

## **Turkic and Slavs: Bi-Polylinguism in Globalization and Migrations (On an Example of Tumen Region)**

*<sup>1</sup>Irina Sovetovna Karabulatova and <sup>2</sup>Zinaida Vasilyevna Polivara*

<sup>1</sup>Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia

<sup>2</sup>Tyumen State University, Tyumen, Russia

---

**Abstract:** Today linguistics is characterized by undiminishing interest to research related to modelling and functioning of bi-polylinguism in the situation of globalization and migration. Inevitable phenomena of interference, intervention (capture of language area), attrition (spoiling) of languages that follow this process affect also усвоение of Russian language and preservation of native language. Authors analyze ethno-linguistic differentiations in Russian language of Turkic migrants living in Tumen region. Respondents were mainly migrants from Azerbaijan and Turkey living now in Tumen region and having problems with communication in Russian, as well as Tatar who are the representatives of local native population and belong to Turkic world.

**Key words:** Bilingualism and polylingualism • Attrition • Ethno-linguistic differentiations • Ethno-psycho-linguistic norm • Turkic • Migrants

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

Bilingualism and polylingualism are the marks of the time. Deepening of cultural, scientific, economic and interpersonal contacts in modern world requires knowledge of several languages not just one or even two [1]. We are now engaged in multiple-vector communicational war in which language status is not an idle question but a question of vitality of a certain lingual culture. In the situation of polylingualism, increase of migration processes and boundaries transparency the problems of linguistic modelling of language person of a new poly-linguo-mental type on a state level not spontaneously become extremely urgent.

For example, main donors of Tumen region population are now Ukraine and Kazakhstan that jointly provided about 60% of migrants in the period between the two population censuses - in 1989 and 2002 years. In is reflected in lingual behavior of local inhabitants. Besides Tatar both local Siberian and from Povolzhie-Kazakhstan are in the fair second place in population size in the region. Representatives of Turkic people have leading position among migrants that is reflected in their lingual communication.

International migration in Tumen region in the period between the two population censuses provided about 1/3 of new migrants. 98% of them were the citizens of CIS and Baltic states. Under such a conditions creation of Euroasia person of a new polylingual type in the conditions of national confessional English-Russian and Russian national confessional English tri-lingualism and studying additional language is an objective process of effectiveness of language policy in preparing modern competitive and mobile professional in the situation of globalization. In such a context of creation of such person ethnic differentiations as well as general lingual dysfunctions play major role in learning both Russian and other languages whether we want it or not.

There is no doubt that local linguistic coloring depends on the specifics of contacting peoples. This coloring is expressed in conditions of material and spiritual culture and language. A number of works in world linguistics cover the theory of language contacts and the processes of adoption and relevant phenomenon. Intensive migration processes that may be compared with melting-out tank of USA [2] attract undiminishing interest to language functioning in Siberia. While American

scientists accept the variability of American English, for example as Spanish [3], Russian researchers argue the variability of Russian language.

Special sociolinguistic situation has formed in the USA as a result of the contact of Spanish and English languages with *direct* language contacts of Spanish and English-speaking people on the territory of the country. Not only direct adoption of language elements into Spanish language but also code switching are characteristics of such type of contacts with pressure from dominating (English) language. The level of structural and semantic adaptation is influenced by two scenario of contact defined by S.G. Thomason and T.Kaufman [4]. In our case it is preservation of Spanish language and lingual shift (i.e. transition from Spanish to dominant English language). According to scientists one may speak about forming mixed lingual phenomenon that is called in English sources *Spanglish*, and *Espanglis* or *Espangles* – in Spanish [4]. That relates to Spanish languages in Spain, Latin America and Spanish languages in USA that is the greatest minority language in the country. 13% of population speak this languages and among them immigrants from Mexico, Puerto Rico and Cuba. None the less the process of adoption goes under different conditions, it is followed by different circumstances and have different implications.

The same phenomena are characteristics of Russian language and contacting Turkic languages. For example, researches of Russian language in Kazakhstan [5], Ukraine [6] make the scientists think about *russofonia*. Not only in post-Soviet space but also in the countries where Russian diaspora lives for a long time new lexemes from the country of a new place of living are being adopted creating specific intonations under the impact of the “old” diaspora and new environment. This problem so obvious for Western countries in post-Soviet space now only begins to manifest itself. In this situation the lingual world landscape of Eurasian person of the new type is a sort of mosaic picture formed by different lingual cultures on the base of native language with account for ethno-linguistic differentiations.

Polyethnic nature of Russian region impacts not only forming specific anthropologic type of population but it is reflected in specifics of languages functioning and forming of bilingualism. F.S. Usmanova notes that Tatar-Russian-German and Tatar-Russian-English trilinguality is characteristics for Tatar [7]. We consider that another type of polilinguism: Tatar-Arabic (confessional) – Russian + foreign language

(English/German/French) is characteristics for Tatar. Suppression of confessional nature of trilinguism of Tatar and other Turkic people is a matter of surprise. Almost all Tatar as a rule in addition to native Tatar language know Russian and also Arabic as Islam language. Learning of languages goes in the following order: 1) Tatar, 2) Arabic, 3) Russian, 4) foreign languages (English/German/French). A.M. Khairtdinova and I.S. Karabulatova note high frequency of occurrence of lexemes of Arabic origin in informants – titles of Tatar media [8]. Other researches note the more frequent occurrence of Arabisms in German languages under the influence of Turk migrants [9].

Lingual norms of native language of bilingual Turkic has significantly influenced adoption of norms of state language but in Russia they are classified by specialists as general lingual dysfunctions although they are not. Interference of Azerbaijan and Russian language is intervention – capture of space of one language by another. General lingual dysfunctions may be caused both by organic reasons and specifics of interference processes. The normal level of interference in different lingual levels and general lingual dysfunctions reflects neuro-psycho-lingual characteristics of bilingual child complicated due to foreign ethnic environment.

Source base of the research are the results of analysis of experimental materials carried out in Tumen Centre of logopaedics and speech development (2005-2011), Institute of Psychology and Pedagogics (2000-2011), Logopaedic cabinet of “City clinic # 1” of Tumen (1998-20011), Centre of national cultures “Ethnos” of Tumen (2005-20011), and the Institute of humanitarian sciences of Tumen State University (2003-2011), in the period of 1998 – 2011. 4.5 thousand of children took part in the research, there were analyzed 77 thousand speech fragments, 2.3 thousand of questionnaires. Data of all these interviews allow understanding specifics of learning native and second languages both by Russians and bilingual Turkic in senior preschool age, defining the level of interference and the role of ethno-lingual differentiations in learning of second language in normal state and with general lingual dysfunctions. The character of functioning reflects interferential character of regional lingual norm that hamper learning second language not only with lingual dysfunctions but with normal lingual development in senior preschool age both by bilingual Turkic and Russian children.

Adoption of second and further languages is creation of a new lingual system of individual to reflect objective reality. Often a child grow up in a family where pure

samples of Russian language are mixed with other variants and as usual he knows ethnic language of one of parents insufficiently. Researches (R.A. Vafeev [10], Ae.A. Salikhova [11]) highlight leading role of norms of native language in learning second one but “mechanism of influence remains the mystery” [12]. We assume that the character of ethnic behavior (social-cultural at first) also contains specifics of learning languages. All this set scientists thinking about new interpretation of ideas of N. Khomski about learning language by children [13].

We assume the ethno-psycho-lingual norm is not just objective but subjective-objective not just natural and hereditary but historically derivative and mediated by media phenomenon. Enormous number of books is dedicated to the norm [14]. Ethno-psycho-lingual norm contains autostereotypes of social, ethno-cultural and lingual behavior of individual as representative of a certain ethnos and reflects constants of national personal identity [15].

At the initial step of learning Russian language the influence of native Turkic language as a language prevailing in lingual activity of individual is the most vivid. Effect of phonetic interference in imitation, reading and perception with further graphic fixing of Russian consonants became apparent in violation of their both differential and integral features. More regularly it was observed in realization of those features that are not present in native language of all test subjects, namely: hard-soft, dorsad and cacumen, and hollow-voiced.

Four types of mistakes were revealed among differential indicators: inability to distinguish among hard and soft, hollow and voiced consonants, way of forming and acting organ. These mistakes were shown in speech of test subjects independent of the aim of experiment but in the greatest degree they were observed in imitation. Effects of phonetic and graphical interference were expressed in phoneme and letter misfits in written language of all test subjects. Wrongly perceived acoustic image on one hand and decoding of sound signal according to the rules of native language on the other hand are the results of inability to distinguish between such word as *balet* (balley) and *valet* (knave).

**Inability to differentiate hard and soft consonants** is caused by an absence of such contraposition on consonants in consonant system of native language of test subjects. Distortions were mainly one-sided, i.e soft consonants were replaced by hard or insufficiently hard. These distortions were observed both in imitation and in reading and perception with further graphic fixing.

**Insufficient differentiation by hollow and voiced characteristic** of Russian labials /f/-/v/ and point /s/-/z/ was observed only in speech of bilinguals. In this case replacements were also one-sided: hollow and insufficiently voiced consonants were realized in place of voiced consonants.

**Distortions caused by inability to differentiate the way and place of forming**, were rather rare in speech of both groups of test subjects except for realization of beyond-tongue [k̟] instead of velar [k] and nasal [ŋ] instead of nasal [n] in speech of bilingual Turkic. This distortion is also caused by the influence of their native language.

Inability to differentiate [f] – [v] and [s] – [z], as well as realization of [k̟] instead [k] of in speech of bilingual Turkic was expressed in greater extent in imitation and reading than in perception with further graphic fixing.

One of distortions observed in speech of all test subjects was realization of affricative consonant [chʼ] in place of soft [tʼ]. Most frequently this distortion was observed in intervocal position and at the end of words. For example, *otets* → «*achetc*», *lomatʼ* → «*lamachʼ*» (*otets* – *achets* (*farhter*), *lomatʼ* – *lamach* (*to break down*)).

The most vivid distortions in speech of all test subjects were distortions of point fricative /sʼ:/, mixing of sonants, affricate, omission of phonetic realization and graphic designation /j/ and others in imitation, reading and perception with further graphic fixing. For example, *stsastʼe* → «*stʼastʼe*» → «*sʼasʼtʼye*» (*schastʼe* – *styastʼe* (*happyness*)), *balet* → «*baret*» (*balet* – *baret* (*balley*)), *tsarʼ* → «*charʼ*» (*the tsar*), *tsirkach* – *chirkasch* (*circus actor*), *sinii* – *chini* (*blue*)).

Besides the mentioned distortions in speech of bilingual Turkics there were mistakes that were not foreseen by preliminary linguistic forecast. For example one of the most frequent distortions in speech of bilingual Tatars was realization of hissing sound [ʒ] in place of sibilant sibilant /z, zʼ/, that was also demonstrated in graphical fixing of this sound. For example, *zimy* → «*zhimiy*» (*form of “winter*), *ozemʼ* – *ozhem* (*to the ground*)).

Increase of duration of unilabiate hollow and velar fricative sounds is also caused by specifics of their realization in Turkic languages where these consonants are pronounced more tensely than in Russian. Comparing of the results of tests allows us to speak about dependence of the level of correct recognition of phoneme characteristics of Russian consonants on the

task of experiment. For example in perception with further graphic fixing the level of correct recognition was the highest in both groups and equals 87.6% / 84%.

Mentioned distortions proves that phonetic base in Russian speech of bilingual Turkics of senior preschool age is not formed.

Indicators of **attrition or loss of native language** are the following:

a) adoptions and loan translations in all levels (words, word combinations, expressions of Tatar language may be inserted in speech in Russian language being pronounced either in the same way as in Tatar language or fully or partly adapted to phonetic system on Russian language either with the use of introducing elements that approve quotation (for example, **as it is said here., as they call it., as in Tatar is**; or with addition of some meta-linguistic reasoning, like: **I don't know how to say in Russian, it cannot be translated in Russian, something like the Russian for**); adopted elements may be changed according to the rules of Russian language (**babaika, adyika, nyanyaika – I want to go to nyanyaike (k(a) – suffix in Russian language)**);

б) lexical replacements (the word of first language is replaced by the other similar in meaning or pronunciation, like **pointed** instead of **pointing**, etc.);

в) expansions (for example, lexeme **tree** is extended on all lexico-semantic line: **forest, park, garden**): **We have nice trees in dacha and there are apple trees there; We walked in tree and gather mushrooms;**

г) contractions (for example, children often interpret the word **mother** as definition of all mothers);

д) transitions (while the word **kulak (fist)** in Tatar means ear, it takes the same meaning in Russian);

е) generalization (for example, forms that express possession like **somebody's** are generalized on all possessive constructions, like **book's many pages I read; I know girl's brother**);

ж) morphologic leveling (for example, bilingual child thinks that ending **-ka** may be added to all nouns and after that the word may be declines as first declension: **adyi (uncle) – adyika, k adyike (to uncle with sympathetic expression), stol (table) – stolka – na stolke (on a little table)**, etc.);

з) simplification (short expression is made from long: **everything is good for baby if he doesn't cry**);

и) conversion (instead of different elements of one line of synonyms a limited number of lexemes is used: word **plate** is used instead of words **bowl, earthen saucer, saucer, dish, basin, pan**);

к) false rejection of exceptions (suppletive forms are replaced by one: **det'** instead of **rebyonok**, (*something like Clilds instead of Children*) **Yua shela** and **Yua idila** instead of **Yua shla/Yua idu**).

Bilingual children unlike monolingual are more interested in linguistic phenomena because their lingual experience is much wider and they actively use the knowledge of both languages.

In forming experiment we carried out correctional work using methods and exercises aimed to correct imperfections of lexical and grammatical system of bilingual children taking into the account specifics of Tatar language grammar. Efficiency level increased in average by 16%.

In testing in ascertaining experiment bilingual children made 124 mistakes of 23%, after correctional work according to program we had developed a number of mistakes reduced to 56 or 10,4%. So we observe positive dynamics – a number of agrammatisms in gender inflexions in speech of bilingual children reduced twofold.

So we see the necessity to form real bi/polylinguism with the account for ethno-socio-linguistic component of modern world. The question “If the glass is half empty or half full?” in research of lingual personality of bilinguals in modern changing world is always urgent.

## REFERENCES

1. Milroy, L. and P. Muysken, 1995. One speaker, two languages. Cambridge: CUP.
2. Muysken, P., 2000 Bilingual speech. A typology of code-mixing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Rodriguez, G.F., 1999. Anglicisms in contemporary Spanish. An overview. Atlantis.
4. Thomason, S.G. and T. Kaufman, 1988 Language contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp: 411.
5. Zhuravleva, E.A., 2007. Variability of lexical system: Russian as polynational language. Author's abstract of Doctor dissertation thesis. Almaty: Al-Farabi KazNU, pp: 48.
6. Rudyakov, A.N., XXXX. Russofony and Russian philology in XXI century. [www.82.207.112.221/dudchenko/165/fulltext/knp110t1/knp110t1\\_7-9.pdf](http://www.82.207.112.221/dudchenko/165/fulltext/knp110t1/knp110t1_7-9.pdf)
7. Usmanova, F.S., 2008. Theoretical basis of thelingualism in the conditions of Tatar-Russian bilingualism with contact with German language (on the data of expression of case endings). Author's abstract of Candidate dissertation thesis. Tobolsk, D.I. Mendeleev TGNI, pp: 10.

8. Khairetdinova, A.M. and I.S. Karabulatova, 2012. Specifics of functioning of nominative units of ethno-linguo-information space (on the material of Tatar language). *Kemerovo State University of Culture and Arts Herald. Is, 2(15): 56-62.*
9. Zhilinskaya, L.A., 2011. Sematic assimilation of Arabisms in German language. *The World of Modern Science. #5. www.cyberleninka.ru/article/n/semanticheskaya-assimilyatsiya-arabizmov-v-nemetskom-yazyke*
10. Vafeev, R.A., 2001. Tatar-Russian bilingualism and the aspects of bilinguology. *Tobolsk, D.I. Mendeleev TGNI, pp: 247.*
11. Salikhova, E.A., 2007. Modeling of processes of learning and using the psychological structure of a word meaning in bilingualism. *Ufa. BashGU, pp: 146.*
12. Kiseleva, L.N., 1979. Methods of analysis of belles-lettres texts in national school and their role in learning languages. *Perseption of belles-lettres text. The thesis of conference-seminar. E. Vilde Tallinn Pedagogical Institute, pp: 21-24.*
13. Chomsky, N.A., 1987. *Studies on Semantics in Generative Grammar, The Hague: Mouton, 1972; N.A.Chomsky. Language in a Psychological Setting, Tokyo: Sophia University.*
14. Chomsky, N.A., 2002. *The Common Good: Interviews with David Barsamian, Berkeley, CA: Odonian Press.*
15. Karabulatova, I.S. and Z.B. Polivara, 2012. *To the concept of ethno-psycho-linguistic norm of bilingual children. Special Education, pp: 22-29.*