

Professional Communication in the Republic of Kazakhstan in Conditions of Diglossia and Bilingualism*

Elena Shelestyuk

Chelyabinsk State University,
Chelyabinsk, Russia

Altyngul Suyunbayeva

Military Institute of Air Defense Forces,
Aktobe, Kazakhstan

Marat Bukharbaev

Kazakh-Russian International University,
Aktobe, Kazakhstan

This article analyses the sociocultural aspects of bilingualism and presents a specific case study of educational professional bilingualism in the Republic of Kazakhstan. In post-Soviet space, bilingualism/diglossia is functional rather than social, it is professionally conditioned and aimed at the conceptual-terminological and discourse-patterns mediation between the macro-mediator language and the national state language. Bilingualism is inevitable in multiethnic societies. Despite the complexity and additional stress associated with the need to learn 2–3 languages in a multiethnic society, bilingualism needs to be tolerated as a natural necessity. But in countries where the languages and cultures of ethnic minorities are not given due attention, bilingualism often spells semilingualism: L1 is hardly formally taught, and L2 is not fully acquired because of insufficient training. The alternative, common in the post-Soviet space, is the finely orchestrated linguistic education in both languages – a two-stage process, when macro-mediator L2 is taught as a subject in junior grades, and later instruction is conducted in it along with titular regional languages, as well as the inclusion of all languages in high domains of communication. It is also vital that such bilingualism be endoglossic, so that the original languages of those territories in which they existed for hundreds of years are studied, including

* *Citation:* Shelestyuk, E., Suyunbayeva, A., Bukharbaev, M. (2022). Professional Communication in the Republic of Kazakhstan in Conditions of Diglossia and Bilingualism. In *Quaestio Rossica*. Vol. 10, № 5. P. 1642–1656. DOI 10.15826/qr.2022.5.752.

Цитирование: Shelestyuk E., Suyunbayeva A., Bukharbaev M. Professional Communication in the Republic of Kazakhstan in Conditions of Diglossia and Bilingualism // *Quaestio Rossica*. 2022. Vol. 10, № 5. P. 1642–1656. DOI 10.15826/qr.2022.5.752.

the macro-mediator language. The objective laws of linguistic development in this process should be combined with guided targeted measures to ensure it. If a state language is not to date sophisticated enough to serve academic and official discourses, its quality, status, and weight should gradually change with the assistance of an endoglossic macro-mediator language.

Keywords: functional bilingualism, linguistic situation, sociolinguistics, diglossia, macro-mediator language, professional communication

В статье представлены краткий анализ социокультурных аспектов двуязычия и социологическое исследование профессионального двуязычия в вузе Республики Казахстан. На постсоветском пространстве билингвизм (диглоссия) носит скорее функциональный, чем социальный характер: он профессионально обусловлен и направлен на опосредование концептуально-терминологических и дискурсивных паттернов между языком-макропосредником (русским, L2) и национальным государственным языком (L1). В многонациональных обществах (коих в числе стран мира подавляющее большинство) двуязычие неизбежно. Несмотря на сложность и дополнительный стресс, связанный с необходимостью изучения двух-трех языков, двуязычие нужно терпеть как естественную необходимость. Но в странах, где языкам и культурам этнических меньшинств не уделяется должного внимания, двуязычие часто означает семилнгвизм: формального обучения L1 практически нет, а L2 осваивается не в полной мере из-за недостаточной языковой подготовки. Альтернативой, распространенной на постсоветском пространстве, является тонко срежиссированное лингвистическое образование на двух языках – двухэтапный процесс, когда язык-макропосредник L2 преподается как предмет в младших классах, а в дальнейшем на нем ведется обучение (наряду с государственным языком), а также происходит включение региональных, коренных языков и языков меньшинств в «высокие» области функциональной коммуникации в качестве официальных языков. Также жизненно важно, чтобы такое двуязычие было эндогlossным, чтобы изучались оригинальные языки тех территорий, на которых они существовали в течение сотен лет. Объективные закономерности языкового развития в этом процессе должны сочетаться с целенаправленными мерами по его обеспечению. Если государственный язык на сегодняшний день недостаточен для обслуживания научных и официальных дискурсов, его качество, статус и вес должны постепенно меняться с помощью эндогlossного языка-макропосредника.

Ключевые слова: функциональный билингвизм, диглоссия, языковая ситуация, социолнгвистика, язык-макропосредник, профессиональная коммуникация

Bilingualism, concomitant notions, and sociocultural problematics

The functioning of languages in any country depends on the linguistic situation – the co-existence of languages within regional, administrative, and political entities, their territorial-social and functional parameters [Сююмбаева, с. 97]. Viewed as a conceptual field, the linguistic situation includes a) language contacts, statuses, policies, construction, competences, value orientations of ethnophores, b) communicative domains in which languages' social functions are manifested, c) the social situation providing the cultural, economic, and professional infrastructures for language functioning [Аюпова, с. 156].

In cognitive terms, bilingualism is an individual's knowledge of two languages with the same or different degrees of competence and social communication in them. J. D. Desheriev and I. F. Protchenko define bilingualism as “command of two languages to such an extent as to express thoughts comprehensibly and perceive other people's messages with understanding, regardless of inner speech processing (in L1 or L2) and linguistic interference” [Дешериев, Протченко].

A sociolinguistic definition emphasizes bilinguals' “functioning in the same territory, in the same national environment. Bilingualism is the use of two languages by the same population in the process of communication” [Головин]. A broad view uses cultural-civilizational dimensions: “bilingualism is the result of civilizational interaction of cultures, a form of adaptation to a different or related linguistic culture” [Багирокков, с. 33–34].

Diglossia is functionally and socially differentiated bilingualism where languages may differ in statuses and serve for different domains of social, official, and professional interaction. Diglossia is a norm in any modern multiethnic society and state, it may evolve naturally in the joint evolution of territorially related languages or be legitimated by fiat. In ideal models, diglossia implies equal statuses of languages, their different functions and mutual enrichment. Oftentimes, however, one language serves as a macro-mediator transmitting modern conceptual and terminological package, and the other as a traditional cultural “data storage medium” and recipient of modern information. For recipient languages, diglossia may be transitional, as they transit to a higher science and technology status through borrowing terms and concepts from the macro-mediator language.

An important notion concomitant with bilingualism and studied both by cognitive linguistics and functional sociolinguistics is code-switching – mental-linguistic operations bilinguals perform using their abilities and competencies in transition from one language (dialect, style) to another depending on conditions of communication [Боева-Омелечко, с. 26]. Code-switching embraces not only cognitive-linguistic operations, but also changes of functional and cultural codes based on the differentiation of languages and cultures (causing symbolic changes of bilinguals' social and cultural identity).

Functional code-switching is manifest in multiethnic communities with bilingualism in official, social, and professional domains. There is also spontaneous, automatic, often emotional code-switching in communication, formal or informal. Both functional and spontaneous code-switching should be carefully studied.

For an individual, bilingualism is associated with a number of difficulties: the need for and cognitive stress of mastering two languages, competent communication in them, coping with interlingual interference, adequate, appropriate code-switching from one language to another.

There are many taxonomical oppositions of bilingualism; three classifications essential for us are subordinative/coordi-native/mixed, balanced/unbalanced, subtractive/additive.

Subordinative bilingualism is individual bilingualism in which the speaker perceives one language (more often L2, but sometimes recessive L1) through the nominal-conceptual system of the other (more often L1, but sometimes dominant L2). As a result, there may be interferences (phonetic, lexico-semantic, grammatical, syntactic) in the speech of such bilinguals. Coordinative bilingualism is individual bilingualism in which L1 and L2 are autonomous in the bilingual's mind and hardly mix in speech. Conceptual systems corresponding to language systems are also quite autonomous. The functional domains of communication of these languages are different, so language interferences are minimal. Mixed (correlative) bilingualism implies an ideal case of L1 and L2 acquisition, where both languages exist in the mind of the speaker as equal communicative systems [Словарь социолингвистических терминов] but correlate in terms of content (the bilingual's conceptual frames and scripts) and expression. Mixed bilingualism minimizes interferences due to high proficiency in two languages.

Balanced bilingualism means equally adequate and competent social functioning of an individual in two languages. Unbalanced bilingualism is characterized by different degrees of bilingual linguistic use and competence, when L1 (or widespread and official L2) dominates over the other language [Peal, Lambert]. In practice, bilingual and multilingual situations are rarely balanced. Balanced bilingualism is rare, as there is no complete symmetry in the socio-ethnic conditions of the coexistence of two languages in society [Мечковская]. The language that a person speaks better is dominant, and the one they speak worse is recessive. This opposition emphasizes the speaker's competencies and the frequency of language use.

Additive bilingualism refers to a situation in which the study of L2 has a developmental effect on the recipient, while not harming his competence in L1; languages and related cultures "cooperate", introduce positive elements into the overall development of a person. Subtractive bilingualism is characterized by the loss or erosion of L1, two languages compete rather than complement each other [Lambert; Baker; Liddicoat].

Bilingualism (multilingualism) and diglossia are inevitable in multiethnic societies, that is, in most of the countries of the world. However, in lots of countries the languages and cultures of minor ethnic groups are not given

due attention, there is no formal education in L1 and insufficient training in L2. Bilingualism in this case turns into semilingualism, i. e. the lack of education causing semiliteracy in L1 and incomplete, defective acquisition of L2 [Skutnabb-Kangas]. As a result, people speak two languages at a low level, with evident deficiencies in both languages, they frequently do not receive a complete secondary education (not to mention higher education) and have low-paying jobs.

The alternative is seen 1) in the finely orchestrated parallel linguistic education in both languages, a two-stage process, when macro-mediator L2 is taught as a subject in junior grades, and later instruction is conducted in it along with titular/regional languages; 2) the expansion of functioning of national, indigenous and minority languages, the inclusion of them in official, professional, scientific, and cultural communication along with the official language(-s). Both principles are generally implemented in the post-Soviet space.

While in multiethnic countries bilingualism (multilingualism) ought to be accepted as a natural necessity, despite the complexity and stressfulness of learning and using 2–3 languages, it is necessary that such bilingualism should be endoglossical, so that majoritarian, autochthonous, and old languages of countries be official and studied. It will help preserve state sovereignty and cultural identity. Exoglossical bilingualism (by which we imply Ch. A. Ferguson's meaning of an extraneous, foreign language which is not ethnically represented within a country), is a colonial vestige, it usually proves subtractive and is best avoided. An extraneous language should not claim an official language status, and taught as a foreign language of international communication, it should be culturally void, like an international auxiliary language.

Features of the linguistic situation in Kazakhstan

In the linguistic situation of the post-Soviet space, national-Russian bilingualism is common. Its distinctive feature is homogeneous (e. g. Belarusian – Russian, Kazakh – Uzbek) or heterogeneous, but territorially united languages (e. g. Kazakh – Russian, Kazakh – Ukrainian). In Kazakh sociolinguistics, many serious studies have been devoted to the problem of bilingualism, e. g. by E. D. Suleimenova, Zh. S. Smagulova, N. Zh. Shaimerdenova, M. B. Amalbekova, B. Kh. Khasanov, M. M. Kopylenko, M. R. Kondubaeva, O. B. Altynbekova, Z. K. Akhmetzhanova, etc. B. Kh. Khasanov regards bilingualism as “an integrating means of communication in the heterogeneous or mixed use of two languages” [Хасанов, с. 29]. An important inference from this is that bilingualism not only serves for the integration of a society in communication, but also ensures that the thesauruses and concepts of languages of a country's nationalities somehow converge. It is well known that languages in multiethnic countries exchange conceptual and nominal materials. Some languages provide ready-made models for written and institutional discourses. Such languages are termed macro-mediator

languages. They also function as translated educational and lexicographic sources for other languages/cultures. As a rule, they are languages of numerous ethnic groups, large nationalities of a country.

According to R. O. Jacobson, O. N. Trubachev, and other linguists and philologists, for the languages of the Eurasian language union, the macro-mediator language has been Russian, first in the Russian Empire, then in the Soviet Union. For its part, Russian imbibed the concepts and names of the nationalities' linguo-cultures [Шапошников]. The tradition of drawing on the Russian language for terms, formal discourses, and education texts has been preserved. National-Russian bilingualism obtains after the republics became independent states. Russian is normally used as the second official language, the language of a nationality second in number after the majoritarian nationality.

In fact, the functional and speech development of languages is a long and objective process. Transition of a national majority language to the leading status in all high functional domains may be gradual. In this respect Russian as a macro-mediator language has been important and is important still. Besides, in multiethnic countries teaching non-majority nationalities' languages as a subject and instruction in them is an objective necessity that must be taken for granted. Russians being a national minority in the newly formed post-Soviet countries, the Russian language is of right an official language there (and a language of international communication).

At the same time, Russian today is considered by many linguists pluricentric, i. e. the language that has brought forth its varieties due to long contacts with other dominant languages, with their own lexis, phraseology, pronunciation, spelling, and morphology. Russian in Kazakhstan has undergone diversification and Kazakhization through long-time functioning on the cultural borderland, it reflects the internalized conceptual and mental picture of the world inherent in all the Kazakhstani people. In the capacity of language variety, Kazakhstani Russian can claim the development of its own norms and standards. An important criterion for recognizing the existence of the Kazakhstani variety of Russian is the "hermeticity", "opacity", and incomprehensibility of Kazakhstani Russian for the speakers of Russian living outside of Kazakhstan [Suleimenova et al.].

The Republic of Kazakhstan is the crux of the Eurasian language union, the territory of the intensive interaction of the Turkic and the Slavic peoples. The autochthonous and majoritarian population of the Republic are Kazakhs – 13,497,891, the second largest nationality are Russians – 2,981,9461. Kazakhs have lived here and in the adjacent territories in enclaved or striped pattern since the fourth, Russians settled in the seventeenth century. The Kazakh-Russian bilingualism in Kazakhstan is the co-functioning in a single communicative space of two demographically and communicatively powerful partner-languages.

Other linguistic and extralinguistic factors of bilingualism in Kazakhstan include degrees of distribution, ethnic composition of speakers (Kazakhs,

Russians, Uzbeks, Ukrainians, Germans, Uyghurs, Tatars), their socio-psychological, ethnolinguistic, and cultural characteristics. Central and eastern Kazakhstan (the Middle Jüz) uses Kazakh and, less frequently, Russian as a lingua franca; northern and western Kazakhstan (the Junior Jüz) use mainly Russian in this capacity; the southern and south-eastern Kazakhstan parts (the Senior Jüz) use Kazakh, Russian, Uzbek, Kyrgyz, and Uyghur (rarely) in this capacity.

The official languages of Kazakhstan are Kazakh and Russian. Kazakh has the constitutionally fixed status of the state language, Russian – the status of an official language and a language of international communication. German, Tajik, Tatar, Turkish, Ukrainian, Uyghur, and Uzbek are also officially recognized (Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Article 7; 1997 Language Law; On the Languages of the Peoples in the Republic of Kazakhstan).

Language policy is the most important component of the national state policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan, largely determining the preservation of its statehood. “Modern Kazakh language policy is centralized, since it is carried out by the state and provides for a system of obligatory measures; it is aimed at changing the existing language situation. The language policy takes into account the interests of the broad masses and can be called democratic. It is necessary to emphasize the international nature of the language policy, since even though priority is given to the development of the Kazakh language, maximum attention is paid to the development of the Russian language and the languages of all the other ethnic groups of the country” [Ойон и др.].

Communication in professional domains is institutionally included in relevant activities, it is purposeful and occurs in socially conditioned and socially oriented communicative space [Голованова]. Professional communication is an effective way of achieving extralinguistic goals, including through the functional use of a language of international communication with a range of professional sublanguages. Russian is frequently used as language of science and technology in the Republic, including world communication systems (television, radio, Internet transmissions, air, and space communications, etc.).

Among the factors of the spread of languages of international communication, of particular importance is the ability to perform functions that are not peculiar to national (ethnic) languages: to have a long-standing and flexibly changing system of styles and genres, to have elaborate and ever developing systems of special/professional sublanguages (LSPs), to designate notions and concepts unambiguously and systemically (terminological systems), and to be capable to absorb and create philosophic/scientific concepts and descriptions. In this regard, the functioning of a language of international communication outside its ancestral territory is limited to certain communicative situations and domains: economy, trade, education, science, etc. Social groups of the non-Russian Kazakhstanis, whose professional activities are related to these

domains, have specific communicative needs that are successfully met by Russian linguistic mediation.

Practice shows that Russian has successfully acted as a macro-mediator language and connected individuals' thinking with the objective meanings of complex sciences and the laws of logical reasoning. It has long been the language of professional training, a medium of science, knowledge, assimilating technical and information achievements, as well as expanding horizons. The Kazakh language, having the status of the state language, so far has had a narrower range of applications within scientific and technical domains and has been enriched through Russian. From the above positions, we assess the bilingualism in the Republic of Kazakhstan as functional and transitional, with the Kazakh language functioning as the main state and official language and Russian functioning as the macro-mediator and source language of professional terminology and discourse in scientific and professional domains.

Professional use of Russian is an important tool for achieving success in a specialty. However, there are many obstacles on the way to acquiring the professional brand of language: professional discourses are distinguished for complex terminological systems (basic terms, general scientific words, specialized terms, nomina, pre-terms: professionalisms, jargon [Дробышева]); official-business and scientific styles necessitate accuracy, logic, normalcy, awareness of specificity of various genres; professional communication involves literacy and compliance with the norms of speech culture and etiquette. Hence the necessity for the extensive study of literary and popular science substyles of language.

Professional communication carried out in the fields of increased responsibility, like aviation, entails that its participants speak a common language that is understood by all parties unambiguously. Therefore, the linguistic training of future airmen and related professions is intense, particularly in languages of international communication (esp. ICAO languages) and sublanguages (LSPs) of aviation.

Let us consider the specific linguistic and language-related situation among of the cadets of the Military Institute of the Air Defense Forces of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Aktobe). About 73.2 % of the trainees are graduates of Kazakh national schools, but the Kazakh language is so far not in demand in professional communication, due to the above-mentioned reasons, primarily, insufficient vocabulary/terminological bases. Among cadets, the use of Kazakh is mainly limited to informal types of discourse. At the same time, they must be proficient in Russian as the language of professional communication, fluent in it in social life, clear and accurate in professional usage. To form the speech competence of future airmen and related specialties, a course of Russian was introduced in the Institute's curriculum. This course aims at cadets gaining linguistic and communicative knowledge, skills, and abilities as professional competences.

To identify the functioning of bilingualism in cadet groups of the Military Institute of the Air Defense Forces of the Republic of Kazakhstan,

we conducted a series of surveys in 2015–2021, and the results of the latest one are listed in this paper. The survey was conducted on December 2, 2021. The initial number of respondents was 387, then it was reduced to 156. We chose those who answered the question “Do you speak two languages?” positively and indicated Kazakh and Russian in reply to “What languages do you speak?”. So only natural bilinguals were selected for further research in our sociolinguistic study.

The respondents’ nationalities split as: Kazakhs – 91 %, Russians – 5 %, other – 4 %. Of them, 87 % reported fluency in Kazakh and 88 % – in Russian. 1 % Kazakh and 2 % Russian respondents admitted to understanding speech in the other language but inability to paraphrase messages in the mother tongue.

Since Kazakhs constituted more than 90 % respondents in the 2021 survey, it can be considered as mostly based on the linguistic condition of young Kazakhs.

Our respondents were aged 17–22.

The survey involved a sociological analysis based on questionnaires. Its purpose was to identify the linguistic condition of the respondents, the types of their bilingualism, and the distribution of roles of Kazakh and Russian in everyday and professional communication, at leisure. The questionnaire included a few special questions: inquiry about their age, what languages they spoke, why it was necessary to learn Kazakh/Russian (providing several reasons). We also inquired which language cadets considered their native (mother tongue), that is, according to V. G. Kostomarov, the language that a person learns and comprehends simultaneously with the development of the ability to think, one of the main signs of ethnic self-consciousness and identity [Костомаров]. The main bulk of the questionnaire comprised yes/no questions about the use of Russian and Kazakh in different communicative spaces of public life, leisure activities, and vocational training.

We compared the percentage of use of Kazakh and Russian (see the table below) suggestive of the linguistic situation in the educational institution and the level of its students’ language competencies.

Use of Kazakh and Russian by bilingual cadets in Kazakh and Russian

What language do you use?	Kazakh			Russian		
	some-times	often	always	some-times	often	always
At college (at work)	32 %	26 %	42 %	19 %	45 %	42 %
On the street (on public transport)	26 %	49 %	30 %	32 %	54 %	39 %
In the store and catering establishment	26 %	44 %	25 %	23 %	53 %	24 %
When watching TV/listening to the radio	49 %	30 %	21 %	13 %	46 %	41 %

What language do you use?	Kazakh			Russian		
	some-times	often	always	some-times	often	always
When you read books/newspapers	42 %	36 %	22 %	24 %	42 %	34 %
When you read non-fiction	25 %	29 %	20 %	49 %	51 %	59 %
When you read fiction	23 %	25 %	23 %	41 %	52 %	56 %
To work on a computer	18 %	20 %	10 %	70 %	36 %	56 %
On websites (on the Internet)	67 %	21 %	12 %	70 %	65 %	58 %
At home	17 %	30 %	53 %	45 %	31 %	46 %
With friends	25 %	29 %	46 %	38 %	46 %	52 %

According to the results obtained, 42 % Kazakh and 45 % Russian speakers use both the Russian and the Kazakh languages. The respondents speak 49 % Kazakh and 54 % Russian on the street (on public transport), similar are the numbers for stores and catering establishments – 44 % Kazakh and 53 % Russian. While in the above communicative spaces there are no big differences in the use of the languages, in more formal and technologically mediated environments we see a different picture. When watching TV/listening to the radio, reading non-fiction (scientific, technical) and imaginative literature, working on a computer and on the Internet, most respondents prefer Russian and use Kazakh but rarely. The problem is that many changes and processes in the field of technology and information and, accordingly, in the development of languages occur spontaneously. Russian seems more fit to adapt to these changes as they reflect on it immediately. As for Kazakh, neither state regulation nor education measures or normalization can help it to keep pace with modern parlances and new meanings.

The key factors determining the linguistic condition of the respondents appear to be practicability/viability, informational satisfaction, and language environment (language users constituting the average person's milieu [Жикеева, с. 52]). These factors influence both the functioning of bilingualism and the formation of language competences. Thus, in the family Kazakhs communicate mainly in their native language. In the circle of friends and acquaintances the use of Russian grows, partly because this circle includes people who do not speak Kazakh, partly due to the larger range of topics for communication. At work the use of Russian grows significantly – apparently because this communicative space is more professionally oriented. When special information is circulated – professional, political, economic, cultural etc., i. e. anything that goes beyond the regional, family, and household framework – the Russian language dominates.

Imitative activity when asserting one's national and social identity is yet another important factor of the linguistic situation. I. Gonzalez notes that when a bilingual person is "tuned" to the perception/production of Spanish, they act and think like native speakers of Spanish, and vice versa, even phonemes are categorized in different ways due to the "tuning" to a particular language [González, Pujolar]. Possibly, the cognitive systems of early coordinative bilinguals have two separate processing modes, and when there is a need for code-switching, they "tune" themselves and start thinking in the language they speak.

In general, in most cases bilingualism in Kazakhstan is coordinative or mixed. It is generally balanced, but the balance is apt to tip in monolingual environment. It is additive for most professionals.

The results of our survey also revealed the opinions on the need to study Russian and Kazakh: 96 % of the Kazakh and 98 % of the Russian speakers stated that both languages needed to be studied.

The chief reason for learning Kazakh is that it is the state language. The mentioned reasons for learning Russian are as follows:

1. Knowledge of a second language makes it possible to use various sources of information in Russian.
2. The prestige of Russian in Kazakhstan is quite high.
3. The status of Russian is stipulated by law.
4. Russian is "linguistic capital" in modern Kazakhstan.
5. Russian is the language of international communication.
6. Russian effectively serves the purpose of professional communication.

Language education at the Institute reflects the current linguistic situation. In the first year, cadets are divided into two language subgroups: graduates of national Kazakh schools and other nationalities learn Russian, and graduates of Russian schools with perfect proficiency of Russian learn Kazakh; there is also an opportunity to study either language upon request. The number of students who graduated from national schools is increasing in Kazakhstan by the year, therefore it is Russian that is predominantly taught in the 1st–2nd years of study. In the 3rd–4th years of study, languages are not taught as subjects, cadets are trained in specialized subjects, with Russian as the language of instruction. Since aviation graduates work as airmen, technicians, engineers, where the Russian language prevails, proficiency in Russian is validated through certification testing, carried out in the 4th year, along with specialized subjects and the history of Kazakhstan. The certification is preceded by half-year weekly preparatory consultations for the cadets aimed at refreshing their competencies which may be rusty after their acquisition in the 1st–2nd years.

Essentially, the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) determines the languages that are recommended for use for flight safety purposes. Safety being the prerequisite for the air transport system functioning, it is advisable to use the working languages of the ICAO, Russian being one of them. English is used on international airlines for radio communications. And within the Republic of Kazakhstan, English is also

used as a third language, as this country strives to become a trilingual state. In the case of radio communications, aviation engineering and technology, English proves a useful language for professional communication, which is its appropriate function in the globalized world.

As a complex phenomenon, bilingualism is associated with certain problems. For the individual, bilingualism imposes additional duties and burdens on the speakers associated with learning 2–3 languages, overcoming interferences, regulating code-switching. The use of a non-native language in the learning process, including professional communication, is also a disputable idea. At the same time, endoglossic bilingualism in a multiethnic society is an objective necessity. This particularly concerns professional communication, which can and should be carried out in official languages. Therefore, people studying to become professionals in a particular field should be competent in these languages.

The viable rules of modern language policy are:

1) The use of endoglossical bilingualism for interethnic communication within the state. Endoglossia should have top priority in national states, as well as internationally, the teaching and learning of native languages should be given ample attention and finance, the didactic materials and texts used for it should be culturally rich so as to ensure deep-rooted enculturation. Endoglossical languages should serve both the “high” and everyday communication.

2) Exoglossical national-global bilingualism is justified in the field of international and interstate communication, when, according to a general agreement, a certain language appears in the form of a lingua franca or an international auxiliary language, a code for transmitting individual and national meanings, as well as specialized information. Its teaching and learning should be based on texts, whenever possible cleared of the specific realia of the corresponding linguistic culture. A foreign language (as an artificial IAL) should serve well-defined purposes in international communication.

Kazakhstan, as the other countries of the post-Soviet space, is characterized by a linguistic situation of functional transitional bilingualism (diglossia), where national scientific-professional communication is mediated by and replenished through Russian as a macro-mediator language. Codification of scientific and technical terms, descriptions of inventions of engineering thought have been successfully fulfilled by Russian with its developed functional style of science with a range of scientific sublanguages (LSPs). Professional communication in aviation is highly specialized and best accomplished with the help of the Russian conceptual-terminological apparatus, due to both the tradition and the fact that science and technology are complex and multifactorial processes, involving the accurate use of terms and exact knowledge of the concepts

behind them. The Kazakh language can so far play a subsidiary role, but the situation with Russian and Kazakh as languages of science is evening out.

Our survey data basically indicate coordinative/mixed, balanced, and additive bilingualism among the cadets of the Military Institute of Air Defense Forces. Most often, the Russian language is used as the language of formal communication, studies, and vocational training.

Our study makes it possible to identify the degree of the formation of communicative competences in natural bilinguals in the specific Kazakhstan professional environment. The level of Russian and Kazakh language proficiency among cadets can be assessed as above average. The data obtained in the study also indirectly indicate that while maintaining the formation of a bilingual personality, functional transitional bilingualism will serve as a factor of mutual intercultural respect and strengthening stability in the country.

Список литературы

Аюпова Л. Л. Языковая ситуация: социолингвистический аспект. Уфа : Изд-во ВЭГУ, 2000. 156 с.

Базироков Х. З. Билингвизм: теоретические и прикладные аспекты (на материале адыгейского и русского языков). Майкоп : Изд-во АГУ, 2004. 316 с.

Боева-Омелечко Н. Б. Краткий толковый словарь социолингвистических терминов. М. : Готика, 2004. 60 с.

Голованова Е. И. Категория профессионального деятеля : Формирование. Развитие. Статус в языке. М. : Элпис, 2008. 304 с.

Головин Б. Н. Введение в языковедение. М. : Высш. шк., 1983. 324 с.

Дешериев Ю. Д., Протченко И. Ф. Основные аспекты исследования двуязычия и иноязычия // Проблемы двуязычия и многоязычия. М. : Наука, 1972. С. 26–42.

Дробышева Н. Л. Состав и стратификация авиационной лексики // Стратификация национального языка в современном российском обществе : сб. ст. пятой всерос. конф. (г. Санкт-Петербург, 28–31 ноября 2015 г.). СПб. : Златоуст, 2015. С. 76–79.

Жикеева А. Р. Специфика двуязычия Костанайской области // Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. 2009. № 7 (188). Филология. Искусствоведение. Вып. 41. С. 52–55.

Костомаров В. Г. Мой гений, мой язык: размышления языковеда в связи с общественными дискуссиями о языке. М. : Знание, 1991. 64 с.

Мечковская Н. Б. Социальная лингвистика : пособие для студентов гуманитар. вузов и учащихся лицеев. 2-е изд., испр. М. : Аспект-Пресс, 2000. 206 с.

Ойон И., Жумашиев Р. М., Досова Б. А. и др. Языковая ситуация в Казахстане на современном этапе // Вестник Карагандинского ун-та. Серия: История. Философия. 2017. № 1. С. 29–32.

Словарь социолингвистических терминов / отв. ред. В. Ю. Михальченко. М. : [Б. и.], 2006. 312 с.

Суюнбаева А. Ж. Языковая ситуация как фактор функционирования языка для специальных целей // Научный диалог. 2016. № 5 (53). С. 97–109.

Хасанов Б. Х. Языки народов Казахстана и их взаимодействие. Алма-Ата : Наука, 1976. 215 с.

Шапошников А. К. Академик О. Н. Трубачев о роли русского языка в СССР и СНГ // Русский язык как язык межкультурного и делового сотрудничества в полилингвальном контексте Евразии : материалы 2-го междунар. конгр., 1–3 октября 2009 г. / отв. ред. Н. Ж. Шаймерденова. Астана : Сарыарка, 2009. С. 71.

Baker C. Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. Clevedon ; Avon : Multilingual Matters, 1993. 319 p.

González I., Pujolar J. Linguistic “mudes” and the De-Ethnicization of Language Choice in Catalonia // *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 2013. Vol. 16. P. 138–152.

Lambert W. E. Deciding on Languages of Instruction: Psychological and Social Considerations // *Multicultural and Multilingual Education in Immigrant Countries* / eds. T. Husen, P. Opper. Oxford : Pergamon Press, 1983. P. 111–143.

Liddicoat A. Bilingualism: An Introduction // *Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Melbourne : National Languages Inst. of Australia, 1991. P. 2–20.

Peal E., Lambert W. E. The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence // *Psychological Monographs*. 1962. Vol. 76 (27), № 546. P. 1–23.

Skutnabb-Kangas T. Linguistic Genocide in Education – or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights // *Journal of Linguistic Society of America*. 2001. № 5. P. 421–422.

Suleimenova E. D., Akanova D. Kh., Aimagambetova M. M. Biz birgemiz, or Revisiting the Diversification of Russian Language in Kazakhstan // *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*. 2021. Vol. 12, № 1. P. 7–22. DOI 10.22363/2313-2299-2021-12-1-7-22.

References

Ayupova, L. L. (2000). *Yazykovaya situatsiya: sotsiolingvisticheskii aspekt* [Linguistic Situation: Sociolinguistic Aspect]. Ufa, Izdatel'stvo Vostochnoi ekonomiko-yuridicheskoi gumanitarnoi akademii. 156 p.

Bagirov, Kh. Z. (2004). *Bilingvizm: teoreticheskie i prikladnye aspekty (na materiale adygeiskogo i russkogo yazykov)* [Bilingualism: Theoretical and Applied Aspects (Based on the Adyge and Russian Languages)]. Maykop, Izdatel'stvo Adygeiskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. 316 p.

Baker, C. (1993). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon, Avon, Multilingual Matters. 319 p.

Boeva-Omelechko, N. B. (2004). *Kratkii tolkovyi slovar' sotsiolingvisticheskikh terminov* [A Brief Explanatory Dictionary of Sociolinguistic Terms]. Moscow, Gotika. 60 p.

Desheriev, Yu. D., Protchenko, I. F. (1972). Osnovnye aspekty issledovaniya dvuyazychiya i inoyazychiya [The Main Aspects of the Study of Bilingualism and Foreign Languages]. In *Problemy dvuyazychiya i mnogoyazychiya*. Moscow, Nauka, pp. 26–42.

Drobysheva, N. L. (2015). Sostav i stratifikatsiya aviatsionnoi leksiki [Composition and Stratification of Aviation Vocabulary]. In *Sbornik statei pyatoi vserossiiskoi konferentsii (g. Sankt-Peterburg, 28–31 noyabrya 2015 g.)*. St Petersburg, Zlatoust, pp. 76–79.

Golovanova, E. I. (2008). *Kategoriya professional'nogo deyatelya. Formirovanie. Razvitie. Status v yazyke* [The Category of a Professional. Formation. Development. Status in the Language]. Moscow, Elpis. 304 p.

Golovin, B. N. (1983). *Vvedenie v yazykoznanie* [Introduction to Linguistics]. Moscow, Vysshaya shkola. 324 p.

González, I., Pujolar, J. (2013). Linguistic “mudes” and the De-Ethnicization of Language Choice in Catalonia. In *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Vol. 16, pp. 138–152.

Khasanov, B. Kh. (1976). *Yazyki narodov Kazakhstana i ikh vzaimodeistvie* [Languages of the Peoples of Kazakhstan and Their Interaction]. Almaty, Nauka. 215 p.

Kostomarov, V. G. (1991). *Moi genii, moi yazyk: razmyshleniya yazykoveda v svyazi s obshchestvennymi diskussiyami o yazyke* [My Genius, My Language: Reflections of a Linguist in Connection with Public Discussions about Language]. Moscow, Znanie. 64 p.

Lambert, W. E. (1983). Deciding on Languages of Instruction: Psychological and Social Considerations. In Husen, T., Opper, P. (Eds.). *Multicultural and Multilingual Education in Immigrant Countries*. Oxford, Pergamon Press, pp. 111–143.

Liddicoat, A. (1991). Bilingualism: An Introduction. In *Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Melbourne, National Languages Inst. of Australia, pp. 2–20.

Mechkovskaya, N. B. (2000). *Sotsial'naya lingvistika. Posobiye dlya studentov gumanitarnykh vuzov i uchashchikhsya litseev* [Social Linguistics. For Students of Universities for the Humanities and Lyceums]. 2nd Ed., rev. Moscow, Aspekt-Press. 206 p.

Mikhail'chenko, V. Yu. (Ed.). (2006). *Slovar' sotsiolingvisticheskikh terminov* [Dictionary of Sociolinguistic Terms]. Moscow, S. n. 312 p.

Oyon, I., Zhumashev, R. M., Dosova, B. A. et al. (2017). Yazykovaya situatsiya v Kazakhstane na sovremennom etape [The Language Situation in Kazakhstan at the Present Stage]. In *Vestnik Karagandinskogo universiteta. Seriya: Istoriya. Filosofiya*. No. 1, pp. 29–32.

Peal, E., Lambert, W. E. (1962). The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence. In *Psychological Monographs*. Vol. 76 (27). No. 546, pp. 1–23.

Shaposhnikov, A. K. (2009). Akademik O. N. Trubachev o roli russkogo yazyka v SSSR i SNG [Academician O. N. Trubachev on the Role of the Russian Language in the USSR and the CIS]. In Shaimerdenova, N. Zh. (Ed.). *Russkii yazyk kak yazyk mezhkul'turnogo i delovogo sotrudnichestva v polilingval'nom kontekste Evrazii. Materialy 2-go mezhdunarodnogo kongressa, 1–3 oktyabrya 2009 g.* Astana, Saryarka, p. 71.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2001). Linguistic Genocide in Education – or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights. In *Journal of Linguistic Society of America*. No. 5, pp. 421–422.

Suleimenova, E. D., Akanova, D. Kh., Aimagambetova, M. M. (2021). Biz birgemiz, or Revisiting the Diversification of Russian Language in Kazakhstan. In *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*. Vol. 12. No. 1, pp. 7–22. DOI 10.22363/2313-2299-2021-12-1-7-22.

Suyunbaeva, A. Zh. (2016). Yazykovaya situatsiya kak faktor funktsionirovaniya yazyka dlya spetsial'nykh tselei [The Linguistic Situation as a Factor in the Functioning of the Language for Special Purposes]. In *Nauchnyi dialog*. No. 5 (53), pp. 97–109.

Zhikeeva, A. R. (2009). Spetsifika dvuyazychiya Kostanaiskoi oblasti [Specificity of Bilingualism of Kostanay Region]. In *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. No. 7 (188). Filologiya. Iskusstvovedenie. Iss. 41, pp. 52–55.

The article was submitted on 02.06.2022