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ABSTRACT

A study has been conducted of language choice and language use by a small Moslem community—the Adyges, living in the North West Caucasus of the Soviet Union. A particular aim of this work was to look for possible differences between rural and urban communities and between different age groups. Approaches used included the analysis of questionnaires administered through social networks, interviews and observations, e.g. of book use.

It was found that among rural schoolchildren Adyge was widely spoken in conversations with grandparents and parents; whereas within their own peer group over one third of children used Russian exclusively. In the case of rural adults over 90% used Adyge both at home and with friends.

Children experienced considerable difficulties in writing in their native language and showed disinclination to read Adyge. Adult Adyges also preferred to read books in Russian even when the same book was available in Adyge.

Urban Adyges tended to use their native language significantly less in all situations (at home, with friends, shopping, at work, at the doctors') than rural Adyges.

A model is presented which depicts in diagrammatic form the current status of the Adyge language.

* Thanks are due to the three anonymous referees for Gengo Kenkyu, who provided me with invaluable comments useful for improving the present paper.
INTRODUCTION

There have been many studies of language choice and language use among bilingual communities. A number of attempts have been made to establish a common rationale underlying language choice (Romaine 1989). Important social variables have been identified as ethnic background, social class, age, sex and nature of the community (e.g. rural or urban). Language choice is, in part at least, a reflection of the desire to sound like those with whom an individual claims group or status membership (Labov 1981).

However, individuals with apparently different social status do not always differ in their language choice nor is it inevitable that those with the same social status will make the same choice. This behaviour may be explained if it is accepted that the network of informal interactions (social network) of an individual, rather than their social category, is the primary force imposing linguistic norms (Milroy 1980).

In contrast to the very considerable research on language use and language choice in western and various developing countries, work in the Soviet Union on this theme has been very limited in scope. An exception is the work of Ladyzhenskaya (1988), who conducted a study of the use of the Russian language by Lithuanian secondary schoolchildren. She claimed a better knowledge of Russian in the towns than in the villages. She noted that the majority of rural pupils (80%) first learned Russian at school, whereas in the case of urban Lithuanians equal number of pupils learned Russian first from family or from contact with neighbours. Unfortunately, it is difficult to assess the correctness of these conclusions since Ladyzhenskaya provides no information on how her survey was carried out or on the size of the sample investigated.

It should be noted that Lithuania was one of the 15 Union Republics, Lithuanian being its official language. As a conse-
quence, all Lithuanian pupils receive extensive education in their native language. Many TV and radio programmes are also in Lithuanian.

There are many much smaller nationalities in the Soviet Union which possess their own distinctive languages but with less favoured status. The Adyges, who are largely Moslem, are one such minority group. The population of some 100,000 lives among a predominantly Russian population in the north West Caucasus of the Soviet Union. The native language has minority status and as a result education in Adyge is very limited in rural communities and non-existent in urban ones. All official communications are in Russian as are the great majority of TV and radio programmes (broadcasts in Adyge are on average about 2 hours per week). Books and newspapers in Russian are very widely available.

In this time of rapid change in the Soviet Union it is important to assess the language choice and use, both written and spoken, in such minority communities and to establish a base from which to identify the changes that undoubtedly will occur over the next decade.

The primary purpose of this paper is to attempt to provide answers to the following questions:

i. What is the extent of use of Adyge and Russian by Adyges?

ii. Can the use situations of Adyge be characterised?

**SPEECH COMMUNITIES**

The Adyges, unlike other indigenous groups in the Caucasus, are intermingled with Russians. Even the few villages with a predominantly Adyge population are surrounded by Russian settlements. The speech profile is further complicated by the presence of groups who are not of 'pure' Russian origins, such as Cossacks,
Armenians, etc. Russian has been the lingua franca of the area since the middle of the last century.

**SOCIAL NETWORKS**

A key aspect of much of this work has been the use of two social networks: one in the urban suburb of Krasnodar called Yablonovka and the other in the village of Shendjii. No previous published studies of the use of language in terms of social networks in the USSR, let alone in the North West Caucasus, have been identified. Consequently, there is no directly relevant experience to draw on, although there have been many studies involving social networks in other parts of the world (Milroy 1980; Hamers and Blanc 1987).

In the initial phase of this work preliminary observations were conducted to identify the types of social networks which best represented the Adyge situation. It became apparent that rural Adyges social networks differed significantly from those of urban Adyges. Firstly, the rural communities tended to be much smaller and considerably more tightly knit, with rather fewer regular outside contacts, than the urban communities. It was observed that this environment led to closely interwoven individual social networks and provided a strong pressure on rural Adyges to comply with the network norms. Their Moslem-based culture places great value upon family and friendship, with a particular respect for the older generation. Older Adyges have always been guardians of the 'proper' use of the native language among all members of their family.

The main population in towns is Russian and the Adyges are interspersed as numerically insignificant groups in 'foreign' surroundings. Adyge networks in towns were noted to be heterogeneous and looser, and traditional Adyge values found difficulty in competing with the predominantly Russian cultural environment.
Figure 1. Networks used

Rural network (2 primary network members in Shendjii)

Urban network (15 primary network members in Yablonovka)

NOTES  A=Author,  I=Informant,  N1=Primary network members,  F1=Family members of N1. Lines indicate individuals in regular communication.  
NB Only a few family members are shown to simplify the diagram; similarly only 2 of the 15 primary network members are drawn for the urban community.

Yablonovka social network

Krasnodar is the capital of the region and Yablonovka is the main suburb in which the Adyges reside. It fits the above de-
scription of a town (urban) network. The informant whose social network was used (see Figure 1) by the researcher was a bilingual Adyge female store buyer aged 25. She was introduced to the researcher by a close mutual friend, a Russian. The core of the network was fifteen Adyge women in their early twenties who worked as shop assistants in Krasnodar and its suburbs. The assistants enabled contacts to be made with their families and friends. This particular social network had an extra dimension of providing/exchanging goods in short supply to each other. Only after strong rapport had been established were questionnaires employed

*Shendjii social network*

The Adyge village of Shendjii (population approximately 3000) is located not far from Krasnodar. It was first recorded as a settlement in 1860 after Russia’s annexation of the North West Caucasus. The village is now part of a collective farm and, though the majority of its inhabitants are agricultural workers, some of the younger people commute to the city to work either in a textile factory or in a sawmill. As noted above Krasnodar is predominantly monolingual in Russian as indeed are some of the surrounding villages, but Shendjii is populated almost entirely by Adyges. It is fairly easy to travel from Shendjii to Krasnodar. Two principal informants were used. Informant N1 was the head of a large family and a cousin of the principal informant in Yablonovka.

1) The researcher was fortunate in gaining quite quickly, a significant degree of trust from this informant, because the Adyge woman regarded the mutual Russian friend as a model of, on one hand, sophistication and intelligence, on the other hand, integrity and honesty (especially in dealing with authorities). There is also a certain touch of Moslem ethos in this informant’s proclaiming ‘any friend of a valued friend is trusted and assisted in every possible way’. The informant introduced the researcher to her family, her colleagues and to her friends, who tended to be associated with her professional interests.
He was in his early 40's and worked as a farm mechanic having received a college education in Krasnodar. His wife also worked on the farm. They had three children under 12 years old. Informant N₂ was the wife of the head of a second family. She taught at the local school. Her husband was an agricultural engineer who had received his higher education in Krasnodar. They had two children under sixteen. Both families were related in one way or another to nearly half of the village. In both cases most of the members of the social networks were relatives. Both families had children who attended the local school. The second informant and others helped the researcher in establishing links and conducting interviews at this school²).

**METHODOLOGY**

Methods used in this investigation included recording of conversations with Adyges, interviews, use of questionnaires, investigation of library use and observations by the author of the language choice in particular situations.

**Questionnaires**

Questionnaires were used to gain an overview of the situations in which Adyges selected their native language. This part of the work was mainly conducted between 1985 and 1987. Questionnaires had to be used with caution because of the deep suspicions about

---

²) Because most respondents were unfamiliar with working with researchers interested genuinely in their opinions, a major initial element in carrying out this work was to obtain the confidence of those interviewed. Being a Russian, the researcher experienced initial suspicion and to overcome this great use was made of the urban and rural networks described above. These relationships were greatly strengthened by long standing family links between the two Adyges informants and the researcher. In establishing trust it proved also to be a considerable advantage to be a woman in interview situations, with children in particular.
their possible misuse. Consequently, a somewhat abbreviated list of questions had to be used compared with that used typically in the West.

a) For Schoolchildren.

To assess the choice of language for oral communication, reading and writing among schoolchildren, the questionnaire given in Appendix 1 was used. A rural rather than an urban school was selected because preliminary investigations showed that rural schoolchildren had a substantially greater average ability in speaking Adyge than urban children. Two groups of rural school children were investigated, ten year olds and sixteen year olds. Up to the age of ten rural Adyges are taught primarily in Russian but with some lessons in Adyge daily. In contrast in the secondary part of the school, all subjects are taught in Russian although there are some literature classes still in Adyge. The questionnaire was distributed to each class by its teacher. The questionnaire was available in Russian and Adyge. Care was taken to explain that the research was for pedagogical purposes and not for use by the school. The nature of the answers, e.g. showing preference for Adyge for some purposes and Russian for others provides a good indication of the honesty of the answers. Furthermore, six cases were selected for detailed interviews and home visits. For each there was a high degree of consistency with the questionnaire answers.

b) For Adults.

The questionnaire was modified considerably to gauge the language choice and use among Adyge adults in the rural and urban community (see Appendix 2). The reason for this was that the responses to the questionnaire used for the schoolchildren were available. This highlighted the need to obtain information on the choice of Adyge in a much greater range of use situations (i.e. formal—at work, at the doctor; semiformal—shopping; informal—
with friends, at home). It was felt from preliminary interviews that adults were reluctant to admit their inability to read and write in their native language. Consequently, questions on this theme were omitted from the questionnaire and an investigation on library book usage was carried out instead. Consistency in the answers to related questions and with responses in interviews was used as an indicator of their reliability.

**Investigation of library use**

To obtain an indirect measure of the extent to which written Adyge (which like Russian uses Cyrillic script) is easily understood by Adyges, an evaluation was made of book selection in each language. It was considered that the rural population would have the greatest ability and desire to read in Adyge, and consequently the evaluation was made in the only library in Shendjii. Use of the library is free and as the area does not have a bookshop, books read by the population are very likely to have been borrowed from this library. In contrast, in town there are many potential sources of literature available.

The author examined each lending card over two ten-month periods, classifying readers into children and adults and categorising the borrowed books into language of publication, language of origin and type of book.

**Interviews and observations**

Wherever possible, attempts were made to verify opinions by careful observations. For example, claimed ability of schoolchildren in reading Adyge and Russian was verified in a number of cases by a) asking them to read aloud in each language, b) visiting their homes and seeing the books they had available, c) comparing their statements with the views of their teachers and the experiences of the staff of the Pedagogical Institute, Maikop.
Studies were also made of language choice by adults in a wide range of situations both formal (at the doctors' and in the workplace), semi-formal (shopping) and informal (at home or with friends). A tape recorder was used wherever possible during interviews and informal discussions encouraged to aid the above analysis.

RESULTS

a) Questionnaires

1. Schoolchildren (in rural areas)

The data in Table 1 come from the questionnaire (see Appendix 1), given to 33 rural Adyge schoolchildren of both sexes; 22 ten year olds and 11 sixteen year olds. Although Russian and Adyge are started simultaneously in school, there are far fewer classes in Adyge. By the age of sixteen there are only two lessons per week in Adyge. There is also no formal examination in Adyge; a disincentive for Adyge children to learn their native language in an education system that attaches great importance to examinations.

In the case of the sixteen year olds it was notable that all the answers to the questionnaire were in Russian. Just over half of the ten year olds responded in Adyge.

1.1. Choice of language in speaking

These rural schoolchildren invariably used Adyge with their grandparents and in most cases with their parents.

3) The presence of spouses, children and other members of these families often made a conversation more general and less under control than the researcher wished. Also neighbours and friends tended to drop in and contributed to the discussions. Nonetheless these situations provided many excellent opportunities for both recording and observing customs and attitudes.
Table 1. Language choice of Adyge rural schoolchildren in oral communications
(Figures are percentage of total respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Language Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandparents and their generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Ten year olds (N=22)</td>
<td>Adyge only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both languages but Adyge-dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both languages but Russian-dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Sixteen year olds (N=11)</td>
<td>Adyge only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both languages but Adyge-dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both languages but Russian-dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This consistent use of Adyge by all pupils with their grandparents in part reflects the inability of many rural grandparents to speak Russian. However, the use of Adyge is also associated by the children with respect to their elders and keeping up tradition. Needless to say the use of Adyge at home is zealously observed by grandparents in particular.

All children thought it easier to express themselves in Adyge for everyday purposes and reckoned that they used more Adyge than Russian in general (Appendix 1, questions 7 and 9).

Among both 10 year olds and 16 year olds there was an increasing tendency to use Russian as the primary language of com-
munication in the following order: grandparents > parents > siblings or peers at home; peers at school > teachers at school.

Surprisingly, with one exception, no pupil considered that in any situation they communicated predominantly in Russian. From this author's observations all the children used a considerable number of Russian words and expressions in their conversation. Thus, one interpretation of the above response is a failure of the children to recognise the extent to which they use Russian words when speaking Adyge. It was noticeable that the young children of the only Russian family who lived in Shendjii talked Adyge fluently with their neighbours and peers but spoke only Russian at home.

Language choice differs between the two age groups. This is, at first sight, remarkable bearing in mind that there is only a six-year age difference between them. For example, whereas 77% of ten year olds claimed that they spoke to their parents exclusively in Adyge, only 27% of sixteen year olds did. Roughly half the 10 year olds used solely Adyge with their brothers and sisters and with friends at home, while only one 16 year old did so. Also notable is the fact that at school all sixteen year old spoke largely or solely Russian.

What is not acknowledged in this survey is the extent to which Adyge has been borrowing from Russian. This occurs regularly even in colloquial speech on everyday topics (Lalor 1990).

1.2. Choice of language in reading and writing

Questionnaires and interviews were used to establish the ability and preferences of rural Adyge schoolchildren to write and read in Adyge and Russian. The questionnaire analysis is summarised in Table 2. The great majority of the 10 and 16 year olds com-

4) The present author's previous name was Lalor. Thus, Lalor (1990) refers to the author's own work.
pleting the questionnaire appeared to be equally confident in reading books in Russian or Adyge. However, when asked what books they read, twenty of them (11 sixteen year olds and 9 ten year olds) said they preferred Russian books as reading in Russian was easier than reading in Adyge. This is not surprising because the Cyrillic-based alphabet in which Adyge is written is inadequate and very confusing for Adyge schoolchildren (Lalor 1990). When writing to friends, where presumably non-formal language is used, most 10 year olds (80%) preferred to write in Russian with only 20% favouring Adyge. Among 16 years olds no pupils chose to write to friends in Adyge. These figures should be viewed in the context of the choice of language to express thoughts and feelings for which none of the pupils chose Russian.

These data were verified by conducting interviews with six pupils and their parents in their homes. The results of these inter-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Book reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year olds</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 year olds</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Writing to friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year olds</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 year olds</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Expression of thoughts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year olds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 year olds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Language choice of rural schoolchildren in reading and writing (in percentages)

N = 22 for ten year olds, N = 11 for sixteen year olds
views were very compatible with the answers given in the questionnaires.

2. **Adults (in rural and urban areas)**

The use of Adyge by rural and urban adults in various situations was also identified by questionnaire (see Appendix 2). The study involved around one hundred rural and urban Adyges. It was found that while the great majority of Adyges stated that they used their native language at home, almost a half claimed to speak Adyge at work or when shopping, and just over one third spoke Adyge at the doctor’s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average score from 1~5 Rural Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.73  4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.06  3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When shopping</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.23  2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.23  2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the doctor</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.7   2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. Use of Adyge by adults in various situations**

The average score for each question demonstrates a markedly greater use of Adyge by the rural than by the urban community in each situation.

b) **Investigation of Library use**

**Choice of books in two languages**

It can be seen from Table 3 that children in this rural community are more avid readers than adults. This presumably reflects both fewer opportunities for distractions and strong parental pressure on children to enhance their education. However, ap-
proximately 1 in 6 of books borrowed by rural adults are in Adyge, while for children the figure is only 1 in 12. The extensive use of books in Russian by children, in part at least, reflects the considerable compulsory reading list in Russian which school pupils would need to borrow from the library. However, it probably also indicates that:

a) even the rural Adyges generally find reading in Russian considerably easier than reading in Adyge;

b) a wider range of book choice is available in Russian.

Of these two possibilities the nature of the book choice indicates that the former factor is the predominant influence on choice. Thus, nearly half (48%) of the books borrowed by adults from the library were translations into Russian of Adyge writers which were also available in the library in Adyge. It is interesting to note, that the preferred books in Adyge were folk tales (Narts) and poetry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of assessment</th>
<th>Number of books borrowed</th>
<th>Russian books</th>
<th>Adyge books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985 (Jan–Oct)</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986 (Jan–Oct)</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (under 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985 (Jan–Oct)</td>
<td>2374</td>
<td>2277</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986 (Jan–Oct)</td>
<td>3252</td>
<td>3112</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Choice of books in two languages in a rural library

c) Observing the natural language (in rural and urban areas)

Proficiency of the use of Adyge

In addition to the above assessment, the author paid particular attention to observing the choice of language in a number of situations. It was noticeable that in intimate, friendly situations interactions were predominantly in Adyge, though young speakers
among themselves resorted to Russian. Most of the conversations recorded and observed were the ones which Labov has termed 'casual style' (see also Milroy 1980).

On the collective farm in Shendjii the author was told proudly that the farm official reports are always read aloud in Adyge, no matter how many Russians were in the audience. In contrast, in most other official situations, like being taken around a school, a library or the farm headquarters, the author noted that Russian dominated the conversation, though it was possible to hear Adyge too, especially among older employees. The author also observed that Adyge teenagers use Russian much more among themselves than younger children. Comparison of the use of Adyge in Shendjii and Yablonovka indicated that in town there is a less strict observance of traditional roles for the native language, which are defined by the age, sex and position of the speaker in the community5) (Lalor 1990).

The author was informed frequently that in the rural communities adults are continually checking that the Adyge language is used by children. The author heard many scathing jokes by rural inhabitants about urban Adyges' 'bad' pronunciation of the Adyge language. This probably helps to further pride in the spoken language in rural communities.

The author observed that students at the Adyge Pedagogical Institute, from the rural areas, usually talked amongst themselves about everyday matters in Adyge. In contrast, students who lived continually in the town and had Russian as their normal means of socialising, as a rule, also spoke in Adyge on meeting up, though

5) Each household has a large plot of land and typically grows tomatoes to supplement its income by selling them at private markets. The town has strong attractions for young rural Adyges, not so much in terms of money or prestige, but because of the opportunities for entertainment and variety of social contacts.
with a number of Russian words and expressions. However, these students, when preparing for examinations, resorted to Russian. This can, perhaps, be partly explained by the fact that teaching in higher education is conducted in Russian. These observations were confirmed by staff members of the Pedagogical Institute.

Examination of conference programmes contained in the Archives of the Adyge Research Institute showed that in conferences and meetings not only at a republic or provincial level, but also at regional level, participants tended to give their speeches in Russian, although in principle they could have chosen to give them in their native language.

Observations and discussions with informants indicated that urban Adyges stand out in villages because of their lack of command of their native language. There is even a derogatory term "урусункъокъ" - 'a half Russian', to describe them. Problems arise when urban Adyges come to visit their relatives or friends in the villages, for talking Russian means disrespect to elders. A Russian newspaper could be read or a Russian TV programme watched, but a discussion which followed is invariably conducted in Adyge by villagers. Several urban Adyges with whom the researcher discussed the matter said that they found such situations taxing, especially if the topic of conversation was not related to family matters.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

Some general statements have been published previously on the general status of the Caucasian languages vis-à-vis Russian. For example, d'Encausse claims (1979: 169) 'Moslem people and those of the Caucasus, even in cities, hardly ever give up their native languages... neither urbanisation nor sex have any real effect on the situation.' However, the research backing for such views appears to be lacking. It is apparent from the present re-
search that as far as the Adyge Caucasian community is concerned, d’Encausse’s view is a serious overstatement of the actual position.

In evaluating the overall use among children of the spoken Adyge language, it should be borne in mind that this is a rural population where the native language is considered more strongly based than in towns. It is hypothesised that the shift to Russian for urban Adyge children would be even more marked (see situation for adults below). Two results show clearly the very strong dominance of the Russian language in schools, both in formal (i.e. discussions with teachers) and informal settings (i.e. conversations with pupils of similar age during school breaks) and that this dominance increases considerably as the children move towards adulthood. Nonetheless Adyge is still very widely employed in conversations with grandparents (who may not be able to speak Russian) and parents. The reasons that there is a much greater use of Russian among older children appear to be: a) the very strong influence of the education system in which, in the later years of schooling, virtually all communication is in Russian, b) their social network extends increasingly with age to include Russian-speaking friends, c) access to Russian culture is relatively easy for 16 year olds in comparison with the 10 year olds.

It is evident that in spite of an ability to read and think in their native language, rural schoolchildren have considerable difficulties in writing Adyge. This can be attributed to the low level of education they receive in Adyge and to the deficiencies in its alphabet. Because of the absence of Adyge language teaching in urban schools, pupils in towns are likely to have even greater difficulties in reading and writing in Adyge.

In the survey of the use of the spoken language by adults in rural and urban communities, it was found that while over ninety percent of the rural population used Adyge at home and over two thirds used Adyge with friends, less than half spoke Adyge in
more formal situations.

The survey of book choice in the library in Shendjii provides useful supporting evidence that both adults and children prefer reading in Russian to reading in their native language. Again the most likely reasons for this are poorer general education in Adyge and difficulty with the Cyrillic script form.

Bearing in mind that this survey covered both children and adults and was in a rural community in which competence in the written language is likely to be highest and desire to use the language greatest, the overall use of the written form of Adyge must be considered very limited.

Observations by the present author indicated, nonetheless, a very genuine pride in being an Adyge particularly among the rural community. One reflection of this was the number of critical comments and jokes about those making mistakes in Adyge; another was the use by many Adyges of terms of address in a disparaging way.

Following the concept of diglossia proposed by Ferguson (1959), the rural Adyge can be perceived as diglossic. Among urban Adyge this appears to be far less common.

Assessment of the degree of language shift and future prognosis for the language requires a measure of a number of factors, two of the most important being the extent to which (Russian) L2 rather than (Adyge) L1 is favoured in various use situations and the degree of language interference. The findings in this present paper of the status of the spoken and written language among rural Adyge may be presented diagrammatically (see Figure 2).

In this figure the vertical axis indicates various situations in which spoken Adyge may be used, whereas the horizontal axis indicates use of the written form of Adyge. On each axis the dotted line indicates the approximate equal use of Adyge and Russian. The point where the dotted lines cross gives the overall
position for the Adyge language use in the rural community. A similar plot for the urban Adyge community would show an even greater dominance of Russian.

From the research described above and other work by the author, it is clear that the use of the native language for writing is very limited and even for reading Russian texts are generally favoured. Thus, the overall balance of language use is strongly tilted to Russian, though the extents of this shift are different for the written and spoken languages. The prognosis for the written form of the language is very poor. For spoken Adyge the situation is less pessimistic; the future would appear to depend on the maintenance of a close-knit rural community.
Appendix 1. Questions used to identify use of Adyge by schoolchildren

1. Your age.
2. Your parents' native language
3. Your own native language
4. What language/s do you use at home
   a) with your grandparents
   b) with your parents
   c) with your brothers and sisters
   d) with your friends
5. What language/s do you use at school
   a) with your teachers
   b) with your friends
6. When and how did you start learning Russian
   a) at home
   b) at school
   c) with your friends
7. What language do you use most often?
8. What books do you read
   a) Russian books
   b) Adyge books
   c) other books
9. Which language is easier for you
   a) to speak
   b) to write
   c) to read

Appendix 2. Questions used to identify use of Adyge by adults*

1. Sex
2. Age
3. Occupation
4. First Language
5. Proficiency in Adyge
6. Proficiency in Russian
7. Accent in Russian
8. Use of Adyge at home
9. Use of Adyge at work
10. Use of Adyge when shopping
11. Use of Adyge with the doctors'
12. Use of Adyge with friends

*This is part of a much longer questionnaire (Lalor 1990). Participants in the questionnaire were asked to score their answers to the questions 5-12 from 1 to 5 on the ascending scale.
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本論は、ソ連邦内コーカサス北西部のあるイスラム集落におけるロシア語アディゲ（Adyge）語の二言語使用状況に関する調査結果とその考察である。調査は、ネットワーク法を使って行われたアンケート・インタビュー、図書館での図書借出し出し状況の観察などの方法を使い、都会と田舎における差異、年齢差による差異に注目して行った。

調査の結果判かったことは、田舎では子供は祖父母や父母とアディゲ語をよく使い、仲間同志では半以上の子供はロシア語のみを使用、また、大人は90％以上が家庭や友人とアディゲ語を使用していることである。

子供はアディゲ語を書くことに困難を感じ、また読みたいがらず、大人もロシア語とアディゲ語の両語で本がある場合でもロシア語の方が好んで選ぶ傾向がある。

すべての場面において、都会においての方が田舎よりアディゲ語がより少なく使用されている。

最後に現在のアディゲ語の使用状況を示す図を提示した。

（改稿論文受理日 1991年12月24日）