recruit a hundred students annually, five from each of the main northern ethnic groups. These are tenth grade students, and at the Institute they follow a three year academic course and subsequently a three year professional teacher's course to which a fourth year is added to prepare them for the specific problems of bilingual education in the Far North up to the 8th Grade. In 1967 the situation had shown a measure of improvement. One tenth of the teachers working in schools of the Chukot National District were Chukchi or Eskimo, Evenk or some other Northern nationality. In the Nenetz National District Nenetz and Komi teachers comprised a quarter of the staffs of the schools and of these up to 80% had higher or secondary specialised education. (Nar.Obraz. 1967,6). In addition to being able to continue their education at the Herzen Pedagogical Institute in Leningrad or at Krasnoiarsk, Magada or Kharovsk the students may be trained as teachers in Nar'ian-Mar, Salekhard Igarka and Anadyr.

There is similar provision for intending teachers of other nationality languages at the Tashkent Institute, The Tbilisi Institute and the Pedagogical Institute in Erevan which like the Institute at Tbilisi has separate sections for the basic language of the Republic and for Russian. All these Institutes work in very close association with the academy of Pedagogical Sciences in Moscow which in 1949 set up a Scientific Research Institute of the Nationality Schools. This has contributed greatly to the understanding of problems connected with bilingual education, the teaching of Russian as a second language and the use of minority languages in schools. At one time it had four branches in the various Autonomous Republics of the RSFSR, and experimental schools for children who speak Mordvin, Buryat, Chuvash and Kabardin.

6. What has the Soviet Union to offer? Some personal observations

A. Introduction

Ideally I would hope that the descriptive account which has been given in this study would encourage and enable American teachers and administrators to draw their own conclusions and make their own comparisons. The American bilingual-education situation is so varied not to say somewhat confused that teachers in different parts of the United States may quite legitimately come to different conclusions about how they compare with the system of education in the Soviet Union. There is more than one United States of America and even a native American who has spent years in studying its provision of bilingual education as Theodore Andersson has done, is aware, as a study of his publications reveal, how difficult it is to generalize. Furthermore it is impossible to isolate any one aspect of Soviet bilingual education from the political, ideological and social context which affords it significance. One cannot approve of this or that aspect of Soviet bilingual education compared with our own, and disown the total system of Soviet education with which it is identified or the social system that the system of education is created specifically to serve. Even more than other countries the educational system is 'holistic' and is only a microcosm of the 'holistic' social system. Even if it were possible to introduce elements of the system of Soviet bilingual education into the American scene the probability is that in the short rather than the long term the assimilation of one element would be the prelude to the introduction of associated features of the Soviet system. What I have said is not meant to discourage the comparative study of Soviet and American bilingual education. On the contrary that study is necessary but it involves more than is involved in attempting to benefit from the experience of Canada or Western European bilingual countries such as Belgium, Ireland and Wales. A system of education does not exist in a vacuum - it reflects and maintains the current distribution of power between professions, social classes and ethnic groups.

B. Some preliminary but fundamental questions

For the reasons already suggested earlier in this study the answers given by Soviet educationists to some of the basic questions concerning the education of a multilingual society may not, and in my view do not find acceptance in the United States. The first question is "How far is the maintenance of an ethnic language

justified for anything but local, oral and intragroup communication?" The Soviet Union takes a 'philosophically utilitarian' view of the matter. If the demographic decline of a particular language or its disuse for a particular purpose entrances the overall advantage of the whole State, the demise of that language is not only justified but welcomed and promoted. Thus, although during its early years the regime provided alphabets for many very small hitherto unalphabeticised languages, it was realized that the advantage of other more viable languages like Russian as well as the welfare of the Soviet Union itself was not promoted by doing so and the newly provided alphabets were used less and less frequently. Mother tongue literacy in such languages does not now proceed beyond grade 2.

The alternative to this political philosophy is to regard all members of a society, individuals or groups (together with their languages) as possessing equal and inalienable rights which are not to be abrogated even if the sacrifice promotes the well being of all the others. This, vaguely conceived and even more vaguely acknowledged is the philosophy which guides the proponents of 'ethnic', 'cultural' or 'linguistic' pluralism in the United States. ~~That~~ It is a reversal of the policy of assimilation previously pursued which was open to the justifiable criterion which has been levelled against it. However, the natural rights policy may not be acceptable in practice, however cogent the theory may be. Strong philosophical and practical arguments exist in favour of ignoring the demands for bilingual education for isolated small communities speaking obsolescent or receding languages. This is the policy of the Soviet Union, whereas the contrary is the case in the United States and the differences are fundamental, going to the roots of political philosophy.

The second question the Soviet Union (as well as the United States) faces is 'how to justify the maintenance of the language of a large ethnic group or nation (e.g. Armenians in the USSR, Poles or Italians in the United States) if the language, though spoken, by over a million Armenians, with a strong territorial base, ~~where the majority is dispersed~~ claim it as the medium of education for small Armenian groups in other Republics. The position is even more complex in the United States where only the Alaskan, the Amerindians and the Mexican Americans of the South West may be said to possess compact historical territorial bases. All large ethnic groups in the United States are dispersed and for that reason though some of the languages, like Spanish, throughout the United States are spoken by

millions, and though groups of speakers in large urban areas, like the Poles of Chicago, constitute what would be large cities of native speakers in their homeland, the question has still to be asked "What criteria should decide the creation of a bilingual programme where the numbers are relatively few and nation-wide communication between the members of such ethnic groups may be infrequent. In such cases bilingual education is primarily meant to maintain local inter-group communication. The Soviet Union resolves the problem by allowing parent choice but using every means which state propaganda allows to guide parents to the choice of Russian medium schools where the native tongue is taught as a subject, or providing schools where the medium of instruction is the official language of the host Union Republic; or, where numbers allow, creating multi-tracked integrated schools. In the Soviet Union theory or stated policy is 'pluralist' limited by practical considerations. In the United States theory or policy is 'unitary' the exception being provided for extremely small numbers - a minimum of 20.

A third question important to the Soviet Union and the United States is whether a claim to be educated in one's mother tongue can be justified as 'of right', or as a pedagogic convenience or expedient. In the Soviet Union 'group rights' or 'national rights' are enshrined in the constitution, so that a Tadzhik can claim to be taught in Tadzhik wherever he may live irrespective of the level of his command of either his native language or of the language of the Union Republic he happens to be inhabiting, or of Russian. "Language dominance" is irrelevant in parental choice. Again, this right is severely circumscribed by practical considerations and is apt to be eroded by propaganda in favour of Russian. Nevertheless it is a right which can be claimed. No citizen of the United States can claim to be educated in a particular language simply on the grounds that the language is his mother tongue. He has to prove that his knowledge of another language, English, is so limited that he cannot at a particular point in his career at school profit from his schooling. There are no group rights: the rights that govern bilingual education are civil rights of equality of educational opportunity for individuals. Qua Germans, or qua French they have no claim to education in German or French.

Consequently the number of options which the constitution makes available to the Soviet citizen is immensely greater than those available to the member of a minority group in the United States. In the first place since the whole system of education is geared to provide a bilingual education, with the exception of areas of the R.S.F.S.R. which are not

Autonomous Republics, or Oblasts (each of these categories of territories being the territorial bases of non-Russian peoples, like Mari or Chuvash). Consequently such bilingual education is available to the vast majority in the Soviet Union, to Russians as well as to the small minorities. Where Russians (corresponding to the American Anglos) have emigrated to other Union Republics they too will be obliged to receive a bilingual education. If they choose a Russian medium school they will be expected to learn the official language of the host Republic, Tadzhik if they migrated to Tadzhikstan. On the other hand they may very well choose Tadzhik as the language of instruction, Russian also being taught to them.

There are other options. Within their native Union Republic (e.g. Georgia) parents may choose to have their children instructed in Georgian (Russian being taught as well), or in Russian, while the official language of the Republic (i.e. Georgian) is also taught, or in the language of a non Russian minority, e.g. Armenians in Georgia may be educated in Armenian while Georgian and Russian are also taught. On the other hand not only is bilingual education not statutory in the United States parental choice of language of instruction is restricted by the concept of 'language dominance'. The United States is not only unable to provide a free selection of variants of universal bilingual education, but in fact makes it difficult for the minority to choose an English language education if the child is 'Minority language dominant'. My understanding is that the concept of 'language dominance' constitutes a restraint on parental freedom of choice of medium of instruction.

Finally, the fourth question, the answer to which determines the relevance of the first three questions, is 'How far does the choice of school promote or militate against Soviet or American national unity, which I assume is a relevant question for American teachers as citizens as well as professionals. The goal of 'national' i.e. Soviet unity is the determinant of bilingual education policy in that country, where bilingual education it is synonymous with solving the 'nationalities problem'. However 'ethnic' the form of educational policy may be, its content is emphatically socialist (or Soviet oriented). It appears to me that the erstwhile assumption or principle of 'national unity', however the unity might be interpreted or criticised, is at present being questioned radically, and that the ethnic justifications for bilingual education are one sign of that radical criticism of the principle of unity. On the other hand if the goal of unity remains

intact are the means which are now being proposed to maintain it likely to prove effective, or perhaps facilitate the disruption of unity? The concept which is elaborated as the basis for an ostensibly new better approach to unity is 'pluralism', not in traditional terms where a large number of interests, religious, economic, cultural, political and linguistic, competed, and where any one individual would inevitably belong to several of these interest groups, but in terms of segmented ethnic interests, the cross-cutting religion, economic and other interests subserving the unity of the ethnos. Such 'pluralism', represented by ethnic and linguistic groups, ensures an even more fundamental cleavage within society than do 'classes' in the old world, since membership of an ethnic group is ascribed, inherited and inflexible, whereas class membership is flexible and a matter of personal achievement or failure. How far can bilingual education as it is proposed in the U.S. accommodate a creative form of pluralism or avoid a segmented society?

(C) Developmental differences between Soviet and American bilingual education

(i) Russian and English as Second Languages

Overall the Soviet Union is in the category of developed and industrialised countries, but within the Union the level of development varies regionally as it does in the United States. However the regions of the Soviet Union correspond to the territorial boundaries of different nationalities. Consequently between the more developed and western Union Republics and the less developed Central Asian and far eastern national territories there is a significant migration, with consequent new urban areas and considerable extension of older cities. Thus linguistic heterogeneity is a characteristic feature of Central Asian old and new cities. However, unlike the United States where the cities are equally if not more linguistically heterogenous the Soviet urban centres, apart from those in the western areas, do not possess traditional immigrant communities like the Poles of Chicago, or the Chinese of San Francisco. They are diffused immigrant communities, none of them very numerous and for that reason they are less likely to maintain their several national languages. For a common language they have a choice of Russian, or the 'official language' of the Union Republic where they are now living. The majority choose Russian, but since it is not a language spoken by any considerable numbers in their new localities it is to all intents and purposes a foreign, rather than a second language. The pressure to teach Russian is far greater than is the pressure to teach English as a second language because Russian has penetrated the

social environment of the non Russian areas slightly and recently.

(ii) Authoritarianism versus libertarianism in bilingual education

Because of its expansionist or imperialist political policy the Soviet Union needs an authoritarian, highly centralised system of government. These characteristics are to be found in all spheres of Soviet activity - political, economic, demographic, cultural and educational. Educational policy is formulated at the centre by the Communist Hierarchy, and though responsibility for implementation rests with the respective Ministries of the Union Republics they have little opportunity even to modify the policies already determined. The Academies of Research and Educational institutions of the Union Republics are regarded as 'branches' of the Moscow based parents. The allocation of funds, the preparation of prototypes of teaching materials (which may be adapted by local institutions to meet 'nationality language' needs, as well as the determination of research priorities are the responsibility of central organisations.

Nothing could be more unlike the 'libertarian' policies pursued within the United States, where these are large numbers of different central agencies with overlapping if not competing interests in education, an array of funding agencies - public and private - and a considerable degree of autonomy granted to individual States, and to School Districts and Boards. Apart from Congressional legislation which is limited by the autonomy of the institutions to which we have referred initiative to promote bilingual education rests with each locality unless it is adjudged legally to contravene the civil rights of parents. This strategy of appealing to the judiciary (though forced upon minorities because of the innate conservatism of the States and School Boards) militates against the creation of a system of bilingual education. Each case is adjudged according to its own set of circumstances; it can be appealed; precedents are difficult to establish, and in some cases judges have disclaimed their competence to adjudicate on educational matters, and have stressed that their concern is with 'individual' civil rights, and have in addition hedged their adjudication by the acceptance of the principle of practicality, especially where numbers are concerned. Finally once a judgement has been handed down, or agreed an inflexibility is introduced into the required programme, and this inflexibility is maintained by a sophisticated system of monitoring, which has given rise or at least

nurtured the growth of a 'parasitic "testing" industry to which I shall return. Bilingual education in the United States where it exists lives in constant fear not of educational advisers or consultants but of the law.

(iii) 'Territorial' bases and Comprehensiveness of Soviet Bilingual Education

The comprehensiveness of Soviet bilingual education is due to the policy of 'dva poteka' the two paths, which was enunciated even before the actual establishment of the regime and is enshrined in Lenin's discussion of 'nationality' policy. Added to this were the other decisions to avoid making Russian an official State language, and to provide compulsory public, and only public education. The whole of the Soviet Union came to possess universal, free, public education dedicated to being socialist in content and national in form - the two paths. Within this overall uniformity of provision flexibility, so far as languages are concerned, was guaranteed by the fact the whole of the Soviet Union consists of 15 major territorial units each roughly corresponding to the home of an ethnic group and the base of an ethnic language. Within such large territories exist smaller but equally compact nationalities. Furthermore although there is a varying degree of migration into and out of these territorial/linguistic units, the level of native language maintenance is very high, and because of favourable birth rates likely to remain high in spite of migration. The guarantee of a good bilingual education in the Soviet Union rests, therefore on the following:

First: There is no official State language which is obligatory by Statute - although propaganda and the prestige of Russian and the need for a common language have made it a necessary language in every school.

Second: Politically (in theory) all nations are equal, but more important they possess defined territorial bases which ensure the maintenance of concentrations of national languages which are 'official' within their respective Union Republics.

Third: The principle of 'mother tongue' or 'native language' has been part of Soviet theory from its early days and is official policy.

Fourth: The Soviet Union recognises 'group' rights, and the corollary that any citizen may demand to be taught in his national language though he may be living in an entirely different Union Republic.

Fifth: At the same time in principle parents are allowed freedom to choose the child's language of instruction. This policy was adopted because it was felt that when it came to the point parents would tend to choose Russian, while safeguarding their national language because it was the territorial language.

The 'territoriality' of Soviet languages solves many problems which face bilingual teachers in the United States.

First: The problem of 'ethnic teachers' does not arise except where a migrant minority chooses its native language as a medium of instruction. Even in such cases, if the migrant minority is of long standing they are able to generate their own 'ethnic' teachers.

Second: The problem of biculturalism, or basically the maintenance of a native and minority culture does not arise because students are taught within their native cultural environment. One important question does arise with regard to the cultural content of bilingual education in the Soviet Union. Irrespectiv of the type of bilingual school the child attends, in whatever Union Republic he is exposed to a 'supra-national culture' which is virtually synonymous with Soviet ideology expressed mainly in the Russian language. The aim is to create a 'Soviet man'. Even in a 'native language' medium school biculturalism consists of inculcating 'national' values as well as the ideals of the Soviet Union, and Soviet culture which is a 'civic' culture. It is explicitly political and its inculcation is correspondingl propagandist. I find the biculturalism of America infinitely preferable because although the English language culture possesses strong and for many people adverse political associations it is one which all 'minority language' students in the United States can share with English speaking, and English acculturated students in historically English speaking countries in many parts of the world. The English speaking component of American biculturalism has a unifying cross-national role. The Russian speaking civic culture of the Soviet Union is restricted to a particular current imperialist social order.

Three: The question of recognizing the different 'learning styles' of different nationalities does not present a problem - the learning style is characteristic of the territory in which the children are taught and from which the teachers are recruited.

(iv) The implications of bilingual education for the social systems of the United States and USSR

It would be wrong to claim that the Soviet interest in types of schools, the curriculum, methods, and materials is not to educate the individual students. It would be wrong so to argue, but it would also be the whole question, which is what concept of education and society those schools, curricula, methods and materials are intended to realize. So as bilingual education is concerned in the USSR the aim is to resolve the 'problem of the nationalities', and this is approached along two paths - respect for the languages of the nationalities, so far as it is consonant with the advancement of Russian. The changes in the alphabets were motivated by political consideration and led first to the isolation of many languages from languages of the same family spoken outside the Union, and ultimately to the use of Cyrillic to ensure closer relations with Russian and to ensure that the lingua franca was acquired more easily. Other aspects of language planning, necessary to the development of literacy, like the relexification of some languages promoted the influence of Russian. The social function of the national languages were distributed in such a way as to add to the prestige of and the demand for Russian. From whatever angle one looks at bilingual education in the Soviet Union one is struck by the firmness with which the two complementary paths are pursued - respect for national languages (where it is practical to provide for them) and the promotion of Russian. The over-riding consideration is Soviet unity: the national cultures are encouraged but they are meant to contribute to an over-arching 'Soviet culture'. The direction of the cultural movement locally is traditional (and it can afford to localise these traditions because of their territorial limitation), but so far as the Soviet Union as a whole is concerned the direction is forward looking - the creation of a new supra-national, civic culture in which the members of all nationalities can participate without forsaking their own particular heritage. Ethnic and linguistic pluralism are not simply encouraged, they cannot be ignored in view of the size of the component units and their ethnic conservatism. But that pluralism is not segmented; each nation is a pillar, a

remarkable structure in its own right, but also functioning to create a great new unity, and a new Soviet man.

Perhaps the most important question arising out of bilingual education in the United States is the kind of pluralism it is committed to. At present American society is being increasingly persuaded of the value and the inevitability of some measures of segmentation along an ethnic/linguistic line of cleavage. Except in the case of the Amerindian and Alaskan as well as the Spanish speaking populations (possibly the French in view of the Canadian experience and external European support) the institutionalization of these segmented units will be difficult. Consequently bilingual education may become divided between on the one han those who are demographically strong, or territorially concentrated; and on the other the very large number of smaller, almost completely geographically diffused groups entirely isolated from external support. Simultaneously a bilingual education policy can, and in respect of some Spanish speaking communities is already leading not to 'pillarization' (as in the Soviet Union) but to 'segmentation'. Bilingual education, I suggest, ought not to be the instrument of "fissiparious disunity, and need not be if satisfactory politico-educational policies are pursued. Over arching co-operation of all the constituent ethnic collectivities of the United States should be as important as the promotion of their individual heritages. A policy of the 'dva potoka' (the two paths) is as important to the United States as it is to the Soviet Union. The possibility of ensuring it in the former is more difficult partly because of the American dedication to 'liberalism' and decentralization of government. Contrary ~~were~~ wise might be it easier in the United States because, for all the criticism that is levelled against it a viable cultural consensus already exists. One of the discouraging features is that the current debate on bilingual education occurs on what is essentially a superficial level - that of the machinery for promoting a policy neither the foundatio nor the implications of which have been sufficiently examined.

(D) Some Elements of the Two Systems Compared

(i) Schools

There is one system of education in the Soviet Union. That system is a composite of several variants of 'bilingual instruction'. The United States has several systems of education - public and private, religious and secular etc., varying from State to State and according to the demands of school district. It is true that there are broad guidelines which must be observed, but otherwise it would be difficult

if not impossible to describe (still more to define) the system of American education. It follows that there is no national system of bilingual education: of even greater importance there is no system of bilingual education at all - nationally or locally. What exists are bilingual programmes the number of which as well as their location may vary from year to year. These programmes, where they exist, are restricted more often than not to minority students, and to that segment of the minority which is unable to use the English language satisfactorily. Such students are in the programme for 3 years; and though some students may be more deficient in English than those who are admitted to the programme, acceptance of the bilingual programme is voluntary and for that reason the most needy may not be catered for. The American programmes, because of the high status of 'evaluation' as well as the extravagant machinery of formal assessment which it has entailed, has a built in research component. The programmes are experimental, in the sense that they set out to substantiate the hypotheses which the 'plan for the programme' encapsulates. They are also provisional, in the sense that the funding of such programmes is not guaranteed for any considerable length of time. Programme directors and teachers are faced with the problems of not contravening segregation laws by legally unacceptable tracking or streaming systems, or of undue individualization of instruction within ethnically integrate classes, whatever advantages might accrue in pedagogic terms. Curriculum design has been criticised as being amateurish by eminent American linguists and educationists (Troike: No date - p.5)*

It cannot be said that options are available to parents anxious that their children should have a bilingual education. Nationally there is a variety of types of programme: immersion, alternate day, the same lesson taught to the whole class taken by the same teacher in each of the two languages during different times, dual medium instruction in the same lesson, alternative medium together with translation in the same lesson. These different approaches within the class may coincide with bilingual school organisations which use graded, ungraded (or across grade grouping) or multigraded systems. The classes may be linguistically homogenous or multilingual. And if they are multilingual a discrete teacher (and her aide if available) may employ linguistic grouping. The deployment of teachers in such schools may vary: the teacher for each class may be bilingual and be responsible for all bilingual instruction; two classes may be taught by two

* Troike, R.C. - Bilingual Education in the United States: the First Decades

different teachers, one of them a 'specialist'; itinerant, bilingual teachers may be employed; there are examples of 'team teaching' where monolingual and bilingual teachers plan a complete programme for several classes; and there are numerous examples where a teacher is assisted by a bilingual aide. All these and other organizational options and class systems are available, but in spite of the emphasis on 'community participation' even a large city like New York does not offer more than very limited number of options - a school where any one of the systems listed above operates, a special centre catering for two or three school in the same district, or a mini-school. The limitation on the parent's choice is due to the fact that bilingual education is peripheral to the 'main stream', and in any locality outside the largest cities or any district of such large cities for any one language group (sometimes for any combination of several such groups) only one programme is available.)

(E) Training of teachers

The training of teachers of bilingual children has been severely criticised in the United States. So far as concerns Title VII programmes 'the quality of teacher and teacher-trainer preparation programmes .. has unfortunately been quite uneven'. (Troike: op cit p.4 A publication of the N.I.E. 'Minority Students: A Research Appraisal' is more categorical: 'Although the number of studies is still very small it is clear that school board members, superintendents and principals have lagged seriously in supplying educational leadership in inter-racial settings. Studies of teacher attitudes strongly suggest a generally negative orientation toward minority children' (p.240). The Public Two-Year Colleges (to a small extent) and Public Four Year and Graduate Colleges, together with Independent Colleges, in New Jersey for instance (Bil. Higher Educ. Resources 1978) offer a comprehensive coverage of training for prospective teachers (see pp 77-82). However, like the bilingual programmes themselves the training of teachers for those programmes is peripheral to mainstream teacher training - teachers qualify for "an endorsement".

For instance a teacher in training in New Jersey who already possesses a degree based upon a four-year programme in an accredited college and certification in another is given the choice of attending courses, e.g. either Social Psychology and the Bilingual Child or Contemporary social proble

(with emphasis on the bilingual/bicultural child), though both courses are vital to the intending teacher. Some courses which are as important as the above need not in fact be taken. The prospective teacher in training who has completed a minimum of 3 full years of successful experience as a teacher of bilingual/bicultural and/or English as a second language, need not complete the obligatory 24 number of semester hour credits in the relevant areas. The training of teachers of bilingual children in the Soviet Union is undertaken, generally speaking in the Pedagogical Institutes or Universities of their native Republic, and since the system of education for which they are destined is 'integrated' - namely the native language is taught and used, there is continuity between schooling and teacher training. Russian is taught to such teachers as a first or second language and if they propose to teach in Russian medium school they will receive their tfaining in Russian. Teachers who are members of minority groups in any particular Republic (e.g. Armenians in Georgia) generally receive their training in their titular Republic, unless they choose Russian as a first language. In other words the training of teachers is a completely integrated system and a continuation of Primary and Secondary Bilingual Education.

Furthermore, it is my impression that the teacher training course in the Soviet Union is far more arduous, intensive and practical than in the United States. In University courses students have a weekly programme of 36 hours of study. Of this total 4 hours is spent in oral practice of the Nationality Language, and 6 hours in Russian as a first or 4 in Russian as a second language. Facilities for additional supervised study are provided in language laboratories. Students are taught in very small groups and the regulations lay down a maximum of ten and an optimum of 7 in a practical study group. Prospective teachers devote 80% of their allocated time in the academic study of language(s) the remainder is devoted to 'professional' courses - methodological, sociological and psychological. This is different from the Unites States and Britain where the theory of education - whether philosophical, sociological, psychological, or the theory of language bulk inordinately large. Teacher in Britain, and from my limited experience bilingual teachers in the United States know more about the theory of bilingual teaching than do Soviet teachers, but are less confident in practice. In the USSR 'teaching practice' begins in the fourth year when students devote a month at the beginning and a similar amount of time at the end of the year to preparing lessons and teaching classes. They put in a similar amount of

time at the beginning and the end of their fifth year. A prospective teacher in the course of his training will have spent 2,000 hours in practical instruction in his language(s); 200 in the practice of teaching and a similar amount of time on the theoretical aspects.

Refresher courses are common to the Soviet teacher and teachers in the United States, but there are important differences. They are obligatory in the Soviet Union, though the impression I am always given is that teachers welcome such courses. They may be pursued during one day a week over a period of five years, when the teacher returns to the Pedagogical Institute or University. Or the teacher may take a consolidated period of one month every five years to pursue courses at designated centres. Since the courses are obligatory the teachers receive no credits but they are free to those who attend. It is possible for the local School Inspector to excuse an outstanding teacher from attendance at such courses.

(F) Approach to the teaching of language

The general Soviet theory of language teaching and the relationship of the acquisition of the mother tongue and the second language have been described, and what remains to be done at this point is to indicate a personal view of how the Soviet aspects of language pedagogy differ from those of the United States. In the first place though the work of Piaget (popular in the United States and the basis of much of its language teaching theory) as well as Chomsky are held in high regard by teacher trainers the epigenetic approach of the former is held to be 'idealist' and therefore suspect. The purely linguistic analytical theory with which Chomsky is associated, transformational theory, is an important element in the teaching of linguistics in the Soviet Union. The rationalist metaphysics of Chomsky, the postulation of an innate linguistic structure is rejected. Soviet linguistics is 'empiricist' in its approach and although Skinner's work is thought to be naive Soviet teachers owe much to the empiricist school which he represents. Contrary to earlier developments towards 'structuralism' in the United States, this approach is not favoured in the Soviet Union. A repetition of what has already been described in the section on 'Implication of Soviet Theory for Language Pedagogy' is unnecessary and American teachers are better able than I to assess how far American teachers agree with the Soviet insistence on the students' consciousness of linguistic rules, the

severely structured programmes of language instruction, the emphasis on the intervention of the teacher (not only as motivator but as instructor) the use of the mother tongue and translation in learning the second language, the relatively muted appraisal of comparative analysis of languages compared with the value of error analysis. My own limited experience of American teaching is that the differences between American teachers are greater than is the difference between the fairly uniform approach in the Soviet Union and the most favoured approach in the United States. This is to be expected in view of the 'libertarian' attitude to education in the United States.

(G) Preparation of Materials

The main difference between the Soviet Union and the United States lies in the reliance of the School Boards and teachers in the United States on 'commercial' resources. Consequently there is a greater variety of text books and readers for the major language in the United States. The second difference is the preparedness of the United States to use materials prepared in the countries of the origin of the languages, ~~however used~~. Some teachers in Universities especially criticise this practice. Third, the materials for use in teaching English as a second language in the United States is far superior to that prepared for teaching Russian as a second language in the Soviet Union. This relative defect of Soviet material derives partly from the attempt to allow each major language group, based on its own Union Republic with its own academic institutions, to adapt the Russian prepared prototype to meet the particular needs of their own native language speakers. While this is good in principle it does not produce good materials. Fourth, the literature which is introduced in teaching the languages as distinct from the language text book, is more traditional, generally speaking less appealing to the Soviet student. Finally, the availability of the material, irrespective of its value is severely restricted in the Soviet Union. Allocations of paper are made at the centre and it is a recurring complaint that non-Russian students are less well treated than the Russians.

As has been suggested already more of the major linguistic groups are able to modify centrally prepared materials, whether these are for the purpose of teaching a particular language or a 'content subject', like History. But this is undertaken by 'branches' of the central Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and in that respect they differ from the network of Centres for the preparing and disseminating materials, established fairly recently in the United States.

The Soviet material adapted by nationalities States are not so comprehensive in the range of curriculum areas for which they cater. The section of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences in Moscow is strong academically and more productive in preparing, testing and evaluating materials, and has had a longer history of co-operation with teachers than any institution of which I am aware in the United States. I can only compare the uncertainties and vicissitudes experienced by the Reading Research project, aiming mainly at the Navajo, in the Universit of New Mexico, and the long tradition of such work for the Peoples of the North, undertaken by Leningrad University. Finally to justify my criticism of American materials I may be allowed to quote a former Director of C.A.L. - "The History of the funding and lack of criteria for operations have seriously hampered the effectiveness of the materials development centers. Despite the expenditure of millions of dollars, only a small amount of materials has been developed thus far, much of it of a relatively amateurish nature and lacking in any organized design or research base." (Troike: op cit p. 5). Soviet material prepared at the Moscow centre though it is biased in favour of Russian, so far as availability is concerned, is professional in the highest degree, the research design is well founded and the results professionally and practically evaluated by teachers over a period of five years before its general release.

(H) Evaluation

One of the consequences of the 'judicial' or 'legal' as distinct from the 'constitutional' basis of American bilingual education is the need for strict, formal and objective surveys to identify the population eligible for bilingual education. If a school district identifies twenty or more of a language minority who possess limited proficiency in English a diagnostic/prescriptive approach is adopted to the design of a bilingual program. This approach entails the use of a five point rating scale for English, as well as for Native Language proficiency. Connecticut has formulated the most sophisticate set of criteria of diagnoses and assessment. It involves a two stage assessment of the Dominant Language. The final determination of dominance is made according to formal objective tests, or lengthy formal observation by trained assessors of the performance of a student in unstructured situations. Thereafter procedures for determining English language proficiency are continued and before February of each year all boards of education involved in bilingual programmes are

expected to file with the Secretary the number of children whose dominant language is other than English and those whose dominant language is English. There is an annual review of the English proficiency and of the 'placement' of each child in the programme, and this review involves standardized tests, academic grades or their equivalents and a personal interview. Standards for annual increased English proficiency are set and a determination to remove the child from the programme (or not) and the basis of the determination conveyed to the parents. Such surveys involve the elicitation of information from parents as to the language spoken at home; teacher assessment at the end of the first year of the level of students' competence in comprehending, expressing himself and reading English. On the basis of a cross tabulation of parental and school assessments, a decision concerning students who are identified as having limited English speaking proficiency are administered a uniform state wide aural/oral language dominance test. Students who are native language dominant are administered a uniform statewide native language proficiency test.

In Texas tests for minority children involve objective assessment of oral language giving major consideration to pronunciation, vocabulary and syntax. They include rhetoric, i.e. the forms of discourse such as explaining, describing, narrating and persuading and their literal, social, artistic use; register or style i.e. the adjustments a speaker makes for variables such as formality of situations, type of audience and topic' (Texas Educ. Agency: Minority Programs Performance Objectives Pilot Project on Oral Language). One is reminded by this statement of the contents page of a text book on linguistics and rhetoric. The balance between teaching and the theory of testing has been reversed, and the practice of education is evaluated as though it were possible to regard it as a number of discrete units rather than an ongoing exercise in listening, speaking, reading and writing. For this type of testing to be applied to Soviet students whether they are learning their native or second language would be inconceivable.

The State of New Jersey it has been suggested 'requires a total rethinking of 'program transition' the net result of which would be to assess the student's home language on a continuous basis, teachers evaluation of students' linguistic ability, cross reference of these two processes; an English language proficiency assessment according to a uniform, formal and objective Scheme for the whole State; a dual

language measure to ascertain language dominance; native language proficiency assessment; most of these language tests are itemized in detail e.g. Aural and Oral skills each with 9 sub-items; Morphology/ Morphophonemics with 7 sub-items; lexicon with 2 sub-items. To these are added tests of Conceptual Skills including Syntax with 7 sub-items Semantics with 11 sub-items. Even in Britain, which is accustomed to formal and objective testing, the American testing system especially for minority children appears to be an incubus on the process of teaching - necessary though it may be in order to forestall legal or judicial enquiries and complaints. In the Soviet Union such a system does not exist. Students are graded by the teacher at the end of each lesson and the annual assessment of progress is made on the aggregation of such 'grades'.

(I) Research

The same basic difference between the Soviet Union and the United States affects research as it does all other aspects of support for education: the United States has a proliferation of private Consultancy and Research organization which may be employed by boards of education or State organizations. These are not an integral part of the educational system but they constitute an 'industry' which in the last resort is funded from resources which might be better used by the State setting up or improving its own research institutions, or by supporting the existing and exceptionally well qualified academic organizations. So far as bilingual education is concerned the present situation 'reveals the frequent lack of coherent planning or consultation with relevant sources of expertise' (Troike: op cit p.3). Not only so but the priority given by academics to research is not reflected in the amount actually undertaken. The C.A.L. priorities placed 'research' on the last of four issues requiring attention, namely teacher training materials development, a national clearing house of information and finally research. Since 1969 (USOE Conference) research has been a perennial source of discussion and the NIE supported efforts to determine research priorities. The Office of Child Development conferred on priorities in 1976 but no basic research has been designed or promoted. The most frequent researches into bilingual education are undertaken by Title VII M.A. & Ph.D fellows. From my reading of some dissertation much of their material is derived from the evaluation of Title VII programmes and it is no exaggeration to say that as research material these resources are not only unco-ordinated but trivial (Troike, R.C: Research evidence for the effectiveness of bilingual education.) Attempts are made to extrapolate and generalize from single bilingual programmes