

# ‘Maintaining and Developing the Languages’: Participation in Decision-Making and Support for Language Revival in Russia’s Finno-Ugric Republics

*Konstantin Zamyatin (Helsinki)*

## **Abstract**

In the early 1990s the revival of titular languages was set as one of the goals of language policies in the national republics of Russia. The republican authorities intended to achieve this policy goal through designating the titular languages with an official status on par with Russian and the corresponding expansion of their use in the public domains by institutionalizing elements of official status in legislation. The extent of institutionalization of titular languages varied across the republics and depended on the level of representation of ethnic elites in regional parliaments. Did the extent of implementation correlate with that of institutionalization? How important was participation of elites in decision-making for the successful implementation? To what extent were the institutionalized elements also implemented? The purpose of this paper is to compare the extent and content of institutional support provided to titular languages in the republics in order to understand the limits in the ability of ethnic elites to promote the titular languages. Today, after more than two decades of implementation, the policy effectiveness can be already evaluated. The policies were implemented through executive programs. The approach of this study is to examine executive programs in the republics titled after the ‘peoples’ speaking Finno-Ugric languages with the help of some qualitative and quantitative criteria. The comparison demonstrates that the official status of titular languages achieved in the early 1990s did not automatically open the access to their institutional support. Ethnic elites steadily had to bargain for funding for policy implementation. Insufficient support does not ensure language maintenance.

**Keywords:** Language revival, executive programs, decision-making, policy implementation, Finno-Ugric republics, Russian Federation

## **1. Introduction**

Institutionalization of languages implies the introduction of a language in certain institutional contexts (see Zamyatin 2014c). Institutionalization of titular languages in legislation marked commitment of authorities to the expansion of their official use. However, in the top-down policy approach towards promotion of the titular languages, legal provisions rarely required their compulsory use

in practice and, instead, left to decide over practical issue to the discretion of bureaucracy. In this situation, policy implementation mattered more for achieving the policy goal than legislation. What determined the extent and content of support directed at ‘maintenance and development’ of titular languages? It would be logical to expect that the access of elites to power mattered also at the stage of policy implementation. The purpose of the current article is to check the hypothesis that participation of ethnic elites in decision-making was the key variable for providing institutional support at the level of policy implementation. In order to achieve this aim, the first objective is based on previous research to explore the link between participation in decision-making and support for language revival. The second objective is to outline the institutional framework for policy implementation and limitations it imposed on the forms of support. The third objective is to test the hypothesis by studying the content and measuring the extent of support in case studies. The fourth objective is to provide a perspective for evaluation of policy’s possible implications.

This study will start with exploring in its first part the reasons for and circumstances of the attachment of language revival to the officialization of titular languages and the role of elites in this process. From a federal perspective, the study will utilize the findings regarding the limits imposed by the federal policy and its shifts that conditioned the dynamics in the policy adoption and its changes in regional language legislation (Zamyatin 2014b). From a regional perspective, it will address the problem of minority access to power through ethnic political representation and participation in decision-making. Fernand de Varennes wrote about the political, administrative and legal mechanisms needed for the policy of official bilingualism to be effective (see de Varennes 2012: 47-51). Accordingly, the second part will outline the main resources in these three fields both in their horizontal and vertical power dimensions needed for the expansion of the use of titular language. This part will describe the ‘hardware’ of institutions that had to back the policy and the ‘software’ of regulations, of which executive programs became the most important mechanism in defining the extent and content of support and providing financial resources for policy implementation.

If the policy adoption was a non-recurrent step (in fact, three steps: see Zamyatin 2014a: 97-103), then the stage of implementation is a protracted in time activity. For that reason, the implementation will be studied from a diachronic perspective. Furthermore, to exclude historically contingent factors, the study will undertake a comparison of policy implementation in several republics. So, in the third part of the article a comparative analysis of executive programs will shed light on the extent and content of support provided in the Republics of Karelia (RK), Komi (KR), Mari El (RME), Mordovia (RM), Udmurtia (UR). The programs are the primary data to be analyzed. While the

texts of the programs are available, the data on their implementation is less so. The situation has somewhat improved in the late 2000s, when authorities were obliged to make their policies more open and accountable to the public. When available, also reports on activities of executive authorities and some other official sources are used among the research materials.

Regarding the content of support, the paper will explore, what was the scope of executive programs, whether a program was focused on state languages or had a wider application and, further, whether a program was focused more on status planning, corpus planning or prestige planning. Regarding the extent of support, the paper will explore how intensive were measures by comparing the amount of funds provided. In order to see how the extent and content of support changed over time, the paper will study all programs directed at 'maintenance and development' of languages approved in these republics since the early 1990 but it will only briefly present the latest cycle of programs of the early 2010s. A limitation of the paper is that it will not explore the programs in conjoined spheres, notably, in culture and education, that also contained some measures on language promotion. Another limitation is that this study will not explore separately the circumstances and political background behind the programs' approval. When applicable, the study will draw upon the parallels with the adoption of the language laws (Zamyatin 2013c; see paragraph 4.3 below). Furthermore, analysis is restricted to studying language planning and does explore neither its impact on language practices nor the influence of the sociolinguistic situation on policy.

Finally, in the fourth part, the obtained data on implementation will be put in an evaluative perspective. First the problem of evaluation will be discussed and then the extent and content of programs evaluated. The evaluation of the data is conducted not on an absolute but on a relative account, *inter alia*, against the background of the republics with greater amount of support. The Republics of Tatarstan (RT) and Chuvashia (ChR) serve as a frame of reference, against which to measure what could have been done also in the Finno-Ugric republics. The results demonstrate that, after all, the implementation was not as bleak as could be expected from the low institutionalization. The content of support was quite manifold, although the official status of state languages *per se* was not especially useful to significantly increase the extent of support at the stage of implementation. Ethnic elites were co-optated into executive authorities and were in control of executive programs but not of providing funds. As a result, the extent of support provided in executive programs does not guarantee language maintenance in the long run.

## **2. Language policy and the role of elites in its implementation**

### **2.1. ‘Top-down’ language revival policy and the role of elites in its adoption**

The processes of decrease in linguistic diversity inspired a recent wave of research in language revitalization. Sophisticated accounts, such as the model of reversing language shift (Fishman 1991), emerged that propose tools for dealing with language shift and are successfully utilized in some revitalization projects. Joshua Fishman (2001) pointed out that efforts both ‘from above’ and ‘from below’ are necessary for the reversal of language shift to be successful. While researchers now quite well understand the mechanics of language shift at the micro level and propose their solutions through grass-root activities, less studied is the situation of language endangerment at the macro level in communities with hundreds of thousands of speakers, who, nevertheless, rapidly lose their language. Researchers agree that the problem might be in the language policy of the state that promotes national identity, for which strong regional languages might become an obstacle. However, researchers have not yet quite found answers for the situation, when the despite the explicit commitment of public authorities to preserving diversity and multilingualism, the minority languages continue to quickly disappear, as is the case in post-Soviet Russia. Whether the reason for the failure of the revivalist attempts is inefficiency of the policy or are there some other explanations?

An appropriate approach to the study of language policy of the state that can shed light on the problem of policy efficiency is the policy analysis that explores the political process developing in a sequence of stages (see Zamyatin 2014a: 46). According to Bernard Spolsky (2004: 5–15) language policy is comprised of three components: language practices, language ideology and language planning, where the latter amounts to a set of actions by public authorities. In a diachronic perspective, language planning undergoes the stages of policy adoption, its implementation and evaluation (see, e.g., Grin 2003: 47). In a synchronic perspective, the three types of language planning: acquisition planning, status planning and prestige planning (see Cooper 1990: 100-103) include, accordingly, to actions directed at creating capacity, opportunity and desire to use the language in François Grin’s C-O-D model.

The policy analysis approach is suitable for a case study of Russia’s national republics because of the state-centered character of language politics there. On the wave of popular ethnic mobilization in the late 1980s, the language shift among non-Russians to the Russian language appeared among the popular concerns in the Autonomous Republics of the Russian SFSR and the demand for ‘language revival’ was pronounced. A possible fix would have been addressing the problem of broken intergenerational language transmission in family through

grass-root activities. Yet, the leadership of national movements identified the absence of non-Russian languages in the public sphere as another cause of language shift and ethnic assimilation that could be tackled with only through the public policy. At the same time, the public policy directed at reversal of language shift had to be restricted to the public sphere. Free choice of language use was recognized that precluded state interference in private affairs of individuals. This way top-down language policy in the national republics of Russia became the mainstream approach to solving the problem of language shift and language loss (see Zamyatin 2014b: 109).

The goal of the expansion of language use in the public sphere could be achieved through status planning, that is, the designation of certain languages with an official status. In the early 1990s almost all former Autonomous Republics of Russia established Russian and titular languages as their state languages first in the declarations of state sovereignty and later in the constitutions. The officialization of the titular languages opened the gate both for the expansion of their practical functions in office and, wider, for systemic preferential support for their ‘maintenance and development’ through a set of regional government actions (see Zamyatin 2014a: 103-104). While the officialization was a measure of status planning, ‘maintenance and development’ of languages included measures of corpus planning and acquisition planning and was not restricted to officialized languages. In ideological terms, ‘maintenance and development’ of languages does not imply a qualitative change but rather a process of ‘language promotion’ and, thus, is unpretentious in comparison with popularly demanded ‘language revival’, which supposes the result (see Zamyatin 2013c: 140). Furthermore, the adherence to promoting the official use of titular languages instead of requiring its use by authorities also reveals intention to further limit the official use of titular languages to a more symbolic role instead of actually achieving a state of official bilingualism (de Varennes 2012: 52-56). This also means that even if some republics established status languages as equal in their status, *de facto* unequal functioning of languages is taken as a starting point. Why was the policy goal formulated so restrictively from a revivalist perspective?

While the republican authorities officially used public demands as justification for the official designation of languages, meaningful is the distinction between popular ethnic mobilization and the activities of authorities especially in those republics where the public demands have only partially become the government agenda. Furthermore, in the conditions of the turn to authoritarianism, the instrumental interests of elites became an intrinsic part in their motivation behind the demands for officialization. The different segments of regional elites that were advancing their interests by this act of officialization are referred here as ‘(titular) ethnic elites’ and ‘Russian elites’. Given high

politicization of ethnicity, ethnic origin of government officials and other members of elites often mattered in search for political compromises over ethnic and linguistic issues (see further discussion on different segments of elites in Zamyatin 2014a: 60-64).

All the republics adopted the revival of titular languages though their official designation as a goal of their policies, even if in terms of the process of promotion and not the require result. This outcome is somewhat unanticipated, because the expansion of titular languages in the public sphere was not in the interest of the Russian elites and in the republics with the Russian majority they could have prevented this step. Jan Blommaert conceptualized political attitudes propagating the need for reducing multilingualism as those based on 'the efficiency assumption' and 'the integration assumption' (Blommaert 1996: 210–212). Applying these assumptions specifically towards the situation with co-official languages, the arguments against the designation of two and more official languages would go that this step makes governance 'unworkable' and would further inspire nationalist political aspirations by creating an institutionalized obstacle to national unity. In fact, neither arguments about costs and benefits nor about equality, justice and rights (see, e.g., Kymlicka 1995, Grin 2003) have become central but the issue of power. Both titular and Russian regional elites had a common interest in establishing the state languages in the sovereignty declarations as one more attribute of the national statehood that could serve as an argument for a greater self-governance in the face of central authorities also in republics with a Russian majority (see Zamyatin 2013a: 151-153).

At the same time, titular ethnic elites attempted to use language requirements for top officials in regional politics as a political instrument. Russian regional elites resisted inclusion in the republican constitutions of this and some other provisions that stipulated practical use of titular languages. In reaching an agreement with titular ethnic elites, the Russian regional elites insisted on a number of conditions that made impossible the use of official status as an instrument of exclusion in the republics, where titular groups were in the numerical minority (Zamyatin 2013b: 369-371). The conditions included a co-official status of Russian and the disconnection between symbolic recognition of the official status and practical expansion of titular languages in the public sphere. Alexander Osipov studied the workings of ethnic federalism in Russia and demonstrated how conflict of interests ends up in the situations of 'systemic hypocrisy', when the political actors contend with symbolic recognition and do not reach the actual implementation of legal provisions (Osipov 2012). Hypocrisy in the given case meant that the scope of the official status remained undefined. State languages were only symbolically designated in sovereignty

declarations and constitutions, while the matter of practical expansion was left to be solved in language laws.

Nevertheless, contrary to the instrumentalist view on language (see, e.g., Robichaud & De Schutter 2012), the self-interest of elites was not the only motive in their actions. The fact that elites had instrumental interests in the officialization does not exclude the sincerity of their revivalist efforts, because also in the latter category of republics the officialization went beyond symbolic recognition and included the expansion of practical use of titular languages through the adoption of language laws (see Zamyatin 2013c: 146-147).

## **2.2. Ethnic political representation and participation in decision-making**

A feature of the Soviet totalitarian regime was that its representative legislative bodies of authorities performed rather a decorative role, while the real decision-making was concentrated in hands of *nomenklatura*, that is, bureaucracy recruited under supervision of the Communist Party. Although *de facto* the Soviet Union functioned as a unitary state, ethnic federalism was formally preserved, and non-Russians were often even overrepresented in Supreme Soviets, quasi-parliaments elected on a non-alternative basis. The second chamber of the USSR Supreme Council was the Soviet of Nationalities, where nationally defined territorial units were represented depending on political status of their ‘titular peoples’ in the Soviet hierarchy of nations. However, it was representativeness in the Communist Party and *nomenklatura* that marked participation in power structures. From the early years the Soviet policy of ‘indigenization’ of the state apparatus ensured participation of “national cadres” also in executive bodies of nationally defined territories. An unwritten practice was formed of appointing individuals of titular ethnic origin to the positions of top officials in these territorial units (see Zamyatin 2014a: 87-89).

The political developments of the early 1990s in Russia marked an attempt of transition to democracy. Reconstruction of the state structure in line with democratic principles included the division of powers both horizontally between branches of authorities as well as vertically through the federative structure with two tiers of government: central and regional authorities. While Soviet legacies for Russia’s state-building were remarkable, a major difference was that ethnic representation was not institutionalized at the federal level and only some regions were ethnically based. The Russian constitution (12 December 1993) established the federal system, where the upper chamber of the Russian parliament was based on the principle of regional representation and did not pretend to represent the nationalities (see Moser 2012, Prina 2012). The 2001 federal law permitted only federal political parties and explicitly prohibited the creation of political parties on the grounds of ethnic or religious affiliation

(Federal Law, 11 July 2001). The core of ethnic politics shifted to the regions. At the same time, the federal design permitted the republics pursuing the policies of the promotion of cultures and languages of their titular ethnic groups.

On the wave of popular ethnic mobilization, former autonomous republics and some autonomous regions of Russia upgraded their political status in accordance with the right to national self-determination of their 'titular nations' to that of national republics. However, in every republic its 'multinational people' was recognized as the source of sovereignty and not the titular ethnic group. Democratized electoral systems did not contain 'national' quota that previously provided the mechanism for minority political representation. As a result, in those republics, where titular groups were in the numerical minority, titular ethnic elites were typically losing their positions, when power shifted from the CPSU regional committees to legislatures. Claiming that autochthonous groups could not exercise self-governance in the conditions of majority rule, titular elites tried to solve this problem, inter alia, advocating for establishment of two-chamber legislatures, where the second chamber would be formed on the basis of ethnic representation. These attempts failed. Another suggestion was to form the legislature in manner of the federal parliament or at least with a mixed principle of representation through both proportional and territorial electoral districts, which, however, did not solve the problem of under-representation (see Zamyatin 2013b: 342-345).

The opportunities of ethnic elites to include their revivalist agenda in language laws were, thus, restricted. As the laws were passed in parliamentary procedure, the level of political representation of ethnic elites in regional parliaments proved to be crucial for the extent of institutionalized elements of the official status that implied practical use of titular languages. This level depended, first of all, on the share of the titular group in the total population of the republic and the ability of ethnic elites to mobilize popular support. The previous comparative study has demonstrated that the higher was the level of ethnic representation in republican parliaments, the more provisions institutionalizing titular languages were included in legislation. Other linguistic variables, e.g. number of speakers, their share in the republic's population, the existence of alternative standard forms of a language, or extralinguistic variables, e.g. the existence of political tensions, were functional to strengthening or weakening the position of ethnic elites at the table of negotiations but did not in themselves hinder or promote officialization and institutionalization of titular languages (see Zamyatin 2013c: 141-146).

However, political under-representation of titular groups in republican parliaments has not become a major obstacle to the inclusion of language revival into the government agenda also in republics with the titular minority for the reasons mentioned above (see also Zamyatin 2013a: 155-158). The language

laws in the republics also were an outcome of the political bargaining between Russian and ethnic elites. As ethnic elites in all Finno-Ugric republics were only minor stakeholders, the level of institutionalization in law depended there on their ability to negotiate with other segments of regional elites. The predominantly Russian regional elites effectively prevented the full institutionalization, using the mechanism of the co-official status of Russian (see Zamyatin 2014b: 126-127). Among the institutionalized elements, these were mostly provisions contributing to language landscapes and other on symbolic use (see Zamyatin 2014c).

Language laws could have filled the gap between symbolic recognition and practical implementation by prescribing compulsory use of titular language. Yet, in many instances the adopted in the early 1990s laws reminded more policy statements than legal texts, *inter alia*, due to a Soviet legacy, when the function of legislature was to imitate the democratic procedure and to approve the Party decision formally. In the conditions, when legal provisions were of descriptive and declaratory character, government officials and civil servants became central figures responsible for the implementation of public policies (Zamyatin 2013c: 129-130).

Ethnic elites were often better represented among government officials than in legislature, because their membership was ensured through other mechanisms than political representation. The concept of the horizontal division of powers also at the regional level enabled executive authorities to act quite self-reliantly in many instances. Since the October 1993 coup and the following ‘presidentization’, the executive branch of power started to dominate first in Moscow and soon also in regions. The shift during the 1990s resulted in establishment of regional authoritarian regimes (Zamyatin 2013b: 344-345), where continuity was ensured through power networks with the ‘first figures’ on the top (see Ledeneva 2013). This shift removed the problem of political under-representation but simultaneously raised the problem of support on the side of the first figures (see Zamyatin 2013b: 369-371, 2013c: 140-141). Ethnic elites managed to negotiate and receive their share of the ‘republican pie’ with some exceptions (notably, in Mari El since the early 2000s, see the next paragraph).

All in all, when a ‘titular people’ composed the biggest ethnic group in a republic, its ethnic elite was typically also in the majority in regional legislature and in control of regional government, the process Ruslan Galliamov called ‘ethnization of regional elites’. For example, in the 1990s in Tatarstan ethnic Tatars were slightly less than a half of the republic’s total population but counted for up to three fourth of the regional ruling elites. The opposite scenario was also typical with some exceptions. An outstanding example of an exceptional influence of ethnic elites is Bashkortostan, where titular group composed less than a third of the total population, but around half of parliamen-

tarians and up to two thirds of top government officials were of titular ethnic origin (see Galliamov 2006: 37-41). In the same way as higher representation in Bashkortostan was explained by the fact that the upper chamber of legislature was composed of territorially elected heads of local administrations, who in effect were appointed by the republican president, higher participation in decision-making was also assigned to the key role of the president, who appointed the ministers. None of these worked this way in the Finno-Ugric republics, where ethnic Russians compose the biggest group of regional ruling elites (see Zamyatin 2013b: 366-368). For example, ethnic Russians compose 78% of regional ruling elites in Udmurtia, about 68% in Mari El and 52% in Mordovia (*Natsionalnyi vopros* 2013: 39). Was this phenomenon of a higher share of individuals with titular ethnic background in the executive branch of power than in legislature characteristic also for the Finno-Ugric republics and if yes, how to explain it?

### **2.3. Ethnic participation in decision-making by executive authorities**

According to an institutionalist explanation, 'ethnic institutions', created by the Soviet state, such as nationally defined territorial units, national schools or social institutions instead of once and for all times solving 'the nationalities question', promoted local identities and, thus, facilitated the rise of nationalism and virtual collapse of the USSR (see Brubaker 1996: 13-22, Gorenburg 2003: 3-5). However, institutional solutions in managing diversity, as ethnic federalism itself, might also be viewed as mechanisms that prevented conflicts and kept the state together. The official status of the titular languages is, among other things, an element of institutionalized ethnicity (see Zamyatin 2014a: 122-123).

The decline in ethnic mobilization in the national republics of Russia led to the weakening of the position of titular ethnic elites in Finno-Ugric republics. The enrooted in the Soviet times practice of appointing chief executives, *inter alia*, on the ground of their ethnicity, in order to reach an inter-ethnic balance, was significantly undermined. Sometimes it was fully abandoned. Mari El is example of a region, where a newly elected republican leader did not take into account local political traditions and came with his own team. Since the early 2000s, the new president expelled most ethnic Mari officials of previous administration from their posts, and by the mid-2000s the Minister of Culture became one of the three ethnic Mari among the government members (see Zamyatin 2013b: 360-363).

Yet, even if ethnicity of the first figure did not guarantee their automatic support for language revival, it remained an issue of concern at least for ethnic elites. The head of republic irrespective of his ethnicity typically consulted with 'interests of the autochthonous people' (see Zamyatin 2013b: 370-371). Furthermore, regional elite pacts typically foresaw that ethnic elites were gi-

ven their share in power through access to government offices, including the top positions. As the core of their agenda were in the cultural and educational sphere, officials of titular ethnic origin are usually headed executive authorities in the spheres of (1) nationalities policy/nationalities affairs/inter-ethnic relations, (2) mass media, (3) education, (4) culture.

Also some other spheres, such as agriculture, were often given to the individuals of titular ethnic origin, because titular groups typically resided in rural areas, but this did not touch upon ethnic issues. The complication in the republics is that the republican financial resources for implementation are not directly accessible, because ethnic elites did not have access to leadership in ministries of economics, finances and state property, as, for example, in Tatarstan or Chuvashia. Moreover, the latter republics have not created an executive authority in the sphere of nationalities policy. The reason was exactly that there was no need for a special body, as the ethnic elites controlled the government and it was assumed that the republic itself performs this function. However, in the Finno-Ugric republics language policy was not an issue of concern for the whole republican state apparatus, but only of a particular part of it. Only executive authorities in the social and cultural sphere were involved, while other authorities, particularly those in the sphere of resources and law enforcement agencies, but also regional departments of federal authorities, could not be subjected to regional policy of official bilingualism (see Zamyatin 2014b: 123-125).

It is not easy to provide evidence on the ethnicity of civil servants in Finno-Ugric republics, because these data are usually undisclosed and rarely public. For example, it was reported that in Mordovia 35-40% of ministers and civil servants in the government structures were of the titular ethnic origin (Dolgaeva 2001), that more or less correlated with the share of the titular group in the total population. At the same time, biographical data of the top government officials are accessible in open sources: since the Soviet times information on ethnicity is considered essential and provided in biographies of public officials such as *Kto iest kto v Marii El* 2000. For example, in Udmurtia among top government officials (ministers and acting ministers) ethnic Udmurts were predominant in 4 ministries: nationalities policy, education, culture, mass media. Given frequent turnover at the top positions during the last decades, these data are not systematically presented here. The fact of consulting ethnicity in appointing officials by itself demonstrates deliberate efforts to ensure participation of ethnic elites in decision-making, at least in the issues regarding ethnicity.

Of course, government officials do not represent ethnic groups in the sense parliamentarians or members of public consultative bodies might do, because they traditionally were viewed as acting independently of group interests and/or in the interest of the state. Yet, from the perspective of the elite theory,

government officials are part of the ruling elite and, thus, dependent on its interests. Ethnic elites can be described as belonging to broader political elites and can advocate for their visions but do not directly influence political decision-making. Sometimes members of ethnic elites are co-opted in power and become government officials themselves. It is not an easily accessible topic for the study, how much inclinations for revivalist project officials retain and what are the motivations behind their actions. As public figures, officials would express ‘concerns’ about assimilation and language shift but also ‘commitment to internationality accord’ in order to maintain stability and would not acknowledge sharing nationalist ideas (see discussion on the problem of making distinction between officials, members of ethnic elites and activists in Klestov 2000: 118-125; also Zamyatin 2014a: 106-107). Paraphrasing Michel Foucault, people might know why they do what they do, but they do not know the effects of their deeds. Whatever the motivations, it is still possible to study the policy effects in its objectivized outcomes.

### **3. Institutional Framework and Support for Language Revival**

#### **3.1. Executive authorities in charge of language revival**

Given the legacy of finding institutional solutions to ethnic problems, it is not unusual that special executive bodies were created for the revivalist task. With an exception of the early Soviet period, when there was the People’s Commissariat of Nationality Affairs, there was no executive authority in the field throughout the Soviet times. It was assumed that nationally defined units themselves resolve ‘nationalities question’. Only after aggravation of inter-ethnic tensions into open conflicts in the late 1980s the State Committee of the Russian Federation for Nationalities Affairs was created in 1989. In January 1994 it was transformed into the Ministry of Nationalities Affairs and Regional Policy and was liquidated in 2001. National movements in republics demanded establishing public bodies with the mission of pursuing revival policies and republican authorities followed the suit (see also Ianush 2013).

(1) The State Committee of the Komi Republic for Nationalities Affairs was established in 1993 (KR Supreme Council Presidium Decree, 1 April 1993; KR Council of Ministers Presidium Decree, 11 August 1993). It gained the status of the Ministry of Nationalities Affairs in 1994 (KR Head Decree, 13 February 1995), which was first transformed into the Ministry of Culture and for Nationalities Affairs in 2002 and into the Ministry of Nationalities Policy in 2008 (KR Government Decree, 18 December 2007).

In the Republic of Mari El for a long time there was no special body established which would be responsible for the implementation of nationalities policy, perhaps, because ethnic elite controlled the government. In 1996, the Mari El Ministry of Culture was given this function (RME President Decree,

18 October 1996). In 1999 the department of internationality relations in the Ministry of Culture was liquidated and its function was given to a newly established sector for nationalities affairs in the apparatus of the republican government. In 2001 the department of internationality relations was re-established in the Ministry of Culture (RME Government Decree, 26 February 2001; RME Government Decree, 27 January 2004). Another peculiarity of this republic was that a special consultative body in the field of the language policy, the Council on the State Languages at the Government of the Republic of Mari El, was established in 1998 aiming at the development and dissemination of the state languages (RME Government Decree, 11 June 1998; RME Government Decree, 23 March 2001). Later, by merging with the terminology commission, it was transformed into the Commission on the State Languages (RME Government Decrees, 30 September 2003, 28 April 2004, 16 July 2008, 14 January 2011). Also in the Komi Republic the Commission was established for the implementation of the language law (KR Head Decree, 5 May 2000).

The Committee for Nationalities Affairs at the Government of the Udmurt Republic was established in 1994 (UR Council of Ministers Decree, 3 October 1994), which in 1999 gained the status of the Ministry of Nationalities Policy (UR Government Decree, 16 August 1999; UR Government Decree, 21 September 2001). The Committee for Nationalities Policy at the Government started its work in 1994 (RM Council of Ministers Decree, 1 April 1994). It became the State Committee in 1998 (RM Government Decree, 6 May 1998) and was upgraded to the Ministry in 2010 (RM Government Decree, 21 May 2010). In Karelia the Committee of Nationalities Policy was created already in 1991 (Karelian ASSR Council of Ministers Decree, 4 December 1991). It was transformed into the State Committee in 1997 and gained the status of the Ministry in 2006 (RK Government Chairman Decree, 1 September 1997, RK Head Decree, 24 May 2008).

It could be noticed that the importance of the sphere grew with the raise in the legal status of the according agency in the hierarchy of executive bodies: for committee at the government to the state committee and to the ministry. At the same time, a higher status should not conceal the specific niche this body occupied among the executive authorities. Unlike ministries of culture or education with hundreds of employees and many subordinate organizations, its personal in every republic included typically only a dozen civil servants with some occasional subordinate units such as national-cultural centers or a “peoples’ friendship palace”. Only sometimes a substructure was created in ministries of nationalities policy specifically to pursue language revival (as in Komi, see the according paragraph below). Nevertheless, language promotion remained one in a row of goals ranging from arranging cultural events to, more and more in the recent years, activities for the prevention of inter-ethnic conflicts.

What is more important, the one-man management principle implied that the minister could make 'language revival' a *de facto* priority in agency's activities. This will be enhanced by the circumstance that, as the agency was created from a blank list, s/he would typically come with his/her own team, where representation of titular ethnicity would typically be unproportionally high, although always somewhat balanced by the strife to represent the main 'peoples of republic' (see, e.g., the data on ethnicity of employees in ministries and departments (1 January 1996), *Fenomen Udmurtii* 2002: 480-481). Yet, even if their leadership and personnel shared the revivalist ideas, the ministries and government agencies were not totally free to pursue their agenda. Executive authorities were restrained by consultative bodies such as expert councils, which represented national NGOs of 'the peoples residing in the republic' and claimed to represent the interests of other ethnic groups also to be consulted.

(2) Since the Soviet times there used to be the State Committee of the Komi ASSR on Publishing Houses, Printing and Book Trade. It was transformed into the Ministry for Publishing and Information in 1992. Soon after that the Agency of the Komi Republic for Publishing and Information was established that still exists as the Agency of Publishing and Mass Communications. A similar state committee used to be also in the Mari ASSR. In 1992 it was transformed to the Ministry of Publishing and Information, which was liquidated in 1993. Its functions were given to the Committee with the same name, which gained in 1997 again the status the State Committee of the Republic of Mari El of Publishing and Information. Finally it was liquidated in 2003 and the functions given to the Ministry of Culture in 2004, which acquired its current name (RME Government Decree, 6 May 1992; RME President, 21 July 1993; RME President Decree, 12 September 1997; see Vorontsov 2004). There used to be the department for publishing at the Council of Ministers of the Udmurt ASSR. In the new times it was transformed to the Ministry of Publishing and Information of the Udmurt Republic. However, this Ministry was liquidated and the functions given to the Ministry of Culture in 2009 (UR Government Decree, 28 August 2009). There was the State Committee of the Mordovian ASSR on the Affairs of Publishing Houses, Polygraphy and Book Trade. In 1992 it was transformed to the Ministry of Publication and Information of the Republic of Mordovia. There was the State Committee of the Karelian ASSR for the Affairs of Publishing Houses, Polygraphy and Book Trade that in the new times was transformed into the Committee with the same name and in 1997 merged into a bigger Ministry.

(3) In Komi the department of national schools was created in the Ministry of Public Education already in 1988. In 1995 it was transformed to the department of national education systems and rural schools. In Mari El was too created the department of national problems of education in the Ministry of Education,

which was responsible for developing national schools, support for teaching native languages and other ethno-cultural subjects. However, the department was liquidated already in 2001 (RME Government Decree, 29 March 2001). The department of national education was created in the Ministry of Public Education of Udmurtia in 1990, which was later transformed into the sector of national education in the Ministry of Education and Science. The Ministry of Public Education was transformed to the Ministry of Education of Mordovia in 1992. There were plans to create, as in the other republics, a department of national education in the Ministry of Public Education of the Republic of Karelia, but the attempts failed and, instead, a deputy minister was in charge of the issues in 1990-1994 (Klementiev 2008: 65).

(4) In all republics there has been Ministries of Culture.

In the republics, where the titular ethnic elites are not in control of the state apparatus, like those titled after the Finno-Ugric peoples, only some executive authorities were typically headed by members of ethnic elites. Nevertheless, the control of institutions in social, cultural, educational sphere allowed starting implementation language revival projects. The extent of support provided for titular languages varied greatly across the republics and depended on ability of ethnic elites collaborate and participate in government and decision-making processes. Measures directed at language revival were passed in form of executive programs that is a typical mechanism in the Russian legislative and financing procedure for all public policies.

### **3.2. Place of executive programs in the Russian legislation**

As a logical extension to the mentioned above problem, that language laws were declaratory and left too much at the discretion of government officials, was the fact that their implementation was not provided with direct funding. For the purpose of funding, first the USSR language law (24 April 1990) and later Russia's language law (25 October 1991, Article 4 and 7) proposed the republics to pass 'programs of maintenance and development of the languages' of their peoples. The Russian law defined the main possible directions of the programs that could be assistance in printing literature in all languages of the peoples of the Russian Federation, financing of scientific research, creation of conditions for language use in mass media, training of specialists in the field, development of the system of national education.

Regional authorities did not accept revivalist rhetoric and usually copied both their title and format for their programs from the federal legislation. The programs are typically titled and aimed at 'maintenance and development' of languages, which is a sign of the attitude to languages as ones to 'be "modernized" and "developed"', so as to enable them to cope with the tasks' on the efficiency assumption (Blommaert 1996: 211). At the federal level since the

early 1990s their format was defined as that of ‘state programs’ but towards the 2000s this changed to ‘federal programs’. At the regional level there was also a partial move away from ‘state programs’ to language law implementation programs.

At the turn of the millennium, a shift was made in Russia’s nationalities policy. In the sphere of language policy, despite pertained duality of the policy goal the emphasis shifted from the revival of titular languages in the republics towards the promotion of Russian (Zamyatin 2014b: 138). Among the steps towards the language policy change, the amendment to Russia’s language law (Federal Law, 24 July 1998) added as a new primary direction of executive programs enhancing of the functioning of Russian as the state language of Russia, the state languages of the republics and other languages of the peoples of Russia. Since 1996 a federal program “Russian Language” was regularly approved and the latest in a series is the Federal Program “Russian Language” for 2011-2015 (20 June 2011).

A new shift in nationalities policy was initiated in the early 2010s and it should be associated, first of all, with the approval of the federal Strategy of the Nationalities Policy (19 December 2012). Since the late 2000s the federal authorities in a move towards more bureaucratization established hierarchy of programs, where ‘federal target(ed) programs’ and subprograms were subordinated to ‘state programs’ and regional authorities complied. Accordingly, the Strategy’s implementation mechanism includes its Action Plan (21 July 2013) and the Federal Program “Strengthening of the Unity of the Russian Nation” (20 August 2013), which became part of the state program ‘Regional Policy and Federative Relations’ (26 March 2013). The new policy endeavors towards unification of regional policies that have to be pursued ‘on common methodological grounds’ and include a package of similarly titled programs and action plans also in regions and action plans down to the level of municipalities.

### **3.3. Support for language revival in regional executive programs**

Comparison reveals that the structure both of proposed directions in Russia’s language law and actual programs, particularly, of those in the first round, does not conform to the chapters of the regional language laws, because, despite their lower legal status, the programs were prepared by executive authorities, who often acted quite autonomously. Basically, the mentioning of the possibility to pass programs in Russia’s language law was sufficient to make legitimate their approval by the republican governments. In other words, the adoption of the regional language laws was not a prerequisite for passing the programs. On the contrary, the laws could formally contain norms demanding compulsory use of languages in public domains that would not be self-executing. The im-

plementation of most norms could be reached only through systemic measures in executive programs.

The structure of programs typically did not cover all the domains of language use in the public sphere and were rather task-oriented. Instead, the measures of status planning would be concentrated in one section of a program, while the other section would be focused on practical measures. Furthermore, programs of the first cycle also did not themselves have a direct funding and were supposed to be financed through the budget line assigned for the executive authorities. Hence, the first programs were passed only after the respective agencies were created since 1993 (see the previous paragraph), even if the first language laws were already passed, e.g., in Chuvashia in 1990 and in Tatarstan in 1992 (see Zamyatin 2013a: 134).

In some republics with weak ethnic elites, e.g. Udmurtia or Karelia, language laws were passed only in the early 2000s after the formation of largely authoritarian regimes (see discussion on the nature of regional regimes in Galliamov 2006: 51-58), when regional elites were consolidated around ‘first figures’. At the same time, minority political under-representation in the republican parliament has not become a threshold for approval of executive programs in the 1990s also in these republics. Even if the confrontation in parliaments, e.g. between ‘democrats’ and the *nomenklatura*, could not yet have been solved, the precondition for successful functioning of government was the compromise at least on the level of the ruling elites. Among other segments of regional elites, also ethnic elites originated mostly in the *nomenklatura* and some of their demands were included in elite agreement. The need to make concessions to ethnic elites for their readiness to compromise drove the consent the ruling elite to launch executive programs also in Finno-Ugric republics. The agreement at the governmental level was sufficient, and if in some republics the ruling elite could face strong opposition in parliament, that might have resulted in the program’s failure, its approval often was made a prerogative of the government or went with a signature of the ‘first figure’. Only later, in the 2000s, the federal norm was established that the programs are to be approved in the legislative procedure and even by law. Yet, the practice of passing the legislation depending on the political situation in some republics continued also later: e.g., in Mari El the change in the late 2000s was in the opposite direction towards approval of programs by decree.

Among the first republics to approve the programs were again those, which adopted early the language laws. It is useful to first have a look at the outlying cases, where ethnic elites were in the majority, notably in Tatarstan and Chuvashia, to understand what was possible to do. In Chuvashia the Supreme Soviet approved the state program for the implementation of the language law already in 1993 and set forth the goal of ‘the expansion of the public functions of the

Chuvash language'. Its first section was on the functioning of state languages, but as the other sections, it was mostly on support for the Chuvash language. After a two-years break, the second republican program was approved in 2002 that was assigned with about 9.3 million rubles annually (ChR Cabinet of Ministers Decree, 6 December 2002). This program did not have a separate section or any measures on functioning of the state languages in the public sphere, but is rather concerned with measures in the field of education. It is not an occasion then that the Ministry of Education is responsible for implementation of this program. Besides, ministries of culture, nationalities' affairs, information policies as well as municipalities take part in financing measures of the program. The third program has received annual funding ranging between 0.7 and 3.5 million rubles (ChR Cabinet of Ministers Decree, 13 September 2012).

In Tatarstan the Supreme Soviet approved the first state program for the maintenance, study and development of the languages in 1994 (RT Supreme Soviet Decree, 20 July 1994). It was stated in the intervening implementation report that there was success achieved in slowing down the process of the narrowing of the spheres of functioning of Tatar language and expansion of Tatar language usage in the public sphere. However, as was noted in the intermediate report, practices of legal bilingualism in the legislative process and circulation of documentation in Tatar were not enrooted yet (see Zaripov & Faller 2003: 166). The second program (RT Law, 11 October 2004) intended, *inter alia*, to finalize the process of the formation of the legal status of state languages. There were plans to introduce language preferences, bonuses for language usage in work environment, to pass regulations on documentation circulation in the state languages, on their use in official visual and graphic information, on design of official personal identity documents in the state languages and collections model documents. For the first time, the program included measures of prestige planning, while public opinion polls became a criterion for measuring effectiveness (see Khamidullina 2010: 102). The program was assigned with about 12 million rubles annually. The current third program received funding ranging between 122 and 184 million rubles depending on the year (RT Cabinet of Ministers Decree, 25 October 2013).

It is worth noting that in both republics programs worked uninterruptedly, with a short break around the turn of the millennium. It is also remarkable that in Tatarstan every program was approved immediately after the adoption of a new language law of 1992, 2004 and 2013, which reveals the support both at the legislative and executive level. Yet, despite continuous efforts an relative success in terms of implementation, also in Tatarstan language revival is said to have failed to reverse language shift (see Gorenburg 2005, Graney 2009: 95-96). Among the reasons are listed the failure to create incentives for language knowledge or bureaucratic inertia, a lack of commitment and outright opposi-

tion to the policy on the side of officials (see Cashaback 2008, also Zamyatin 2014a: 104-106). A sociolinguistic research could show the impact of policies on language practices also in the Finno-Ugric republics. Yet, without doubt, language revival was a failure also there and the impact was very limited.

In focus of this study, instead, will be only language planning. First of all, the very fact of the existence or absence of the programs says a lot about the policy in a republic. The approach in the next part is to compare executive programs on the basis of quantitative and qualitative indicators. The extent of support is measured by comparing the amount of funding assigned for the programs. The content of support is evaluated by a qualitative analysis of main directions of language planning contained in the programs.

#### **4. Executive Programs in the Finno-Ugric Republics**

##### **4.1. Komi Republic**

###### **4.1.1. The first, second and third programs of 1994, 1996, 1999**

Despite the early adoption of the language law in 1992, the implementation of most provisions was conditioned by the approval of the executive program (KR Supreme Council Decree, 28 May 1992). The first program approved in 1992 was on the national schools. The program “Maintenance and development of the Komi language (1994-1996)” was passed in 1994 (KR Supreme Council Presidium Decree, 18 January 1994) as part of a joint state program “On maintenance and development of the state languages of the Komi Republic”; another part contained measures on maintenance and development of the Russian language. This exclusive focus of a separate program on the titular language was unique. The program itself aimed at the creation of conditions for language learning. An important role was given to a newly created the termini-orthography commission, a body that performed the function of the language board responsible for corpus planning. Due to economic crisis, the program received only minimal funding from what was planned (22% in 1995, 7% in 1996).

In continuation was passed the second state program “Maintenance and development of the Komi language (1997-99)” (KR Head Decree, 2 September 1996). This program aimed at the creation of conditions for the expanding of functions of Komi as the state language. The second program was financed on a more regular basis, apart the crisis year 1998, when it received only 18% of planned funds. Annually the program received about 0.3 million rubles (in post-1998 prices). Among the implemented measures were establishing of Sunday schools and evening courses of the Komi language, the purchase of software fonts in Komi for urban and local administrations, training of teachers of the Komi languages and literature initiated in the Komi Pedagogical Institute, re-

search and book-printing. Directions of research and publishing activities were also outlined in the program. The next stage was the program “Maintenance and development of the state languages of the Komi Republic (2000-05)” (KR Head Decree, 17 December 1999). This program assured continuity of the implementation and aimed already at the creation of actual official bilingualism. Annually the program received about 0.4 million rubles.

All in all, despite financial difficulties, the implementation of the programs succeeded in many aspects. The information and translation center was created at the Ministry for Nationalities Affairs in 1994. In 2003 this function was given to the department of the state languages of the reformed Ministry of Culture and Nationalities Affairs, which is a unique entity (KR Government Decree, 29 April 2003). The Komi translations of all laws and legal acts started to be published in the official periodical “Gazette of the Normative Acts of the Authorities of the Komi Republic” (KR Government Decree, 5 February 2008). A number of acts of executive authorities for the implementation of the provisions of the language law was approved, which defined the rules of making translations, making design for signboards of geographical names, street names, names of legal entities, texts of document in two languages. There were three representatives of the Ministry appointed responsible for the implementation of the language programs in municipalities, which is also a unique development. It issued the dictionary of termini in the public sphere. Language courses for civil servants are being regularly organized. The gradual switch of educational institution to teaching Komi as a state language was taking place. The number of newspapers (5) and journals (3) in the Komi language remained stable, but their editions dropped. There are three municipal newspapers in Komi, more seven have leaves in Komi. The amount of TV and radio broadcasting remained the same for years: about 25% of own TV broadcasting and 35-40% of own radio broadcasting by GTRK “Komi Gor”. The amount of book-printing in Komi remained stable: however, mostly textbooks and teaching materials for schools are being published (Tsypanov 2003; Mosin 2003).

#### **4.1.2. The fourth program of 2005**

The 2002 amendment to the language law added the provision that the long-term target program for the maintenance and development of the state languages has to be approved by the State Council in order to ensure equal opportunities for the functioning of the state languages (article 13). The republican target program “Maintenance and development of the state languages of the Komi Republic (2005-2009)” was approved by law (KR Law, 14 May 2005). The Ministry of Culture and Nationalities Affairs was made responsible for coordination of its implementation. This program also aimed at creation of conditions for the maintenance and development of Komi as a state language. The task was to

introduce the new internet technologies in the sphere of the functioning of the state languages. Training of qualified specialists with the knowledge of the state languages was set as a next task for achieving the actual official bilingualism. It was planned to use mass media in propagation of the Komi language.

The priority was given to the measures aimed at strengthening of the status of Komi as a state language. The content of the program with seven sections of its action plan was affected by the official status of the Komi language. (1) The section on the state languages prescribes such measures as creation of the typical forms of documents for management of public affairs and official language circulation and arrangement of the Komi language courses for civil servants. The plan was to increase the number of civil servants with some language knowledge by 20%. (2) The section on the languages as the basis of artistic and spiritual culture provides support of different cultural events and conferences. (3) The third section aims at the increasing book-printing in the state languages. It assigns about third of the program's funds to publication of dictionaries and books with importance for the official language functioning. It is expected that the amount of teaching would increase by half and the overall number of books by a third. (4) The next section on mass media also strives at the development of the state languages through introduction of innovative projects. It includes support for TV and radio projects aimed at learning of Komi, production of video materials and other projects. It plans the increase of broadcasting in Komi by a third. (5) This section contains measures for the propagation of the Komi language among the youth and children. The plan was to increase the number of young people participating in international and inter-regional events by 60%. Finally, (6) the last section aims at using internet technologies in functioning of the state languages. This section contained the creation of the official internet-page for the development of the state languages of the republic.

This program was assigned annually about 5 million rubles. The typical instruction for management of public affairs and official language circulation in the executive authorities and state institutions was approved in 2006 with no language demands (KR Government Decree, 18 August 2006). Even in the Ministry of Nationalities Policy there were no language preferences for professions introduced (KR Ministry Order, 13 October 2008). An exceptional feature of the implementation of the language policy in the Komi Republic is the approval and implementation of the language programs also at the municipal level in majority of municipalities (see, e.g., Municipal Town District "Ukhta" Council Decision, 26 June 2006). The centers of national culture in the district implement the municipal programs.

Much more was done for the promotion of the official status of the Komi language than in the other republics, which are being compared. At the same

time, everywhere the implementation faces the same problems and was evaluated as insufficient. It was noted that neither had the Komi language become a working language of authorities nor a language of the legislative procedure and management of public affairs. It has remained a symbolic language for names of geographical objects and authorities. The language policy remained adaptive and not actively regulative (KR Ministry Report 2010; Kozulina 2003).

#### **4.1.3. The fifth program of 2009**

The long-term 2010-2012 program for the state languages was approved after the 2009 amendment to the language law (KR Government Decree, 14 September 2009). The funding for the program was cut in time in comparison to the previous program, inter alia, because, program's supporters did not have time to interfere with the process, as was the case with the amendments to the language law towards deterioration of the position of the Komi language.

While the Ministry of Nationalities Policy was still responsible for the coordination of its implementation, it received less than half of the program's budget. The program aims at ensuring the 'optimal (balanced) functioning of the state languages' and contains only two directions of activities: scientific support for the functioning of the state languages and the expansion of the state languages. It was planned to print at least two thousand copies of materials on the functioning of the state languages. The program prioritized publication of books and textbooks for children and young people and assigned more than half of its funds for this purpose out of 4 million rubles annually. The funding for the program was increased in 2010 and it was planned to print at least 1.5 thousand copies of books for children in the Komi language and 30 thousand copies of textbooks and teaching materials. The program was clearly much weaker than the previous one.

#### **4.1.4. Part of the subprogram of 2011 and of the regional program of 2013**

The tradition of having a separate program on the law implementation was broken by 2013. As a result, there was no single agency responsible for language planning. Somewhat strangely, the task of maintaining and developing the state languages had to be pursued through a subprogram of the state program on culture (KR Government Decree, 30 December 2011). Its 2013-2015 action plan assigned annually 3.8 million rubles to the Ministry of Nationalities Policy for the expansion of the official language use and the creation of methodological basis for this purpose (KR Ministry of Culture Order, 5 December 2012). Besides this, the action plan assigned to the Agency for Publishing and Mass Communications with 1.6 million rubles for financing publication of books in state languages in addition to the agency's own program on book-publishing. Furthermore, financing of some aspects of language planning was continued

as part of the regional program for the strengthening of the Russian nation and ethno-cultural development, where funds of about 3.6 million rubles are directed annually to the part that included development of ethno-cultural education (KR Government Decree, 19 December 2013). The practice of support for languages in municipal programs was also continued (KR Ministry Reports 2010, 2011).

## **4.2. Republic of Mari El**

### **4.2.1. Subprogram on the language and education policy in the program of 2004**

In Mari El in since 1997 there was a separate line in the republican budget with the funds of less than one million rubles (in post-1998 prices) annually assigned for the policy in the field of inter-ethnic relations, which were in responsibility of Ministry of Culture, Publishing and Nationalities Affairs (Sharov 2003). In the 1990s funds were situated directly for the accomplishment of Ministry's actions in the field (Sharov 2004). The implementation had to be done, *inter alia*, through funding the programs, which, however, were not approved. Indeed, a draft program of the implementation of the language law was developed, which planned assign 4 million rubles for six years (Draft State Program 2000-05; Yanalov 2000).

In the early 2000s after the amendment to the language law in 2001, no further regulations were passed, which would have created the mechanisms for the implementation of the language law provisions, except a decree prescribed the order of installation of information signs on the objects of cultural heritage (RME Government Decree, 21 February 2003). In 2003 the funds for nationalities policy doubled and counted now 3.8 million rubles annually. Arguably, it happened due to the conflict between a new President and leaders of the Mari national movement. President was accused of attempts to confine the support for the titular culture and language and was forced to demonstrate the opposite (Sharov 2003). Due to the lack of language programs, there were language sections in programs in the field of nationalities policy. In line with the change in federal policy, since the early 2000s the legislator in Mari El was careful not to use the term 'national' but 'ethno-cultural' in the programs' titles. The republican program of the development of ethno-cultural and internationality relations was approved in 2004 (RME Laws, 9 September 2004, amended 28 April 2007). Notably, the program was directed for the implementation of the law on culture and not of the language law, even if the latter should have also been implemented through the approval of a program. However, the according provisions of the language law (articles 6 and 7) are not formulated as the obligations of executive authorities, but it is only assumed that the programs "are developed and approved".

Because there is no separate program on languages, implementation of some language issues were included as a subprogram in the program on culture. One of the culture program's aims is to maintain cultural and linguistic diversity. The goals of the subprogram on the language and education policy were to enhance practical functioning of the Mari language in social life, to satisfy the demands provided by language rights on access to information and public services in the native language, to support modernization of the education system until 2010 in the part on perfection of study and development of the state and native languages. This subprogram was implemented in cooperation with the Ministry of Education. That is why its heavy point is in the sphere of language-in-education. The Commission on the State Languages was also among the partners, but it is only a consultative and not an executive body. The Commission enhanced the implementation of the subprogram by finding solutions the language problems. For example, in 2008 the discussion issues in the agenda of the Commission of official language use in public transport, installation road signs, use of new IT technologies (Sharov 2008b).

The program had separate financing from the republican budget. Peculiarity of the program is that it is project competition based. This means that much depends on civil initiative of non-government organizations and efforts of cultural activists. 3.85 million rubles were assigned for five years for the section of language and education policy in the republican program 2004 for financing projects directed at (1) development of national-regional component in education, (2) subscription of national periodicals for cultural and education institutions and, finally, about half of this money for financing projects directed at (3) the state languages, including solution of sociolinguistic and technology problems of their functioning and dissemination of multilingualism, that is, mostly corpus planning. The program actions' financing was based on the project scheme. In the sphere of the language and education policy such projects were implemented as arranging an education forum of Mari language teachers from the republic and diaspora, the literature and poetry competitions, the Day of Mari literary language (Sharov 2008a). It was recognized that the implementation of the program faced gross difficulties. The number of national schools and teachers of native languages continued to drop, while teachers' average age was growing (Sharov 2006).

#### **4.2.2. Part in the program of 2008**

The next republican program of the ethno-cultural development in the Republic of Mari El (2009-2013) was approved (RME Government Decree, 24 March 2008). The program did not have subprograms. But one of the program's goals is again to maintain cultural and linguistic diversity, but also to assist in creation of conditions for citizens to study and develop culture and learn native and state

languages. The effectiveness of the program in the part on the language and education policy will be evaluated number of grants and implemented projects. Earlier the President decree on grants approved the regulation of awarding these kinds of grants (RME President Decree, 14 December 2008). As in Tatarstan, the Mari El authorities passed a regulation on the official language use in publicly significant information and advertisements, that is, went further than the other Finno-Ugric republics (RME Government Decree, 8 December 2010).

Despite inflation, it was assigned even less funds than the previous program. Only 3.37 million rubles were assigned for five years in the republican program of 2008, or about 0.67 million annually, for financing of projects in the section on the Mari language for (1) carrying out new language technologies, (2) multilingual education, (3) stipends to teachers using these technologies in multilingual education and, finally, (4) extension of the spheres of language use. The system of project financing remains the same as in the previous program and should encourage civil initiatives. In comparison to the other republics, the funds assigned for the language in Mari El are minimal. It is argued that Mari El is a poor region, which could be a reason for the minimal funding (Yanalov 2001). At the same time, the amount of funding reveals the attitude of authorities towards the topic.

#### **4.2.3. Some measures in the subprogram of 2012**

Some measures on language policy were included in part of the subprogram on the ethno-cultural development of a larger state program ‘State Nationalities Policy’ (RME Government Decree, 8 October 2012). The budget of the subprogram is between four and five million rubles annually. Only two of nineteen measures in the subprogram, or presumably a tenth of all funds, were directed at the development of multilingualism and the Mari language. An action plan for the implementation of Russia’s Nationalities Policy Strategy was passed (RME Government Order, 21 November 2013).

### **4.3. Udmurt Republic**

#### **4.3.1. The first program of 1994**

The state program for the maintenance and development of the Udmurt language and other languages was approved by the republican government (UR Council of Ministers Decree, 14 June 1994). The task of coordination of its implementation was given to the newly created Committee for Nationalities Affairs. The content of the program was affected by the language status, and priority was given to the expansion of social functions of Udmurt: first and second sections of action fields were devoted to (1) the use of the state languages in the public sphere and (2) the position of the state languages in education. The third section was a piece on corpus planning and contained a

number of measures on (3) the scientific research of the Udmurt language. Next two sections, on (4) mass media and (5) book-printing, were too devoted mostly to promotion of the Udmurt language. The next section (6) was on the languages of Udmurt diaspora and the languages of diaspora in Udmurtia, that is, Tatar, Mari, Chuvash and Besserman (actually, in other official documents Besserman was regarded not as a separate language, but as an Udmurt dialect). Even if the program had a separate section (7) on Russian as the language of internationality communication, it was mostly devoted to the promotion of the titular language.

There was no overall evaluation of the implementation of the program, but some result can be found in reports of the activities of the Committee for Nationalities Affairs (UR Committee Reports 1995-99). In the public sphere, the first and second measures were not implemented: the list of professions requiring knowledge of the titular language and ensuring proportional representation of major ethnic groups among officials in government offices and the list of language requirements were not approved. Third measure of providing oral and visual information in state languages in public places, post offices and public transport was implemented partially. For example, official announcements in Udmurt at bus stations were introduced in 1997. What concerns fourth and fifth measures, Udmurt has not become working language in government offices, official documents in state languages were proliferated to some extent. The sixth measure, establishment of official translation service at the republican government, was not implemented. Therefore, the main steps ensuring the official status of Udmurt were not taken. Somewhat more successful was implementation of actions in the field of the state languages in education (see Zamyatin 2012a, b). What concerns the other fields, a noticeable institutional development was the establishment of the termini-orthography commission with the mission of corpus planning. Other actions were rather of everyday routine character.

A lack of funding was presented as the main problem during the first years of the implementation. It is hard to draw a picture of how much money was actually spent on actions of the program, because the program did not have its own line in the republican budget. Some funds came from the Committee for Nationalities Affairs, and actions in this part were fruitful. Many measures had to be financed from the budgets of ministries and government agencies not dominated by ethnic Udmurts. A lack of funding was being explained by the economic crises 1998. Still, the authorities could choose were to cut the budgets. Government officials were quite reluctant in support for the measures of language promotion. Most government officials were against the promotion of substantial bilingualism behind the mere façade of stamps and names. As a result, actions were financed in the last turn, if ever. It explains also, why the

setting of language preferences was unsuccessful. It was acknowledged by promoters that implementation of the program in the public sphere largely failed. Most notably, it was acknowledged that the contraction of social functions of Udmurt was not reversed.

In 1997 the implementation of the program was dropped from the agenda of the republican government (UR Government Decree, 10 November 1997). If in 1995-1997 the implementation of the program was the second prior activity of the Committee, so in 1998-1999 it was only the fifth point in the Committee's agenda. Implementation of the state program was not mentioned among activities of the newly established Ministry of Nationalities Policy in 2000.

#### **4.3.2. The second program of 2004**

Twice during the next years there were attempts to reintroduce this state program in its original format: as a subprogram to the 1998 draft state program and to the 2000 draft complex program of national development and internationality cooperation, that had to include among other subprograms also ones on national culture, national education, mass media, science, diaspora etc., in other words, the directions of the 1994 state program. However, the attempts failed and there was a pause, as in other republics. At that time all efforts were directed at the adoption of the language law, which was done in 2001. The language law stated that its implementation programs had to be approved in the legislative procedure.

A five-year implementation program faced the same problem as the law itself: years went before it was approved in 2004 (UR State Council Decree, 30 November 2004; see Semionov 2004). The main goal of the program was the strengthening of the official status of the state languages of the republic and the ensuring of their social functioning in this capacity. Prestige planning was not listed among the goals of the program but was in focus of implementers (Vorontsov 2007). The creation of the necessary conditions for maintenance and development of languages and further development of Udmurt as a state language were taken as a criterion for measuring effectiveness of implementation. Main directions of the action plan reflected the ones of the previous program: (1) state languages in the public sphere, (2) state and other languages in education and culture, (3) languages in infrastructure, (4) the Udmurt language of diaspora. No language preferences and bonuses were stipulated, although some government officials made remarks on such possibility.

An improvement in comparison to the previous program was the inclusion of a separate budget line for the program; the republican budget financed the action plan to the program annually with about 5 million rubles (the whole budget of the program is 25 million rubles). Another improvement was the reliance solely upon Ministry's resources and not upon possible input of other

authorities that proved to be illusive in the case with the previous program. At the same time, in its activities Ministry of Nationalities Policy relied on support and cooperation with the Ministries of Education, Culture, Publishing and Information as well as the State Broadcasting Company “Udmurtia”, National Library and some academic institutions.

According to the first main direction, a decree regulated the order for installing the names of geographical objects (UR Government Decree, 7 November 2005). Installment of geographical names is mentioned as the only obligation of federal and regional state authorities in Russia’s language law (art. 24), and the signs in the state languages were set up in Udmurtia anyway, at least on the federal highways. The other two out of three planned governmental acts were not passed, including a decree which was supposed to regulate the order of official publication of laws and other republican and municipal legal acts in both state languages and a decree to approve a national-regional component of the state standard of primary, secondary and professional education. The last will be never approved because of the abolition of the national-regional component by the education reform (see Zamyatin 2012a, b). A novelty of this period, however, was the adoption of an act on language policy implementation in the capital city (Izhevsk City Administration Decree, 3 May 2006).

This program was quite modest in stating claims in the public sphere, it advocated only for creation of an official translation service (this time not at the government level, but at the Ministry of Nationalities Policy) as well as translations of official documents, blanks and stamps. The program did not introduce principally new measures in education that now included also scientific research and book publishing. And most funds were directed at implementation of actions in these fields: about half of all the program’s funds went for book-publishing in the state languages in education and cultural sphere. It is striking that only 4 books for children were published with this money in the Udmurt language in 2008. The editions were small, 500 to 1000 exemplars, rarely 2000, the largest 4000, which nevertheless is reported to cover the demand. As in the previous program, other measures in education and culture included support for the language board and other scientific activities, but also TV programs, subtitles and some other measures. The program did not touch upon the issue of national schools, because there was a separate document developed in the Ministry of Public Education. The tenth part of all funds was allocated in infrastructure for the implementation of the decree on the order of place names. Support for languages of Udmurt diaspora continued to be rather symbolical.

In practical terms, implementation efforts resulted in installation of bilingual signs of authorities and legal entities, bilingual signs of geographical objects. Announcements in Udmurt were initiated at some stops of public transport. There were excursions in Udmurt organized in the National Museum of the

republic introduced. Multimedia products were issued, such as Udmurt scripts, ‘Udmurt language course’, an e-encyclopedia of Udmurt literature. Nineteen books were published in both state languages during the first three years of the implementation, first postcards in two languages issued. Free Udmurt language courses were arranged in premises of the Ministry of Nationalities Policy and other institutions in Izhevsk and Glazov. Annually the competition of TV programs in Udmurt was arranged. The program “Udmurt language course” re-introduced on TV. Russian subtitles to Udmurt programs were introduced to raise interest of the Russian-speaking population (KR Ministry Information 2005-2007; Vorontsov 2007, 2009: 656-667; see Torokhova 2012: 154). Overall, some actions were taken in direction of creating the necessary conditions for maintenance and development of the Udmurt and other languages, but hardly anything was done for strengthening of the official status of Udmurt.

#### **4.3.3. The third program of 2009**

Despite the legal demand of programs’ approval in the legislative procedure, the next five-year program was endorsed by the government (UR Government Decree, 19 October 2009). The reason for this was the general mechanism of the financing of target programs, according to which the respective amendments to the language law were passed (UR Government Decree, 4 May 2010; a similar amendment, that the government approves the language programs, was done, for example, to the language law of the Komi Republic). In comparison to the previous program, the emphasis of the program changed: it did not prioritize the strengthening of the state languages and aimed, instead, at the creation of the necessary conditions for the ensuring the guarantees for the constitutional rights of the peoples of Udmurtia to maintain, study and promote their native language (according to Article 68, Russian Constitution, 12 December 1993). The collective dimension of the rights prevailed in justification for the need of the program. The ensuring of individual language rights, including the right of access to information in one’s native language, was mentioned among the goals of the program but did not serve as a criterion for assessment of its effectiveness.

In a longer perspective the program sought only for the lowering of intensity of ethnic and linguistic assimilation processes. The partners of the program remain the same as in the previous one. The structure of the program contains only three sections: (1) ensuring of the functional development of the Udmurt language as one of the state languages, (2) informational resources and ensuring of ethno-linguistic demands of population, (3) ensuring of ethno-linguistic demands of population in the sphere of culture and education. There was neither separate section on status planning, nor actual steps planned for the strengthening of the official status of the state languages, as it was the case in the previous programs. The program continued to provide analysis of the

ethno-linguistic situation, to ensure the installation of signs with geographical names, translation of names of authorities and legal entities to Udmurt, and to support activities of the language board.

In its second section, the program aimed at the development of new domains of language use, particularly, at standardization of the Udmurt language. New computer technologies had to be used for the promotion of the Udmurt language in the internet. Among the measures supported here were the creation e-dictionaries, e-library, and other internet content. A government decree on the unified standard script of the Udmurt alphabet. A conjoined field was production and distribution of audio-visual materials. A relatively significant expenditure was invested in the creation of TV programs for children. As in the previous program, half of the program funds are directed at book-publishing, but this time books for children were in focus. For this purpose some federal money and other extra funds had to be raised. A new and certainly positive development was the inclusion of actions on prestige planning in the third section. Among the educational measures only support for Sunday schools and language courses was stipulated (Vorontsov 2013: 159-160). It was planned to assess effectiveness of the program by numbers and editions of books, audio-video items, theater plays and internet-sites in the Udmurt language as well as their distribution. It is hard to find out this was, if necessary conditions for the ensuring of the maintenance, study and promotion of the native languages were created. The program was assigned with about 16 million rubles annually. If to take into consideration inflation, it was not a big increase in comparison with the previous program.

#### **4.3.4. Part of the program 2013**

Recently an action plan for the implementation of Russia's Nationalities Policy Strategy was passed (UR Head Order, 14 March 2014), which has a section on languages but does not have its own funding. Instead, a new three-year state program "On the Ethno-Social Development" (UR Government Decree, 19 August 2013) was approved for the next period, which had a subprogram on languages. Accordingly, almost half among indicators of its effectiveness were connected to languages, including 'a decrease in intensity of (linguistic and ethnic) assimilation processes'. Financing of the subprogram in 2013-2014 was arranged through the 2009 program and amounted to, accordingly, 10 and 7 million rubles from the republican budget and some extra-budgetary funds, which ensured continuity with the previous program. In 2015, the funding of 7 million rubles for the subprogram will come directly from the republican budget.

Actually the implementer received only 6 million out of assigned 16 million rubles in 2012 and used only 3.7 million out of 4.5 million rubles assigned in the republican budget for the program in 2013 (UR Ministry Information

2012, 2013). The underfunding again demonstrates how in times of economic difficulties these programs are among the first to be cut. In general, actions of the program are not directed at status planning, but at corpus planning and prestige planning of the Udmurt language.

#### **4.4. Republic of Mordovia**

Mordovia remained behind the other republics in the field of implementation of the language policy. The only program approved in 1996 in the field of nationalities policy was the Program of National Development and Internationality Cooperation (RM Government Decree, 15 April 1996). Approval of such programs was planned in the other republics too, but it was done only in Mordovia. This program had a section on the foundations of the language policy and the development of national education, which aimed at the creation of conditions for broadening the spheres of active use of the Mordvin and Tatar languages, development of national education. However, the measures for ensuring official bilingualism and creation of a separate body which would be responsible for the implementation of the language policy were not included in the final text of the program. Despite its aim, the language section intended only to broaden the volume of broadcasting in the Mordvin languages, training of teachers, preparing and publishing of teaching materials. The program did not have a deadline and rather served as the framework of the routine work of the State Committee on the Nationalities Policy.

Despite the adoption of the language law in 1998, there was no special implementation program approved, although such programs were developed for many years. As a consequence, many provisions of the language law were not implemented (Mosin 2009). Only road signs were being installed, which was an authorities' obligation according to the federal law, anyway. Despite the according legal provisions, the Mordvin languages were practically not used in other public spheres of language use. There was no management of public affairs in these languages. These languages did not serve as the medium to make requests to authorities. Signboards in these language were not designed (Poliakov 2005). Partly the reason for the poor implementation might have been the fact that the termini-orthography commission was created quite late. The number of mass media was limited: one official newspaper, one magazine and one children's magazine in either language. In addition, there is an independent newspaper "Erzyan Mastor". The amount of TV and radio broadcasting was from 15 minutes per day. In GTRK "Mordovia" 30% of TV broadcasting and 20% of radio broadcasting (3.5 hours per week) were in the Mordvin languages. The list of books published annually contained under ten titles (Poliakov 2003). At the same time, the main efforts were directed at the unification of the Mokshan and Erzyan languages and corpus planning of one Mordvin literary

language (see RM Government Decree, 1 November 2010; Shilov 2002). Until recently, the minor efforts did not have any remarkable effect.

For the first time over a long period of time a wave of new documents in the sphere of nationalities policy was approved in 2013 (see RM Ministry Report 2013). First an action plan for the implementation of Russia's Nationalities Policy Strategy was passed (RM Government Decree, 28 October 2013). Then the state program "Harmonization of Internationality and Inter-confessional Relations" was approved that contains some measures on language policy (RM Government Decree, 18 November 2013). The total budget of the program is 40 million rubles annually, but the amount of funding for the language promotion is not explicit.

#### **4.5. Republic of Karelia**

##### **4.5.1. Program of 1995**

The titular Karelian language was not designated a state language of the republic, but the implementation of the language policy in Karelia was even more intensive than in the other republics. The first very first program was passed already in 1991 but was devoted exclusively to the national schools. The early creation of the State Committee on Nationalities Affairs allowed starting financing the revival efforts already in 1992 through the Foundation of National Revival (RK Council of Ministers Decree, 5 May 1992; see Klementiev 2004). Among the first measures was the launch of a new newspaper in Karelian and Veps, the increase in the amount of TV and radio broadcasting, introduction of language teaching in some schools.

The first program for the revival and development of languages was developed by the Committee for Nationalities Affairs, endorsed first on the Second Congress of Karelians, a body of ethnic representation, and then approved by the Head of the Karelian Government (RK Government Chairman Decree, 30 January 1995). The program aimed at the creation of the conditions for the satisfaction of ethno-cultural demands of Karelians, Veps and Finns and the functioning of their native languages and cultures. Unlike the first programs in the other republics, this program received its own line in the republican budget. The program was approved first for the years 1995 and 1996 and then prolonged. Out of assigned 1.4 million rubles for 1995 and 5.5 million rubles for 1996 only 30-40% was actually delivered (in post-1998 prices). In 1997 and 1998, the program lost its separate financing from the budget and was assigned with 0.5 million rubles, but *de facto* received much less (RK Legislative Assembly Decree, 26 March 1998). In the conditions of the 1998 financial default and after the elections the authorities cut the funding of the program in 1999 in six times and stopped it altogether in 2000 (Strogalshchikova & Klementiev 2000). Among the institutional measures taken was the establishment of the

termini-orthography commission for the Karelian and Veps languages in 1998 (Kleerova 2004: 9).

#### **4.5.2. Regional target program of 2005 and the departmental program of 2005**

As in most other republics, there was a pause in the implementation after 2000. Again, as in the early 1990s, activities were mainly concentrated on the development in national education through the according programs of 2000-2002 and 2002-2005. There were attempts to approve another program on languages, but they failed. Finally, the continuous efforts advocating the language law resulted in its adoption in 2004. The law on the state support of the languages contained the provision on the need of the programs (article 3). Accordingly, the five-year regional target program “State Support of Karelian, Veps and Finnish” was approved next year (RK Legislative Assembly Decree, 16 June 2005) but received funding only starting from 2006 (Klementiev 2004). The program aimed at ensuring the rights of Karelians, Veps and Finns for the maintenance, development and study of their native languages. It is interesting that not one, as in the other republics, but three authorities became the main implementers of the program: the State Committee on Nationalities Policy Affairs, the Ministry of Education and Youth Affairs, the Ministry of Culture and Public Relations. One half of the program’s budget was at disposal of the State Committee; the Ministries shared equally the other half. The budget of the program was 22.8 million rubles, which is about 4.5 million rubles annually. The number is comparable with annual 5 million of the according programs of Komi (2005) and Udmurtia (2004), but the target group is much smaller in Karelia.

The program had two main directions. One direction of the program contained the measures in the fields of education, culture, science, information and administrative activities. (1) The first section in this direction was on national education and intended to increase the number of public services in the field. The task was to improve the language knowledge of students and to broaden the number of schools with an ethno-cultural component. It was planned to measure the level of satisfaction of the demands of citizens by the number of requests to executive authorities. (2) There was the tendency of decrease in number of national mass media. The second section defined the measures of support for mass media and strived to preserve the number of existing mass media in the national languages. (3) The third section was devoted to book-printing and publications and planned publishing of six new projects or materials yearly. The further sections were on (4) scientific research, including sociolinguistic monitoring once every three years, (5) culture, and (6) onomastics. Another direction of the program was on the development of international and inter-regional contacts as well as support for activities of cultural organizations.

In 2006 a newly created Ministry on the Issues of Nationalities Policy and Relations with Religious Organizations became responsible for the implementation of the program. The Ministry's reporting was quite optimistic and stated that the main form of the implementation was accomplishment of the projects on the measures of the program such as "Road signs and signboards in the national languages", "National literature", "Language planning", "The Day of Native Language", arrangement of other cultural events, conferences and other projects (RK Ministry Information 2009; see Boinich & Bogdanova 2008; Klementiev 2006). Besides the 2005 program, the Ministry was the implementer also of the regional target program "Harmonization of National and Confessional Relations» (RK Government Decree, 25 January 2007) and the five-year departmental program "National Development and Internationality Cooperation" (RK State Committee Decree, 18 December 2005), which contained some measures in the field of language promotion.

Altogether, the Karelian, Veps and Finnish cultural organizations evaluated the implementation as insufficient. They appealed to the Head of the Republic in January 2006, listing non-targeted use of resources, inclusion of measures, not directed at the implementation of the goals of the program, impossibility to implement some measures due to a lack of funding among the problems of implementation (Klementiev 2006, 2007).

#### **4.5.3. Action Plan of 2009**

The next step was the approval of an action plan and a list of complex measures on development of the Karelian language (RK Ministries' Joint Order, 28 May 2009). The action plan aimed at ensuring the legal, social and economic protection for the Karelian language. The plan did not intend to create one Karelian language and, instead, recognized its varieties and dialects. The Plan intended at the maintenance of at least three republican newspapers in Karelian and leaflets in Karelian in three municipal newspapers, annual publication of at least nine books, keeping of the current number of schools with the language teaching (37 schools) and students learning the language (2000).

The list of the measures of the action plan contained sections on status planning, language ecology, language acquisition planning, and corpus planning of Karelian. (1) The measures on status-planning included the drafting of (a) amendments to the language law, which had to provide additional guarantees of the state support of mass media and book-printing, (b) draft law on the status of national municipalities, (c) draft government decree on installation and maintenance of road signs and other public signs, (d) draft legal acts on corpus planning of Karelian and ensuring of the functioning of Karelian in the education system. (2) The second section contained measures on language ecology and scientific research. (3) The measures of language acquisition planning

included training of specialists, introduction of innovative methods, arranging seminars and conferences. (4) Corpus planning included creation of a center for language standardization and preparation of dictionaries and encyclopedias. (5) The last two sections contained the measures of ‘language building’ such as support of activities of the republican termini-orthography commission, support of TV and radio broadcasting. From a comparative perspective, the action plan is very well developed. Its weakness is that it did not have a separate funding and relied upon the funds of the 2005 and 2007 programs as well as resources of the state, municipal authorities and organizations.

#### **4.5.4. Part of the Subprogram of 2013**

The recent developments included approval of the regional program “Maintenance of the Unity of Peoples and Ethnic Communities of Karelia” (RK Government Decree, 12 December 2011) and its transformation into a subprogram of a larger state program (RK Government Decree, 19 December 2013), both of which have some measures for the development of languages (RK Ministry Report 2013). Also in Karelia an action plan for the implementation of Russia’s Nationalities Policy Strategy was passed, which has a section on the support of Russian as the state language of the republic but also some measures for the promotion of other languages (RK Government Order, 14 January 2014). However, most supporting funds were directed through the departmental program (RK Ministry Order, 28 December 2012). The program assigned 16 million rubles in 2013 and 20 million rubles in 2014 for the creation of conditions for the maintenance and development of Karelian, Veps and Finnish languages, most of which is directed at financing publications in these languages.

### **5. Evaluation of the Content and Extent of Support**

#### **5.1. Problem of evaluation**

The problem in evaluation of the extent and content of support is that the evaluator cannot escape value judgments regarding the policy because its goals are ideologically charged. First of all, policy effectiveness can be assessed according to whether the policy reaches its goal. While the revivalist goal implied full-fledged official bilingualism/multilingualism, this was not achieved in practice. As it was pointed out, the measures provided in executive programs were insufficient to achieve the policy goal even in Tatarstan. This inadequacy could raise doubts whether language revival was the policy goal despite the according ideological statements. One approach here would be to deduce alternative explanations for the policy effects, following Elana Shohamy (2006) in her distinction of the official and *de facto* policy, where the latter goes beyond ideology of the previous and takes into account also language planning. Yet, in looking for ‘hidden agendas’ there is a danger of exaggeration regarding

integrity of the implementer, while in reality there was no single actor behind the policy-making.

Rather the revival should be viewed not as an absolute goal of language policy but as one balanced by other goals, including those in language policy and the conjoined spheres, such as nationalities policy. Political actors advocated for different group interests and achieved inclusion of various principles that sometimes were in contradiction, for example, those of preferential support for titular languages and non-discrimination on the basis of language, equality of languages and their *de facto* hierarchy (see Zamyatin 2014b: 114-121). Subsequently, uneven distribution of political forces resulted in the situation of more or less official bilingualism in republics that needs a more complex evaluation. From a normative perspective, Fernand de Varennes notes that the use of official languages can be distributed according to the principle of proportionality, which applies a sliding-scale and could be dependent, *inter alia*, on the number of speakers (see de Varennes 2012: 45-47). An important variable here is the share of an ethnic group in the total population. Alternatively, then, policy effectiveness can be assessed depending on whether the measures are proportionate according to some objective and subjective criteria.

Language planning is a complex phenomenon that includes different types of activities, all of which deserve separate evaluation both along qualitative (content) and quantitative (extent) objective indicators. For example, in acquisition planning the clearest indicator of success would be an increase in language competence of students (see Klementiev 2004). The evaluation of acquisition planning was not part of this article but of a separate study on language-in-education policies in Finno-Ugric republics and regions that explored the access to native language learning (see Zamyatin 2012a, b). It is more difficult to quantitatively evaluate the other types of language planning that are in focus here. Throughout the period under consideration, authorities would typically report in a positive manner, presenting the absolute numbers of festivals arranged, teachers trained and books published without referring whether their amount satisfies the demand.

Only recently the federal legislator introduced a standard for evaluating effectiveness of executive programs by subjective indicators, including the level of the satisfaction of citizens' ethno-linguistic demands. The satisfaction of demands is difficult to evaluate, because empowerment with rights was not the approach in legal regulations (see Zamyatin 2014b: 110-111). Even if quantitative methods alone cannot show the whole complexity involved (Edwards 2009), theoretically this new way of evaluation should in itself have brought the measures closer to the demands and, thus, should have contributed to policy efficiency. In practice, discouragement of ethnic identities, that was rooted in late Soviet policy and has been reinstalled as part of the Russian nation-building

agenda since the 2000s, predetermines utilitarian language attitudes and low popular demand. Currently there is no broad social support for stronger language demands even among members of titular groups themselves. As a result, the extent of support according to the new indicators has actually decreased in comparison with support provided hitherto.

Ideally popular demand should be an important input for policy, but in 'top-down' policy these were rather language attitudes of elites that mattered. The measures reflected the efforts at language promotion of titular ethnic elites that claimed to represent popular demands. The analysis provides evidence that the extent of delivered support corresponded with the bargaining power of elites. In the conditions, when it was at the discretion of government officials to decide over the measures of state support, its extent depended on the ability of ethnic elites to participate in decision-making, while the major obstacle was the position of the majority elites. At least part of the political process around the policy formation is public and transparent, because laws are voted openly in parliament. A peculiarity of implementation as a distinct phase is that in Russia decisions at the level of government are taken behind the closed doors. The opaque character of this phase as well as federal structure and involvement of many actors in the policy-making creates additional obstacles for accommodation of diverging interests of elites through the political bargaining over implementation (see Solomon 2008: 119–120).

Language attitudes of government officials that resulted in the bureaucratic resistance to implementation are not an easy subject for research (for a more detailed account see Zamyatin 2014a: 104–107). Government officials and other actors may have their own interests relating to power and policy that are 'more likely to derive from informal institutions such as clientelistic networks' (see Solomon 2008: 130–131). If having no interest, officials are able to impede or distort the policy implementation through different techniques, such as selective, virtual or manipulative compliance. In this practice of 'doublethink' and 'doubledeed' the officials do not reject the policy goals openly but sabotage its implementation in effect (Ledeneva 2013). As in the case with language laws, the compromise of elites regarding implementation has not included the practical steps. Even the consent of the ruling elites for passing the programs did not guarantee their actual implementation, because non-implementation was implicit by the pretext of a lack of funds in the conditions of the continuing economic crisis (Zamyatin 2013c: 146–147). Not going into the study of motivations, it is nevertheless possible to grasp the outcomes of settlement among the elites at the objectivized level of implementation, because the extent of approved measures is itself illustrative of the language attitudes (see paragraph 1.3 above).

A full-scale evaluation of regional language policies would be possible only by the executive agencies themselves. A complication for this task is that measures that promoted language use were usually not codified as a separate direction of activities but went under nationalities policy. Furthermore, according to distribution of powers many measures are in competence of authorities other than the agency responsible for the implementation of nationalities policy. Ministries of culture, education and mass media have their own programs that sometimes also contain measures of language promotion. The data has demonstrated that sometimes the programs in conjoined fields overlap, e.g., in providing language teaching, which is then resolved in a way that ministry of education typically supervises public educational institutions, while agency for nationalities policy arranges irregular forms such as evening courses and Sunday schools. In some republics, there is no separate agency responsible for nationalities policy and then the responsibility for this field is shared among other agencies. In other republics, e.g. currently in Mari El, a superagency covers most of the fields. The absence of executive programs specifically devoted to language promotion since the last year and division of the field between several agencies makes a full-scale official evaluation virtually impossible.

## **5.2. Content and timing**

Given all these complications, the choice of a narrow perspective in the current study was inevitable. Recognizing the problem of evaluation, this study produced only a limited relative account based on measuring the extent and content of support provided in the programs (see the data on executive programs systematically presented in Table 1). As the amount of available funds was limited, it is interesting, what priorities were chosen in regard to status planning, corpus planning and prestige planning and how these priorities changed over time. The changes were introduced through approval of new programs.

If one generalizes the data on the time of the approval of executive programs, at least five stages could be distinguished. The stages broadly correspond to the shifts in Russia's nationalities policy that were followed by the adjustment of regional policies. Yet, continuity in the programs in Tatarstan and Chuvashia witnesses that the shifts in federal policy was not a decisive variable for the ups and downs in the extent of support for titular languages in the republics. Even if priorities changed, the federal authorities imposed only some limits but usually did not directly interfere with the regional language policies. It was more important how inside the republics regional authorities translated changes at the federal level into their policies through the adoption and amendments to regional language laws. This transition depended on the position of titular ethnic elites among the regional elites and their ability to ensure continuity of the policies.

In the early 1990s the regional authorities positively responded to the demands of national movements for the state support, first of all, for the titular languages in their capacity of the state languages. The programs had to provide affirmative action in order to achieve the (equal) functioning of the titular languages as the state languages on par with Russian. The programs of the first cycle typically consisted of the lists of measures without separate funding. The expansion of the official status of the titular languages to the domains of the public sphere became a priority of the first programs in many republics. Among the other measures, corpus planning was important. For this purpose all republics created language boards. The language programs contained also measures of acquisition planning, especially if there was no education program in a republic. Negligible funding in the conditions of the economic crisis undermined effectiveness of the first cycle of the programs. Since 1993, the decrease in activities of national movements and weakening of the position of ethnic elites led to even lower effectiveness conditioned by reluctance of officials to implement programs beyond symbolic steps. The authorities did not perceive an urgent need to react on nationalist sentiments and public demands anymore. In most republics funding was practically stopped after the 1998 Russian financial default.

After that there was a long pause in implementation due to the shift in nationalities policy and overall changes in the country around the year 2000. As a part of the process of the state authorities' consolidation into 'power vertical', the promotion of Russian gradually became a focal point of the federal language policy. The federal authorities did not demand regional authorities to break with the previous policies of the promotion of titular languages right away. At the same time, the rhetoric of 'national revival' and 'language revival' and other ideas associated with self-governance in regions were discouraged. As part of 'bringing regional legislations into concordance with federal legislation', republican language laws were amended in a way that reinforced the turn to an instrumental approach in language planning that was based on the efficiency assumption (see Zamyatin 2013c: 144-146). Only the authorities in the Komi Republic managed to preserve continuity by passing the 2000 program that can be counted as the program of the second cycle. The other republics passed programs of a new – third cycle only between 2004 and 2005. The expansion of titular languages to the public domains ceased to be a priority. Instead, the main feature of these programs became the routinization of activities in the achieved domains. As a result, the new programs were not anymore merely the lists of measures but more sophisticated documents that linked measures to their funding and implementers.

The ideology changed in the fourth cycle of the programs passed in 2008 and 2009. Status planning was not the priority anymore even in Udmurtia and

Komi. Neither did the programs strive for the equal status or equal functioning of state languages, as was the case in some republics previously. For example, momentous use of the term ‘nominal equality’ signified the changed status quo in the 2008 Mari El program. The programs supported the languages not because of their status of state languages but titular languages in the sociolinguistic situation of minority languages. The change in the programs’ content reflected the diminished role of state languages. The funding of programs was continued on the same scale with the adjustment to inflation. A novelty was that since the second half of the 2000s federal authorities introduced meeting the demands of citizens as one of the main criteria for measuring effectiveness of policy implementation (see previous paragraph). The fact that the programs were still passed showed that ethnic elites retained their niche among the regional elites.

All the Russian republics have adjusted their nationalities policies in line with the recent policy shift of the early 2010s. All Finno-Ugric republics passed in 2013 and 2014 the action plans or programs for the implementation of Russia’s Nationalities Policy Strategy and applied for federal subsidies to fund them. If Komi received for the goal of ethno-cultural diversity maintenance from the federal center in 2014 about 8 million, Udmurtia 6 million and Mordovia 3.3 million rubles, then Karelia only slightly more than 0.3 million and Mari El somewhat less than 0.3 million rubles (RF Government Order, 22 March 2014). The action plans or respective programs address also some language issues and by the absence of specific language programs could be counted with some reserve as the fifth cycle of programs. Again, the shift in federal policy does not preclude that the republics continued to pursue their policies. In some republics language policy retained their significance, while in others marked yet another break in continuity. The Volga Turkic republics retained separate programs on language policy. Asymmetry among the republics remains and manifests itself in the fact that some other republics, notably the Finno-Ugric republics, do not anymore have separate executive programs that would be targeted specifically at the promotion of their titular languages (currently, with the exception of Udmurtia). Sure enough, the absence of specific language programs will negatively affect the position of titular languages.

All in all, with some adjustment to local realities, the content of support is similar across the republics due to dissemination of similar ideas about language revival that were borrowed, inter alia, from Fishman’s theory or other such theories. The range of implementation measures is quite diversified and covers most areas of language planning. With the development of scientific research, measures became more and more sophisticated over time and included developments also in new domains, for example, in internet technologies. The adequate delivery in respect of the content can be explained by the circumstance that a group of devoted officials and experts was free in choosing measures

so far as these did not interfere with federal priorities. The latter limitation stands for the decrease in significance of status planning in the later programs.

### 5.3. Extent and participation

The extent of support varies across the republics but is not sufficient for the task of language maintenance and development either to objective or subjective criteria. The findings demonstrated that the measures in the Finno-Ugric republics were proportionate neither in absolute terms of the number of speakers nor in relation to the relative share of titular groups in the total population. Quantitative indicators demonstrate drastically small numbers of published books, hours of TV and radio broadcasting and do not amount to the satisfaction of demands.

Because of the problem regarding the choice of subjective and objective criteria for the evaluation, this analysis of the extent was restricted to the amount of funding as the lowest denominator. The readiness of authorities to direct funds beyond expressing commitment is perhaps the best indirect way of evaluating the *de facto* policy and predicting its effectiveness. Of course, in absolute terms, the amount of funding was far from adequate for the revivalist goals. For example, 16 million rubles annually were assigned for the third program of Udmurtia, or about 0.40 million euro in prices of 2010, which is less than one and half euro per speaker of the Udmurt language in the republic (331 thousand speakers reported in the republic). Furthermore, the extent of support in its monetary equivalent had to be renegotiated every year in the budgetary process. Change in the amount of funding sometimes resulted in respective correction of a program's technical part but not of their content. More often the funds assigned to programs were not formally cut but the sums received *de facto* by implementer were lower in times in comparison to those assigned in the program budget. At the same time, within the funds available, it was up to implementers to ensure continuity or make necessary changes over the content of support.

In the observed period there was a striking contrast in the patterns of funding between the programs in the Volga Turkic and Finno-Ugric republics. In the Volga Turkic republics of Chuvashia and Tatarstan the programs were approved without breaks for a long-term period of a decade, which ensured independence of the political change and predictability of funding. In the Finno-Ugric republics the programs were approved for a middle-term of four or five years and sometimes lengthy breaks departed one program from another. The difference in the extent of support between two clusters in Volga Turkic and Finno-Ugric republics depended on whether local ethnic elite controlled the republican authorities or was in position of a minor stakeholder (see Zamyatin 2013c).

Yet, a certain extent of support also in the Finno-Ugric republics was enabled by a relatively fruitful participation of ethnic elites in decision-making by

executive authorities compared with their political under-representation. The control of respective agency in the field of nationalities policy was among the key variables for providing support for language revival projects. Of course, the ability of ethnic elites to cooperate with other segments of elites also in parliament, as in the Komi Republic, allowed not only a relatively high level of institutionalization of titular language in language law but also stable funding at the stage of implementation. But the cases of Udmurtia and Karelia provided the evidence that political support was not the most important factor for implementation. The language laws in these republics were passed late (in 2001 in Udmurtia and in 2004 in Karelia) and in a reduced version because of the absence of the status of state language (in Karelia). The political under-representation and unfavorable timing predetermined a low level of institutionalization of titular languages there (see Zamyatin 2013c, 2014c). However, about the same amount of five million rubles was assigned annually in the programs of the third cycle for in Komi, Udmurtia and Karelia, whereby the target group in Karelia is much smaller than in the other two republics.

Continuity in elites' access to decision-making ensured also certain patterns in funding, while discontinuity typically resulted in abrupt fall in the amount of funds. Loss of control of decision-making in executive authorities in the early 2000s in Mari El resulted in the minimal financial support for language through its ethno-cultural programs despite the relatively strong institutionalization of state languages in language law. Similarly, failure of ethnic elites to participate in decision-making since the late 1990s and until recently resulted in Mordovia in the absence of any respective programs. In both republics the political situation was unfavorable to titular ethnic elite (see respective sections in Zamyatin 2013a, b).

## **6. Conclusion**

This comparative study has demonstrated that participation of ethnic elites in decision-making was instrumental in providing resources for language revival. After the gradual shift of power to the executive branch both at the federal and regional level, executive authorities acted quite independently. In the situation, when the issue of the expansion in practical functioning of titular languages in the public domains was at the discretion of government officials, the level of ethnic elites' participation in decision-making became the key variable in determining both the content and extent of support provided in executive programs, in the same way as their political representation was the key for institutionalization of titular languages in laws. Members of ethnic elites typically headed executive authorities that were in charge of nationalities policy and language policy. The control over the respective executive agencies and their subordinate units such as language boards predetermined certain autonomy

in choosing the content of support for titular languages in the range of issues under their jurisdiction.

Other linguistic and extralinguistic variables had some relevance for planning the content, e.g., the lack of a written form of Karelian prior to 1989 predetermined that the approval of the written standard and accompanying corpus planning were a more urgent and first-ranking task than other measures. But all these were secondary to the control of institutions by officials devoted to the revivalist agenda. Their autonomy in choosing the content also had some institutional limitations. An important determinant for the content was the link between state support and the official status of titular languages. As in the case of the institutionalization of titular languages in language laws, it was not so much the issue of rights of language speakers but of status planning that justified the implementation of executive programs. The designation of titular languages with the official status opened the possibility for the expansion of their use in the public sphere. Immediate practical effects of official designation without further systemic status planning were small. For successful expansion, the participation of the whole state apparatus would be needed that was, however, unattainable in the republics with a titular minority.

At the same time, this link of status and support was not an inescapable limitation, while the extent of institutionalization did not necessarily limit the extent of implementation. As the case of Karelia demonstrated, the lack of the status of state language and a low level of institutionalization has not precluded the support for the titular language that sometimes was relatively more significant than in some other republics. The content of support was, thus, not restricted to status planning but included also other types of language planning that often were implemented more successfully. The implementation of other measures became possible from the divergence in the structure of language laws and executive programs. While the laws were mostly devoted to status planning, the programs had a much wider scope of application. However, a more general condition for support through laws and programs was the existence of the republics themselves. Even if other types of federative units, both territorially defined regions and territorially and ethnically defined autonomous districts also could and did pass their language legislation support for other languages than Russian was negligible there (for the example on minority language education in deferent types of federative units see Zamyatin 2012b).

Based on the amount of funds assigned as an indicator for the policy evaluation, the study of executive programs has shown that, even if the content of support was adequate to the revivalist goal, the extent of support was insufficient according to any criterion in terms of policy efficiency. Ethnic elites in the republics with the titular minority lacked the control over financial institutions

and resources and were restricted in their ability to lobby in favour of their goals in government and insist on obtaining more funds.

In the light of the problem with evaluation, it should be emphasized here that this study produced only a limited account of implementation, because important aspects of language planning remained outside of its scope. Most importantly, acquisition planning was not part of the analysis here. An important layer in implementation, which typically escapes attention, is local self-government. Sometimes negligible funds are assigned for language policy at the republican level, but some funds are also spent at the level of municipalities. The local measures are closer to the population and for that reason more effective (see Mukharyamov & Timokhina 2011, Ismagilova 2010). For example, in Mari El without significant republican support some measures are taken at the level of municipalities simply by virtue of the fact that titular group is in the majority there. Yet, in the Finno-Ugric republics, only in Komi there was a systematic language policy at the level of local self-government that was shaped through the adoption of municipal executive programs.

Furthermore, the lack of a specific language program complicates the policy evaluation but does not automatically imply a worst performance, although such scenario is likely because of the lack of unified supervision under one agency. Yet, when in a republic with a sizeable titular group, like in Mari El, by relatively strong language legislation, its centralized implementation is deliberately downgraded, decentralization actually turns out favorable for the task of language promotion because authorities in the fields of culture, mass media, education and road traffic implement legal regulations according to their competence. If there is a specific language program in competence of the nationalities policy agency, other authorities tend to ignore language policy implementation as not belonging to their competence.

This situation of adequate content and inadequate extent can be understood in the context of the symbolist policy. Regarding the content, the implementation could be reported positively by box-ticking the activities for the sake of appearance. For example, publication of a single book would be enough for official reporting to tick the respective box that books are published in minority languages. Regarding the extent, one reason for the low scale of implementation behind the checkbox might be that more efforts did not promise to bring as much symbolic benefits in correlation with costs. Often symbolist considerations were predominant over those of practical use. For example, such measures as translations of laws and other official documents (implemented in Komi), corpus planning and other activities of language boards, are important for the 'development' of language, but they are directed at symbolism of recognition and not at the promotion of language use. After analyzing the official reporting documents with their superficial style and juxtaposing them with other

sources, one comes to the conclusion that many elements of the official status institutionalized in law were only partially or not implemented.

The analysis of the possible policy impact on the sociolinguistic situation was not in the scope of this study. Nevertheless, the study results shed some light on policy implications. The analysis of the executive programs and reporting documents demonstrated that titular languages were in focus of the republics' policies. The limited effect of a 'top-down' policy was predetermined by a structural restraint when the official status only 'promotes' the functioning of a language in some domains of the public sphere. Sufficient evidence was found that more than two decades of efforts spent on policy implementation have not reversed the tendency of contracting in the use of titular language in the public sphere. Effective enforcement mechanisms to enroot language practices of official bilingualism were not created. Accordingly, the official status does not influence language use and language practices directly but only indirectly through symbolism of recognition and access to education in and of the language, thus raising language's prestige. The evaluation of policy implementation witnesses, *inter alia*, that the amount of measures is not sufficient to overwhelm the sociolinguistic tendencies of language shift. Furthermore, recently it was from time to time explicitly stated that the actual goal is not the reversal of language shift but only a decrease in intensity of assimilation processes. It remains to be the task for another study to provide sociolinguistic evidence in measuring the policy impact on language practices.

According to the official data (e.g., the data of population censuses), the processes of language shift and ethnic assimilation of the titular groups continue to dominate in the dynamics of the sociolinguistic situations in the Finno-Ugric republics. The extent of measures reveals intention to restrain to the symbolic recognition of diversity but not to the promotion of local ethnic identities. Economic reasons are typically used as pretext for a residual funding of the language policy. However, not so much the efficiency assumption as the integration assumption was the matter of concern. The reluctance of implementers to expand the use of titular language is explicable, *inter alia*, by the conditions of an ongoing political campaign for the Russian nation-building. As Walker Connor (1972) pointed out, nation-building includes nation-destroying. On the market of ideas the nation-building projects in the republics are in competition with the Russian nation-building. Language revival was part of the nation-building projects in the republics. In the conditions of democratization during the first years after perestroika competing nation-building projects co-existed, but after the turn to authoritarianism in the early 2000s, the central authorities might succeed in imposing their nation-building agenda over the competing projects. In this case the official status of languages in the republics as requisites of republics' projects would also be under challenge.

## References

- Blommaert, Jan 1996: Language Planning as a Discourse on Language and Society: The Linguistic Ideology of a Scholarly Tradition. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 20 (3): 199–222.
- Boinich, Valerii & Bogdanova, Elena 2008. Respublika Karelia. *Mnogoiazychie v Rossii: regionalnye aspekty*. Moscow: Mezhhregionalnyi tsentr bibliotchnogo sotrudnichestva, , 25-32.
- Brubaker, Rogers 1996: *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cashaback, David 2008: Assessing Asymmetrical Federal Design in the Russian Federation: a Case Study of Language Policy in Tatarstan. *Europe-Asia Studies* 60 (2): 249–275.
- Connor, Walker 1972: Nation-Building or Nation-Destroying? *World Politics* 24 (3): 319–355.
- Cooper, Robert 1990: *Language Planning and Social Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dolgaeva, E. 2001. Gosudarstvennye sluzhashchie Mordovii: sotsiologicheskii portret. *Mordovia v period reform*. Nauchnye materialy II Merkushtinskikh chtenii, Saransk: Krasnyi Oktiabr.
- Edwards, John 2009: *Language and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fishman, Joshua 1991: *Reversing Language Shift. Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, Joshua 2001: Why is it so Hard to Save a Threatened Language? *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved?* Ed. Joshua A. Fishman. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1–22.
- Galliamov, Rushan 2006. *Elita Bashkortostana: politicheskoe i konfessionalnoe izmerenie*. Kazan: Institute of History.
- Gorenburg, Dmitry P. 2003: *Minority Ethnic Mobilization in the Russian Federation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gorenburg, Dmitry P. 2005: Tatar Language Policies in Comparative Perspective: Why Some Revivals Fail and Some Succeed. *Ab Imperio* 1: 257–284.
- Graney, Katherine E. 2009: *Of Khans and Kremlins: Tatarstan and the Future of Ethno-Federalism in Russia*. Lanham, MD; Plymouth: Lexington Books.
- Grin, François 2003: *Language Policy Evaluation and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Ismagilova, Gulnaz 2010. Munitsipalnoe obrazovanie kak ob'ekt upravleniia nagliadno-informatsionnoi atributikoi goroda v ramkakh realizatsii Zakona o iazykakh Respubliki Tatarstan. *Vestnik Tatarskogo gosudarstvennogo gumanitarno-pedagogicheskogo universiteta* 3 (21) (2010): 166-169.

- Janush, Olga 2013. Finno-ugorskie jazyki: regionalnyi opyt sokhraneniia i razvitiia. *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie* 3, 136-150.
- Khamidullina, Adelia 2010. K voprosu o mekhanizmax realizatsii iazykovoi politiki: primer "Gosudarstvennoi programmy po sokhraneniui, izucheniiu i razvitiui iazykov narodov Respubliki Tatarstan". *Izvestiia RGPU imeni A.I. Gertsena* 124 (2010): 98 – 105.
- Kleerova, Tatiana 2004. My sokhranim rodnye iazyki. *Sovremennoe sostoianie i perspektivy razvitiia karelskogo, vepsskogo i finskogo iazykov v Respublike Karelia*. Conference proceedings, Petrozavodsk, Periodika, 2004.
- Klementiev, Evgenii. V poiskakh pravovoi zashchity kulturno-iazykovykh interesov karel, vepsov, finnov Respubliki Kareliia. *Kazanskii federalist* 3 (11) (2004): 70–107.
- Klementiev, Evgenii 2004. O "Programme podderzhki karelskogo, vepsskogo i finskogo iazykov". *Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 57.
- Klementiev, Evgenii 2006. Ob otchote Goskomnatsa za 2005 god. *Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 65.
- Klementiev, Evgenii 2007. Etnokulturnaia politika: itogi i plany. *Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 7.
- Klementiev, Evgenii 2008. O prave i praktike: iazykovoi aspekt v Respublike Karelia. *Identichnost i izmeniaiushchiisia mir: Materialy k diskussii na V Vsemirnom kongresse finno-ugorskikh narodov*. Syktyvkar: Komi Scientific Center of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Klestov, Igor 2000. *Vostochno-finskie narody v protsesse modernizatsii*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kozulina, Svetlana 2003. Problemy i perspektivy razvitiia komi iazyka kak gosudarstvennogo iazyka Respubliki Komi. *Problemy i perspektivy razvitiia vostochnykh finno-ugorskikh iazykov*. Conference "Funktsionirovaniie iazykov i sostoianie etnokultury vostochnykh finno-ugorskikh narodov: problemy i perspektivy razvitiia", Saransk, 04.-07.06.2003, Conference proceedings, Saransk, 253-254.
- Kymlicka, Will 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ledeneva, Alena 2013. *Can Russia Modernise?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moser, Robert 2012. Ethnic Federalism, Electoral Systems, and the Representation of Ethnic Minorities: Evidence from Russia. *Managing Ethnic Diversity in Russia*. Oleh Protsyk and Benedikt Harzl (eds.). London: Routledge. Pp. 215-237.

- Mosin, Mikhail 1999. Vozrozhdencheskoe dvizheniie mordovskogo naroda Rossii: sostoiianie, problemy, perspektivy. *Doklad predsedatelia Soveta Vozrozhdeniia mordovskogo naroda na III siezde mordovskogo naroda*. Moscow, 7 October 1999. <http://www.suri.ee/doc/ru/mord/sjezd3/doklad.html>
- Mosin, Mikhail 2003. Polozheniie iazykov vostochnykh finno-ugorskikh iazykov: istoriia i sovremennost. *Problemy i perspektivy razvitiia vostochnykh finno-ugorskikh iazykov*. Conference proceedings, Saransk, 11-12.
- Mukharyamov, Nail & Timokhina, Ekaterina 2011: Mestnyi uroven iazykovoi politiki: normativnye izmereniia. *Vestnik Kazanskogo gosudarstvennogo tekhnicheskogo universiteta* 10 (3) (2011): 62-69.
- Natsionalnyi vopros v rossiiskoi obshchestvenno-politicheskoi zhizni (Rezultaty obshcherossiiskogo sotsissledovaniia)*. M. Romanov & V. Stepanov (eds.). Moscow: Public Chamber of the Russian Federation, 2013.
- Osipov, Alexander 2012: Implementation Unwanted? Symbolic vs. Instrumental Policies in the Russian Management of Ethnic Diversity. *Perspectives on European Politics & Society* 13 (4): 425–442.
- Poliakov, Osip 2003. O putiakh rasshireniia funktsii mordovskikh (mokshanskogo i erzyanskogo) iazykov. *Problemy i perspektivy razvitiia vostochnykh finno-ugorskikh iazykov*. Conference proceedings, Saransk, 28-31.
- Poliakov, Osip 2005. Iazyki v Respublike Mordovia: osobennosti upotrebleniia i puti rasshireniia funktsionirovaniia. *Natsionalnoe samosoznaniie mordovskogo (mokshanskogo i erzyanskogo) naroda: nastoiashchee i budushchee*. Materialy dokladov IV siezda mordovskogo (mokshanskogo i erzyanskogo) naroda. Saransk, Krasnyi Oktiabr, 72-73.
- Prina, Federica 2012: Power, Politics and Participation: the Russian Federation's National Minorities and their Participatory Rights. *Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights* 30 (1): 66-96.
- Robichaud, David & De Schutter, Helder 2012: Language is Just a Tool! On the Instrumentalist Approach to Language. *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*. B. Spolsky (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 124–145.
- Semionov, Jurij 2004. O deiatelnosti Ministerstva natsionalnoi politiki. *Etnokonfessionalnaia situatsiia v Privolzhskom federalnom okruge, Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 70.
- Sharov, Vladimir 2003. Etnokulturnaia politika: voprosy finansirovaniia. *Etnokonfessionalnaia situatsiia v Privolzhskom federalnom okruge, Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 67.

- Sharov, Vladimir 2004. Parlament podderzhivaet programmu etnokulturnogo razvitiia. *Etnokonfessionalnaia situatsiia v Privolzhskom federalnom okruge, Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 73.
- Sharov, Vladimir 2006. Problemy natsionalnoi shkoly kak predmet politicheskikh spekulatsii. *Etnokonfessionalnaia situatsiia v Privolzhskom federalnom okruge, Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 118.
- Sharov, Vladimir. Programma etnokulturnogo razvitiia v deistvii. *Etnokonfessionalnaia situatsiia v Privolzhskom federalnom okruge, Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 128, 2008.
- Sharov. O perspektivakh razvitiia gosudarstvennykh iazykov. *Etnokonfessionalnaia situatsiia v Privolzhskom federalnom okruge, Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 135, 2008.
- Shilov, Nikolai. Sovremennaiia iazykovaia situatsiia. *Etnokonfessionalnaia situatsiia v Privolzhskom federalnom okruge, Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 45, 2002.
- Shohamy, Elana 2006: *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Solomon, Peter 2008: Law and Public Administration: How Russia Differs. *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 24 (1): 115–135.
- Spolsky, Bernard 2004: *Language Policy: Key Topics in Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strogalshchikova, Zinaida, Klementiev, Evgenii 2000. O nekotorykh aspektakh natsionalnoi politiki. *Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 34.
- Torokhova, Elena 2012. O iazykovoi politike v Udmurtskoi Respublike. *Vestnik Udmurtskogo Universiteta* 2 (2012): 152-158.
- Tsypanov, Evgenii 2003. Gosudarstvennyi li komi iazyk s točki zreniia iego funktsionirovaniia? In *Problemy i perspektivy razvitiia vostochnykh fino-ugorskikh iazykov*. Conference proceedings, Saransk, 31-37.
- Varenes, Fernand de 2012: *International and Comparative Perspectives in the Use of Official Languages: Models and Approaches for South Africa*. Assessment prepared for the Afrikaanse Taalraad on the use of official languages and the proposed South African Languages Act, 2011 and other issues. Pretoria, South Africa: Afrikaanse Taalraad.
- Vorontsov, Vladimir 2004. Izmeneniie struktury pravitelstva. *Etnokonfessionalnaia situatsiia v Privolzhskom federalnom okruge, Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 73.

- Vorontsov, Vladimir 2007. Ot priniatiia zakona o iazykakh k ego realizatsii. *Etnokonfessionalnaia situatsiia v Privolzhskom federalnom okruge, Bulletin of the Network for Ethnic Monitoring and Early Warning of Conflicts EAWARN*, № 122.
- Vorontsov, Vladimir 2009. Opyt realizatsii iazykovoi politiki v Udmurtii. *Finno-ugry - slaviane - tiurki: opyt vzaimodeistviia (traditsii i innovatsii)*, Conference proceedings. Izhevsk: Udmurtskii universitet, 656-667.
- Vorontsov, Vladimir 2013. Realizatsiia iazykovoi politiki v Udmurtii i obshchestvennye initsiativy. *Grazhdanskie initsiativy v sfere etnicheskoi politiki*. Moscow: Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 157-168.
- Yanalov, Vasilii 2000. "Marii El Respublikyse iylme-vlak nergen" 2000-2005 iilan kugyzhanysh programmym ilyshysh purtyshash zakonyn proektshe nergen. *Problemy razvitiia mariiskogo iazyka kak gosudarstvennogo*. Yoshkar-Ola: Mari Scientific Research Institute of Language, Literature and History at the Government of the Republic of Mari El, 30-33.
- Yanalov, Vasilii 2001. Osushchestvima li mehta o rasstsvete mariiskogo iazyka v XXI veke? *Finno-Ugrian Bulletin*, No. 20.
- Zamyatin, Konstantin 2012a: From Language Revival to Language Removal? The Teaching of Titular Languages in the National Republics of Post-Soviet Russia. *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 11 (2): 75-102.
- Zamyatin, Konstantin 2012b: The Finno-Ugric Languages in Russian Education: Changing Legal-Institutional Framework and Falling Access to Native Language Study. *Études finno-ougriennes* Vol. 44. *Numéro spécial: Les langues finno-ougriennes aujourd'hui*. No I: 197-272.
- Zamyatin, Konstantin 2013a: Sovereignisation and State Languages: Early Formation of Language Policy of Russia's Finno-Ugric Republics under the Conditions of the USSR Disintegration. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 36: 123-165.
- Zamyatin, Konstantin 2013b: Finno-Ugric Republics and Their State Languages: Balancing Powers in Constitutional Order in the Early 1990s. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 94: 337-381.
- Zamyatin, Konstantin 2013c: Official Status As a Tool of Language Revival? A Study of the Languages Laws in Russia's Finno-Ugric Republics. *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics* 7 (1): 125-153.
- Zamyatin, Konstantin 2014a: *An Official Status for Minority Languages? A Study of State Languages in Russia's Finno-Ugric Republics*. *Uralica Hel-singiensia* 6. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.
- Zamyatin, Konstantin 2014b: Evolution in Language Ideology of Post-Soviet Russia. *Linguistic and Cultural Minorities in the Russian Federation and*

*the European Union: Comparative Studies on Equality and Diversity*. Heiko Marten, Michael Rießler, Janne Saarikivi & Reetta Toivanen (eds.). Berlin: Springer, in print.

Zamyatin, Konstantin 2014c: Deficiencies of Official Bilingualism in the Finno-Ugric Republics of Post-Soviet Russia: A Legal Perspective. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen*, Vol. 62, forthcoming.

Zaripov, Yagfar & Faller, Helen 2003: The Politics of Language Reform and Bilingualism in Tatarstan. *Nation-building, Ethnicity and Language Politics in Transition Countries*. Budapest: ECMI.

### **Official sources**

Report on Results and Main Activities of the Ministry of Nationalities Policy of the Komi Republic in 2009-2013, approved by the Decree of the Ministry of Nationalities Policy of the Komi Republic of 14 December 2010.

Report on Results and Main Activities of the Ministry of Nationalities Policy of the Komi Republic in 2010-2014, approved by the Decree of the Ministry of Nationalities Policy of the Komi Republic of 1 December 2011.

Draft State Program for the Implementation of the Law “On Languages of the Republic of Mari El” for 2000-2005. *Problemy razvitiia mariiskogo iazyka kak gosudarstvennogo*. Yoshkar-Ola: Mari Scientific Research Institute of Language, Literature and History at the Government of the Republic of Mari El, 2000. Pp. 63-72.

*Kto iest kto v Marii El* 2002: Bibliograficheskii spravochnik. Valerii Mochaev (ed.). Yoshkar-Ola: Resursy Marii Ėl.

Reports on Activities of the Committee for Nationalities Affairs at the Government of the Udmurt Republic (1995-1999), available in: *Fenomen Udmurtii*. Vol. 2. *Postizhenie suverennosti: stanovlenie gosudarstvennosti Udmurtskoi Respubliki*. Book. 2 *Sfera ispolnitelnoi vlasti*. Eds S. Smirnova, M. Guboglo and others. Moscow-Izhevsk, Udmurtia, 2002. Pp. 371-373, 442-443, 492-493, 576-577, 623-625.

Information on the Situation in the Sphere of Training of National Cadres in the Udmurt Republic, available in: *Fenomen Udmurtii*. Vol. 2. *Postizhenie suverennosti: stanovlenie gosudarstvennosti Udmurtskoi Respubliki*. Book 2. *Sfera ispolnitelnoi vlasti*. Eds S. Smirnova, M. Guboglo and others. Moscow-Izhevsk: Udmurtia, 2002. Pp. 480-481.

Information on the Implementation of the Republican Target Program for the Implementation of the Law of the Udmurt Republic “On the State Languages of the Udmurt Republic and Other Languages of the Peoples of the Udmurt Republic for 2004-2009” for the Period 2005-2007, Ministry of Nationalities Policy of the Udmurt Republic.

Information on the Implementation of the Republican Target Program for the Implementation of the Law of the Udmurt Republic “On the State Languages of the Udmurt Republic and Other Languages of the Peoples of the Udmurt Republic for 2010-2014” in 2012, Ministry of Nationalities Policy of the Udmurt Republic.

Information on the Implementation of the Republican Target Program for the Implementation of the Law of the Udmurt Republic “On the State Languages of the Udmurt Republic and Other Languages of the Peoples of the Udmurt Republic for 2010-2014” in 2013, Ministry of Nationalities Policy of the Udmurt Republic.

Report on the Activities of the Ministry for Nationalities Policy of the Republic of Mordovia in 2013.

Information of the Ministry on the Issues of Nationalities Policy and Relations with Religious Organizations on the implementation of the regional target program “State Support of the Karelian, Veps and Finnish languages in the Republic of Karelia (2006-2010)” in the year 2009.

Report on the Implementation of the Tasks Set in the Strategy of the State Nationalities Policy of the Russian Federation for the Period Up To 2025 as well as on the Results of the Implementation of the Action Plan for 2013-2015 in the Republic of Karelia in 2013.

### **Legal documents**

Law of the USSR “On the Languages of the Peoples of the USSR” of 24 April 1990.

Law of the Russian SFSR “On the Languages of the Peoples of the Russian SFSR” of 25 October 1991 (amended by the Federal Laws of 24 July 1998 and 11 December 2002).

Constitution of the Russian Federation of 12 December 1993.

Federal Law on Political Parties of 11 July 2001.

Federal Target Program ‘Russian Language (2011–2015)’, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of 20 June 2011.

Strategy of the State Nationalities Policy of the Russian Federation for the Period Up To 2025, approved by the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of 19 December 2012.

State Program of the Russian Federation ‘Regional Policy and Federative Relations’, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of 26 March 2013.

Federal Target Program ‘Strengthening of the Unity of the Russian Nation and the Ethno-Cultural Development of the Peoples of Russia (2014–2020)’, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of 20 August 2013.

Action Plan for the Implementation in 2013-2015 of the Strategy of the State Nationalities Policy of the Russian Federation for the Period Up To 2025, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of 21 July 2013.

Order of the Government of the Russian Federation of 22 March 2014.

State Program for the Implementation of the Law “On the Languages in the Chuvash Republic” for 1993-2000 and the Following Years, approved by the Decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Chuvash Republic of 28 May 1993.

Republican Program for the Implementation of the Law of the Chuvash Republic “On the Languages in the Chuvash Republic” for 2003-2007 and until 2012”, approved by the Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Chuvash Republic of 6 December 2002.

Republican Target Program for the Implementation of the Law On Languages in the Chuvash Republic for 2013-2020, approved by the Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Chuvash Republic of 13 September 2012.

State Program for the Maintenance, Study and Development of the Languages of the Peoples of the Republic of Tatarstan, approved by the Decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Tatarstan of 20 July 1994.

State Program for the Maintenance, Study and Development of the State Languages of the Republic of Tatarstan and Other Languages in the Republic of Tatarstan (2004-2013), approved by the Law of the Republic of Tatarstan of 11 October 2004.

State Program for the Maintenance, Study and Development of the State Languages of the Republic of Tatarstan and Other Languages in the Republic of Tatarstan (2014-2020), approved by the Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Tatarstan of 25 October 2013.

Decree of the Supreme Council of the Komi Republic “On Entering into Force of the Law of the Komi Republic “On the State Languages of the Komi Republic” of 28 May 1992.

Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Komi Republic of 1 April 1993.

Decree of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers of the Komi Republic “On the Statute of the State Committee of the Komi Republic for Nationalities Affairs” of 11 August 1993.

State Program “Maintenance and Development of the Komi language (1994-1996)”, approved by the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Komi Republic of 18 January 1994.

Decree of the Head of the Komi Republic “On the Issues of the Ministry for Nationalities Affairs of the Komi Republic” of 13 February 1995.

- State Program “Maintenance and Development of the Komi language (1997-1999)”, approved by the Decree of the Head of the Komi Republic of 2 September 1996.
- State Program “Maintenance and Development of the Komi language (2000-2005)”, approved by the Decree of the Head of the Komi Republic of 17 December 1999.
- Decree of the Head of the Komi Republic “On the Creation of the Commission under the Head of the Komi Republic for the Implementation of the Law of the Komi Republic “On the State Languages of the Komi Republic”, 5 May 2000.
- Decree of the Government of the Komi Republic of 29 April 2003.
- Republican Target Program “Maintenance and Development of the State Languages of the Komi Republic (2005-2009)”, approved by the Law of the Komi Republic of 14 May 2005.
- Municipal Program “Assistance in the Development of the State Languages in the Municipal Town District “Ukhta” for 2007-2010”, approved by the Decision of the Council of the Municipal Town District “Ukhta” of 26 June 2006.
- Typical Instruction for Managing Public Affairs and Official Language Circulation in the Executive Authorities of the Komi Republic and the State Institutions, Established by the Head of the Komi Republic or the Government of the Komi Republic, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Komi Republic of 18 August 2006.
- Decree of the Government of the Komi Republic “On the Ministry of Nationalities Policy of the Komi Republic” of 18 December 2007.
- Regulation On the Journal “Gazette of the Normative Acts of the Authorities of the Komi Republic”, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Komi Republic of 5 February 2008.
- Order of the Ministry of Nationalities Policy of the Komi Republic “On the Approval of the Qualification Requirements for Professional Knowledge and Skills Needed for Accomplishment of Professional Duties by State Civil Servants of the Komi Republic in the Ministry of Nationalities Policy of the Komi Republic” of 13 October 2008.
- Long-term Republican Target Program “Maintenance and Development of the State Languages of the Komi Republic (2010-2012)”, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Komi Republic of 14 September 2009.
- Subprogram ‘Ensuring Access to the Objects of Culture, Maintenance and Actualization of Cultural Heritage’ of the State Program of the Komi Republic “Culture of the Komi Republic”, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Komi Republic of 30 December 2011.

Complex Action Plan for the Implementation of the State Program of the Komi Republic “Culture of the Komi Republic” for 2013-2015, approved by the Order of the Ministry of Culture of the Komi Republic of 5 December 2012. Regional Program of the Komi Republic for the Strengthening of the Russian Nation and the Ethno-Cultural Development of the Peoples of Russia “Komi Republic is a Territory of Internationality Peace and Accord (2014-2020)”, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Komi Republic of 19 December 2013.

Decree of the Government of the Mari SSR “On the Ministry of Publishing and Information of the Mari SSR” of 6 May 1992.

Decree of President of the Republic of Mari El “On Liquidation of the Ministry of Publishing and Information of the Republic of Mari El” of 21 July 1993.

Decree of President of the Republic of Mari El “On the Ministry of Culture and Nationalities Affairs of the Republic of Mari El” of 18 October 1996.

Decree of President of the Republic of Mari El “On Reorganization of the Committee of the Republic of Mari El of Publishing and Information” of 12 September 1997.

Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El “On the Council on the State Languages of the Republic of Mari El at the Government of the Republic of Mari El” of 11 June 1998.

Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El “On Approval of the Statute of the Ministry of Culture and Internationality Relations of the Republic of Mari El” of 26 February 2001.

Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El “The Issues of the Council on the State Languages of the Republic of Mari El at the Government of the Republic of Mari El” of 23 March 2001.

Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El “On the Issues of the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Mari El” of 29 March 2001.

Decree of President of the Republic of Mari El “On the Regulation on the Procedure of Installation and Change of Information Signs “On the Objects of Cultural Heritage of Regional Significance” of 21 February 2003.

Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El “On the Commission on the State Languages at the Government of the Republic of Mari El” of 30 September 2003.

Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El “On Approval of the Statute of the Ministry of Culture, Publishing and Nationalities Affairs of the Republic of Mari El” of 27 January 2004.

Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El “On the Commission on the State Languages at the Government of the Republic of Mari El” of 28 April 2004.

- Republican Target Program “Development of Ethno-Cultural and Internationality Relations in the Republic of in the Republic of Mari El (2004-2008)”, approved by the Law of the Republic of Mari El of 9 September 2004.
- Law of the Republic of Mari El “On the Amendments to the Law of the Republic of Mari El “On the Republican Target Program “Development of Ethno-Cultural and Internationality Relations in the Republic of Mari El (2004-2008)” of 28 April 2007.
- Republican Target Program “Ethno-Cultural Development in the Republic of Mari El (2009-2013)”, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El of 24 March 2008.
- Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El “On the Issues of the Commission on the State Languages at the Government of the Republic of Mari El” of 16 July 2008.
- Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El “On the Presidential Grants in the Field of the Development of Ethno-Cultural Relations” of 14 December 2008.
- Regulation on the Use of Languages in Publishing of Publicly Significant Information on the Territory of the Republic of Mari El, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El of 8 December 2010.
- Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El “On the Issues of the Commission on the State Languages at the Government of the Republic of Mari El” of 14 January 2011.
- State Program of the Republic of Mari El “State Nationalities Policy of the Republic of Mari El for 2013-2020” and its Subprogram “The Ethno-Cultural Development, Internationality and Inter-confessional Relations in the Republic of Mari El in 2014-2020”, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mari El of 8 October 2012.
- Action Plan for 2013-2015 for the Implementation in the Republic of Mari El of the Strategy of the State Nationalities Policy of the Russian Federation for the Period Up To 2025, approved by the Order of the Government of the Republic of Mari El of 21 November 2013.
- State Program for the Maintenance and Development of the Udmurt Language and the Languages of the Peoples Compactly Residing in the Udmurt Republic, approved by the Decree of the Council of Ministers of the Udmurt Republic of 14 June 1994.
- Decree of the Council of Ministers of the Udmurt Republic “On the Establishment of the Committee for Nationalities Affairs at the Council of Ministers of the Udmurt Republic” of 3 October 1994.
- Decree of the Government of the Udmurt Republic of 10 November 1997.
- Decree of the Government of the Udmurt Republic “On the Ministry of Nationalities Policy of the Udmurt Republic” of 16 August 1999.

- Decree of the Government of the Udmurt Republic “On the Statute of the Ministry of Nationalities Policy of the Udmurt Republic” of 21 September 2001.
- Republican Target Program for the Implementation of the Law of the Udmurt Republic “On the State Languages of the Udmurt Republic and Other Languages of the Peoples of the Udmurt Republic” for 2005-2009, approved by the Decree of the State Council of the Udmurt Republic of 30 November 2004.
- Decree of the Government of the Udmurt Republic “On the Regulation of Making Design for the Names of Geographical Objects and Installation of Bilingual Road Signs, Street Signs and Other Public Signs” of 7 November 2005.
- Decree of the City Administration of Izhevsk “On the Measures for the Implementation of the Law of the Udmurt Republic “On the State Languages of the Udmurt Republic and Other Languages of the Peoples of the Udmurt Republic” of 3 May 2006
- Decree of the Government of the Udmurt Republic “On the Ministry of Culture, Publishing and Information of the Udmurt Republic” of 28 August 2009.
- Republican Target Program for the Implementation of the Law of the Udmurt Republic “On the State Languages of the Udmurt Republic and Other Languages of the Peoples of the Udmurt Republic for 2010-2014”, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Udmurt Republic of 19 October 2009.
- Decree of the Government of the Udmurt Republic “On the Draft Law “On the Amendments to the Law of the Udmurt Republic “On the State Languages of the Udmurt Republic and Other Languages of the Peoples of the Udmurt Republic” of 4 May 2010.
- Subprogram „Maintenance and Development of the Languages of the Peoples of the Udmurt Republic“ of the State Program of the Udmurt Republic „Ethno-Social Development and Harmonization of Inter-Ethnic Relations in 2013-2015“, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Udmurt Republic of 19 August 2013.
- Action Plan for the Implementation in 2014-2015 of the Strategy of the State Nationalities Policy of the Russian Federation for the Period Up To 2025 in the Udmurt Republic, approved by the Order of the Head of the Udmurt Republic of 14 March 2014.
- Decree of the Council of Ministers - Government of the Republic of Mordovia “On Establishing of the Committee for Nationalities Policy at the Council of Ministers - Government of the Republic of Mordovia” of 1 April 1994.
- Program of National Development and Internationality Cooperation of the Peoples of the Republic of Mordovia, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mordovia of 15 April 1996.

- Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mordovia “On the Approval of the Statute of the State Committee of the Republic of Mordovia for Nationalities Policy” of 6 May 1998.
- Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mordovia Republic “On the Approval of the Statute of the Ministry for Nationalities Policy of the Republic of Mordovia” of 21 May 2010.
- Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mordovia “On the Approval of the Norms of the Contemporary Mordvin (Erzya and Moksha) Literary Language in Its Use as the State Language of the Republic of Mordovia, of the Rules of Orthography and Punctuation” of 1 November 2010.
- Action Plan for the Implementation in 2013-2015 in the Republic of Mordovia of the Strategy of the State Nationalities Policy of the Russian Federation for the Period Up To 2025, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mordovia of 28 October 2013.
- State Program “Harmonization of Internationality and Inter-confessional Relations in the Republic of Mordovia” (2014-2020), approved by the Decree of the Government of the Republic of Mordovia of 18 November 2013.
- Decree of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Karelia of 4 December 1991.
- Decree of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Karelia “On the Foundation of National Revival of Small-Numbered Peoples of the Republic of Karelia” of 5 May 1992.
- Program “Revival and Development of the Languages and Cultures of Karelians, Veps and Finns in the Republic of Karelia (1995-1996)”, approved by the Decree of the Chairman of the Government of the Republic of Karelia of 30 January 1995.
- Decree of the Chairman of the Government of the Republic of Karelia of 1 September 1997.
- Decree of the Legislative Assembly of the Republic of Karelia of 26 March 1998.
- Regional Target Program “State Support of the Karelian, Veps and Finnish languages in the Republic of Karelia (2006-2010)”, approved by the Decree of the Legislative Assembly of the Republic of Karelia of 16 June 2005.
- Departmental Target Program “National Development and Internationality Cooperation of the Peoples and National Minorities of the Republic of Karelia in 2006-2010”, approved by the Decree of the State Committee of Nationalities Policy Affairs of 18 December 2005.
- Regional Target Program “Harmonization of National and Confessional Relations in the Republic of Karelia in 2007-2011 («Karelia is the Territory of Accord»)”, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Republic of Karelia of 25 January 2007.

Decree of the Head of the Republic of Karelia “On the Ministry for the Issues of Nationalities Policy and Relations with Religious Organizations of the Republic of Karelia” of 24 May 2008.

Action Plan and the List of Complex Measures “Development of the Karelian language in the Republic of Karelia in 2009-2020”, approved by the Joint Order of the Ministry of Nationalities Policy Affairs, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Culture and Public Relations of the Republic of Karelia of 28 May 2009.

Regional Long-term Target Program “Maintenance of the Unity of Peoples and Ethnic Communities of Karelia in 2012-2016 («Karelia is Our Home»)", approved by the Decree of the Government of the Republic of Karelia of 12 December 2011 (not in force since 19 December 2013).

Departmental Target Program “Results and Main Directions of Activities of the Ministry of the Republic of Karelia for Nationalities Policy Affairs, Relations with Public, Religious Organizations and Mass Media for 2013 and up to 2015”, approved by the Order of the Ministry of the Republic of Karelia for Nationalities Policy Affairs, Relations with Public, Religious Organizations and Mass Media of 28 December 2012.

Subprogram “Maintenance of the Unity of the Peoples and Ethnic Communities of Karelia in 2014-2020 («Karelia is Our Home»)" of the State Program of the Republic of Karelia “Development of Institutions of Civil Society and Development of Local Self-Government, Protection of Human Rights”, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Republic of Karelia of 19 December 2013.

Complex Action Plan of Measures for the Implementation of the Strategy of the State Nationalities Policy of the Russian Federation for the Period Up To 2025 in the Republic of Karelia for 2014-2015, approved by the Order of the Government of the Republic of Karelia of 14 January 2014.

## Appendix

Table 1. Executive programs in the Finno-Ugric and Volga Turkic republics

Republic	Chuvashia	Tatarstan	Komi	Mari El
1. 1993-2000	State program for the implementation of language law (1993-2000)	State program of the maintenance, study and development of the languages (1994)	State program "Maintenance and development" (1994-1996); (1997-1999)	Financing of measures directly from the line of the republican budget 1993
2. 2000-2005	--"	--"	State program "Maintenance and development" (2000-2005)	no
3. 2005-2010	Republican target program for the implementation of language law (2003-2007, prolonged for 2008-2012)	State program of the maintenance, study and development of the state languages and other languages (2004-2013)	Republican target program "Maintenance and development of the state languages" (2005-2009)	Subprogram of the republican program of the development of ethno-cultural and inter-ethnic relations (2004-2008)
4. 2010-2013	Annually about 9.3 million rubles	Annually about 12 million rubles	Annually about 5 million rubles	Annually less than 0.8 million rubles
5. 2014-2020	Annually 0.7-3.5 million rubles	Annually 122-184 million rubles	Annually about 5.4 million rubles	Annually about 0.45 million rubles
	Adjusted to inflation	Adjusted to inflation	Annually about 4 million rubles	Annually less than 0.67 million rubles
	Republican target program for the implementation of language law (2013-2020)	State program of the maintenance, study and development of the state languages and other languages (2014-2020)	Part on the state languages of the subprogram of the state program on culture and its action plan (2013-2015)	Part of the subprogram on the ethno-cultural development for 2014-2020 of the state program

Republic	Mordovia	Udmurtia	Karelia
1. 1993-2000	Section in "Program of National Development and Inter-Ethnic Cooperation" (1997)	State program of the maintenance and development of the Udmurt language (1994-2000(1997))	Program "Revival and Development" (1995-1996(2000))
2. 2000-2005	no	no	no
3. 2005-2010	no	Republican target program for the implementation of language law (2004-2008)	Republican target program "State Support of Karelian, Veps and Finnish (2006-2010)"
	-	Annually about 5 million rubles	Annually about 4.5 million rubles
4. 2010-2013	no	Republican target program for the implementation of language law 2010-2014	Action plan "Development of the Karelian language (2009-2020)"
	-	Annually about 16 million rubles	No separate funding
5. 2014-2020	Part of the state program "Harmonization of Internationality and Inter-confessional Relat." (2014-2020)	Subprogram on languages of the state program „Ethno-Social Development in 2013-2015“	Part of the departmental program "Results and Main Directions in 2013 and up to 2015"
	Not explicit (40 mln annually in total)	7, 7 and 10 million rubles	16 and 20 million rubles