6.
RUSSIAN LANGUAGE IN POST–SOVIET RUSSIA

Akin Ademuyiwa, PhD & Obisesan Ayoolu
Department of European Studies,
University of Ibadan, Nigeria
Email: akin.ademuyiwa@gmail.com, obisesanayoolu@gmail.com

Abstract
Russian language is not static, just like any other human language. In response to social events and past political happenings, Russian language has undergone several changes in its grammar, morpho-phonology, stylistics and social usage. In view of this, this paper compares two eras (the Soviet era and the post-Soviet era) and tries to relate the events in those two eras to the changes in Russian language. In variance from similar researches on this subject-matter, the paper adopts a multi-disciplinary approach by focusing on the history and politics of Russia language usage and change in post-soviet era. After an in-depth analysis, the paper finds out that Russian language in post-Soviet Russia is still evolving and changing in response to 1991 Soviet collapse, the hegemonic influence of Western culture after the end of the bipolar world, and the effects of globalisation (or Americanisation). The paper concludes that thelinguistic changes in Post-Soviet Russian can be seen in two folds: de-Sovietisation of the Russian language and the Westernisation of Russian language. A comparison of the two shows that westernisation has effected more changes in Russian language than de-sovietisation.

Keywords: Russian Language, English Language, Language Contact and Change, Post-Soviet Russia, Westernisation, and De-Sovietisation.

Introduction

After the fall of the Soviet Union, transitional post-Communist Russia continues to be fertile ground for numerous scholarly investigations and researches. Similarly, the linguistic implication of this historic collapse has been accorded a prominent position in several research. To mention just a few, scholars like Alpatov (2000), Edgar (2004), Fierman (1991), Kreindler (1982), Liber (1991), Martin (2001), Slezkine (1994), and (Smith, 1998) have become household names in literatures on pre- and post-Soviet linguistic landscape. However, despite the multiplicity of literatures on the linguistic implication of the collapse of the USSR, the political and socio-historical contexts that underscored the dynamics of Russian language in post-communist/soviet era have not been well captured. As an attempt to fill this gap, the paper explores how the use of Russian language in post-soviet era immediately responded to socio-political events in the soviet era.

Russian language was not spared from the historic political, social, economic, and cultural changes that started in Russia in the mid-1980s as well as the change of regime and transition to market economy in the early 1990s. In Perestroika era (1985–1991) and the years following it, significant changes began in the Russian language. Bogomolov (2001) notes that the effects of political and economic reforms were reflected not only in changes of the vocabulary, but also in the liberalisation of general language use. The effect is detectable both in changes concerning linguistic preference and the weakening of norms. Along with the Russian language after the Perestroika era, the linguistic norm has also changed, becoming more dynamic and accepting of varieties. Changes in Russian language can be categorically grouped into two: De-Sovietisation and Westernisation. First, Perestroika was at variance with the core Soviet system of communism and set the pace for the de-sovietisation of Russian Federation immediately after the Union's collapse. The de-sovietisation policy swept across all aspects of Russian society and Russian language was not also exempted. Second, Perestroika led to the immediate demise of the Soviet Union, which consequentially marked the end of the Cold War and the emergence of a unipolar world, in which the United States (an English-speaking country) is the dominant political force. The political changes arguably orchestrated the spread of English language within Russian geopolitical and linguistic landscape (westernisation). With the growing influence and spread of English language in Russian space, structural change in Russian language became

inevitable.

The United States' global economic strength has served as a vehicle for the export of American culture via several means, notably the internet. Without any doubt, one of the most significant technological and cultural advancements of the last two decades was the development of the Internet. According to Poroshina and Brain (2005), this development has two sides. On the one hand, no other technology has brought people around the world into closer contact. On the other hand, the undeniable lingua franca of the internet continues to be English (Poroshina & Brain: 2005). They comment further that for all of the above reasons, globalisation has allowed English to penetrate all societies, of which Russia was not exempted. Though English still remains an exoglossic language in Russian federation, it has nevertheless been the major (if not the only) source of linguistic borrowing. The influx of English borrowings into the Russian language has greatly accelerated structural changes in Russian language, especially in Russian lexicon, grammar and stylistics. It is against this backdrop that this paper seeks to x-ray the changes in the use of Russian language in the post-Soviet Russia.

Basically, the paper will be pre-occupied with the changes in Russian Lexicon, grammar, stylistics as well as the sociolinguistic changes in the post-Soviet Russia. In order to understand the changes that have taken place, we have to pay a visit to the immediate ancestral home (the Soviet Union) that predated the post-Soviet era. Though the purpose of the paper is not to tell historic folktales, however it is equally expedient we push our stocked car backward for it to kick-start and move forward. Hence, the paper starts with a little overview of the two Gorbachev's policies of Glasnost and Perestroika and the implication of these policies on the linguistic situation in Soviet and post-Soviet eras.

Gorbachev's Reform and Its Linguistic Consequences

During the second World war, the Soviet Union, France, United States, and Great Britain came together to defeat Adolf Hitler's Germany. The alliance was a necessary evil to defeat a common enemy. After World War II, the Soviet Union extended its power over much of Eastern Europe. By the 1960s, it appeared that communism was permanently established in the region. In the 1960s and 1970s, the Soviet Union's Communist leadership kept tight control over the Soviet people. The Communist Party was,

according to the Marxist-Leninist ideology, the vanguard of the proletariat and exercised a totalitarian monopoly of power over the political system (Aslund, 1991). The party managed and guided the state and society on behalf of the universal class, the working class. In practice, however, it was dominated by a unique socio-political stratum and the privileged group of party bureaucrats who gained preferential access to the resources of the State through their position within the ruling party. During the high Stalinist era, Soviet society was totally cut off from the outside world, with only extremely rare access to the West. Politburo, the ruling committee of the Communist Party, crushed all political disagreement and censors decided what writers could publish. The Communist Party also restricted freedom of speech and worship.

However, in 1985, following the deaths of radical Soviet premiers within three years, the fifty-four-year-old Mikhail Gorbachev became General Secretary of the Communist Party (CPSU). Amman (1990) reports that the year 1985 represents a major turning point in Soviet history, as Gorbachev's ideas and policies so glaringly differed from previous regimes. His first attempts at reform, however, were minor ones aimed at maximizing the potential of the system, not changing the system itself (for example, the unsuccessful anti-alcohol campaign). Unlike other Soviet leaders who created a totalitarian state, Gorbachev decided to pursue new ideas. He realized that economic and social reforms could not occur without a free flow of ideas and information. In 1985, he announced a policy known as Glasnost, which brought about remarkable changes in the Soviet Union. Owing to this policy, the Soviet government liberalised the media, allowed previously banned churches to open, released dissidents from prison and allowed the publication of books by previously banned authors. Reporters were free to investigate social problems and criticized officials.

Glasnost allowed Soviet citizens to complain about government programmes and protest the rotten economic system. Gorbachev, frustrated by these developments and economic decline, moved towards liberalisation of both the economic and political sphere, in an attempt to reinvigorate the country by involving the masses and creating a more humane and effective system of governance. This new direction was given coherence in the doctrines of perestroika (restructuring), introduced in 1985 (Brown, 1996). Shortly afterwards, the socialist economy began to be liberalised by the decentralisation and formation of cooperative enterprises, as well as

opening of small private businesses. Gorbachev's goal was not to throw out communism, but to make the economic system more efficient and productive. In 1987, he unveiled a third new policy, called democratisation. This would be a gradual opening of the political system. June 1987, for example, saw the first local multi-candidate elections launched (albeit at a local level), aimed at increasing political participation and democracy. The three policies, ***Glasnost, Perestroika, and Democratisation*** were all means to reform the Soviet system. However, these reforms weakened the central government, loosened central controls, caused unrest across the Union, and the republics (national government) began gaining more power. In reaction to these, various nationalities in the Soviet Union began to call for their freedom, leading to the eventual collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.

Though Glasnost and Perestroika were meant to revive the Soviet economy and social life, these two policies however effected several changes in the linguistic structure of the Union. First, Perestroika set the ground for the reversal of the russification policy which instituted the dominance of Russian language; and these led to the revival of titular (republic) languages that were once relegated. Second, the two policies of Perestroika and Glasnost hampered the growth of Russian language and drastically reduced the numbers of Russian speakers. Third, Glasnost opened the Soviet space for western influence and this set the pace for the westernisation of Russian language. Through Glasnost, Soviet citizens gained unhindered access to western channels, books, literatures and were exposed to western ways of life. This uncensored access brought about contact between the West and Soviets. More specifically, it led to a deep contact between Russian and English language, hereby leading to gradual changes in the use of Russian language. Before delving fully into these language changes, it is pertinent to capture the role and the use of Russian language before the collapse of the Soviet Union. Understanding these roles is quite important for identifying the changes in Russian language after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Russian Language in the Soviet Era

The USSR is commonly viewed as a country that had the longest and the most extensive experience with language planning (Anderson & Silver, 1984). In the early Soviet period, language policies supported minority languages and promoted mass literacy. Joan (2006) posits that Lenin rejected the notion that the Russian language should be granted special

status, but rather stressed the equality of languages. He further stated that the Bolsheviks supported a program for the development of minority languages, which included development of writing systems, publishing, and making instruction available in the mother tongue (Joan, 2006). Smith (1998) maintains that these measures were part of a policy known as ***korenizatsiia***, or "***nativisation,***" promising equal rights for all non Russian peoples, guaranteeing rights to minority language use as well as economic and administrative support of these languages in the publishing, education, and cultural sectors. Stalin continued Lenin's policies of language corpus planning for non Russian languages under the slogan "***national in form, socialist in content*** (Stalin, 1936: 209). According to Alpatov (1997: 87), Article 121 of the 1936 Soviet Constitution guaranteed the right of all citizens to instruction in their mother tongue.

However, starting from the late 1930s, the Soviet authority began to realize that 'presiding over 192 languages and potentially 192 bureaucracies was not a very good idea' (Slezkine, 1994: 445) and developed a new appreciation for Russian as a language of state consolidation, industrialisation, and collectivisation. Language propaganda began to glorify the great and mighty Russian language. Under Khrushchev, the Stalinist policy "national in form, socialist in content" gave way to an emphasis on the Russian language as "the language of inter nationality communication and cooperation." Kreindler (1982: 7) submits that during this time, there was so much emphasis on the importance of Russian as the "glue holding the empire together". Following the glorification of Russian language by the Soviet government, policies were adopted that gradually established Russian as the de-facto lingua franca of the Soviet state. The Communist Party Central Committee issued a decree in 1938, which remained in effect until 1994 (Alpatov, 2000: 87), that required the study of Russian in all schools, including schools in the union republics, from the first grade. In 1978, Brezhnev continued the support for the policy of expansion of the role of Russian "as the language of inter national communication in the building of communism and the education of the new man" (Guboglo, 1990: 247).

Due to the State promotion of Russian, the language received a significant boost and the number of its speakers drastically increased. According to Guboglo (1990: 248), from 1970 to 1979, the number of non Russians claiming fluency in Russian as a second language rose from

48.7% of the population (13 million) to 62.2% (16.3 million). During these years of Russification, Russian speakers could afford to be monolingual, speakers of titular languages aspiring social advancement had to be bilingual, and minority language speakers had to be either bilingual (with Russian or the titular language as a second language) or multilingual. However, the spread and State promotion of Russian language did not imply, at least, outwardly replacement of local titular languages with Russian. Rather, the government pursued a dual course, enacting russification policies and at the same time maintaining and strengthening national languages and cultures (Gorenburg, 2006). In view of this, Smith (1998) asserts that Soviet language policies at all times had a dual imperative —nativisation and russification. By implication, the maintenance of these national languages (nativisation) opened the gap for nationalistic feelings and resistance to the dominance of Russian language. This, in turn, set the pace for the derussification of the Soviet republics, starting from the late 1980s.

Derussification of Former Soviet Republics

Kreindler's 1997 paper titled *'Multilingualism in the successor states of the Soviet Union'* offers a comprehensive overview of the language situation in post-Soviet countries in the years after the break-up. By the late 1980s, language status and language rights became a rallying point for ethnolingual groups and nationalist independence movements, seeking to reclaim their identity after decades of policies designed to spread and institute Russian dominance. Joan (2006) noted that in January, 1989, both Estonia and Lithuania declared their titular languages as official languages, and in May, the Republic of Latvia passed a similar language law. By May of 1990, all Soviet republics except for the Russian SFSR had passed language laws. The dissolution of the USSR in 1991 created conditions for a unique sociolinguistic experiment, in which 14 countries previously united by the same language and political system could renegotiate this linguistic imbalance, strengthen the status of titular languages and snatch the safety net from under the feet of monolingual Russian speakers, imposing new linguistic regimes in the process of building new nation-states. The dissolution of the Soviet Empire was accompanied by a deliberate 'removal' of the 'colonial' language from the public sphere of the former Soviet republics. This derussification, as a part of the more general de-Sovietisation

process, included all areas where russification had previously occurred.

In language use, it included elimination of Russian from official paperwork, official communication, the state-sponsored media and public signage. In language acquisition, it involved the closing or reduction in number of Russian-language schools in higher education and either elimination of instruction in Russian as a second language or reduction in the number of Russian-language classes per week. In the area of orthography, several titular languages replaced Cyrillic with Latin. In language corpora, some Russian neologisms were replaced with alternative terms, and geographic names underwent what Smith (1998:147) refers to as a 'toponymic overhaul', whereby Russian names were changed to local-sounding names. Territorial derussification involved out-migration of Russian speakers (Korobkov & Zaionchkovskaia, 2004).

In terms of language policies and practices, Pavlenko (2006) groups the current language policy in post-Soviet countries into five categories: (a) dual-language policy with Russian functioning de facto as the main language (Belarus); (b) dual language policy with titular language as the state language and Russian as an official language or the language of interethnic communication (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan); (c) single language policy with de facto bilingualism in the titular language and Russian (Ukraine); (d) single language policy with Russian functioning de facto in some public contexts (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan), and (e) single language policy with the titular language as the main language both de jure and de facto (Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia). Pavlenko (2006) further notes that the three Baltic countries declared their titular languages the sole languages of the state according to Article 4 of the Constitution of Latvia, Article 14 of the Constitution of Lithuania, Article 6 of the Constitution of Estonia.

English-Russian Language Contact in Post-Soviet Russia

Russian language suffered so many setbacks, following the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the subsequent derussification exercise in the former Soviet republics. While there are still a sizable number of Russian speakers today, its status as one of the leading world languages depreciated in the post Soviet era. According to Shvetsova (2003: 439), the number of Russian language learners worldwide dropped from 23 million in 1982–1983 to 10–12 million in the 1990s. In 1991, Russian lost its status as the lingua

franca of the Soviet empire and became a minority language in many former Soviet republics. Similarly, the linguistic structure of Russian language was not exempted from the political and social changes that surfaced after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Glasnost and Perestroika did not only bring about the democratisation of the Soviet Union, but also led to the democratization of access to different languages in the west, particularly English language. Glasnost and Perestroika loosened the embargo placed on foreign languages and granted the Soviet citizens uncensored access to western literatures, books, TV stations etc. The two policies set a conducive platform for language contact between English and Russian within the Soviet space. However, it should be recalled that the contact between English and Russian language happened long before the Perestroika era.

In their article titled '**English-Russian Language Contact**', Poroshina and Brain (2006) trace the history of language contact between English and Russian language. According to them, the cultural interactions between Russian and English-speaking countries dates back to the mid-sixteenth century when the British ship '***Edward Bonaventure'*** was anchored in the mouth of the Northern Dvina River on August 24, 1553 during the reign of the Russian czar Ivan IV (Ivan the terrible). British merchants brought the first (old) English words to Russia: mester, lord, aldraman etc. (Aristova, 1978: 14). The first written translation from English into Russian on record dates back to 1625 (Beliaeva, 1984: 13). In 1649, Russian–British relations deteriorated. However, Peter the Great enlivened British–Russian relations after he visited Britain and appointed British engineers, mathematicians, and shipbuilders to Russian offices and departments. As a result, interest in the English language increased. Peter's rapid and radical westernisation of Russia had a great impact on the cultural life of the country and brought English language closer to Russians. Russian students frequently travelled to England and other European countries to master both languages and crafts.

As Aristova (1978: 19) points out, the number of translations – especially technical translations – increased greatly. Linguists claim that Peter the Great's reign contributed about 3,000 foreign words to the Russian lexicon. English loans made up only 5 percent of this number. They were primarily navigational terms, titles, religious terms, and some words pertaining to daily life and culture. The attitude toward loan words at that time was quite positive; they were considered proper and necessary since it was natural to name new foreign concepts using loan terms. Using loan

words meant approving of a new value system characteristic of Peter's reforms (Romanov, 2000: 24). The second half of the eighteenth century saw an increase in the number of English words added to the Russian language. This trend reflected the anglophile leanings of the Russian government and high-ranking nobility. In nineteenth century Russia, English was second to French in popularity. Russians primarily studied the language for the sake of English literature and culture. Karamzin, Zhukovsky, Pushkin, Lermontov, Tolstoy, Turgenev, Fet were famous Russian poets and authors who knew English quite well. The ability to read English authors in the original was considered a mark of good breeding and education (Poroshina & Brain, 2006).

The first Russian dictionary of foreign words by N. Ianovski (1803–6) listed 120 words of English origin, dealing primarily with money, measures, dishes and drinks, card games, titles, parties, cloth, and dress names (Beliaeva, 1984:22). Mikhelson's dictionary (1866) included about 300 words of English origin, which made up 15 percent of all loan words. Poroshina and Brain (2006) states that, from the 1840s to the 1860s, several English language magazines emerged in St Petersburg: the *St Petersburg English Review of Literature, the Arts and Science* and *The Nevsky Magazine: A Monthly Journal of Literature, Science and Art*. In the 1820s, English Literary Journal of Moscow was launched (Poroshina and Brain: 2006). These publications show an increasing interest in the English language and literature. The interest lasted until the 1860s and early 1870s, when Russian society became infused with revolutionary ideas. The intellectuals focused their attention on Russian reality and Russian literature, and purism gained force. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, English–Russian contacts weakened. However, the 1930s saw a growth of borrowed words of British and American origin in Russian, brought about by the Soviet Union's push for rapid industrialisation, technological innovation, and development of science and education. It was at that period that English became the main source language for foreign words borrowed by the Russian language (Romanov, 2000: 32).

Poroshina and Brain (2006) further maintain that the climate for English changed again in the 1940s and 1950s. Negative attitudes emerged toward everything of foreign origin, including foreign words. Few words were borrowed at the time. However, these negative attitudes began to fade when Gorbachev introduced the policy of Glasnost and Perestroika; the two

policies that liberalized access to foreign contents (language inclusive). Perestroika brought a stream of borrowings from modern foreign languages (mainly English) as well as low flown words and jargon. During the Perestroika period, a great number of new words entered Russian vocabulary through uncensored mass media, pop culture, science, and literary translations. By the mid-twentieth century, the Russian lexicon contained about 2,000 English words (Beliaeva, 1984). After the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991 (three years after the introduction of Glasnost and Perestroika), contact between Russian and English language still remained intact and more words kept flooding into Russian vocabulary.

This development has been referred to by scholars as the westernisation of Russian language. Under the influence of westernisation, virtually all the aspects (grammar, lexicon, stylistics etc.) of Russian language underwent (and still undergoing) different levels of changes. Similarly, the collapse of the USSR was immediately followed by nation-building process, aimed at breaking away from the Soviet past (de-Sovietisation) and forming a new system. Though political in nature, de-Sovietisation of the post-Soviet Russia had some little effects on Russian language. Based on the foregoing, changes in Russian language can be attributed to two factors: de-Sovietisation and westernisation. The next sub-topic presents the effects of these two factors on the lexical, grammatical, sociolinguistic, and stylistic structures of Russian language.

De-Sovietization of Russian Language

Post-Soviet Russian language is currently under the wave of westernization in a bid to 'de-sovietise' the Russian society. The westernisation and de-sovietisation of Russian society have altered not only socio, political and economic fabrics of Russian federation, but also the language system. While de-sovietisation has little effects on Russian language, it has necessitated some stylistic changes and informed the redundancy of some words mostly used in the Soviet era. Some words that were frequently used and popular during the Soviet era have gained negative connotation after the collapse of the USSR in 1991. One obvious example is **товарищ** (comrade) mostly used for greetings during the Soviet era. This communist word is gradually becoming archaic in the modern use of Russian language. **товарищ** is now being replaced with a господиногоспожа (Russian words for Mr. and Mrs.), suggesting that the communist way of greeting is now outdated.

There are some other public words during Soviet era that have (or are gradually) faded away. Drawing examples from the 2002 Manik's Russian public political vocabulary, Olga Karpova (2002) gives examples of Soviet coloured words that are gradually getting out of use and being replaced by borrowed words. Some of these words and their replacements are:

S/N	OBSOLETE SOVIET WORD	MODERN REPLACEMENT
1	Верховный совет (Supreme Soviet)	Парламент (Parliament)
2	Советминистров (Soviet of Ministers)	Кабинетминистров (Cabinet of Ministers)
3	Советы (Soviet)s	Администрация (Administrators)
4	СобраниеЧиновников (Meeting of Officials)	Саммит (Summit)

As earlier noted, the effects of de-sovietisation of the post-cold war Russia is mostly evidenced in socio-cultural, political and economic sphere, while the Russian language was little or barely affected. This is rational since Russian language still remains language of inter-ethnic communication in the former Soviet republics and the official language of the Commonwealth of Independent Nations (CIS). Massive de-sovietisation of Russian language would have drained the language of the capacity to function in its capacity as the lingua franca within the post-Soviet space.

Westernisation and Russian Language Change

Since the collapse of the Iron Curtain, political, economic and linguistic changes began to emerge in Russia. The event helped to shape the attitudes of Russian speakers towards borrowings from English. It was during the time of change that using new foreign words to describe new foreign concepts was seen as common sense and acceptable. The shift of the Russian Federation towards integration with the Western world was rapid and the enormous changes occurred in all sectors. Simultaneously with the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, there appeared a large number of English words in the Russian language. This period was marked by intensification of contact between English and Russian language, characterized by the "...flow of loans especially in information technology, advertising, and mass media (Proshina & Ettkin, 2005: 444). Language contact is the interaction of speakers of two languages, through both direct and indirect contact. Depending on the nature and intensity of this contact, a language change can occur, as one language adopts words or features of another. Massive influx of English words into Russian after the Cold War has

significant impacts on the structure of Russian language in various ways. The impact is evidenced in Russian grammar, social use (sociolinguistics), stylistics, lexicon etc.

In reference to lexical borrowings from English to Russian language, Proshina & Ettkin (2005: 439) report that English has penetrated all generations and professions. According to them, "...at the high tides of cross-cultural contact, linguistic borrowing has occurred in every imaginable field, from literature and finance to science and pop-culture". Ustinova (2005) reports an estimated 10,000 English words are present in Russian today, of which hundreds are in common use and are familiar to the average Russian. Campbell (1999: 58) defines a loan word as "...a word that originally was not part of vocabulary of the recipient language but was adopted from some other language." Offering a similar definition, Crystal describes a loan word as "a linguistic unit (usually a lexical item) which has come to be used in a language or a dialect other than the one where it originated" (Crystal, 2003: 250).

Commenting on the massive influx of English words into Russian language, Yuliya Thompson (2008), quoting Poroshina & Ettkin (2005:439) submits that:

> Today, Russian people routinely send **ЗСЗМЗСКИ** (ehsehmehski, "SMS-Short Message Service-messages"), surf the **интернет** (internet, "internet"), play **боулинг** (bouling, "bowling"), practice **скейтборд** (skejjtbord, "skateboard"), purchase **Барби** (barbi, "barbie"), work in the **офис** (ofis, "office"), до**шоппинг** (shopping, "shopping") at the **супермаркет** (supermarket, "supermarket"), and chat about a popular **реалитии - шоу** (reality-shou, "reality show") or **суперстар** (superstary, "superstars"). (Poroshina & Ettkin, 2005:439)

Based on the foregoing, it can be rightly said that Russian has become massively exposed to global English language communication. Just as David Crystal stated, "Russia is joining the 'expanding circle' of world Englishes" (Crystal, 2000: 61). A considerable number of researchers have investigated the proliferation of lexical items from English in Russian language discourse. Yuliya Thompson (2008), in her thesis, highlights some of these researchers. According to her, Proshina (2005) and Proshina and Ettkin

(2005) explore Russian-English contact in the historical context; Ter-Minasova (2005), Leontovich (2005), Yuzefovich (2005), and McCaughey (2005) discuss approaches for teaching English in light of the increased language contact. Ustinova (2005) classifies the functions of English in Russia and explores how English surfaces and interacts with Russian in the advertisement genre. Ustinova and Bhatia (2005) consider the role of English in contemporary Russian to be a "marker of Westernisation, internationalism, modernisation, innovation, and prestige." Rivlina (2005) focuses on cross-cultural analysis of semantic calques and grammatical influences of English on contemporary Russian.

All of these research works, as highlighted by Yuliya Thompson (2008), attest to the growing influx of English words into Russian language and provide rich data for future research endeavours. However, Miroslav, S. (2007) maintains that National language corpus still remains the most authoritative source of linguistic data. In her view, a language corpus is a collection of texts that represent a language at a specific time or times. She further stated that Russian National Corpus or Ruscorpora contains texts of many genres, styles, and territorial and social variants, dating from the early 19th century to early 21stcentury. The genres represented include literary works, journalistic and educational writing, correspondence, memoirs and diaries. Ruscorpora also includes texts of various literary styles and many spoken, colloquial and regional dialects (Miroslav, 2007).

The Russian National Corpus was created by linguists specifically for the purpose of language research. It gives a good representation of the Russian language because it contains a balanced selection of a variety of types of written and spoken texts: literary, artistic, journalistic, educational, scientific, business, spoken and dialectical. While emphasizing the uniqueness of the Ruscorpora to linguistic research, Miroslav (2007) asserts that Ruscorpora texts contain around 200 million words, enough to give an accurate sample of the language. There are hundreds of thousands of loan words in The Russian National Corpus and it will be an unending effort, trying to provide all of them in this paper. However, some of the loan words, which Miroslav (2007) considers as the most frequently used and spoken in modern Russian, are listed in the table below.

Loanword	Equivalent
Киллер *killer*	Убийца *killer; murderer; assasin*
Босс *boss; master*	Начальник *boss; chief; commander; director*
Менеджер *manager*	Директор *manager; director* Управленец *manager; senior manager; executive*
Бизнесмен *businessman*	Предприниматель *businessman; entrepreneur*
Бизнес *business*	Предпринимательство *business; enterprise*
Консенсус *consensus*	Согласие *consensus; consent; agreement*
Конфронтация *confrontation*	Противостояние *confrontation; opposition; resistance* Столкновение *confrontation; conflict; encounter*
Амбиция *ambition*	Самолюбие *ambition; self-esteem* Стремление *ambition; aspiration*
Спикер *speaker, chairman*	Председатель *speaker; chairman* Представитель *speaker; spokesman; representative*
Рейтинг *rating*	Оценка *rating; estimate; evaluation*
Преференция *preference*	Предпочтение *preference* Преимущество *preference; privilege; advantage*

Considering the pattern of adoption of English loan words in Russian language, a question needs to be answered: why some loan words find their way into Russian language more easily than others. To answer this question, one has to consider the factor underlining the adoption of loan words. There are many factors that can have an influence on whether or not a loan word is adopted into a language. For instance, if an important political figure or a famous entertainment personality frequently uses a certain loan word in the media, then the popularity of that word among the population increases. Miroslav (2007) suggests that example of this would be the use of **консенсус**'consensus' by Mikhail Gorbachev or the use of **преференция**'preference' by Vladimir Putin.

Miroslav (2007) further submits that another factor that can increase the popularity of a loan word is its phonetic similarity to an existing native word. According to her, the meanings of the native word and loan word can be completely unrelated, but the fact that the new loan word sounds familiar

is enough to increase its popularity. One such example would be the increased popularity of the loan word **кликнуть**'to click', because it sounds the same as **кликнуть**'to call out'. Similarly, brevity of words is another factor to be considered. In spoken language, one-word expressions are often favoured over attributive phrases. Loan words entering the Russian language also serve this economy of expression. The lack of a compact and adequate denomination often leads to borrowing. For instance, arm wrestling known in Russia for a long time and denoted by the long name 'борьбанаруках' was simply replaced by the English 'армрестлинг'.

Another factor (and perhaps the most important) is the media. The media control the air, what people see, hear, and perceive. The media is a great platform for disseminating values, ideologies, and beliefs. In respect to language contact, loan words with strong media visibility (frequently seen on TV, banners, posters, and heard on radio) have more chances of creeping into the lexicon of the recipient language than those with little visibility. The media, especially in the domain of advertisements, has been the most dumping ground for English loan words, as well as the most effective carrier of English language influence on Russian. Following the introduction of Perestroika and Glasnost and the eventual collapse of the Soviet Union, there was a radical departure from the absolute ban on all western media contents. Without the Communist Party's thorough censorship and rigid control over the domains of mass media, the road was paved for the massive influx of Western music, TV shows, and movies.

Similarly, the gradual transition of the post-Soviet Russia from command economy to market economy provided the leeway for the inflow of foreign (western) multinational companies, most prominent ones are Ford Mondeo, Land Rover, Chevrolet, Samsung, Colgate, Lipton, Secret Safeguard, Venus, Old Spice, Tampax, Gloria Jeans or Orbit etc (Ustinova, 2008). The liberalisation of the media and the influx of multinational companies from the West altered the use of Russian language in the media industry. This alteration is mostly evidenced in advertisement and product promotion. Advertisement is often a reflection of the socio cultural, political and most importantly linguistic system of a society. Wordings in adverts are often patterned to align with the psychological make-up of the targeted population. Adverts do not just promote products, but also give insights (data) into the pattern of historical and social occurrences in a society. Hence, by analysing advertorial messages, the paper can provide a clue and

insights on the changes in the use of (post-Soviet) Russian language. In view of this, attempt will be made here to x-ray the sociolinguistic situation in post-Soviet Russia using adverts as the source of data.

Sociolinguistic Situation in Post-Soviet Russia

The media, especially in the domain of advertisements, have become thoroughly populated by English words; it is commonplace to see or hear English in the ads promoting both Western and domestic products and services. In her article titled '*English and American Culture Appeal in Russian Advertising'*, Ustinova (2008) lists advertorial messages and captions that are code-mixed with English loan words. Presented below are some of these code-mixed adverts.

- Компания Trust началап родажи на российском рынкеве бкамеры Megapixel USB2 Webcam Live WB-5400

Transliteration: Kompania Trust nachala prodazhi na Rossiiskom rynke VEB-kamery Megapixel USB2 Webcam Live WB-5400.
Translation: Company 'Trust' started selling on the Russian market 'Web-camcorders Megapixel USB2 Webcam Live WB-5400'.

- HP Omnibook 6000 на базе процессора Intel Pentium

Transliteration: HP Omnibook 6000 na baze protsessora Intel Pentium
Translation: HP Omnibook 6000' on the basis of processor Intel Pentium.

- iPod shuffle. Примерь свой цвет.

Transliteration: iPod shuffle. Primer' svoi tsvet
Translation: iPod shuffle'. Try your colour.

In the examples above, most of the English loan words (Megapixel USB, Webcam Live WB-5400, USB2, iPod) are technical terms that have no direct lexical equivalent in Russian language. Borrowing of technical terms is mostly expedient in a language contact situation involving two languages of different technological status. It is generally believed that English is the language of technology, being the predominant language in the technology industry. The status of English as the leading language of the technology became significantly reinforced with the collapse of the Soviet Union. The USSR collapse symbolizes the decline of Russian language, especially in the field of technology. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the West

(including their language, English) became the dominant force in the area of technology and the major donor of technical words.

Similarly, it is more economical for Russian speakers to borrow technical terms from English language, considering the risk (in terms of convenience, social acceptability and word suitability) of coining new local terms. For instance, it is simply impossible to refer to email and website addresses in written discourse without abandoning the Cyrillic alphabet and resorting to the English Roman alphabet. By the means of borrowing, the recipient language (Russian) fills empty slots in its Lexicon, without bearing any risk. In relating this to post-Soviet Russian language, it can be argued that the collapse of the USSR put Russian language at a disadvantaged position of inevitable borrowing of technical words from English, the beneficiary of the collapse. The 1991 event compromised Russia's position in the 'Tech-world' and gave English language the lead. As a consequence, post-Soviet Russian language will have to depend on English for technical words. It is generally believed that a significant number of Tech-words in Russian language are loan words from English.**Телевизор, телефон, машина, компьютер,интернет, радио**. Other examples of code-mixed advertorials cited by Ustinova (2008) are:

- Тушь Extra Volume Mascara от Lumene придает ресницам суперобъем

Transliteration: Tush Extra Volume Mascara ot Lumene pridaetresnitsam superobem
Translation: Mascara 'Extra Volume Mascara' from 'Lumene' makes eyelashes supervolume.

- У Colgate Triple Action есть germ defense

Transliteration: U Colgate Triple Action est' germ defense
Translation: Colgate Triple Action has germ defence.

- Love Life. Stop AIDs. Проверьте прошлоеваших любовников

Transliteration: Love Life. Stop AIDs. Prover'te proshloevashih lubovnikov
Translation: Love Life. Stop AIDs'. Check the background of your lovers.

The examples above depict the prevailing sociolinguistic situation in

modern Russia. The examples point to socio-economic value of mixing English with Russian language. Among the youth, it is more creative, attractive, and fashionable to shuffle between English and Russian language. To them, it commands respects and attracts rewards (in terms of recognition).

Also, in her article, Ustinova (2008) gives some excerpts of language use among immigrants who have dual identity (that of Russian and the West). Two of these excerpts contain English words written in Cyrillic words and mixed with Russian words. Presented below are the two excerpts.

- Онасказала **сенкс**, о чем-то меня спросила. Она спросила в смысле, накаком я спикаю. Отвечаю, что из Москвы русский. И тут она: ***Рашензэтсокей. Ай эм вери лайк Набоков***

Transliteration: Ona skazala ***'thanks'***, o chem-to menya sprosila. Ona sprosila v smysle nakakom ya speak—ayu. Otvechayu, chto iz Moskvy, Russkiy. I tut ona: ***Russian, that's Okay. I am very like Nabokov.***

Translation: She said ***'thanks'***, asked me about something. She asked what language I 'speak'. I answered that I am from Moscow, Russian. And she: **'Russian, that's Okay. I am very like Nabokov'.**

- Из **драйве** я сразу беринаправо, наследующе могне будет **ютерн**, бери его ипи ли двемили до **плазы**. За **севен элевен** омопять направо, через три **блока** будет **экзит**, те пропусти. Номера у него нет. Но это не тот **экзит** где **газ** и **толл-буты**. Бери **тернпайк**.

Transliteration: Iz **driveway**- ya srazu berinapravo, nasledushche mogne budet **U-turn**, beri ego ili dvemili do **plazz-y**. Za **seven-eleven**-omopat' napravo, cherez tri **bloka** budet **exit**, to propusti. Nomera u nego net. No eto ne tot **exit** gde **gas** i **toll-booth**-y. Beri **turnpike**

Translation: From '**driveway**' turn right, the next 'light' there will be '**U-turn**', take it and go two miles towards **'plazza'**. After **'seven-eleven'** again turn right, in three **blocks** there will be an **'exit'**, don't go there. It has no number. But it's not an **'exit'** with '**gas**' and **'toll-booths'**. Take '**turnpike'.**

The two excerpts above capture the linguistic behaviour of contemporary

Russian youths. Code-mixing Russian with English is now a trend among Russian youths who consider English as a language of modernity and prestige. English loan words are not only used to denote concepts or new object, rather they have psycholinguistic or sociolinguistic significance which often overshadows the linguistic functions. Since the collapse of the USSR, English language has gained more prestige among Russians (especially the youths) and has become a language symbolising 'up-to-datedness' and novelty in the modern and technically developed world. It is a marker of superiority, linguistic prowess and exposure. Due to its global status, English is seen by this set of Russian youths as a passport for becoming a global citizen. Glasnost opened their eyes to the west and English is seen as the means of accessing this outside world (the West). Hence, the use of code-mixing in post-Soviet Russia as a sign of novelty can be traced back to 1985 when the policy of Glasnost was introduced.

Similarly, Ustinova (2008) also gives examples of how English loan words are used for depicting creativity and contrast in adverts. Code-mixing Russian with English loan words makes an advert more attractive and appealing than using a plain (Russian) language. Below are some of the examples in her article.

- Krafts foods выбрал Euro PSCG

Transliteration: Krafts foods vybral Euro PSCG
Translation: Kraft foods' have chosen 'Euro PSCG'.

- Новый макияж Facefinity с системой Permawear

Transliteration: Novii makiazh Facefinity s sistemoiPermawear
Translation: New make-up 'Facefinity' with a system 'Permawear'.

- Clean and Clear, и все впорядке

Transliteration: Clean and Clear, i vse v poryadke
Translation: Clean and Clear' and everything is fine.

The wordings in the advert data presented above mirror the level of change in the use of Russian language in post-Soviet Russia. The adverts can be viewed as a 'micro' or an extension of social happenings and the prevailing sociolinguistics situation in Russian Federation.

Russian Grammatical Changes

So far, the paper has captured lexical changes as well as changes in sociolinguistic situation in post-Soviet Russia. Apart from these two changes so far discussed, other aspects of Russian language use (literature and grammar) are also not spared from the influence of English language. In grammar, Szabolcs. J. (2009) notes that Russian case system as well as word formation processes are partially being altered to reflect the grammatical system obtainable in English language. He further reported that word-building in modern Russian is characterised by new coinages made either like English compounds (e.g. слухмейкер "rumor-maker,") with the second root directly borrowed from English, or out of some English elements in a word (e.g. беспрайсовый "priceless") with the Russian word containing a Russian prefix and an English root *'price'*.

In the first example, English loan word "мейкер" is added to Russian word "слух" to form a compound word "слухмейкер" (rumour-maker). In the second example, Russian affixes "бес" and "овый" are combined with English word "прайс" to form "беспрайсовый" (priceless). Other Russian compound words containing English morphemes are шлягер**мейкер;** сетег**олик** (from the English suffice "olic": as in alcoholic), покупког**олик**, **Трудоголик;** гамбург**ер** (from the English suffice "er" as in teach-er), фишбург**ер**, чизбург**ер**, чикенбург**ер.** In the derivation of Russian nouns, verb and adjectives, Russian affixes (щик, овать, ить, скийetc) are often combined with English loan words. For example, the words "**мультимед**ийщик" (a multimedia expert) is derived by blending the English loan words "multimedia" with Russian affix "щик". Other common examples are **спонсор**ский (sponsor), **интернет**ский (internet), **чат**ить (to chat), **апгрей**дировать (to upgrade), **спонси**ровать (to sponsor), **дигитал**изировать (to digitalise). The examples of word derivations given above point to the grammatical changes in modern Russian language.

Stylist C Lowering and Alteration Of Russian Case System

Russian case system is sometimes altered to align with English grammatical structure. Glovinskaya (2000) emphasizes that synthetic case forms of nouns are more and more being replaced by prepositional phrases. Below are some examples cited in his works.

- "Человек добройдуши" is substituted by "человек **с** добройдушой" (a person with a kind heart);
- "Церемонность обращения" is replaced with "церемонность **в**

обращении" (ceremonies in addressing);
- "Я купил вам хлеб" can also be constructed as "Я купил хлеб **для** вас" (I bought some bread for you).

The three examples above suggest the reduction in the use of Russian case and the stylistic lowering of grammatical function. In the last example, the prepositional phrase **"длявас"** is used to substitute the dative of 'you' **(вам**). This kind of construction is typical of English language that has no case system. In recent times, Russian cases are sometimes altered to reflect English grammatical structure. In other words, the stylistics of Russian constructions are sometimes lowered to conform with the grammatical patterns of English language.

Changes of Russian Language Use in Literature

Proshina (2008) reports that there are some books titled in a hybrid way. Below are some examples:

- Дух**less** (Spiritless) by Sergei Minaev;
- Рублевка. **Live** (Rublyovka. Live) by Oksana Robsky;
- Мульти**MILLIONAIRES** (Multimillionaires) by Lena Lenina;
- Брачный контракт или Who is xy... (Marriage Contract, or Who is Who...) by Tatyana Ogorodnikova.

The code-mixing of titles of Russian literary works signal how Russian language use in literature is rapidly changing under the influence of English language. Writers (especially, the younger ones) are now changing their use of Russian language to showcase their creativity and also to attract sales.

From the data presented above and the following analyses, it is evident that Russian language has undergone immense changes since 1991. These changes involve stylistic "chaos," or mixing of language styles, grammar alteration, and influx of loan words, principally from English **(westernisation)**, just as Russian lexical items referring to the Soviet system were also replaced **(de-sovietisation)**. However, these changes have several negative consequences on Russian language. It has resulted in the degradation of the language, stylistic lowering, and adulteration of the language with slangs. Several researchers (Krasil'nikov: 2003; Grachev: 2001, and Remneva: 2002) have reported that both stylistic mixing and the flood of foreign lexicon have raised public concerns about the current status

of Russian. The use of jargon and lower style of language forms in public, especially in mass media, has given rise to outcries about the falling standards and the degradation of the language. What follows is the last sub-topic which discusses the reaction of Russian authority to the changes in the use of Russian language and the preventative measures taken to reverse the situation.

Response of Russian Authorities to the Language Change

In view of the invasion of Russian language with foreign lexical items, Russian government is reacting by the acts of language planning. Joan (2006) notes that the lower house (Duma) of the Russian government passed a law in 2003"...that would have banned politicians from swearing or needlessly using foreign words..." However, the bill was rejected by the upper house, calling it an "extreme of linguistic purity". Also, a Russian language website (www.russian2007.ru) was launched, with the aim of strengthening the status of the Russian language via activities promoting Russian language and literature at the international level. These activities include digital exhibitions of books by Russian authors as well as forums and conferences related to the Slavic world in general (www.russian2007.ru).

Similarly, Russian language policy has been revisited and amended several times with the sole aim of purifying the language from foreign adulterations. The language policy, titled "On the national language" first emerged from the Federal Council on Russian language in 2001. According to Joan (2006), the council, formed by Yeltsin in 1991 in order to strengthen the Russian language, was charged with the task of supporting Russian language on three levels: first, as the state language, by developing language policies designed to encourage the development and support for Russian language as the national language of the Russian people; second, as a world language; and third, as the language of education and mass media. The most important part of the language policy deals with the issues of language standards and the use of language in the public. Kaadyr Bicheldei, a linguist and Duma representative from the Republic of Tuva who helped draft the law, and one of its most vociferous proponents, argued that one of the main purposes of the policy was to protect Russian as the national language of the Russian federation from slipping standards. Bicheldei, in an interview on a radio station "Ekho Moskvy" in 2002, explained that:

"Russian language must be defended, not from us, but from our

> overly lax use of it as a means of communication... In the mass media and in official speeches, very often the lower style is used. That is, a stylistic lowering of Russian can be observed in society" (Bicheldei, 2002).

Bilcheldei argued that by providing legal norms for spheres of use, the law would increase "the respect of the Russian people towards their language" and would also raise the literacy rate and inspire citizens "to write and speak Russian more correctly". The law focuses on the issue of language norms and sets out to define and regulate non normative language and foreign lexicon. According to Joan (2006), sections of the law regulating the use of foreign lexicon were modeled after the French language policy (known popularly as "Law of Toubon"). The aim of "Law of Toubon" was to raise the status of French by regulating and mandating its use in public (Ager 1999: 135). This is precisely what Russian language policy was intended to achieve as well. In addressing the issue of "sub standard" or "non normative" lexicon, Russian language policy stipulates that ***"setting the standards for the norms of use of the contemporary Russian literary language is government's task"*** (Article 1). Also, language law bans the use of non normative lexicon (Article 6). Earlier drafts of the legislation forbid the use of swear words and obscene expressions in public as well as "insulting language" (Par.3, Article3). However, the ban on foreign lexicon and the prohibition of obscene language were deemed objectionable and were later removed by the Federation Council (Russian Parliament: 2003). Giving reasons for the removal of the ban on foreign words, Sergei Mironov, one of the members of the Council, observed that:

> "If the ban on the use of foreign lexicon were to be forced, then the Constitution of the Russian Federation would have to be rewritten, since it contains more than thirty foreign terms" (Russian Parliament: 2003).

As a result, the ban on foreign lexicon was left out of the bill. The removal of the ban did not imply permission for uncensored mindless borrowing of foreign words. Some little levels of restrictions on the use of foreign lexicon were still upheld. However, the rejection of the ban on foreign borrowings by the Federal Council made the whole Russian language policy so weak to purify the language from foreign indoctrination, and partly made the whole

policy a barking dog that cannot bite. Without any strict legal and constitutional mechanism in place to checkmate the indoctrination of Russian with foreign words, the language has vulnerably become a dumping ground of English loan words, English stylistics, and grammatical system. The resultant effect of this vulnerability is that the Russian language spoken during the Soviet era is quite absolutely different from the present-day Russian spoken in post-Soviet Russia.

Conclusion

By juxtaposing the socio-economic and political situations during the Soviet era with the current state of language use in post-Soviet era (post-Soviet Russia), this paper contends that Russian language was (and it is still) a victim of the collapse of the Soviet Union. The current mode of Russian language use can be attributed to several events that took place in the 1980s and early 1990s: Perestroika, Glasnost, collapse of the Soviet Union, desovietisation and westernisation of the Russian federation, emergence of a unipolar world etc. In respect to the Cold War, it can be argued that the influence of English on Russian language is an emblem of the ideological defeat of the USSR and an indicator of the power relations between the West and Russia

References

Alpatov, Vladimir. *Languages and Politics*. Moscow: Kraft. 2000. Print.

Amann, Ronald. *Soviet Politics in the Gorbachev Era: An End of hesitant Modernization*. British Journal of Political Science 20(3). 1990: 289-310. Web. 4 May 2019.

Anderson, Barbara., and Silver, Brian. *Equality, Efficiency, and Politics in Soviet Bilingual Education Policy*, 1934-1980. The American Political Science Review 78 (4). 1984: 1019-1039. Print.

Aristova, Valentina. M. *Anglo-Russkie Iazykovye Kontakty: Anglizmy v Russkom iazyke. English and Russian Language Contacts: Anglisms in the Russian Language*. Leningrad: Leningrad University Press. 1978. Print.

Aslund, Anders. *Gorbachev's Struggle for Economic Reform*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1991. Print.

Beliaeva, Svetlana. *Angliiskie Slova v Russkom Iazyke XVI–XX vv (English Words in the Russian Language of the 16th–20th Centuries)*. Vladivostok: Far Eastern University Press. 1984. Print.

Bicheldei, Kaadyr. Interview by M. Ganapolskii. Ekho Moskvy. 6 June 2002.

Bogomolov, Oleg. *Neo-liberalism*. In Lawrence, Klein & Marshall, Pomer (Eds.), *The New Russia: Transition Gone Awry*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 2001. Print.

Brown, Archie. *The Gorbachev Factor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1996. Print.

Campbell, Lyle. *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: The MIT Press. 1999. Print.

Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (5th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 2003. Print.

Edgar, Adrienne. *Tribal Nation: The Making of Soviet Turkmenistan*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 2004. Print.

Fierman, William. *Language Planning and National Development: The Uzbek Experience*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. 1991. Print.

Glovinskaya, Marina. *Aktivnye protsessy v grammatike* (Active Processes in Grammar]. In Zemskaya (Ed.), *Russkii yazykkontsa XX stoletiya* (1985-1995), (The Russian language of the late 20th century). Moscow: Yazyki russkoikul'tury. (2000). Print.

Grachev, Mikhail. *V pogone za effektom*. Russkaiarech Vol. 5: 2001: 67–72. Web. 14 May 2019.

Guboglo, Mikhail. N. *The General and the Particular in the Development of the Linguistic Life of Soviet Society*. In The Soviet Multinational State: Readings and Documents. New York; London: M. E. Sharpe. 1990. Print.

Gorenburg, Dmitrii P. *Minority Ethnic Mobilization in the Russia Federation*. England: Cambridge University Press. 2003. Print.

Joan, Chevalier. *Russian as the National Language: An Overview of Language Planning in the Russian Federation*. Russian Language Journal. Vol. 56. 2016: 25 - 36. Web. 6 May 2019.

Korobkov, Andrei. and Zaionchkovskaia, Zhanna. *The changes in the Migration Patterns in the Post-Soviet States: The First Decade*. Communist and Post-Communist Studies 37 (4). 2004: 481-508. Web. 7 May 2019.

Krasil'nikov, Mikhail. *Kulturarechi: Slovommozhnoubit-Slovommozhnospa sti*. Russkaiarech Vol. 6. 2003: 52–67. Web. 6 May 2019.

Kreindler, Isabelle. *The Changing Status of Russian in the Soviet Union*. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 33 (1). 1982: 107 - 119. Web. 8 May 2019.

Leontovich, Olga. *American English as a Medium of Intercultural Communication*. World Englishes, 24(4). 2005: 523 - 532. Web. 9 June 2019.

Liber, George. *Korenizatsiia: Restructuring Soviet Nationality Policy in the 1920s*. Ethnic and Racial Studies 14 (1). 1991: 15 - 23. Web. 8 May 2019.

Martin, Terry. *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union,* 1923- 1939. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. 2001. Print.

McCaughey, Kelvin. *The Kasha Syndrome: English Language Teaching in Russia.* World Englishes, 24(4). 2005: 455-459. Web. 10 June 2019.

Miroslav, Styblo. *English Loan words in Modern Russian Language*. Chapel Hil: University of North Carolina. 2007. Print.

Olga, Karpova. *Language Situation in Russia Today with Special Reference to New Russian Dictionary*. Ivanovo: Ivanovo State University. 2002. Print.

Pavlenko, Aneta. *Russian as a Lingua Franca*. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. Vol 26. 2006: 78- 99. Web. 10 May 2019

Proshina, Zoya. & Ettkin, Brian. *English–Russian Language Contacts*. World Englishes Vol. 24 (4) 2005: 439- 444. Web. 8 June 2019.

Proshina, Zoya. *English as a Lingua Franca in Russia*. Intercultural

Communication Studies 17 (4) 2008: 125-140. Web. 15 May 2019.

Remneva, Marina. *Lingvodidaktika Otsenkakachestva I urovniavladeniia russkimiazykom*. Voprosy filologii, Vol. 1. 2002: 82–88. Web. 10 May 2019.

Rivlina, Alexandra. *"Threats and Challenges": English-Russian Interaction Today*. World Englishes. 24(4). 2005: 477 - 485. Web. 8 June 2019.

Russian Federation. 2003. Parlamentskie Khroniki. http://www.council.gov.ru/inf_ps/chronicle/2003/02/item341.html

Web. Accessed 3 May 2019.

Romanov, ArtemiiIu..*Anglitsizmy i Amerikanizmy v RusskomIazyke i Otnoshenie k Nim* (British and American Words in the Russian Language and Attitude towards Them). St Petersburg: St Petersbur University Press. 2000. Print.

Shvetsova, Svetlana. *Orasprostraneniirusskogoiazykav zarubezhnykhstran akh. In Reshenienatsional'no-iazykovyhvoprosov v sovremennom mire.* Peterburg: Zlatoust. 2003. Print.

Slezkine, Yuri. *The USSR as a Communal Apartment, or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism.* Slavic Review, 53 (2). 1994: 414 -452. Web. 15 May 2019.

Smith, Michael. *Language and Power in the Creation of the USSR,* 1917-1953. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. 1998. Print.

Stalin, Joseph. *Natsional'nyivopros I marksizm*.Prosveschenie. Reissued in 1934 as "Marksizm I natsional'no kolonial'nyivopros," "Marxism and the National and Colonial Question". London: Lawrence and Wishart. 1914. Web. 2 May 2019.

Szabolcs, Janurik. *The Integration of English Loan words in Russian: An Overview of Recent Borrowings.* Studia Slavica 55 (1). 2009: 45 - 65. Web. 15 May 2019.

Ter-Minasova, Svetlana. *Traditions and Innovations: English Language Teaching in Russia.* World Englishes 24(A). 2005: 445 - 454. Web. 9 June 2019.

Ustinova, I. & Bhatia, Tej. *Convergence of English in Russian TV Commercials*. World Englishes 24(4). 2005: 495 -508. Web. 8 June 2019.

Ustinova, Irina. *English and American Culture Appeal in Russian Advertising.* Journal of Creative Communications 3(1). 2008: 77-98. Web. 3 June 2019.

Ustinova, Irina. *English in Russia*. World Englishes 24(2). 2005: 239 - 252.

Web. 8 June, 2019.
http://www.russian2007.ru Accessed on 8 June, 2019.
Yuliya Thompson. *Englishisms in Post-Soviet Russian: Linguistics Makers of Historic Changes.* San Jose: San Jose State University. 2008. Print.
Yuzefovich, Natalia. *English in Russian Cultural Contexts.* World Englishes 24(4). 2005: 509 -516. Web. 7 June, 2019.