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¹ [1] ‘what’s your mother tongue’ in Kazakh
The historical context and language policy of Kazakhstan have created a complex sociolinguistic situation. The majority of urban Kazakh youth is Russian-speaking, but the group often identifies Kazakh as their mother tongue. This study aims to explore motivations for mother tongue identification among young urban Kazakhs using Skutnabb-Kangas’s (1984) criteria: origin, identification, competence, and function. In addition, the background of this study is based on the previous work of Spolsky (2000), Shohamy (2012), Fierman (1998), Smagulova (2006, 2008), Rivers (2002) and others in the field of language policy. The study utilizes mixed research methods. First, quantitative data was collected by an online questionnaire after which interviews were used to gather qualitative data from six participants.

The quantitative data analysis revealed statistical correlation between mother tongue and Kazakh proficiency, family languages, language of instruction in school, and time spent abroad. The qualitative analysis mostly supported the quantitative findings showing that languages used at home, Kazakh proficiency and Kazakh use influence participants mother tongue identification. It was concluded that young Kazakhs who use Kazakh in their daily life and are proficient in it are most likely to report it as their mother tongue. However, the majority of the participants with Kazakh mother tongue have Russian as their dominant language of communication and proficiency. They identify Kazakh as their mother tongue because of its symbolic value for their ethnic identity. Therefore, the majority of the study sample identified their mother tongue as Kazakh due to origin and external identification. Russian mother tongue was chosen because of the participants’ strong Russian proficiency and wide use.
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1. Introduction

This study aims to explore internal identification of Kazakh youth when it comes to language issues. In particular, we are interested in mother tongue identification as well as the factors influencing it.

Kazakhstan is a newly independent Post-Soviet state in Central Asia. The titular Kazakh language has a state status, whereas Russian is an official language. The majority of urban population is Russian speaking (Maximova et al. 2018, Smagulova 2006). However, recent studies show a trend towards Kazakhization of the younger generation (Amantay et al. 2017, Smagulova 2008). Exploring language ideologies among Kazakhs, researchers agree on the fact that Kazakh has a high symbolic value for the people (Rivers 2002, Amantay et al. 2017, Smagulova 2008). It is often mentioned as an expression of patriotic and nationalistic feelings. Russian, on the other hand, despite its great communicative role in not only interethnic interactions but among the Kazakhs themselves, is sometimes seen as a sign of mankurtism. This term is used by Kazakh nationalists to describe Russified urban Kazakhs who allegedly neglected their native language and culture and replaced it with Russian (Davé 1996: 52).

Previous sociolinguistic studies have shown that in Census 1989 the vast majority of ethnic Kazakhs reported Kazakh as their mother tongue, however not all of them could speak it (Fierman 1998, Smagulova 2006). Fierman (1998: 174) further argues that many Kazakhs have Russian as their first and strongest language but still choose Kazakh as their native language. One explanation proposed to this is the strong national identity of Kazakh people.

In this complex sociolinguistic situation, urban Kazakh youth is under pressure to speak, or at least claim to speak, Kazakh in order not to be blamed for neglecting their "nativeness". In this study, the concept of mother tongue is used to explore linguistic identity of urban Kazakh youth. According to Skutnabb-Kangas (1984), there are four criteria to define one's mother tongue: origin (the language one learned first), internal and external identification (internal identification is the language one identifies with, and external identification is the language one is identified as a native speaker of by others), competence (the language one knows best), and function (the language one uses most).

The hypothesis of the study is that the majority of urban Kazakh youth defines their mother tongue as Kazakh according to external identification. In other words, despite their proficiency level in
Kazakh and frequent use of the Russian language, the youth define their mother tongue as Kazakh because it is their native language, the language of symbolic value for Kazakh people. The primary research question is what the relationship between Kazakh proficiency and identified mother tongue of urban Kazakh youth is. The secondary research question is what other criteria affect their mother tongue identification, and how it is related to their background.

The thesis is structured as follows. Chapter 2 explores the theoretical framework of the study. Chapter 3 presents the general methodology of the study as well as addresses the research ethics. Chapter 4 provides the detailed description of the quantitative phase of the study: data collection and method of its analysis. In chapter 5, the quantitative results are reported. Chapter 6 describes the methodology of the qualitative part of the study, and chapter 7 follows with the qualitative results. Finally, chapter 8 discusses the findings of the study as well as states study implications and limitations.
2. Literature review

This chapter comprises previous theoretical work which is relevant to this study. The literature review starts with a discussion of broader concepts such as language policy, language and ethnic identity, and mother tongue. It continues with more specific studies on language policies in Post-Soviet countries. Finally, the chapter presents research on language policy of Kazakhstan.

2.1 Language policy and identity

The traditional approach to language policy, taken by linguists after the Second World War, was quite limited. They defined it as a certain list of regulations implemented by the state to control language practices of a nation (Spolsky 2012: 3). In its turn, language planning was seen as achievable as economic planning. However, after exploring the complex nature of language policy in its various context, it became obvious that it is a broader field of linguistics. Spolsky (2012: 5), in his book The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy, describes language policy as having three independent but related elements: actual language practices produced by participants of a language community, their beliefs and ideologies regarding different linguistic varieties existing in the group, and language management expressed through efforts to control and alter language use by authoritative members of a language group. Spolsky deliberately uses the term language management instead of the traditional term language planning emphasizing its complex nature which cannot always be planned. It is important to note that language planning does not necessarily influence language ideologies and practices of a speech community (Spolsky & Shohamy 2000: 2).

A significant change was brought to the field in the 1990s, when it was discovered that language policy does not exist only on the nation-state level. Instead, it is executed at all levels of society: family, school, religious organizations, workplaces, local governments, nations and states, as well as international organizations (Spolsky 2012: 6). Therefore, language planning deals not only with linguistic legislations, but also with implicit policies made by respective agents.

Elana Shohamy together with Bernard Spolsky provide a detailed description of the notion of language policy and place it in the context of Israel. They emphasize the importance of differentiating the three terms: language ideology, language practice, and language policy. Language ideology is a set of implicit rules which are formed from people's beliefs about the appropriate language use in the community. These beliefs "both derive from and influence practice" (Spolsky & Shohamy 2000: 4). Language policy, also referred to as language planning, does not have as close link to ideology and
practice. Policies are created in order to alter or secure existing ideologies and practices (Spolsky & Shohamy 2000: 4). Spolsky and Shohamy argue that a successful language policy has to find a feasible way to bring language practices to its desired state while also considering language ideologies of the group (Spolsky & Shohamy 2000: 10). In this research, the focus is on urban Kazakh youth, their language use, beliefs, and ideologies, which is a part of Kazakhstan's language policy.

In sociolinguistics, the concept of identity goes hand in hand with language policy discussion. According to Carmen Llamas and Dominic Watt (2010: 1), language use is what defines one's identity. One's membership to social groups is clearly seen in their linguistic behavior. When defining identity, it is crucial to consider the Social Identity Theory developed by Tajfel. According to it, identity is "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel 1978: 63). Moreover, John E. Joseph claims that one's language use is what allows them "to make themselves" (Joseph 2004: 110). Therefore, identities are not possessed by individuals, but rather negotiated in different circumstances. Similarly, one can have a number of identities which are performed depending on the environment (Llamas and Watt 2010: 14). For this reason, it is common to look at identity as a fluid rather than static concept.

In the context of this study the term ethnic identity plays a crucial role. According to Skutnabb-Kangas and McCarty (2007: 3), ethnic identity is “historical, geographical, cultural, linguistic, sociolinguistic, and/or national associations that bind individuals together as a distinct, self-identified group”. Language has been granted a defining status in ethnic identity by many researchers (Fishman, 2001; Daller, 2005; Harris, 2006). May (2000:119), in his study on minority status of Welsh, demonstrates how the language is associated with ethnic identity of Welsh people even if they do not speak it. In addition, Daller (2005) suggests that language is a tool for differentiating one’s ethnic identity from others. In this study, ethnic identity of young Kazakhs is hypothesized to influence their mother tongue identification.

Mother tongue is the central concept of this research. Thus, it is crucial to state its definition. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, a researcher known for her work on linguistic human rights, minority education, and language policy, has given a definition of mother tongue according to four criteria: origin, identification, competence, and function, illustrated in more detail in table 1.
Skutnabb-Kangas believes that these definitions overlap for speakers of a majority language. In contrast, linguistic minorities often combine these criteria when defining their mother tongue. These criteria do not necessarily apply to the same language for an individual. For example, one can identify language A as their mother tongue because of external identification, while also claiming language B as a second mother tongue because of their competence in it. Further, the author points out that from the perspective of Linguistic Human Rights, it is important to “to ONLY use a mother tongue definition by internal identification” (Skutnabb-Kangas 2008: 86-88). This study aims to identify which of these criteria has the most influence on mother tongue identification of young Kazakhs.

2.2 Language policy in the Post-Soviet Union countries

In order to analyze language policies in the Post-Soviet Union countries, it is important to briefly mention the linguistic situation in the Soviet Union in its later years. The languages of Soviet Republics—which are commonly referred to as titular—enjoyed autonomy, but they did not share an equal status with Russian. Aneta Pavlenko (2008: 7) describes this situation as “Russian speakers could afford to be monolingual, speakers of titular languages aspiring to social advancement had to be bilingual”. This demonstrates the social prestige of the Russian language, which has functioned as a lingua franca in interethnic communication. It is interesting to note that the Soviet language policies were specifically targeted at certain ethnicities and class members (see eq. Alpatov 2000; Weeks 2001). Therefore, it had various degrees of impact on the individual republics with some being more influenced by Russian than others.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, language management in the former Soviet republics underwent certain changes. Hogan-Brun and Melnyk (2012: 594) define three common language
policy patterns of the newly-formed states: strengthening of the national languages’ status, de-Russification and language shift, and promotion of minority languages.

The status planning included a number of linguistic legislations which proclaimed the titular languages of the Post-Soviet countries as “state” languages. The concept of a “state” language (which in English translations usually used as a synonym with the term “official”) in the context of the former Soviet republics possesses a symbolic value and usually is accompanied by a national flag and an anthem (Hogan-Brun and Melnyk 2012: 598). This type of language policy, driven by the goal to strengthen national identity, is described by Sposky and Shohamy. They write that a state language “takes a symbolic value much higher than an objective assessment of its economic or instrumental worth would suggest” (Spolsky & Shohamy 2000: 25). Often status planning has been given a higher priority than corpus planning. This leads to a limited use of titular languages, but grants them a crucial role in building a national identity.

Despite active status planning, the policy of de-Russification was not always successful and faced a number of problems. Pavlenko (2008: 9) lists them as following:

- significant number of Russian-speakers in the Post-Soviet countries;
- Soviet Russification policy of nations;
- Russian serving as a lingua franca in the heterogeneous ethnic composition;
- limited functionality of the titular languages.

These four factors had various results on the linguistic situation of each individual state. However, it is possible to discuss some of them in four geopolitically determined groups: Baltic states (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania), Slavic states (Ukraine, Belarus), Transcaucasian states (Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia), and Central Asian states (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan).

2.2.1 Baltic states

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania declared their titular languages official prior to the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Estonia was the first state to pass the Language Law in 1989, which stated that Estonian was the only official language of the state giving no status to Russian. This law required the use of Estonian not only in governmental bodies, but also in private organizations as well as minority schools. Latvia followed the example of Estonia and passed down a similar legislation, despite the discontent from the Russian-speaking minority. Lithuania, in contrast, implemented more liberal language policy, which included requirements only for state administration (Riegl and Vaško 2007: 3). Minority languages have received more support in the Baltic states with the growing influence of
the European Union. Today, the language policies for minority speakers in these countries can be described as “a form of integration that involves both the acquisition of the state language as a second language and the preservation of their first language and culture” (Hogan-Brun and Melnyk 2012: 614). Therefore, the language policies of the Baltic states were the most effective in the post-Soviet territories in terms of de-Russification and straightening the status of the titular languages.

2.2.2 Slavic states

Among all post-Soviet countries, Belarusian, as a titular language, has received the weakest support giving its way to Russian. Even though both languages possess official status in Belarus, Russian has a higher position and functionality, whereas Belarusian is often associated with low prestige. This is possible to observe in educational sector with a decreasing number of Belarusian medium schools (Hogan-Brun and Melnyk 2012: 615). In contrast, Ukraine has successfully raised the status of Ukrainian. One of the main reasons for this is the fact that the state is officially monolingual with Russian listed among other minority languages. The presence of Russian has been dramatically decreased in the public sphere. However, this is regionally dependent. For example, in the Eastern part of Ukraine Russian is still popular among young people (Pavlenko 2008: 12). One can imagine that current political situation has brought some changes to linguistic practices and the status of Russian in Ukraine.

2.2.3 Transcaucasian states

In Transcaucasian states, the titular languages have enjoyed a high status even in the Soviet Union. One of the main reasons of successful de-Russification is relatively dense monolingual population of the Transcaucasian states and the positive attitudes towards the titular languages. Today, Russian is considered a foreign language. The attitudes towards Russian, however, differ across the countries with the highest prestige in Armenia, neutral position in Azerbaijan, and the lowest in Georgia. In terms of minority languages, there is an active process of revitalization observed through the use in media, education, and cultural sphere (Hogan-Brun and Melnyk 2012: 617). Despite the fact that the use and influence of Russian varies greatly between the Transcaucasian states, the general trend is towards official monolingualism, where Russian functions as a foreign language.
2.2.4 Central Asian states

Central Asian states have acquired different language policies since gaining independence. Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan acknowledged the position of Russian as an official language, though still subordinate to Kazakh and Kyrgyz respectively. This decision can be explained by the large proportion of Russian speakers and Russification of titular nations, where ethnic Kazakh and Kyrgyz often have Russian as their strongest language (Hogan-Brun and Melnyk 2012: 617). For this reason, bilingualism is seen in public and private domains including education. In Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, in contrast, only titular languages have an official status. In Tajikistan, Russian is mentioned in the Constitution as a language of interethnic communication. The interest in Russian in both countries is quite high among the population despite the government's efforts of active de-Russification.

Turkmenistan is the only Central-Asian state where monolingualism is de jure and de facto (Hogan-Brun and Melnyk 2012: 612). In general, Central Asian states promote the policy of multilingualism in different degrees with an exception of Turkmenistan, where languages other than Turkmen do not receive any support.

2.3 Sociolinguistic situation in Kazakhstan

This section will first briefly cover historical and demographical background of Kazakhstan. Then, it will focus on its language policy including language management, practices, and attitudes. Lastly, the issue of language identity in Kazakhstan will be discussed.

2.3.1 Historical and demographical background

The territory of Kazakhstan until the eighteenth century was inhabited by nomadic tribes, which formed the Kazakh Khanate and spoke the Turkic language, which later evolved into the modern Kazakh language. The language spoken in the Kazakh Khanate was a part of Turkic language family among Kyrgyz, Uzbek, Turkish, Tatar, Kalmyk, and others. During the first part of the eighteenth century, The Kazakh Khanate, seeking military support to protect its land from Dzungar invasions, became a part of the Russian Empire (Smagulova 2008: 441–442). For the next two hundred fifty years, Kazakhstan was highly influenced by the Russian language and culture, especially during the Soviet Union years. Russian is one of the Slavic languages and has little in common with Kazakh.

According to Smagulova (2008: 444), by the 1960s, Kazakhs became a minority in their own country with the population dropping almost twice compared to 1926, 30% and 58% respectively. This was
caused by a number of Soviet economic policies: collectivization, forced deportation, industrialization, and campaign of Virgin Lands. Nevertheless, the role of the Kazakh language as a symbol of ethnic identity remained high for local people. The demographic situation in Kazakhstan has gone back to its usual state by the resolution of the USSR. In 1999, Kazakhs constituted 53% of the population.


Table 2. Ethnic composition of the population (% of the total population) (RK Statistic Agency, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>62.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>30.02</td>
<td>23.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbek</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uigur</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatar</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that Kazakhs are the major ethnic group following by Russians which constitute almost a quarter of the total population of Kazakhstan.

2.3.2 Language management in Kazakhstan

According to the Constitution, Kazakh is the sole state language, while Russian also has an official status. The superior status of the Kazakh language has been emphasized in a number of legislations, such as “Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan” (1995), “On regime of control of the implementation of language legislation” (1996), “The Language Law” (1997), “Principles of extension of the spheres of use of the state language” (2006) (Smagulova 2008: 449).

These legal documents issued by the state are a part of the language policy of Kazakhization. It is a top-down linguistic program which is aimed at introducing Kazakh to all the spheres of social life.
starting with the transfer of all paperwork into the Kazakh language by 2010. This state program required all businesses to issue documents in both Kazakh and Russian. In reality, this program has been executed only on the level of state institutions since these were closely controlled. Private businesses continue to issue their documents in Russian due to low Kazakh proficiency of the workers (Smagulova 2008: 452).

This situation reveals a deeper problem which cannot be solved by issuing language legislation: the majority of the population do not possess sufficient language skills to be able to use Kazakh in work settings. Smagulova (2008: 453) writes that the language lacks formal terms, modern vocabulary, and stylistic variations that are needed to be used in business and science. People—who are put in a situation where they have to use Kazakh in the spheres which have not been previously managed in Kazakh—are forced to be creative and invent new terms and phrases. This creates a chaotic linguistic situation and results in incomprehensible and ungrammatical texts.

Rivers (2002) discussed challenges of language policy makers in Kazakhstan. He points out that after the resolution of the Soviet Union there was no infrastructure for the development of the Kazakh language: “...upon independence, primary education in Kazakh was offered at one school in Almaty and nowhere else in the country” (Rivers 2002: 160). Another issue which policy makers face in Kazakhstan is the shift towards Russian among the urban youth due to the spread of English. In cases of bilingualism, English often replaces Kazakh becoming the youth's second strongest language after Russian (Rivers 2002:160). Despite the recent improvements in access to Kazakh learning and its intensive status planning, language shift towards Russian among the young urban population is evident.

In spite of the policy of Kazakhization, multilingualism is also encouraged by the state. The former president of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, strongly emphasized the importance of language equality preventing ethnic and language discrimination. The influence of the Russian language in Kazakhstan is unarguable obvious. Nowadays, Russian, being the first language of many Kazakhs, has great communicative value not only in interethnic interaction but also often between Kazakhs themselves. In the 1995 Constitution, Russian was given a status of an official language, whereas Kazakh was named a state language. This requires all legislative documents and administrative services to be in both languages. However, the formulation of status of the Russian language varies in different legislations from ‘[i]n state organizations and local government bodies Russian is officially used on equal footing with Kazakh’ (Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Article
7) to ‘could be used if necessary’ in the Law on Languages (Smagulova 2008: 454). This creates an ambiguous situation in regards of the status of Russian.

When it comes to the language of instructions in schools, parents are free to choose between Kazakh and Russian. The option of choosing a language of instruction is explained by the state having two official languages. Russian is a compulsory subject in Kazakh-medium schools. Similarly, Kazakh is always taught in Russian-medium schools. Both languages are a part of the standardized final examination upon the graduation of school. This model is similar to the Finnish school system, where Swedish is a required subject due to its official status (Spolsky & Shohamy 2000: 14). The school curriculum is unified, which makes it possible to transfer from a Kazakh-medium school to a Russian one and vice-versa. From 1989 to 2007, the percentage of pupils in Kazakh-medium schools increased almost by half, 30.2% and 54.8% respectively. However, in urban areas, the number of Russian-medium schools is still higher compared to Kazakh ones. This could be caused by the fact that the majority of Russian speakers live in cities. Higher education is available in both languages (Smagulova 2008: 456).

A case study by Lydia Catedral and Madina Djuraeva (2018) shed light on possible reasons behind the choice of language of instruction for children. The authors interviewed three parents, two of which reside in Kazakhstan. The first participant was a Kazakh father of two children of under school age. When asked about what school he would like his children to attend, he gives his preference to a Kazakh-medium school. He explains it by saying that having graduated from a Russian-medium school himself, “he wants his children to be more patriotic” (Catedral & Djuraeva, 2018: 510). Moreover, he associates Russian-medium schools with low morality, smoking, and drinking. The second participant was an Uighur woman who went to an Uighur school in Kazakhstan. She was also interviewed about her school preference for her future children. Similar to the first participant, she chooses a Kazakh-medium school. When asked why, she explains the closeness of Uighur and Kazakh cultures and the importance of speaking Kazakh in Kazakhstan. In addition, she provides an example of her older siblings, who went to a Russian-medium school, and argues that their Russification has negatively affected their behavior. She calls it “a mistake” that her mother did and “decided to fix” by sending her to an Uighur school (Catedral & Djuraeva, 2018: 512). The qualitative data of this study is a great example of existing language ideologies in Kazakhstan. It is clear that the participants grant Kazakh a high status aligning it with the feeling of patriotism and morality.
2.3.3 Language practices and attitudes

It is a common problem of sociolinguists to be able to objectively assess existing language use of a speech community. Often quantitate data collected to identify a number of people speaking a language is unreliable (Spolsky & Shohamy 2000: 30). In regards to language practices among ethnic Kazaks, the situation is ambiguous. Most of the available statistics is based on National Censuses, where people self-report their language proficiency in state languages, but do not report on their actual language use. Bhavna Davé in her study “Entitlement through numbers: nationality and language categories in the first post-Soviet census of Kazakhstan” (2004: 450) criticizes the 1999 National Census for its question on the knowledge of Kazakh, where people had to choose from four answers: know, know weakly, do not know, and learning. Fluency is not mentioned in this question, allowing people to give a positive response, having only limited Kazakh proficiency. The author also claims that the question is “based entirely on subjective evaluation, is methodologically flawed, as overestimation of language skills is common in self-evaluation and evaluation of students” (Davé 2004: 451). Therefore, it is possible to argue that Census data is not a reliable source to state people's actual language proficiency or language practices.

Making the same argument in regards of creditability of self-reported language proficiency, Henryk Jankowski (2012: 25) has collected a number of examples of various language use during his fieldwork in 10 major cities as well as some villages in Kazakhstan between 2006 and 2012. His material included spontaneous discourse, dialogues with locals, commercial ads, language used on television, and other language practices in different spheres of social life. Jankowski describes his experiments when he pretended not to speak Russian and tried to force Kazakhs to speak Kazakh to him. Interestingly, they would prefer to switch to English. However, when he would use Kazakh with Kazakhs, they usually would not have a problem understanding him. He further questions the low Kazakh proficiency being the main issue, suggesting that it is the language attitudes which make people choose Russian over Kazakh: “They do not speak Kazakh not because they do not know it, but because they do not want to speak it” (Jankowski 2012: 32). This proves that language attitudes play crucial role in language use in Kazakhstan.

In 2007, the international nonprofit research agency Eurasian Monitor in cooperation with the nonprofit Eurasian Heritage Foundation conducted a large-scale sociological survey to analyze the status of Russian among 13 Post-Soviet countries, including Kazakhstan. The Kazakhstan sample consisted of 1057 participants and was ethnically representative of the population (Eurasian Monitor and Eurasian Heritage Foundation 2007). According to the findings, 84% of the Kazakhstan sample
are fluent in Russian, 12% have basic communication skills, 3% have only receptive skills, and only 1% do not speak Russian at all (figure 1).

Figure 1. Reported Russian proficiency among Kazakhstani population (Eurasian Monitor and Eurasian Heritage Foundation 2007)

Smagulova in her work “Language Identity and Conflict” (2006) uses information from the 2004 Statistical Yearbook, when discussing language proficiency. According to it, 75% of Kazakhs are proficient in Russian, while 25% are monolingual Kazakh speakers. This is region dependent, with the highest population of Kazakh speakers in South and West. In North and East, more than half of Kazakhs do not speak the language (Smagulova 2006: 304). Again, the link between language proficiency and actual practice is not universal: one can report to 'know' the language, but not speak it.

To have a more realistic picture of the language situation in the country, a team of Kazakh researchers, including Smagulova, conducted a large-scale survey on reported language proficiency, use, and attitudes towards language policies issued by the state. The data was collected between 2005 and 2007 at schools, universities, and workplaces in different regions of Kazakhstan using convenience sampling method. There were 2255 respondents consisting of five main ethnic groups: Kazakhs, Russians, respondents of Turkic and Slavic backgrounds, and other ethnicities. 1548 females and 703 males took part in the survey. The respondents were divided into four age groups: 23 and younger, 24–35, 36–55, and older than 55 (Smagulova 2008: 459).

From the results of the survey, it is obvious that Russian remains the preferred language of communication among the majority of the respondents. It is highly-widespread among Kazakhs and almost universal among other ethnic groups. The percentage of monolingual Kazakhs turned out to be only 5.7% (Smagulova 2008: 461). When it comes to language use, there is a clear mismatch
between reported proficiency in Kazakh and its reported use. While more than 95% of Kazakhs reported either high or sufficient proficiency in Kazakh, less than half of them say they use it at work and only 70% reported to use it with friends. Furthermore, it turned out that younger Kazakhs reported more frequent use of Kazakh with their friends than others (Smagulova 2008: 464–465). Last but not least, the respondents were asked if they agreed that Kazakh should be a single state language and required as a school subject. About half of them agreed with the first statement, while 37.8% disagreed, and 8.2% remained indecisive. In contrast, the answers to the second question are quite homogeneous: respondents from all ethnic groups agreed that Kazakh should be taught in schools (Smagulova 2008: 466–467).

Based on the survey's results, the researchers concluded that Kazakh is gaining social prestige. The majority of the respondents acknowledge the importance of learning Kazakh for their children. However, they resist to fully replace Russian with Kazakh, as it still plays a huge role in their day-to-day communication. The pattern from the survey results seem to imply that the preferred linguistic policy is multilingualism (Smagulova 2008: 468). The findings of this study agree with the interview analysis by Lydia Catedral and Madina Djuraeva (2018) mentioned previously. Both suggest that despite having high proficiency in Russian—often it being the strongest language—Kazakhs recognize the importance of speaking Kazakh and regard it as a crucial attribute of their ethnic identity.

### 2.3.4 Family language policy

Researchers Amantay, Myrzabayeva, and Karabay (2017) collected a qualitative case study which aimed to identify Kazakh family language ideologies, practices, and management. Their data collection included surveys, interviews, and observations at home. The participants were 8 Kazakh parents from Astana, Almaty, and Shymkent. The results showed that the most common language ideology among the participants derives from the value of Kazakh as a national symbol. Namely, “Kazakh should speak Kazakh” (Amantay et al. 2017: 16). Among the language practices observed by the authors, code-switching was the dominant strategy used in communication of the families. Interestingly, the language could change based on the settings or subject of interaction. As one of the participants reported in the interview, “For as long as I can remember, my parents and I and all our relatives have spoken Russian. I spoke Kazakh only when I was in my grandmother’s village in the summer” (Amantay et al. 2017: 16). Thus, the researchers suggested that Kazakh is often used with the elder to demonstrate respect. Overall, despite the participants' strong language ideology in favor
of Kazakh, Russian also plays an important role in everyday communication through code-switching or dominant use.

These conclusions are in line with the findings of a quantitative study implemented by the Eurasian Monitor and the Eurasian Heritage Foundation (2007) which was mentioned earlier. The results showed that while 45% of the participants in Kazakhstan use Russian at home, 30% use both Russian and Kazakh, and 23% use Kazakh only (Eurasian Monitor and Eurasian Heritage Foundation 2007). A similar study among 6 independent states was conducted in 2017 where Kazakhstani sample consisted of 258 participants. According to it, Russian is the most popular language for communication in families (53.7%), preceding Kazakh (37.4%), and the smallest group using both languages (8.9%) (Maximova et al. 2018: 3). After comparing the two studies, it is possible to suggest that after 10 years, the number of bilingual families has dropped from 30% to 8.9%, whereas the number of Kazakh-only speaking families has increased by 14%. However, these differences might be explained by different sampling methods. Unfortunately, the article by Maximova does not provide these details.

2.3.5 Mankurtism and urban Kazakh youth

When studying language attitudes among college students in Kazakhstan, Rivers (2002) utilizes a term *mankurtism*, which has an interesting meaning. Kyrgyz writer, Chingiz Aitmatov, was the one who introduced the term *mankurt* in his novel “И дольше века длится день” [day lasts more than one hundred years] (Rivers 2002: 161). The writer used the term to describe a mythological Kazakh slave who was tortured and forced to wear constrictive headgear which made him lose his memory (Aitmanov 1983). Since then, the word *mankurt* has been used to refer to a person who forgets about his past and ancestry, which makes him easily influenced (Serov 2003). Further, Davé (1996) finds the term being used by Kazakh nationalists to describe Russified urban Kazakhs who allegedly neglected their native language and culture and replaced it with Russian (Davé 1996: 52). Finally, Rivers chooses to use the term *mankurtism* as “the expression of the desire by college-age Kazakhs to raise their admittedly prospective children in Russian, rather than Kazakh” (Rivers 2002: 162).

Aiming to analyze the level of mankurtism among Kazakhstani college students, the researcher collected a survey among 8 universities across the country in 1999. Besides the question on preferred language for raising prospective children in, the survey asked to additionally report their gender, ethnicity, place of residence, mother tongue and etc. The study revealed that female students were more likely to raise their future children in a language other than Kazakh (Russian, or a combination
of languages including English). In addition, younger participants were more likely to give a preference to Kazakh in this matter. Lastly, high reported proficiency in Russian and urban residence positively influenced students' choice towards Russian. However, gender turned out to be the strongest factor in choosing a language to raise children in. Rivers suggests that females take a more pragmatic approach to choosing a language for their children, whereas males tend to attach nationalistic feelings to it (Rivers 2002: 168).

2.3.6 Language Identity in Kazakhstan

Language identity is a complex issue in the context of Kazakhstan. Fierman argues that despite the fact that Russian is the first and strongest language of many ethnic Kazakhs, they do not report it as their “native” language (Fierman 1998: 174). Smagulova explains it by the strong national identity of the Kazakh people. Even though 25% to 40% of all Kazakhs do not speak Kazakh, 99.4% of them reported it as their native language in the Census 1999 (Smagulova 2006: 312).

Similar situation is observed on the level of the state language management. Kazakhs are often expected to know “their own” language when it comes to job opportunities. The same requirements do not apply to representatives of other nationalities (Smagulova 2006: 313). Fierman provides an example from a newspaper published in 1989, which he summarized as follows:

It is desirable for everyone in Kazakhstan to know Kazakh. For managerial jobs it is acceptable if non-Kazakhs do not know the language. But for ethnic Kazakhs, knowledge of the mother tongue should be required. Without knowledge of it, ethnic Kazakhs are not worthy individuals to hold management positions. (Fierman 1998: 183)

This demonstrates a popular opinion that a Kazakh has to speak Kazakh. Language policy is often aimed specifically at Kazakhs. This creates a situation where Russian-speaking Kazakhs often have to face shaming for not speaking their “native language”.

The above-mentioned sources confirm the fact that Russian is widely used not only as a lingua franca in Kazakhstan, but also among Kazakhs themselves. Russian is the first and strongest language of many Kazakhs. However, the language policy of Kazakhization grants Kazakh a high symbolic value. According to the Census data, majority of Kazakhs reported Kazakh as their mother tongue. In this complex sociolinguistic context, it is interesting to explore the linguistic identification of young Russian-speaking Kazakhs. The research question is what the relationship between Kazakh
proficiency and identified mother tongue of Russian-speaking Kazakh youth is. The secondary research question is what criteria affects their mother tongue identification, and how it is related to their background.
3. Research design

This chapter briefly describes the empirical part of the study and its general structure. Data collection of the study consists of two phases which are presented first. Then, ethical considerations will be discussed in detail.

3.1 The two phases of the empirical study

This study utilizes mixed methods which correspond to its two phases. The first phase is based on quantitative data which is collected using online questionnaire. Its main aim is to find out what language urban Kazakh youth define as their mother tongue. In addition, it is designed to analyze possible correlations between the participants’ mother tongue and other background variables. The questionnaire design is discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

After statistical analysis of the questionnaire data, the second phase of the study was designed. Its data collection method is online interviews which involves a smaller number of participants. The qualitative data analysis is aimed to further study mother tongue identification of the target group. The two empirical phases were implemented consequently because the focus of the qualitative phase is determined on the basis of the quantitative results. Therefore, the quantitative method as well as its results will be presented first, followed by the interview design and the qualitative data analysis.

3.2 Ethical considerations

Since this study utilizes participants, it is crucial to consider research ethics in order not to cause any harm for the participants as well as provide them with all relevant information about the study. For these reasons, both questionnaire and interview participants were presented with Participant Information before they had to give their consent for participation. Now, I will describe in detail how the ethical questions were handled for both data collection methods.

For the questionnaire, it was decided to include the relevant information and the consent form in the beginning of the questionnaire (see Appendix A). It included a short information for participants: purpose of the study, target group, description of personal data protection. Respondents were then asked if they would like to read full participant information. If their answer was yes, then a new section became visible which included detailed information about the study, its aim, methodology, as well as contact details of the researcher. This section was chosen not to be visible by default because too much text in the beginning of the questionnaire could discourage participants from
proceeding to the questions. This way, all of the participants were offered a chance to read the long
version of the participant information by answering yes to the question “Would you like to read full
participant information?” At the end of the section, respondents had to tick a box “I have read the
Participant Information” (in its short or long form). The next section asked for participants' consent
to voluntarily participate in the study. This section also included a description of personal data
protection. If the participants gave their consent, the questions of the questionnaire became visible
to them.

It is important to note that the respondents answered the questionnaire anonymously. It is impossible
for anyone including me to identify them unless they gave their consent to participate in a further
interview for which they were asked to leave their contact information (email address or a phone
number). These as well as all the other collected data is stored in the UEF OneDrive system which
can only be accessed with a username and password.

Due to the fact that the interviews were conducted online, it was impractical to have the participants
physically sign a consent form. Therefore, before the interview, the participants were sent a link to
E-lomake form, which included Participant Information as well as asked for their consent to
participate. It differed from the one used in the questionnaire since the interviews collected more
data as well as required recording. The form is available Appendix B.

Interview recordings and transcripts are safely stored with the quantitative data in the UEF OneDrive
protected by a username and password. More information about personal data protection of this
study can be found in the privacy notice for scientific research in Appendix C. The quantitative and
qualitative results will be reported anonymously without mentioning any personal information of
the participants which could be used to identify them.
4. Data and method of quantitative phase

This chapter is devoted to the quantitative phase of the study. It includes description of the questionnaire design as well as method of analysis of the collected data.

4.1 Questionnaire design

The aim of the questionnaire is to identify what language the participants report as their mother tongue as well as to search for possible correlations with other variables (gender, age, ethnicity, location, education, language of instruction in school, time spent abroad, reported language proficiency in Russian, Kazakh, English, family language policy, language use among friends, at work, and at school). Also, due to the lack of statistical information on language use among young Kazakhs, the results are expected to give an idea of the current ratio between Russian and Kazakh speaking young Kazakhs. Even though the main target group of the research is young urban Kazakhs, the questionnaire's only predetermined criterion is age. The age limits are from 18 to 28 years old because people born in 1992 represent the first generation born in independent Kazakhstan. The participants' ethnicity, location, and strongest language are not limited. This is done to enable further analysis of data in case of insufficient findings.

Originally, the questionnaire was planned to be distributed only in Russian. The English version was created for the purpose of analysis. However, it was later decided that the respondents should be given the option of choosing between Russian, Kazakh, and English. This way, monolingual Kazakh speakers are not excluded from the sample. Even though they are not the target group of the study, their answers could be also interesting to consider. First, the questionnaire was created in Russian, since it is my strongest and first language. Then, I translated it into English keeping in mind the research questions and aiming for the same meaning rather than “word-to-word” translation. The Kazakh translation was made with the help of friends and family, since I do not speak enough Kazakh. The quality of translation was assessed between two main translators. It is important to note that with the Kazakh translation, the translators were not included in the whole research process as it is recommended by Berman and Tyyskä (2010). The translators were given the Russian version of the questionnaire and were asked to translate it into Kazakh without any further instructions. However, the translators were aware of the research questions and methodology, as the original source text included Participant Information section with the details about the study. By the end of the data collection, only 5 participants chose to answer the Kazakh translation and 9 preferred the English version. Together they represent only 5% of the respondents. Therefore, the translation of the questionnaire has not significantly affected the data analysis. Finally, three parallel
questionnaires in Russian, Kazakh, and English were designed on E-lomake platform. Appendix A includes the English version of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire included 33 questions, 31 of which were obligatory. The questionnaire consisted of four main sections: information for participants and consent, background information, proficiency levels in three languages (Russian, Kazakh, English), and language use. The first section is discussed in detail in the third chapter. The second section comprised general questions on the participants' background as well as language-related questions (see Appendix A). Next section included questions on language proficiency in Russian, Kazakh, and English respectively. Each of them had the same four questions related to different language skills: listening comprehension, reading comprehension, speaking, and writing. There were three options for each question: fluently, with difficulty, no proficiency (for example, speaking: I speak fluently, I speak with difficulty, I don't speak). These options were borrowed from an earlier study by Smagulova (2008) when her and other researchers asked the participants to report their proficiency in Kazakh and Russian. Even though these options are rough, they seemed suitable for this study and they enabled me to compare my results to the study of Smagulova.

The following section asked the respondents what languages they used the most with mother, father, mother's parents, father's parents, friends, at work or at school. The idea to differentiate language use with maternal and paternal grandparents was borrowed from Rivers' study (2002). The researcher's questionnaire included detailed questions on family language use to seek for correlations between languages used with family members and participants' preferred language of instruction in school for future children (Rivers 2002). Lastly, the participants were asked to leave any questions or comments they might have and give their consent to be contacted further for an online interview. If they chose yes, they were asked to leave their contact information.

The questionnaire was piloted with the use of four friends and family members of the target age. They were asked to time their answering process as well as to share any comments in the follow-up interview. The interview was unstructured and held via phone call. The participants’ feedback was mainly positive with some remarks on the questions concerning language proficiency. Originally, there was only one question on each language. Later, it was decided to extend each language questions into four skills. The feedback was useful and identified areas which needed improvements.

The questionnaire was distributed online using different social media channels. The data was
collected by convenience sampling. This means that I recruited participants who fit the target criteria by posting the invitation online and asking friends and family to distribute it further. Data collection lasted five days from March 19th to March 24th. The questionnaire was answered by 257 participants; 243 of them preferred the Russian form, 5 Kazakh, and 9 English.

4.2 Methods of analysis

Due to the fact that the collected data was quantitative, statistical methods were used to analyze it. The original file with the data was extracted from E-lomake platform as a csv file. Then, it was cleaned and reorganized using Python. Each row had a submission ID, while each column represented a question of the questionnaire. A subset of the data including only ethnic Kazakhs was extracted. Then, crosstabulations of a dependent variable, mother tongue, and all independent variables were created. For each crosstabulation a Chi-square test was run. Ordinal data was coded and tested for correlation using Mann-Whitney test.
5. Quantitative results

The quantitative results are reported in the following order. The chapter starts with a general demographic overview of the sample, then it continues with a summary of the participants’ family languages and their reported language competence. Finally, mother tongue crosstabulations with the variables which showed significant correlations are presented.

5.1 Data overview

Tables 3a–c demonstrate the demographic overview of the sample. Due to convenience sampling, the values are not representative of the young population in Kazakhstan. Almost 3/4 of the sample are females, and the majority comes from the urban part of North Kazakhstan. This could be due to the northern location of the capital, Nur-Sultan, and the fact that young people tend to move to cities for studies and work opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3a. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3b. Place of residence

| Region                                         | Frequency | Percent |
|                                               |           |         |
| North Kazakhstan (Nur-Sultan, Pavlodar, Kokshetau) | 151       | 59%     |
| South Kazakhstan (Almaty, Shymkent, Taraz)    | 75        | 29%     |
| West Kazakhstan (Aktobe, Atyray, Aktau)       | 18        | 7%      |
| Central Kazakhstan (Karaganda, Temirtau, Balkhash) | 11        | 4%      |
| East Kazakhstan (Ust-Kamenogorsk, Semey, Ridder) | 2         | 1%      |
| Total                                         | 257       | 100%    |

Table 3c. Region of residence

Ethnic composition is shown in table 4. Kazakhs, being the focus group of the study, are the
majority with 87%, followed by Russian with 4%. Others include Kyrgyz, Korean, Uzbek, Uighur, Tatar, Ukrainian, and Belorussian.

Table 4. Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 2a and 2b comprise mother tongue distributions among the whole sample and its subset of Kazakhs. The most common answer was Kazakh (175). Interestingly, it was chosen only by ethnic Kazakhs; respondents of other ethnicities chose either Russian or other languages. Among Kazakhs, 78% reported Kazakh as their mother tongue, 20% Russian, and 2% other.

5.2 Family languages

Table 5 presents languages used with family members by ethnic Kazakhs. The data shows that Kazakh participants often use different languages with different family members. Not surprisingly, Kazakh is used more with older generation. Also, Kazakh is used with fathers by 10% more than with mothers. It is interesting that, although 78% of Kazakhs report their mother tongue as Kazakh, still c. 60% of them use Russian with their parents.
Table 5. Languages used with family members among Kazakhs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used with</th>
<th>Mother (N=218)</th>
<th>Father (N=205)</th>
<th>Maternal Grandparents (N=206)</th>
<th>Paternal Grandparents (N=190)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Language proficiency

In order to compare the reported language proficiency by ethnicity, the mean values of the four skills were calculated. Those, whose estimated mean value was 3 (on the scale of 1–3) are represented in table 6. It is clear that Russian is the language of high proficiency among all ethnicities in the sample. Kazakh, however, has less fluent speakers than English. Those who are fluent in Kazakh are mainly ethnic Kazakhs.

Table 6. Fluency in Kazakh, Russian, English by ethnicity (N=257)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Kazakhs</th>
<th>Russians</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking into language skills of Kazakh group (table 7), it can be noticed that fluency in Russian is quite high in all language aspects. In regards to Kazakh, receptive skills seem to be the easier than speech production. Similar trend is observed in English fluency. Interestingly, the fraction of Kazakhs who reported fluent speaking in Kazakh and English is nearly the same (50% and 49.8%)
Table 7. Fluency by language skills among Kazakhs (N=223)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Mother tongue and independent variables

To answer the research question, ethnic Kazakhs' mother tongue values were tested for relationship with all independent variables. Eight of them showed statistically significant dependence. They were languages used with family members, time spent abroad, strongest language, language of instruction in school, and proficiency in Kazakh.

5.4.1 Measure of Association

For the purpose of accurate analysis of dependence, the participants' answers “Other” were excluded from the main group which now consisted of 173 submissions. This left two options for each question on language use: Kazakh or Russian.

Due to the fact that Chi-square value is affected by sample size, the crosstabulations and respective p-values cannot be meaningfully compared. To visually see the relationships between variables, a measure-of-association matrix was created (figure 3). It includes eight independent variables which, when tested, demonstrated strong dependency with mother tongue. The measure of association matrix allows one to compare the levels of relationships between variables. The values for nominal data in the matrix are Cramer's V which are based on Pearson's Chi-square test. The values for continuous variables are Pearson's R. 0 shows no relationship between variables, while 1 means that they are the same. The lighter the color, the stronger the correlation between the variables.

The matrix demonstrates that independent variables are in different levels of dependency with the participants' mother tongue. The strongest correlation is seen with Kazakh proficiency (Cramer's V=0.46, p<.001). The smallest value is observed when mother tongue is associated with the strongest language (Cramer's V=0.14, p=.023). However, it is important to note that the latter
dependency is still statistically significant with p-value being less than 0.05.

Figure 3 also includes correlations between other variables. Not surprisingly, the strongest relationship is between family languages: language used with father is highly correlated with language used with mother and paternal grandparents. One interesting observation is that strongest language of the participants has the largest dependency with language used with mother, followed by language of instruction in school and only then language used with father. In contrast, mother tongue is correlated more with language used with father than with mother. A negative association between time abroad and Kazakh proficiency indicates that an increase in time spent abroad is correlated with a decrease in the participants' Kazakh language skills.

5.4.2 Mother tongue and family languages

After analyzing correlations of the sample in a broader sense, certain cases of dependencies are reported in more detail. This aimed to suggest possible interpretations of statistical test results. Among the family languages, language used with father demonstrated the strongest dependency with mother tongue, $X^2(1)=30.3$, p<.001. Table 8 shows that 100% of Kazakhs who speak Kazakh with their fathers reported it as their mother tongue. In contrast, those who speak Russian with their fathers still prefer to report Kazakh over Russian as their mother tongue (66% and 33%).
Table 8. Crosstabulation of mother tongue and language used with father among Kazakhs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language used with father</th>
<th>Mother tongue</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When it comes to grandparents, the situation is quite similar (table 9). Around 90% of Kazakhs who use Kazakh with grandparents on both sides choose Kazakh as their mother tongue. Those who use Russian, still mainly choose Kazakh mother tongue over it (c. 64%).

Table 9. Crosstabulation of mother tongue and language used with grandparents among Kazakhs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language used with maternal grandparents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 demonstrates mother tongue answers crosstabulated with language used with mother, $X^2(1)=13.9$, $p<.001$. This proves the strong correlation between the variables. Table 10 shows that those who use Kazakh with their mother are very likely to report Kazakh as their mother tongue (98%). However, when Russian is used with mother, it does not mean that reported mother tongue is Russian. In this case, mother tongue choice is influenced by other variables.
Table 10. Crosstabulation of mother tongue and language used with mother among Kazakhs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language used with mother</th>
<th>Mother Tongue</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.3 Mother tongue and language of instruction in school

Now, it is interesting to explore possible mother tongue correlations inside a smaller group: Kazakhs who speak Russian with their mother. Since language of instruction in school has previously shown highly significant correlation among the Kazakh group, $X^2(1)=14.8$, $p<.001$, it was tested for dependence with mother tongue among Kazakhs who speak Russian with their mother, $X^2(1)=5.8$, $p=.016$ (table 11). This proves that language of school still correlates with mother tongue even among the smaller group: those who went to Kazakh school are more likely to choose Kazakh as their mother tongue even if they speak Russian with their mother (89%). Among graduates of Russian schools, the majority (69%) still reports Kazakh as their mother tongue despite the fact that they use Russian with their mother. Therefore, except the above-mentioned variables (language spoken with mother and language of instruction in school), there are other factors which make up the participants' choice towards Kazakh.

Table 11. Crosstabulation of mother tongue and language of instruction in school among Kazakhs who speak Russian with their mother

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of instructions in school</th>
<th>Mother Tongue</th>
<th>Kazakh</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.4 Mother tongue and time spent abroad

To check correlation between time spent abroad and mother tongue, the categories were coded from 0 (haven't been abroad) to 5 (more than 24 months). Then, due to the ordinal nature of data, non-parametric Mann-Whitney test was conducted. Time spent abroad turned out to correlate with mother tongue among all tested groups: Ethnic Kazakhs (U=2599.0, p<.001), Kazakhs who speak Russian with mother (U=1880.0, p=.004) and Kazakhs who speak Russian with mother and went to Russian school (U=980.5, p=.009). The test has rejected the null hypothesis proving that Kazakh and Russian mother tongue participants significantly differ in their travelling periods. The contrast among all Kazakhs is presented in figure 4. While over 1/4 of Kazakhs who reported Kazakh as mother tongue have never been abroad, 1/3 of Kazakhs with Russian as mother tongue have spent more than 2 years outside of Kazakhstan. Therefore, it is possible to suggest that Kazakhs who have spent more time abroad are more likely to report Russian as their mother tongue. However, this difference could be caused by a third factor, for example, social class. Unfortunately, this variable was not controlled in this study.

![Figure 4. Time spent abroad presented by mother tongue groups among all Kazakhs](image)

5.4.5 Mother tongue and Kazakh proficiency

The variable which demonstrated the strongest correlation with mother tongue is Kazakh proficiency. It is presented in the figure 5, where the x-axis shows the mean values of Kazakh language skills and the y-axis is a percent of Kazakh participants with respective proficiency scores. The scores of two mother tongue groups were tested with Mann-Whitney test, U=1421.5, p<.001. Figure 5 allows to
visually understand such strong correlation: those who reported Kazakh as their mother tongue have a higher Kazakh proficiency score. In fact, over a half of them reported to be fluent in all language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) with a mean score of 3. The group with Russian mother tongue demonstrated much lower Kazakh proficiency: under 5% reported to be fluent, while the most common score was 2.25. Therefore, the higher participants' Kazakh proficiency, the more they are likely to report Kazakh as their mother tongue.

Figure 5. Kazakh proficiency mean presented by mother tongue groups among all Kazakhs

5.4.6 Mother tongue and strongest language

Among the above-mentioned variables, strongest language is in the weakest dependency with mother tongue, $X^2(1)=5.2$, $p=0.023$. Looking at table 12, it is clear that Kazakh and Russian speakers do not choose their mother tongue equally between Kazakh and Russian. The number of participants with Russian as the mother tongue is much lower than the number of Russian speakers. The majority of Russian-speakers still chooses Kazakh as mother tongue despite having Russian as the strongest language. In contrast, all Kazakh speakers, being the minority of the sample (11% of all Kazakhs) report Kazakh as their mother tongue.

Table 12. Crosstabulation of mother tongue and strongest language among Kazakhs (% N=214)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mother tongue</th>
<th>Strongest L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, strongest language is in strong dependency with language used with mother, $X^2(1)=59.2$, p<.001. The participants who speak Russian with their mother are very likely to have it as their strongest language. Although, more than a half of those who use Kazakh with mother are more comfortable speaking Russian (table 13). Overall, Russian is the dominant language of the sample and the language most spoken with mother.

Table 13. Crosstabulation of language used with mother and strongest language among Kazakhs (%), N=215

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>L used with mother</th>
<th>Strongest L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.7 Mother tongue and Kazakh language use

To understand the participants' language use and how it relates to their mother tongue identification, I decided to create a Kazakh use score, which is determined by the following questions:

1. language of instruction in school;
2. language used with mother;
3. language used with father;
4. language used with maternal grandparents;
5. language used with paternal grandparents;
6. language used with friends;
7. language used at work or studies.

The participants receive one point for each time they answered “Kazakh” to the 7 questions listed above. The score was not calculated for the participants who answered “other” to language use questions. Overall, the score was estimated for 170 ethnic Kazakhs.

Table 14 shows that no participants with a score more than 3 reported Russian as their mother tongue. What is really surprising is the fact that among those who reported no use of Kazakh at all (with score 0) more than a half still chose it as their mother tongue.
Table 14. Mother tongue crosstabulated by Kazakh use score among Kazakhs (N=170)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mother Tongue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kazakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When looking into scores of Kazakh mother tongue group (figure 6), one can see that the most common score is 0: 18% of those who reported Kazakh as their mother tongue do not speak it with their family, friends or at work. In addition, only 4% of the Kazakh mother tongue participants have chosen Kazakh as their only language used in daily life.

![Figure 6. Kazakh use score among the Kazakh mother tongue group (N=137)](image)

It has become clear that the participants who are fluent in Kazakh or often use it in their daily life report Kazakh as their mother tongue. However, it is curious that out of 47 participants who reported no use of Kazakh at all, 25 (i.e. 53%) still chose Kazakh as their mother tongue. Their Kazakh
proficiency mean is 2.25 out of 3 (figure 7), which means that most of them do not speak Kazakh fluently. They constitute 11% of the whole ethnic Kazakh sample.

Now, the question is what makes those 25 participants prefer Kazakh over Russian if they do not use it or even cannot use it due to insufficient proficiency? The qualitative part of this research aims to answer this question.

Figure 7. Kazakh proficiency among the group with Kazakh mother tongue and no Kazakh use
6. Data and method of qualitative phase

As already mentioned in the chapter 3, the qualitative phase was designed based on the quantitative results. This chapter provides a detailed description of the interview design, its participants as well as method of qualitative data analysis.

The questionnaire responses were used to create appropriate interview questions and recruit participants. The aim of the interviews was to receive a more in-depth understanding of reasons for mother tongue identification among the Russian-speaking Kazakh youth. The interview was designed semi-structured allowing to change the order of questions and adjust it to interviewees' narrative. When designing questions, I kept in mind the importance of the narrative approach. According to Mary Bucholtz and Kira Hall (2010), discourse is the only way to study one's identity. Therefore, it was important for me to let the interviewees tell their stories and only lead the conversation to cover important parts. All of the interviews were held in Russian, since it was indicated as the strongest language of proficiency among the interviewees.

6.1 Participants

Interview participants were planned to be recruited from the questionnaire respondents. Altogether 101 questionnaire participants agreed to be contacted further for an online interview and left their contact information. However, after statistical analysis of quantitative data, it was decided to limit the interview focus to a smaller group according to the following criteria:

- ethnicity: Kazakh;
- strongest language: Russian;
- not orally fluent in Kazakh (Kazakh speaking score less than 3);
- language of instruction in school: Russian;
- language used with mother and father: Russian.

This was done to further analyze motivations influencing mother tongue choice of the participants whose dominant language of everyday life is Russian. The interview focus group now consisted of 37 candidates. In addition, it was decided to interview an even number of participants who reported either Russian and Kazakh as their mother tongue in order to enable comparisons among the two groups. To check if time spent abroad influences their mother tongue identification, each subgroup was designed to have participants who spent minimal time abroad, those who spent 12–24 months, and those who spent over 2 years.
Unfortunately, only three questionnaire participants with the above-mentioned criteria responded to the interview invitations. One of them turned out to be a linguist, which significantly influenced his answers (as noted by himself), so his participation was eliminated. Therefore, I decided to look for suitable participants on Twitter and, after having them answer the questionnaire, recruited four more people. However, it turned out to be difficult to find a participant with Russian mother tongue who has not been abroad. Instead, a participant with 10 months of travel was interviewed in this group. Overall, six participants took part in online interviews. Their background information as well as reported proficiency in Kazakh and English is presented in the table 15. Participants K1, K2, K3 reported Kazakh as their mother tongue in the questionnaire, while participants R1, R2, R3 chose Russian. Further, they will be referred to using these codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Time and place abroad</th>
<th>KPM</th>
<th>EPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>18 months in Russia</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>7 years in England</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother tongue - Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 months of travelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1 F 26 South Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 F 25 South Bachelor's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 M 23 North Bachelor's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Interview protocol

The interview consisted of two main parts. The question template is available in Appendix C. The first part included a warm-up conversation with introduction to the topic and follow-up questions from the questionnaire. During a warm-up, I tried to build a connection with interviewees and make them feel comfortable. Then, the participants were asked to elaborate on their language use, specify in what context they might use Kazakh, report in detail their Kazakh proficiency, and talk about motivation for learning Kazakh.
A second part of the interview was focused around their mother tongue identification as well as their language attitudes. The questions covered topics such as why they choose a language as their mother tongue, what is mother tongue in their opinion, experiences of telling people about their mother tongue abroad (if they have travelled), their feelings and attitudes towards Russian and Kazakh, medium of instruction in school for future children, and attitudes towards Kazakhization policy of the state.

6.3 Method of analysis

The interviews were conducted online using Skype and Zoom and recorded. They were conducted between April 9th and April 11th. They lasted from 30 minutes to an hour. The interviews were transcribed using voice input function of Google Documents. The transcriptions consisted of 3282–8107 words. The goal was to transcribe as close to the original sound as possible including ungrammatical sentences typical to spoken speech. A sample of interview transcript is available in Appendix D. Then, the interviews were coded using ATLAS.ti, software for qualitative analysis. The codes included phrases and sentences that answered the research questions (discussions on mother tongue) as well as any relevant information to the participants’ language background, examples of language use and language attitudes. In addition, the information was considered relevant to code if it was repeated throughout the interview or mentioned by other participants. Overall, there were 60 codes and 251 quotations. The codes were further grouped by common themes which resulted in 13 groups. Since the interviews were conducted in Russian, I had to take a role of a translator when quoting them and reporting the results. I am aware of the possible bias I could bring to the translations. However, keeping this in mind, I tried to avoid any subjective language and translate as close to the original as possible while also conveying the meaning.
7. Qualitative results

To be able to understand the participants’ motivations for choosing a language as their mother tongue, it is crucial to analyze their background, language use as well as their language attitudes. These are the major themes discussed in the interviews. They will be presented below with the relevant quotes of the participants. After each quote, a participant code is shown in brackets to demonstrate who is quoted. In the cases when Kazakh words are used, they are left in their original form with a translation in brackets.

7.1 Region of residence and language

The participants come from different regions of Kazakhstan: West, South and North. These areas differ in their level of Kazakh use with the West and the South typically seen as more Kazakh speaking than the North (Smagulova 2006: 304). Participant K1, who lived in the rural and urban areas of the West Kazakhstan, pointed out that Kazakh is used more than Russian in his region:

(1) Atyrau region is a very Kazakh speaking region. In the districts, particularly in the villages, Kazakh is used almost all the time. That is if you come into a store there, ask for bread in Russian, it is most likely you will be replied in Kazakh or they will give you a dirty look like “look at you come and speak Russian”. (K1)

Participants K2 and R3 relate their decreased proficiency in Kazakh with the move to Astana and Almaty when they were children. These are the two biggest cities of Kazakhstan which have large Russian-speaking populations. This is how participant K2 described it:

(2) I think the fact that we used to live in Shymkent and all the relatives there, well 85% of them probably, they are Kazakh speaking. And with them we had to speak Kazakh. And when we moved to Almaty, here you don’t speak Kazakh with almost anyone. Except the family, that’s all. (K2)

Participant R3 further emphasizes the importance of speaking Russian especially in the North of Kazakhstan:
A person who doesn’t know Russian and who only knows Kazakh, will struggle. Yes, it will be easier for him in the Southern regions, but if he will go to the North, he will have serious problems. (R3)

Participant K3 has also moved to Astana from the South when she was little. She repeatedly refers to her Southern origin as an important part of her identity:

We moved to Astana somewhere about 20 years ago probably. But we are generally Southern, we are from the South, we are like from the South-South. (K3)

And we are in a close contact with the relatives. Well, as it happens with Kazakhs, especially the Southern ones. The relatives often come, grandmother often comes and therefore somehow there wasn’t any … how should I say it, some kind of separation from our… past ties with the South. We still remain… well, in terms of, how should I say it, even the mentality or something like this perhaps. (K3)

[…] That’s cool, I’m very glad, I like to spend time with them, because I’m kind of getting free a bit. I can be for a while this southern... [smiles] the southern in me, I can show it, it's cool. (K3)

Participants R1 and R2 are both from Almaty, and when asked if they would describe the city as Kazakh-speaking; both responded negatively:

This is a difficult question, because well historically, and as I remember my childhood, not at all. It also has to be considered that I am always in a Russian-speaking environment. But I see that lately, either because of incoming people or Kazakh is really starting to develop inside the families, people speak more yes. (R1)

No, I’ve grown up in the yard, in general, the whole environment, everyone spoke Russian, in kindergarten, too, in school. (R2)

Based on these examples, it is clear that region of residence has influenced participants language practices: those who were born in or moved to the main urban areas of Kazakhstan describe them as dominantly Russian-speaking in comparison with the South. Moreover, participant K3 described the
differences beyond just a dominancy of a language, she associates her Southern background with a different “mentality”.

7.2 Childhood

When talking about childhood, every participant except R2 said that they used to be fluent in Kazakh when they were children:

(9) My mother told me, “you had very big problems with the Russian language.” That is, I could go out into the yard to play with children there and we did not understand each other. They were all Russian-speaking, and I arrived from a village in the Atyrau region, I don’t understand the Russian language at all... Well, somehow we communicated, but in general there were problems, yes. Before going to school, I spoke only in Kazakh. (K1)

(10) I know that in Shymkent, when I lived in this ... I went to the kindergarten, I spoke perfectly both Kazakh and Russian. Well, I always hosted all kinds of events, there were... Well, I was this unique, because I was always appointed as the host almost everywhere. I knew that, well, that was exactly so. Well, at school I've definitely already started to use Russian more, and so. (K2)

(11) Even my mom now by the way tells me stories that when we just arrived, she would take me out to play outside, and all the girls there speak Russian. I don’t understand them and just blanking [laughs] […] Mom says, “the girls are arguing and you just show them your tongue because you cannot speak Russian to them.” My mom tells me this often. That is why I understand that yes. This is not an assumption, but really it is so that I knew Russian, I was sent to a Russian kindergarten. (K3)

(12) Before I turned two, I think, we lived with my mother’s parents, there were a lot of us there. And there, I think, everyone spoke Kazakh and until I was two, I spoke only Kazakh. And then they sent me to a Russian-speaking kindergarten and that's all, since then I haven’t been speaking. (R1)

(13) Well, at least they told me so that until five years old, I think something like that, I only spoke Kazakh. That is, I had a good command of the Kazakh language, but then my family moved to the North of Kazakhstan. (R3)
The participants said that before going to a Russian-medium school or a kindergarten, they spoke mostly Kazakh. However, participants K1 and R3 mentioned that they were told this by their parents, since they were too young to remember speaking Kazakh. If these stories are true, then it means than 5 out 6 Russian-speaking participants had Kazakh as their first learned language. This could have had a great impact on their linguistic identity. For participants K3 and R1 going to a Russian school is seen as a necessary measure taken by their parents in order to receive better education or to learn Russian for its practicality:

(14) And I remember very well that I easily... easily spoke, very fluent Kazakh, I definitely remembered that. Then they sent me to a Russian kindergarten, firstly, I think there weren’t even Kazakh kindergartens near our house. Secondly, my parents did it so that I wouldn’t well, “қыйналмасын деп” (Kazakh for “so she doesn’t suffer”), then in the future that she does not know Russian. (K3)

(15) It was a family decision, because when they were deciding to which kindergarten send me, and then to which school, they considered that the level of education in Russian at that time, it was the end of the 90s and the beginning of the 2000s, it was much higher than in Kazakh. (R1)

Based on the language they use, it seems that the participants with Kazakh mother tongue are more certain that their first learned language was Kazakh than those with Russian mother tongue. Participants K2 and K3 reported to remember it themselves. Therefore, one can imagine that it could justify their decision to report Kazakh as their mother tongue.

7.3 Languages spoken with parents

It is important to remember that the interviewees were intentionally chosen to be Russian speaking and mostly use Russian with their parents in order to understand what makes some of them report Kazakh as their mother tongue. However, after conducting the interviews it was clear that for some participants Russian is not the only language spoken at home. The participants’ elaborations on family languages are presented in table 16. It is interesting that participants K1 and K2 both mentioned that they mostly use Russian with their parents, while the parents often speak Kazakh to them. In contrast, participant K3 reported to use both languages when speaking to her parents with the dominancy of Russian.
Table 16. Languages spoken with parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>participant</th>
<th>mother</th>
<th>father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian/Kazakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>Russian/Kazakh</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3</td>
<td>Russian/Kazakh</td>
<td>Russian/Kazakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>participant</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>participant speaks Russian, parent speaks Kazakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K3</td>
<td>participant and parent both code-switch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>only one language is used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table clearly visualizes the difference in the languages spoken with parents of the two groups. Those who reported Kazakh as their mother tongue either use or hear Kazakh from their parents to some extent, whereas the participants with Russian mother tongue use solely Russian at home. This could mean that even smallest presence of Kazakh at home can influence the participants’ mother tongue identification.

7.4 Kazakh use

The interviewees were also asked to describe the contexts and give examples of their Kazakh use. Participant K2 said that he uses Kazakh as much as Russian with his friends:

(16) I don’t know, we could be in Discord with the guys, playing Counter-strike or something, and we almost all the time communicate in Kazakh. […] When we meet here, in Almaty, half in Kazakh, half in Russian. I won’t say that 60% in Russian, exactly half would probably be in Kazakh. (K2)

Participant K3 said she mostly speaks Russian with her siblings but they often code-switch when they talk about things that are best described in Kazakh:

(17) Mostly in Russian, but we also insert Kazakh a lot because again there are some phrases, some things which… how should I say it, I feel that in Kazakh I will be able to say exactly
what I mean. […] For instance, my sisters are telling me off because I am taking too long to get ready. Mom is telling me off because I am taking too long to get ready. They say something like “Жыбырлап (Kazakh for “flailing around”) you can take a couple of hours… (K3)

The rest of participants admitted to use Kazakh only when it is required, for example with distant Kazakh-speaking relatives or monolingual Kazakh speakers at a store, in a taxi or on the streets:

(18) Generally, I can use Kazakh for some domestic needs, yes. That is, of course, I would not be able to give an interview, for example; I can’t do it in Kazakh. But going to the store and using Kazakh to buy groceries, that I can do. (K1)

(19) Yes, I use it [Kazakh] with sellers, with taxi drivers, when I hear that they speak Kazakh in front of me, for example, with their customers. I can explain very simple things: what do I need to buy, ask how much it costs, and so on… turn left, stop there, drive past a traffic light, that's all. (R1)

An interesting pattern is observed when participants are asked to describe the context of their Kazakh use. Participants K2, K3, R1, R2 reported to use Kazakh to tell jokes or, as participant K2 calls them, ROFLs (internet slang meaning “rolling on the floor laughing”):

(20) We also speak шала2-Kazakh, but mostly Russian of course, around 80–70% of time and the rest in Kazakh. Some memes, ROFLs in Kazakh, well they sound funnier. (K2)

When asked if she uses Kazakh with people around her, participant R1 said she uses Kazakh “only as a joke” and gave the following example talking to her colleagues:

(21) […] for example, my work partner calls my name to show me something, he goes “қарағықара” (Kazakh for “look-look”). But it is always some kind of a joke [smiles] (R1)

The most common context for Kazakh use among the participants turned out to be every-day situations where communication is quite limited. Also, Kazakh is often used with close people to tell

---

2 “Шала” is a Kazakh word for “half”. In combination with other words conveys a meaning of deficiency
jokes. Generally, the group with Kazakh mother tongue reported more regular use, except the participant K1, who admitted to use mostly Russian.

### 7.5 Kazakh proficiency

Proficiency in Kazakh was also a controlled criteria in recruiting participants for interviews. According to the quantitative results of this study, fluency in Kazakh associated with Kazakh mother tongue: the higher the proficiency, the more likely the participants were to report Kazakh as their mother tongue. However, almost a half of those who chose Kazakh as their mother tongue did not report fluency in it. Therefore, the focus of the qualitative part of the study was put on those Kazakhs who did not report full fluency in Kazakh. This means that their Kazakh proficiency score was less than 3.

During the interviews, the participants were asked to elaborate on their Kazakh proficiency. All of the participants pointed out that their Kazakh is limited. Listening comprehension seems to be the easiest among the group. As R2 describes it, “I understand what they want from me”.

Also, all participants mentioned that they can speak Kazakh when it comes to everyday and simple matters. However, with more advanced topics the participants admitted to struggle to express themselves. K3, who seems to use Kazakh the most among the others, describes it the following way:

(22) But if we talk about something ... about some real topics, I am lost, I don’t know the words, I ... I start to somewhat stutter from my insecurity. (K3)

In the context of Kazakhstan, not being able to use Kazakh in formal settings is not an uncommon phenomenon. R1 describes a case which happened at her work and illustrates the general level of Kazakh proficiency among the workers:

(23) Although I did not work in the state service, I worked in a quasi-public sector, these are national companies ... And when we received letters in the Kazakh language from the Prime Minister’s office, we ran around not knowing what to do with them. […] We do not understand what this letter is about, and until we have a translator ... no one could translate. And until we took this letter to the translator, we did not understand what they wanted from us in the Prime Minister’s office. This is very funny. (R1)
Unfortunately, the proficiency level of the participants was again only reported as I did not test it in any way. Nonetheless, based on the examples provided by the interviewees, participants K2 and K3 seem to have better Kazakh proficiency than the rest.

7.6 Shaming for speaking Russian

When it comes to speaking Kazakh, everyone except the participant K3 talked about being shamed by other ethnic Kazakhs for not being fluent in it or choosing to use Russian instead. Participants K1, K2 and R3 shared their experiences:

(24) well, let's say when you switch to the Russian language, they can sometimes say something like “қазақша сөйлейшійі” (Kazakh for “speak Kazakh”) and “don’t you speak Kazakh?” (K1)

(25) well, speaking is kinda difficult. You know how it is, it’s in your head, you kinda say it and it’s kinda hard to pronounce it, and you’re afraid of making a mistake and making people laugh at you “you are Kazakh and don’t know your own language” something like this. (K2)

(26) […] they are trying to somehow say that “you are Kazakh, you don’t know your native language"3, what kind of Kazakh are you” like this, for example. Someone says it in a rough form, someone speaks softer, but most of them one way or another point to my problem. (R3)

Participants K2 and R3 use the same wording when giving an example of shaming they have faced. In both cases, they were blamed for not speaking “their” language. From the given examples it is clear that speaking Russian is seen as a betrayal to Kazakh “nativeness”. Here, it is important to mention that in Russian “родной язык” used to refer to native language and mother tongue. This could have had influenced the participants’ perception of mother tongue as it is directly linked to the term native, which is commonly associated with ethnic heritage. In Kazakh, however, the phrase mother tongue literally means “the language of mother”.

Another important observation from quote 26 is the wording participant R3 chooses to describe his low proficiency in Kazakh. He calls it a “problem” people point to. It is possible to suggest that the

3 “Родной язык” in Russian literary means native language, but it also means mother tongue
participant takes the blame and believes that he, as an ethnic Kazakh, has to speak Kazakh in order to be able to claim his ethnic heritage.

Participant R2 also described a situation during her studies at a university in Almaty when someone told her that she “is not Kazakh” if she doesn’t speak it. In response to this, participant R2 claimed to speak it in order to defend her ethnic belonging:

(27) No, I know, мен қазақпін (Kazakh for “I am Kazakh”). (R2)

Here we can see that the participant intentionally says the second part of the sentence in Kazakh signaling her ethnic identity. In contrast, participant R1 described a different reaction to a similar kind of shaming for speaking Russian coming from taxi drivers:

(28) I loved to make up all kinds of stories for them; that I do not live in Kazakhstan, had recently moved, learning the language, that I was not a Kazakh. [laughs] (R1)

These examples demonstrate the common shaming of ethnic Kazakhs for speaking Russian instead of Kazakh. To avoid this type of shaming, participant R1 decided to pretend not to be Kazakh, whereas participant R2 claimed to speak the language. It is obvious that ethnicity is directly linked to the language one “has to speak” in order to claim the ethnic belonging.

Surprisingly, when asked about their attitude to the shaming they receive, the participants either say that it is “not shaming but these kinds of jokes” (R2) or say that there is not much of it, at least not now:

(29) I’m not afraid of such shaming in principle. I don’t think that it would appear as much right now. (K2)

(30) No, I wouldn’t say that it happens now. (R1)

Along with the public shaming described above, participants K2, K3, and R3 also talked about internal shame for not being fluent in Kazakh:

(31) when they ask me a question in Kazakh, I can hardly put the words together in Kazakh and I feel ashamed. (R3)
Participant K2 also feels shame for not being fluent in Kazakh. He described an incident during a wedding in Shymkent (dominantly Kazakh-speaking city in the South of Kazakhstan):

(33) You know, I couldn’t pronounce the phrase in Kazakh, well, there were these Kazakh-speaking dudes and we had a run-in there. And I kind of wanted to answer in Kazakh, but said the phrase in Russian. I still have this in my nightmares. [...] there we had a serious ... well, serious situation. I do not think that someone would have laughed then. Well, it was just for me... I said it and I thought to myself “damn what did you say”. (K2)

Looking at these examples, one can tell that participants K2, K3, and R3 to some extent agree with the popular opinion that “Kazakh should speak Kazakh”. They feel ashamed for not being able to speak it fluently.

7.7 Motivation for learning Kazakh

The participants were also asked if they would like to learn Kazakh and speak it more. The participants divided based on two different opinions. Participants K1, R1, R2, R3 all replied that they do not see a reason to learn Kazakh. According to them, speaking Russian fulfills all their needs in the working as well as entertainment spheres. Participant K1 believes that there needs to be more content available in Kazakh for him to learn it:

(34) I don’t see the point in it. We are perfectly fine communicating in Russian. That is, again (pause), the Kazakh language is not just the language of communication, you have to read in Kazakh, watch TV shows in Kazakh, I don’t know what else... listen to music in Kazakh. All of this doesn’t exist, so why learn it. (K1)

Participant R2 said that she might learn Kazakh if there would be an urgent need for it or if she decided to go “back to basics [originally used in English], return to the roots”. This is an interesting example which once again demonstrates the link between the language and its value as a part of heritage.
A different response was received from participants K2 and K3, who both reported to have a strong wish to improve their Kazakh proficiency and increase the use of it. Although, as participant K3 noted, the language needs a wider spread:

(35) Of course, I would like to be fluent in it, and I would like people around me to be fluent too, so that I can talk to them. Otherwise, well, I understand now that, well, let's say I am fluent in it, so what? My friends aren’t fluent, who will I talk with? (K3)

Participant R3, however, seems to have conflicting thoughts on this topic. At first, he stated that he was planning to learn more Kazakh because he feels ashamed:

(36) […] I also want to speak beautifully, express my thoughts in the Kazakh language fluently, because I’m kinda ashamed. […] I am not learning the Kazakh language for any opportunities, but simply because a Kazakh must know the Kazakh language, and also so I don’t feel ashamed in front of other Kazakhs and myself too. (R3)

But then, after talking about shaming for not speaking Kazakh, participant R3 expressed different opinion saying that he doesn’t see much reason to learn Kazakh:

(37) Somehow I don’t have... even my environment does not motivate me to learn the Kazakh language. If there would be some resources, websites in the Kazakh language or some interesting books in the Kazakh language or I don’t know social network app in the Kazakh language, then of course in such conditions I would have been motivated to learn the Kazakh language. But knowing the Russian language, I feel very comfortable in Astana at least, I don’t know how in other regions, but in Astana without knowing Kazakh, but knowing Russian I feel very comfortable. (R3)

Possibly he changed his mind with the reflection on this topic, as quote 36 preceded quote 37. On the other hand, the participant might find it difficult to find another reason to learn Kazakh except the fact that he has to do it because of his origin. Despite the fact that he agrees that “every Kazakh should speak Kazakh”, he still seems to lack motivation to learn it.

Generally, those who reported Kazakh as their mother tongue seems to have more motivation to improve their proficiency. Interestingly, participant K1 is an exception. As mentioned previously, he has also reported less Kazakh use than participants K2 and K3.
7.8 Being abroad

Time spent abroad has also been a controlled variable when searching for interview participants. The aim of this was to check whether participants’ answers will differ based on their time spent abroad. Participants K3 and R3 have spent more than 5 years living in England and China respectively, participants K2 and R2 have lived in Russia for the last 18 months, whereas participant K1 has not been abroad and participant R1 has only travelled for leisure for a total of 10 months.

Those who have travelled were asked if they ever had to explain to foreigners what languages are spoken in Kazakhstan and why they speak Russian. All of them replied positively and shared their experiences. Participant K2 and R3 both had previously explained why they speak Russian fluently. They both mentioned that it has never been a surprise to people in Russia and China as those were aware of the historical context. In contrast, participant R2 shared that her colleagues in Russia assumed that she spoke Kazakh fluently and when she told them that she did not, they got surprised:

(38) [...] they ask what language are spoken in Kazakhstan and why I don’t know Kazakh. It reached a point of absurdity, we had a client at work, we had an agency and we had a client from Kazakhstan, and it was needed to urgently translate a text into Kazakh, but I can’t and generally I ... this is not my area like writing texts. But they thought if anything we will give it to [...] she will translate. [laughs] I was like “no, I'm sorry” and they were surprised. (R2)

Very interesting stories were shared by participant K3 and R1. They both admitted to hide their low proficiency in Kazakh from foreigners. However, they explained different reasonings behind it. Participant K3 believed that telling people about the language situation in Kazakhstan would affect the country’s image:

(39) That's because ... it just seems to me that if I walked around telling everyone “it’s bad, we don’t speak Kazakh,” it would... it would become the norm for people who don’t know what it’s like in Kazakhstan, for foreigners, for people from outside of it, it would be ... it would become the norm. I wouldn’t want it to be so that people thought, they knew that “oh these people don’t speak their own language”. That’s why I’m trying to only... say and show positive things. (K3)

Participant R1, however, thinks that it is too difficult to understand for people who are not familiar with the history of Soviet Union:
Well, by the way, from a practical point of view, I always say to foreigners that my mother tongue is Kazakh, because for them it's just a brain explosion, that an Asian girl speaks Russian... all these weird things [laughs] That’s why it’s easier to say like “yes, Kazakh is my native, I’m Kazakh. That’s all, don’t rack your brains, you don’t know what the Soviet Union is.” (R1)

From the examples above, it can be noted that when it comes to explaining language practices of Kazakhstan abroad, participants K2, R2, and R3 openly talk about the fact that Russian is widely spoken and they are not fully proficient in Kazakh. Participants K3 and R1, on the other hand, decided to hide this information for different reasons. Quote 40 shows that participant K3 perceived the situation as negative and therefore decided to not describe it as it is. Participant R1 explained it solely as a practical matter: she didn’t want to explain it because it would require knowledge of historical context which in her opinion foreigners lack.

Participants K2 and K3 also mentioned that time abroad has made their attitude more positive towards Kazakh. Participant K2 told that missing home has made him speak Kazakh more. He described it as having “brain reprogramming” since living in Russia. Similarly, participant K3 mentioned a warm feeling when she hears Kazakh speech in the airport on the way home. She called it “music to her ears”.

It seems like time spent abroad had either no influence on the participants’ linguistic identification or shifted it even more towards Kazakh for those who have already previously identified it as their mother tongue.

7.9 Language attitudes

The interviewees were asked about their attitudes towards Kazakh and Russian. Participants K1 and R2 pointed out that they do not have any special feelings or emotional attachments with the languages. Participants K2 and R3 reported to have changed their attitude towards Kazakh over the years. They both said that they used to perceive it negatively because they associated it with uneducated people, as they both call them “мамбыты” or “мамби”, the latter being stronger than the former. These are pejorative words that are used to describe uneducated Kazakh-speaking people coming from rural areas (Beniaminova, 2017). Participant K2 described it as following:
there were moments, you know, when you think that those who speak Kazakh are kind of ignorant, you might say “мәмбичи”. Well, I don’t know, it was such an imposed feeling, but then it all went away when you started speaking yourself. (K2)

Participant K3 stated unequivocally that Kazakh has a higher value for her than Russian:

I had this thought that if I, how should I say it, if I could replace my knowledge of Russian with knowledge of Kazakh, I would do it right away. I am willing not to know Russian, if I knew Kazakh. If I had a choice. (K3)

In contrast, participant R1 replied that she has a better attitude towards Russian because of her “language barrier in Kazakh”. She said that she feels more involved with Russian:

It is because there are a lot of memes about the Russian language on the Internet and I understand that it is my cultural space, because I understand all of this and it is in context of my life. (R1)

Language attitudes could also be traced when the participants talked about their preferred language of instruction in school for their future children. Their answers are presented in figure 8 with the participant number in brackets.

When choosing Russian as a medium of instruction for future children, participants K1 and K2 explain it by saying that language influences who you are. Participant K2 believes that speaking Russian will make his children “more communicative”. Participant K1 says that he would not like his children to be monolingual Kazaks because he associates it with nationalistic ideas like “Kazakh nation is the strongest”. It is interesting how the participants assign different identities for future children based on the language they would speak. The preference goes to Russian, as it is associated
with more favored identity. Participant R2 explained her preference by “higher” quality of education in Russian-speaking schools.

Kazakh is selected by participants K3 and R3 because they believe that it is very important for the children to “know the language of their ancestors”. In fact, participant K1 and R1 also deem Kazakh important for their future children. Participant K1 says that he would like his child to know at least basics of Kazakh, as he believes it is needed for his Kazakh “identity”:

(44) After all, he must have some kind of identity, Kazakh identity. For example, I understand that I am Kazakh, and basically I understand the Kazakh culture. For him, for a child, with learning and understanding the Kazakh language, he should understand the Kazakh culture in the future. He must be after all, even though he is Russian-speaking, I feel like he must still be a Kazakh. (K1)

While participants K1, K3, and R3 think their children would need to speak Kazakh in order to be closer to the Kazakh culture, participant R1 views it as something practical. Despite the fact that she would prefer an English-speaking school for her children, she believes that Kazakh will also be important for them, since it has been spreading and developing in the recent years.

7.10 Mother tongue

One of the interview questions asked the participants to explain why they choose a language as their mother tongue. The analysis of their responses has shown that the participants define their mother tongue according to three criteria: their ethnicity, their language of strongest proficiency and the functional value of the language (figure 9).
Interestingly, those who reported Kazakh as their mother tongue (participants K1–K3) all explained it by referring to their ethnicity:

(45) Mother tongue, I think, is the language your parents speak, yours... your family. And basically, if you are Kazakh, I think that no matter what language you speak, your mother tongue will still remain the Kazakh language, that’s what I feel like. You can speak any language, but basically you are still kind of ... your mother tongue is Kazakh. (K1)

(46) Well, mother tongue is, I think [pause]. Well, the language, hold on I need to phrase it correctly. [pause] Well, the language of your people, I think. (K2)

(47) Well, mother tongue is the language of my ancestors, the language of my parents, the language of the soil that raised us… (K3)

As for the Russian mother tongue group, the most common answer was the language of strongest proficiency. Participants R1 and R2 agree on this:
(48) I think in it and it is the language in which I express myself the best, read and all that. (R1)

(49) Well, mother tongue is the one you think in. So I think in Russian 100%, I read, I speak, I live in Russian. (R2)

Participant R3, who reported Russian as his mother tongue in the questionnaire, seems to not have a clear explanation to why as he kept changing his opinion. Firstly, he talked about the functional value of Russian:

(50) First of all, the environment is Russian-speaking, education is in Russian and ... the availability of content, a huge amount of content in Russian online and not only online and ... I don’t know what to call it, well, the people around, well in this city, in this region, they use Russian more than Kazakh. (R3)

But then later, I asked the participant to describe what mother tongue is in his opinion and whether he understands it as a language one speaks the most. He replied by talking about national identity, the history of Kazakhstan, and independence. He asked to repeat the question when he realized he went a bit off topic. He then replied that mother tongue in his opinion is the language “which is spoken, was… is spoken by your ancestors”. As participants K1, K2, and K3, he referred to his ethnicity when defining mother tongue. This contradicted the fact that he initially reported Russian as his mother tongue. I decided to change the topic a bit, since I suspected that the participant could feel uncomfortable talking about this in the presence of his family members, who sometimes would appear walking in the background. Later, I decided to clarify what language he identifies as his mother tongue. He gave the following example:

(51) Well, they say that your mother tongue is the language ... This is how you can figure it out: for example, you hit your little toe on the nightstand, in what language you swear – that is your mother tongue. I swear in Russian. We can say that the Russian language ... is also my mother tongue. (R3)

I asked the participant if “also” means that he has two mother tongues: Kazakh and Russian. His reply was positive: “I guess we can say so”. To conclude his answer, participant R3 is hesitant to choose one mother tongue, as he seems to have conflicting thoughts on what actually defines it: his origin or the language he is most proficient in, which is also the most functional language in his case. He then decides to choose not one but two, as they both seem to have high value for him.
Participant R3, in comparison with the others, has a dual linguistic identity. Russian is highly important for him, since it is the language he speaks, thinks, reads in. However, he is also emotionally attached to Kazakh, as it symbolizes his national identity.
8. Discussion and conclusions

This final chapter discusses the findings of the study based on the quantitative and qualitative results. These findings are then linked and compared to the previous sociolinguistic research reviewed in the chapter 2. Lastly, the implications and limitations of the study are presented.

In order to summarize the findings of the study, the original research questions should be considered:

1. What is the relationship between Kazakh proficiency and identified mother tongue of urban Kazakh youth?
2. What other criteria influence their mother tongue identification and how is it related to their background?

Now, the hypothesis was that the majority of urban Kazakh youth define Kazakh as their mother tongue because of their ethnic origin, even if they are not fully proficient in it and use Russian more often. The next section is aimed to answer the first research question.

8.1 Mother tongue and Kazakh proficiency

Using quantitative methods, it was found that 78% of Kazakh participants chose Kazakh as their mother tongue. Their reported Kazakh proficiency demonstrated the strongest correlation with mother tongue among all other variables. More than a half of those who chose Kazakh as their mother tongue reported to be fluent in Kazakh, whereas only 5% of Kazakhs with Russian as their mother tongue reported fluency in Kazakh. To compare, almost all of the Kazakh sample (98%) reported fluency in Russian. Therefore, Russian fluency, in contrast with Kazakh, has no influence on the participants' mother tongue identification. What is interesting here is that there is a significant number of participants with Kazakh as their mother tongue who reported to not be fully proficient in Kazakh, that is they claimed to have a “difficulty” with some of the language skills. This means that fluency is not a critical factor for choosing Kazakh as mother tongue: 49% of those who chose Kazakh as their mother tongue reported better proficiency in Russian than Kazakh. However, not being fluent in Kazakh seems to be an important factor for choosing Russian as a mother tongue.

Of course, there is always an issue with analyzing reported proficiency. In the context of Kazakhstan, it has been a common practice to overestimate language proficiency in reports (Jankowski 2012, Smagulova 2006, Davé 2004). In addition, Spolsky and Shohamy argued that language proficiency data collected by quantitative methods is not a reliable source for sociolinguistic analysis (Spolsky & Shohamy 2000: 30). Therefore, in the qualitative part of the
study the interviewees were asked to elaborate on their Kazakh proficiency in detail using examples from every day communication. It is important to bear in mind that the interviewees were intentionally chosen not to be fluent in Kazakh according to their questionnaire answers. This enabled me to focus on those participants who chose Kazakh as their mother tongue without being fully proficient in it and compare them to the participants’ with Russian mother tongue. The qualitative analysis identified that all interviewees reported to be able to use Kazakh to some extent when it comes to everyday communication, whereas Kazakh in a more formal context posed a difficulty for the participants. Based on the examples of Kazakh use provided in the interviews, it is possible to suggest that participants K2 and K3 have a higher Kazakh proficiency compared to others. They both reported to frequently use it with their siblings and friends. Participants K1, R1, R2, and R3, on the other hand, reported to have very limited Kazakh skills and use it only when it is required.

To sum up, the quantitative findings demonstrated that the majority of young Kazakhs taking part in this study chose Kazakh as their mother tongue. However, almost all of the participants with Kazakh mother tongue reported not to be fully fluent in it and having Russian as their strongest language of proficiency. In regards to the participants with Russian mother tongue, Kazakh fluency turned out to be very low among the group. The interviews supported this pattern showing that even among those who reported not to be fluent in Kazakh the participants with Russian mother tongue generally have lower Kazakh proficiency than those whose mother tongue was Kazakh. Therefore, it could be concluded that fluency in Kazakh is associated with Kazakh mother tongue. However, it is not a critical factor. Mother tongue identification of almost half of the participants with Kazakh mother tongue is influenced by other factor(s) than Kazakh proficiency.

Collected quantitative data on reported Kazakh proficiency of Kazakh youth makes it possible to compare it with an earlier study. Smagulova (2008) also collected data on reported proficiency in Kazakh. However, her closest age category was 23 and younger. Nevertheless, it is still possible to compare the results, since I borrowed the wording of language skills questions from Smagulova’s study. Table 16 shows that the overall reported proficiency is quite similar. In this study, slightly less participants’ reported fluency in speaking, reading, and writing, whereas listening comprehension seems to have improved.
Table 16. Reported Kazakh fluency in four skills among young Kazakhs (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>listening</th>
<th>speaking</th>
<th>reading</th>
<th>writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This study</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smagulova’s study</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fluency in all four skills was reported by 42% of the participants of this study. Unfortunately, this information is not provided in the article by Smagulova.

8.2 Mother tongue and ethnic origin

Because of the high symbolic value of the Kazakh language for ethnic Kazakhs (Rivers 2002, Amantay et al. 2017, Smagulova 2008), it was hypothesized that ethnicity is the main criterion for identifying mother tongue of young Kazakhs. The qualitative part of the study was aimed to check the validity of this hypothesis.

According to the interview analysis, ethnicity turned out to be the main factor influencing the participants’ choice in favor of Kazakh as their mother tongue. All interviewees had Russian as their dominant language of use and strongest language of proficiency. Three of them reported Kazakh as their mother tongue later explaining it by their ethnic belonging. The other half reported Russian as their mother tongue as the language they speak the best. Although, participant R3, who initially chose Russian as mother tongue, during the interview claimed to have two: Kazakh and Russian, since they both have a personal value for him.

The relationship between ethnic origin and mother tongue was also observed when the participants spoke about their motivation to learn Kazakh and internal shame for not speaking Kazakh. Participants K2 and K3 reported to want to learn and speak more Kazakh because they view it as a crucial attribute of their national identity. In other words, they believe they need to speak the titular language in order to call themselves “real” Kazakhs. Participant R3 also admitted to feel ashamed of his low Kazakh proficiency. However, he is uncertain about his willingness to improve it because of the insufficient functionality of the Kazakh language. In a similar way, he then hesitated to define his mother tongue. It is possible to suggest that this ambiguity reflects his language identity conflict. On one hand, the participant is attached to Kazakh as the language of the ancestors and symbol of the national independence. On the other hand, he also recognizes the functional value of Russian being his strongest language of proficiency, the language of everyday use.
Participant K1 also related his mother tongue to his ethnic origin. According to him, all Kazakhs have Kazakh as their mother tongue because of their ethnicity. In addition, he believes that learning at least some Kazakh will be important for his children in order to maintain their Kazakh identity. Thus, for the majority of the participants (K1, K2, K3, R3), the Kazakh language plays an important role as a symbol of their national identity, which makes them choose it as their mother tongue. This finding is supported by previous studies by Fierman (1998) and Smagulova (2006) who wrote that Kazakhs report Kazakh as their mother tongue in Census even if they are not proficient in it.

This suggests that Kazakh participants who do not speak Kazakh report Kazakh mother tongue because it is their “native language” or at least it is considered to be. This type of identification Skutnabb-Kangas (1984) calls external, meaning that one chooses to identify a language as their mother tongue because they are viewed as a native speaker of this language by others.

The following sections will discuss other possible factors influencing the participants’ mother tongue identification: family language policy, overall Kazakh use, and time spent abroad.

8.3 Mother tongue and family language policy

According to both the questionnaire and interview data, Kazakh spoken at home and especially with father influences participants’ mother tongue identification in favor of Kazakh. However, the quantitative analysis showed that when Russian is reported to be the most spoken language within a family, Kazakh is still chosen as a mother tongue by the majority of the participants. The interviews enabled me to further analyze family language practices of Russian-speaking Kazakhs. It was found that even if Kazakh is not the language used the most within the participants’ family but spoken to some extent by their parents, it still seems to make the participants’ choose Kazakh as their mother tongue. The interviewees with Russian mother tongue described their household as “only Russian” speaking. It would be interesting to add a question asking the questionnaire participants if they use Kazakh to some extent at home. Unfortunately, they were only asked to report the language used the most with each parent and grandparents.

In addition, the questionnaire results revealed that mother tongue has stronger association with language used with father, while strongest language correlates more with language used with mother. To exemplify, one is more likely to report Kazakh as their mother tongue if they use it with their father, even if they speak Russian to their mother and have it as their strongest language. This
trend supports Rivers’ (2002) findings, when he concluded that females are more likely to raise their children in Russian taking a more pragmatic approach, while males would prefer Kazakh because of its national symbolic value (Rivers 2002: 9). Perhaps, the participants coming from bilingual families have a stronger proficiency in a language spoken with their mother. However, a language spoken with a father could be more important for their national identity.

Moreover, during the analysis of the qualitative data an interesting pattern was observed when the participants described their childhood. Almost all of them with an exception of the participant R2 claimed to have Kazakh as their first learned language. However, only participants K2 and K3 reported to remember this themselves, whereas others heard it from their parents. This could suggest that the participants who chose Kazakh mother tongue could also argue that it was their first language. Having Russian as their dominant language could be seen simply as a consequence of moving to a Russian-speaking region or going to a Russian-speaking school.

Overall, the analyses of both types of data seem to indicate that the participants’ mother tongue identification is influenced by languages spoken at home and their first learned language. According to Skutnabb-Kangas’s (1984) definition, the participants’ origin plays a role in their linguistic identity.

8.4 Mother tongue and overall Kazakh use

Not surprisingly, the amount of Kazakh use also showed correlation with mother tongue among the participants’ of this study. Those who use Kazakh in their daily life are highly likely to say that their mother tongue is Kazakh. For instance, participants K2 and K3 use Kazakh relatively more than participants R1, R2, R3, K1 inside their family as well as with friends. For an ethnic Kazakh who uses the Kazakh language to some extent it comes natural to report it as their mother tongue because there is no contradiction: they are born Kazakh, they live in Kazakhstan, they either went to a Kazakh school, or speak it with their father, or mother, or grandparents.

However, the situation is more ambiguous for Kazakhs who only use Russian and are not fluent in Kazakh. The questionnaire data showed that only 47% of them report Russian as their mother tongue, while 53% say it is Kazakh. Participant K1 is an example of the latter group. He identified Kazakh as his mother tongue, but also reported to have very limited Kazakh proficiency and use. He explained his mother tongue choice by his ethnic belonging. The qualitative data as well as the previous studies by Fierman (1998) and Smagulova (2006) suggest that the main motivation of Russian-speaking
Kazakhs for choosing Kazakh as their mother tongue is their strong national identity, which grants the Kazakh language high symbolic value.

8.5 Mother tongue and time spent abroad

The quantitative data indicated another variable with a strong dependency with mother tongue–time spent abroad. Those who chose Russian mother tongue were more likely to spend a longer time travelling or living abroad than those whose reported mother tongue was Kazakh. Perhaps, the more they travelled, the more they had to elaborate on their mother tongue to foreigners. This could have had an effect on their perception of mother tongue. However, the qualitative results did not demonstrate any clear relation between the interviewees’ time spent abroad and identified mother tongue.

I decided to add a question on time spent abroad because of my personal reflection of what has affected my own understanding of mother tongue. With travelling, I met new people and I had to repeatedly explain how my mother tongue is a language I do not really speak, but mostly understand. And then I found it easier to just say that Russian is my mother tongue, since it is my strongest language of proficiency and the language I use the most with my family and friends. However, while living in Kazakhstan I have never questioned why I say that my mother tongue is Kazakh. It seemed natural, since it is a titular language of the country, the language strongly associated with my ethnic identity. Also, the phrase “Менің ана тілім - қазақ тілі” (my mother tongue is Kazakh) is one of the few phrases I remember from Kazakh classes in school. I wondered if travelling has affected other young Kazakhs’ linguistic identity in the same way. Even though the quantitative data has showed strong correlation between mother tongue and time spent abroad, it does not indicate direct causation. There are other ways to explain this relationship: Russian speakers could have had more opportunities to travel due to their social class, language skills or education. Nevertheless, this is an interesting addition to the previous research findings which could be studied further.

After discussing each factor in detail, it is possible to conclude that young Kazakhs who speak Kazakh fluently and use it to some extent in their everyday life are extremely likely to say that their mother tongue is Kazakh. Russian-speaking young Kazakhs in most cases still report Kazakh as their mother tongue due to their national identity. They view the language as a mandatory attribute of a Kazakh who values and respects the culture and the history. The minority of Russian speaking Kazakh youth identify Russian as their mother tongue because it is the language they have always spoken and used. According to Skutnabb-Kangas’ (1984) criteria for mother tongue identification,
urban Kazakh youth define their mother tongue as Kazakh due to external identification and origin; Russian mother tongue is reported because of competence and function.

The findings are in line with the hypothesis of the study. 78% of Kazakhs reported Kazakh as their mother tongue, even though the majority of them do not use Kazakh in their daily life and roughly half of them reported not to be fully proficient in it.

8.6 Implications and limitations of the study

Because this study only focused on young Kazakhs, further research is needed to be able to conclude if there are any differences in mother tongue identification between age groups. This type of research could shed more light on the effectiveness of state language policies considering the fact that the older generation grew up in the Soviet Union and experiences many changes in language management after Kazakhstan gained independence.

Another possible implication for further research is to analyze the type of relationship between time spent abroad and mother tongue identification. It would be interesting to see whether they are influenced by a third criteria or time abroad has an actual impact on language identity of Kazakh youth. This would require controlling other social variables such as participants’ income, occupation, and education level. Other possible factors could be the amount of contact with Kazakh-speaking people abroad and countries the participants reside in. Based on the discovered strong correlation between mother tongue and time spent abroad, it is possible to suggest a hypothesis for future research: living abroad influences Kazakh youth’s perception of mother tongue and consequently makes them more likely to report it as Russian.

When discussing the findings of the study, it is crucial to also consider its limitations. Due to convenience sampling used in the quantitative part of the study, the sample is not representative of the whole urban population of young Kazakhs in Kazakhstan. Therefore, the findings of this study must be regarded with caution.

Another limitation is the fact that language proficiency was not tested and only reported by the participants themselves. Even though having a large number of participants do a language test seems impractical, it would definitely be more reliable data than reported proficiency. Similarly, language practices were reported by the participants themselves. Ideally, I would have observed the interviewees in their daily communication with their family and friends. Unfortunately, this was impossible due to the fact that I was not in Kazakhstan when conducting this study.
It is also important to mention a chance of my personal bias affecting the interview design as well as the data analysis. Having a personal affiliation to the subject of the study, I could have been subjective when interviewing the participants and further analyzing their answers. However, I believe that being constantly aware of this possibility decreased the risk of it.
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Appendix A

English version of the questionnaire

The purpose of the research study is to investigate current sociolinguistic situation in Kazakhstan through language use, language attitudes, and language ideologies of Kazakh youth.

QUESTIONNAIRE
The age of the target group is 18-28 years old.

Would you like to read full participant information?
☐ Yes
☐ No

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION
The purpose of the research study is to investigate current sociolinguistic situation in Kazakhstan through language use, language attitudes, and language ideologies of Kazakh youth. More specifically, we are interested to know what Kazakh youth identifies as their mother tongue and what factors influence their identification.

The participants are invited to answer a digital questionnaire which will help us analyze current sociolinguistic trends in the country. The only pre-determined criteria for the target group is age (18-28 years old). For the questionnaire, we are intending to involve as many participants as possible in order to receive the most accurate results. The participation is entirely voluntary and a participant can withdraw from the study at any time. If the participant withdraws from the study or withdraws his/her consent, any data collected from him/her before the withdrawal can be included as part of the research data.

Participants will be involved in a questionnaire once. It should not take more than 10 minutes. In the questionnaire the participants will be asked about their background information (age, gender, education etc.) and language use related questions. At the end, the participants are able to leave their comments or questions regarding the research study. If they give their consent to be contacted further, they will be involved in an online interview. The interview will take approximately an hour. During the interview, the participants will be asked further questions about the language use, language attitudes and language ideologies. In particular, the questions will be focused on their mother tongue identification.

Participation in this study will involve no cost to you. You will receive no payment for your participation. This research is not funded by any organisation.

If the participants are interested in the results of the study, they can let us know by email (akbotam@student.uef.fi). The results will be shared after this Master’s thesis is graded. It is important to mention that the participants will not be identified from any report or publication placed in the public domain.

Further information related to the study can be requested from the researcher.

Contact details of the researcher:
Akbota Medebayeva
University of Eastern Finland,
Philosophical faculty, Linguistic Sciences
email: akbotam@student.uef.fi

Processing of personal data in the study
Within this study, your personal data will be processed according to the European Union General Data Protection Regulation (EU) Act 679/2016) and current national regulation. The processing of personal data will be described in the following items:

Data controller of the study:
Akbota Medebayeva
University of Eastern Finland,
Philosophical faculty, Linguistic Sciences
email: akbotam@student.uef.fi

Types of personal data that will be collected from you:

https://elemake.uef.fi/3mkkkoet/25555/lemake.html
Personal data that will be collected from you is your age, gender, ethnicity, mother tongue, place and region of residence, level of education, overall approximate time spend abroad, your language use in different settings, and your contact information, if you choose to be contacted later. There is no statutory or contractual requirement to provide personal data, participation is entirely voluntary. No personal data will be collected from other sources, for example from official registries.

For what purpose will personal data be processed?
The purpose for the processing of the personal data is scientific research.

Legal basis of processing personal data:
Legal basis of processing personal data is a consent granted by the data subject. The research subject has the right to withdraw the consent at any time by contacting the researcher.

Duration of the research (how long will the personal data be processed):
The research will last 4 years including the time for collecting and analyzing the data, publication of the study, possible reclaims about the research results and time needed to respond to them. The data will be stored in a secure server (protected by username and password) for a year after the study has been completed and then it will be destroyed.

Data transfer outside of research registry:
No personal data will be transferred outside the research group.

Possible transfer of personal data outside the EU or the EEA:
No personal data will be transferred outside the EU or the EEA.

Because your personal data will be used in this study, you will be registered to study registry. Your rights as a registered person are the following:
• Right to obtain information on the processing of personal data
• Right of access
• Right to rectification
• Right to erasure (right to be forgotten)
• Right to withdraw the consent regarding processing of personal data
• Right to restriction of processing
• Notification obligation regarding rectification or erasure of personal data or restriction of processing
• Right to data portability
• The data subject can allow automated decision-making (including profiling) with his or her specific consent
You can exercise your rights by contacting the data controller of the study.

Personal data collected in this study will not be used for automated decision-making.

A Privacy Notice for Scientific Research has been compiled of the study, and you have a possibility to get to know it by contacting the researcher.

CONSENT

Any personal data will be kept strictly confidential and no one outside the research team will be allowed access to them. Participation in the study is entirely voluntary and participants are free to withdraw their consent at any time without giving any reason. If a participant withdraws from the study or withdraws their consent, any data collected from them before their withdrawal can be included as part of the research data.

By choosing yes, I confirm that I voluntarily consent to participate in this study

☐ Yes
☐ No

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Age:

Gender:
☐ Female
Male
Other or prefer not to answer

Ethnicity:

If other, please specify:

Mother tongue:
- Kazakh
- Russian
- Other

If other, please specify:

Place of residence (last 5 years)?
- Urban
- Rural

Region of residence (last 5 years)?

If you have lived in more than one region during the last 5 years, please list here the regions and the amount of time you have lived there (for example, South Kazakhstan 4 years, Central Kazakhstan 6 months):

Level of education:

If other, please specify:

Overall approximate time spent abroad:

Language of instructions in school:
- Kazakh
- Russian
- Other

If other, please specify:

Strongest language of proficiency (the language you are the most comfortable with):
- Kazakh
- Russian
- Other

If other, please specify:

RUSSIAN PROFICIENCY

Your listening comprehension of Russian:
- I easily understand oral speech
- I understand oral speech with difficulty
- I do not understand oral speech

Your reading comprehension of Russian:
- I easily understand written text
- I understand written text with difficulty
- I don’t understand written text
**Your speaking in Russian:**
- I speak fluently
- I speak with difficulty
- I don't speak

**Your writing in Russian:**
- I write easily
- I write with difficulty
- I can't write

**Kazakh Proficiency**

**Your listening comprehension of Kazakh:**
- I easily understand oral speech
- I understand oral speech with difficulty
- I do not understand oral speech

**Your reading comprehension of Kazakh:**
- I easily understand written text
- I understand written text with difficulty
- I don't understand written text

**Your speaking in Kazakh:**
- I speak fluently
- I speak with difficulty
- I don't speak

**Your writing in Kazakh:**
- I write easily
- I write with difficulty
- I can't write

**English Proficiency**

**Your listening comprehension of English:**
- I easily understand oral speech
- I understand oral speech with difficulty
- I do not understand oral speech

**Your reading comprehension of English:**
- I easily understand written text
- I understand written text with difficulty
- I don't understand written text

**Your speaking in English:**
- I speak fluently
- I speak with difficulty
- I don't speak

**Your writing in English:**
- I write easily
- I write with difficulty
- I can't write

**Language Use**

What language do you use the most with your mother?
- Kazakh
- Russian
- Other

If other, please, specify:
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What language do you use the most with your father?
☐ Kazakh
☐ Russian
☐ Other

If other, please, specify:

What language do you use the most with your mother’s parents?
☐ Kazakh
☐ Russian
☐ Other

If other, please, specify:

What language do you use the most with your father’s parents?
☐ Kazakh
☐ Russian
☐ Other

If other, please, specify:

What language do you use the most with your friends?
☐ Kazakh
☐ Russian
☐ Other

If other, please, specify:

What language do you use the most at work/school?
☐ Kazakh
☐ Russian
☐ English
☐ Other

If other, please, specify:

If you have any further comments on this topic or about the questionnaire, please add them here:

Is it possible to contact you further for an online interview?
☐ Yes
☐ No

CONTACT INFORMATION

Your contact information for further communication (e-mail, phone number)
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https://elomake.urf.fi/lomakkeen/25555/lomake.html
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Interview Consent Form (in English)
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the research study is to investigate current sociolinguistic situation in Kazakhstan through language use, language attitudes, and language ideologies of Kazakh youth. More specifically, we are interested to know what Kazakh youth identifies as their mother tongue and what factors influence their identification.

After the questionnaire, participants are invited to answer questions in the form of an online interview, which will help us implement a deeper analysis of current sociolinguistic trends in the country.

The participation is entirely voluntary and a participant can withdraw from the study at any time. If the participant withdraws from the study or withdraws his/her consent, any data collected from him/her before the withdrawal can be included as part of the research data.

Participants will be involved in an interview once. This should not take more than one hour. During the interview, participants will be asked additional questions regarding their answers in the questionnaire. Questions will include the following topics: language use in everyday life, language skills, questions about mother tongue and personal language attitudes. Interviews will be recorded for further analysis. At the end, participants can leave their comments or questions regarding the study.

Participation in this study will involve no cost to you. You will receive no payment for your participation. This research is not funded by any organization.

If the participants are interested in the results of the study, they can let us know by email (akbotam@student.uef.fi). The results will be shared after the Master’s thesis is graded. It is important to mention that the participants will not be identified from any report or publication placed in the public domain. Further information related to the study can be requested from the researcher.

Contact details of the researcher:

Akbot Medeubaeva
University of Eastern Finland,
Philoicstical faculty, Linguistic Sciences
email: akbotam@student.uef.fi

Processing of personal data in the study

Within this study, your personal data will be processed according to the European Union General Data Protection Regulation (EU) n Act 679/2016 and current national regulation. The processing of personal data will be described in the following items:

Data controller of the study:

Akbot Medeubaeva
University of Eastern Finland,
Philosophical faculty, Linguistic Sciences
email: akbotam@student.uef.fi

Types of personal data that will be collected from you:

Personal data that will be collected from you is a recording of your voice, as well as information about your language use in various contexts, linguistic attitudes and ideologies, and personal examples confirming them. There is no statutory or contractual requirement to provide personal data, participation is entirely voluntary.

No personal data will be collected from other sources, for example from official registries.

For what purpose will personal data be processed?

The purpose for the processing of the personal data is scientific research.
Legal basis of processing personal data:

Legal basis of processing personal data is a consent granted by the data subject. The research subject has the right to withdraw the consent at any time by contacting the researcher.

Duration of the research (how long will the personal data be processed):

The research will last 4 years including the time for collecting and analyzing the data, publication of the study, possible reclamations about the research results and time needed to respond to them. The data will be stored in a secure server (protected by username and password) for a year after the study has been completed and then it will be destroyed.

Data transfer outside of research registry:

No personal data will be transferred outside the research group.

Possible transfer of personal data outside the EU or the EEA:

No personal data will be transferred outside the EU or the EEA.

Because your personal data will be used in this study, you will be registered to study registry. Your rights as a registered person are the following:

- Right to obtain information on the processing of personal data
- Right of access
- Right to rectification
- Right to erasure (right to be forgotten)
- Right to withdraw the consent regarding processing of personal data
- Right to restriction of processing
- Notification obligation regarding rectification or erasure of personal data or restriction of processing
- Right to data portability
- The data subject can allow automated decision-making (including profiling) with his or her specific consent

You can exercise your rights by contacting the data controller of the study.

Personal data collected in this study will not be used for automated decision-making.

A Privacy Notice for Scientific Research has been compiled of the study, and you have a possibility to get to know it by contacting the researcher.

**CONSENT**

☐ I have read the Participant information and I confirm that I voluntarily consent to participate in this study

**Name:**
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https://elomake.uef.fi/lomakkeen/25712/elomake.html
This privacy notice contains the information that must be shared with research subjects when you process any personal data in connection with scientific research. This obligation to inform is laid down in articles 12 – 14 in the EU’s General Data Protection Regulation, GDPR (EU 2016/679). This privacy notice also contains the information that must be in the records of processing activities by the article 30 in the GDPR. Personal data is information that could be used to identify a person directly or indirectly by e.g. linking one piece of data to another piece of data, which then allows the person to be identified.

This privacy notice demonstrates the data controller’s accountability. Accountability is a key principle of the Data Protection Regulation and means that the data controller must be able to demonstrate that they are complying with data protection legislation. This privacy notice can also be used as a template when you are preparing the information that is to be provided to research subjects.

1. **Name of the research**
   Ана тілін қандай? Linguistic identity of urban Kazakh youth

2. **Data controller**
   Akbota Medeubayeva

3. **Research parties and the division of responsibilities**
   Akbota Medeubayeva

4. **Responsible leader of or group responsible for the research**
   Akbota Medeubayeva

5. **Research implementers**
   Akbota Medeubayeva

6. **Contact information of the data protection officer**
   No data protection officer has been nominated for the research

7. **Contact person for matters related to the processing of personal data**
   Akbota Medeubayeva

8. **Nature and duration of the research**

   ☒ One-time research  ☐ Follow-up research

   Duration of the research (how long the personal data is to be processed):
   4 years

   How the personal data will be processed after the research has ended:
   ♂ Any research materials containing personal data will be archived
   ♂ without identifiers
   ♂ with identifiers
Where the materials will be archived and for how long:
The personal data will be stored in a secure server (protected by username and password) for a year after the study has been completed and then it will be destroyed. The questionnaire data contains no identifiers and interview data contains identifiers.

9. For what purpose will the personal data be processed?
The purpose for the processing of the personal data is scientific research.
The purpose of the research is to study mother tongue identification of Russian speaking Kazakh youth and the factors influencing it.

10. On what basis will the personal data be processed?
The processing of personal data always requires a legal basis. In this research, the processing basis is:
☐ a task carried out in the public interest / the exercise of public authority belonging to the controller, more specifically:
☐ scientific or historical research or the compilation of statistics
☐ the archival of research materials and cultural heritage materials
☐ the implementation of the legitimate interests of the controller or a third party
   specify the legitimate interest:
☒ consent of the data subject
☐ compliance with the controller’s legal obligations

11. What personal data is included in the research materials?
Personal data that will be processed in the research is participants' gender, age, home municipality, ethnic origin, language use, philosophical beliefs regarding their language ideology and mother tongue identification. Also, voices of few participants will be recorded in the interview stage for qualitative analysis.

12. What sources will be used to collect the personal data?
The following sources will be used to collect the personal data:
☐ Directly from research participants
☒ Interview
☐ Video recording
☒ Digital questionnaire (eLomake or similar)
☐ Questionnaire sent by mail
☐ Other method, please specify:
☐ From other sources than the participants in the research, where and what data:

☒ The research subject is not obligated to provide the necessary personal data, participation is voluntary

13. Transfer/disclosure of the data outside the research group
No data will be transferred/disclosed outside of the research group. Every step of the research (data collection, processing, analysing) will be implemented by Akbota Medeubayeva.

14. Data transfer/disclosure outside the EU or the EEA
No data will be transferred/disclosed outside the EU or the EEA.

15. Automated decision-making
Personal data collected in this study will not be used for automated decision-making.
An automated decision means a decision that is used to evaluate the specific characteristics of a person, is implemented with just automated data processing, and has legal implications for the data subject or will otherwise affect them in a significant manner. Some examples of automated decision-making include creditworthiness decisions and profiling. The data subject has the right to not be subjected to automated decision-making.

In scientific research, the processing of personal data is never used in any decisions concerning the participants of the research.

16. Personal data protection principles
A preliminary ethical review has been conducted on the research:
☐ Yes
☒ No

The data that is to be processed in the information systems has been protected using the following:
☒ user ID
☒ password
☐ user registration
☐ access control (physical location)
☐ other methods, please specify:

**Pseudonymisation and anonymisation:**
When conducting scientific research, it is necessary to store the research materials used, so that the results of the research can be verified and that the research materials that have already been collected can be used in further research and new scientific research initiatives. The research materials will be anonymised or pseudonymised whenever possible. The research results will be published in such a way that no individual persons can be identified from the results. In special cases, such as when an artist is interviewed about their work, there may be reason to identify the person.

In this research:
☒ The materials will be anonymised during the establishment phase of the materials (all identification data will be removed completely to ensure that the identification data cannot be reintroduced to the materials and that no new data can be linked to the materials)
☐ Direct identification data will be removed during the establishment phase of the materials (pseudonymised materials, meaning that a code or similar piece of information can be used to reintroduce the identification data back to the materials and that new data can be linked to the materials)
☐ The materials will be analysed using direct identification data, because (specify justification for retaining direct identification data):

Safeguards to protect any sensitive data:
☐ Research plan
☐ Responsible leader of the research, please specify:
☒ All personal data will be processed and disclosed only for research purposes and all the participants in the research agree to ensure that no data pertaining to a specific individual will be disclosed to any third parties
☐ A data protection impact assessment has been conducted on the research.

17. The rights of the data subject and any possible limitations to these rights
The data subject has following rights:
• Right to obtain information on the processing of personal data, unless an exception has been provided for by law
- Right of access
- Right to rectification
- Right to erasure (right to be forgotten). Not applied when legal basis of processing is legal obligation or public interest
- Right to withdraw the consent regarding processing of personal data
- Right to restriction of processing
- Notification obligation regarding rectification or erasure of personal data or restriction of processing
- Right to object to the processing when legal basis of processing is public or legitimate interest
- Right to data portability when legal basis of processing is consent
- Right not to be subject to a decision based solely on automated processing
- The data subject can allow automated decision-making (including profiling) with his or her specific consent
- Right to file a complaint to the Office of Data Protection Ombudsman if data subject considers that the current data protection legislation has been violated during the processing of his/her personal data

To exercise his or her rights, the data subject can contact the controller or the contact person or the data protection officer of the research. Further information related to the rights of data subjects can be requested from the contact person or from the data protection officer of the research mentioned in the beginning of this Privacy Notice.

If the purposes for which a controller processes personal data do not or do no longer require the identification of a data subject by the controller, the controller shall not be obliged to maintain, acquire or process additional information in order to identify the data subject for the sole purpose of complying with this Regulation. If the controller cannot identify the data subject the rights of access, rectification, erasure, notification obligation and data portability shall not apply except if the data subject provides additional information enabling his or her identification.

A derogation in the rights of data subject is necessary and justified if the research is meant for the purposes of the public interest and the rights of the research participant would be likely to prevent reaching these goals or hinder them greatly and these derogations are necessary to ensure these objectives.

☒ There are no derogations from the rights of the data subjects in this research.

The following protection measures have been enacted in this research so that the derogation in the rights of the research participants can be made:

☐ The processing of personal data is based on the research plan.
☐ The research has a responsible leader or group.
☒ The personal data is used and disclosed only for the purposes of historical or scientific research or some other compatible purpose and all parties involved in the research agree to ensure that no data pertaining to any specific individuals is disclosed to any third parties.
☐ The research involves the processing of sensitive materials and an impact assessment on this has been made and submitted to the Office of the Data Protection Ombudsman 30 days before the processing is set to begin.
Appendix D

Interview question template (in English)

1. Warm-up (greeting, small talk, introduction to the theme of the interview) and follow-up questions from the questionnaire:
   - You mentioned that you use Russian the most, can you tell me more about it?
   - Do you ever use Kazakh? What about your family?
   - What about childhood? Has anything changed since?
   - What languages do you use with friends, at work?
   - Have you always lived in … ?
   - Would you describe your region as Kazakh-speaking?
   - In the questionnaire you mentioned that … could you elaborate more on your Kazakh proficiency?
   - What do you feel the most comfortable with: speaking, listening, writing, reading?
   - Any specific contexts which make you feel more comfortable to use Kazakh than usual?
   - Would you like to learn more Kazakh? Why?
   - Has anyone ever shamed you for speaking Russian?

2. More open ended questions about their mother tongue, language identity ("tell me about...")
   - why they choose Russian/Kazakh as their mother tongue
   - have they always had Russian/Kazakh as their mother tongue or has that changed over time? do they ever change their mind in certain situations?
   - their travelling experience and how they talk about their mother tongue abroad (for those who have travelled)
   - language attitudes towards Russian and Kazakh
   - if they plan on having children, what school would they send their children to if they stayed in Kazakhstan and why
   - how they feel about the Kazakhization policy and that Kazakh has been spreading with children.
Appendix E

Sample of interview transcript (participant K2)

Я: Я бы хотела поговорить с тобой о языках, на которых говоришь, когда в каком контексте, почему и так далее. для начала у меня есть пару дополнительных вопросов с опросника. Ты ответил, что чаще всего говоришь только на русском, можешь рассказать поподробнее?
А: Получается с мамой разговариваем знаешь на шала-казахском можно сказать. Там половина на казахском, половина на русском. Блин, сейчас примеры привести ээм... Ну типа, говоришь там "Рахмет за Дастархан" ну типа вот так. Ну в таком, бытовом смысле. И ты не паришься там, само как-то выходит. А с папой, не знаю, больше на русском. Хотя папа наоборот учил на казахском языке, как бы в казахской школе, всё такое. Не знаю, как так получилось. А мама, с возрастом, сама стала больше использовать казахский, сама вот… я не знаю почему так произошло. Видно что она… раньше если мы что-то обсуждали, она там на русском говорила, а сейчас на казахском большую часть проговаривает.
Я: Есть такое, что она к тебе обращается на казахском, ты можешь ответить на русском?
А: А да-да-да, я ну почти вот, в 70 процентах так наверное.
Я: Если тебе нужно было бы выбрать язык, который ты используешь с мамой, не она с тобой, ты. Это был бы всё-таки русский, или казахский в большинстве случаях?
А: (пауза) ммм то есть я да обращаюсь? (я киваю) Да, наверное русский.
Я: А у тебя есть братья, сестра?
А: Да, младший брат есть.
Я: А вы как общаетесь, на каком языке?
А: Ну мы тоже шала-казахском, но больше на русском конечно, где-то процентов 80-70, а ну остальное время на казахском. Ну там знаешь мемы какие-нибудь, рофлы на казахском, ну как бы и смешнее звучат вот.
Я: То есть если это шутки чаще всего, то это на казахском?
А: Да-да-да.
Я: Я понимаю. Расскажи про другое своё окружение, друзья. Ты отметил что тоже используешь казахский, да?
А: Да-да-да. Ну получаешься я учусь в Новосибе где-то уже 1.5-2 года, ну второй год будет летом. И как я уехал там, ну знаю такое чувство, тоска навевает там, скучаешь по Родине. И ты как бы ненароком начинаешь искать ну там больше казахских песен там, начинаешь разговаривать больше на казахском. Я не знаю, там мы в дискорде сидим с пацанами, играем в counter-strike че-нибудь там, ну и постоянно почти общаемся на казахском. Наверное, это
сыграло роль конечно, так вот. Ну когда встречаемся там вот здесь, в Алматы, половина на казахском, половину на русском. Не скажу что там 60% на русском, ровно половину наверное будет на казахском.

Я: Если у тебя друзья, которые, допустим, чисто говорят только на казахском? И тебе приходится использовать только казахский, или вы все смешиваете?

А: Не, мы все смешиваем, все смешиваем, да.

Я: А как насчёт учёбы, ты учишься на русском, я понимаю, да?

А: Да-да-да, на русском.

Я: А школа, тоже была русская?

А: Да, школа была русская. Вот садик был… я вот в два садика ходил. А, не-не, вру. Садик был на русском тоже. Да, всё было на русском: и садик, и универ, и школа получается.

Я: И всё в Алмате, правильно?

А: Сад был в Шымкенте, школа и универ здесь, в Алматы уже.

Я: Ясно. Давай поговорим про детство. Было такое, что может быть ты говорил больше или меньше на казахском в детстве, по рассказам?

А: Да-да, было. Знаю, то что вот в Шымкенте когда я жил и в этом… ходил в сад получается, разговаривал идеально и на казахском и на русском. Ну я всегда вёл всёкие мероприятия, были там.. Ну, я был такой единственный, потому что меня всегда там назначали ведущим везде почти. Я знал что вот, как было точно. Ну я и в школе это по-любому я уже начал больше использовать русский, ну и вот.

Я: Как ты думаешь, что повлияло в детстве на твоё такое свободное владение, это семья?

А: Я думаю, то что мы жили в Шымкенте и все родственники там, ну процентов 85 наверное, они казахоязычные. и с ними по-любому приходилось разговаривать на казахском. А вот когда мы переехали в Алмату, уже здесь почти ни с кем ты не разговариваешь на казахском. Ну вот, кроме семьи и всё.

Я: В каком возрасте, ты помнишь, ты переехал?

А: Да, в 5 лет.

Я: В 5 лет, ага. Давай теперь поговорим насчёт владения казахским. Ты отметил, в принципе тебе без проблем понимать, читать, писать, только вот говорение чуть-чуть с трудом, правильно?

А: Да-да. Ну говорение с трудом, это знаешь как, в голове есть, но ты как-бы говоришь, ну как бы трудно выговаривается и ты боишься ошибиться и то что, сейчас засмейт “ты казах и не знаешь своего языка” типа такое, вот.

Я: Мхм, хорошо. В школе никогда не было проблем с казахским?
А: Не-не, в школе я… Ну знаешь как там было, проблем с самим языком не было, потому что я всегда сдавал там все, у меня всегда там были пятерки, потому что я относился серьезно, ну обычный предмет был для меня. Учил все правила, падежи знал, всё такое. Но мы не разговаривали на нём, вот.
Я: Хорошо, так. Есть такое что тебе легче общаться на казахском с близкими, знакомыми людьми, нежели с незнакомыми?
А: Да, есть наверное, есть-есть. Это знаешь как ты общаетесь на казахском, да вот знаешь тип с родными. Типа признак то что они тебе близкие вот да, я бы сказал да. Типа ну, когда ты доверяешь, легче разговаривать на казахском, я бы сказал.
Я: Ага, потому что не боишься ошибиться и так далее?
А: Да, не боишься ошибиться и ты свободно говоришь там, можно даже вставить там пару русскоязычных слов и они поймут, без проблем.
Я: Кроме школы ты где-нибудь учил прям как класс, предмет?
А: А нет, нет-нет-нет.
Я: Ага, понятно. И есть ли у тебя желание может быть говорить больше? Или тебе достаточно кажется?
А: Нет, да желание наверное есть прям, но это вот в последние годы проявляется, что ну как бы знать свой язык, мне кажется нужно. Просто ещё знаешь вот то что он же ведь такое нераспространенный язык по сути, только для нас он нужен. А если мы не будем его знать, то он пропадет и как-то обидно становится.
Я: Что... как ты планируешь, если у тебя планы или это просто желание улучшить владение?
А: Не, это пока только желание, планов нет.
Я: Я хочу поделиться личным опытом, плюс другие ребята мне говорили, что когда, тебе кажется что у тебя есть внутреннее желание, мотивация и ты осознаешь важность, тебя останавливает возможно чувство страха, вот это когда тебя люди стыдят и так далее. Ну вот, когда ты учишь язык среди казахов таких же, и когда тебе могут сказать “как ты до сих пор вот этого не знаешь”. У тебя есть такое, что это может влиять на твою мотивацию учить?
А: Нет, я бы не сказал. я наверное, ну как бы останавливает то что времени не совсем как бы… Ну не всегда распределяю время рационально знаешь, может не выпасть окошко там для обучения. Из-за этого я вот хотел записаться на класс английского, но я до этого работал, и там у нас график был жёсткий, ну и никак не выпадало получается свободное время, ну и вот. А так, шейминга такого я не боюсь в принципе. Я не думаю, что он именно сейчас будет проявляться прям так.
Я: А ты когда-нибудь с этим сталкивался вообще что тебя публично так может стыдили или… таксисты и так далее?
А: ммм ну да наверное сталкивался. Но не таксист, это было вроде этот, на свадьбе, в городе Шымкент. Знаешь тип, я не смог произнести фразу на казахском, ну там чуваки казахоязычные и у нас там стычка была. И я типа хотел ответить на казахском, а сказал фразу на русском. Мне до сих пор это снится в кошмарах.
 Я: А как они на это отреагировали?
 А: Они не, они никак. там у нас была серьёзная… ну серьёзная обстановка. Я не думаю, что кто-то бы засмеялся тогда вот. Ну мне просто самому, я это сказал и такой подумал “блин, что ты сказал”.
 Я: Ага, ясно. То есть в том контексте это было как-то неуместно?
 А: Да-да-да, ага.
 Я: Ты упоминал работу, и отметил что русский казахский используешь. Можешь рассказать поподробнее?
 А: Да, я работал вот бариста ммм ну где-то месяца полтора, где-то месяц работал. Я там использовал русско-казахский можно сказать 50 на 50, потому что контингент был такой что много казахов, и они понимали ну всякие рофлы знаешь типа (непонятно). И у меня было ассистентка, она русская была, Надежда её звали. Хотя она знала почти идеально казахский и было так ну легко прям, я с ней всегда на казахском разговаривал.
 Я: Извини, я тебя прослушала, что-то была заминка, ты сказал “контингент был такой, и все понимали...” и потом что-то…
 А: Да, понимали, типо говоришь “Сула, калайсын” или там “Адиль, кофе дайын” ну вот в таком плане. Можно было даже парофлить там что-нибудь, но я тебе пример сейчас не приведу, не вспомнить даже сразу.
 Я: Хорошо. и ты сказал, что твоя ассистентка была русская, вы всё равно могли использовать казахский?
 А: Да-да, потому что она выросла в Таразе, потом у неё муж было казах ну и всё такое, я думаю там нормально.
 Я: Интересно. Как ты думаешь, это как-то повлияло на твоё, на твою практику языка? Увеличилась, вот это работа?
 А: Да-да, увеличилась. Я думаю то что, ещё что мне нравится, то что мои друзья, они ну, мы тоже все казахи такие, ну можно сказать шала, но мы стали больше использовать казахский язык и это помогает знаешь типа не забывать и быть увереннее, когда ты говоришь с кем-нибудь.
 Я: Давай поговорим о том, что ты смотришь, слушаешь? На каком языке?
 А: Да. Ну я сразу скажу, что на казахском языке я почти ничего не смотрю, только вот последние фильмы выходят новые там казахстанские, вот типа “Акима” там всё такое. Ну
там знаешь такие комедии, наши короче и мы вот с семьёй смотрим. И я думаю, крутая практика то что там все такие именно смешные моменты, они билингвистические. Типа можно, ну именно билингвист должен понять, потому что я думаю кто не знает казахского, он не поймёт полностью шутки. Или кто не знает полностью русского, он тоже не поймёт. Нужно именно чтобы ты знал хорошо и казахский и русский, тогда нормально. А так сериалы и почти... большинство ну процентов 70 на английском смотрю, ну в оригинале там на японском что-нибудь и на корейском, только с субтитрами всё, вот.
Я: Ага, как насчёт музыки, слушаешь что-нибудь на казахском?
А: А ну да, но с музыкой полегче, потому что на казахском да там нормально треков. Ну я думаю там процентов 20 на казахском, процентов 20 на английском, и 60 на русском. А можно там ещё по 5% накинуть за японскую… (непонятно)
Я: Извини, ты опять завис. На японском ты сказал 5%?
А: Да-да, и на корейском можно добавить.
Я: А какую музыку ты слушаешь на казахском? Какой жанр примерно?
А: ммм так есть получается джаз, рэп и… и такой я бы сказал инди-поп, вот такое.
Я: ммм, интересно. А давай теперь переидем к родному языку. Ты отметил свой родной язык казахский. Что для тебя родной язык, можешь объяснить?
А: ммм.. ну родной язык это, я думаю (пауза). Ну язык, получается, сейчас, надо сформулировать правильно. (пауза) ну язык твоего народа, я думаю вот.
Я: То есть ты отметил казахский как свой родной, потому что это язык твоего народа, правильно понимаю? Или ещё какие-то причины?
А: (пауза) нет.
Я: Нет? Извини, (а: нет) Опять что-то виснет связь и я.. нет, ага.
А: Да, что-то зависит. Да, я понял.
Я: Хорошо, всегда ли такое было, что ты воспринимал казахский как свой родной язык?
А: ммм… были моменты знаешь, когда ты думаешь что те, кто разговаривают на казахском, ну такие типа невежи там, можно сказать мамбичи. Ну я не знаю это такое была навязанное эээ чувство, но потом это всё прошло, когда ты сам начал разговаривать (непонятно)
Я: ммм, то есть тогда, блин это связь меня очень раздражает, то есть тогда в какой-то момент возможно ты не так относился к нему?
А: Да-да-да. Я считал, что это как-то стрёмно немного.
Я: Было ли такое, что в то время у тебя может быть было более… близкое, как сказать, (показываю на грудь) родное отношение к русскому языку или так никогда не относился к русскому?
А: ммм нет, я наверное так не относился, но я в те моменты думал, что он важнее для меня. Типа его знать престижнее, вот так я бы сказал.
Я: Сейчас ты так не думаешь?
А: Нет, сейчас так не думаю. Сейчас думаю наоборот: вот бы знать идеально казахский, было бы куу прикольно.
Я: Ты отметил, что за рубежом жил больше 2 лет. Это Новосибирск или ещё где-то?
А: Нет-нет, Новосибирск.
Я: мхм, Расскажи, пожалуйста, поподробнее сколько времени ты жил там?
А: Получается, полтора... и вот летом я должен туда поехать, если закончится вся эта карантин (непонятно) ну я там учусь, сначала жил в общаге, потом снимал квартиру вот.
Я: То есть до сейчасшнего времени это полтора года, да?
А: Да-да-да.
Я: И можешь рассказать были ли у тебя такие истории, когда люди у тебя спрашивали, возможно не зная на каких языках у нас говорят, интересовались и может быть им было интересно, почему ты говоришь на русском, или там всё понимают в принципе?
А: Да, они спрашивали (непонятно) но там.. почти (непонятно) и даже в универсе казахов не встречал, только одного встречал и ну в каждой компании ну я же говорю (непонятно) я всегда казахом получается…
Я: Извини, я опять я… пропадаешь.
А: Да-да алло?
Я: Давай я попробую остановить и перезвонить тебе, хорошо?
А: Давай-давай.
Я: Давай, с последнего вопроса. Было ли когда-нибудь такая ситуация, когда тебе нужно было объяснять людям, россиянам возможно, там на каких языках мы говорим, почему ты используешь русский и так далее?
А: Ну да, почти всегда интересовались, нормально да меня слышно?
Я: Вроде да.
Я: Извини, я опять я… пропадаешь.
А: Да-да алло?
Я: Давай я попробую остановить и перезвонить тебе, хорошо?
А: Давай-давай.
Я: Давай, с последнего вопроса. Было ли когда-нибудь такая ситуация, когда тебе нужно было объяснять людям, россиянам возможно, там на каких языках мы говорим, почему ты используешь русский и так далее?
А: Ну да, почти всегда интересовались, нормально да меня слышно?
Я: Вроде да.
А: Почти всегда интересовались, потому что во всех компаниях я был единственным казахом. И даже в универсе там я 1 казаха только встречал. И приходилось объяснять почему ну как бы я знаю ну в идеале по сути русский язык и как вообще обстоят дела там. Ну россияне интересовались там не гоняют ли русских у нас, всё такое. Ну я говорил то что у нас 2 государственных языка и это вообще не проблема там как бы..
Я: мхм, блин опять это начинается, ну вроде я услышала последнее. То есть спрашивали когда-нибудь именно про твой личный родной язык или такого не было?
А: не-не, такого не было прямо чтобы спрашивали.
Я: мhm, так секунду. И последнее, давай поговорим про отношение к языкам. Вот ты немного уже начал об этом говорить. Есть ли у тебя такое, что ты относишься по-разному к русскому и казахскому? Может быть они вызывают разные чувства какие-то?
А: (Вздыхает) да, ну я бы сказал казахский вызывает такие знаешь, ну домашние чувства, потому что это родной язык. И когда ты разговариваешь на казахском, на нём как бы легче на генном уровне доверять, потому что сам казах и вот в таком плане. А на русском, я не знаю, русский он стал таким знаешь обиходный языком то что средство коммуникации и всё такое почти все знают его ну и всё.
Я: Так, а есть такое что, казахская речь вызывает у тебя какие-то патриотические чувства?
А: Да-да, думаю есть.
Я: Когда за рубежом слышишь у тебя есть такое что становится может быть... гордиться?
А: эээм ты пропала на секунду, не услышал.
Я: Когда за рубежом допустим слышишь казахскую речь, у тебя есть такое что какие-то патриотические чувства вызывает?
А: Ну да-да, я бы сказал есть. Охота подойти, сказать о, как дела? всё такое.
Я: И представь что, допустим, про будущих детей давай поговорим. Я не знаю собираешься ли ты иметь детей, но если бы у тебя были дети, в какую школу бы ты их отдал, если бы жил в Казахстане? И почему?
А: Знаешь, я раньше думал что (непонятно) если дети родятся, то будем сразу там с женой разговаривать на английском. Я думал, нужно будет вот вдалбливать английский как (непонятно) родной будет идти. Но это вот со временем конечно всё меняется, сейчас я бы отдал наверное в русскую школу, чтобы казахский там тоже был в плане не так как один предмет там, чтобы он нормально велся в принципе. Я бы так наверное отдал.
Я: Уточню, а то не расслышала. Ты сказал, что хотел чтобы вы использовали английский и вдалбливали детям как родной да? Что-то такое ты сказал.
А: Да-да-да. Ну чтобы да-да, чтобы по умолчанию они думали, что это родной язык. Типа в будущем им было бы так легче.
Я: Сейчас ты до сих пор так думаешь или всё-таки нет?
А: Нет-нет-нет, сейчас уже нет. После Новосибирска, я думаю у меня перепрограммирование головного мозга прошло.
Я: Ага, в сторону более такую, казахскую?
А: Да-да (смеётся), казахскую сторону.
Я: Интересно, интересно что у тебя с опытом жизни за границей наоборот чувства выросли. Ну это интересно, да. Так что ты сказал в русскую школу, но где казахский хорошо учат. Это какая-то определённая, специальная школа или обычная гимназия?
А: (непонятно) наверное гимназия была бы, но я не думаю что в обычных школах это будет прямо вестись хорошо. Это просто как бы желание, типа была бы такая школа, я думаю туда бы я записал детей, если бы мы жили здесь.
Я: Почему именно в русскую школу? (зависло) Не слышу совсем.
А: Пропал, да?
Я: Да, ещё раз можно, почему именно в русскую?
А: Да, имеется в виду то что как средство коммуникации русский язык (непонятно) И если ты уверен в русском, ты более коммуникабельный. Я это заметил ну по своему опыту.
Я: мхм, русский язык как средство коммуникации, да ты сказал?
А: Да.
Я: И последнее, я не знаю заметил ли ты, но сейчас есть такой тренд, что всё больше и больше детей занимаются в казахских школах и будто бы молодые родители осознают важность этого, возможно больше чем с нашим поколением. Как ты думаешь куда это приведет? Возможно ли что казахский язык получит равноправие с русским? Или даже заменит его?
А: Я кстати об этой тенденции не знал. Думал там, думал больше перевешивает всё-таки русскоязычные ну классы, школы. И ну в принципе наблюдая замечаешь все эти ну там, реформы там проводятся с увеличением часов для казахского языка и всё такое, я думаю ну когда-то да, ну ближайшие лет 15-20, я думаю уже можно будет говорить что вытеснит. Хотя бы как минимум 60 на 40 будет уже в сторону казахского.
Я: Как ты к этому относишься сам лично?
А: Блин знаешь это вот такой двоякий вопрос, он такой ещё хитрый в принципе. Ну с одной стороны, у нас же два государственных языка и знать нужно именно как бы 2. Если ты один знаешь, один нет, то это не даёт тебе как бы права что-то делать всё такое. Ну молодец ладно что ты знаешь один хотя бы. И то что как бы научаешь вот это ну я бы сказал знаешь, много всяких людей бывает. Бывают странные там, начнутся притеснения всё такое. Этого конечно тоже не хотелось бы, но просто много встречается таких индивидов, которые начинают “это Казахстан типа, видишь слово казах типа наша земля” и всё такое. Ну я думаю нужно просто знать два языка и всё, и быть хорошим человеком.
Я: То есть ты как бы за билингвализм, даже в будущем?
А: Да-да, билингвист алга.
Я: мхм, чтобы русский тоже сохранился в стране?
А: Да-да-да, это знаешь такая мера, она как бы будет держать в узде и первых и вторых, я бы сказал.
Я: (киваю) есть такие теории, что с развитием английского в образовании и вообще в стране, возможно что английский заменит русский. Как ты на это смотришь?
А: Но в принципе, я думаю если заменит как бы это не очень будет. Можно было бы рассмотреть вопрос о добавлении 3 государственного языка, я был бы за. Ну это просто мне кажется облегчило бы всем работу. То что оно типа стандарт, там идет три языка и ты можешь варьировать там между тремя.
Я: Спасибо большое, вроде бы у меня всё.