Amanda Greber
Title VIII Southeast European Research Scholar Program Final Report
Macedonia 2009-2010

Proper Language, Proper Citizen:

Standard Practice and Linguistic Identity in Primary Education

My research focuses on the role of primary education in the transmission of language, identity, and culture as part of the nation-building process. Schooling has an enormous influence on the production and reproduction of identities. The school is one of the first and most important places where a community can transmit its values, its culture and its linguistic practices. Textbooks and other educational materials encode cultural, linguistic, and national identity and their relation to collective values. The linguistic practices represented in textbooks depict "good language" and thus index also "good citizen." Textbooks, then, serve as a link between state-level processes and the classroom and as a concrete product of the implementation of state ideology and policy. Therefore, my research is concerned with the ways in which linguistic practice changes when the idea of what (and who) makes a "good citizen" changes – in other words, how schools construct linguistic norms in association with the construction of citizenship.

The issues of language, identity and culture are fraught with tension and emotion in any country. The way in which language is used as a marker of identity and as a vehicle of cultural transmission is vital to understanding many conflicts, notably in the Balkans and post-Soviet countries, but also elsewhere. The break-up of the Serbo-Croatian language has shown the importance of status planning and corpus planning in cultivating linguistic identity. While issues of language and identity have played out less explosively in Macedonia, the relatively recent standardization of Macedonian allows us to trace language shift in education and makes it an ideal candidate for this analysis. The extensive corpus planning of the Soviet Union makes Russia another excellent candidate for this type of study. I have also chosen these areas because of the dramatic changes in ideology and complete restructuring of society experienced in the 20th century. The stark contrast between Marxist ideology and the new capitalist and more individualistic ideology provides a clear distinction in the representation of "good" citizen.

Ethnicity, Nation and Nationalism

Ultimately, such a study must begin with a framework for understanding ethnicity and nationalism. "Ethnicity emerged as a key problem in anthropology with Edmund Leach's (1954)

challenge to the conventional assumption that societies and cultures covary sufficiently that the two terms can be used interchangeably."[1] The debate then shifted to whether ethnic identity derived from primordial attachments, and was thus a stable characteristic of human beings (Geertz 1963, 1973; Isaacs 1975) or derived from instrumental manipulation and was thus malleable (Barth 1964, 1969; Bates 1973). This dichotomy is usually labeled primordialist-instrumentalist, and it continues to influence studies of ethnicity, though some scholars, such as Bentley, feel that it "obscures important aspects of the phenomena under study."[2] As he explains, "differences between the primordialist and instrumentalist approaches reflect fundamentally different assumptions about human action. Instrumentalists view human action as rationally oriented toward practical goals while primordialists view action as value-oriented (see Weber 1978); instrumentalists stress circumstantial manipulation of identities while primordialists point to the emotional power of primordial symbols."[3] Bentley (1987) approaches ethnicity by focusing on the underlying reason for developing feelings of likeness and difference in groups, using Bourdieu's theory of practice. "In order to account for ethnic group formation and mobilization, we must identify dimensions of common experience and habitus that underlie the ability of ethnic leaders to mobilize their followers. In addition, we need to analyze how ethnic appeals implicate conceptions of personal and group identity in order to account for their effectiveness."[4] He also criticizes other scholars (Barth (1964, 1969c), Leach (1954), Lee Drummond (1977, 1980)) for failing "to take account of history in explaining present-day ethnicity."[5]

The debates on ethnicity have heated up again with the post-Cold War surge in ethnic conflicts. Wimmer (2004) discusses several theories for these new conflicts, including the attribution of "the growing political significance of ethnicity to what one may call a "defrosting effect." As the "ice" of authoritarian rule that was preserved through superpower rivalry melts away, "ancient hatred" between ethnic groups (Kaplan 1993) is being revived and fueled by incompatible claims to rational self-determination and political sovereignty (Callahan 1998)."[6] Others, such as Beck 1997, postulate a "universal desire for cultural rootedness, accentuated

---

[1] Bentley, p. 24
[2] ibid.
[3] ibid., p. 24-25
[4] ibid., p. 47
[5] ibid., p.49
[6] Wimmer, p. 3

under current conditions of globalization and rapid social change. Globalization makes people search for a secure homestead and produces an aggressive nationalism that threatens existing states where national and political boundaries do not coincide."[7] In Wimmer, et al. (2004), we see a return to the primordial-essentialist views: Walker Connor argues that "ethnicity is a matter of deeply rooted identity and culture and therefore represents a perennial issue of political life, while Rogers Brubaker maintains that ethnicity represents only one among many possible schemes of interpretation available to actors on the ground – not a naturally given basis of political solidarity and conflict."[8]

Ethnicity comes into play in any classical work on nationalism as one of the two ideal types: ethnic and civic nationalism. In ethnic nationalism, the ties of solidarity and loyalty are based on cultural affinity or "primordial ties," whereas civic nationalism is characterized by instrumental interpersonal bonds and a nation bound by political boundaries. Scholarship on ethnic nationalism has turned towards a social constructivist view of ethnic identity. This view, that what constitutes a community (or a nation) is not fixed and can be shaped, though not infinitely or easily, is best represented by the work of Benedict Anderson and Eric Hobsbawm. These scholars also provide us with a theory of ethnic nationalism linked to linguistic nationalism. Hobsbawm (1990) in particular dissects European nationalism as developing according to an ideology in which language, nation, and state are intimately and inseparably linked. Here we should also clarify that the term 'nation,' is not synonymous with state, though, unfortunately, it is often used in this manner. The nation refers to a community, or a group of people who are tied to one another in some way – either through an ethnic bond or a civic bond.

Macedonian nationalism leans towards an ethnic-linguistic nationalism, in which a common language is linked to a nation, which in turn is linked to a nation-state.[9] Lunt and Friedman have demonstrated that the Macedonian national and linguistic identities developed simultaneously and were intertwined. Language became a marker of Macedonian identity, "establishing them as a separate people and… acknowledging the legitimacy of Macedonian nationality."[10] While a civic nationalism existed under and was tied to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Republic of Macedonia has not created a sense of civic nationalism.

---

[7] ibid.
[8] ibid., p. 14
[9] See Friedman 1986, 1999, 2000, 2003.
[10] Naylor, in Bugarski and Hawkesworth 1992, p. 82

Russia, on the other hand, practices a civic nationalism, in which the state is the unifying feature.[11] In imperial Russia, "'the building of an empire impeded the formation of a nation'. Ethnic Russians were encouraged to identify with the Russian empire as a whole, rather than develop a national solidarity amongst themselves."[12] This continued in the USSR, when Russians identified more with the Union than the RSFSR, and in the Russian Federation, where both Yeltsin and Putin "advocated a civic and non-ethnic definition of Russian nationhood, embracing all the citizens of the Russian Federation."[13]

Language Planning

When we think of language planning, the first thought is of language standardization. It is best to consider language standardization as a process rather than an achievement. In fact, as Milroy and Milroy (1985) are right to point out, absolute standardization of a language is never fully achieved, as language is constantly changing. The standard language exists "as an idea in the mind rather than a reality" and it is therefore more appropriate to consider standardization as an ideology.[14] The ideology of a standard language is often seen as a given – the fights over so-called Ebonics show how much we in North America take for granted the ideology of language standard, standard linguistic practice, and how rigid we can be with regards to language variation in our schools. These and other public debates over language – ever-present even in the most stable times – reveal that language is not just a means of communication but marker of identity. Indeed, it seems to have a "special ability to serve as an object for debating broader issues of identity and state building,"[15] or, to use Cooper's *bon mot*, "to plan language is to plan society."[16]

There is a growing body of research on the processes and methods of language planning which includes a multiplicity of definitions of language planning.[17] Haugen 1959 defined language planning as "the activity of preparing a normative orthography, grammar and

---

[11] It is worth noting that the Russian language has separate designations for an ethnic Russian (*russkij*) and a citizen of the Russian Federation (*rossijanin*) who may be of any nationality.
[12] Duncan, p. 283
[13] ibid., p. 283-4.
[14] Milroy and Milroy, p. 23.
[15] Gorham, p. 4
[16] Cooper, p. 182
[17] See Fishman, Haugen, Milroy & Milroy, Rubin & Jernudd, Rubin et al, Woods, inter alia; see also Cooper p. 30-31 for an excellent summary of some of the most prominent definitions.

dictionary for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogeneous speech community."[18] He later came to view these activities as outcomes of language planning and in 1969 defined language planning to include "the normative work of language academies and committees, … and all proposals for language reform or standardization."[19] According to Rubin and Jernudd 1971, "language planning is *deliberate* language change; that is, changes in the systems of language code or speaking or both that are planned by organizations that are established for such purposes or given a mandate to fulfill such purposes. As such, language planning is focused on problem-solving and is characterized by the formulation and evaluation of alternatives for solving language problems to find the best (or optimal, most efficient) decision," while Fishman 1974 says simply "the term *language planning* refers to the organized pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at the national level."[20]

Language planning is most often divided into the sub-categories of corpus planning and status planning. Status planning refers to the allocation of languages or language varieties to given functions (e.g., official language, medium of instruction, language of mass communication, etc.). Corpus planning refers to the planning within a language. It includes the coining of new terms, reforming spelling, or adopting a new script; more broadly, it includes language cultivation, reform, and standardization. To these two, Cooper adds a third sub-category – that of acquisition planning. Acquisition planning is directed towards means and methods of teaching the language and increasing the number of users. As Cooper explains, "status planning is an effort to regulate the demand for given verbal resources whereas acquisition planning is an effort to regulate the distribution of those resources."[21] The means of acquisition planning include those designed to create or improve the opportunity to learn (such as school instruction, creation of media in the language), those which create or improve the incentive to learn (including status planning decisions), and those that do both.

Prator joins Cooper as one of the few scholars who regard language teaching as an object of language planning:

"Language policy is the body of decisions made by interested authorities

concerning the desirable form and use of languages by a speech group. It also

---

[18] quoted in Cooper, p. 8
[19] ibid., p. 29-30
[20] ibid., p 30
[21] ibid., 120

involves consequent decisions made by educators, media directors, etc., regarding
the possible implementation of prior basic decisions. According to this definition,
the decision to emphasize in a language class specific skills or linguistic forms –
even the choice of a textbook – could become a part of language policy. The latter
should thus be one of the primary concerns of language teachers. The entire
process of formulating and implementing language policy is best regarded as a
spiral process, beginning at the highest level of authority and, ideally, descending
in widening circles through the ranks of practitioners who can support or resist
putting their policy into effect."[22]

Of course, language planning is spurred by nonlinguistic factors and is directed toward
nonlinguistic ends: national integration, mobilization of national movements, political control,
creation or maintenance of elites, etc. In the 19th century, industrialization, the spread of literacy
and the rise of nationalist movements combined to form national standard languages in Europe.
In the wake of the French revolution, the bourgeoisie used language planning to deny the sans-
culottes access to resources. Through the use of corpus planning, the new elites were able to
exclude the sans-culottes and legitimate and maintain inequality.[23] "That language planning
should serve so many covert goals is not surprising. Language is the fundamental institution of
society, not only because it is the first institution experienced by the individual but also because
all other institutions are built upon its regulatory patterns (Berger and Berger 1976)."[24] Gorham
recognizes this as well: "Discussions about the representations of language, therefore –
particularly in times of radical social and political change – frequently reflect broader attempts to
articulate visions of state authority and national identity."[25]

Controversies over language planning have played out explosively in the Balkans and can
be studied as a model for smaller scale language fights elsewhere in the world. Victor
Friedman's work on language in the Balkans (1999, 2003) has shown that language is used as a
flag (a phrase originally coined by Kenneth Naylor), essentially conflating linguistic and national
identities. Robert Greenberg's *Language and Identity in the Balkans* (2004) has shown how
linguistic identities can be formed and language practice changed to reflect national identity.

---

[22] quoted in Cooper: 160
[23] Higonnet 1980
[24] Cooper, p. 182
[25] Gorham, p. 6

Language planners in these countries are making every effort to reduce mutual intelligibility among the successor languages of Serbo-Croatian, and citizens are actively changing their speech patterns to reflect the new Croatian, Bosnian and Serbian standards. Because Macedonia is an area of dialect transition between Serbian and Bulgarian, the standard language carried heavy ideological weight, and corpus planning was especially important.

In the Socialist Federal Republic of Macedonia, status planning targets were clear: after the 1944 declaration, Macedonian was to be the official language. Cooper makes three distinctions under the official status – statutory, working and symbolic. Macedonian's status as a statutory language was codified in the constitution. It also fulfills the symbolic designation, being used by the government as a symbol of the state. As most government officials had been educated in another language, usually Serbo-Croatian (during the Kingdom of Yugoslavia) but also Bulgarian, the status planning target of using the new standard in day to day government activities and as the working language would take time. Officials could now replace the lingua franca of Serbo-Croatian with Macedonian, but the new prescriptive standard would likely not match their native local dialect. Even 60 years after standardization, the usage of standard Macedonian has not spread as far as some would like. Professor Olivera Jašar-Nasteva has publicly inveighed against the use of non-standard speech by ethnic Macedonians in the parliament (Christina Kramer, p.c.).

Another status planning target of interest is that of educational medium. "Determining media of instruction for school systems is perhaps the status planning decision most frequently made, the one most commonly subject to strong political pressures," according to Cooper.[26] Before 1945, educators were often forced to sneak Macedonian textbooks into the classroom to challenge the hegemony of Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian education. This was the first time Macedonian had an official status as medium of instruction, and all new textbooks had to be prepared in the newly codified standard.

In the USSR, communist ideology dictated that all languages were equal and accordingly, there was no official state language, in the statutory sense. There was also no particular symbolism attached to the Russian language *qua* language. Russian was an official language, however, under Cooper's working language definition. What is more important, in the case of Russian, was the Bolshevik's corpus planning. Along with the new Communist ideology came a

---

[26] p. 109

way of speaking and writing that was just as new for most citizens. The array of neologisms, acronyms, stump compounds, foreign borrowings, and new stylistic discourse was astounding. The process of legitimation was trying for the party officials, since, rather than adopting the new way of speaking, "peasant and working class citizens in particular expressed frustration, alienation and mistrust toward the 'language of authority.'"[27] Gorham describes the competing, overlapping and evolving models of language that developed in the early years of state building, also discussing "underlying implications of their characteristic notions of authority and identity."[28] The educational establishment incorporated the new Bolshevik language into its textbooks very early on. "The question of how a student was to speak and write became integrally linked to the more general task of shaping young Soviet citizens."[29]

Textbooks and Identity Formation

There have been numerous studies on the importance of education, and particularly textbooks, in identity formation. Wojtas (2003), for example, examines the role of schools in Polish nation-building. She interprets representations of Polishness disseminated by schools "as a form of a narrative that embraced the goal of "retrospective mythology" and allowed the nation-builders to mold the collective memory of the citizenry."[30] Lee uses discourse analysis to examine how Taiwanese identity was constructed in seventh grade Chinese textbooks and how these textbooks reflected the historical and sociopolitical contexts of Taiwan from the 1970s to 2004. These studies and others like them draw upon the notion that students generally accept textbooks content as "objective, encyclopedic-nature, impersonal" and socially legitimate knowledge.[31] The influence of textbooks or use of textbooks as a tool becomes even more important in socialist and transitioning societies where the state controls education and the curriculum. In The USSR and Yugoslavia, there was only one state-issued textbook for each subject and year. This allowed the governing authorities to shape identity by controlling what to include and exclude from the curriculum. In addition, there was often no alternative source available, and no public debate about the factuality of the information presented, making it all the more likely that the student would accept what was presented in the textbook.

---

[27] Gorham, p. 16
[28] ibid.
[29] ibid.
[30] Wojatas, p. 1
[31] Soysal and Schissler 2004, p. 1; see also Brophy and Sledright 1997, Olson 1989

A majority of studies on education in former communist societies focus on the policy level.[32] There have also been a number of studies on Yugoslavia and the former Yugoslav states, in particular Bosnia, Serbia and Croatia, which explore ethnic identity and the representation of the other in textbooks, particularly history textbooks.[33] Many of these studies of education in the once and former Yugoslavia focus on Serbian and Croatian conceptualization of the other and nationalism, often with the intention of explaining the upsurge in nationalism and violence and ethnic hatred . Baranović explains the particular focus on history and social studies textbooks thus:

> "Since it is precisely in these subject areas that the state (politics) attempts to convey to the young what the "desired" social and political values are, it is here where the school systems of three communities differ from each other most. In their efforts to promote a desired ethnic identity and national awareness, the so-called group of national subjects became critical. History, literature and geography acquired a significant political importance and were subjected to significant changes. This especially applies to the history curriculum, which now must reinforce the notion that one's specific ethnic group has a long history and a claim to sovereignty over a certain geographic area. Therefore, history itself becomes an essential constituent of ethnic identity. For this very reason, it acquires a special importance when the development or redefinition of nations or ethnic groups takes place."[34]

 Baranović looks closely at various history textbooks in use in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the late 1990s, finding that each of the three ethnicities (Bosnian, Serbia, and Croatian) uses their own, ethnically oriented textbooks, a situation which came about through educational policy, in which each community creates its own textbooks. This contributes "more to the creation of a closed, ethnocentric identity than to an identity open to diversity … [and] serve[s] more as a disintegrative than integrative factor in the post-war reconstruction period."[35]

---

[32] See Beredy, et al., Holmes 1991, and Kirschenbaum 2001 on Russia; Rodden 2002 on East Germany; Soljaga 1998 on Yugoslavia; Eriksen, et al., 1991; *inter alia*.
[33] See Jelavic 1990, Höpken 1996, Pavasovic 2006, Plut et al., 1994, Baranović 2001, *inter alia*.
[34] Baranović, p. 16
[35] Baranović, p. 13

In the volume *Warfare, Patriotism, Patriarchy*, Plut, Rosandić, Pešić, and Stojanović explore various aspects of identity and ethnicity representations through narratives of war in elementary and secondary school textbooks. Plut explores the "rules" of society that are implicit in the elementary school textbooks. Her concern is those messages which the community intended to confer, hence those which the community considered important. Rosandić discusses the forms and changing definitions of patriotism expressed in textbooks from the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and the SFRJ, and Pešić discusses messages of war and peace in elementary school textbooks.

Höpken examines history textbooks from all the Yugoslav republics from the 1970s through dissolution in the 1990s, evaluating how much of the text was devoted to national history vs. Yugoslav history, and also how the history was portrayed. He concludes, as does Baranovic, that history is not presented as open, and also that, in the texts, "historical identity is not based on discourse, but on ready solutions." In his analysis, the textbooks' "main intention obviously is not to develop a "civic identity," … but to supply political elites with legitimacy and preparing students for the elites' current politics." [36] This analysis has been confirmed by others as well (Dimić and Olimpić, Plut, Ronsandić, Pavasović). Pavasović studies the same time period as Höpken, but focuses only on Serbia so as to more systematically plot changes in the textbooks over time. She finds the sharpest change after 1988, when the socialist, "brotherhood and unity" messages were replaced by sharp nationalistic themes. She also finds that the ethno-nationalism increases beginning in 1982, and precedes political changes, such as the rise of Milosević and the dissolution of Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, it is not only the textbooks themselves which have an ideological slant. Some of the scholarship on textbooks, particularly on Macedonia, is marred by the scholars' own ideologies of ethnicity and nationalism (in particular work by Vouri on Macedonian and Bulgarian textbooks, as well as Kofos on Macedonia).[37]

Studies of textbooks vary in their methods of analysis. Approaches vary from entirely quantitative methods, typically coding positive or negative messages or associations (e.g. Rosandić, Vouri, Pešić), to entirely qualitative, where the scholar chooses the most relevant textbook passages for the point at hand (e.g. Dimić and Olimpić 1996, in *Öl ins Feuer*), and

---

[36] Höpken, p. 119-20
[37] See Vouri 1996, in *Öl ins Feuer*; Evagelos Kofos, 1994. "The Vision of the Great Macedonia," Observations in the New Textbooks of Skopje. Museum of the Macedonian Struggle: Thessaloniki.

various combinations of the two approaches. For example, Plut conducts a content analysis of the text according to a specific model: a unit of analysis is the *message* of the textbook – the text itself she counts instances of a particular message, groups them according to "area," then divides areas into points and ranks points according to frequency. She takes these points and considers them to be "rules" for the pupil. Unfortunately, the multiplicity of approaches makes it difficult to build upon previous research in a systematic way. I follow Pavasovic 2006 and Baranović 2001 in employing a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. Pavasović first examines the texts and determines key themes and ideologically loaded phrases. She then counts the number of times each appears in a particular book and codes these to compare the frequency of terms across the timeline.

A New Approach

What is missing in the above-mentioned research on textbooks is a focus on the language itself, in addition to the messages conveyed. There have also been few studies of this kind on the other former Yugoslav republics, Slovenia, Macedonia and Montenegro.[38]   I aim to remedy this gap in the literature with a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the language and images used in primary education materials in Macedonia immediately after World War II and during the early years of independence in the 1990s. As a comparison, I will look at Russia just after the revolution of 1917 and after the fall of the Soviet Union. A comparative approach will allow for some ways of teasing out the relationship between universalizing socialist ideologies, broad globalizing capitalist and more regional nationalist ones.

The messages of "good" citizen are explicit in books from the earlier periods, both in written texts and visual representations. In a Macedonian adult literacy textbook from 1946, the pupil is encouraged to continue reading with this post-script: "We are all obliged to expand our knowledge. He who reads more will do his work better and thus will be more useful to his people." In modern Macedonian and Russian textbooks, we must look deeper to find the encoded messages of identity, society and nationalism, not only because of the ideological premise of an accepted literary standard but also owing to images of an idyllic child's world. In addition, new textbooks in Macedonia have adopted Western ideologies of childhood in

---

[38] The lack of scholarship on Montenegro can be explained by the lack of an official designation of Montenegrin as a nationality (*narod*) in Yugoslavia, and its later move toward independence. I suspect that many studies on Montenegro (and Montenegrin language) will soon be added alongside the other successors to Serbo-Croatian linguistic identity.

education, in which the child inhabits a liminal space, relatively free from responsibility, and not a "small comrade," as Lisa Kirschenbaum refers to the child in Soviet ideology. Kirschenbaum's study of Soviet preschools and John Rodden's on East German education before and after reunification shed remarkable light on the top-down process of reshaping of the structure of education based on ideology. I plan to show how this is achieved at the textbook level through the specific use of ideologically loaded linguistic forms, language practices, and illustrations. I will also investigate how educators wrote the values of the new society into textbooks whose primary aim was to teach basic skills, impart civic values and model civic behavior, and how this process differed in the socialist and post-socialist periods. Nadežda Konstantinovna Krupskaja, the first Deputy Commissar of Education, originally insisted that schools should transmit political propaganda.[39] However, in the early Soviet years, "Narkompros avoided dictating the specifics of education… Rather, it prepared general, non-obligatory guidelines with scant concern for content…. History classes acquainted pupils not with facts but with "the spirit of each epoch"; the study of language centered around classroom use of the local dialect."[40]

The ideal citizen is clearly delineated in the aforementioned adult literacy educational booklet produced in Skopje in 1946, at the inception of Macedonian standardization – *Bukvar za vozrasni*, "A Reader for Adults." The primary aim of this booklet was to teach literacy; its secondary aim was to teach culture and values, and it did so largely through various linguistic choices and illustrations of Socialist labor and Yugoslav multiculturalism. For instance, the use of colloquial variants, including Turkisms, whenever possible and presenting a relatively unvarying prescriptive standard in the first section of the book implicitly underscored the ideas of universal access and right to education and the ideology of standard language. The use of specific linguistic forms (and the omission of others) re-imagined the boundaries of the language community and aimed to produce a certain kind of speaker by legitimizing only one way of speaking. The selection of texts provides a glimpse at the values which were the secondary educational focus. These texts emphasized work and industrialization – values of the socialist Yugoslavian regime of the time – and the values of the Brotherhood and Unity policy, and contained nationalistic themes as well. For instance, one of the texts in the reader was a brief biography of the saints Cyril and Methodius, brothers who not only developed a writing system

---

[39] Holmes, p. 5
[40] ibid., p. 9-10

for the Slavic dialects, but who are revered in the Orthodox world for bringing Christianity to the Slavs by translating the Bible into their Thessaloniki dialect. The text here, in keeping with the socialist taboo on religion, downplayed the brothers' role as missionaries and honored them for their role in uniting all Slavic peoples through language – essentially through a standard written language. Accompanying images were equally carefully selected, featuring scenes from traditional agrarian life, industrialization, and cooperation among ethnicities.

For Macedonia, I will examine textbooks from 1945 through 1955, the years of the implementation of the standard language and the first years of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. I am particularly interested in tracking changes after 1948, when there were changes made in the standard language (e.g., verbs ending in –ue changed to –uva) and when Tito broke with Stalin, which both reflected and led to changes in the Yugoslavian socialist ideology. Finally, I will collect textbooks from the period of the decline and dissolution of Yugoslavia and creation of an independent Macedonian state, from 1985 through 1995. As a control, I analyze textbooks from the late 60s and early 70s as well.

For Russian, I will take primary education textbooks from Russia from 1918 until the mid-nineteen twenties, during the earliest period of state-building. The second period in question is the post-Soviet one and I will be looking at textbooks from the Gorbachev era to roughly 2000, so as to trace any changes immediately preceding the fall of the Soviet Union. I am looking at these periods in which social change is most drastic in order to measure the discursive shift which occurs alongside cultural shift. In order to measure if discursive shift is indeed greater during greater social shift, I will also take textbooks from the 1960s, a time of relative calm.

My analysis will combine qualitative and quantitative methods. I will first analyze patterns of language usage in the textbooks from a sociolinguistic point of view and carefully consider what, if anything, these patterns indexed. Here I will also rely on scholarship on Soviet images and ideology to classify the accompanying visuals. Then I will analyze the content of the textbooks with respect to notions of identity, citizenship, nationalism, culture, etc. I intend to parse out what values are attached to these notions (e.g. what constitutes "good" or "bad" culture, what it means to be a "good" citizen, what it means to be Macedonian). My quantitative analysis will include cataloguing frequency of certain terms and themes; I will also tag and catalog texts for certain linguistic features, e.g., *-uva* vs. *-ue* verbal suffixes; the use of

prepositions *v, vo* and *na*; dropping vs. non-dropping of intervocalic -*v*-; lexical items as archaic, ideological, dialectical, etc. I will do the same for images. This will allow me to quantify particular qualities for each text and thus show and quantify movement.

I also look at policy documents and archives of those who were integral in preparing curricula at these times such as Krupskaja, Lenin's wife and the Deputy People's Commissar of Education and Enlightenment, and Anatolij Vasil'evič Lunačarskij, the Commissar for Education and Enlightenment until 1929. I analyze not only what the educators and policy makers said about curricula, but also how they said it – how their language use coincided with the official standard, and in what ways it differed.

Research Conducted

When I arrived in Skopje, Macedonia on my grant from American Councils, Velika at the local office put me in touch with Dimitar Poposki, information manager at the Faculty of Philology "Blaze Koneski" at the University of Ss. Kiril and Methodius. Dimitar helped me to get in touch with the Institute of Macedonian Language, where I spoke with the Director, Liljana Makarijoska, and the National and University Library (NUB). The majority of my time has been dedicated to searching NUB's collection of textbooks and copying any relevant finds. I collected approximately 70 textbooks for grades 1-4 from the period of 1945 to 1955, focusing on textbooks for Macedonian language and literature, history, civics, geography and earth science – fields which contain a narrative and representation of nation and citizen. I found a similar number of textbooks from the early 1990s. NUB's collection of elementary textbooks is far from complete, however, and there are many more books I would like to find. To that end, I contacted the educational publishing house *Prosvetno Delo* to inquire about seeing their archives. Unfortunately, I have not been granted access yet. I will remain in Macedonia until September 2010, and will continue working diligently to fill in the gaps of my textbook collection, which will allow me to closely track the minute yearly changes in the language and messages represented in the books. In some cases, there may be only one word changed in a passage, which is then changed back to its original form in the next edition. Having a full series is thus very important to my research.

Since my arrival, I also spoke with a number of Macedonian scholars about my research. While there are many scholars here who are engaged in the study of Macedonian language and linguistics, and language in education, there is no one who is conducting similar research. Most

telling is an issue of the journal *Literaturen Zbor* dedicated entirely to language in primary school textbooks. The essays are, for the most part, devoted to prescriptivism: analyzing deviation from the standard language, advising ways to better educate students in "correct" usage and stamp out "incorrect" Macedonian, or discussing fluctuations in the norm for scientific jargon. Director Liljana Makarijoska has offered to publish an article about my research in the Institute of Macedonian Language's journal; my goal is to help open up Macedonian scholarship to a new approach to language in education.

Contributions

My work is at the intersection of linguistic and cultural knowledge. While there have been numerous studies on nationalism and ideology, and others on ideology and language planning, I am combining these two areas, examining how these interrelated ideologies function in practice. Another gap in the scholarship this study fills is that of the *process* of linguistic and ethnic/national identity formation. That school textbooks have an impact on childhood socialization and ethnic identity has been confirmed by study after study. What is lacking, especially in the areas of post-communist Europe, is a sense of how identity is (re)constructed and what role education plays in this process. Ultimately, I hope to shed light on discursive shifts in societies transitional to and from communism and the role of education in nation-building at the ground level, not the policy level. However, this study does not intend to determine the *effectiveness* of the textbooks in inculcating the ideals. Indeed, the early Soviet curriculum was widely rejected and ignored by Russian teachers, parents and local authorities.[41] My concern is only the intended messages, which reflect on the values of the society.

Language and education are basic to understanding cultural shift. Often, changes in the direction of a nation and the conceptualization of national identity appear in other realms, such as education, before they make political headway. Pavasovic (2006) shows that increased ethnic nationalism in Serbia appeared in textbooks *before* Milosevic's rise to power, and not as a result of this. By understanding the cultural and linguistic identities and practices, as well as civic values, that are represented and transmitted in primary education, we can better predict the future direction of a nation. A better understanding of a nation's core values and aspirations for the future as reflected in its educational focus at the primary level would be valuable for other nations which seek to establish a productive working relationship.

---

[41] Holmes 1991

The contribution of my research is methodological, as well. The tagging of certain grammatical forms introduces quantitative analysis to enable us to categorize a text as more or less standard language. This quantitative data will be used in conjunction with the broader qualitative questions. The research model that I am developing for this project can be applied to other regions where there has been significant linguistic and social shift. This could include the former Soviet states and beyond. It can be used to analyze other regions in conflict, for example the other former republics of Yugoslavia and the Caucasus, to quantify and evaluate the shifts that occurred in identity formation and to investigate how they encode each other in textbooks.

References

Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.

Baranović, Branislava. 2001. "History Textbooks in Post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina." *Intercultural Education,* 12 (1): 13-26.

Barth, Fredrik. 1964. "Competition and Symbiosis in North East Baluchistan." *Folk,* 6:1, 15-22.

----. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries.* Boston: Little, Brown.

Beck, Ulrich. 1997. *Was ist Globalisierung?* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Bentley, G. Carter. 1987. "Ethnicity and Practice." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 29 (1): 24-55.

Bereday, George Z. F., William W. Brickman, Gerald H. Read, eds. 1960. *The Changing Soviet School: The Comparative Education Society Field Study in the U.S.S.R.* Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press.

Berger, Peter L. and Brigitte Berger. 1976. *Sociology: a biographical approach*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, Ltd.

Brown, Keith. 2003. *The Past in Question: Modern Macedonia and the Uncertainties of Nation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1970. *La reproduction*. Paris: Minuit.

Bugarski, Ranko and Celia Hawkesworth, eds. 1992. *Language Planning in Yugoslavia*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc.

Callahan, David. 1998. *Unwinnable Wars: American Power and Ethnic Conflict*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Cooper, Robert L. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drummond, Lee. 1977. "Structure and Process in the Interpretation of a South American Myth: The Arawak Dog Spirit People." *American Anthropologist,* 79:4, 842- 68.

----. 1980. "The Cultural Continuum: A Theory of Intersystems." *Man* (n.s.), 15:2, 352-74.

Duncan, Peter J.S. 2005. "Contemporary Russian Identity Between East and West." *The Historical Journal*, 48 (1): 277–294

Eriksen, Knut Einar, Andreas M. Kazamias, J. J. Tomiak, et al., eds. 1991. *Schooling, Educational Policy and Ethnic Identity: Comparative Studies on Governments and Non-Dominant Ethnic Groups in Europe, 1850-1940,* vol. 1. New York: New York University Press.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1985. *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity*. New York: Mouton.

----. 1997. *In Praise of the Beloved Language: A Comparative View of Positive Ethnolinguistic Consciousness*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

----. 2006. *Do Not Leave Your Language Alone: The Hidden Status Agendas within Corpus Planning in Language Policy*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.

Fishman, Joshua A, ed. 1999. *Handbook of Language & Ethnic Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Friedman, Victor. 1986. "Linguistics, Nationalism, and Literary Languages: A Balkan Perspective," *The Real World Linguist: Linguistic Applications in the 1980's,* ed. by Victor Raskin and Peter Bjarkman. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 287-305.

----. 1999. "Linguistic Emblems and Emblematic Languages: On Language as Flag in the Balkans." In: *Kenneth E. Naylor Memorial Lecture Series in South Slavic Linguistics*, No. 1. Columbus: Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures, The Ohio State University.

----. 2000. "The Emergence of the Modern Macedonian Standard Language and its Relation to Modern Macedonian Identity." In: *The Macedonian Question: Culture, Historiography, Politics*, ed. by Victor Roudometoff. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 173-206.

----. 2003. "Language in Macedonia as an Identity Construction Site." In: *When Languages Collide: Sociocultural and Geopolitical Implications Of Language Conflict and Language Coexistence*, ed. by Brian Joseph, et al. Columbus: Ohio State University, 257-295.

Geertz, Clifford. 1963. "The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States." In: *Old Societies and New States: The Quest for Modernity in Asia and Africa*, ed. Clifford Geertz. New York: The Free Press, 105-157.

----. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Gorham, Michael S. 2003. *Speaking in Soviet Tongues: Language Culture and the Politics of Voice in Revolutionary Russia*. Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

Haugen, Einar 1968(1959). "Language Planning in Modern Norway." In: Fishman, Joshua A., ed. *Readings in the Sociology of Languages*. Paris: Mouton de Gruyter, 673-687.

Higonnet, P. 1980. "The politics of Linguistic Terrorism and Grammatical Hegemony during the French Revolution." *Social Theory* 5: 41-69.

Hobsbawm, E. J. 1992. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2nd ed.

Holmes, Larry E. 1991. *The Kremlin and the Schoolhouse: Reforming Education in Soviet Russia, 1917-1931*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Höpken, Wolfgang, ed. 1996. *Öl ins Feuer? Schulbücher, ethnische Stereotypen und Gewalt in Südosteuropa*. Hannover: Verlag Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

Isaacs, Harold P. 1975, *Idols of the Tribe: Group Identity and Political Change.* New York: Harper and Row.

Jelavich, Charles. 1990. *South Slav Nationalisms – Textbooks and Yugoslav Union before 1914.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Kaplan, Robert. 1993. *Balkan Ghosts: A Journey through History*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kirschenbaum, Lisa A. 2001. *Small Comrades: Revolutionizing Childhood in Soviet Russia, 1917-1932*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Leach, Edmund. 1954. *Political Systems of Highland Burma.* London: G. Bell and Sons.

Lee, Sheue-Jen Ou. Taiwanese identity construction: A discourse analysis of Chinese textbooks from the 1970s to 2004. Ph.D. diss., Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Milroy, James and Lesley Milroy. 1985. *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardization*. London: Routledge.

Pavasovic, Tamara. "Reconstructing Ethnic Identity in Post-Communist Serbia: Ethno-Nationalist Socialiation through Textbooks (1974-2002)." Presented at the 11th Annual World Convention of the Association for the Study of Nationalities, New York, March 2006.

Rodden, John. 2002. *Repainting the Little Red Schoolhouse: A History of Eastern German Education, 1945-1995.* Oxford University Press.

Rubin, Joan and Björn H. Jernudd, eds. 1971. *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Rubin, Joan, et al., eds. 1977. *Language Planning Processes*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Soljaga, Dorothy Darinka. 1998. Education and Nationalism in the Former Yugoslavia: A Policy Analysis of Educational Reform from 1974-1991. Ph.D. diss., The Ohio State University.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2004. "Introduction." In A. Wimmer, et al, eds., *Facing Ethnic Conflicts: Toward a New Realism.* Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1-22.

Wimmer, Andreas, et al, eds., *Facing Ethnic Conflicts: Toward a New Realism.* Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Wojtas, Dorota. 2003. Learning to Become Polish: Education, National Identity and Citizenship in Interwar Poland, 1918-1939. Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University.

Woods, Douglas J., ed. 1985. *Language Standards and their Codification: Process and Application.* Exeter Linguistic Studies 9. University of Exeter.