

The Education Reform in Russia and its Impact on Teaching of the Minority Languages: An Effect of Nation-Building?

Konstantin Zamyatin*

University of Helsinki

Public minority-language schools have a crucial role in the preservation of the societal culture of the minorities. This article explores the institutional position of the languages of the minorities of the Russian Federation in the education system and its transformation as a result of the latest education reform. In the area of language education the reform was justified by the need to ensure the free choice of languages in education by citizens. However, it is argued that those who developed the reform were not as concerned with the rights of citizens as with a nation-building agenda. The analysis of policy documents and legal acts demonstrates that the education reform has not institutionally affected the modes of language education. It is further argued that the reform actually discourages teaching of minority languages and, therefore, will inevitably produce further decline in the numbers of students learning their “native language”.

Keywords: Russia, education reform, language education, minority languages, nation-building

In many countries of the world language education policy is implemented in situations of linguistic and cultural diversity. The Soviet education system addressed issues of linguistic and cultural diversity within a separate structure of ‘national education’ (*natsionalnoe obrazovanie*). Russia’s education system mostly began to take shape at the beginning of 1990s, and it inherited many educational structures of the Soviet period. Its construction continued for a decade. From the beginning of the 2000s the dynamics of language education in Russia began to be determined by preparations for a new educational reform. As in some other countries, the need for modernization was used as justification. It began through systematic attempts by the Russian Ministry of Education to change federal and regional educational policies and practices towards

* Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian and Scandinavian Studies, University of Helsinki, Finland. Email: konstantin.zamyatin@helsinki.fi. The research for this article was made possible through the grant of the Academy of Finland, research project *Revitalization and Empowerment Trends among the EU and Russian Minorities* (chair: Janne Saarikivi).

the recentralization of power in Moscow and ‘restoring the role of the central state as a major “player” in school affairs’ (Eklof, 2001: 16–17). In 2007 the reform was launched by the adoption of the amendments to the Education Law (Federal Law, December 1, 2007). Among other changes, the education reform eliminated ‘national–regional’ and school components from the state educational standards, which had previously served as a framework for teaching the history and languages of Russia’s peoples. The authorities of Tatarstan, Bashkortostan and other republics expressed their concern that this elimination might hamper the teaching of history and language (*Federalnyi standart*, 2010: 7–14).

The problem is that, while the impact of the reform on teaching of history in the regions has been studied at length both domestically and internationally (see Eklof, 2001: 3, 10), its impact on various modes of minority language education has yet to be evaluated. How has education reform affected the institutional status of languages in Russia’s education system today? To answer this question, the article will begin with an analysis of policy statements and legislative regulations¹, along with official international and domestic reports², expert opinions and other secondary sources. Second, it will explore Soviet language education legacies, before examining the position of languages in the Russian education system prior to the reform. Third, it will look at the ideological foundations for restructuring language education as part of the reform, as well as the content and the course of the reform. Finally, based on the data obtained, the impact of the education reform on modes of language education will be evaluated. The analysis is restricted to an investigation of the modes of language education in primary and secondary general school (*obshcheobrazovatelnaia shkola*) and does not address the issue of changes to the content of teaching, its volume or quality. Neither pre-school nor higher education, nor the teaching of foreign languages, are included within the scope of this study, which is designed and interpreted from a ‘legal-institutional’ perspective (see Kymlicka and Grin, 2003: 5–7). The analysis demonstrates that, while the reform of the education system has not institutionally affected the modes of language education, the major change – leaving whether a language is taught as ‘native’ (*rodnoi iazyk*, see discussion on the term below) to parental choice – will inevitably produce further decline in the numbers of students learning their ‘native language’.

Dynamics in language education in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) and in the Russian Federation

What were the Soviet legacies in language education of post-Soviet Russia? In the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) ‘national schools’ (*natsionalnye shkoly*) were created and expanded in the 1920s and 1930s as part of Lenin’s nationalities and language policy. The use of the ‘national language’ as the medium of instruction marked a school as ‘national’. In principle, all students had to study in their native language. By the 1960s, in the RSFSR 50 languages were used as media of instruction, besides Russian (see Kreindler, 1989: 54; Batsyn and Kuzmin, 1995: 14). Since the Soviet education reform of 1958, parents ‘were to choose their children’s language of instruction and even decide whether they be taught their native language at all’ (Kreindler, 1989: 49). This brought about a mass increase in schools where Russian was the language of instruction, and the most affected among titular nationalities were those of autonomous republics of the RSFSR (Batsyn and Kuzmin, 1995: 15-16). In fact, parents were forced to choose Russian for their children, rather than their native language, as a language of opportunity. The reform of 1958 resulted in the virtual dismantling of the national schools system which taught in the languages of the many titular peoples of the USSR, primarily in the autonomous republics of the RSFSR. By the 1970s many languages in Russia – beginning with the languages of the peoples of the Caucasus – stopped functioning as a medium of instruction; the amount of teaching of many languages, especially the Finno-Ugric languages, decreased; the native language of instruction almost disappeared in urban areas and continued functioning in reduced numbers, mostly in rural areas (for more details see Kreindler, 1989). As a consequence, the language of instruction in national schools was either the native language or Russian; it was no longer obligatory to learn one’s native language.

At the end of the Soviet period, by the late 1980s, out of the 18.5% non-Russian population of the RSFSR only 9% of schoolchildren, or less than half, studied in national schools; the other 9.5% studied in ordinary Russian schools. Besides Russian, 44 native languages were taught, including 26 languages that were only taught as subjects. Out of 18 languages of instruction only four (Tatar, Bashkir, and to lesser extent Yakut and Tuvina) were used in secondary school (*sredniaia shkola*); 11 were a medium of instruction in primary school (*nachalnaia shkola*) for three grades,

and three languages for four grades (Batsyn and Kuzmin, 1995: 18). For the latter categories in secondary schools the medium of instruction switched to Russian, and the native language was henceforth taught as a subject only (Kuzmin and Artemenko, 2006).

If Soviet education was highly centralized, then the fundamental principle of Russia's Education Law (RF Law, July 10, 1992) became:

[T]he removal of state control from education policy. In regions with non-Russian populations, that meant that educational institutions could base their curricula and teaching methods on national and historical traditions. In all regions, enactment of the law meant significant autonomy for local authorities to choose education strategies most appropriate to the time and place (Curtis and Leighton, 1998: 259).

From the early 1990s, which saw the beginning of the decentralization education reform, the dynamics of language teaching were determined by the implementation of a language revival policy for a decade and even longer, notably in the republics. In official documents of the republics the terms 'national education' and 'national schools' were preserved, but in practice these were 'native-Russian bilingual and bicultural education institutions' (Russia's Second Report, April 26, 2005: 29), that is, ordinary schools which additionally had native language teaching either as the medium of instruction or as a subject. Nevertheless, these schools were an important mechanism and resource in ensuring the sustainability of languages and cultures of the peoples in post-Soviet Russia. From a comparative perspective, native (Russian and non-Russian) language learning in the educational system of Russia had a higher share among the humanities, and foreign language learning a lower share, than the global average (Agranovich and Kozhevnikova, 2006: 38–39, 51).

How is the current situation in language education assessed? The number of languages taught and the amount of language teaching increased, due to the implementation of a decade-long language revival policy. The inertia of the 1990s policy still had some impact at the beginning of the 2000s, when the new education reform had not yet had an immediate impact on language teaching. By the end of the 2000s, 39 languages were media of instruction while 50 languages were taught as a separate subject (State Council Report, 2011: 11). The growth in the number of languages used in education since the beginning of 1990s is typically presented in official reports as evidence for the efficiency of the language policy. However, in order to grasp the bigger picture, one should view it from a perspective that is

extended over time. Namely, if one takes into account the number of languages used in education before the 1958 reform the growth does not seem exemplary at all. Moreover, the number of languages used in education often does not necessarily reveal their actual use and in some aspects might be misleading. For example, Altaic, Bashkir, (Meadow) Mari, Tatar, Udmurt, Chuvash, Evenki, Yukagir and Yakut are listed as languages of titular nationalities used as a medium of instruction ‘in the senior years’ (State Council Report, 2011: 11). However, the Evenki and Yukagir languages are only the media of instruction for tens of children in the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) (Tishkov et al., 2009: Table 9 in Appendix 2). Further, in Tatarstan there is native language instruction for a few hundred Mari and Udmurt schoolchildren in secondary education, and in Bashkortostan for a few hundred Udmurt schoolchildren in primary school and approximately 3,000 Mari schoolchildren in basic secondary education (Tishkov et al., 2009: Table 10 in Appendix 2). The situation for these nationalities is worse in their own titular republics: the 11,000 Mari and 19,000 Udmurt schoolchildren in the Republics of Mari El and Udmurtia respectively learn the native language as a subject only. Thus, the number of languages is not a very informative criterion, because it does not reveal the actual amount of teaching for every language in every region.

Another official criterion is the number of schools where native (not Russian) languages are used in the educational process (‘national schools’). There are five types (models) of national school (Russia’s Second Report, April 26, 2005: 29-30). In the republics of Tatarstan and Bashkortostan, secondary education is taught in the native language for the whole period of study (first type). In the republics of Sakha, Tyva and Chuvashia, students are instructed in the native language for five or seven grades (second type), while in other republics like Buryatia and Mordovia this is limited to elementary school (third type), and thereafter children are instructed in Russian and continue studying their native language as a separate subject. In most other republics, autonomous districts and regions, national schools use Russian as the language of instruction throughout the whole period of study, while the native language is taught only as a separate subject (fourth and fifth type). In addition, there are several types of schools for indigenous small numbered peoples of the North (Russia’s Third Report, April 9, 2010: 50–51).

It was officially reported that by 2005, in 9.9% of general education institutions in Russia, students were taught in their native languages, while in other

16.4 % of schools native languages were taught as a separate subject (Russia's Second Report, April 26, 2005: 28–29). In 2009 the share of schools teaching in a native language has been measured at 45% in Bashkortostan, 40% in Sakha, 59% in Tatarstan and 80% in Tyva. It is further reported that the number of schools teaching in native languages in all Russia's republics increased on average from 13.5% in 1991 to 56% in 2009 and that the number of schoolchildren increased accordingly (State Council Report, 2011: 11, 43; Artemenko, 2010: 47-48).

However, contrary to the generalized assertion that “the number of schoolchildren increased accordingly”, the share of schoolchildren actually learning the languages is at times smaller than the share of schools with native language instruction. This is so because, typically, languages are taught in small rural primary schools or in separate classes of urban schools. It is sufficient for a few pupils to learn their language for it to count as a school with native language instruction. Therefore, the number of schools listed in official reports as having native language instruction does not reveal, but actually *conceals* information about what share of schoolchildren have access to native language education.

In practice, the extent of language education depends on the status of a language and on the sociolinguistic situation in the different regions. By these institutional settings two central variables in the dynamics of teaching in and of minority languages are: (a) the mode of language education and, (b) the school type for a particular educational institution in a particular region. These institutional settings are established in the legislation.

Languages in Russia's education system under the pre-reform legislation

In what ways were the different modes of language teaching dependent on the official status of a language? Russia's legislation does not use the terms ‘national minorities’ or ‘minority languages’ (Tishkov et al., 2009: 8–13). Instead, both the Declaration on the Languages of the Peoples of Russia (October 25, 1991) and the Language Law (October 25, 1991) proclaim equal protection and equal opportunities for all languages of the peoples of Russia. This meant that, in line with the Soviet legacy, the ‘peoples of the Russian Federation’ were considered ‘equal-in-right collectivities’, irrespectively of their size. Furthermore, the Russian Federation comprised the ‘multinational people of the Russian Federation’, the latter being ‘the bearer of

sovereignty' in Russia (Preamble and Article 3, Constitution, December 12, 1993). Article 3 of the Language Law states that all languages of the Russian Federation have 'equal rights' in terms of their maintenance and development.

At the same time, Russia's Language Law followed the 1960s Soviet policy tradition of hierarchization of nations, peoples and ethnic groups. There are several legal regimes for languages in the Russia's legislation: (1) 'the languages of the peoples of the Russian Federation', (2) 'the state language of the Russian Federation', (3) 'the state languages of the republics' and (4) 'the native languages'. Because designation of particular languages as official languages means state protectionism, this hierarchy implies actual inequality of languages. According to the recent opinion of experts, trusted to give statements on the official policy, Russia's Language Law establishes 'functional equality' *only* among the languages of the peoples of the Russian Federation (Tishkov et al., 2009: 19–20).

Article 3 of the Language Law has given Russian the status of 'state language', while the republics obtained the right to designate their own 'state languages'. There is no definition of the term 'state language' either in international documents or in Russian legislation. The 'state language' (*gosudarstvennyi iazyk*) in the Russian context is loosely corresponds to what is internationally referred as an 'official language'. Additionally, it emphasizes the existence of the state and acts as a symbol of national identity; to use the terminology of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), it is a 'national language'. Besides 'state languages', the term 'titular languages' is also used in Russian legislation, but the latter term is not used to designate languages taught in the Russian education system (for further discussion of the terms see Neroznak, 2002: 12–13).

All citizens of Russia are obliged to learn Russian as the state language at school. In some republics bi- and multilingualism is a feature of their multinational communities ('multinational peoples of the republics'). In these places both majority and minority members have to be mutually bilingual (multilingual). The need for common languages is used to justify official bilingualism and the compulsory study of the state languages of the republics by all inhabitants, irrespective of their identity. However, only some republics established state bilingualism and the compulsory study of the titular languages in all schools through their legislation. In line with the Soviet tradition, the term 'native language' is applied not to one's mother tongue, first language or language in use, but to the language one identifies with, which tends to

coincide with the language of one's ethnic group (Tishkov et al., 2009: 11). Thus, the term 'ethnic language' (*etnicheskii iazyk*) has recently entered into use, after being invented as a substitute for the expression 'national language' (*natsionalnyi iazyk*).

Article 10 of the Language Law states that Russian has to be taught as the state language in general and professional establishments; teaching of the state languages of the republics is undertaken in accordance with their (regional) legislation. Citizens have the right to learn their native language and to have it as their language of instruction (see Leontiev, 1995). According to the original text, the language of instruction in educational establishments had to be defined by federal and regional legislation, and parents had the right to choose educational establishments based on their language of instruction (Article 9). Since the 1998 amendment, the language(s) of instruction have to be selected by the founder(s) of the educational establishments - predominantly state (federal and regional) and municipal authorities - , and/or stated in the establishment's charter (Federal Law, July 14, 1998).

Article 6 of the Education Law (now in force), echoed the wording of the Language Law and articulated the right of citizens of Russia to receive basic secondary education in their native languages, and also to choose the language of instruction, but only within the range of possibilities afforded by the education system. The right to education in one's native language is ensured by establishing a required number of appropriate educational institutions, classes and groups, and by providing the conditions for their functioning. The study of Russian is compulsory in all state-accredited educational establishments, except for pre-school education.

However, these legal provisions are not directly enforced and are not backed up by sufficient funding. The Council of Ministers in the Council of Europe noted that:

Detailed norms for implementing the right to receive instruction in or of minority languages, provided for in federal legislation and in the laws of a number of subjects of the federation, have still not been developed (CoE Council of Ministers Resolution, May 2, 2007).

That is why it is of crucial importance not to restrict the study to an analysis of legal provisions, but to examine administrative regulations as well.

Division of powers, state educational standards and language education

According to the Russian Constitution (December 12, 1993), Russian federalism is ordered in accordance with the principle of vertical division of powers; powers thus fall either under the exclusive competence of the federal authorities, the exclusive competence of regional authorities, or the joint competence of both. Even after the policy shift towards enhanced nation-building in 1999-2000 (see below), the constituent entities of the federation (in Russia these are officially termed *subiekty Rossiiskoi Federatsii* or ‘Subjects of the Russian Federation’) were largely autonomous in arranging the process of education within public institutions under their jurisdiction, and in providing support to language teaching and other areas of ethnocultural orientation (RF Law, October 6, 1999; Federal Law, July 14, 2003; Federal Law, December 31, 2005, Article 26/3, Section 2, Subsections 13, 13.1, 20). The sphere of joint competence is funded from the federal budget, but administered regionally. This sphere continues to include, *inter alia*, financing municipal general educational institutions through municipal budgets, including teachers’ salaries and the costs of textbooks and training aids for implementation of the main general educational programmes (*osnovnye obshcheobrazovatelnye programmy*). The state educational standard (*gosudarstvennyi obrazovatelnyi standart*) is the central element of the education system. The standard is a set of norms and requirements on the minimum content of basic study plans, the maximum permissible workload and the level of graduates’ proficiency. The requirements on the content of education include ‘integration of an individual into the national (*natsionalnaia*) and international culture’ (Education Law, Article 14). In line with the principle of vertical division of powers, the standards, before amendments in 2007, were divided into a federal component, a national–regional component and an educational institution component. The content of each component was decided, respectively, by the federal, regional and school authorities.

Since the adoption of the revised version of the Education Law (Federal Law, January 13, 1996), and until the adoption of relevant amendments in 2007, languages of the peoples of Russia could be used as languages of instruction within all three components of the educational standards, and could be taught as a discipline either as part of the national–regional component or as part of the component of the educational institution. In the regions, the (national–)regional component made up at

least one tenth of study time and included history and culture of the region, geography, art, technology and traditional crafts. In the republics, the national–regional component additionally included the titular languages and literature.

Adjusting the standard to the level of educational institutions, the Provisions Concerning General Educational Institutions (March 19, 2001) mirror the provisions of the Education Law by stating that the language(s) taught at school, as well as the language(s) in which education and training are conducted, should be stated in the charters of the relevant institution, and that the teaching of Russian is compulsory. The Provisions serve as a basis upon which institutions can elaborate their charters. The Provisions add that an educational institution has to enable citizens to execute their right to acquire basic secondary education in their native language and to choose their language of instruction (Provisions, paragraphs 2 and 37).

Languages in main educational programmes and core curricula

Typically, the solutions to many practical issues in Russia are not prescribed by laws, but are transferred to the executive authorities. As the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (ACFC) points out:

In most cases the relevant norms lack mechanisms that would guarantee their implementation, leaving too much discretion at the hands of the executive authorities (ACFC Second Opinion on Russia, May 11, 2006).

The original plan was that approval of the federal component of state educational standards would be through a law, but according to the prescribed procedure it was only approved by an administrative decision (RF Government Decree, February 28, 1994). The federal component was approved as a ‘transitional’ standard for in its first phase of application (‘first generation’) by an order of the Minister of Education (Federal Component, March 5, 2004). It is implemented through the main educational programmes and related core curricula. The federal component contains the sample programmes (*primernye programmy*) of each separate subject of study for all types of schools in Russia (both with Russian or native language of instruction) (Khruslov, 2007: 331–332) and declares Russian as a compulsory subject for each stage of school education. The educational programmes were elaborated on the basis of the ‘Compulsory Minimum Content of Education’ (*Obiazatelnyi minimum sodержaniia obrazovaniia*), which is a normative document

approved for primary education in 1998 and secondary education in 1999, and which established a level of knowledge which school graduates must attain and which must be demonstrated by proficiency exams at the end of the study period.

The Federal Core Curriculum (*federalnyi bazovyi uchebnyi plan*) must be approved for each stage of school education (primary I-IV grades, basic secondary V-IX grades and secondary complete X-XI grades), together with models of sample syllabi (*primernye plany*) for all types of schools. The Federal Core Curriculum was approved on 9 March 2004 and contains sample syllabi for educational institutions: (1) with instruction in Russian, (2) with instruction in Russian but where one of the languages of the peoples of the Russian Federation is also taught, and (3) with instruction in the native (not Russian) language. Five types of national schools operate within the second and third models depending on the language of instruction. It is stipulated in the curriculum that, at educational institutions with instruction in native (non-Russian) language, class hours for teaching the ‘native (non-Russian) language and literature’ are counted as part of the national–regional component or the component of the educational institution. At educational institutions with instruction in Russian, a ‘native (non-Russian) language’ must be taught by applying ‘a component of the educational institution, the sixth educational day in a week, and the time reserves of the educational year’ – meaning the time that is left after the teaching of other subjects (Federal Core Curriculum, March 9, 2004).

Thus, according to the legislation, minority language education occurs through: (1) teaching language as a state language of a republic, (2) teaching language as a native language, and (3) native language of instruction. Already in the debates over the drafting of the relevant provisions, some officials advocated for a common standard and a unified content of education for all types of schools. The need for the same level of literacy among all school graduates in order to ensure equal opportunities for entering university was brought forward as justification for such step, as it implies an obligatory written exam in Russian (Khruslov, 2007: 333–334). In fact, the Provisions (March 19, 2001) did not regulate the use of language in the interim and final exams: Russian served as the language of examinations by default. Nor did the language laws of the republics set rules regulating the use of their state language in final examinations. However, unification of the content of education did not happen at that stage, because until the 2007 reform the competence of federal authorities was limited to developing the federal component of the educational

standards, and federal educational policy in general. Therefore, in pre-reform institutional settings curricula for common Russian schools and national schools diverged.

Education reform, revised division of powers and the nation-building agenda

By 2000 language teaching was carried out according to the system of ‘national education’. However, the change in language education policy was part of an overall policy shift in Russia. At the turn of the millennium and with a new president entering into office, there were changes in the policy of federalism and the nationalities policy in Russia. To strengthen the centralized state system, between 1999 and 2001 there began a process of imposing the supremacy of federal law and bringing regional legislations into compliance with it. To reshape the existing balance of powers, the constitutional division of competences between the federal centre and the constituent entities was now interpreted extensively in favour of the former.

The federal authorities now claimed jurisdiction over general issues of language policy (Constitution, December 12, 1993, Article 71(f), Article 72(f); Russia’s Third Report, April 9, 2010: 44), moving towards legislation which treated language as part of culture. Indeed, languages, dialects and subdialects are understood as cultural values (RF Law, October 9, 1992, Article 3). These provisions were used, *inter alia*, as grounds for extended interpretation of the competence of the federal centre by declaring:

Since the status of state languages of republics of the Russian Federation interferes with the status of the state language of the Russian Federation and with the rights and liberties of her citizens in the sphere of education and culture, it thus cannot be an issue of exclusive competence of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation (Judgement of the Constitutional Court of Russia, November 16, 2004).

Therefore, teaching of state languages of republics must be determined by federal educational standards (Tishkov et al., 2009: 11).

Furthermore, the Language Law was amended in a way that reduced the importance of languages other than Russian (e.g., the 2002 amendment forbade state languages of republics to be based on scripts other than Cyrillic) (Federal Laws, July 14, 1998 and December 11, 2002). In 2005, a federal law was adopted to strengthen the position of Russian as the state language of the whole country, and a federal

programme for ‘The Russian Language’ was approved (Federal Law, June 1, 2005; Federal Programme, December 29, 2005). Arguably, among the reasons for the adoption of that document was the desire to stress the primary status of Russian over the state languages of the republics, and thus to pave the way for a reform of language policy, as shown below.

Meanwhile, a concurrent process of revision of nationalities policy and language policy was underway in the sphere of education (see Zajda, 2010: 182). The principles and agenda of education reform were also laid out between 2000 and 2001 through the National Doctrine of Education (October 4, 2000) and the Concept of Modernization of Russian Education (December 19, 2001). Notably, the latter states that ‘the multinational school in Russia has to manifest its important role in preserving and developing the Russian language and the vernaculars, and in shaping the Russian civil self-awareness and identity’.

Ideological basis of the education reform concerning nationalities issues

During the same period, a Draft Concept of the State Ethno-National Educational Policy was developed at the Institute of National Problems of Education of the Russian Ministry of Education in 2001, but was only brought before a wider audience in November 2004³. The Draft Concept was a package of several documents and included a draft Programme for the Implementation of National Educational Policy for the Modernization of the General Education System. The accompanying analytical report, justifying the need for the new programme and signed by the Director of the Institute Mikhail Kuzmin, stated that the document should have been developed earlier ‘as a departmental regulatory act to define in more detail the implementation of the Concept of the State Nationalities Policy in the area of education’.

Shortly before the report was presented officially, it was published as an article on ‘transformation of the mosaic-like traditional polyethnic society into the homogeneous civil society’ (Kuzmin, 2005: 16; Shnirelman (2006) noticed discrepancies between the report and Kuzmin’s article text). The article pointed out that the Education Law had already ‘disunited the vernacular language and the native culture, subjecting them to the competence (and control) of various agencies acting in the educational space’.

The Draft Concept sought, in turn, to deepen the separation established by the Education Law by atomizing national education into isolated linguistic and cultural elements and scattered demand units. The Draft Concept admitted that ‘ethnoses’ may have their own interests, which differ from and occasionally compete with those of the state, and which tend to cause conflict of interest between the dominant ‘ethnos’ and other ‘ethnoses’. The Draft Concept, however, offered no solutions to this conflict of interests.

Instead, the Soviet policy of the 1960s and 1970s of the accelerated ‘drawing together’ and ultimate ‘merging’ of peoples into a single ‘Soviet nation’, with Russian as the ‘second’ native language, was evaluated positively in the report. The need to restructure the education system was emphasized in order to ‘consolidate the multinational people of the Russian Federation into a single Russian (“*rossiiskii*”) political nation’ (on the distinction between an ethnolinguistic ‘*russkii*’ and a territorial–political ‘*rossiiskii*’ aspects of the term ‘Russian’, see Brubaker, 1996: 30). The draft contained the implicit assumption that building up alternative republican national identities or republican ideologies of language revival would hamper the policy of identities (Kuzmin and Artemenko, 2006). Naturally this approach was rebuffed, first of all in the republics. The draft was characterized as contradicting the federal structure of the Russian state, strengthening unitarian tendencies, and provoking tensions between the federal and regional education authorities (Iskhakov, 2005).

In 2004, work began on a new Draft Concept of the Nationalities Policy in the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IEA RAS) (text in Sokolovskii, 2004: 172–182). Neither the Draft Concept of the Nationalities Policy nor the Draft Concept of the State Ethno-National Educational Policy were accepted in their proposed forms, and thus did not attract much attention. However the latter draft, and the dispute it caused, was particularly interesting, since it served as a basis for the Concept of the State National Educational Policy (August 3, 2006). This document laid the ideological foundations for restructuring language policy both in education and well beyond the education sphere (see Zajda, 2010; Prina, 2011). The focal point of the paper was the idea of building a politically unified and culturally homogenized Russian nation through ‘consolida[tion] of the multinational people of the Russian Federation into a single Russian political nation’.

Judging from the title of the paper, it ought to be a supplementary document to the Concept of the State Nationalities Policy, but in fact came close to substituting it.

The Concept seeks to overcome ‘the negative tendencies’ caused by the transformation of ‘an educational institution intended to implement the educational programmes with a national–regional component and with instruction in the native (non-Russian) and the Russian (non-native) languages, into a tool of ethnic mobilization used to transform federal relations into confederative ones’, and offers a set of measures for overcoming those tendencies. These include a total reshaping of the conceptual framework. Instead of the notions of ‘national component’, ‘national school’ and ‘national education’, the authors instead prescribe notions with the prefix ‘ethno-’, e.g. ‘ethnocultural component’, ‘schools with an ethnocultural component’, and ‘ethnically-oriented education’. Realizing the inflammatory nature of this document, the authorities refrained from bringing it forward for broader discussion. Instead, the Concept was quietly approved by an order of Minister of Education and thus escaped wider public attention.

Elimination of standard components and redistribution of competences

The draft amendments to the Education Law which contained the ideas of the Concept were developed by the Ministry of Education and were said to have been supported by the majority of constituent entities of the Russian Federation (Materials, 2009: 61). It was only in 2007 when the changes were statutorily approved through amendments (Federal Law, December 1, 2007), that they were subject to wider public discussion.

In line with the ideas laid out in the Concept, the division of state educational standards into federal, national–regional and school components, which had existed since adoption of the Education Law in 1992, was now eliminated. The pretext for this was that Article 43 of the Russian Constitution on the right to education did not envisage the division of federal educational standards or their transfer to the constituent entities of the federation. The transition to unified federal standards was scheduled to begin in the 2009 school year, and to start from the first grade of elementary school; students admitted prior to 2009 would complete their studies in accordance with earlier standards. Thus, a big step was made towards implementing the principle of “one curriculum for all learners”.

The elimination of the national–regional component made teaching of the languages, literature and culture of titular peoples of the republics, and the history and geography of regions, problematic. In the republics of Tatarstan and Bashkortostan the discussion was largely focused on teaching history and history textbooks. It became clear that the federal authorities, in their efforts to construct a ‘single political nation’, would not tolerate any alternative interpretations of history. Proposals were even made to introduce censoring of history textbooks (for more details on the evolution of ideas and of the debate on the teaching of history, see Shnirelman, 2006). Details of the discussion aside, an indicative innovation should be noted: under the amended law there was a procedure of expert evaluation of all textbooks recommended or permitted by the federal authorities (Federal Law, December 1, 2007, Article 28). Most importantly, elimination of the national–regional component inevitably affected not only the teaching of history, but also the teaching of native languages. Indeed, in some regions, the teaching of languages became as controversial as the teaching of history, as illustrated below.

Another important point in the 2007 amendments to the Education Law was the redistribution of competences from the regional to the federal level, and to the educational institutions themselves. Prior to the passage of the amendments, the educational authorities of republics, i.e. the ministries of education, were the locomotives of ‘language revival’ in the republics; *inter alia*, they could influence the selection of the language(s) of instruction and the amount of language teaching undertaken in schools. Under the amendments, and in line with the ideas of the Concept of the State National Educational Policy, the educational authorities of the republics lost virtually all control over the process of language education, and with it the ability to directly support their titular languages. The amendments restricted the capacity of regional ministries to intervene in decisions relating to the language of instruction and the amount of language teaching, and it is now the schools themselves which take such decisions.

The republics ministries of education still have some options for the implementation of republican legislation in the area of education, *inter alia* through implementation of national educational development programmes. The design and implementation of such programmes, on national, socioeconomic, ecological, cultural, demographic matters specific to the region, have remained within the competences of

regional authorities and can act as a tangible lever for developing the education sphere (RF Law, July 10, 1992, Article 29, Section 5).

Language teaching within the reformed education system

According to the 2007 amendments to the Education Law, the main educational programme and its federal core curriculum is now divided into two parts: an obligatory part is shaped by the federal authorities, while a variable part is shaped by participants in the educational process (*Federalnyi standart*, 2010: 16; *Analiticheskii vestnik*, 2011).⁴ The teaching of state languages of the republics is assigned to the former, while the teaching of native languages is assigned to the latter. Participants in the educational process at a general educational institution are defined as follows: ‘students, teaching employees of the general educational institution, parents (or legal representatives) of students’ (Provisions, March 19, 2001, paragraph 44). This means that the language of instruction at a state or municipal educational institution and the number of hours (if any) allocated to native language teaching must be determined by students themselves, together with their parents and teachers, organized in parental, trustee, supervisory or other boards capable of developing collective positions.

Schools are typically the municipal educational institutions. Local self-government authorities are in charge of establishing new municipal educational institutions and still have control over schools’ supervisory bodies (Article 31). Therefore, in practice, municipal authorities should be able to influence the selection of the language(s) of instruction by schools.

The 2007 amendment to the Education Law has introduced ‘satisfaction of linguistic and ethnocultural educational needs of citizens of the multinational Russia’ as the main criterion for determining the efficiency of its language policy. This differs from the quantitative indices previously used by republics in that it proposes moving from a focus on demand to a focus on supply. This shift is facilitated by the separation of requirements into ‘linguistic’ and ‘ethnocultural’. To substantiate this, statistical data have been produced which demonstrate the language shift taking place among many peoples in Russia, and use rhetoric about the inadmissibility of compulsory language teaching that ignores the will of parents (State Council Report, 2011: 11). A proposal was also made to evaluate the needs of children and their parents by statistically monitoring parental desire to have the native language taught to

schoolchildren. In other words, consideration would only be given to the needs manifestly declared by children and parents (Kuzmin and Artemenko, 2010: 44–46).

Subsequent changes in the reform as a result of compromises

How was the need for reform of the language domain in education ideologically substantiated? When justifying the reform, its exponents portrayed the amendments made to the Education Law in 2007 as a reaction to the ‘alarming rise in the number of complaints filed by members of the public with the state authorities and the courts’, stating that state and native languages were being taught at the expense of Russian (Tishkov et al., 2009: 37–38).

However, the amendments were poorly received in the republics, as some had anticipated during discussions on the draft concepts. The uncertainty about whether the languages of Russia’s peoples would be preserved, and how they would be conducted, caused anxiety and protest in Tatarstan and Bashkortostan, not only among national elites but also among teachers and parents who feared that officials would take the amendments to mean prohibition of language teaching (Stepanov, 2010: 6). The amendments caused complications for the educational institutions, which found themselves in a situation of double-subordinance in relation to both federal and regional authorities.

In 2008 the administrations of both republics appealed to the federal authorities, demanding revocation of the 2007 amendments. The conflict received widespread media coverage. Articles appeared with titles like: ‘*Moscow Is Destroying the Multilingual System of Education in Bashkortostan*’, or even ‘*The New School Education Standard as Casus Belli*’ (see Iulbarisov, 2009; Ivanova-Gladilshchikova, 2009). According to some experts, the exponents themselves provoked ‘a growth of interethnic tension in the republics of Russia’ as a reaction to ‘the deprivation of the republican or regional authorities of a considerable share of their rights in organising the education in native languages and their teaching at schools’ (Iamskov, 2010: 199–200; Stepanov, 2010: 5).

In reaction to these appeals from regional authorities, the Ministry of Education proposed a number of ways to ensure the use of languages in education. One of the proposals was a new amendment (Federal Law, February 10, 2009) that supplemented the Education Law with a mechanism that allowed regional authorities

to participate in the development of model educational programs with regard to regional, national and ethnocultural specifics, based on federal educational standards (Article 29, Section 5, Clause 2). Although the law does not contain a separate reference to linguistic issues, it is expected that the mechanism will enable the teaching of native languages to be preserved under the new federal educational standards.

A public discussion was also initiated on this issue. The lower chamber of the Russian parliament, the State Duma, held parliamentary hearings (*Federalnyi standart*, 2010). Representatives of Tatarstan and Bashkortostan expressed their concern that amendments to the law could tip the balance in federal relations. The resolution adopted following the hearing acknowledged legislative deficiencies that deprived the regions of autonomy in developing teaching programmes reflecting national and ethnocultural specificities. According to one expert's opinion, subsequent discussions and compromises resulted in changes to the draft charters of educational institutions, allowing for the teaching of various subjects in the languages of the peoples of Russia (Shnirelman, 2010: 61). It was embarrassing that, even once negotiations were completed and compromises reached, initiators of the reform still confirmed that:

[t]he difference from the previous norms and practices is that native languages, including Russian, should be taught now at schools only at the will and choice of participants of the educational process themselves instead of the educational administration of the constituent entity [of the Russian Federation] (Artemenko, 2010: 50).

According to the compromise, a mechanism was developed by which the republican education authorities, alongside the federal ones, participated in determining the scope (the number of hours) and the structure (the list of subjects) of teaching in native languages within the Federal State Educational Standards, later included in the Education Law (Federal Law, June 3, 2011; Rules on the Development, February 24, 2009) (hereinafter 'the Rules'). Some experts evaluated this step as 'a fairly reasonable compromise' (Iamskov, 2010: 203-204). Another step back from the original reform was the extension of the transition period to the new federal educational standards to the end of 2009 (Federal Law, July 18, 2009).

If requirements in the 1990s only related to the content of education, then the reform changed this. Following the Rules, the 'new generation' of Standards for

Primary Education (October 6, 2009, revised November 26, 2010; in force since September 1, 2011) and for Basic Secondary Education (December 27, 2010; in force since September 1, 2012) were approved. The standard is defined a set of requirements concerning: (a) the substantive accomplishments of the main educational programme; (b) the programme's structure, including the obligatory part, and the part devised by participants in the educational process; and (c) the conditions of its implementation. The standards establish that the part shaped by participants in the educational process, which can include native language teaching, accounts for up to 20% of the main educational programme in primary education and 30% in basic secondary education (*Analiticheskii vestnik*, 2011). The standard for the third stage, that is, for secondary education (tenth and eleventh grades), in 2012 was still only as a draft and a hot topic of debate. Among the most contested issues is the intention of reformers to limit the obligatory part of the curriculum to 40%, which would not include either Russian or native languages. This intention has been justified on the grounds of providing students with more freedom to take optional subjects. The establishment of rules for this particular area of education is at the forefront of current developments in Russia's education system.

Modes of language education in the core curricula

What should be the expected state of languages under the final compromise option? Both approved standards establish that, if federal or regional legislation so regulates, the curricula ensure the possibility of receiving an education in the state language of those republics where state bilingualism is established by legislation or in the native language, and define the number of hours for this purpose (*Analiticheskii vestnik*, 2011). On the basis of the standards, the Main Model Educational Programmes was elaborated both for primary education in 2010 and basic secondary education in 2011. These are not normative documents but models for educational institutions to approve their educational programmes and curricula.

The revised Federal Core Curriculum (March 9, 2004, revised August 30, 2010) is attached to the relevant Main Programmes and contains the same models of sample syllabi for educational institutions listed at the beginning of the article. The Draft Federal Core Curriculum for Educational Institutions was elaborated from the same methodological perspective in 2008, but is not yet enforced. The Provisions

(March 19, 2001, paragraph 31) presume division of classes into two groups for the purpose of native language teaching and foreign language teaching. The document demands a minimum number of students of 25 in urban schools and 20 in rural schools, but allows for the establishment of smaller groups if sufficient resources are available. Thus, three modes of language education were maintained, as illustrated below.

1) Philology is an obligatory “learning area” for primary and basic secondary schools, and includes both the Russian language and literature, as well as the native language and literature. This means that the native language can be the medium of instruction in those schools which have chosen a sample syllabus as the basis for their school study syllabus. The reformers emphasize that this decision must be taken by participants in the educational process themselves (Kuzmin and Artemenko, 2010: 46). They argue that Russian constitution and the Language Law establish free choice in the language of instruction, which the reform enforced, and that educational administrations of constituent entities of the federation should not interfere with the choice of language of instruction by schools.

2) The state languages of the republics cannot be used as a medium of instruction in schools that have not chosen to use them, but may still be taught as subjects in the obligatory part of the main educational programmes (Kuzmin and Artemenko, 2010: 46). Another compromise was that the teaching of state languages of republics as subjects was not restricted to the part determined by participants in the educational process. In 2004, notwithstanding the shift in the ethnopolitical line in Russia by that time, the Constitutional Court of Russia found compulsory teaching of both state languages in the Republic of Tatarstan to be constitutional (RCC Judgement, November 16, 2004). The court ruled that the state languages of the republics must be taught in compliance with federal educational standards. However, while state language learning is compulsory, and a request from children and their parents is not required, the volume of state language teaching is usually restricted to one or two hours per week.

3) Before the reform, native languages were taught as subjects within the national–regional and educational institution components. With the elimination of these components the primary issue of concern in the republics was the possible negative repercussion resulting from the discontinuation of native language teaching. Under the new law, teaching a language as ‘native’ is only allowed during that part of

the main educational programmes which is determined by participants in the educational process, in other words by the pupils, their parents and their teachers. Following the reform, they must 'choose' to assign more hours of the syllabus to subjects that fall under the obligatory part of the Unified State Exam (as Russian) at the expense of subjects from the variable part (including native languages). In particular, this concerns the regions and schools that have chosen a model where Russian is the medium of instruction and one of the languages of the peoples of the Russian Federation is taught as a subject. The author's fieldwork shows that this is why, even if a native language can potentially be taught for up to six hours per week, in practice the actual native language teaching often only amounts to three to five hours in republics and to one to two hours in other regions.

Probable impact of free choice on language teaching

It seems that free choice can only work in a fully functioning civil society. In the reality of modern Russia much will depend on the collective attitudes of the community at large (majority attitudes) because the decision-making body, instead of being formed exclusively by participants in the educational process, will be appointed in part by the management of the educational institutions. The schools will have to choose an arrangement of the 'ethnocultural component', including when the language of instruction is the vernacular. The schools will also select subjects for its curriculum that satisfy the ethnocultural and linguistic needs of students, while simultaneously taking account of the opinions of participants in the educational process; these subjects may include language teaching. All this is especially difficult given that the amendments to the law, as well as other administrative ordinances, fail to establish a concrete mechanism to take account of the interests of the population regarding the introduction of a non-Russian language of instruction at school. Experts have pointed out that the basic drawback of the amended Education Law is the absence of a mechanism and criteria for selecting the language of instruction at an educational institution. It was only recently that scholars started to address the issue (Stepanov, 2011). In practice, when schools make decisions, they tend to jettison all arrangements that include language teaching, particularly with regard to instruction in the native language, and the Russian language serves as the default setting.

The likelihood of this development was fostered by another innovation: since 2008 the final secondary school examination in basic subjects of general education could only be conducted in the form of the Unified State Exam in Russian (Regulation, November 28, 2008, paragraphs 4–6). Typically, the issue of language tests was initially addressed not in laws but in administrative acts. Indeed, the system of knowledge assessment is one of the key indicators of language education policy. After another heated public debate, native languages can now also become subjects of optional final examination after completion of basic secondary and complete secondary education, by a decision of regional authorities (Federal Law, June 3, 2011). Soon afterwards, a unified regional state exam in ‘state language of the republic’ was developed in some republics (State Council Report, 2011: 45).

Some progress has been made towards free choice, so that now active parents not only have a nominal right but can also demand teaching in/of native language in territorial units of Russia that are neither republics nor autonomous districts. However, the criterion based on individual demand still suggests a much narrower interpretation of linguistic needs than in the case of ethnic self-identification of students as applied in population censuses and sociological researches arranged by republican authorities (see *Gosudarstvennye iazyki*, 2006). Presumably, individuals who ethnically self-identify with the titular group of a republic, but fail to master the titular language, would be recognized as having ethnocultural needs while lacking linguistic needs.

What is more, this approach ignores the collective interest of the group in expanding the network of schools that instruct in the vernacular and for teaching those who have not mastered their native language. As the population is mixed and teaching of the titular languages is optional, ‘the range of possibilities provided by the education system’ would be confined only to areas of dense residence in mainly rural districts. Situations where a large number of children of the titular ethnic origin, particularly those residing in urban areas, are deprived of an opportunity to study the ‘native language’ will not be properly evaluated. Put another way: answering the question of whether demand or supply should serve as an indicator of satisfaction of the educational needs of peoples and citizens is the key to selecting the proper criteria for evaluating language planning in education in the republics.

The criterion set by the reform is based on demand, and is arguably aimed at reducing the supply level to the demand level. This reduction may be implemented

indirectly by closing down small rural schools to “optimize” the school system, using demographic decline as justification. Or it may take the form of direct parental will for allocation of fewer hours for native language teaching, explained by the need to comply with the maximum permissible workload. The evaluation of needs is already hampered, and the opening up of “national classes” is discouraged by requirements introduced prior to the reform, notably *per capita* financing of schools and the imposition of a minimum number of students per class.

Conclusion

This paper began with the assumption that recent educational reforms in Russia have impacted on the teaching of minority languages. Was the impact planned and what was the rationale behind it? It seems that the weakening of the institutional position of languages in the education system was not a by-product of the reform, but was instead the result of deliberate action aimed at diminishing the role in education of languages other than Russian. The purpose and mechanisms used, as well as the scenario of the present reform, suggest a parallel with the Soviet education reform of 1958. There, too, freedom of choice took priority over the right to mother tongue education and the obligation of state support for all languages. Freedom of choice has once again become a means to enhance the language shift. If the reform of 1958 served as part of the mechanism to ‘merge’ Socialist nations into a single ‘Soviet people’, then the need to build a Russian political nation with Russian as its language (State Council Report, 2011: 61) is reemphasized over and over again in speeches by senior Russia officials and in key policy documents. The latest document in the series of several drafts is the federal target programme ‘Strengthening the Unity of the Russian Nation and the Ethnocultural Development of the Peoples of Russia’, announced by the Ministry of Regional Development in November 2011. The policy of nation-building might provide the key to understanding covert efforts to narrow the scope of native language teaching despite the official language ideology in support of linguistic pluralism.

This means that, as is the case with history textbooks, the language of instruction is used as another tool in nation-building, first by federal authorities but also by regional authorities in some republics, for instance in Tatarstan. The normative question of which nation-building exercise is more justified, or whether

any such exercise is justified at all, was not included in the discussion, but it seems that current power relations have led to the contemporary prevalence of the trend towards recentralization. Supporters of the present reforms have barely concealed their nation-building objectives in their ideological substantiations. Instead, they hope to continue with the reform notwithstanding the compromises agreed (Iamskov, 2010: 204). What is striking is that everybody is busy exercising their nation-building agenda, but nobody presents any vision of a functionally multilingual society in which there are two-directional communicative choices.

How would the reform affect the future state of languages in education? The reform is currently ongoing and there are still many open questions concerning the place of languages within the reformed system. The draft Education Law is being elaborated in the Ministry of Education. Still, bilingualism is not a policy goal and no modes of language education directed at the promotion of functional bilingualism have been put forward to date. The results of the current study demonstrate that, formally, the three modes of language education that existed previously have remained in place, with all types of national schools. In practice, however, the proportion in which these modes and types are applied has changed, particularly due to the transition of schools from teaching native languages to teaching state languages of the republics.

What is the reason for this transition? The information available suggests that teaching languages as state languages of republics is likely to continue. Consequently, the reform has not directly affected the teaching of languages in this respect. The republics may introduce the teaching of state languages through their own legislation. In some republics, e.g. in Tatarstan and Bashkortostan, the teaching of state languages has been made compulsory for all schoolchildren. However, the current ethnopolitical situation will hardly allow for the introduction of language teaching in those republics where it has not existed to date, as any efforts to do so would be interpreted by federal authorities as attempts to promote regional identities at the expense of the overarching Russian political identity.

If schools refrain from teaching a language as native in a situation where studying state languages is compulsory, this may lead to a shift by schools from teaching a language as native to teaching it as the state language. Such a move would lead to considerable deterioration in the quality of language teaching. According to the core curriculum, the amount of time allocated per week for teaching the titular

language as the state language in republics does not usually exceed two hours, which is adequate for familiarizing students with the language but not for developing sufficient competence in it. To develop competence in a language, it is clearly preferable to study it as a native language rather than as a state language, as the weekly time allotted to teaching children their native language is greater: up to six hours for different grades in different regions. Most preferable for developing language competence and bilingualism in schoolchildren is instruction in the native language. Of course, the quality of teaching does not depend merely upon the number of hours, but also on the supply of adequately trained teachers, and current textbooks and methodologies. The narrowing of the competence of regional education authorities has had an indirect impact on the number of teachers and teaching materials, because their supply will now depend solely on the decreasing number of students.

The educational reform has stripped educational administrations of the constituent federal entities of the opportunity to directly influence the choice parents would make regarding whether or not the native language should be taught, as well as the choice of native language by an educational institution. It is safe to anticipate a further decrease in the number of children studying native languages, either because parents would reject the idea or merely because of a lack of demand from parents. To understand the further implications of the education reform, one should not restrict the analysis to a general study of official data on absolute numbers of languages used in the education system, schools with language teaching, or students. To analyse the scale of changes in the various modes of teaching and in the numbers of schools and students, it is necessary to study the results and effects of the education reform separately in terms of the amount of teaching of particular languages in every region and the proportion of students of titular ethnic origin.

Notes

1. Policy documents and legal acts cited in the article (available at <http://zakon.scli.ru/>):
Declaration *On the Languages of the Peoples of Russia*, approved by the Supreme Council of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, October 25, 1991;
Law of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic *On the Languages of the Peoples of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic* of 25 October 1991 № 1807-I (as amended by the Federal Law of 24 July 1998 № 126 and the Federal Law of 11 December 2002 № 165);

Law of the Russian Federation *On Education* of 10 July 1992 № 3266-I (as amended by the Federal Law of 13 January 1996 № 12 and the Federal Law of 03 June 2011 № 121); *Fundamentals of the Legislation of the Russian Federation on Culture* approved by the Law of the Russian Federation of 09 October 1992 № 3612-I;

Constitution of the Russian Federation of 12 December 1993;

Order of the Development, Approval and Endorsement of the Federal Components of the State Educational Standards of General Primary, General Basic Secondary, General Secondary Complete and Primary Professional Education, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of 28 February 1994 № 174;

Concept of the Nationalities Policy of the Russian Federation, approved by the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of 15 June 1996 № 909;

Federal Law *On General Principles Governing the Organization of Legislative (Representative) and Executive State Authorities of Constituent Entities of the Russian Federation* of 6 October 1999 № 184 (as amended by the Federal Law of 4 July 2003 № 95 and the Federal Law of 31 December 2005 № 202);

National Doctrine of Education in the Russian Federation 2000-2025, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of 4 October 2000 № 751;

Typical Provisions concerning General Educational Institutions, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of 19 March 2001 № 196 (as amended by the Government Decree of 10 March 2009 № 216);

Concept of Modernisation of Russian Education to 2010, announced by the Order of the Government of the Russian Federation of 29 December 2001 № 1756-p;

Federal Component of the State Education Standards for Primary, Basic and Complete Secondary General Education, approved by the Order of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation of 5 March 2004 № 1089;

Federal Core Curriculum of the Russian Federation, including Sample Syllabi for Educational Institutions of the Russian Federation Implementing General Education Programmes, approved by the Order of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation of 9 March 2004 № 1312 (as amended by the Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation of 30 August 2010 № 889);

Judgement of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation On the Case of the Examination of the Constitutionality of the Provisions in Section 2, Article 10 of the Law of the Republic of Tatarstan On the Languages of the Peoples of the Republic of Tatarstan, Part 2, Article 9 of the Law of the Republic of Tatarstan On the State Languages And the Other Languages of the Peoples of the Republic of Tatarstan, Section 2, Article 6 of the Law of the Republic of Tatarstan On Education, and Section 6, Article 3 of the Law of the Russian Federation On the Languages of the Peoples of the Russian Federation in relation to the Complaint of the Citizen S. Khapugin and the Request of the State Council of the Republic of Tatarstan and the Supreme Court of the Republic of Tatarstan of 16 November 2004 № 16-P;

Federal Law *On the State Language of the Russian Federation* of 1 June 2005 № 53;

Federal Target Programme ‘Russian Language (2006–10)’, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of 29 December 2005 № 833;

Concept of the National Educational Policy of the Russian Federation, approved by the Order of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation of 03 August 2006 № 201;

Federal Law *On Amendments to Selected Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation Concerning Changing the Notion and Structure of the State Educational Standard* of 01 December 2007 № 309;

Typical Provisions concerning Institutions of Higher Vocational Education, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of 14 February 2008 № 71;

Regulation on the Methods and Procedure for Conducting State (Final) Certification of Students Having Completed the Main General Educational Programmes of Secondary Complete Education, approved by the Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation of 28 November 2008 № 362;

- Rules on the Development and Endorsement of Federal State Educational Standards*, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of 24 February 2009 № 142;
- Federal Law *On the Amendments to Selected Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation on Provision of Scholarships and the Arrangement of the Educational Process* of 18 July 2009 № 184;
- Federal State Educational Standard for Primary Education*, approved by the Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation of 6 October 2009 № 373 (as amended by the Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation of 26 October 2010 № 1241);
- Federal State Educational Standard for Basic Secondary Education*, approved by the Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation of 17 December 2010 № 1897.
2. Official documents under Framework Convention and domestic reports:

Second Report of the Russian Federation on the Implementation of Provisions of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. April 26, 2005. Available at http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/3_FCNMdocs/PDF_2nd_SR_RussianFederation_en.pdf.

Second Opinion on the Russian Federation of the Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. May 11, 2006. Available at http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/3_FCNMdocs/PDF_2nd_OP_RussianFederation_en.pdf.

Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the Council of Europe on the implementation of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities by the Russian Federation. May 2, 2007. Available at <https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1126345&Site=CM&BackColorInternet=C3C3C3&BackColorIntranet=EDB021&BackColorLogged=F5D383>.

Third Report of the Russian Federation on the Implementation of Provisions of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. April 9, 2010. Available at http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/3_FCNMdocs/PDF_3rd_SR_RussianFed_en.pdf.

‘Report of the State Council of the Russian Federation on Measures of Strengthening the Inter-Nationality Concord in Russian Society’ (in Russian). Ministry of Regional Development, March 29, 2011. Available at http://www.minregion.ru/activities/interethnic_relations/national_policy/505/902.html.
 3. ‘Draft Concept of the State Ethno-National Educational Policy’. Federal Center for Educational Legislation, November 2004. Available at http://www.lexed.ru/pravo/actual/?concept_01.html. Institute (later, Centre) of National Problems of Education (NB: not, for example, of problems of national education), subordinated to the Ministry of Education (later to the Federal Institute for the Development of Education at the Ministry of Education) and headed by Mikhail Kuzmin (later, Olga Artemenko), was a think tank for language reform in education.
 4. In fact, the 1993 and 1998 Core Curriculum also had two parts, but at that time the variable part was shaped mostly by regional authorities.

References

- Agranovich, Mark, and O. Kozhevnikova. *Sostoianie i razvitiie sistemy obshchego srednego obrazovaniia v Rossiiskoi Federatsii: Natsionalnyi doklad 2005*. Moscow: Aspekt Press, 2006.
- Analiticheskii vestnik*. ‘Seriia: Zakonodatelnoe obespechenie razvitiia nauki, obrazovaniia, zdravookhraneniia, kultury’. *Federalnye gosudarstvennye*

- obrazovatelnye standarty v shkole 5*. Moscow: Apparatus of the State Duma, 2011.
- Artemenko, Olga. 'Obrazovanie i iazyk: sovremennyyi rossiiski opyt'. *Etnopoliticheskaia situatsiia v Rossii i sopedelnykh gosudarstvakh v 2009 godu. Ezhegodnyi doklad Seti etnologicheskogo monitoringa i rannego preduprezhdeniia konfliktov*, eds. V. Tishkov and V. Stepanov. Moscow: IEA RAS, 2010.
- Batsyn, Vladimir, and Mikhail Kuzmin. 'Natsionalnye problemy obrazovaniia v Rossiiskoi Federatsii'. *Shkola i mir kultury etnosov 2* (1995): 5-30.
- Brubaker, Rogers. *Nationalism Reframed. Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Curtis, Glenn E. and Marian Leighton. 'The Society and its Environment'. In *Russia: A Country Study*, ed. Glenn E. Curtis. Washington: Library of Congress, 1998.
- Eklof, Ben. 'Introduction – Russian Education: The Past in the Present'. In *Educational Reform in Post-Soviet Russia: Legacies and Prospects*, eds. Ben Eklof, Larry E. Holmes and Vera Kaplan. New York: Frank Cass, 2005.
- Federalnyi gosudarstvennyi obrazovatelnyi standart – strategicheskii resurs ustoiichivogo razvitiia mnogonatsionalnogo obshchestva: zakonodatelnaia initsiativa subiektov Rossiiskoi Federatsii*. Materials of Parliamentary Hearings, February 19, 2009. Moscow: State Duma, 2010.
- Iamskov, Anatolii. 'Problema ekspertizy federalnykh gosudarstvennykh obrazovatelnykh standartov'. In *Etnokulturnoe obrazovanie. Metody sotsialnoi adaptatsii rossiiskoi shkoly 1*, ed. V. Stepanov. Moscow: IEA RAS, 2010.
- Iskhakov, Damir. 'O proekte "Kontseptsii gosudarstvennoi obrazovatelnoi politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii"'. In *Realizatsiia natsionalno-regionalnogo komponenta istoricheskogo obrazovaniia v natsionalnykh respublikakh Povolzhia i Priuraliia: problemy i perspektivy*. Materials of the Second Interregional scientific-practical conference, October 26, 2004. Kazan: Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, 2005.
- Iulbarisov, B. 'Moskva razrushaet mnogoiazychnuiu sistemu obrazovaniia Bashkortostana'. News Agency *Bashinform*, February 15, 2009. Cited from the *MariUver* News Agency. Available at <http://mariuver.wordpress.com/2009/03/03/shkol-standart/>.
- Ivanova-Gladilshchikova, N. 'Novyi shkolnyi standart kak povod k voine'. *Russkii zhurnal* (2009). Available at <http://www.russ.ru/pole/Novyj-shkol-nyj-standart-kak-povod-k-vojne/>.
- Khruslov, Georgii. 'General Analysis of Current National Curricula in Language(s) of School Education in Russia'. In *Towards a Common Framework of Reference for Language(s) of School Education?* ed. M. Martyniuk. Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych Universitas, 2007.
- Kreindler, Isabelle T. 'Soviet Language Planning since 1953'. In *Language Planning in the Soviet Union*, ed. Michael Kirkwood. London: Macmillan Press, 1989.
- Kuzmin, Mikhail. 'K voprosu o razrabotke Kontseptsii federalnoi obrazovatelnoi politiki v Rossiiskoi Federatsii'. In *Realizatsiia natsionalno-regionalnogo komponenta istoricheskogo obrazovaniia v natsionalnykh respublikakh Povolzhia i Priuraliia: problemy i perspektivy*. Materials of the Second Interregional scientific-practical conference, October 26, 2004. Kazan: Tatarstan Academy of Sciences, 2005.
- Kuzmin, Mikhail, and Olga Artemenko. 'Iazykovaia politika Rossii v svete novykh pravovykh norm'. In *Etnopoliticheskaia situatsiia v Rossii i sopedelnykh*

- gosudarstvakh v 2009 godu. Ezhegodnyi doklad Seti etnologicheskogo monitoringa i rannego preduprezhdeniia konfliktov*, eds. V. Tishkov and V. Stepanov. Moscow: IEA RAS, 2010.
- ‘Organizing Education in Polyethnic Russia’. Intervention at the Seminar ‘International Legal Guarantees for the Protection of National Minorities and Problems in their Implementation: With Special Focus on Minority Education’. Strasbourg, Council of Europe, October 18, 2006. Available at http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/minorities/6_resources/PDF_RussSem_Pres_MKouzmine_OArtemenko_en.pdf.
- Kymlicka, Will, and François Grin. ‘Introduction – Assessing the Politics of Diversity in Transition Countries’. In *Nation-building, Ethnicity and Language Politics in Transition Countries*, eds. F. Grin & F. Daftar. Budapest: ECMI, 2003.
- Leontiev, Alexei. ‘Linguistic Human Rights and Educational Policy in Russia’. In *Linguistic Human Rights*, eds. T. Skutnabb-Kangas and R. Phillipson. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995.
- ‘Materialy, predstavlennye k parlamentskim slushaniiam: Ministerstvo obrazovaniia i nauki’. *O merakh po realizatsii tselei Vtorogo Mezhdunarodnogo desiatiletiia korennykh narodov mira v sferakh narodnogo obrazovaniia i sokhraneniia rodnykh iazykov v raionakh prozhivaniia korennykh malochislennykh narodov Severa, Sibiri i Dalnego Vostoka Rossiiskoi Federatsii*. Materials of Parliamentary Hearings, October 2, 2008. Moscow: Federation Council, 2009.
- Musina, Rozalinda. (ed.), *Gosudarstvennye iazyki v shkolnom obrazovanii Respubliki Tatarstan. Informatsionno-analiticheskii material po rezultatam etnosotsiologicheskogo issledovaniia v gorode Kazani*. Kazan: Tatarstan Academy of Sciences Institute of History, 2006.
- Neroznak, Vladimir. ‘Iazykovaia situatsiia v Rossii: 1991-2001 gody’. *Gosudarstvennye i titulnye iazyki Rossii: Encyclopedia*. Moscow: Academia, 2002.
- Prina, Federica. ‘Homogenisation and the “New Russian Citizen”: A Road to Stability or Ethnic Tension?’ *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 10 (1) (2011): 59–93.
- Shnirelman, Viktor. ‘Rossiiskaia shkola i natsionalnaia idea’. *Neprikosnovennyi zapas* 6 (2006). Available at <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2006/50/sh21.html>.
- ‘Rossiiskaia shkola snova na perelome’. In *Etnopoliticheskaia situatsiia v Rossii i sopredelnykh gosudarstvakh v 2009 godu. Ezhegodnyi doklad Seti etnologicheskogo monitoringa i rannego preduprezhdeniia konfliktov*, eds. V. Tishkov and V. Stepanov. Moscow: IEA RAS, 2010.
- Sokolovskii, Sergei. *Perspektivy razvitiia Kontseptsii etnonatsionalnoi politiki v Rossiiskoi Federatsii*. Moscow: Privet, 2004.
- Stepanov, Valerii. ‘Sotsialnaia orientatsiia rossiiskoi shkoly’. *Etnokulturnoe obrazovanie. Metody sotsialnoi adaptatsii rossiiskoi shkoly*, ed. V. Stepanov. Moscow: IEA RAS, 2010.
- ‘O metodakh otsenki iazykovykh i etnokulturnykh potrebnosti naseleniia v sisteme shkolnogo obrazovaniia’. In *Pravovoi status finno-ugorskikh iazykov i etnokulturnye potrebnosti rossiiskoi shkoly*, ed. V. Tishkov, 247–269. Moscow: IP A.G. Iakovlev, 2011.
- Tishkov, Valerii, Valerii Stepanov, Dmitri Funk, and Olga Artemenko (eds.), *Status of and Support for Linguistic Diversity in the Russian Federation. Expert Report*. Moscow: IEA RAS, 2009.

Zajda, Joseph. 'The Politics of Education Reforms and Policy Shifts in the Russian Federation'. In *Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research*, ed. J. Zajda. 11th volume. *Globalisation, Ideology and Education Policy Reforms*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2010.