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Abstract

This paper presents the results of sociolinguistic research conducted in March and April 1998 among the 4,000 Udi people living in the village of Nic in north-central Azerbaijan. The goals of the research were to investigate patterns of language use, bilingualism, and language attitudes with regard to the Udi, Russian, and Azerbaijani languages in the Udi community. Of particular interest are the differences between self-perception of proficiency in Russian and the results of testing and the apparent vitality of the language in spite of recent out-migration. Interviews, observations, questionnaires, and a Russian Sentence Repetition Test were employed.∗

1. Background

The Udi language is a member of the Lezgi family of North Caucasian languages (Grimes 1996). According to the 1989 Soviet census,1 there were 7,971 ethnic Udis living in the Soviet Union. Traditionally, the Udi people lived in the villages of Oğuz (formerly Vartaşen) and Nic in the Qəbələ District of north-central Azerbaijan.2 The Udi spoken in these two villages is sufficiently different to be considered distinct dialects (Schulze-Fürhoff 1994:449).

While the traditional home for the Udi is the villages of Oğuz and Nic, the Udi people are quite widely dispersed. Wegge (1996:75) reports that while 4,300 Udis still live in Nic, only 35 Udi families still live in Oğuz. If these figures are accurate, more than 3,000 Udis live outside of the traditional homeland. Many Udis from Oğuz have evidently moved to the village of Oktomberi (formerly Zinobiani) in the Quareli district of western Georgia. This village was established between 1919 and 1922 by a group from Oğuz. While Schulze-Fürhoff (1994:449) reports that the Udi of Oktomberi have maintained the Oğuz dialect, Wegge (1996) indicates it is uncertain to what extent they have been incorporated into the surrounding Georgian community. More recently, many Udis have moved to Russia (Wegge 1996).

Much of this movement can be traced to the fact that the Udi people are Christian, not Muslim like their neighbors. Wegge (1996:75–77) traces the Udi church to the historic church of Old Albania. In 1836 Tsar Nicholas I forced the Udi people to give up the Albanian tradition. The Udis in Oğuz joined the Georgian Orthodox Church. This is probably a major factor in their emigration to Oktomberi in Georgia. The Udis in Nic, on the other hand, joined the Armenian Orthodox Church. Because of this link, many of the surnames for the Udi in Nic were modified to resemble Armenian surnames. During the conflict over Nagorno Karabakh this led to fear of reprisals from neighbors. This, as well as a lack of jobs, accounts for the movement of many Udi from Nic to Russia (Wegge 1996).

Another factor leading to the movement of Udis to Russia is that a majority of the Udi people speak Russian as a second language. This behavior in language use may well be

∗The research documented in this paper was carried out under an agreement with the Nasimi Linguistics Institute of the Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan. The actual research was done in Nic village during 30 March to 1 April 1998. We would like to express our thanks to Dr. Agamusa Akhundov and Dr. Novruzalı Mamedov of the Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan and to Ernest Danakari and Jopa Keçaari of Nic for their invaluable assistance during this survey. And we are especially grateful to the many people of Nic who showed us kindness in many ways and made us feel welcome.


1All figures from the 1989 Soviet census are taken from Trosterud (1998).

2For more on the history of the Udi ethnic group see the SIL Electronic Survey Report titled, “The Udis: Histories-Ethnographic Research.”
due to the fact that they are Christian. This difference between the Udis and most other ethnic groups in Azerbaijan is shown by the data in table 1 taken from the 1989 Soviet census.

### Table 1: Second-Language Proficiency of Selected Ethnic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Pop.</th>
<th>Second Language</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talysh</td>
<td>21,602</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>15,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsakhur</td>
<td>19,972</td>
<td>4,691</td>
<td>10,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udi</td>
<td>7,971</td>
<td>4,086</td>
<td>1,947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than 5.5% of ethnic Talysh speak Russian as their second language. Similarly, less than 24% of the Tsakhur speak Russian as their second language in spite of the fact that according to the same census over 25% of the Tsakhur people live in Dagestan in Russia. Neither of these groups is monolingual: almost 73% of the Talysh and almost 54% of the Tsakhur are bilingual in a language other than Russian. In Udi, on the other hand, over 52% speak Russian as their second language. It is likely that many of the Talysh and Tsakhur people speak Russian as a third or fourth language, and that many Udi speak Azerbaijani as a third or fourth language. It is the relative ranking of Russian in relation to Azerbaijani which is different in Udi from that in Talysh or Tsakhur.

The overall language proficiency figures for the Udi people taken from the 1989 Soviet census are given in table 2.

### Table 2: Language Proficiency of the Udi People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Udi</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First language</td>
<td>6,834</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second language</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>4,086</td>
<td>1,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,063</td>
<td>4,836</td>
<td>2,334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to these figures, 6,834 (85.74%) spoke Udi as a first language and 7,063 (88.61%) spoke Udi as a first or second language. From the data in table 2 we can determine that from 54.13 to 59.79% of the ethnic Udis who spoke Udi as a first language were bilingual in Russian. An additional 750 (9.41%) spoke Russian as a first language. The same data also indicates that from 11.72 to 28.36% of ethnic Udis who spoke Udi as a first language were monolingual.

Various implications can be drawn from this data. On one hand, the fact that over 85% of all ethnic Udis still speak the language as their first language and almost 89% speak it as their first or second language suggest it has a high vitality. In addition, the census figures do not measure the actual level of competence in the second language. It could be that the actual competence in Russian does not pose a threat to the vitality of Udi. On the other hand, the fact that up to 60% of these speakers are bilingual in Russian, coupled with the fact that as few as 12% of all ethnic Udis speak Udi monolingually could suggest that the language is in danger of being swamped by Russian. The evident

---

3 The formula for the higher figure is $R_2/U_1$ (where $R_2$ is the number of Udis speaking Russian as a second language and $U_1$ is the number of Udis speaking Udi as a first language). The formula for the lower figure is $(R_2-0_1)/U_1$ (where $0_1$ is the number of Udis whose first language is something other than Udi or Russian).

4 The formula for the higher figure is $(U_1-(R_2-0_1)-(0_2-R_1))/U_1$ (where $U=Udi$, $R=Russian$, $O=Other$, 1=first language, 2=second language). The formula for the lower figure is $(U_1-R_2-O_2)/U_1$. 
out-migration, especially to Russia, is another indication that Udi is endangered. As Udi speakers become more dispersed and the number of Udi speakers in the Udi homeland decreases, the language becomes less viable. In addition, if people are moving to Russia in search of jobs this also indicates the language is becoming less viable. Karan (1997) argues that the perceived value of various languages is a good measure of language vitality. Following Karan’s model, if the perceived value of Russian for its economic value is great, this would cause a shift away from Udi. Vahtre and Viikberg (1991) express a fear for the future of the Udi language as follows:

“The most painful issue nowadays is the survival and usage of the mother tongue in Udi society. As illustrated earlier, so far, the percentage of native speakers is still quite high. However, the absence of a written language and the foreign-language schooling may gradually erode this. Nowadays the Udis in Azerbaijan are being educated in Russian, and in Georgia, in Georgian.”

Although Wegge (1996:77–78) reports that attempts were being made to produce literature in Udi, it was unclear what implications this would have on language vitality, especially since Wegge also says lack of funds had put a stop to many of these projects.

Considerable linguistic research has been done on Udi, beginning in 1852 (Schulze-Führhoff 1994). Vahtre and Viikberg (1991) call it “one of the most investigated Caucasian languages.” These studies include grammatical sketches (Dzheiranishvili 1971, Panchvidze 1974, Schultz 1982, Schultz-Führhoff 1994, Volkova 1967), a text corpus (Dirr 1928), and an Udi-Russian dictionary (Gukasyan 1974). In the midst of all this research, however, the sociolinguistic patterns of language use and attitudes among the Udi people have not been studied. The sociolinguistic research described in this report was designed to explore the following issues:

1. who uses Udi, and in what situations,
2. what attitudes exist among the Udi towards Udi vis-à-vis other languages,
3. what the actual level of bilingualism is, and
4. what the effect of out-migration has been and will be on language maintenance.

2. Methods and Results

We collected information about language use and attitudes in Nic village using several methods: interviews, observations, questionnaires, and a sentence repetition test. Each of these methods will be discussed in turn, along with the results of each.

2.1 Interviews

We were able to interview Ernest Danakari, the mayor of Nic; Jora Keçaari, the author of Udi literacy materials; and the headmasters at two of the schools in Nic.

According to the mayor, about 6,000 people live in Nic at present, of whom about 4,000 are Udi. A few of the other 2,000 residents are Lezgi; the rest are ethnic Azerbaijani. This represents a decrease from the 1970s when the population was 7,200, of whom 5,000 were Udi. Thus, the non-Udi population has remained fairly stable, while the number of Udis has decreased fairly dramatically. According to the mayor, this decrease is not due to deaths since the birth rate has consistently been about twice the death rate. In addition, the size of Udi families has remained constant, with the average family having 3–4 children.

The mayor attributed this decrease in the number of Udis in Nic to one particular practice of the priests in the Armenian Orthodox Church. When priests registered names, they regularly changed surnames that traditionally ended in -ari, -iri, or -hoi so that they ended in -yan like Armenian surnames. Because of this, during the Karabakh conflict many of their neighbors considered the Udis to be Armenians. This was a major force behind the out-migration of many Udis to Russia, especially to the Rostov-na-Donu area. More recently the Udi people have received permission to change their surnames back to
the traditional forms. Danakari reports this has almost entirely eliminated the animosity of their neighbors towards them.

Another factor behind the decrease in population has been the lack of employment opportunities. There used to be a factory in Nic which employed about 400 people, but it is not currently in operation. There are about 200 teachers in the five schools, and there are a few doctors, nursing sisters, and others in the medical profession in Nic. By far the largest number of employed worked in one of the three collective farms. The primary commodities were tobacco, grain, and silk cocoons. In addition, people raised animals, fruits, and nuts on their own individual plots of land around their houses. More recently the collective farms have been closed. The Agricultural Commission is overseeing them during a transitional period, but ultimately the land of each farm will be divided up between the families that traditionally worked that particular farm.

Russian-language education is actually relatively recent in Nic. In 1953 the first Russian school opened in Nic. Before this everyone in Nic studied in Azerbaijani-medium schools. The first teachers in the Russian-medium schools were from Russia. While a few of these stayed for a long time, most left after two or three years. Now most of the teachers are from Nic. Knowledge of Russian has allowed a number of Udis to find jobs with better salaries. At one time this led to a number of Udis leaving Nic. More recently, however, some of these people have returned to Nic.

The combination of proposed land reform and the reversion to the original non-Armenian surnames has evidently helped to stem the decrease of Udis in Nic. In 1997 the Udi population in Nic increased for the first time in over a decade.

The 4,000 Udis in Nic represent about 1,100 households. Of these, only about thirty Udi men in Nic have non-Udi women, while about twenty to thirty Udi women have non-Udi husbands. The rate of marriages between Udis and non-Udis has remained stable over the years. All of the non-Udi spouses reportedly speak Udi, although most do not speak it well.

In a separate interview, Jora Keçaari reported there are 8,600 Udis in all, of whom 4,000 live in Nic. Most of the other 4,600 live in nearby countries, especially Russia and Georgia. Almost 800 from Oğuz live in Oktomberi in Georgia; about 1,000 live in Krasnodar in Russia, and another 400 live in Shakhty, about 79 km from Rostov-na-Donu.

Keçaari also commented that much of this dispersal was due to problems during the Karabakh conflict. In addition to reverting to their original surnames, he indicated that a number of the Udis in Nic have expressed an interest in re-establishing the Albanian church in place of the Armenian Orthodox Church.

In general, the dispersed Udis have tried to maintain the Udi language. For example, Keçaari reports that the Udis living in Oktomberi continue to speak Udi in the home, and when they visit Nic they speak in Udi. Similarly, those living in Shakhty frequently visit Nic and use Udi in their homes. Most of them have Udi spouses. The children of those living in Russia, however, are finding it difficult to learn Udi. They tend to use a large number of Russian words when speaking Udi.

Language mixing is not common in Nic. According to Keçaari, Udi young people in Nic do not mix Russian and Udi when speaking. And they use Udi consistently at home.

The two school headmasters made similar comments. There are five schools in Nic: three Russian-medium schools and two Azerbaijani-medium schools. The Udi generally send their children to Russian-medium schools. Thus, most of the students at the Russian-medium schools are Udis (School #2, for example, is 98% Udi), while most of the students at the Azerbaijani-medium schools are Azerbaijanis and Lezgis.

Most of the teachers at the three Russian-medium schools know Udi. In the early grades, teachers use Udi in explanations. There are also preparatory classes to teach Russian since most children entering school do not understand Russian. Udi is used to teach vocabulary. In addition, Udi language has been introduced as a subject in the first
four classes. An alphabet guide and primers for the first three classes have already been produced. These use a new Roman-based alphabet. Due to the large number of phonemes in the language, quite a few graphemes include diacritics. In addition, some Cyrillic graphemes are used in the current Roman-based alphabet.

The headmasters and teachers feel children’s language skills are generally more developed now than as compared to the past, especially in the case of Azerbaijani. In large part, they trace the improvement in Azerbaijani language skills to Azerbaijani radio and television broadcasts. At the same time, the children generally use Udi even at school during breaks and before and after classes. Little code switching or language mixing has been observed.

2.2 Observations

The agricultural orientation is clear from the village organization. Individual family houses are located on relatively large plots of land. Each family grows livestock (including pigs) and fruit and nut trees (especially walnuts and filberts) on their individual plots. Houses are built from wood following typical rural construction techniques.

The teahouses form the focal point for general gatherings, especially of men. It is common to see groups of men drinking tea and talking either inside or outside the teahouses. Women are rarely seen in the teahouses.

Direct observations of language use were complicated by the fact that when people spoke to us they used Russian or Azerbaijani since none of the researchers spoke Udi. Our general observation, however, was that Udi is generally used in homes, at the teahouses, and in the school yards.

2.3 Questionnaires

We asked thirty-four Udi speakers to answer one of four sets of questions we had prepared to determine people’s attitudes towards Udi and other languages, as well as to obtain subjective evaluations of their abilities in various languages. All four sets of questions are given in appendix B. The overall purpose of the questions in set 1 was to explore which languages were used in various domains, especially in written or aural domains. The questions in set 2 were designed to elicit responses regarding the groups with which various languages are used. Question set 3 explores issues regarding attitudes towards children’s use of language. Finally, set 4 asks for self-assessment of language proficiency.

Half of the Udi speakers who answered questions were chosen by Jora Keçaari, the other half were chosen randomly as we sat in the teahouse or visited various offices. Participants were given a particular set of questions at random. A breakdown of participants by age and gender is given in table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Set</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>10–30</th>
<th>31–50</th>
<th>51–70</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these specific questionnaires, all thirty-four participants plus seventeen Udi speakers who took the SRT described in section 2.4 were asked the demographic questions in appendix A. Two of these questions also dealt with language usage in the home and at work. All fifty-one speakers said Udi was the language of the home, including five whose native language is Russian and one
whose native language is Armenian. Disregarding the participants who are unemployed, the work language of the respondents breaks down as shown in table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Udi</th>
<th>Rus</th>
<th>Az</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language use at work is fairly evenly divided: twenty-eight of the thirty-nine subjects use at least some Udi at work, twenty-five use at least some Russian, and twenty-four use at least some Azerbaijani. Almost 40% use all three languages.

Since the groups answering each set of questions was so small, the results are not statistically significant. Therefore, rather than present all the data in tabular form, we will present the more important findings in prose.

In question set 1, it was not surprising that most respondents indicated they used Azerbaijani or Russian in official or business situations (question 3), especially in light of the fact that education has been in Azerbaijani or Russian. It is perhaps more surprising that two of the ten indicate they use only Udi even in official situations, while an additional two indicate they use both Udi and Azerbaijani.

Since Udi was not developed as a literary language and was not taught in the schools until very recently, it is not surprising that respondents do all reading and writing in either Azerbaijani or Russian (questions 5, 6, 11, 12, 13). Which language is easier to use is generally tied to the age of the respondent: older respondents were schooled in Azerbaijani and find it easier to read and write in Azerbaijani; younger respondents find it easier to read and write in Russian.

Finally, it is not surprising that most of the respondents indicated they speak Udi most fluently (question 4). It is somewhat surprising that four said they are equally fluent in Udi and Russian and/or Azerbaijani.

In question set 2, the respondents were unanimous that they used Udi outside of classes in school (question 1). This corroborated the comments of the headmasters and teachers.

There were basically two answers to question 2, which investigates which languages are used in various domains. One group indicated they use Udi, Russian, and Azerbaijani as needed, depending on the language abilities of the person with whom they were interacting. An equal number of respondents indicated they only (or primarily) used Udi with friends, neighbors, and in the market and stores. It could be that the real difference is that the second group interacts almost entirely with people who speak Udi and therefore have no need to switch to Russian or Azerbaijani.

The responses to questions 3 and 4 corroborate the claim that Udi is the language of the home. One person indicated he used both Udi and Russian when speaking to his spouse, while another person indicated she used both Udi and Russian with her children. Even these two indicated they used Udi with all other family members.

There was also unanimous agreement that children should master Udi (question 8) and that Udi should be taught as a subject in the schools (question 9). Finally, seven of the ten respondents indicated they knew Udi folk stories and told them to their children (question 10).
The answers to question set 3 showed an overwhelming commitment to passing on Udi to the children. While all respondents indicated children should be able to speak Udi, Russian, and Azerbaijani (question 1), there was also unanimity in the feeling that mothers should speak Udi to children (question 2) and that the child’s first language should be Udi (question 3). Russian and Azerbaijani were given as the second and third language that should be learned. Several respondents emphasized that Russian should be taught in the school, not at home.

The home/school split is brought out in the answers to question 5. While we noted above that a majority of respondents answering question set 2 indicated a desire to have Udi taught in the school, all but two of the respondents here said they would send their children to Russian-medium schools as opposed to Udi-medium or Azerbaijani-medium schools. Some of them explicitly said that this was the best way to prepare the children for better jobs. At the same time, we assume the respondents would agree that Udi should be taught as a subject since they all said children should learn to read in Udi, Russian, and Azerbaijani.

The answers to questions 7 and 8 regarding marriage to non-Udis are significant. On the one hand, almost all responded that ethnicity is not important if the two love each other. At the same time, almost all also said that it would be better to marry another Udi—or at least to be sure the non-Udi partner was willing to learn Udi. One respondent said it would be acceptable so long as the children all learned Udi, while another said it would be best for a potential spouse to first live in Nic and learn Udi before getting married.5

The answers to question set 4 are in some ways the most interesting. Respondents uniformly indicated that they could deal with the first six situations in Udi, Russian, or Azerbaijani. Most respondents, however, indicated they would either find it easiest to deal with the four most complex situations in Russian, or that they would have difficulties using Udi in the last four situations.

2.4 Russian Sentence Repetition Test

The self assessment of the respondents to the questionnaires is that they speak Russian fluently; indeed, they feel they can deal with some situations better in Russian than in Udi. The question arises, then, as to how accurate these self-assessments are. To evaluate this, we administered a Sentence Repetition Test (SRT) in Russian to forty-seven Udi speakers. Twenty-one of these had responded to one of the questionnaires; the other twenty-six included eleven school-aged young people. The SRT, as described in Clifton and Heidelberger (1998), consists of two practice and fifteen test sentences in Russian. The sentences have been carefully selected and arranged in order of difficulty. The subjects listen to and repeat these sentences, and the researcher counts how many mistakes are made. This gives a numerical score that can be compared with the scores of other nonnative Russian speakers whose ability in Russian has been independently evaluated. This results in an objective measure of the Russian ability of a given group of people.

The thirty-six adults were not chosen randomly.6 We did, however, attempt to have a representative sample according to age and gender as shown in table 5. (The total is only thirty-five because we did not record the age of one male subject.)

---

5 Most respondents did not differentiate between Azerbaijani and Russian-speaking potential spouses. Those that did said that it is better to marry a Russian speaker than an Azerbaijani speaker. This was generally qualified with the comment that it would be all right for an Udi to marry an Azerbaijani speaker if the person was a Christian. It appears that these comments were triggered by religious, not language, issues.

6 They were chosen by Jora Keçaari.
Table 5: Age and Gender of Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10–30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are at least five subjects in four of the six cells in table 5. The preponderance of men is due to the fact that much of the testing was done at the teahouses. The numbers are weighted in favor of those in the middle-age range. However, this is not necessarily bad. This age group is more influential than the younger age group. It is also likely that the language abilities of this group better reflects the future of the language than do the linguistic abilities of the older age group.

The overall results of the SRT are summarized in table 6, where a score of 45 indicates no mistakes were made.

Table 6: SRT Overall Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRT Score</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>PC Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27–33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34–45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PC Rating refers to the system used by the Peace Corps to indicate language ability. A PC rating of 4+ indicates native-speaker ability. According to our results, only two of the forty-six Udis who took the SRT performed at this level. Even factoring in the margin of error, only seven subjects performed with native speaker ability. Over a third of the group received a rating of 3. This represents ‘good, general proficiency’. If we assume that the speakers are native speakers of Udi, this implies the vast majority of Udis cannot speak Russian as well as they can speak Udi.
There is some correlation between age and Russian ability as can be seen in chart 1.

![Chart 1: Age vs. SRT Score](image)

There is considerable variability among school-aged young people. There is less variability in the rest of those who took the SRT: Russian ability is relatively low among those in their 20s, increasing to a maximum among subjects in their late 30s and early 40s, then decreasing again. One possible interpretation of these findings is that the Russian learned in school is not what is actually used in the workplace. Thus, after students finish school, their Russian ability actually decreases as they do not use their school-Russian. After using Russian in the workplace, however, their ability in Russian again increases. However, since the correlation is a weak 0.134, far above the 0.05 needed for statistical significance, it is unclear how much weight this correlation should be given.

3. Conclusions

It is clear that all age groups actively use Udi in a wide range of settings. In that sense it has high vitality. Udi people have the opportunity to learn other languages and are at least functionally bilingual in Russian and Azerbaijani. Furthermore, adults feel it is important for their children to learn both Russian and Azerbaijani. In spite of this, they want their children to be well grounded in Udi and speak only Udi at home. The Udi people are very proud of their language and have no intention of giving it up.

In spite of this commitment to the language, the combination of the small number of Udi speakers and the rapid increase in out-migration over the past ten years raises the issue of the long-term prognosis for the Udi language. Our findings indicate that the situation is finally beginning to stabilize. Several factors argue that in spite of its small size, Udi has a relatively positive future. First is the fact that Udi speakers in Rostov and Oktomberi have maintained their ties with Nic. Second is the net increase in the size of Nic in 1997. Third is the development of literacy materials in Udi and the introduction of Udi classes in the schools.

We have raised questions about Udi speakers’ self-assessment that they speak Russian as well as Udi. If their self-assessment is not accurate (as seems to be the case), the most likely explanation is that they do not normally participate in activities in which native-speaker ability in Russian is necessary. If they can function well in all necessary situations, they would naturally assume their abilities in Russian are as good as their abilities in Udi. This state of affairs is even more likely given the fact that most of their neighbors were educated in Azerbaijani and so likely have even less ability in Russian than the Udi people do. At the same time, however, it must be realized that the Udi people would be at a distinct disadvantage if they have to compete against native
speakers of Russian in a situation in which native-like command of Russian was necessary. It is also possible that in many situations Udi speakers do not realize what they do not understand in formal Russian language.

In conclusion, the Udi language does not seem to be in imminent danger of extinction. As long as the out-migration continues to be reversed, the attitudes of the Udi people towards their language would seem to ensure its survival. At the same time, it is important that efforts to strengthen its position as a literary language to give it higher prestige among its neighbors be actively encouraged and supported.

Appendix A: Demographic Information

1) The place where the form is filled in/Date the form is filled in
2) Sex
3) Age
4) Where you were born/How long lived there?
5) Place of residence/How long lived there?
6) Have you ever been to Ganja, Baku,…for a longer period of time?/How long lived there
7) Nationality
8) Education (primary/uncompleted primary/uncompleted higher education/higher education)
9) Where do you work (study)?
10) What is your occupation? (How do you make a living?)
11) Profession (what you were trained for)
12) Have you done military service?
13) Your mother tongue
14) Your home language
15) Your work language
16) What other languages (apart from your mother tongue and Russian) do you know?
17) What languages do you master? understand/speak/read/write/consider your mother tongue
   Udi
   Russian
   Azerbaijani
18) Where are your father’s/mother’s families from?
19) Your father’s/mother’s nationality
20) Your husband’s (wife’s) and children’s nationality
21) Surname, name, patronymic
Appendix B: Questionnaires

Question Set 1

1) Which language do you speak at home—Azerbaijani, Russian or Udi? If more than one, which of them do you use most?

2) Which language do you speak at your work?

3) Which language do you use outside your home and your job for business and official situations? for nonofficial situations?

4) Which language do you speak most fluently?

5) Which language do you read most?

6) In which language is it easiest for you to understand what you read?

7) Do you encounter any difficulties in understanding when you read Udi? What is it that you don’t understand—separate words or the whole meaning? What about in reading Russian?

8) Which language do you prefer to listen to on the radio? Which language do you listen to most on radio?

9) Do you understand radio programs in Russian?

10) What kind of songs do you sing—Udi or Russian?

11) In which language do you write letters?

12) In which language do you write official papers (applications, reports, minutes from meetings etc.)?

13) In which language is it easiest for you to write?

Question Set 2

1) Which language did you speak in your childhood/at primary school (between and after the lessons)/at secondary school (between and after the lessons)?

2) Which language do you use most at your job/with neighbors/with friends/in shops/in the market/in the village council?

3) Which language do you use when you talk to your parents/husband/wife/children/brothers and sisters?

4) Which language do your parents/your husband/wife/your children use when they talk with you?

5) Do they teach your children the Udi language at school?

6) How well, in your opinion, do you master the Udi language? well/average/poorly/don’t master it understand speak

7) Do you listen to radio programs in the Udi language?

8) Do you want your children to master the Udi language?

9) Do you want your children to be taught the Udi language at school?

10) Do you know any Udi folk stories? Do (did) you tell your children folk stories in the Udi language?
Question Set 3

1) Do you want your children to speak Udi/Russian/Azerbaijani?
2) What language should a mother use to speak to her children?
3) What language should children learn to speak first/second/third?
4) What language would you like to speak better?
5) If there was an Udi school and a Russian school, which would you send your children to?
   If there was an Udi school and an Azerbaijani school, which would you send your children to?
   If there was an Azerbaijani school and a Russian school, which would you send your children to?
6) Should your children know how to read Udi/Azerbaijani/Russian?
7) Is it good for an Udi woman to marry a man who speaks only Russian/only Azerbaijani?
8) Is it good for an Udi man to marry a man who speaks only Russian/only Azerbaijani?

Question Set 4

1) Can you count to ten in Udi/Russian/Azerbaijani?
2) Can you name the days of the week in Udi/Russian/Azerbaijani?
3) Can you buy things using Udi/Russian/Azerbaijani?
4) Can you order in a cafeteria using Udi/Russian/Azerbaijani?
5) Can you give information about your family in Udi/Russian/Azerbaijani?
6) Can you speak to people in social situations, weddings, funerals in Udi/Russian/Azerbaijani?
7) Can you describe how you spend your free time in detail in Udi/Russian/Azerbaijani?
8) Can you describe your present employment or studies in Udi/Russian/Azerbaijani?
9) Can you describe what you hope to achieve in the next five years in Udi/Russian/Azerbaijani?

Can you give your opinion on a controversial subject (politics, religion) in Udi/Russian/Azerbaijani?
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