

Review into the present state of Slavonic and East European Studies in the higher education system of the UK



J A Dunn

April 2013



***Дело помощи утопающих — дело рук самих утопающих*¹**

(I. Il'f, E. Petrov, *Dvenadtsat' stul'ev*)

¹ Helping the drowning is the responsibility of those who are drowning.



Contents

Section	Page
Preface and acknowledgements	5
List of abbreviations	6
Terms of reference	7
Executive summary	8
1. Introduction	13
2. Context	17
2.1. Geopolitical	17
2.2. National	19
2.3. European	22
3. The current state of provision for Slavonic and East European Studies in UK universities	24
3.1. General survey of undergraduate provision in Russian	24
3.2. Undergraduate provision in other Slavonic languages	25
3.3. Undergraduate provision in other Central and East European languages	26
3.4. Undergraduate courses in Slavonic Studies without a compulsory language element	26
3.5. Undergraduate curriculum	26
3.6. Undergraduate student numbers	28
3.7. General survey of taught postgraduate provision	31
3.8. Postgraduate student numbers	34
3.9. Research	36
3.10. Staffing	39
3.11. The issue of sustainability	41
4. Careers and the world beyond university	50
4.1. Career destinations of graduates in Slavonic and East European Studies	50
4.2. Employment opportunities and demand for graduates in Slavonic and East European Studies	53
4.3. Case studies: the graduate's perspective	56
4.4. Case studies: the employer's perspective	59
5. Conclusions and recommendations	64
5.1. Summary of conclusions	64

5.2. What is to be done?	68
Appendix A	73
Appendix B	93
Appendix C	95

Preface and acknowledgements

This report, which was commissioned by the Higher Education Academy (HEA) and the British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies (BASEES), differs from its predecessors in several important respects. Earlier reports were produced on behalf of official bodies such as government departments or funding councils; they were, therefore, documents of a fundamentally different nature and reflect contexts that were to varying degrees different from that in which this report has been written. In the past the reports were produced by committees, often with conveners drawn from outside academic life; this report was written by a retired academic working on his own. Previously the committees were able to travel round the different universities and to obtain information first hand; this report, for various reasons, had to be written in an office in Bologna. It is, indeed, a remarkable reflection of the ways in which email and the Internet have changed academic communication, though it does mean that at times I have felt a little like St Stephen of Perm as described by Epifanij Premudryj; sadly the results of my endeavours will never compare in splendour to the creation of an entire new alphabet. If this report is, so to speak, a horse, rather than a camel, it is nonetheless true that the wisdom of committees can produce valuable insights and make it easier to avoid errors and omissions. I am willing to accept the credit for anything positive that might be found in this report; responsibility for any deficiencies rests solely with myself. Except where others are being quoted, all opinions expressed are my own.

It would nevertheless have been impossible to produce this report without a considerable input from others, and I am immensely grateful to all those who took the time and trouble to respond to long and detailed questionnaires or to reply to my importunate requests for information and observations on matters relating to career opportunities. I should also like to thank the BASEES committee for their valuable comments on the final draft; these have led to significant improvements, especially in the way the recommendations are presented. Finally, my warmest thanks are due to Filippo Nereo of the HEA for his seemingly limitless ability to resolve bureaucratic problems and both to Filippo and to Stephen Hutchings of BASEES for their help and enthusiastic support at all stages of the project and for their forbearance in waiting for a report that has taken considerably longer to produce than was originally envisaged.

J A Dunn
Bologna, February 2013

List of abbreviations

No self-respecting text on a subject related to education can appear without a healthy admixture of abbreviations, and this report is no exception to this rule. On the assumption that most readers will recognise most of the abbreviations, but few will recognise all of them, all but the most common abbreviations are explained on their first appearance. To give further assistance a list of abbreviations is given below.

AHRC	Arts and Humanities Research Council
ASEES	Association for Slavic, East European and Eurasian Studies (USA)
BASEES	British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies
BUAS	British Universities' Association of Slavists
CEELBAS	Centre for East European Languages-based Area Studies
CoFoR	Collaboration for Research
COSEELIS	Council for Slavonic and East European Library and Information Services
CRCEES	Centre for Russian, Central and East European Studies
ESRC	Economic and Social Research Council
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HESA	Higher Education Statistics Agency
ICCEES	International Committee for Central and East European Studies
LBAS	Language-based Area Studies
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PGCE	Postgraduate Certificate in Education
RAE	Research Assessment Exercise
SFC	Scottish Funding Council
SIVS	Strategically Important and Vulnerable Subjects
SSEES	School of Slavonic and East European Studies (University College, London)
TEFL	Teaching English as a foreign language
UGC	University Grants Committee
UTREES	University Theses in Russian and East European Studies

Terms of reference

- Include a national audit of provision in Slavonic Studies in UK HE, including breakdowns of Russian degree intakes by level of entry: post A-level and *ab initio*, primarily;
- Include detailed information on employment destinations of Russian graduates;
- Consider the importance of Slavonic Studies, and Russian in particular, in terms of: defence and diplomacy, business and emerging markets, the European Union (EU), multilingualism and multiculturalism;
- Recognise the wide student interest in the history, politics, geography and culture of the region, explore the need for appropriate language provision to support postgraduate researchers (PGRs) in these areas;
- Identify and highlight the benefits to the individual of understanding the history and cultures of others;
- Include perspectives and case studies from 'users' on the importance of these disciplines;
- Consider ways of strengthening successful individual units, while also investigating the scope for co-ordinating provision in, for example, a consortium, with the aim of making these and other units more resilient;
- In particular, the review will explore the appropriateness of this for both Russian and also for the various other disciplines taught as options in Russian departments, such as Czech, Polish and other Slavonic and East European languages, as well as related social, historical and cultural areas of study;
- Consider evidence on the sustainability of provision of Slavonic Studies and recommend steps that could be taken to avoid an undesirable reduction in the scale of provision and, where appropriate, to expand it.

Executive summary

In 1989 the Berlin Wall came down; in 1991 the Soviet Union ceased to exist and Yugoslavia started to fall apart. The intervening 20 years or so have seen substantial changes in the social, economic, political, cultural and, indeed, the linguistic architecture of Central and Eastern Europe, and it is these changes that provide the context for this review into Slavonic and East European Studies.

Though the strategic significance of Slavonic and East European Studies has changed since the end of the Cold War, it has not in any way diminished. Russia remains a major world, European and regional power, possessing both nuclear weapons and enormous reserves of oil and gas. It is a country with which we engage in a wide range of areas, including security, business, culture, the mass media, entertainment and sport; it is a country we need to know and to understand, and, if recent misunderstandings and disagreements are anything to go by, it is a country about which we still know far too little and which we understand even less. The other countries of the region present a number of different opportunities and challenges: with the new members of the EU there are growing trading, political and cultural links, enhanced by the free movement of individuals in both directions; elsewhere there are unresolved political and security problems, which can develop into major crises (Ukraine 2004) or even armed conflict (Kosovo, the Southern Caucasus).

Similarly, Russian has retained its importance as a world language which is still widely used in many parts of the region and is increasingly important as an international business language. The importance of other languages, above all Polish, is also increasing, and a knowledge of these languages is increasingly required in a range of contexts encompassing such activities as translating EU documents, setting up business deals in Hungary or Ukraine and managing a Polish-speaking workforce.

What this means in practice is that there are plentiful job opportunities for graduates with a good knowledge of the relevant language(s) and culture(s), that there is a continuing need for high quality research and teaching in the subject area and that there is a growing requirement for engagement with a wide range of users to ensure that the specialised knowledge of those in the profession is put to maximum effect. In other words, Britain needs to maintain and to develop its provision in Slavonic and East European Studies and it needs to ensure that this provision is both quantitatively and qualitatively appropriate to meet the opportunities and challenges of 21st-century Europe.

There is, however, another aspect to this issue. Since World War II this subject area, often on its own, though sometimes in conjunction with related disciplines, has been the subject of several reports, and if to this is added the various internal reviews carried out at institutional level, then it becomes clear there is no discipline that has been more examined, enquired into, reviewed and reported on than Slavonic and East European Studies. The history of the discipline since 1945 can be characterised as a series of repeats of the following cycle: review → action → neglect leading to a perceived disequilibrium → another review. A major aim of this review is to produce proposals that offer the opportunity to break this cycle.

This review is structured around two issues that can be defined, somewhat crudely, as supply and demand. The former is concerned with levels of provision in British universities, while the latter relates chiefly to career opportunities and the world beyond university. The final chapter contains a summary of conclusions and a list of recommendations.

The provision for Slavonic and East European Studies in British universities

Undergraduate provision of Russian in English universities is enjoying one of its very rare periods of equilibrium. Though the number of English universities offering degree courses in Russian is small (no

more than 12), all the units in question are, under present conditions, clearly operating at a sustainable level in terms of student numbers, staffing and research output. In particular:

- student numbers have increased by almost 30% since 2007;
- there has been some consolidation of staffing, and at present no unit has fewer than three members of staff in teaching + research posts;
- there have been important changes to the undergraduate curriculum, especially in the area of cultural studies.

There is, however, cause for concern that this equilibrium may be disturbed by the changes to undergraduate student funding being introduced in England from 2012. The outlook is at present uncertain and requires careful monitoring. It would in any case be useful to start the systematic collection of data relating to student enrolments (as already happens in North America).

In other areas of undergraduate provision there are more immediate causes for concern:

- Slavonic and East European Studies have to all intents and purposes disappeared from Wales and Northern Ireland, and concerted action is needed to ensure the three remaining units teaching Russian in Scottish universities are placed on a long-term sustainable basis;
- provision for Slavonic and East European languages other than Russian has failed to develop in a way that reflects the social and political changes that have taken place in Europe since 1989, and provision for all these languages is either at a very low level or non-existent. Student demand is strongest for option and subsidiary courses, and in principle it would be desirable for every student of Russian to have the opportunity of learning a second Slavonic language.

Numbers taking a Masters course in translation and/or interpreting have increased by over 80% since 2007-08, and numbers enrolled on doctoral programmes have almost doubled over the same period; enrolments on other postgraduate courses show no significant change. Doctoral students are widely distributed among the departments providing teaching in Slavonic and East European Studies.

There is scope for the structured and controlled development of intensive language courses at postgraduate level, partly to remedy shortfalls in undergraduate provision, but also in order to serve both postgraduate students and those in employment who need to learn a new language. In order to provide as close a match as possible between supply and demand, such courses will involve the implementation of innovative and more flexible patterns of provision (including distance learning).

The overall picture regarding research in the subject area is positive: the total number of research-active staff has remained constant over the last two RAEs, and there is a significant proportion of Early Career Researchers. Patterns in research are changing, and a new emphasis on cultural studies means that scholars are increasingly willing to cross traditional disciplinary and temporal boundaries, but there is also concern that some fields of study are poorly represented.

The Language-based Area Studies programme, set up in 2006, has played an extremely important role in developing postgraduate study and research; its continuation, albeit in a much reduced form, is to be welcomed. If only from an organisational point of view it would seem opportune to expand the consortia to include all universities with an interest in the subject area and to cover any relevant fields of study that may have been excluded from the original programme.

The increased emphasis placed by HEFCE and the Research Councils on impact and on engagement with the community is reflected in a wide range of activities undertaken by individuals and by the LBAS consortia, though evidence of under-reporting suggests the importance of these factors is not yet fully

understood and that academics might need greater encouragement to shed their innate modesty. These activities, which include work with governments, with NGOs and with the mass media, are, as might be expected, not restricted to the UK. The LBAS consortia have forged successful links with local and national government and with NGOs; forming links with the business community has been harder, with much of the bridge building being done by the academic community, but here too each of the consortia has developed valuable initiatives.

Career opportunities and the world beyond university

There are plentiful career opportunities for graduates in Russian or other areas of Slavonic and East European Studies in the public, private and tertiary sectors. Many of these career opportunities have an international dimension, and there are numerous and varied opportunities for working in the region, either on a long-term or a short-term basis. Russian has, perhaps surprisingly, maintained much of its earlier significance throughout Central and Eastern Europe, but there is also evidence of the increased importance to employers of other languages, especially Polish. As might be expected, most of the employment opportunities relate to Russia and the new members of the EU, but it is important not to overlook the possibilities opening up in other areas, such as Ukraine, the Balkans and parts of the Caucasus and Central Asia.

Those contributing evidence to the review stressed the advantages of knowing not just the language, but also the culture of one's business partners and drew attention to the fact that knowing one Slavonic language made it relatively easy to learn other languages in the family. It was also noted that the globalisation of business had greatly increased the need for cross-cultural knowledge and hence for the knowledge of the languages of the countries where business was conducted.

Here too, though, there are areas of concern:

- there are strong indications that for a career in business language skills may need to be supplemented by other competencies. It should be possible for such portfolios of skills to be acquired in different sequences, eg by making intensive postgraduate language courses available to those with degrees in other subjects, and there should be greater collaboration between universities and business over identifying and meeting demand for language skills;
- the relevant Directorates-General of the European Commission report the difficulty they experience in finding enough suitably qualified candidates able to translate or interpret from the Central and East European languages of the EU, but indicate at the same time the complications involved in remedying the situation. Here too there would seem to be scope for greater collaboration between providers and employers with a view to devising a strategy that might help match supply with demand;
- it would be useful to undertake the systematic collection of data relating to graduate destinations and subsequent career paths.

Conclusions and recommendations

On the basis of the evidence collected it is possible to draw up a list of 15 specific recommendations that can be divided into three categories: actions that can be taken immediately either to solve existing problems or to bring about essential improvements in levels or modes of provision (1-6); measures to be adopted in the medium term, principally with the aim of stabilising and preserving elements of the system potentially under threat (7-12); certain long-term activities, mostly relating to the collection and exchange of information (13-15).

The following is the full list of recommendations:

1. The necessary steps should be taken to ensure that Russian teaching in Scotland is placed on a basis that is sustainable in the long term: appointments should be made to the Chairs in Russian or Slavonic languages at Edinburgh, Glasgow and St Andrews, and other posts that have become vacant in recent years should be re-filled.
2. Steps should be taken to ensure the viability of Russian teaching in England is not undermined by changes that are taking place in the funding system and that such teaching is maintained on a sustainable basis at its present level at least, as is abundantly justified by student demand.
3. There should be a co-ordinated and planned development and enhancement of the teaching of Slavonic and East European languages other than Russian at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels. This should include the elaboration of funding models that will support the arrangements made on a long-term basis: in particular there should be immediate steps to ensure the continuation of the SIVS programme in England and the creation of an equivalent scheme in Scotland.
4. There should be a co-ordinated and planned development of intensive postgraduate language courses aimed at a variety of target groups, including research students in various disciplines who need to acquire a knowledge of the relevant language, people whose career path requires them to learn a new language and graduates in one Slavonic language who wish to acquire a good knowledge of another such language. Steps should be taken to encourage and support the development of innovative and flexible modes of provision in order to optimise the match between supply and demand and to enhance the employability of graduates. In appropriate circumstances (eg for preparing research students) earmarked funding should be made available to support these courses.
5. The organisational structure created by the LBAS programme should be extended to include all universities with an interest in the relevant areas of study in order to serve as the basis for the further development of postgraduate provision and research.
6. There should be moves towards the creation of consortia and the elaboration of other forms of both formal and informal collaboration. All such arrangements should either be initiated by individual units or involve such units from a very early stage and should be designed from the outset to have clear aims and to bring clear benefits, with which all those participating are able to identify.
7. Where it is both appropriate and feasible, steps should be taken to develop and enhance Russian teaching, particularly with a view to maintaining and/or restoring the subject in institutions other than the ancient and the civic universities.
8. Steps should be taken to preserve and, where necessary, to enhance curricular diversity, particularly with a view to ensuring that students continue to have the possibility of taking course elements involving medieval studies and linguistic topics and that in general they continue to have a choice of different curricula and course combinations.
9. Steps should be taken with a view in due course to providing all students of Russian with the opportunity of studying a second Slavonic language.
10. Encouragement should be given to developing those forms of innovation in teaching methods and curriculum design that will serve to enhance the employability of graduates.
11. All necessary steps should be taken to ensure the continuing viability of extended periods of residence abroad, especially in Russia, but also, where necessary, in other countries not covered by EU schemes of student mobility.
12. All necessary steps should be taken to ensure that library provision and other resources are maintained at an appropriate level to support both research and student learning.
13. A system should be instituted for the regular collection on a UK-wide basis of data relating to student enrolments on courses in Russian and other fields of Slavonic and East European studies.
14. With the co-operation of university careers staff a similar system should be instituted for collecting data on student destinations and, wherever possible, career paths. Consideration

should be given to the setting up of a database of graduates and prospective employers with a view to assisting recruitment and finding employment.

15. All feasible steps should be taken to improve the relationships between universities and other stakeholders and, in particular, to ensure the efficient and timely exchange of information; active consideration should be given to setting up a permanent forum to unite all stakeholders with an interest in Slavonic and East European Studies.

What these 15 recommendations amount to is a medium to long-term plan for the development of Slavonic and East European Studies in UK universities. It is recognised that anything called a plan does not fit comfortably with the academic practices that currently prevail in British universities, but it cannot be emphasised too strongly that these recommendations cannot be successfully implemented without a considerable element of co-ordination and planning and that only by means of this plan will it be possible to escape from the dismal cycle described above. The plan will presumably be owned ultimately by the four Funding Councils, though its successful creation and implementation would require the continuing involvement of a wide range of stakeholders, including the individual universities with an interest in the area, professional organisations, representatives of employers in all three sectors and others.

It would be idle to pretend these recommendations do not have resource implications, though every effort has been made to keep these within reasonable limits. The full extent of these implications will become fully apparent only as the plan develops, but it may be assumed that the following activities will require investment:

- the restoration of a small number (perhaps no more than two or three above what is already budgeted for) of Russian-teaching posts that have been lost in recent years, especially in Scotland;
- the creation of a small number of posts to further the teaching of languages other than Russian; here, however, there may be opportunities for the more efficient deployment of existing staff and for obtaining support from the countries of the region;
- the creation and administration of consortia and the support, where necessary, of staff and student mobility;
- support for the creation of innovative teaching programmes;
- some support for the year abroad in Russia may be necessary, depending on the extent to which it is possible to set up schemes involving work placements.

I. Introduction

- I.1. Scarbrough Commission 1947: Report of the Inter-Departmental Commission of Enquiry on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies.

Hayter Report 1961: University Grants Committee, Report of Sub-Committee on Oriental, East European and African Studies.

Atkinson Report 1979: Report on Russian and Russian Studies in British Universities.

Wooding Report 1989: Review of Soviet and East European Studies.

HEFCE 1995: Review of Former Soviet and East European Studies.

When to that impressive list of national reviews, reports and enquiries (all but the last carried out on a UK-wide basis) is added the numeral internal reviews that have taken place in individual institutions, it becomes impossible to avoid the observation that there can be no subject area in the UK higher education system that has been subject to more reviews since the end of the Second World War than Slavonic and East European Studies

- I.2. Contemplation of this list suggests three conclusions. The first is that this subject area is one that has been perceived throughout this period as having considerable strategic value. For if there were no strategic value, there would be no point in undertaking a review. During the period of the Cold War the nature of this value was clear and well understood, but the events of the last two decades have created a situation which is much more complex and where continuities and discontinuities require a reappraisal and a possible redefinition of strategic interests. One of the aims of this review is to undertake an assessment of the strategic significance of Slavonic and East European Studies in the context of the geopolitical architecture of post-1989 Europe and to use this assessment to demonstrate the need for a plan of action to promote the maintenance and development of the subject area.

- I.3. The second conclusion is that either those who have produced reviews in the past have not carried out their duties successfully or where they have succeeded in identifying a problem and proposing sensible solutions, those with the appropriate responsibilities have lacked the courage or the financial resources fully to implement these solutions. There may indeed be a certain amount of truth in this: there are perhaps those who feel that the Atkinson Report, having correctly identified a problem of over-provision of Russian coupled with an undue proliferation of small, unviable departments, undermined its efforts with a fatally flawed methodology and an inability adequately to communicate the urgency of the need for change. It is also true that governments and other funding bodies rarely respond to proposals to spend more money with unrestrained enthusiasm, and it is the case that the absence of any system of medium- or long-term planning that has prevailed in British universities since the collapse of the quinquennial system in the 1970s means that any plan for development is likely to be consigned to oblivion within a year or two of its adoption. A closer look suggests, however, that this conclusion is somewhat simplistic, and that part of the problem is due to the factors mentioned in the previous paragraph and explored in more detail in [section 2.1..](#) Nevertheless, even when allowance is made for these factors, there is a clear indication here that this is not a problem that lends itself to quick and easy solutions.

- I.4. The final conclusion is in some ways the least comforting: it is that the subject area of Slavonic and East European Studies cannot survive at a sustainable level without some sort of

outside intervention and if left to its own devices it will sooner or later fall out of equilibrium with the consequent danger that resources of strategic significance will be lost. Throughout the post-war period this circumstance has resulted in a vicious circle, which is vividly described by James Muckle in his extremely valuable history of the learning and teaching of Russian in the UK:

The point about monitoring represents a constant problem in Slavonic Studies, in that throughout the second half of the twentieth century government had repeatedly perceived a crisis in the field, which had been followed by action, followed again by inaction and neglect, leading to further crisis — and so the cycle had continued.²

It is thus small wonder that many academics working in this subject area, and especially those with administrative or representative responsibilities, have to devote an undue proportion of their time to concerns over the future of the profession and that there are those who reach the end of their career oppressed with feelings of frustration and *déjà vu*.

1.5. What all this indicates is that Slavonic and East European Studies is in the British university system (and, one might surmise, in that of other Western European countries) a subject area that is *sui generis*. After all, people do not generally speak, except in a narrow philological sense, of Romance Studies or Germanic Studies. Celtic Studies may offer some analogies, but this is a subject area firmly rooted in the British Isles and is one involving a relatively small number of languages, while European Studies tends to revolve around the institutions of the European Union. Slavonic and East European Studies involves a dozen or so closely related (and sometimes mutually comprehensible) languages, as well as a number of other languages belonging to other linguistic families; one is a major world language, while a further ten (soon to be 11) are official languages of the European Union. It covers half of one continent and, somewhat paradoxically, a significant proportion of another, since it conventionally takes in the Asiatic part of Russia and can extend to the newly independent states of Central Asia.³ The countries covered by the subject area are not defined solely by geography: they often share elements of their history, culture and political systems with one another in ways that can be difficult to disentangle, though at the same time each of them is robustly distinct in a manner often traduced by the stereotypical figure of the 'East European' much beloved by sections of the British media. It is not being claimed here that the subject area of Slavonic and East European Studies is the only one with unique features, but it is suggested that its specificities and its complexities present a particular challenge for those burdened with the responsibility of managing the British university systems.

1.6. One feature which characterises Slavonic and East European Studies is the way in which the subject area has always combined arts and humanities disciplines (language, literature and cultural studies, history) on the one hand and social science disciplines (politics, economics, sociology) on the other. And given that the history and politics of the region mean that culture and language often have a political dimension, the boundaries between these disciplines may be less sharp than elsewhere. This was given recognition by the decision taken at the end of the 1980s to merge the British Universities Association of Slavists and the National Association for Soviet and East European Studies into a single professional organisation, now known as the British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies, to embrace the whole subject area. It is true that this characteristic is probably not unique to this particular subject area, though it does differentiate it from other subject areas with a

² James Muckle (2008) *The Russian Language in Britain: a historical survey of learners and teachers*. P. 208. Ilkeston: Bramcote Press.

³ It is no coincidence that one of the most important academic journals in the area is known as *Europe-Asia Studies*. All of the Central Asian states are members of the OSCE, while Kazakhstan, notwithstanding its long border with China, is a member of the European confederation of football associations (UEFA).

focus on Europe; it does, however, mean that any recommendations must take account of this factor and that any programme of action for the development of the subject area must be capable of encompassing the whole of its range.

- 1.7. Anyone who undertakes a review of this nature must start out with the aim of proposing measures that would allow the subject area finally to escape from the vicious circle described above. This is undoubtedly an ambitious aim, but in the concluding section a set of proposals will be presented, which, if implemented, offer the prospect that it might at last be achieved. It is true that these proposals will in certain respects go some way beyond the customs, practices and fashions that currently prevail in British universities, but only robust and radical measures can create the sustainable conditions for Slavonic and East European Studies to flourish and prosper in a way that meets the needs of the UK.
- 1.8. The structure of this report can be outlined as follows. Chapter 2 describes the geopolitical, national and European context in which this review is taking place. Chapter 3 is a survey of the present state of provision for Slavonic and East European Studies in British universities; it is divided into the following sections:
 - 3.1 A general survey of undergraduate provision in Russian;
 - 3.2 Undergraduate provision in other Slavonic languages;
 - 3.3 Undergraduate provision in other Central and East European languages;
 - 3.4 Undergraduate studies in Slavonic and East European Studies without a compulsory language element;
 - 3.5 The undergraduate curriculum;
 - 3.6 Undergraduate student numbers;
 - 3.7 General survey of taught postgraduate provision;
 - 3.8 Postgraduate student numbers;
 - 3.9 Research;
 - 3.10 Staffing;
 - 3.11 The issue of sustainability.

Chapter 4 deals with issues relating to employment and the world beyond university; it is divided into the following sections:

- 4.1. Career destinations of graduates in Slavonic and East European Studies;
- 4.2. Employment opportunities and demand for graduates in Slavonic and East European Studies;
- 4.3. Case studies: the graduate's perspective;
- 4.4. Case studies: the employer's perspective.

The final chapter summarises the conclusions and presents a series of recommendations.

- 1.9. To obtain information for this review questionnaires were sent to all university units perceived to have an interest in this area of study. These requested statistics on student numbers for the academic years 2007-08 to 2011-12, as well as information on graduate destinations and also asked a series of questions requiring a narrative response. Different versions of the questionnaire were sent to the BASEES Committee, to the Heads of the two Language-based Area Studies (LBAS) consortia and to representatives of the body uniting Slavonic librarians (COSEELIS); a further version was made available to members of BASEES via the BASEES-Members email list. The text of the various questionnaires is reproduced in

Appendix A. In addition to this emails or letters were sent to the four UK funding councils, to the Ministers with responsibility for higher education in the Welsh and Northern Irish Governments, to selected graduates and to a large number of individuals and organisations who represent potential employers or who can in other respects be considered stakeholders in the subject area. Finally, there were one or two spontaneous responses from people who had found out about the review on the grapevine. A list of all those who returned the questionnaires or who responded to the requests for information is given in Appendix B.

2. Context

2.1. Geopolitical

- 2.1.1. Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK have always been unduly influenced by geopolitical considerations. Except for a brief interlude of unwonted Russophilia in the period just before and during the First World War (when, significantly, a number of Russian departments were set up) relations between the UK and Russia or the Soviet Union have generally been poor, and in conducting these relations the UK has generally been less successful than other West European nations in maintaining a satisfactory working relationship and avoiding diplomatic mishaps of one sort or another. As for other countries of the region, British attitudes can perhaps be summed up by adapting Neville Chamberlain's unfortunate, but revealing phrase: these were 'far-away countr[ies, inhabited by] people of whom we know nothing'.
- 2.1.2. Between 1945 and 1989 the dominant influence was the Cold War. During this period Soviet studies flourished, and Russian, as the language of the 'other' superpower, acquired a strategic importance it never managed to acquire when it was merely the language of a real or potential ally. Moreover, since Russian was taught as a compulsory language in all the nations that formed the Soviet bloc, it was widely assumed, not always correctly, to be a *lingua franca* that could be used throughout the region. At the same time, however, the poor state of bilateral relations, the often unattractive face that the Soviet Union presented to the outside world and the extremely limited and highly structured nature of such direct contacts as were possible in this period all meant that Russian never succeeded in broadening its appeal to match that of the more widely-spoken Western European languages.
- 2.1.3. The events of 1989-1991 and the end of the Cold War have had extremely important consequences for the study of the languages, cultures and societies of Central and Eastern Europe. At first sight the changes may seem disadvantageous to Russia: it no longer has the status of a hostile superpower; its language is no longer taught as a compulsory subject in the majority of countries of the region. Nevertheless, this conclusion would be simplistic, if not downright wrong: the strategic significance of Russia has undoubtedly changed, and the straightforward simplicities of the Cold War era have been superseded by a context that is infinitely more complex and subtly nuanced, but it has not in any way diminished.
- 2.1.4. In the first place the Russian Federation remains an important power in its own right: it is a member of the G8 and the G20 and has inherited from the Soviet Union the right of permanent membership of the Security Council of the UN. It continues to possess nuclear weapons and plays an extremely active role in world affairs, sometimes acting in concert with the Western powers, but more often pursuing an independent line. Furthermore, given that Russia has recently joined the World Trade Organisation, that it is one of the so-called 'BRICS' countries⁴ and that it has enormous reserves of oil and gas, it is reasonable to predict that its economic weight in world terms is likely to increase. Second, Russia is, though it sometimes likes to pretend otherwise, a European power: it is a member of such European institutions as the OSCE and the Council of Europe and has a complex relationship with the EU; no less important is the fact that Russia supplies a considerable proportion of Europe's gas. And Russia is in some ways more integrated into Europe than may at times be thought: there is already, for example, a significant Russian-speaking population living within the borders of the EU, including the UK. Finally, Russia is the dominant power of its region: it has complicated relations with almost all of its neighbours, often resulting in serious

⁴ Along with Brazil, India, China and South Africa.

political or even, on occasion, military conflict (as with Georgia in 2008); it is pursuing a policy of economic and political reintegration, which may in due course produce a supra-national entity capable of rivalling the EU.

- 2.1.5. All of this means Russia is a country with which we engage and with which we will continue to engage over a wide and, in all probability, an increasing range of areas. And if contacts are not yet as free or as easy as might at one time have been hoped, they are much less limited and much less structured than they were during the Cold War and encompass such areas as security, business, culture, the mass media, entertainment and sport. This is not to say that the process of engagement will be simple or straightforward: on some occasions security interests coincide and a degree of co-operation is possible, while on others they come into conflict; in many circumstances the obstacles to doing business in Russia are successfully surmounted, but it can sometimes happen that doing business can prove well-nigh impossible. In other words, Russia is a country we need to know and to understand, and, if recent misunderstandings and disagreements are anything to go by, it is a country about which we still know far too little and which we understand even less.
- 2.1.6. As far as the language is concerned, historical circumstances mean that notwithstanding the decline in the teaching of Russian in Central and Eastern Europe, Russian can still be a useful means of communication outside the borders of the Russian Federation, sometimes in surprising situations;⁵ evidence obtained for this report indicates in any case that hostility towards the Russian language has abated since the early 1990s and that the decline in the teaching of Russian is being reversed (4.2.1.). There are thus no reasons whatsoever for concluding that the Russian language has declined in importance since the end of the Cold War, even if the reasons for studying it and the uses to which a knowledge of the language might be put have undergone significant changes over that period.
- 2.1.7. Very important changes have taken place elsewhere in the region. With the end of the Soviet Union and of Yugoslavia and with the break-up of Czechoslovakia around 20 newly independent states have appeared on the scene. Ten of these – Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia – have joined the EU; Croatia joins them in 2013. These states have reacted to their new status in different ways: some, notably Poland, are playing an increasingly active role in EU affairs; others present challenges of one sort or another. More problematic are those countries outside the EU: the Balkans and the Caucasus have been the location of Europe's most recent armed conflicts, while Ukraine presents a different sort of issue, reflected in its difficult relationships with Russia on the one hand and with the EU and NATO on the other. Particular note should be taken of those entities whose status is disputed: Kosovo, Transnistria, Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Nagorny Karabakh.⁶ These tend to be locked in conflicts which at any one time may or may not be 'frozen'; all of these, incidentally, involve Russia, and it may be argued that a closer analysis of Russia's response to Kosovo's declaration of independence in 2008 may lead to a greater understanding of the conflict that broke out between Russia and Georgia later that year.
- 2.1.8. These changes have inevitably had their consequences for the languages of the region other than Russian, and all of these have in one way or another enhanced their status and relevance for the UK. Belarusian, Macedonian, Slovak, Slovene and Ukrainian, as well as (among non-Slavonic languages of the region) Armenian, Azerbaijani, Estonian, Georgian, Latvian and Lithuanian have become the official state languages of sovereign independent

⁵ For example, when going through the security check at Tallinn Airport.

⁶ The form that is often used in anglophone sources, Nagorno Karabakh, is strictly speaking wrong, being derived from the Russian adjective, rather than the noun.

nations. As a result of the accession processes completed in 2004 and 2007 Bulgarian, Czech, Polish, Slovak and Slovene, as well as Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian and Romanian have become official languages of the European Union; they will be joined by Croatian in 2013. Native speakers of some of these languages (above all Polish) form a significant proportion of the UK's workforce; data collected for the 2011 Census indicate that Polish has now become the second most widely-spoken language within England.⁷ These changes mean that all these languages have acquired a greater or lesser degree of importance, which will vary according to such factors as the size and wealth of the country concerned, its geographical and cultural proximity to the UK and the extent of present and foreseeable future links. It cannot automatically be assumed that the present level of provision for these languages in British universities is an appropriate reflection of these different degrees of importance.

- 2.1.9. There have been other changes to language status that may be mentioned briefly here. Serbo-Croat, possibly the only language with fixed dates for its beginning and end, has split into three, four or more separate languages, eg Bosnian, Croat, Montenegrin and Serbian. Kashubian (Poland), Rusyn (several countries, but principally Slovakia, Serbia and, potentially, Ukraine) and Burgenland Croatian (Austria) were 25 years ago considered mere dialects, but all now have official recognition as distinct languages; others (Silesian?) may at some point follow the same path. None of this is necessarily of immediate importance: the differences between the various post-Serbo-Croatian languages are from the pedagogical point of view not greatly significant; there may well not be any particular demand to teach Kashubian or Rusyn. Nonetheless, it would seem desirable to establish capacity to ensure that the various socio-political and cultural changes affecting language status and function in Central and Eastern Europe are kept under observation.

2.2. National⁸

- 2.2.1. The history of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK since 1945 can be characterised, albeit somewhat schematically, in the following terms: steady state with limited growth, followed by rapid expansion, semi-planned restructuring and a slow, but steady decline. In part this history has been related to geopolitical factors described above, although it is arguable that no less important have been changes in university funding regimes, especially in the rather more turbulent years from the late 1970s onwards.
- 2.2.2. Until the early 1960s Slavonic Studies remained a somewhat marginal element of British academic life: in 1960 Russian was taught to degree level in only 13 universities (Muckle, 2008, p. 143). The Scarbrough and later the Hayter Reports had created the conditions for stability, while providing the basis for the subsequent development for what became known as Area Studies; the former also resulted in a modest increase in the teaching of Slavonic languages other than Russian. The rapid expansion took place in the 1960s: Muckle (2008, pp. 173-4) reports that by 1972 Russian was offered by no fewer than 35 universities, as well as by eight polytechnics. Unfortunately, for a number of mutually-reinforcing political and educational reasons (the end of the 'Thaw', the perceived difficulty and marginality of Russian) the exponential increase in the number of students which was needed to support this proliferation of departments failed to materialise. In addition, the funding climate for universities changed significantly for the worse during the 1970s, so by the end of that decade it was not too difficult to make a case for there being a significant over-provision of Russian and for this provision being spread over an unduly large number of departments,

⁷ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2013/jan/30/polish-becomes-englands-second-language>.

⁸ The opening paragraphs of this section are based heavily on Muckle, *op.cit.*, especially for the period before 1980.

some of which were too small to sustain viable academic activity. It was in this context that the University Grants Committee set up a working party to investigate Slavonic Studies; this resulted in the Atkinson Report of 1979, which recommended a substantial programme of closures and mergers; these recommendations were repeated almost verbatim in the infamous UGC Grant Letter of 1981.

- 2.2.3. In retrospect there seem to be clear indications that by the time the Atkinson Report was produced the UGC already had some forewarning of the scale of the cuts that were to be imposed on universities in 1981; it may also be the case that they wanted to use a relatively small subject area as a pilot project for the planning and management of more widespread cut-backs in provision. In the event, however, the process was only semi-planned: as a result of serious flaws in Atkinson's methodology and the unpredictably thrown nature of individual university managements a number of departments that had been recommended for closure survived, while others that had not been singled out were nonetheless closed down. The element of planning can be seen in the arrangements that were put in place for the staff in departments scheduled for closure: with the support of the UGC they were in most cases able to move to other universities. Thus, while it is undoubtedly the case that some departments that saw themselves as perfectly viable were closed down, the organised movement of academic staff permitted a reconstruction of the profession, in which receiving departments were able to maintain or even to strengthen their position. And in a warning to axe-wielders everywhere it may be noted that at least two departments originally singled out for closure are now among the strongest in the UK.
- 2.2.4. A second element of planning resulting from the Atkinson Report was the setting up of a number of consortium arrangements. These involved only selected universities, and their activity, which received financial support from the UGC, seems to have been largely confined to allowing academics to undertake teaching in institutions other than their own. These arrangements lasted for only a few years, and their passing, as far as can be judged, was generally unmourned.
- 2.2.5. The post-Atkinsonian restructuring of the profession did not create a system in equilibrium, and two further reviews were subsequently carried out with the aim of producing stability and allowing for a degree of expansion: these were the UK-wide Wooding Report of 1989 and the HEFCE enquiry (for England alone) of 1995. How successful these were is open to debate, though in the case of the former it fell victim to an unfortunate accident of timing, in that its recommendations were seriously undermined by the events of 1989-1991. Both, however, seem to have suffered from the fact that they could offer only 'one-off' solutions, an instant injection of resources without any longer-term plan for the allocation of resources or for the development of the subject area; both may have under-estimated the importance of language learning. Also worth mentioning here is the 'special factor' funding adopted by the Universities Funding Council (successor to the UGC) at the end of the 1980s to support *inter alia* certain subjects in low demand which did not attract sufficient students to be financially viable. Russian did not come within this category, but the scheme was used to support the teaching of other Slavonic and East European languages.
- 2.2.6. Notwithstanding these measures a number of departments closed during the 1990s and the 2000s. In part this was due to a circumstance foreseen by at least one distinguished professor at the end of the 1980s, namely the mass retirement of the large contingent of academics who had been appointed during the period of expansion during the 1960s. It is true that a number of universities embarked on a robust programme of replacement; one or two even did so proactively. Elsewhere, however, these departures provided institutions with the opportunity to close units that were, according to whatever criteria these institutions saw fit to adopt, perceived as 'under-performing' or 'no longer viable'. Some

indication of the scale and pace of the decline can be gained from figures given in the report of Sub-Panel on Russian, Slavonic and East European languages after the RAE in 2008: in 1996 21 institutions made submissions to this panel; by 2001 the number had fallen to 17, and by 2008 it was 15, although two of these had not made submissions to this particular panel in the previous exercise.⁹

- 2.2.7. A substantial proportion of the departments that have closed since 1990 were located outside England, and this suggests another relevant factor. In 1992 it was decided to devolve university funding to the four constituent parts of the UK, and in consequence four separate funding councils were set up. With the creation of the Scottish Parliament and the Assemblies for Wales and Northern Ireland universities inevitably fell into the devolved sphere, and to the different schemes of university funding that had been put in place were added increasingly divergent models of student funding. Though these developments have a certain logic within the context of UK domestic politics, it may to an outside observer seem completely bizarre that at a time when the rest of Europe is moving towards the creation of a single European higher education space (see below), the UK is busily putting in place four separate and increasingly incompatible higher education spaces.
- 2.2.8. Whatever benefits may have accrued elsewhere, there is no doubt that the devolution of university funding has been catastrophic for Slavonic and East European Studies. In Northern Ireland and Wales the teaching of Slavonic languages has been almost totally wiped out. In Scotland one of the first acts of the new funding council was to abolish the 'special factor' allocations mentioned in 2.2.5.; it then refused to participate in the 1995 HEFCE enquiry. In addition the Scottish Funding Council has funded the teaching of modern languages at a lower rate than in England and has consistently refused to intervene, even when unique areas of provision were threatened. Since 2000 the teaching of Russian has come to an end in two Scottish institutions, and the situation is difficult in the three universities where Russian and/or Slavonic Studies survives. The present position is examined in more detail in the following chapter.
- 2.2.9. Up until now the funding system in England seems to have allowed for more stability: modern languages have been funded at a higher rate than other Arts and Humanities subjects, and the 'special factor' scheme has survived and evolved into a programme for protecting strategically important and vulnerable subjects (SIVS). All this, however, is about to change with the introduction of a totally new funding model which will be applied from 2012-13 onwards. According to this model English universities will no longer receive direct funding to support the teaching of a wide range of subjects, including modern languages; instead they will receive student fees, which in most of the universities where Slavonic languages are taught will be set at the maximum level of £9,000 per annum. Changes are also planned to the SIVS scheme, though it would appear that at the time of writing these have yet to be finalised.
- 2.2.10. There is one positive development within the last decade that should be noted here. In 2006 the ESRC and AHRC, in collaboration with the English and Scottish Funding Councils, launched a scheme called Language-Based Area Studies. Under this scheme five multi-university centres were set up, two of which were concerned with Central and East European Studies: CRCEES, centred on Glasgow and including universities in Scotland and the North and the East Midlands of England, and CEELBAS, centred on London and Oxford and including universities in various parts of England. The scheme was concerned with research and included support for doctoral and post-doctoral studentships, for strengthening

⁹ RAE 2008: UOA5I Subject Overview Report, p. 6; available as a pdf file from <http://www.rae.ac.uk/pubs/2009/ov/>

Masters programmes through the incorporation of language study and for innovative forms of collaboration. It had been hoped the programme would be extended after the first grant expired in 2011, but a reduction in money available to the Funding Councils meant the centres were able to continue only in a severely diminished form.

- 2.2.11. There is no doubt that both the geopolitical and the British contexts have helped significantly to reshape academic life in the area of Slavonic and East European Studies. In part this relates to the development of new research topics, the increased availability of research materials and the emergence of new opportunities for collaboration, but it is also a consequence of the requirement for engagement with the user community that was an explicit feature of the LBAS programme and the emphasis on impact that is an important part of the new Research Excellence Framework that is to be completed in 2014. This issue is examined in detail in [section 3.9.](#), but it is worth noting here that a number of different forms of user engagement and of impact have been identified: these include advising the British and foreign governments, working with NGOs and voluntary bodies, providing informed comment in the media, writing dictionaries and grammars and organising cultural events. It is indeed the case that academics working in the field of Slavonic and East European Studies constitute a valuable resource for the UK.

2.3. European

- 2.3.1. There are two separate developments contributing to the creation of the common European Higher Education Space mentioned above. At the level of the EU there are the Erasmus and Erasmus Mundus programmes. The former is principally concerned with providing opportunities for staff and student mobility within the EU, while the latter allows for various types of collaboration between institutions in different EU countries, including collaborative postgraduate programmes at both Masters and Doctoral levels; as the name suggests, under certain conditions programmes can be extended to include countries outside the EU.
- 2.3.2. The second development is the Bologna Process, a programme which implements a declaration signed in Bologna in 1999. The aim of the process is to enhance both the unity and the transparency of the higher education systems of the participating countries so as to increase the opportunities for inter-action of various sorts between these different systems. Because the process comes under the auspices of the Council of Europe it extends to all European countries with the exception of Belarus, but including Russia. The implementation of the Bologna Process, and in particular the move to a common three-tier structure with specified parameters, has led to far reaching changes to university courses in most European countries, often imposed at short notice by central or regional governments. One such change is that in a number of countries the first tier has become the preserve of more generalised degree programmes, with advanced specialisation being left to the second tier, the Masters cycle. Whether something similar is taking place in the UK is difficult to say; if it is, it is happening much more slowly and without any element of planning or organisation.
- 2.3.3. There seems to be little awareness of the Bologna Process in the UK, something confirmed by the responses to the questionnaires, but there are nonetheless some specific developments connected to the process that have potential implications for Slavonic and East European Studies. There has been a proliferation throughout Europe of taught Masters courses (the middle tier of the structure), and in a number of countries such courses are increasingly being taught in English as a way of making them attractive to a greater number of potential students. These may well compete with British courses, especially when they are offered in countries with less onerous fee regimes than those that exist in parts of the UK. The second development relates specifically to Russia, which is in the process of changing from the traditional Soviet-style *Diplom + Kandidatskaia* system to a Bologna-compatible

Bachelor's + Masters + Doctoral system. As these new courses come on stream and as they acquire Bologna-compatible schemes of accreditation, there would seem to be the opportunity, if not immediately, then in the longer term, of increased collaboration between British and Russian institutions, especially those that have an orientation towards Europe.

- 2.3.4. It is generally the case that in recent years that BASEES and its members have tended to look more to North America than to Europe for academic alliances and inspiration. In the last few years, however, attention has started to turn back to Europe, as people have discovered the opportunities offered by the Erasmus and other EU programmes. The European dimension may receive an additional boost from the joint BASEES/ICCEES Conference, due to take place in Cambridge in April 2013, but it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that greater collaboration with other European countries would still be desirable. Academics working in the field of Slavonic and East European Studies, especially in the Western half of the Continent, work in similar conditions and face similar problems: at the very least it would seem sensible to exchange experiences and discuss common problems; in some circumstances it may be possible to make gains by presenting a common front. Ideally one might look to see the creation of a European Association for Slavonic and East European Studies, but until that can come about, it would be opportune to pursue every opportunity for formal and informal links with our European partners.

3. The current state of provision for Slavonic and East European Studies in UK universities

3.1. General survey of undergraduate provision in Russian

- 3.1.1. Different universities have very diverse systems of degree nomenclature, and names used for internal purposes may not in every case coincide with listings in the UCAS Handbook. Consequently, defining what constitutes a degree in Russian is not the exact science one might expect it to be. For present purposes it has been decided to consider as a degree in Russian any course in which the study of Russian language and associated 'content' topics constitutes a significant proportion of the total.
- 3.1.2. On the basis of that definition undergraduate courses in Russian are available at the present time in the following UK universities: Bath; Birmingham; Cambridge; Durham; Edinburgh; Exeter; Glasgow; Leeds; Manchester; Nottingham; Oxford; Queen Mary, University of London; St Andrews; Sheffield; University College, London (School of Slavonic and East European Studies). Single Honours courses in Russian (or a close equivalent) are currently available at: Bristol; Cambridge; Durham; Edinburgh; Leeds; Manchester; Nottingham; Oxford; Queen Mary, University of London; St Andrews; Sheffield; University College, London (School of Slavonic and East European Studies).
- 3.1.3. In addition to the universities listed in the previous paragraph, there are a number of institutions that offer one or more years of credit-bearing courses in Russian that can form part of degree programmes in other subjects. Such institutions include King's College, London; the London School of Economics; the University of Wolverhampton and the University of York. These have not been included in the survey. An exception to this is Imperial College, London, which offers credit-bearing undergraduate courses, as well as postgraduate courses in translation and which was kind enough to respond to the questionnaire.
- 3.1.4. It will be noted that the above lists of institutions are dominated by English universities. In Wales and Northern Ireland there are now no undergraduate degree courses whatsoever in Russian (or any other Slavonic language for that matter). In Wales Russian has in the past been taught at Aberystwyth, Bangor and Swansea; the first of these closed in the post-Atkinson reconstruction of the early 1980s, while the last two closed some time around the start of the present century. In Northern Ireland Russian was taught at what is now the University of Ulster and at Queen's University, Belfast; the former closed in the mid-1980s and the latter in 1996. In Scotland Russian is taught in three universities, but has disappeared in a further three: in Aberdeen the teaching of Russian came to an end in the 1980s (though it was revived at Levels 1 and 2 for a brief period in the 1990s); at Heriot-Watt and Strathclyde it came to an end around the middle of the last decade.
- 3.1.5. The Ministers with responsibility for higher education in the Welsh and Northern Irish governments were approached for their comments on this situation. Both replies alluded to the autonomy of individual institutions and their right to determine independently what subjects they offered, though the letter from the Welsh Department of Education and Skills made the additional point that:

... the Minister for Education and Skills has made clear in his remit letter to the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW) that he would like the

Council to continue to focus on the delivery of subjects of strategic importance including the maintenance of modern foreign languages.

Unfortunately no reply was received from HEFCW, so their response to this injunction cannot be ascertained. Both Ministers seemed satisfied that adequate funding arrangements were in place to allow students resident in Wales or Northern Ireland who wished to do so to study Russian or other Slavonic languages elsewhere in the UK or the EU.

- 3.1.6. Outside the UK there is an undergraduate course in Russian (approximately equivalent to Joint Honours) available at Trinity College, Dublin. As far as can be ascertained, there are no undergraduate courses in Russian that are taught through the medium of English available in any other EU university.
- 3.1.7. Although the universities offering Russian in England and Scotland are reasonably well distributed geographically, a striking feature of the provision is the lack of institutional diversity. Some Russian appears to be taught at Westminster and Wolverhampton, but apart from that the language has totally disappeared from the post-1992 universities. With the exception of Bath it has also disappeared from the universities founded in the 1960s, a group in which at one time it had a considerable presence. In Scotland no Russian is taught in any university founded after 1582. Effectively, therefore, Russian, and by extension other Slavonic and East European languages have become the almost exclusive preserve of the ancient and civic universities, with implications for student choice and course design that go beyond the scope of this review.

3.2. Undergraduate provision in other Slavonic languages

- 3.2.1. Bulgarian is available in combination with certain other subjects at University College, London.
- 3.2.2. Czech is available as a Joint Honours (or equivalent) at Bristol, Oxford and University College, London. At Sheffield Czech can be taken as a minor language in combination with other languages or as a major language within the three-language BA in Modern Languages. At Glasgow the Joint Honours degree in Czech was recently withdrawn, though the language remains on offer at Levels 1 and 2; Honours level teaching is likely to resume in the near future as part of a new degree in Slavonic and East European Languages and Cultures.
- 3.2.3. Polish is available as a Joint Honours equivalent at University College, London. At Sheffield Polish is offered on the same basis as Czech, and at Oxford it is available as a minor subject. At Birmingham it is available as an Honours option to students of Russian. At Glasgow the Joint Honours degree in Polish was recently withdrawn, though the language remains on offer at Levels 1 and 2; Honours level teaching is likely to resume in the near future as part of a new degree in Slavonic and East European Languages and Cultures. In addition Polish is offered as a minor subject at Trinity College, Dublin and is taught as a subsidiary language at Leeds and at Manchester.
- 3.2.4. Serbian and Croatian (this is the term that tends to be preferred in British universities for the post-Serbo-Croatian languages) are offered as a Single and Joint Honours subject at Nottingham and as the equivalent of a Joint Honours subject at UCL. Croatian with Serbian was until recently offered as an Honours option for students of Russian at Durham, but has now been withdrawn.
- 3.2.5. Slovak is available as a Joint Honours equivalent at University College, London. Courses in Slovak are available for students of Czech at Bristol.

- 3.2.6. Courses in Slovene are available for students of Serbian and Croatian at Nottingham.
- 3.2.7. Ukrainian is available as a Joint Honours equivalent at University College, London. Courses in Ukrainian are available at Cambridge, and an Honours module is available to students of Russian at St Andrews.
- 3.2.8. In addition to the above teaching in a number of Slavonic languages, notably Bulgarian, Serbian/Croatian and Ukrainian, is available at Oxford in association with Special Subjects in Comparative Slavonic Philology and the History and Structure of a Slavonic Language.

3.3. Undergraduate provision in other Central and East European languages

- 3.3.1. Finnish, Hungarian and Romanian are available as a Joint Honours equivalent at University College, London. Georgian is available as a minor subject at the School of Oriental and African Studies, where a single course in Armenian (Western variant) is also on offer.

3.4. Undergraduate courses in Slavonic Studies without a compulsory language element

- 3.4.1. As far as can be ascertained, there are a small number of courses available in the literatures and cultures of the Slavonic world that do not involve the compulsory of a language, albeit that language courses can be taken as an option. There is a course in Russian Civilization at Leeds and a course in Russian and East European Civilisations (available as a Single and a Joint Honours course) at Nottingham. The course in Slavonic Studies (Joint Honours only) at Glasgow has been under threat of closure, but is now likely to survive in a revised form which will include the study of a language at some point.

3.5. Undergraduate curriculum

- 3.5.1. Most (though not all) universities now give detailed information about curricula and course content on their websites, which makes this information relatively easy to retrieve and, in most cases, to interpret. This confirms the initial supposition that there have been significant changes to curriculum and course content in recent years. It would be wrong to suggest that traditional 'language and literature' courses have disappeared: this is far from being the case, but the majority of such courses have been broadened by the incorporation of new elements that were not generally available 20 or 30 years ago. At the same time, however, some other elements that formerly played a significant role in undergraduate courses have declined in importance, while others have failed to develop in the way that might have been expected. And while the comments below are fairly generalised, it is worth bearing in mind that almost every university will include in its provision individual course units which are unique to that institution and which arise as a rule out of the specific academic interests of individual members of staff.

3.5.2. Language

Almost all universities offering courses in Russian have separate first-year streams for beginners and for those with A-level (or equivalent); in the great majority of cases numbers in the former are higher than in the latter. The practice of offering an additional year of intensive Russian teaching to beginners, formerly widespread in English universities, seems to have died out, presumably as a result of changes in student funding, though also perhaps because it is now much easier for students to spend a year in Russia. Indeed, the fact that it

has become the norm for students of Russian to spend a significant amount of time in the country is one of the most important changes to have affected the study of the language over the last few decades. Other Slavonic and East European languages are normally taught on the assumption that all new students are beginners. Languages available as Joint or Single Honours subjects are normally taught over four years (including year abroad), though some Scottish courses last for five years, reflecting the particular structure of the Scottish (undergraduate) MA degree. Those languages offered as minor subjects are normally taught over two years, while languages available as a single course module may be taught over one year or even in some cases one semester. In addition to their core languages courses a few universities offer additional specialised language modules in such areas as advanced translation, business Russian and translation and/or interpreting. For the most part, however, specialist courses at interpreting and translating are left to the postgraduate level; the one undergraduate Russian course that specialised in producing translators and interpreters (at Heriot-Watt) closed in 2005.

3.5.3. Literature

The teaching of literature has been significantly affected by a move away from the 'Core + options' pattern that tended to dominate in the later years of the last century. As one might expect, the study of Russian literature remains strongly focused on the 19th, 20th and, now, the 21st centuries. Though survey courses in 19th and (less often) 20th century literature survive, they have been replaced in many institutions by shorter periods defined by political events (eg 1917-1941, Stalinism) or by literary descriptors (the Golden Age, the Silver Age). Other courses are based on genre (eg shorter prose) or what might loosely be termed theme (St Petersburg, Exile and Emigration, Women's Writing). The individual authors most widely selected for special study are Dostoevskii and Tolstoi, though other authors who feature include Pushkin, Gogol' and Nabokov. Only a very few universities adopt the practice of combining two authors in a single course unit.

3.5.4. Cultural Studies

There is no doubt it is this area that has undergone the most rapid expansion in recent years, so there now seems to be only one university offering Slavonic and East European Studies that does not include some element of what may be termed Cultural Studies in its programme. It is particularly interesting to note that a number of universities now include a unit called 'Introduction to Russian Culture' in their first-year programme. At more advanced levels cinema and visual culture are especially strongly represented, while courses relating to specific periods (Soviet culture, Stalinist culture) or to specific forms of culture (eg aspects of popular culture) are also to be widely found. Media studies, on the other hand, are restricted to a very small number of institutions.

3.5.5. Linguistics and Philology

This is a subject area that has suffered a significant decline over the last two decades. Philology, as traditionally understood in the British academic tradition (ie historical and comparative linguistics) is alive and well at Oxford and Cambridge, but nowhere else, it seems. Given what has happened in other language departments, this is perhaps not surprising, though the importance of such studies within the Slavonic academic tradition and their potential value to students, especially those wishing to study more than one Slavonic language, mean that it may be considered somewhat disappointing (see also the comments on intercomprehension in 4.4.10.). What is more disturbing, however, is the failure to develop in their place courses that adopt other approaches to Slavonic linguistics. Courses that examine the structure of modern Slavonic languages are available in only two

institutions, while courses with a sociolinguistic orientation can be found in only three; only one of the latter is concerned with present-day Russian.

3.5.6. Medieval and Early Modern Studies

This is another subject area that is alive and well in Oxford and Cambridge, but which has almost totally disappeared everywhere else, impaled, presumably, on the Morton's Fork of 'student demand' and 'relevance'. In the circumstances it would scarcely be possible to argue for a wholesale revival of the subject area, but a reassessment of its overall significance might be useful. As for relevance, there are those who would argue that Putin's Russia cannot possibly be understood without some knowledge of pre-Petrine Muscovy.

3.5.7. Other subject areas

Intellectual History and History *tout court* are taught in a few institutions, but neither is widely available. Courses in Russian and/or East European politics are also restricted to a small number of universities and are generally found in those institutions where staff with an interest in this area are located in the same administrative unit as staff who teach language (as is the case at Bath and SSEES). At these and at some other institutions, such as Manchester, there is something of a tendency to replace or supplement traditional language and literature courses with courses combining a language with cultural studies, social science subjects and/or history. It is also true that in some universities there are other routes available to students who wish to combine interests in language and politics (eg Joint Honours Russian and Politics, a Slavonic language combined with Central and East European Studies), but on the whole the role of politics and related disciplines in language courses seems curiously underdeveloped. This is a question that merits further examination: in particular, it might be useful to clarify the relative importance of factors relating to supply (the difficulty of collaboration between different administrative units in systems of devolved funding) and demand (the extent to which students of language are interested in politics or other social science disciplines and vice versa).

3.5.8. As the preceding paragraph implies, there is a significant amount of teaching in the areas of history and social sciences which is undertaken separately from the teaching of language, literature and cultural studies. In some instances this takes the form of individual course units offered in general departments of history, politics or economics, but there are a number of major centres, notably at Birmingham, Glasgow and SSEES, that can trace their origins back to the Scarbrough Report or even earlier. These offer undergraduate courses in aspects of Central and East European Studies that may but need not necessarily be combined with study of the relevant language(s).

3.6. Undergraduate student numbers

3.6.1. Information relating to numbers of undergraduates studying Russian or other Slavonic and East European languages for the academic years 2007-08 to 2011-12 was obtained by means of the questionnaire mentioned in 1.9.. Now the arrival of a long and detailed questionnaire just at the point when the summer examination season is coming to an end is not going to be greeted (and was not greeted) with unbridled joy; moreover, since this report is not commissioned by a body responsible for allocating funds, it was not possible to encourage a prompt response by threatening dire penalties for non-compliance. Warmest thanks are therefore due to those Heads of Departments and Schools, academic colleagues and administrators who were able to spare the time and take the trouble to collect the data requested and to answer a series of difficult questions. Thanks are also due to those colleagues who tried to respond to the questionnaire, but who were unable to do or whose

responses were delayed because of difficulties in extracting the data relating to student numbers. To someone who spent an unduly large proportion of his academic career in collecting data of this nature for one type of review or another, the existence of this problem came as something of an unpleasant surprise. It appears to be a consequence of changes in administrative procedures, and the report returns to this issue below (3.10.11.).

3.6.2. Given that it would be useful for BASEES and for other appropriate bodies to have access to information on student numbers when conducting discussions with funding bodies and with other stakeholders and given that data available from HESA are insufficiently detailed, this is a problem that is worth addressing. For some years the American University and the Committee on College and pre-College Russian have collected enrolment statistics from universities in the US and Canada,¹⁰ and it is proposed that serious consideration be given to mounting a similar operation for the UK (or, if preferred, the British Isles). It is unlikely that such data will ever be 100% complete, but with reasonable co-operation there should be enough to provide useful statistics on student numbers and, in due course, trends. And if enrolment statistics for each year are sent in shortly after the beginning of each academic year, this should obviate the need for complicated exercises in data extraction. As to who should conduct the exercise, this may, at least initially, have to fall on the shoulders of BASEES, though if an individual institution or another body with an interest in the area were willing to become involved, this could only be welcomed.

3.6.3. Notwithstanding the above information on student numbers was received from the following universities: Bath; Cambridge; Durham; Edinburgh; Exeter; Glasgow; Imperial College, London; Leeds; Manchester; Oxford; Queen Mary, University of London; Sheffield; St Andrews; University College, London (SSEES). Detailed information is given in Appendix C, sections 1 and 2, but the results can be summarised here. What they show is that the total number of students enrolled on Honours courses in Russian at the universities who responded was as follows:

Table 1: Number of students enrolled in Russian courses	
Year	Number of students
2007-08	1108
2008-09	1194
2009-10	1337
2010-11	1447
2011-12	1431

The absence of data from Edinburgh for the first two years slightly complicates the picture, but what these figures show is a year-on-year increase for every year until the last. The increase from 2007-08 to 2011-12 amounts to almost 30%. It is difficult to know what to make of this, since enrolments on individual years at individual universities are subject to a significant degree of variation, to which it is not always easy to ascribe a pattern. The total enrolments for first-year courses at Advanced and Beginners' level were as follows:

¹⁰ The latest figures are available at <http://www1.american.edu/research/CCPCR/COLLEGEENROLL.htm>

Table 2: Total enrolments for first year Russian courses

Year	Advanced level	Beginners' level
2007-08	165	263
2008-09	164	279
2009-10	163	355
2010-11	158	408
2011-12	161	345

Over the five years of the survey the number of students arriving with A level (or equivalent) has remained remarkably constant, while there has been a marked increase in those taking beginners' courses, with a particularly impressive, but possibly anomalously high figure for 2010-11.

3.6.4. Overall these figures look very healthy, and this assessment is confirmed by the figures for individual departments given in [Appendix C](#). They certainly justify the view expressed by most departments (3.1.1.2.) that under conditions as they have existed in recent years the situation is generally sustainable. The only area where there might be cause for concern is for A-Level entry, where the numbers in some individual departments are in single figures; some universities (Bath in 2009, Glasgow in the 1990s) have abandoned this stream of entry (in Glasgow suitably qualified students can go straight into the second year of the course). This is an area that needs particularly careful monitoring, especially in light of the difficult position of Russian in secondary schools (4.2.9.). Nevertheless, given that numbers have not changed overall and given also the importance of this stream for producing able and committed students, no case can be seen for any further abandonments. Interestingly, the number of students taking A-level Russian has been increasing in recent years: the Edexcel Examination Board reports 759 entries in 2007, 908 in 2011 and 1008 in 2012;¹¹ the extent, however, to which this can be attributed to native speakers of Russian is something that cannot readily be determined, though the information contained in 4.2.9. does rather point in this direction.

3.6.5. The picture is not quite so healthy when one looks at the figures for undergraduate degrees in languages other than Russian; these are given in [Appendix C, section 2](#). Though the absence of responses from Bristol (for Czech) and from Nottingham (for Serbian/Croatian and Slovene) mean that the data are incomplete, the information available indicates that enrolments on courses that run from beginners' to Honours level are generally in single figures and sometimes are very low indeed. It would thus be very difficult to argue for an immediate expansion of such provision, but at the same time it is important to warn against being seduced by the superficially attractive notion of 'rationalising' or reducing provision. Some capacity for these languages will always be required: we may not need many, but we will always need some graduates in Finnish, Hungarian or Romanian. For the more widely-used languages (Czech, Croatian/Serbian and, above all, Polish) a plurality of provision is required. This is to a large extent a matter of student choice: the small number of courses that are available differ from one another in terms of content and of the possible combinations; the increasing incompatibility of the English and Scottish systems of higher education makes it essential for some provision to exist in Scotland.

¹¹ Data extracted from <http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/gce-stats.aspx>.

- 3.6.6. It is difficult to know what else can be done. SSEES has over the years restructured its courses in languages other than Russian; Glasgow is in the process of redesigning its offerings in Czech and Polish. It is also the case that each unit offering such courses has to work within a framework of institutional, faculty and departmental constraints and regulations. Nor has the surprising boom in entries for A-level Polish helped the situation,¹² presumably because they consist entirely of native speakers of Polish who wish to take other subjects at degree level. There may, however, be some scope for greater collaboration and co-operation between the individual units, and it would certainly be opportune to instigate collaboration between the academic providers and other stakeholders (eg potential employers) to consider whether courses can be made more attractive to potential students and whether action is needed to match supply with demand. There is certainly need for a robust campaign of information and education to make more widely known the increased importance of many of these languages and the opportunities that exist for someone who has studied one or more of them.
- 3.6.7. Where the numbers look more encouraging is on one- or two-year subsidiary courses or the first year of programmes that allow students to drop a language after one year (for example Sheffield and Glasgow); here they are much more likely to reach into double figures. This is also true of the subsidiary courses in Bulgarian and Czech that were taught at Leeds and the course in Croatian/Serbian formerly available at Durham, which makes it all the more regrettable that these have had to be discontinued. It is with subsidiary courses that there is scope for expansion; indeed, one might set it out as a *desideratum* that all Honours students of Russian should have the opportunity of at least one year's study of another Slavonic language. Not that this is something that is going to happen in the immediate future or, perhaps, at all: whether, how and in what time scale this might be achieved are all complex questions. It would, however, be opportune for individual institutions to consider what might be done in this regard; in some instances consortium arrangements or other forms of collaboration, such as joint appointments, may provide possible solutions.

3.7. General survey of taught postgraduate provision

- 3.7.1. Taught postgraduate provision in Slavonic and East European studies can be divided into three categories: 'content-based' Masters courses; Masters courses in translating and/or interpreting; intensive courses, usually leading to a diploma or a certificate, in a language not previously studied. In addition there is one set of courses that encompasses both the first and third categories.
- 3.7.2. Almost all departments included in this review either offer or participate in 'content-based' postgraduate courses. In only about four institutions is there a specific named degree course in Russian or Slavonic Studies, while in one or two others the subject area forms a named pathway in a more generically-titled degree. Elsewhere the practice is to offer individual modules or to contribute a Slavonic element to modules in more general degrees, usually in Cultural Studies or in an area thereof. The relative paucity of named courses in Slavonic Studies probably reflects the twin constraints of staffing and minimum requirements imposed by universities for student numbers; as one might expect, it is with very rare exceptions only the largest units that are able to offer courses of this nature.
- 3.7.3. Mention should also be made here of taught postgraduate courses in the areas of history and social sciences. To give some examples, Birmingham offers postgraduate courses only in Social Sciences, while SSEES makes available a range of courses in both Arts and Social

¹² The AQA examination board reports 929 results in 2012; see http://store.aqa.org.uk/over/stat_pdf/AQA-A-LEVEL-STATS-JUNE-2012.PDF.

Sciences subject areas; at Glasgow some of the taught courses in Central and East European Studies include modules taught by staff in Slavonic Studies. Masters courses are also being developed at the newly-created Russia Institute at King's College, London, and there are other courses offered elsewhere that include significant elements relating to Russia or Central and Eastern Europe, such as the MA in Modern European History at the University of East Anglia. In neither of these institutions are there degree courses in Slavonic and East European languages.

- 3.7.4. There are three universities that offer postgraduate courses in both interpreting and translating: Bath, Leeds and Westminster; the specialist course at Bradford closed a number of years ago. Westminster offers Polish as well as Russian. Rather more universities (at least seven) offer courses in translating or translating studies; Edinburgh lists a course on literary translation, as does Trinity College, Dublin. Institutions offering other Slavonic and East European languages in addition to Russian are Glasgow (Polish, though not for the time being Czech), Imperial College (Hungarian and Polish) and Sheffield (Czech and Polish). As far as it is possible to ascertain, these are courses that are principally intended for native speakers of English, but mention should be made here of postgraduate courses in interpreting and translating that are available at Queen's University, Belfast, where among the language pairs offered are Polish-English and Russian-English; these can be taken either by native speakers of English or by native speakers of Polish/Russian, but so far the only students to have taken the courses belong to the latter category.
- 3.7.5. It follows from the above that out of the Slavonic and other Central and East European languages that have acquired or are about to acquire the status of official languages of the EU, translation courses are available for only three (Czech, Hungarian and Polish) and an interpreting course for only one (Polish). It might therefore be appropriate to give consideration, perhaps in conjunction with the relevant bodies of the EU, to the question whether it is desirable to build the capacity to offer courses in some or all of the remaining Slavonic and other Central and East European languages of the EU, even if demand meant that such courses were not necessarily made available each year. This question is returned to in 4.4.8.-4.4.14..
- 3.7.6. For many years the only postgraduate course of the third type was the intensive Diploma in Russian offered at Strathclyde University. According to James Muckle, this was one of four courses set up to train qualified teachers in other subjects as teachers of Russian (Muckle, 2008, p. 158),¹³ but unlike the others, it survived until the teaching of Russian ceased at Strathclyde, moving to Glasgow in 2004. Over the years the student intake changed, and latterly the course tended to attract postgraduates wishing to study topics related to Russia and professionals from other spheres of activity who needed urgently to acquire a knowledge of Russian. A factor that helped the course to survive was that until recently a number of earmarked grants were available to students resident in Scotland.
- 3.7.7. At the time the Strathclyde Diploma was transferred to Glasgow student numbers were in low-to-middle single figures, and the longer-term future of the course was uncertain. The situation changed, however, with the advent of the LBAS scheme with its emphasis on language learning by postgraduates in Humanities and Social Science subjects. Under the auspices of this scheme the Glasgow Diploma gained a new lease of life and analogous courses were set up in Russian and in other Slavonic and East European languages in a number of institutions.

¹³ Muckle, *op. cit.*, p. 158. The other three were at Holborn College, Liverpool College of Commerce and the University of Birmingham.

- 3.7.8. The drastic reduction in LBAS funding, perennial uncertainties over student demand and, in at least one case, the unfathomable logic of university 'managers' have led to a situation which is complex and in some respects confused. Nevertheless, some indications of what is at present available can be given here. At Birmingham courses in Polish and in Russian aimed at Social Scientists appear to be offered at three different levels, and there is a course in Ukrainian with a similar orientation; courses in Georgian and Kazakh are also available, at least notionally. At Glasgow the original Diploma in Russian and similar Diplomas in Czech and Polish created under the auspices of the LBAS scheme are not at present being offered, though they have not been formally withdrawn; at the same time, however, new Certificate and Diploma courses in Russian, offering a more flexible course structure, elements of distance learning and a period of study in Russia, are being made available, and in due course analogous courses may be offered in other languages. The response to the questionnaire from Glasgow also suggests that in recent years there has been some teaching of Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian and Lithuanian. Nottingham offers postgraduate Diplomas in Serbian/Croatian and Slovene and has just launched a similar course in Russian.
- 3.7.9. In some other institutions tuition in a language from beginners' level forms either a compulsory or an optional part of other taught degree programmes. At SSEES students can take an intensive language course in one of 13 Central and East European languages as part of an MA or a MRes degree, while at Oxford learning a new Slavonic language (ten are at least notionally on offer, including Croatian and Serbian as separate languages) forms a compulsory part of the one-year MSt and the two-year MPhil degrees in Slavonic Studies.
- 3.7.10. The provision of postgraduate beginners' courses in Slavonic and other Central and East European languages, whether as self-standing Certificate or Diploma programmes or as part of taught Masters programmes, presents both opportunities and challenges. The first of the opportunities relates to the preparation of researchers, especially postgraduates. In their responses to the questionnaire many universities commented on the desirability of ensuring that postgraduates with qualifications in other disciplines who wished to carry out research on a topic related to Central or Eastern Europe had a knowledge of the appropriate language(s), and indeed the LBAS programme was set up to meet this need. There is no doubt that the LBAS programme has achieved considerable success in this area, but the momentum needs to be maintained, and to this end it would be valuable if the Research Councils could include funding for these courses in their provision for postgraduates. The responses also suggest that there is still work to be done both in raising awareness among new researchers, their supervisors and university administrators and in guaranteeing an adequate level of provision.
- 3.7.11. The second opportunity is that which can be offered to graduates in one Slavonic language, usually Russian, of acquiring an adequate working knowledge of a second Slavonic language or of another language used in Central or East Europe. As was shown above, in sections 3.2. and 3.3., undergraduate provision in Central and East European languages other than Russian remains extremely sparse; in these circumstances the capacity to offer intensive postgraduate courses in these languages can at least partially remedy any shortfalls in undergraduate provision and offers the potential of creating a flexible and cost-effective way of allowing students to extend their qualifications and to give themselves more possibilities in the employment market.
- 3.7.12. The challenges relate in different ways to matching supply to demand. For a small number of languages there may well be sufficient demand to allow one or more courses to run on a regular basis; this presumably applies to Russian and should be applicable to Polish and, if not now, then in the near future, to Croatian/Serbian. For other languages, however, demand may be more irregular, and here it may be more appropriate to have capacity in place to

offer courses as and when demand arises, albeit that it is recognised such a system raises problems for the organisation of teaching and for matching demand with supply.

- 3.7.13.** A further complication is that supply characteristically consists of more or less intensive courses, either full-time self-standing or combined with other academic programmes, whereas demand may be for shorter courses, for part-time tuition or for the possibility of distance learning. It may therefore favour the matching of supply with demand if more consideration could be given to mounting programmes with part-time tuition, to offering multiple exit points and to devising schemes of self-tuition and/or distance learning. Some universities are already starting to move in this direction, but this would seem to be an area where there is scope for further activity. Responses to the questionnaire suggest little attention has been paid so far to the distance learning, yet this would seem to be area with potential for development, and it would be worth carrying out a serious investigation into likely demand for offerings of this type. It is not suggested that every university might wish to go down this route; the majority will probably prefer not to, but in certain specific circumstances and especially for languages where supply is now and is likely to remain very limited, this may offer valuable opportunities for attracting students who are at present unable to find what they are looking for. In some instances it may be appropriate to involve university languages centres in helping to overcome the problems mentioned here and in the previous paragraph.
- 3.7.14.** A further potential problem is that of courses appearing and then disappearing after only a short period of existence. This not only causes difficulties for would-be students, but can lead to the danger of swinging between the poles of saturating the market and of total absence of provision. The problem is exacerbated when institutions use crudely simplistic criteria for 'viability' which fail, for example, to take into account future fee income from those who go on to postgraduate study and which inhibit the rational use of intra-institutional and in some cases perhaps inter-institutional cross-subsidy. The only way of avoiding this problem is to introduce a robust element of planning and co-ordination, preferably at national (UK-wide) level, rather than at the level of individual consortia. Not only would this offer the best opportunity to match supply with demand, but it would allow for arrangements where, for example, a student could study a language in one institution and go on to study for a research degree somewhere else.
- 3.7.15.** The conclusion therefore is that postgraduate language courses offer some opportunity for development and for enhancing the overall provision in the area of Slavonic and East European languages. At the same time, however, this potential will be realised only if three conditions are fulfilled: a flexible and innovative approach to content and earning methods is adopted; provision is structured in a way that allows courses to be available, but not necessarily offered every year; a robust system of central planning and co-ordination is needed to avoid both under-provision and surplus provision.

3.8. Postgraduate student numbers

- 3.8.1.** Numbers of students taking taught postgraduate courses are given in [Appendix C, section 3](#).

The totals for each type of course are as follows:

Table 3: Intensive postgraduate diplomas (or equivalent) in a Slavonic or other East European language	
Year	Number of students
2011-12	24
2010-11	14
2009-10	22
2008-09	24
2007-08	27

Since Glasgow was the only university to return figures under this heading, it is impossible to make any general observations.

Table 4: Masters courses in translation and/or interpreting			
Year	Subtotal Russian	Subtotal Polish	Total
2011-12	28	14	43
2010-11	24	16	40
2009-10	21	9	31
2008-09	17	6	23
2007-08	15	8	23

Here there is a distinct and encouraging tendency for numbers to increase from year to year, a statistic that applies to both Polish and Russian; the increase from 2007-08 to 2011-12 comes to over 80%. It is noteworthy that with one exception numbers for Polish are between one third and one half of the total for Russian. Other languages are represented only very marginally and in some years not at all.

Table 5: Other Masters courses		
Year	Subtotal Language, Literature & Culture	Total
2011-12	38	133
2010-11	48	156
2009-10	39	119
2008-09	43	123
2007-08	25	92

The overall total is dominated by SSEES and, though to a much lesser extent, by Glasgow, but the subtotal for those courses with a content partly or wholly related to language, literature or culture is also substantially made up of students at SSEES. Only six universities returned data under this heading, reflecting the fact that only a small number of universities are in a position to offer specialised taught Masters courses in Slavonic and East European languages, literatures and cultures. Unfortunately the survey cannot report on the contribution made by units teaching Slavonic and East European languages to more general courses on languages, literature and culture.

3.9. Research

3.9.1. A detailed account of the current state of research in the area was given in the report of Sub-Panel on Russian, Slavonic and East European languages after the RAE in 2008, and here it is necessary only to note the salient points. Though the somewhat Panglossian concluding sentence does not reflect the content with total accuracy, the report is generally positive. In particular, it is noted that the decline in the number of units making submissions to the panel is balanced by a small increase in the average numbers of researchers in each unit, so that the overall number of researchers in the area is about the same as in the previous assessment. The report also drew attention to a significant number of Early Career Researchers (nearly 20% of the total), though it also noted that in one or two institutions senior staff who might have been expected to provide research leadership had not been replaced.

3.9.2. As might be expected, the report considered the coverage of different fields of study within the subject area, drawing mixed conclusions. It noted that Russian literature of the 19th century and later was particularly strongly represented and that there had been a considerable expansion of research into such areas as women's writing, cultural politics, visual culture, cinema and the media; it also noted that scholars were increasingly willing to cross disciplinary and temporal (though, not, it seems, geographical) boundaries and that in consequence published work was becoming harder to categorise. It also, however, noted fields of study that had only minimal representation or which were totally unrepresented: these were medieval Russian and East European history and culture, modern Russian language and a number of other Slavonic and East European languages and cultures (no fewer than 12 are listed). It also observed that the remaining Slavonic languages and cultures (apart from Russian) were but thinly covered and that this coverage might be further reduced or even disappear completely if departing senior staff were not to be replaced.

3.9.3. An increasingly important factor in research assessment and funding is impact and engagement with the community, and some time ago BASEES undertook a survey of its members on this topic, the results of which have been kindly made available by the President of that organisation. Unfortunately the survey is far from complete: for whatever reason extremely few people responded, and it is clear the results reveal only a very small proportion of the work that is actually being done. Nonetheless it is possible to draw some conclusions. The activities in which academics working in this subject area have been involved include the following:

- monitoring elections in Russia and elsewhere on behalf of international bodies such as the OSCE;
- acting as consultants for foreign governments;
- giving informed advice to British government bodies, for example the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Ministry of Defence;
- organising cultural events and exhibitions;

- working with NGOs and bodies in the voluntary sector, both in the UK and in the countries of the region;
- participating as informed commentators in news and current affairs programmes on radio and television;
- writing and compiling grammars and dictionaries.

As the nature of the subject area would suggest and as this list confirms, impact and user engagement are not restricted to the UK.

3.9.4. An important aspect of this issue is what is termed 'user engagement', which formed a major element of the LBAS programme. This has never been an easy matter to address: in the early 1990s, for example, the University of Glasgow set up a Central European Research and Development Unit which among other activities held briefing seminars for local businessmen, but these achieved only limited success, and the programme was eventually discontinued. The LBAS Centres have achieved rather more: one response notes that successful links have been achieved with local and national government and with NGOs, but that forming links with the business community has been harder, with much of the bridge building being done by the academic community. Nevertheless, CRCEES has established a Scottish-Russian Business Forum and a Scottish-Hungarian Business Forum and has also developed an internship programme with the business and cultural communities; CEELBAS has a programme of knowledge exchange partnerships and events and maintains a database of expertise. It is thus legitimate to conclude that the LBAS scheme has enabled significant advances in user engagement to be made over what is really a short period of time.

3.9.5. Numbers of research postgraduates are given in [Appendix C, section 3](#). The totals are as follows:

Table 6: Masters research degrees		
Year	Numbers enrolled ¹⁴	Numbers completing
2011-12	11	8
2010-11	14	12
2009-10	9	3
2008-09	15	8
2007-08	11	5

¹⁴ One respondent noted an inadvertent ambiguity in the word 'enrolled', as used in the questionnaire; here it means the total number of students participating in the programme, not the number entering the programme for the first time.

Table 7: Doctoral degrees¹⁵

Year	Numbers enrolled	Numbers completing
2011-12	74	19
2010-11	58	9
2009-10	43	12
2008-09	41	13
2007-08	38	12

The numbers taking Masters research degrees show no particular tendency and are in any case fairly low; in fact, only six universities returned data under this heading. Nevertheless, even if such offerings form only a minor part of the overall provision, they do in certain circumstances fulfil a useful role; in particular, for many part-time students they present a more realistic proposition than a full programme of doctoral research.

- 3.9.6. The figures relating to doctoral students require more detailed comment. It is interesting to note overall numbers have almost doubled over the years covered by the survey, and it would be useful to compare these figures with those for related disciplines to see if this forms part of a more general trend. How this might relate to employment opportunities is another question worth exploring: on the face of it it is difficult to imagine all 74 doctoral students enrolled in 2011-12 finding academic posts, but it may be that a higher degree is increasingly seen as opening doors to employment opportunities in other spheres.
- 3.9.7. An even more remarkable statistic to emerge from this enquiry is that every single university that responded to the questionnaire reported it had had at least one doctoral student during the period covered by the survey, implying that all of these institutions have the necessary facilities and members of staff competent and willing to supervise postgraduates at that level. Given the number of institutions offering Slavonic and East European Studies is in any case small, it is hoped that any changes to postgraduate funding will not lead to any further concentration of provision. Certainly the consortium arrangements discussed elsewhere in this chapter can be used to rationalise and to enhance research training, but it makes sense for the actual doctoral research to be carried out in the institution most suited to the needs and the interests of the individual student.
- 3.9.8. Detailed information about theses completed in the area of Russian and East European Studies (as broadly conceived) can be found in the UTREES database.¹⁶ This reveals, *inter alia*, that in the period since 1970 the number of theses written on language and literature topics has increased slightly (134 in 1970-80 and 166 in 2001-2011), but has declined sharply when calculated in proportion to the total number of theses relating to the subject area as a whole (32% in the first period, but 9.3% in the most recent). In the period before 1990 66.1% of theses dealt primarily with Russia or the Soviet Union; for the period after 1990 the corresponding figure is 35.4%. In literature, however, Russian continues to be predominant;

¹⁵ These totals do not include the figures for SSEES, which arrived just as the final version of the report was being completed, but which probably require separate consideration anyway. The doctorate enrolment figures for SSEES are: 2009-10 – 49; 2010-11 – 65; 2011-12 – 59; 2012-13 – 52.

¹⁶ University Theses in Russian and East European Studies. I am grateful to Dr Gregory Walker for drawing my attention to this resource and for his help in extracting data therefrom.

for language the distribution is more varied, though the total number of theses in this discipline is very small.

3.10. Staffing

- 3.10.1. The data produced in the report on the last RAE suggest there has been a degree of consolidation in terms of staffing and also that many institutions have indeed undertaken a programme of replacement for the large cohort of staff appointed in the 1960s and others who have departed in recent years. An examination of university websites suggests that there have also been certain changes in staffing patterns.
- 3.10.2. Taking, first of all, the 12 English universities offering full degree courses in Russian and academic grades of Lecturer-Senior Lecturer-Reader-Professor (or their equivalents) the smallest unit has two members of staff in this category teaching Russian, the largest eight. There are two units with seven such members of staff, but no fewer than five with only three, albeit in one of these there are members of the academic staff teaching other Slavonic languages. When it comes to professorial posts, the distribution is curiously uneven, perhaps reflecting an increasing tendency to promote internally: two units have three professors, three have two and the same number one. This leaves no fewer than five units without a professor, although one of these is due to make an appointment soon. The existence of a relatively high number of units without a professor would seem a matter of some concern, though it may be that the incorporation of formerly self-standing departments into larger departments or schools of modern languages has made units without a professor rather less exposed than once was the case.
- 3.10.3. The position in Scotland is rather less satisfactory: here out of the three remaining units two have only two members of staff on academic grades teaching Russian and the other has four. There are at present no professors of Russian or Slavonic Studies in any of the Scottish universities, although St Andrews has promised to restore the Chair in Russian from 2013-14.
- 3.10.4. To obtain a full picture of the staffing position it is necessary to take account of a significant change that has occurred over the last ten or 20 years. At one time it was the norm for members of the academic staff to devote a significant proportion of their time to teaching practical language classes at all levels from beginners upwards, with conversation classes taught by a native speaker; many of these were appointed on a ten-month contract through the exchange scheme that used to be run by the British Council. In recent years, however, there has a growing tendency to assign a significant proportion of the language teaching to staff specially appointed for the purpose. All but one of the 12 units in England have at least one such person, and the great majority have more than one; four have three or more.
- 3.10.5. Here too the position in Scotland is different, since only one of the three units has a member of this staff in this category, a situation that undoubtedly reflects the almost non-existent opportunities for recruitment that two of the units have had in recent years. Rather worryingly, in the third unit a senior language teacher of Russian was, along with the holders of analogous posts in the other language units, made redundant in 2010.
- 3.10.6. It is possible to identify three reasons for the increased use of specially appointed staff for language teaching: the pressure caused by the RAE on the time of those academics with research obligations; the possibility of appointing part- and full-time staff on teaching-only contracts; the increased availability of native speakers of Russian who are qualified, legally entitled and willing to undertake this work. It is an arrangement which copies that found in other language departments, and it must be assumed to work to the satisfaction of all

concerned. It does, though, raise an issue: all the specialist language teachers that could be identified are native speakers of Russian and almost all of them are women. This presumably reflects the absence of any real career structure attached to these posts. At the present time this is perhaps not a problem, but it could become one in the future, not least because teachers of Russian may not have the opportunities for mobility and advancement that exist for teachers of West European languages, who often retain links with their country of origin. It is something that should be borne in mind, as perhaps should the fact that in the past there were those in the profession who considered that native speakers did not necessarily make the best language teachers, especially for beginners.

- 3.10.7. The staffing position for other Slavonic and East European languages can best be described in tabular form.

Table 8: Staffing position for other Slavonic and East European languages

Language	Total academic staff	Professors	Teaching Fellows, Lecturers, etc
Bulgarian	1	0	0
Czech	6.5	1	4
Polish	4.5	0	5?
Serbian/Croatian	3	0	4
Slovene	0	0	1.5
Ukrainian	1	0	4?+
Estonian	0	0	1?+
Finnish	1	0	1
Hungarian	1	0	1.5?
Romanian	0	0	2 ¹⁷

- 3.10.8. This information is principally based on university websites and may be not be totally exact. Information gained from responses and personal knowledge suggest that in some institutions, such as Birmingham, Glasgow and Oxford, there may be additional capacity to offer some languages as and when there is student demand, and indeed, this would seem to be an example of the sort of flexibility that was called for above. On the other hand it may also be that in some cases residual information about courses no longer offered survives in the deepest recesses of some university websites, apparently forgotten, but open to retrieval through the injudicious use of search engines. In any event it would seem desirable for universities to ensure that full, up-to-date and accurate information about provision in these languages is available, especially given the overall paucity of provision that exists throughout the UK.

- 3.10.9. Paucity of provision is what is indicated by these figures since, with the possible exception of Czech, staffing for all the languages listed in the table is at a very low level indeed. What makes the picture even more alarming is that for all languages a very high proportion of the

¹⁷ The Lectorship in Romanian at Oxford, set up in 2012 and financed by the Romanian Government, is located in the Faculty of Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics; it is conceivable that there are posts in Romanian elsewhere that are located in units concerned with Romance languages.

staff consists of teaching fellows and lecturers and that for some languages this is the only staffing that exists. This is not to say that such posts are undesirable in themselves, merely that they are likely to be more precarious than full academic posts. As is indicated by the patterns of undergraduate and postgraduate provision discussed above, the posts that do exist are concentrated in a very small number of institutions.

3.10.10. In this context it is appropriate to mention another development that was not raised in any of the responses, but which has come up in discussion. This is the practice being adopted in some universities of transferring some or all language teaching from academic units into Language Centres. This is a potentially complex and inevitably controversial change, but there is no necessary reason why it should not be successful; the outcome will doubtless depend on the individual circumstances pertaining in each university. It does, however, have serious implications for a number of areas, notably contracts of employment and control over curricula and course content, and where it is being contemplated, it is essential that all members of staff with a professional interest in language teaching are involved at all stages of the process. Where this move is imposed by managerial *fiat* as an administrative convenience, it is safe to predict that the outcome will be a disaster.¹⁸

3.10.11. There is a final staffing issue worth mentioning here. Several of the responses to the questionnaire made mention in one way or another to the contribution made by administrative staff to collecting the data. This may come as a shock to those used to a system where administrative staff was the preserve of deans and vice-chancellors, and where the only support provided to heads of department was a departmental secretary, who might well have been part-time. This change is one of the consequences of merging what were free-standing language departments into larger departments or schools of modern languages, and if it frees academic staff from such tiresome routine tasks as collecting data on student numbers for questionnaires, it can only be warmly welcomed. There are, however, some potential disadvantages of this change: administrative staff tend to have a greater autonomy to establish their own ways of working and to set their own priorities, which may not always coincide with those of the academic staff; academic staff who are less involved in administration may lose their appreciation of the wider context in which they are working; many departmental secretaries became fiercely loyal to their departments, taking the trouble to master the specific problems of dealing with the languages and cultures of Central and Eastern Europe and in some cases serving as the institutional memory of their departments. These potential drawbacks may be particularly significant in a subject area that presents a number of individual features, and a failure to take them fully into account when reforming administrative procedures may mean that any gains in efficiency are at least partially offset by unforeseen losses. More particularly, if it is the case, as some responses have suggested, that academics do not have ready access to such fundamental data as student numbers, this would seem to be a serious dysfunctionality which should be addressed as a matter of urgency.

3.11. The issue of sustainability

3.11.1. The question of sustainability needs to be considered separately for the following categories: undergraduate provision for Russian in England; undergraduate provision for Russian in Scotland; undergraduate provision for other Slavonic and East European languages; postgraduate provision; library provision.

¹⁸ This question is considered in more detail in the report written by Professor Michael Worton for HEFCE in 2009 (*Review of Modern Foreign Languages provision in higher education in England*).

- 3.11.2. To take first the category of undergraduate provision for Russian in England, then the responses received to the questionnaire suggest the system is enjoying one of its very rare periods of equilibrium. It is true that the number of universities offering degree courses in Russian is relatively small and that the degree of diversity, in terms both of the types of institution where Russian is taught and of course content is less than might be wished for in an ideal world, but no evidence was found that any of the surviving units was in any danger of disappearing. Indeed, all appear to be securely located within larger units and all appear to be fully sustainable from the point of view of both staffing and student numbers. One might therefore be justified in suggesting the use of the command 'Steady as she goes'.
- 3.11.3. The successful execution of this command depends, however, on a constant watch being kept for the presence of tempests that might disturb the equilibrium and impede progress. One factor with this potential relates to staffing. Though present staffing levels appear to be for the most part adequate, units are by present-day university standards relatively small and there is no slack, so that the situation can be maintained only if all staff who depart, whether through scheduled retirement or for other reasons, are adequately replaced. There may well be a greater recognition on the part of university managers of the need to ensure that units remain viable, but this is an issue that will require to be monitored by BASEES and other stakeholders.
- 3.11.4. The second issue concerns diversity of provision. Some areas of study, such as 19th and 20th century literature and cultural studies are extremely well represented, but there are others, notably medieval studies and philology and linguistics, that are in a much more precarious position. If these areas of study are not in immediate danger of total disappearance, they are confined to a very small number of institutions, a situation that has serious implications for their continued viability, as well as for student choice. In particular, it cannot be satisfactory that medieval studies and philology are available only in Oxford and Cambridge, since for reasons that do not need to be spelled out here, there will be a number of potentially good students of Russian who do not wish or who are unable to study at either of these institutions. It may be that the protection of areas of study that are becoming confined to the ancient universities or which are in danger of disappearing altogether will require resorting to non-standard solutions. Individual universities may well be reluctant to appoint a medievalist or an expert in Slavonic linguistics, but there may be greater willingness to consider such a move if appointments could be made on a shared basis, either as part of a formal consortium or through some other arrangement. This is not a simple matter, since there are employment issues and practical questions to address, but where geographical propinquity and other factors favour such appointments, it is an approach that should be given serious consideration.
- 3.11.5. There is, however, not so much a tempest as an iceberg of uncertain dimensions lurking on the horizon. This is the new funding regime being put in place in English universities with effect from 2012-13, and in particular the move from a HEFCE grant for teaching to a total dependence on the income from student fees (2.2.9.). This is a substantial change with potentially serious consequences for all arts and social sciences departments, and for this reason the questionnaire asked if the funding regimes being put in place in the different parts of the UK threatened the sustainability of Slavonic and East European Studies. Of the responses received from English universities, two indicated uncertainty, two were an unembroidered 'Yes', while a further three plus the response from BASEES provided a substantiated 'Yes'; the remaining responses were blank, so that no positive responses were received.
- 3.11.6. There are, if truth be told, no compelling reasons for assuming this new funding regime is itself sustainable in the medium or long term, but equally there is no way of knowing what

might replace it or when. At the same time the new regime is only starting to come into operation, so it is difficult to predict exactly what its consequences may be, a circumstance that no doubt explains the relative taciturnity of the some of the responses. Even, however, as this report was being written a first ominous indication has appeared: in an article on the difficulty some universities have experienced in filling their places, *The Guardian* stated that 'Some vice-chancellors admit they are thinking hard about whether they can continue to prop up their ailing language courses' and noted the pessimism felt by the director of the UK Subject Centre for Languages.¹⁹ Although it is not clear to what extent Russian and other Central and East European languages are affected, this would seem to provide some justification for the concerns expressed in a number of the responses.

- 3.11.7. There are two issues arising out of the change in funding regime that apply particularly to Russian. The first relates to EU students, since in some universities students from other EU countries who enrol for a full degree course have provided a useful boost for student numbers. When they are faced with a requirement to pay fees that are much higher than those charged in any other country in the EU, it seems inevitable that such students will choose alternative destinations. Interestingly, one such destination may well be Scotland, where EU students at present pay no fees at all. In fact, the admissions procedures of Scottish universities make it difficult to target EU students, and even were it possible, such a policy would for a combination of financial and political reasons be unwelcome to university managements, but even so at least one Russian department in Scotland has found their numbers are significantly enhanced by the presence of EU students.
- 3.11.8. The second issue relates to the year abroad, since Russian is the only European language that cannot benefit from Erasmus schemes. Mention was made earlier (3.5.2.) of the importance of the year abroad in improving language performance, but it also plays a vital role in increasing cultural awareness, and it would thus be extremely disappointing if the situation were to revert to how it was in the 1960s and early 1970s. The 'Bolognification' of Russian degree programmes (2.3.3.) may in due course make it easier to integrate study in Russia into British degrees, but this is a long-term prospect and may not in any case resolve the financial issue. The BASEES response to the questionnaire mentions the possibility of work placements, which may offer a better way forward but depends on the co-operation of external partners and on factors outside the control of the university sector.
- 3.11.9. More generally, it is difficult to know how to react to a problem which has not yet arisen, which may not arise at all and which, if it does arise, will have consequences that cannot at present be foreseen. There is clearly a need for a constant monitoring of the situation on the part of BASEES and other stakeholders, and since one implication of the article in *The Guardian* is that universities may make rapid decisions on the basis of short-term fluctuations in student numbers, there may be a need for urgent interventions at short notice. It is probable that if success is to be achieved, it will need the involvement not only of BASEES, but of other organisations that can be identified as having an interest in the survival and maintenance of Slavonic and East European Studies.
- 3.11.10. If the threat in England is potential, in Scotland it is already real; here the position of Russian is much more precarious than in England. All the three remaining units have been reviewed in recent years, and only in St Andrews does there seem to be a commitment to maintaining and developing the subject, with the planned appointment of a professor in 2013. In Edinburgh and Glasgow the subject has been allowed to decline: staffing has been reduced

¹⁹ Anna Fazackerley (2012) University chiefs fear for the future after admissions chaos [online]. Place of publication: *The Guardian's* website, on 10 September 2012. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2012/sep/10/university-admissions-chaos-clearing-numbers-down>

to a minimum, departing staff have not been replaced and there are no signs that new staff, whether at a junior or at a senior level, will be appointed in the foreseeable future. At Glasgow there have been two attempts to close Slavonic Studies within the last ten years, though there is now no immediate threat to the survival of the unit. What makes this situation all the more regrettable is that in recent years student numbers, perhaps in part because of closures elsewhere, have been surprisingly buoyant; unfortunately this merely exacerbates the danger of entering the vicious circle of fewer staff teaching more and more students, leading to poor results in research assessment exercises and consequent further disinvestment.

- 3.11.11. The difficulties affecting Russian in Scotland are, in part, a reflection of a wider problem relating to modern languages as a whole in that country, namely a tendency to regard the subject area as having low priority and little esteem. This tendency begins with the Munn Report of 1977²⁰ and has, perhaps more inadvertently than by design, been exacerbated by the advent of devolution and a consequent increased interest in matters internal to Scotland. This tendency may not be too dissimilar to what has occurred elsewhere in the UK, but in a country with a smaller and much more uniform education system (there is nothing corresponding to specialist language schools in Scotland) its effects have been felt more keenly: one of these has been the virtual elimination of Russian teaching in Scottish state schools and loss of the Higher examination in Russian. This has had particularly serious consequences for Glasgow: Glasgow University recruits the great majority of this students from Scotland, and it is no coincidence that Glasgow is one of the very few universities that does not have a separate first-year stream for students with a Higher or an A-Level pass in Russian.
- 3.11.12. There are now appearing the first signs that the tendency described in the preceding paragraph is starting to be reversed. The incumbent Scottish Government is committed to applying the EU's '1+2' [native tongue + two other languages] policy, and to that end a detailed report on how this might be implemented was published on Scottish Government's website in May 2012.²¹ This is an important and welcome development, but even if the programme is adopted and implemented in full, it will be a long time before its effects are felt in the universities.
- 3.11.13. One step that has been taken is to mount campaigns. A group based mainly in Glasgow University has petitioned the Scottish Parliament; since this relates more to Czech and Polish than to Russian, it will be considered in detail below. One body that has campaigned vigorously on behalf of Russian is the Scotland-Russia Forum, though understandably its attention has been focused mainly on schools, where the problem is more acute. These campaigns play a valuable role and can achieve useful results, but it is difficult to maintain momentum. One question that might be considered is that of improving co-ordination between the different universities and the SRF with a view to maximising impact.
- 3.11.14. Over the last 30 years the Scottish universities have probably tried every expedient known to humankind in order to improve their situation, but one avenue that might usefully be explored is that of increased collaboration between the surviving units. This is a surprisingly delicate matter: various attempts have been made in the past, but they have foundered on a combination of practical difficulties and inter-institutional suspicions reinforced by ancient tribal rivalries between the East and the West of Scotland. In Glasgow the institutional structures and systems currently in place are actively hindering collaboration between

²⁰ The Munn Report dealt with the curriculum in secondary schools and by making it difficult for pupils to study more than foreign language led to a serious weakening of language departments in schools.

²¹ The report is available at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2012/05/3670/1>.

Slavonic Studies and the former Department of Central and East European Studies. Now, however, Edinburgh, Glasgow and St Andrews are all part of the CRCEES consortium, and although this is concerned with postgraduate study and research and relates more to social sciences than to arts-based subjects, it would seem to offer a launching pad for other forms of collaboration. One might venture to suggest that a fully-fledged Scottish consortium for Russian and Slavonic Studies would not only offer opportunities for developing new ways of working, but could serve as a horizontal structure which could counteract some of the top-down tendencies in the Scottish education system and promote and develop the subject area within the Scottish universities.

- 3.11.15. The position throughout the UK regarding Slavonic and East European languages other than Russian also causes concern. With the possible exception of Czech none of these languages can be considered to be in a secure position: provision for Polish, Ukrainian and the post-Serbo-Croatian languages is at a very low level, while for other languages it is minimal or non-existent. In some cases, where minimal provision is dependent on 'soft' money, there is always a danger that it may disappear altogether, and while this fate does not appear at the moment to threaten Polish, Ukrainian or the post-Serbo-Croatian languages, the threat to the Polish Honours course at Glasgow (now in the process of being lifted) and the termination of the teaching of Croatian at Durham indicates the precariousness of the position.
- 3.11.16. Here too there are complications due to funding issues. In England some protection has been given to languages which attract only small numbers of students through the SIVS scheme. This scheme is, however, due to change in 2013. One response to the questionnaire indicated that the support received until now was being removed completely, but the response from HEFCE itself is rather vaguer, suggesting that the system is being changed, but that the details of this change are yet to be finalised. In particular they say:

HEFCE is aware of concerns from the HE sector regarding challenges to small areas of MFL provision. We do want to encourage a universities-led approach towards protecting and promoting MFL and to this effect will work with the sector to explore how provision could be maintained.

If one is to take HEFCE at its word, there would seem to be an urgent need for those English universities with an interest in teaching Slavonic and East European languages other than Russian to enter into discussions with the funding council with a view to establishing the precise means by which this commitment can be implemented.

- 3.11.17. In Scotland, as was noted above (2.2.8.) there has not been any equivalent of the SIVS scheme since the advent of devolved funding for universities, but after a recent review into modern languages at Glasgow University threatened the continued teaching of Czech and Polish a petition bearing over 3,000 signatures was presented to the Scottish Parliament, calling for 'the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to instruct the Scottish Funding Council to provide targeted funding for lesser taught languages and cultures at Scottish universities'. In response the Petitions Committee took evidence from, among others, Sir Tom Stoppard, and there have subsequently been exchanges of letters involving the petitioners, the Scottish Parliament, the Scottish Government and the Scottish Funding Council. Unfortunately the responses received so far from the Funding Council have been disappointing: it may be because of a fear that by giving way on this issue it will create an awkward precedent, but the Council has so far set its face firmly against introducing any special funding for the languages in question. Sadly the Council did not avail itself of the opportunity to respond to this review, but its letters to the Scottish Parliament appear to show little understanding of the nature of the problem and a surprising degree of

complacency regarding the position of modern languages generally within the Scottish university system. Matters are still proceeding and the final outcome is as yet unknown, but it may be noted that in its 2012-13 Outcomes Agreement with the SFC Glasgow University has committed itself to continue teaching nine languages, including Czech and Polish, and has stated that it currently has no plans to stop teaching any of these subjects.

3.11.18. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that when it comes to undergraduate teaching the British university system has not succeeded in taking proper account of the changes that have taken place in Central and Eastern Europe and their implications for language usage. Indeed, provision for languages other than Russian has, if anything, decreased rather than increased over this period. There does seem to be some recognition that the problem exists: some (though by no means all) of the responses express the view that provision nationally is unduly biased in favour of Russian, and in at least four institutions there is a desire to extend provision to other Slavonic languages (those mentioned are Polish and Bulgarian), as and when conditions allow. At the same time, however, it must be acknowledged there is no evidence that there exists an untapped reservoir of demand, an issue explicitly mentioned in two of the responses.

3.11.19. There is here a complex problem, which certainly needs to be addressed, but which in all probability requires the adoption of a multi-track approach. These are some of the tracks that might be followed by BASEES and other stakeholders:

- every step should be taken to ensure there is no further diminution of provision;
- every opportunity should be taken to increase provision in whatever form this can take;
- as suggested above (3.6.7.), consideration should be given to using consortium agreements or other forms of collaboration, such as joint appointments, in order to extend opportunities for studying the languages;
- strong support should be given to the campaign taking place in Scotland to secure special funding for lesser-taught languages;
- strong support should be given to English institutions in any discussions that may take place with HEFCE to ensure the SIVS continues to be used in a way that maintains and, where possible, furthers the provision for lesser-taught languages;
- consideration should be given to finding ways of stimulating demand for languages other than Russian, perhaps by mounting publicity campaigns to stress the significance of these language and of the countries where they are spoken; this would be particularly relevant to those languages that are or are about to become official languages of the EU;
- consideration should be given to promoting the idea that it is desirable for students of Russian to take up any opportunity they may have of studying one or more additional Slavonic languages.

3.11.20. There is a further track, which may be worth exploring. In 2.3.2. the question was asked whether Britain was slowly moving in the same direction as other European countries and leaving more advanced specialisation to the second tier of the structure, ie the Masters level. If that does prove to be the case (and it is far from certain), one consequence may well be that the greater part of provision for Slavonic and East European languages is shifted to the postgraduate level. This does not mean that existing undergraduate provision should not be maintained; it is likely that there will always be some demand for undergraduate provision in such languages as Czech, Polish and the post-Serbo-Croatian languages, and it is entirely appropriate that this demand be met. Nevertheless it may be the case that demand is more effectively stimulated and becomes more apparent at a postgraduate level and is more

satisfactorily met by offering postgraduate courses of various types. How this might be achieved was considered above in section 3.7.10. to 3.7.15..

- 3.11.21. When it comes to postgraduate study and research, the issue is less of sustainability than of enhancement and development, but there are some issues that might be considered. The first relates to the future of the LBAS consortia. The responses to the questionnaires indicate these have on the whole been remarkably successful, so it is extremely disappointing that funding for the second phase of the consortia had to be drastically curtailed. Given what the consortia have achieved, particularly in the areas of research collaboration, research training and provision for language learning at the postgraduate level, it would seem propitious to give some consideration to what might be done to build on these achievements. Here two proposals are put forward.
- 3.11.22. The first is that given the number of institutions with an interest in the subject area is relatively small, it would seem sensible to extend the consortia to include those universities that have not so far been included in either CRCEES or CEELBAS. Whether this is done by simply expanding the existing consortia or by some other means would presumably be for discussion between the institutions and the Funding Councils, but the former would seem to be the simpler solution. It is understood why the consortia had to be set up around lead institutions, but if the concept of lead institutions is retained, it would be desirable to ensure that the consortia do not degenerate into two-tier structures with a sharp divide between centre and periphery, and that all participants have the opportunity to feel equally involved.
- 3.11.23. The second proposal is that the consortia be extended to incorporate those fields of study that, because they were not defined as 'Area Studies', did not form part of the LBAS system. Depending on the attitude of the Funding Councils, these might, especially in the early stages, be simply structures for planning and co-ordination, but since both the main research funding councils seem to be encouraging collaborative ventures at postgraduate level and beyond, it may be possible for this expansion to receive formal recognition. In any event, it would at the very least seem to provide the structures necessary for creating the same sort of synergy for research in arts subjects as has already been created for area studies.
- 3.11.24. A second form of collaboration that might present opportunities for expansion is international. At present only a very small number of institutions participate in Erasmus Mundus schemes, and while it is recognised that setting up an Erasmus Mundus programme is an extremely onerous and time consuming process, there may be scope for further developments of this kind. Where an Erasmus Mundus programme is not possible, it may be worth exploring possibilities for less extensive or less formal types of collaboration where this offers the prospect of enhancing taught postgraduate or research provision.
- 3.11.25. One geographical area that requires special consideration here is the Caucasus. In general Caucasian Studies have not been seen as part of Slavonic and East European Studies: in the UK they have traditionally been concentrated in the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London, though there are signs of increasing interest being taken in the region by other universities, such as Birmingham. The Caucasus is an extremely difficult region to study: it is geographically remote and its linguistic complexity reaches an extraordinary level. Nevertheless, it is an area of considerable strategic significance, partly because of its relevance to the question of energy security, but even more because it is the site of the two most recent armed conflicts in Europe and of 'frozen' conflicts and continuing low-intensity unrest. There is undoubtedly a case for a modest and carefully planned expansion of Caucasian Studies in the UK; to achieve this it will doubtless be necessary first to arouse the interest of outside stakeholders, including, in this instance, the British

Government.²² There may, however, be some scope for collaboration with the universities and other institutions of the independent states of the Southern Caucasus; collaboration with Russian institutions over the North Caucasus will almost certainly be more difficult.

- 3.11.26. An important aspect of the sustainability of Slavonic and East European Studies is library provision. Responses to questionnaires indicate the present level of provision may be adequate but it is threatened by impending cuts. One response drew attention to the difficulty that UK institutions already have in affording expensive electronic journals and datasets and to the danger that the UK will find itself without access to important research resources.
- 3.11.27. During work on this report two issues in particular have come to light. The first concerns co-ordination of the management of collections between different institutions. This is particularly important for a very broad subject area with a small number of departments and of individual researchers, and its importance will increase as cuts in funding continue. Since 2004 co-ordination within Slavonic and East European Studies has been handled through an agreement known as CoFoR, which, however, is due to expire in 2014. The specialist subject librarians, through their organisation COSEELIS, are looking to see if this agreement can be extended, and it is very much to be hoped that all those involved can find a way of ensuring that this happens.
- 3.11.28. The second issue relates to specialist subject librarians. There seems to be tendency for these not to be replaced when they depart; in one or two cases this may be due to an institutional downgrading of the subject area, but it seems to be more a consequence of a general change in library staffing policy to one which regards function as more important than academic specialisation. This circumstance means the tendency will not be easy to reverse, but it is worth making the point that the absence of librarians who have a good knowledge of the linguistic and cultural peculiarities of the region is not conducive to the adequate management of collections which are in many cases nationally important or even unique.
- 3.11.29. It is appropriate to conclude this chapter by taking a separate look at the question of consortia and other forms of collaboration. The successful LBAS consortia provide a clearly positive example, but it is no less important to consider those arrangements in the past that have not been as successful, notably the short-lived consortia set up after the Atkinson Report and the various abortive attempts to introduce collaborative arrangements in Scotland. It would seem that the lack of success can be accounted for by two factors: these arrangements were set up or proposed on a top-down basis by funding councils or by university managements; those participating (or required to participate in them) had no clear idea of what the arrangements were meant to achieve or what benefits might accrue from them. It follows from this that any new arrangements that might be set up in the future should either be initiated by individual units or involve such units from a very early stage and should be designed from the outset to have clear aims and to bring clear benefits, with which all those participating are able to identify.
- 3.11.30. How the success of the LBAS programme might be exploited and built on is described above (3.11.21.-3.11.23.), but there are other areas where collaborative arrangements of one sort or another have the potential to bring benefits. Some of these have already been mentioned; they are:

²² In this context it may be noted that the Caucasus has been identified by the EU as a stream for funding under the most recent research programme (FP7).

- the protection of subject areas that are poorly represented or in danger of disappearance and the extension of student choice in these areas (3.11.4.);
- the extension of the opportunity to study an additional Slavonic or East European language to universities where this cannot at present be offered (3.6.7.);
- protecting and consolidating Slavonic Studies in Scotland (section 3.11.14.).

3.11.31. Another area where increased collaboration is likely to bring benefits is that of infrastructure and resources. The desirability of extending the CoFoR agreement has already been mentioned (3.11.28.), but at a time of cut-backs it would appear opportune to consider whether other forms of collaboration in the provision of library services can be developed. There are, however, other resources that do not fall within the traditional purview of university libraries: for example, some universities have built up extensive holdings of films and recordings from television, and it would be extremely valuable if these could be made more widely available on a systematic basis; where necessary, funds should be sought for digitising materials and for preparing user-friendly catalogues. It may well also be appropriate that the preparation and distribution of on-line and other teaching materials be carried out on a collaborative basis, especially in the case of languages for which demand is limited and provision is minimal.

4. Careers and the world beyond university

4.1. Career destinations of graduates in Slavonic and East European Studies

- 4.1.1. Obtaining information about the career destinations of graduates in Slavonic and East European Studies proved somewhat difficult. The data that were found on the HESA website were too general for present purposes, and three universities reported that information that was collected by the institution was generic to modern languages as a whole. It is likely that the same problem exists in other universities where no response was given to the relevant part of the questionnaire.
- 4.1.2. This raises an immediate point. Now that former Departments of Russian/Slavonic Studies are for the most part merged into Schools of Modern Languages which have the benefit of administrative support, there would seem to be an opportunity for these Schools to work together with university careers services to produce more detailed information relating to the separate languages. It would, after all, be surprising if units teaching Russian and other Slavonic and East European languages were the only ones interested in the subsequent fates of their former students.
- 4.1.3. Notwithstanding the above, some respondents were able to provide information about the career destinations of their graduates. For understandable reasons this information came with varying degrees of detail and varying degrees of precision, but it does give some useful indications of some of the career opportunities open to those graduating in the subject area covered by this review. The destinations indicated can be summed up as follows:
- Public sector:
 - Diplomatic service;
 - Dept of International Development;
 - GCHQ;
 - Local authority.
 - Private sector:
 - Russo-British Chamber of Commerce;
 - Financial sector: Accenture; Acoro Capital Partners; HSBC; J.P. Morgan; Santander; investment banking;
 - Law;
 - Oil and Gas (Shell, Gazprom);
 - Other (Blue Mountain Coffee; Christies; Honeycomb Project Management).
 - Education:
 - TEFL (in the UK and in Russia);
 - Teacher training (primary).
 - Media/Journalism:
 - BBC;
 - Bloomberg;
 - Mostra Communication Agency;
 - *Russia Today*;
 - *Moscow News*.

- International:
 - Language Services, International Atomic Energy Agency;
 - World Intellectual Property Institute (interpreting);
 - Charity (in Russia);
 - Missionary work in Russia;
 - Unspecified international organisations.
- Other:
 - Freelance translation;
 - Freelance interpreter;
 - Freelance theatre management;
 - NGOs (Frontier);
 - Medicine.

4.1.4. Partial and anecdotal as this list is, it does provide some interesting information. In particular, it may be noted that the list covers a very wide range of employment and that the destinations mentioned cover most, if not all, sectors of the economy. If the public sector receives relatively few mentions, the private sector is well represented, while the three mentions of freelance work may be a reflection of the current state of the British economy.

4.1.5. Only a relatively small proportion of the destinations mentioned can be described as directly language-related: two of these are freelance, two are with international organisations and one with GCHQ. There are some noteworthy absentees from the list, such as the BBC Monitoring Service and the European Union, though this may in part be due to the unrepresentative nature of the data and, in the latter case, to the fact that most, if not all, of the graduates concerned had degrees in Russian. At any event, it appears that only a relatively small number of graduates in Slavonic and East European Studies go on to this type of employment.

4.1.6. If, however, the category is broadened to take in employment with an international dimension, then the picture changes significantly: almost all the destinations mentioned in the public and in the NGO/voluntary sectors belong to this category, as do a number of others. Some of these involve work in Russia, while in others a knowledge of the language studied will be of immediate relevance, even if the actual work is carried out elsewhere. In some instances, however, the language itself may be less important than the more general skills obtained and the particular outlook formed during the period of study. If we take all these different circumstances together, the opportunities for employment with an international dimension would seem (as one would hope) to be both many and varied.

4.1.7. One specific type of employment with an international dimension is the TEFL sector, and it is not surprising that this receives a number of mentions. It covers a wide variety of different working circumstances: it is, for example, known that for some students the opportunity to teach English in Russia is used as a way of returning to Russia for a year or two after graduation without it necessarily being seen as a long-term career prospect. The only other point to note about the education sector is the absence of any mention of anyone going on to teach Russian at secondary level; this is sad, but in the present situation hardly surprising.

4.1.8. Journalism and the mass media have for a long time constituted a sector that has recruited graduates in Russian and other Slavonic and East European languages. Opportunities have increased in recent years, partly because of changed political circumstances, but partly because the media have themselves expanded; as the mention of the television channel *Russia Today* and of the newspaper *Moscow News* indicates, these opportunities are no longer

limited to media structures based in the UK. Since journalists tend by definition to pursue a career that it is rather more visible to the outside world than many others, they may well make useful contacts for those wishing to make a case for Slavonic and East Studies.

- 4.1.9. As for the remainder of the private sector, one might expect some graduates to obtain employment in the financial services and consultancy sector, but the large number of mentions comes as something of a surprise, as do the mentions of law, since this might be thought of as a sector that is difficult to enter for someone who has a degree in another subject. It does, however, correlate with the point made elsewhere about the advantages of combining languages with another skill (section 4.4). On the other hand, there were only two mentions of the oil and gas sector, although this is usually seen as an important area for business links between the UK and Russia.
- 4.1.10. The voluntary sector and NGOs provide a significant number of opportunities, both in the UK and in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Because the opportunities are more varied and harder to fit into predictable patterns than in other sectors and because they are likely to be increasing, generalisations are difficult, and it would be particularly useful to make a concerted attempt to collect information about the possibilities offered by this sector. And there will always be those whose careers fall outside the standard categories: it is possible to think of at least two politicians with a background in Slavonic Studies who have achieved ministerial rank (or equivalent);²³ at least one graduate in Russian has become a priest in the Russian Orthodox Church, while another was last heard of working as a croupier in a casino on the Dutch-German border.
- 4.1.11. With the possible exception of this last example, the careers mentioned here so far have been what can be described as 'graduate-level' jobs, and it is hardly surprising that those filling in the questionnaires would wish to concentrate on this area. There was, however, one university which was able to obtain detailed information on the first destinations of their graduates, and this presents a somewhat different picture, in that approximately one third of the destinations indicated was made up of jobs that would not generally be considered as 'graduate-level', for example bar staff, sales assistant, market stall trader. In a period of prolonged economic difficulties this is not unexpected, and in any case for a number of years now students have on graduation taken up all sorts of jobs for all sorts of individual reasons, often going on later to pursue totally different careers. What this demonstrates is that data about first destinations, while useful, cannot on their own provide the information needed about the careers of graduates in this area.
- 4.1.12. Most of the information given does not distinguish between undergraduates and postgraduates, though it is probable that by far the greater part of it refers to the former. There is, however, one specific comment about postgraduate destinations worth quoting here; it comes in a response from a university with a substantial taught postgraduate programme: "Masters students very often have plans for working in a field more directly related to their MA, for example, in international organisations." Taught postgraduate courses may well provide a sharper focus than undergraduate programmes and in consequence lead to different employment patterns, reflecting a closer link between degree programme and subsequent employment. For this reason data about the destinations of postgraduates should probably be collected separately. As a postscript to this it may be noted that at a later stage, when work on this report was almost complete, SSEES was able to provide detailed information about initial destinations of some its MA graduates. This indicated that while some graduates did indeed join international organisations, overall patterns were not significantly different from those discussed in the preceding paragraphs.

²³ George Walden, Minister for Higher Education 1985-87, and John Randall, Deputy Chief Whip since 2010.

- 4.1.13. On the basis of the very limited information provided by the questionnaires it would be difficult to draw too many conclusions, and indeed the principal conclusion that does present itself is that it would be desirable to undertake the systematic collection of information relating to the career destinations of graduates in Slavonic and East European Studies. Such information should, as far as possible, be 'longitudinal', in that it should cover the first five to ten years after graduating, and where possible, selected data covering longer periods would be useful. Data should be collected separately for those completing undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. It was suggested above (4.1.2.) how administrators in schools of modern languages and careers service staff might collaborate in the collection of such data. Such data will never be complete (and there is no necessary reason why they should be), but a representative sample of reasonable size would be useful in buttressing a case for Slavonic and East European Studies.

4.2. Employment opportunities and demand for graduates in Slavonic and East European Studies

- 4.2.1. During the preparation of this review it was possible to have access to two reports relating to language skill and employment. The first is the report of the ELAN project,²⁴ produced for the European Commission in 2006. This report is concerned with the whole of the EU, and much of it is not immediately relevant to the purposes of this review. Nevertheless, there are some findings that are worth reporting here:

- though English is important as a world business language, its significance can be exaggerated, and other languages, such as German and Russian, are used extensively as intermediate languages (pp. 11, 19, 57);
- a finding that may surprise some is that the backlash against Russian that existed in much of Central and Eastern Europe at the end of the last century is reported as no longer being in evidence (p. 6) and that Russian is extensively used as an intermediary language for trade in the Baltic States, Poland and Bulgaria (p. 19). In this connection there is perhaps need for further research into changing attitudes to Russian in Central and Eastern Europe;
- in the various tables indicating the relative importance of foreign languages in different circumstances Russian appears consistently, usually in about fourth place. Of other languages of the region only Czech and Polish gain the occasional mention, though there is an intriguing passing reference to the use of Polish, alongside Russian and German, as a *lingua franca* in Eastern Europe (p. 6).

- 4.2.2. It is also worth looking at some of recommendations of the ELAN report. These include the following:

3. Improve Business-Education links in relation to languages. Identify and disseminate models of successful collaboration between Business and Education especially, but not exclusively, directed towards the promotion of language skills.
9. Business should be encouraged, through incentives where appropriate, to:
 - f) support education and training programmes linking languages and enterprise, working with schools, colleges and universities;
10. Strengthen (foreign) language education within education and training at all levels.
11. Improve the match to employer need by:

²⁴ Effects on the European Economy of Shortages of Foreign Language Skills in Enterprise. The report is available online from: http://ec.europa.eu/languages/documents/elan_en.pdf

- diversifying the range of languages taught, particularly in tertiary and vocationally-oriented education;
- improving the contextualisation of courses and qualifications to the business context;
- embedding periods of work experience abroad, with explicit opportunities to use the target language, within courses which combine languages with other subject areas relevant to business;
- improving flexibility to meet changing employer needs.

12. Improve the supply of interpreters and translators in less commonly taught languages such as Chinese, Arabic, Russian (in Western Europe) and Japanese. (pp. 58-9).

4.2.3. Some of these recommendations are straightforward common sense; others are more complex and would require further consideration; all of them might be difficult to implement in the specific context of the UK. Nevertheless, the two principal points to note are the welcome support for language diversity (including the specific mention of Russian) and the need for greater collaboration between universities and business over the question of identifying and meeting demand for language skills.

4.2.4. There is one further recommendation that merits special consideration:

14. Build on existing language skills by encouraging development of the languages spoken by children of migrant workers alongside the national language of the host country. Examine the potential of European programmes to support this, eg by web-based sharing of expertise and resources where a lack of critical mass is a barrier to development of local or national support. (p. 59).

The second part of this recommendation is linked to the languages spoken by the children of migrant workers, but it has the potential for much wider application. In particular, and in the context of this review, it would seem to offer a possible means of supporting provision in the case of languages for which supply and demand are at a low level, that is all languages covered by this review except Russian.

4.2.5. The second report is *Learning to grow: what employers need from education and skills*. This is the fifth education and skills survey produced by the CBI in conjunction with Pearson and published in June 2012.²⁵ A chapter of this survey is devoted to language skills and reveals *inter alia* that 72% of businesses say that they value language skills among their employers and that 21% of businesses are either concerned that weaknesses in foreign language proficiency are losing them business or are uncertain whether this is happening (pp. 55-6). Particularly interesting is a table showing which languages are rated by employers as being useful to their organisations (p. 57): here Polish appears in fifth place, behind German, French, Spanish and Mandarin, while Russian is in joint eighth place, behind Arabic and Cantonese. This is not the first report to place Polish in an unexpectedly high position;²⁶ a possible reason is suggested in the 2012 Survey:

²⁵ I am grateful to James Fothergill, Head of the Education and Skills Group of the CBI, for supplying me with a copy of this report.

²⁶ See the article <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/education/education-news/balls-opens-door-to-primary-school-mandarin-lessons-1857536.html?origin=internalSearch>, posted on the web-site of *The Independent* on 4 January 2010.

The scale and importance in the UK of the migrant workforce from Poland and other parts of central and eastern Europe is well known, so it is no surprise that many British employers value employees who understand the language and culture to achieve effective working relationships (with 19% rating knowledge of Polish as useful). (p. 57)

However it is interpreted, this is a finding that sits rather uncomfortably with the very low level of Polish teaching in the UK.

4.2.6. An interesting and valuable response was provided by GCHQ; this is worth quoting in full:

GCHQ continues to employ individuals with either degree-level or equivalent qualifications/experience in Russian. Linguists undertake duties such as translation, transcription and analysis to support GCHQ in meeting its stated mission, for instance, in ensuring national security.

We view our ability to employ informed and well-prepared graduates to undertake language analysis as highly important. We continue to seek linguists who have a strong degree-level (or equivalent) appreciation of the Russian language, as well as the sociocultural and area studies knowledge that complements it. Where language skills are specifically concerned, our entrance testing seeks to identify candidates with demonstrable strength across a range of subject areas.

As the above suggests, we recognise that language knowledge is one of several component parts that combine to produce a strong linguist. We therefore value graduates who can not only work with the structures and stylistics of the language, for example, but also understand the contexts within which the language is used. The approach taken by many universities to produce Russian linguist graduates who also have a knowledge of the country's politics, society and culture, both past and present, therefore remains a valuable one for us as employers.

Particularly significant here is the final sentence, which refers to 'Russian linguist graduates who also have a knowledge of the country's politics, society and culture, both past and present'.

4.2.7. The response from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office made the following point:

The FCO recognises the importance of Slavonic and East European Studies and we have a team of in-house specialists research analysts in this area whose expert advice helps to inform policy-making. The eastern [sic] research analysts have trained in Russian, Slavonic or Eastern European studies and have spent time working in the Eastern Europe and Central Asian region.

The response goes on to mention the contacts that exist between the FCO in-house analysts and UK-based academics involved in Russian/Slavonic Studies and notes that the FCO has established Russian language classes in London for staff who work on the region. One must assume that these courses were provided by an outside contractor: at one time the FCO had its own language-teaching unit, which was known for its innovative practices, but this has been disbanded, presumably as a cost-cutting measure.

4.2.8. As this review was being prepared, a number of relevant job adverts appeared. In the early part of summer the Security Services were advertising for a Russian linguist, and in October their website said that they were looking for a Russian Intelligence analyst; the skills required for this post were an excellent comprehension of Russian and a knowledge of Russia's

cultural affairs, history, politics, ideology and economy.²⁷ At the same time the United States Embassy was looking for a specialist in post-Soviet affairs (with a legal right to work in the UK) to work at its outpost in Reading. This post required a knowledge of Russian current affairs and media, as well as working fluency in Russian and an ability to translate from Russian into English; fluency in Central Asian and/or Caucasus languages was considered desirable. Finally, the Oak Foundation was looking for a Programme Officer to support its International Human rights Programme in Russia. Among the skills required were fluency in written and spoken English and Russian and an interest in international affairs, including specific knowledge of the contemporary Russian context.

- 4.2.9. It is possible that there is an element of coincidence in the job advertisements, but there does seem to be a common pattern here, in that there is in the public and the voluntary sectors a certain demand for graduates, and in particular for graduates in Russian, who have a knowledge not only of the language and the culture, but also of the politics, society and current affairs of Russia. Though there are some exceptions, the two branches of study tend to be kept in separate compartments, especially at undergraduate level, and there are grounds for asking whether more could be done to bridge this divide, either by expanding available options or by developing new course combinations.
- 4.2.10. In 4.1.7. it was observed that no respondent had mentioned any of their graduates going on to teach Russian at secondary level. This career option is not, however, closed off, since a small number of universities offer Russian as a subject for the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE). Replies were received from the Universities of Sheffield, which takes about four students each year, and Portsmouth, which aims to take two. For both universities another language is required; in the case of Portsmouth the language must be French. Both replies note the difficulty in finding suitable schools for teaching practice: Sheffield uses four schools, all but one in the private sector and all located some distance from South Yorkshire. One response notes that the loss of funding for specialist language colleges has led to a reduction in the number of schools offering Russian.

4.3. Case studies: the graduate's perspective

- 4.3.1. A relatively small number of graduates in Slavonic and East European Studies have careers that bring them to the attention of the wider public. Apart from the Members of Parliament mentioned earlier (4.1.10.), whose studies may in any case not have been hugely relevant to their future careers, perhaps the most visible group is made up of journalists. To name but two, Bridget Kendall at the BBC and Angus Roxburgh at *The Sunday Times*, *The Sunday Correspondent* and the BBC have had long and distinguished careers specialising in Russian and the Soviet Union or more generally in international affairs. A slightly different case is presented by Clementine Cecil, who after graduating worked as a correspondent for *The Times* in Moscow; while there she became interested in trying to preserve Moscow's architectural heritage and has now moved on to become Director of SAVE Britain's Heritage.
- 4.3.2. The information in the previous paragraph is in the public domain, but most graduates in Slavonic and East European Studies pursue their careers away from the public eye, and for that reason the remaining case studies are presented in an anonymous form. PP studied Russian and Soviet Studies at what was then a polytechnic (where Russian is no longer taught) and went on to take a taught postgraduate course at one of the ancient Scottish universities. He subsequently went on to hold the Pushkin Institute Fellowship (a post combining the roles of group leader for the British students and research fellow) in Moscow for a year, and then, unable to find work connected with the Soviet Union, worked for three

²⁷ Advertised at <https://www.mi5.gov.uk/careers/current-jobs/job.aspx?id=184> (Date accessed 2 October 2012).

years in what was then the Inland Revenue. During this period he maintained his contacts with Russia and became involved with a scheme to set up a twinning arrangement with a city in Ukraine. Opportunities to work in Russia arose at the end of the 1980s, and after involvement in one short-lived venture PP worked for 17 years for an international company in the minerals sector, being based at different times in Ukhta (in the Komi Republic), Moscow and the UK.

- 4.3.3. PP has made comments on the importance of understanding the culture of one's business partners and of knowing the language of the people with whom one is dealing; these are worth quoting in full:

My job was in logistics: to facilitate the movement of oil from Russian/Kazakh/Azeri, etc, producers to the world market via the former Soviet Union's export routes. It involved frequent travel to various corners of European Russia, the Caucasus and Central Asia. I met with and dealt with private and state businessmen and women and relied on my understanding of their commercial, cultural and personal constraints, imperatives and ambitions to develop a professional working relationship with them.

It is far easier to do business with a knowledge of the language and culture than to work through interpreters. I recently went on a trip to Russia with a British colleague and deliberately did not speak any Russian so that I could gauge the quality of the interpreters. It was most instructive to sit and hear how much was lost in translation; how much of the structure of the conversation was left untranslated and how many ideas and asides were discussed by one side or the other and not communicated to the other party.

- 4.3.4. AZM's undergraduate degree was in Politics, but he took two years of Polish and two years of Russian along the way. His subsequent career was spent covering part or the whole of Central and Eastern Europe for a number of well-known international companies in the drinks, toys, cigarettes and pharmaceutical sectors during both the communist and post-communist periods. In his comments for this report AZM is adamant that a knowledge of the relevant language, history, politics and mentality played an important role in his success in promoting the various products with which he worked and establishing them as prominent brands in countries where they had previously had little market penetration.

- 4.3.5. AZM's comments on the specific ways in which a knowledge of the relevant languages and local circumstances were valuable and were appreciated by both employers and customers can be quoted here:

[In the 1980s] apart from some eastern European nationals, I think I was virtually the only multilingual operative (speaking the local languages) working for a British or American company. Indeed the companies themselves, large as they were, felt unique in having an operative with local knowledge. In addition, it tended to enhance their status with the local countries and companies. By employing someone who knew the local languages and the country background, the western company in question was showing them respect.

In terms of business, local knowledge and languages paid dividends. It was easier to build up a rapport with the customer if you knew their language: they felt at ease when talking and felt reassured when you knew their country's history and circumstances. This was particularly true during communist times, but still important today. At trade fairs, where much of the relationship building was done over dinner, customers would rather go to dinner with somebody with whom they could relax,

speak their own language, trade jokes, often political jokes. This always gave us an advantage over our competitors.

Language also helped when we went beyond the buyers and visited the local shops, talking with the shop assistants and shop managers to a) get an understanding of the products at grass roots and b) flatter them by having them meet somebody from the 'company from the west'. This motivated them to sell our products...

As a final note, my peers in competitor companies, while having the commercial expertise, lacked the local knowledge and this was crucial in getting the edge. Where locals were employed [. . .] they tended to do well in the countries from where they originated but not so well in the other Eastern European countries.

I am no longer in the business, but I observe that companies are employing Germans and eastern Europeans for these positions. I am guessing that there are either no UK people trained to deal with these countries or those that do not wish to go into business.

- 4.3.6. AZM also makes an interesting comment about the importance of intermediary languages other than English and about how knowing one or two Slavonic languages can help with understanding others. This relates to the notion of intercomprehension, which is discussed below (4.4.10.):

I was fortunate enough to be able to do this in Russian and Polish, and a basic knowledge of Bulgarian. This combination helped me to understand Czech, Slovak, Ukrainian and Serbo-Croat. Knowing German helped me to communicate in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, where German was the preferred foreign language. The older generation in these countries also spoke French and were always delighted to practise their knowledge with me.

- 4.3.7. JC took a single Honours degree in Russian followed by a postgraduate Diploma in Vocational Techniques for Career Linguists (which seems to have been a forerunner of the present-day Masters courses in translation). He then worked for three years in the BBC Monitoring Service and after a brief period in the civil service of one of the Channel Islands spent a number of years as a freelance translator working from Russian into English. He comments on the advantages and also the drawbacks of this type of work:

I operated in various fields, but eventually specialised in certain areas - geology and geophysics, associated with the oil and gas industry which dominates the Russian economy; shipping; some scientific work (patents) and general legal and business translation. There was very little *belles lettres*, although I was asked once or twice to translate some fiction and also personal correspondence, and occasionally political comment. By far the bulk of commercial translation work is business related and often highly technical. Nevertheless, the hours are long, deadlines tight and the pay largely poor and workflows are intermittent. Although it can be intellectually rewarding and challenging, it is also financially challenging."

- 4.3.8. Needing a more reliable source of income, JC set about obtaining legal qualifications and has since worked mainly in the financial sector, in the areas of compliance and regulation. He hopes in the near future to bring the different strands of his career together by embarking on a research project on financial regulation in Russia. JC sums up his career in these terms:

Out of my working career I have spent about a third of the earlier years as a staff or freelance linguist, directly using my language skills and related area knowledge. For the rest I have sometimes found a linguistic training useful, although not essential, but I find it something of a bonus to be able to add something extra. Very occasionally I

have actually used or been asked to make direct use of my languages - Russian and very occasionally Italian and French: as a shipping paralegal, I once had to take and translate witness statements in a collision case involving a Russian vessel; I have translated regulatory correspondence in Russian; peruse and abstract due diligence material on Russian investment funds, and so on.

JC's career has taken more twists and turns than the others considered here, but in terms of career changes and of accumulating different kinds of experience it probably bears more resemblance to what awaits those who are about to graduate or who have graduated in recent years.

- 4.3.9. There is not and probably never will be any such thing as a typical career involving Slavonic and East European Studies. What these case studies do indicate, however, is the value, which can be both direct and indirect, of knowing the languages of the region, as well as the benefits that accrue to the individual from an understanding of the history and culture of those people with whom they come into contact, often on a regular basis.

4.4. Case studies: the employer's perspective

- 4.4.1. IB took a first degree in Czech and Archaeology, which was followed by an MBA. Subsequently she worked for 13 years as the export manager for Eastern Europe for a major healthcare company. After a spell working in Budapest she has in recent years been working as a recruitment and management consultant based in Prague. She thus has both the graduate's and the employer's perspective, though it is the latter that is the particular interest here.
- 4.4.2. In her comments for this report IB makes four points. The first relates to her early career, when as an export manager she was responsible for recruiting staff to work in Central and Eastern Europe. At that time, the main markets for her company were the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia and, therefore, she was looking for graduates with a knowledge of both Russian and Serbo-Croat; in the event the people she recruited had studied both those languages at the University of Nottingham. The second point stresses the enormous number of opportunities that have opened up in Central and Eastern Europe since 1989, but more especially since the accession of many of these countries to the EU in 2004 or 2007; she notes that these opportunities exist not only in business, but also in other spheres, such as culture, observing that 'it is amazing what contribution can be made by those who speak the local CEE language'.
- 4.4.3. Her third point reinforces some of the conclusions of the ELAN Report mentioned above (4.2.2.). This is that in many circumstances language skills are essential, but not in themselves sufficient. What these skills are and how they are acquired will vary: law and accountancy will require further formal qualifications; some graduates will go on to take an MBA, while others will be trained in business skills by their employers; presentation and communication skills may be acquired either in education or in employment or even both. IB's comments are predicated on the situation of a language graduate going on to acquire other skills, but it is worth observing that there is no compelling reason why the process should not happen in the reverse order: graduates in other disciplines might go on to acquire language skills at some point in their careers. To some extent this already happens, for example on the Strathclyde/Glasgow postgraduate Russian course or in the form of the one-to-one tuition sometimes provided by language centres, but if it is possible to organise postgraduate provision on a more flexible basis (3.7.13.), this might allow demand to be met on a more cost-effective basis.

- 4.4.4. The final point addresses a consequence of the increasing globalisation of business. It appears that corporations spend millions of Pounds/Euros/Dollars on organising cross-cultural seminars, workshops and other forms of training to prepare their staff to manage businesses and to conduct trade across cultures. IB (who describes herself as a nearly fully-trained cross-culture coach) considers that if more senior staff had a knowledge of the relevant languages and cultures, businesses and, indeed, governments could save themselves the enormous sums of money that they spend on this training, as well as avoiding loss of business or failure to reach agreement because of a lack of cultural awareness.
- 4.4.5. Will Hackett-Jones is a Russian graduate who is now the Managing Director of Eclectic Translations, based in St Petersburg. He is almost certainly not the only British graduate in Russian to be running a successful business based in Russia, but his position is undoubtedly unusual, and his career, which was described in a recent article in the Russian version of *Forbes*,²⁸ makes interesting reading. Some of the observations on doing business in Russia go beyond the scope of this review, but it is encouraging to note that with the right idea, a considerable dash of entrepreneurial spirit and persistence it is possible to create and run a successful business in Russia. The clients of Eclectic Translations have included *Baltika* brewers and the St Petersburg Economic Forum, while a significant proportion of their work relates to translating and sub-titling Russian films. Mr Hackett-Jones's conclusion is that the slogan 'Russia is a land of opportunities' contains a great deal of truth²⁹ and that in Russia he has been able to achieve in a very short time what would have taken 20 years in the UK.
- 4.4.6. In an email response Mr Hackett-Jones notes the Russians are, as he puts it, oddly Anglophilic and that the demand of teachers, translators, editors, consultants and top managers is high. He considers that if more people knew about the job opportunities associated with Russia and the language, they would be more ready to study the language, and he stresses the importance of language and cultural understanding for doing business. One problem he draws attention to is that Eclectic Translations and companies who wish employ their own staff all have difficulty in finding enough suitably qualified people to work for them. Noting that university departments do not keep track of their graduates (4.1.1. and 4.1.2.), he proposes the creation of a database or exchange, where students, graduates and employers could register and which could serve as a way of linking the different categories in a way that helps match supply with demand. Given that Russia and, indeed, the rest of Central and Eastern Europe form, from the employment point of view, a sort of niche market this seems a promising idea that is worth following up. It is certainly an area where there is scope for co-operation between the business and academic communities.
- 4.4.7. Substantial responses were received from the Directorates-General for Translation (hereafter DGT) and for Interpretation (hereafter DGI) of the European Commission,³⁰ and as these make a number of important points, they are worth examining in some detail. The DGT considered at some length the question of Russian. Russian is not an official language of the EU and thus cannot figure in EU competitions, but it does figure as an immigrant and a neighbourhood policy language. In the latter capacity it plays a certain, albeit limited role in the work of the DGT: in 2011 1,150 pages were translated from Russian, which amounts to slightly less than 0.05% of the total. More generally, the response notes the increasing importance of Russian as a language spoken within the EU, with over three million speakers in Germany, around one million speakers in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and smaller minorities on other EU countries; it also notes the 'surprising' manner in which the teaching

²⁸ <http://www.forbes.ru/svoi-biznes/predprinimateli/114117-kak-britanets-poluchil-godovoi-kontrakt-na-rasshifrovku-zapisei-a>

²⁹ но в лозунге «Россия — страна возможностей» много правды.

³⁰ I am grateful to Antje Plutte from the Directorate-General for Translation and to Ian Andersen from the Directorate-General for Interpretation for responding to my requests for information.

of Russian in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe has regained some of the ground lost immediately after the fall of the Iron Curtain. On the question of language co-operation, a General Framework for Co-operation on Language Matters was signed by representatives of the EU and the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2005; Russian universities are starting to show interest in becoming involved in the European Masters in Translation programme.

- 4.4.8. On the question of the official EU languages and the supply of and demand for translators from the languages of Central and Eastern Europe into English the response notes an unfortunate mismatch of real demand and a culturally and administratively very limited supply. In relation to demand the DGT notes the following:

Yes, there is a clear need, in that the English Language Department (which belongs to Directorate B of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Translation) is responsible for the translation into English of all documents drafted in any of the EU's official languages, including the Slavonic and Eastern European Languages mentioned, and in a number of non-EU languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Turkish, Russian, etc. On the basis of Regulation n° 1/1958, all Member States and their corporations and citizens are entitled to communicate with the Commission in the official language of their home country. For the Commission services to be able to understand and analyse written communication from governments, companies or citizens of EU Member States, they require translations into a widely known language, and currently that is mainly English. This means that the English Language Department's 120 translators constantly translate documents from Slavonic and Eastern European languages (with volumes - for 2011 - ranging between 5,700 pages of Estonian-English and 12,300 pages Polish-English; 1,150 pages Russian-English and a couple of hundred pages from Ukrainian, Croatian, Albanian and Serbian).

- 4.4.9. In relation to supply the following answer was given to a question whether the DGT is able to recruit sufficient candidates with the appropriate qualifications:

No, and the reasons are manifold: (a) there is a general lack of interest in language learning and linguistic professions in the UK and, where people set out to study a language, others - French, German, Spanish - are usually more popular than Slavonic and East European languages, which already greatly limits the pool of potential candidates to start with (although there is a high potential in this regard in the UK: bilingual children of immigrants); (b) the current organisation of the translator competitions - a prerequisite for becoming permanent, temporary or contractual EU staff - makes it difficult, if not impossible, for interested candidates to participate, because it requires an in-depth knowledge of French or German for one of the translation tests. A student who has excellent knowledge of, say, Latvian and Lithuanian, Czech and Slovak or Polish and Bulgarian, will not be admitted unless he or she can also translate at a high level from French or German. This is a pity, because the English Department's needs in terms of source language skills are currently greater for Hungarian, Latvian, Slovene or Bulgarian than for French, German, Italian or Spanish. Having said this, some candidates with Slavonic and/or East European languages do succeed, but their numbers are limited in comparison to those pursuing mainstream language studies.

Finally the response notes that at present the mismatch between supply and demand is overcome by the use of in-house (re-)training.

- 4.4.10. In connection with the position of Slavonic languages within the EU the DGT mentions the concept of intercomprehension. This concept was initially developed for language teaching, but is being promoted by the EU as means to reduce the complexities involved in translating from a large number of languages, many of which, such as the Romance and the Slavonic languages, are closely related. It presents points of interest to those teaching Slavonic

languages, especially languages other than Russian.³¹ The essence of intercomprehension is to take advantage of the fact that someone who has a good knowledge of one language, for present purposes a Slavonic language, can acquire a knowledge of closely related language without expending a large amount of time and effort. The EuroCom project team is engaged in studying the application of the principles of intercomprehension for different language groups,³² and there would seem to be scope for using this work in furthering the learning of second and subsequent Slavonic languages, especially in those cases where the focus is on comprehension, rather than production.³³

- 4.4.11. The DGI in its response notes it would like to see more staff with the Eastern European languages, particularly the Slavonic languages and Hungarian. It also notes, however, that the number of students of such languages is not very high and that with the exception of Polish these languages are not offered on a regular basis in UK interpreting schools, so someone wishing to learn to interpret from, eg, Hungarian would have to go to Budapest to do so. Resolving this problem is seen as being extremely difficult, since universities would probably be reluctant to establish appropriate courses in these languages without special funding. That said, the DGI does co-operate with UK universities offering postgraduate courses in conference interpreting and can offer bursaries to students and grants to universities, particularly to help with infrastructure.

- 4.4.12. The DGI goes on to make other points:

In the case of the Baltic languages where practice has shown that they are actually spoken very little in meetings, we have realised that it's better to ask native speakers to translate into English (or German, or French, or whatever) rather than asking an English native speaker to devote many years to learning a language which he/she will then find it very difficult to maintain. The same could be said to a lesser extent of the Slavonic languages, but as these are closer to one another an interpreter would find it easier, having acquired one, to add others – Czech plus Slovak, for example. Polish is spoken rather more often so is an exception to the rule.

There is also an underlying economic problem in that it's very expensive to have someone sit all day in a booth just to interpret from a language which may be spoken twice for three minutes.

Overall, then, our ideal is to have interpreters who speak some of the 'core' languages, such as FR-DE-ES-IT, add an eastern European language to their existing combination. Alternatively, we would be happy to see candidates with (say) French, Czech and Slovak, or German, Slovene and Croatian, as we could be reasonably sure of being able to employ them on a regular basis.

- 4.4.13. The conclusion to be drawn from these two responses is that there is a mismatch between supply and demand in relation to both translators and interpreters for the EU, but that solving this problem is likely to be far from straightforward. It is not just a matter of providing more opportunities for acquiring the relevant qualifications in Slavonic and East European languages and of persuading students of the value of taking advantage of these opportunities, but also of ensuring that students who wish to work in this sphere are equipped with the right qualifications. From their responses it would appear that both

³¹ Those would like to know about this subject can download an article from: http://bookshop.europa.eu/is-bin/INTERSHOP.enfinity/WFS/EU-Bookshop-Site/en_GB/-/EUR/ViewPublication-Start?PublicationKey=HC3012594

³² <http://www.eurocom.uni-frankfurt.de>

³³ The writer of this report was intrigued to discover that many years ago he had been applying *ante litteram* the principles of intercomprehension when teaching Polish to students who already knew Russian.

Directorates-General are looking for candidates who can combine one or more Slavonic and East European languages with one of the more widely-used languages of Western Europe.

- 4.4.14. It may be felt that British universities have not succeeded in integrating themselves with EU institutions to the extent that would be desirable (the same might perhaps be said of other British institutions, but that is another story). There is certainly a difficult problem to be addressed: what is the best way of meeting a real, but not necessarily large demand for translating and interpreting skills in the Slavonic and East European languages? Ideally one might wish to see a national strategy put together by the various stakeholders; at the least there would seem to be scope for greater collaboration between the relevant British and EU institutions which should take place not only at the level of individual universities, but also at a supra-institutional level. In the present economic and political climate arguing for additional financial resources will present something of a challenge; this does not mean that it should not be attempted, but it would be prudent to explore to what extent existing resources can be used more effectively.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

5.1. Summary of conclusions

5.1.1. The evidence collected for this report allows the following conclusions to be drawn.

1. Slavonic and East European Studies form a strategically important subject area that is *sui generis* and which cannot survive at a sustainable level without periodic outside interventions (1.1.–1.5.).
2. Though the strategic significance of the subject area has undergone certain changes, it has not in any way diminished since the end of the Cold War (2.1.1.–2.1.9.). In particular, though our relations with Russia have become more complex and more nuanced, the country remains a major world power with which we engage in a wide range of areas. The other countries of the region present a number of different opportunities and challenges, extending from close economic and political co-operation within European structures to unresolved security problems.
3. Similarly, Russian has retained its importance as a world language which is still widely used in many parts of the region, while many of the other languages of the region have gained in importance either by acquiring the status of official languages of the EU or by becoming the official languages of independent states.
4. Since the Atkinson Report of 1980 there has been a steady decline in the number of UK universities offering degree courses in Russian (2.2.3.–2.2.6.). Presently there are as few as 12 universities in England offering undergraduate degree courses in Russian and no more than three in Scotland (3.1.2.).
5. Notwithstanding conclusions 1 and 4, the system of undergraduate provision of Russian in English universities is enjoying one of its very rare periods of equilibrium (3.1.–3.5.). All the surviving units are operating at a sustainable level in terms of student numbers, staffing and research output (3.6.; 3.9. and 3.10.).
6. Given the small number of surviving units, this equilibrium must, however, be considered precarious, and it could easily be disturbed if, for example, retiring staff in one or more institutions are not replaced (3.10. and 3.11.3.). The relatively high number of units without a professor (five in England, all three in Scotland) is a matter of some concern, although in two instances professorial appointments are either under way or promised for the near future (3.10.2. and 3.10.3.).
7. One factor with the potential to threaten the sustainability of Russian teaching in England is the new funding regime being introduced from 2012. Though the changes taking place are drastic, their consequences are as yet difficult to predict, and there is clearly much uncertainty, so that the situation will need careful monitoring (3.11.5.–3.11.8.). Particular attention needs to be paid to the question of the prolonged period of residence (a semester or a year) in Russia, where Erasmus arrangements are not possible (3.11.7.).
8. The consequences of the devolution of the university systems to the constituent parts of the UK have been catastrophic for Slavonic and East European Studies. With one small (and potential, rather than real) exception the subject area has entirely disappeared from Wales and Northern Ireland, and while none of the three surviving units in Scotland is under immediate threat of closure, their long-term future is uncertain unless a more appropriate funding model can be put in place. Unfortunately the Scottish Funding Council has not up to now shown any serious interest in trying to resolve this problem. Over the years many expedients to improve the situation have been tried, but there is still scope for the remaining units to work more closely together, perhaps under the aegis of a consortium

- (3.1.4.; 3.11.10-3.11.14 and 3.11.17.).
9. Although the universities offering Russian in England and Scotland are reasonably well distributed geographically, the lack of institutional diversity is a matter of concern. Russian has totally disappeared from the post-1992 universities, and with one exception it has also disappeared from the universities founded in the 1960s (where at one time it had a considerable presence). This has considerable implications both for student choice and for curricular variety of provision (3.1.7.).
 10. Information relating to student numbers was received from 14 institutions, three in Scotland and the remainder in England. It shows that in these institutions the total number of students studying Russian on degree courses increased between 2007-08 and 2011-12 from 1108 to 1431, with a peak of 1447 in 2010-11. Overall numbers enrolled in first-year advanced courses have remained remarkably consistent, while there has been a significant increase in those enrolling in first-year beginners' classes (3.6.3. and Appendix C).
 11. Provision for Slavonic and East European languages other than Russian has failed to develop in a way that reflects the social and political changes that have taken place in Europe since 1989, and with the possible exception of Czech provision for all these languages is either at a very low level or non-existent (3.2.1.-3.3.). A very high proportion of staff teaching these languages are designated as lectors or teaching fellows (3.10.7.-3.10.9.). Given the position of Poland within the EU and the surprisingly high importance that Polish has for those employers who were surveyed by the CBI (4.2.5.), the inadequate level of provision for this language is particularly worrying, though there must also be concerns about the relative lack of provision for the post-Serbo-Croatian languages and, perhaps, for Bulgarian and Ukrainian. It is therefore extremely disappointing to note the recent cut-backs in and threats to the already limited provision for Croatian, Czech and Polish. Discussions should be held and, where necessary, pressure should be exerted to ensure the continuation of the SIVS scheme in England and the creation of a similar scheme in Scotland (3.11.16.-3.11.20.).
 12. That said, there is little evidence that the demand from employers for people with a knowledge is balanced by a corresponding demand from students wishing to study these languages, and numbers enrolled on courses running for beginners' to Honours degrees have remained very low (3.6.5. and 3.6.6.). The development of provision for these languages may therefore require new approaches, including, for example, an information campaign and a shift of emphasis to postgraduate study (3.6.6. and 3.6.7.; 3.7.10.-3.7.15.); in all probability a multi-track approach will be required (3.11.19.).
 13. Numbers are much healthier on one-year or two-year subsidiary courses (including longer courses that allow exit after the first year), and here there is room for expansion. In principle, it would be desirable for all students of Russian to have the opportunity of studying another Slavonic language for at least one year, though it is recognised that if this is to be achieved, it may mean making more use of consortium arrangements and/or joint appointments (3.6.7.).
 14. Because of the strategic significance of the region consideration should be given to a modest and carefully planned expansion of Caucasian Studies (3.11.25.).
 15. Undergraduate curricula have undergone a number of changes with a move away from the core + options model. Language and literature remain important, but there has been a substantial expansion of cultural studies, especially visual culture and cinema (3.5.2.-3.5.4.). Language is now mostly taught by specialist language teachers who are invariably native speakers of the language (3.10.4.-3.10.6.).
 16. One consequence of these changes is that some areas of the curriculum are not well represented and may be in danger of disappearing altogether. Medieval studies appear to be confined to Oxford and Cambridge, and linguistics and philology are

taught in only a small number of institutions (3.5.5. and 3.5.6.). The protection of these subject areas may be helped by consortium arrangements or by a system of joint appointments (3.11.4.). Though there are some options in business Russian, specialised translation and interpreting are now mostly left to the postgraduate level (3.5.2.).

17. Though there is evidence of some demand from employers in the public and voluntary sectors for graduates with a knowledge of politics, current affairs and recent history (4.2.6.-4.2.9.), options in these areas are not widely available for language students (3.5.7.).
18. Taught postgraduate courses can be divided into three categories: 'content-based' courses; specialised courses in translation and interpreting; intensive language courses aimed mostly at beginners. Outside SSEES the number of courses of the first type and the number of students enrolled is generally small (3.7.2. and 3.8.1.), while there has been a significant increase in numbers taking courses of the second type for both Polish and Russian, albeit that other languages are represented only minimally or not at all (3.7.4. and 3.8.1.). Given the requirements of the EU and other bodies, there may be a case for building up the capacity at least to offer courses in translation and interpreting from those other languages that have acquired official status in the EU (3.7.5 and 4.4.8.-4.4.14.).
19. There is scope for the structured and controlled development of the intensive language courses at postgraduate level, partly to remedy shortfalls in undergraduate provision, but also in order to serve both postgraduate students and those in employment who need to learn a new language. In order to maximise the match between supply and demand this might involve the implementation of innovative and more flexible patterns of provision (including distance learning) and the creation of capacity to offer courses as and when required; where appropriate, eg for preparing postgraduates, it would be helpful if special funding were to be made available (3.7.10-3.7.15.).
20. The LBAS programme has played an extremely important role in developing postgraduate study and research; it is therefore regrettable that the funding for the programme has had to be cut back so drastically, though the continuation, even in a reduced form, is to be welcomed. From an organisational point of view it would seem opportune to expand the consortia to include all universities with an interest in the subject area and to cover those fields that do not come under the heading of Area Studies (3.11.22. and 3.11.23.).
21. The overall picture regarding research in the subject area, as reflected in the last RAE, is generally positive: the total number of research-active staff has remained constant over the last two RAEs with some degree of consolidation, and there is a significant proportion of Early Career Researchers. New fields of study are opening up, and scholars are increasingly willing to cross disciplinary and temporal boundaries. Some important fields of study are, however, poorly represented, and some institutions could have done more to replace senior staff who provided research leadership (3.9.1. and 3.9.2.).
22. The increased emphasis on impact and engagement with the community in relation to research is reflected in a number of activities undertaken by individuals and by the LBAS consortia, though information about the former seems to be affected by under-reporting; this suggests some academics need to be encouraged to shed their innate modesty, but also that information needs to be spread more widely about what constitutes 'impact'. In general, up to now, attempts to engage with the public sector and with NGOs have been more successful than attempts to engage with the business sector (3.9.3. and 3.9.4.).
23. Numbers of students taking research Masters degrees have remained fairly constant at a low level, but there has been a considerable increase in those

- enrolling for doctoral degrees (38 in 2007-08, but 74 in 2011-12) (3.9.5. and 3.9.6.). Interestingly, during the period covered by the survey there has been at least one doctoral student in every university that responded to the survey, which raises doubts about the need for any further concentration of research at this level. It is suggested instead that while consortia arrangements can help with research training (including language learning), it is appropriate for the actual doctoral research to be carried out at the location most suited to the individual student's needs (3.9.7.).
24. Library provision for the subject area appears to be adequate for the time being, but is threatened by cuts which may leave the UK without access to important research resources. To try to maintain provision, the CoFoR agreement should be extended and other forms of collaboration should be explored (3.11.26. and 3.11.27; 3.11.30.). Collaboration arrangements may also help to protect and to enhance other resources, eg collections of film and television recordings (3.11.31.).
 25. British universities have generally been slow to respond to developments taking place elsewhere in Europe, and there would seem to be scope for further interaction between individual universities and groups of universities, as well as between BASEES and equivalent organisations in other European countries. Perhaps in due course this may lead to the formation of a European Association for Slavonic and East European Studies (2.3.1. and 2.3.4.). British universities would do well to look out for challenges and opportunities arising out of the Bologna Process (2.3.3.).
 26. It was a matter of both surprise and concern that some universities had difficulty in getting access to data relating to student numbers, and it would seem that in some instances there is a strong case for an urgent review of administrative procedures. There is also a strong case for instituting a centralised procedure for the systematic collection of data relating to student enrolments, as already happens in North America; in the first instance this should probably happen through the auspices of BASEES (3.6.1. and 3.6.2.).
 27. There is also a case for instituting the systematic collection of data relating to career destinations of graduates. This collection of information, which would presumably involve both academic and careers service staff, should ideally be longitudinal and should distinguish between completing undergraduate and postgraduate degrees (4.1.1. and 4.1.2.; 4.1.12 and 4.1.13.). One employer case study points out that it can be difficult for employers to find graduates with appropriate qualifications and suggests that there would be merit in collecting information and creating a database that would link employers, graduates and students and thus help match supply with demand (4.4.6.).
 28. As is the case with other academic subjects, not everyone graduating with a degree in Russian or in another area of Slavonic and East European Studies will move immediately into a 'graduate level' job (4.1.11.), but there are nonetheless numerous career opportunities in the public, private and tertiary sectors. Many of these career opportunities have an international dimension, and there are numerous and varied opportunities for working in the region, either on a long-term or a short-term basis (4.1 and 4.3.).
 29. There is evidence that the significance of English as the language of business has been overestimated and that Russian continues to be an important language for doing business in Central and Eastern Europe. In a report produced for the CBI Polish came fourth and Russian joint eighth in a table showing which languages are rated by employers as being useful to their organisations (4.2.1. and 4.2.5.). One employer case study notes the large number of opportunities that exist in Russia for those who have a knowledge of the language (4.4.5. and 4.4.6.).
 30. Two of those who provided case studies stressed the advantages of knowing not just the language, but also the culture of one's business partners, and one drew

attention to the fact that knowing one Slavonic language made it relatively easy to learn other languages in the family. A further case study noted that a knowledge of languages and other cultures could bring benefits in work that was not ostensibly language-related (4.3.). One employer case study noted the globalisation of business had greatly increased the need for cross-cultural knowledge and by ensuring that managers had a knowledge of the relevant languages and cultures companies could save large sums of money spent on cross-cultural training (4.4.4.).

31. A report compiled for the EU and one of the employer case studies both indicate that for a career in business language skills may need to be supplemented by other competencies, eg in accountancy or law or by skills in presentation and communication. It should be possible for such portfolios of skills to be acquired in different sequences, eg by making intensive postgraduate language courses available to those with degrees in other subjects, and there should be greater collaboration between universities and businesses over identifying and meeting demand for language skills (4.2.2.-4.2.4.; and 4.4.3.).
32. Responses from the relevant Directorates-General of the European Commission note the difficulty they experience in finding enough suitably qualified candidates able to translate or interpret from the Central and East European languages of the EU, but indicate at the same time the complications involved in remedying the situation. One point to emerge is that candidates for either type of work should be qualified in one of the more widely-used West European languages, as well as in one or more of the Central and East European languages. Here too there would seem to be scope for greater collaboration between providers and employers with a view to devising a strategy that might help match supply with demand.

5.2. What is to be done?

5.2.1. On the basis of the enquiry and the conclusions summarised above it is possible to draw up a list of 15 specific recommendations that can be divided into three categories. The first category consists of actions that can be taken immediately either to solve existing problems or to bring about essential improvements in levels or modes of provision. The second category is made up of measures to be adopted in the medium term, principally with the aim of stabilising and preserving elements of the system potentially under threat. In the final category there are a number of long-term activities, mostly relating to the collection and exchanging of information.

5.2.2. The following recommendations belong to the first category:

1. The necessary steps should be taken to ensure that Russian teaching in Scotland is placed on a basis that is sustainable in the long term: appointments should be made to the Chairs in Russian or Slavonic languages at Edinburgh, Glasgow and St Andrews, and other posts that have become vacant in recent years should be re-filled.
2. Steps should be taken to ensure that the viability of Russian teaching in England is not undermined by changes that are taking place in the funding system and that such teaching is maintained on a sustainable basis at at least its present level, as is abundantly justified by student demand.
3. There should be a co-ordinated and planned development and enhancement of the teaching of Slavonic and East European languages other than Russian at both undergraduate and post-graduate levels. This should include the elaboration of funding models that will support the arrangements made on a long-term basis: in particular there should be immediate steps to ensure the continuation of the SIVS programme in England and the creation of an equivalent scheme in Scotland.

4. There should be a co-ordinated and planned development of intensive postgraduate language courses aimed at a variety of target groups, including research students in various disciplines who need to acquire a knowledge of the relevant language, people whose career path requires them to learn a new language and graduates in one Slavonic language who wish to acquire a good knowledge of another such language. Steps should be taken to encourage and support the development of innovative and flexible modes of provision in order to optimise the match between supply and demand and to enhance the employability of graduates. In appropriate circumstances (eg for preparing research students) earmarked funding should be made available to support these courses.
5. The organisational structure created by the LBAS programme should be extended to include all universities with an interest in the relevant areas of study in order to serve as the basis for the further development of postgraduate provision and research.
6. There should be moves towards the creation of consortia and the elaboration of other forms of both formal and informal collaboration. All such arrangements should either be initiated by individual units or involve such units from a very early stage and should be designed from the outset to have clear aims and to bring clear benefits, with which all those participating are able to identify.

5.2.3. The following recommendations are in the second category:

7. Where it is both appropriate and feasible, steps should be taken to develop and enhance Russian teaching, particularly with a view to maintaining and/or restoring the subject in institutions other than the ancient and the civic universities.
8. Steps should be taken to preserve and, where necessary, to enhance curricular diversity, particularly with a view to ensuring that students continue to have the possibility of taking course elements involving medieval studies and linguistic topics and that in general they continue to have a choice of different curricula and course combinations.
9. Steps should be taken with a view in due course to providing all students of Russian with the opportunity of studying a second Slavonic language.
10. Encouragement should be given to developing those forms of innovation in teaching methods and curriculum design that will serve to enhance the employability of graduates.
11. All necessary steps should be taken to ensure the continuing viability of extended periods of residence abroad, especially in Russia, but also, where necessary, in other countries not covered by EU schemes of student mobility.
12. All necessary steps should be taken to ensure that library provision and other resources are maintained at an appropriate level to support both research and student learning.

5.2.4. The remaining recommendations are in the third category:

13. A system should be instituted for the regular collection on a UK-wide basis of data relating to student enrolments on courses in Russian and other fields of Slavonic and East European studies.
14. With the co-operation of university careers staff a similar system should be instituted for collecting data on student destinations and, wherever possible, career paths. Consideration should be given to the setting up of a database of graduates and prospective employers with a view to assisting recruitment and finding employment.
15. All feasible steps should be taken to improve the relationships between universities

and other stakeholders and, in particular, to ensure the efficient and timely exchange of information; active consideration should be given to setting up a permanent forum to unite all stakeholders with an interest in Slavonic and East European Studies.

5.2.5. At various points in this report reference has been made to the need for planning, co-ordination and intervention, and in this light the 15 recommendations listed above should be interpreted as constituting a medium- to long-term plan for the development of Slavonic and East European Studies in UK universities. It has become clear that all the evidence collected for this review points to one inescapable conclusion: the only way in which Slavonic and East European Studies is ever going to be freed from the endless cycle of neglect and intervention and to be placed on a stable and sustainable footing is by the creation and the consistent and full implementation of a plan of this nature. It is recognised that a proposal of this nature poses something of a challenge to a system that has in recent decades been characterised by a pathological aversion to any form of academic planning, but, while no-one is advocating a move to anything resembling Soviet-style five-year plans, it is contended that the complexities of the academic world will be better addressed by a differentiated model that takes account of the specific requirements of different subject areas than by a uniform approach. In this particular instance a medium- to long-term plan provides the best opportunities for maximising academic potential, for developing links between academia and the 'user community' and last, but for many people not least, for the most efficient use of scarce resources.

5.2.6. Ultimate responsibility for the plan and its implementation would presumably rest with the four UK Funding Councils and, where appropriate, with the two relevant Research Councils, but if the plan is to achieve its stated aim, it will need the extensive and continuing involvement of a range of stakeholders. These would include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

- the individual universities with an interest (real or potential) in the subject area;
- BASEES;
- the UK and the devolved governments, both as ultimate holders of the purse-strings and as employers of graduates in the subject area;
- the EU Directorates-General for Translating and Interpreting, as well as other bodies with an interest in multilingualism, such as the Council of Europe;
- representatives of employer bodies, such as the Russo-British Chamber of Commerce and the equivalent bodies for the other countries of the region;
- representatives of NGOs and the voluntary sector;
- where appropriate, consular and diplomatic representatives of the countries of the region.

The precise means by which these different structures might be involved is a topic for further discussion, but a useful starting point would be the setting up of a forum along the lines mentioned above in recommendation 15.

5.2.7. Given the economic situation in which the UK finds itself and given the present financial state of the British university systems, it would be unrealistic to bring forward proposals that would involve spending large sums of money; it would, however, be futile to imagine that Slavonic and East European Studies can be placed on a secure and sustainable footing without incurring some additional expenditure. The full financial implications of the recommendations listed above will become clear only as the plan is developed, though it is fair to assume that there will always be a gap between the aspirations of the profession (and, one would hope,

some of the stakeholders) on the one hand and the willingness of the government and the Funding Councils to disburse on the other. Nevertheless, the immediately identifiable costs would seem to be very low and no more than an infinitesimal proportion of the UK's higher education budgets. The following activities would require investment:

- the restoration of a small number (perhaps no more than two or three above what is already budgeted for) of Russian-teaching posts that have been lost in recent years, especially in Scotland;
- the creation of a small number of posts to further the teaching of languages other than Russian; here, however, there may be opportunities for the more efficient deployment of existing staff and for obtaining support from the countries of the region;
- the creation and administration of consortia and the support, where necessary, of staff and student mobility;
- support for the creation of innovative teaching programmes;
- some support for the year abroad in Russia may be necessary, depending on the extent to which it is possible to set up schemes involving work placements.

5.2.8. It is unlikely that much progress can be made in implementing the recommendations listed above without a considerable input from BASEES. The view that BASEES might play a more pro-active part in the development of Slavonic and East European Studies is supported in a number of responses to the questionnaire, and while it is not suggested that the Association is not at present doing anything that it should be doing, there does seem to be further scope for it to play a decisive role in either initiating or promoting, whether on its own or in collaboration with other bodies, a number of actions that would contribute towards achieving the aims set out here. These actions might well include:

- the collection of data on a UK-wide basis, relating to student numbers and to graduate career paths;
- the co-ordination and support of approaches to the Funding Councils in England and Scotland, especially in relation to the question of support for lesser-taught languages (to the extent that this is not being done already);
- the co-ordination, where no external body is willing to take on the role, of developing provision in languages other than Russian.

BASEES might also wish to consider what role it could play in creating and developing a platform for liaison between university departments and other stakeholders.

5.2.9. A final thought relates to how we might make more creative use of our own professional expertise. It is not that long since the fall of the Berlin Wall, and few have a better understanding than experts in Slavonic and East European Studies of how to subvert top-down authoritarian regimes. Experience tells us that what such regimes fear most is the creation of 'horizontal structures', which unite individuals or groups who are dispersed throughout the system and which give a certain political weight to those who would otherwise be effectively disenfranchised. One such 'horizontal structure', uniting the three remaining units in Scotland, was suggested in section 3.11., and there may be scope for others to be formed on a geographical basis, eg in the North of England; another type of 'horizontal structure' might unite those units with an interest in teaching languages other than Russian. In fairness, the parallel suggested here is not entirely exact, and wherever this is possible, any such 'horizontal structures' (or, for those who might prefer a different terminology, 'informal networks') that come into being will want to work with, rather than against university authorities and Funding Councils. Nevertheless, they may, where

circumstances justify this, provide a platform that reduces the imbalance that often exists between university management and individual units.

- 5.2.10. These proposals are put forward on the premise that they offer a real opportunity to put Slavonic and East European Studies on a sound and sustainable footing for the medium and long term. Otherwise the baton will inevitably pass to whoever is given the task of producing the next review into the subject.

Appendix A

Questionnaire sent to university departments

Report on the state of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK

Terms of reference

- Include a national audit of provision in Slavonic Studies in UK HE, including breakdowns of Russian degree intakes by level of entry: post A-level and *ab initio*, primarily;
- Include detailed information on employment destinations of Russian graduates;
- Consider the importance of Slavonic Studies, and Russian in particular, in terms of: defence and diplomacy, business and emerging markets, the European Union, multilingualism and multiculturalism;
- Recognising the wide student interest in the history, politics, geography and culture of the region, explore the need for appropriate language provision to support PGRs in these areas;
- Identify and highlight the benefits to the individual of understanding the history and cultures of others;
- Include perspectives and case studies from 'users' on the importance of these disciplines;
- Consider ways of strengthening successful individual units, while also investigating the scope for co-ordinating provision in, for example, a consortium, with the aim of making these and other units more resilient;
- In particular, the Review will explore the appropriateness of this for both Russian and also for the various other disciplines taught as options in Russian departments, such as Czech, Polish and other Slavonic and East European languages, as well as related social, historical and cultural areas of study;
- Consider evidence on the sustainability of provision of Slavonic Studies and recommend steps that could be taken to avoid an undesirable reduction in the scale of provision and, where appropriate, to expand it.

A. Statistical information

Please insert student numbers in the tables below, as appropriate.

Please feel free to deconstruct, reconstruct and adapt the tables to suit your own particular circumstances and to ignore those parts that do not apply.

Where statistical data for previous years cannot be retrieved, it would be appreciated if you could supply any information relating to trends that may be available.

I. Undergraduate

I.1. Russian

	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
1 st year post A-level or equivalent					
1 st year <i>ab initio</i>					
2 nd year					
Year abroad					
3 rd year					
4 th year (if applicable)					
Subsidiary					

I.2. Other Slavonic and East European languages

Language	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
1 st year post A-level or equivalent					
1 st year <i>ab initio</i>					
2 nd year					
Year abroad					
3 rd year					
4 th year (if applicable)					
Subsidiary					

Language	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
1 st year post A-level or equivalent					
1 st year <i>ab initio</i>					
2 nd year					
Year abroad					
3 rd year					
4 th year (if applicable)					
Subsidiary					

Language	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
1 st year post A-level or equivalent					
1 st year <i>ab initio</i>					
2 nd year					
Year abroad					
3 rd year					
4 th year (if applicable)					
Subsidiary					

1.3. Non-language-based undergraduate courses in Slavonic, Central and East European Studies

	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
1 st year					
2 nd year					
3 rd year					
4 th year (if applicable)					
Subsidiary					

2. Postgraduate

2.1. Intensive postgraduate Diplomas (or equivalent) in a Slavonic or East European language

Language	2011-12		2010-11		2009-10		2008-09		2007-08	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT

2.2. Masters courses in Translation and/or Interpreting

Language	2011-12		2010-11		2009-10		2008-09		2007-08	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT

2.3. Other Masters courses

Course	2011-12		2010-11		2009-10		2008-09		2007-08	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT

2.4. Postgraduate (Research)

	2011-12		2010-11		2009-10		2008-09		2007-08	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
Masters enrolled										
Masters completing										
Doctoral enrolled										
Doctoral completing										

Do you offer any online or other distance-taught courses? If so, please supply details of the courses and student numbers.

If not, would you be interested in offering any such courses, if there were shown to be the appropriate level of demand?

B. Other information

1. In relation to Point 2

Please supply me with any information you have relating to employment destinations of graduates in Russian and (where applicable) other Slavonic and East European languages.

2. In relation to Point 4 (where applicable)

- 1 What arrangements do you have in place for providing language instruction to PGR students working in the areas mentioned?
- 2 Are there additional or alternative arrangements that you would wish to see in place and, if so, how might this be achieved?
- 3 What are your views on the relationship between language learning and research in humanities and social sciences areas other than literature? Would it be desirable for this relationship to be improved and, if so, how might this be achieved?

3. In relation to Point 5

1. What specific benefits do you see the individual gaining from the study of the history and cultures of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe?
2. Are there any specific features of your provision that you would like to highlight as making a particularly important contribution to providing these benefits?

4. In relation to Points 7-9

1. Do you consider your existing provision in the area of Slavonic and East European Studies to be sustainable for the foreseeable future?
2. If so, are there any steps that could realistically be taken that would enhance your provision?
3. If not, what steps could reasonably be taken to make your provision sustainable?
4. Are you at present, or have you been in the past, part of any consortium arrangement?
5. If so, what are or were the advantages and disadvantages of the arrangement(s)?
6. If not, do you consider that a consortium arrangement might help to enhance your provision or to make it more sustainable? What might that consortium arrangement be?
7. Do you consider the balance between the provision for Russian and that for other Slavonic and East European languages to be appropriate:
 - a) in your institution?
 - b) nationally?
8. Are you aware of any significant gaps or areas of under-provision in the area of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK?
9. Do you consider that the different funding regimes for universities being put in place in the different parts of the UK threaten the sustainability of Slavonic and East European Studies?

5. The international dimension

1. In what ways do the opportunities offered by EU programmes for student and staff mobility and the Bologna Process enhance your provision?
2. Do you consider that there might be ways in which these and other opportunities might be used in a more fruitful way? If so, how?
3. The implementation of the Bologna Agreement has led to far-reaching changes to university courses in most European countries, often imposed at short notice by central or regional governments. In the UK any such changes, if they are happening at all, are taking place much more gradually and in a much more disorganised fashion. Nonetheless, do you consider that the implementation of the Bologna Agreement in the UK will lead, in due course, to significant changes in the provision of Slavonic and East European Studies, either at undergraduate or postgraduate level, and, if so, what might these changes be?
4. Do you consider that there are any international organisations that might have a role to play in maintaining or enhancing Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK?

6. General

1. In recent years many universities have undertaken restructuring exercises which have had the consequence, *inter alia*, of combining what were once independent departments into larger units, such as schools etc. If a restructuring exercise of this nature has taken place or is taking place in your institution, do you consider that, once the initial upheaval of change is out of the way, the results have led/will lead to an enhancement in the provision of Slavonic and East European Studies?
2. Given that even after such restructuring exercises different activities relating to Slavonic and East European Studies can find themselves in different administrative units, what do you consider would be the most effective administrative structure for maintaining and enhancing Slavonic and East European Studies in your institution?
3. As you will be aware, the history of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK since the end of World War II has been characterised by cycles of expansion and decline, punctuated by reviews and reports that seem to be produced at ever more frequent intervals. Do you consider that there are any steps that can reasonably be taken to put this subject area in the medium or the long term on a more stable basis, thereby obviating the need for further reviews?
4. Do you consider that there is a case for drawing up a plan for the maintenance and development of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK in the medium and long term. If so, which stakeholders should be involved in producing such a plan?
5. Regardless of your answer to the previous question do you consider that there is scope for BASEES and other interested organisations to play a more proactive role in maintaining and developing Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK?
6. Have you any other comments and observations on any topic relevant to the terms of reference of this review?

Please return completed questionnaire as an email attachment to me at: John.Dunn@glasgow.ac.uk

I would be most grateful if completed questionnaires could be returned by 20 July 2012.

John Dunn

Questionnaire sent to the Directors of the two LBAS centres

Report on the state of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK

Terms of reference

- Include a national audit of provision in Slavonic Studies in UK HE, including breakdowns of Russian degree intakes by level of entry: post A-level and *ab initio*, primarily;
- Include detailed information on employment destinations of Russian graduates;
- Consider the importance of Slavonic Studies, and Russian in particular, in terms of: defence and diplomacy, business and emerging markets, the European Union, multilingualism and multiculturalism;
- Recognising the wide student interest in the history, politics, geography and culture of the region, explore the need for appropriate language provision to support PGRs in these areas;
- Identify and highlight the benefits to the individual of understanding the history and cultures of others;
- Include perspectives and case studies from 'users' on the importance of these disciplines;
- Consider ways of strengthening successful individual units, while also investigating the scope for co-ordinating provision in, for example, a consortium, with the aim of making these and other units more resilient;
- In particular, the Review will explore the appropriateness of this for both Russian and also for the various other disciplines taught as options in Russian Departments, such as Czech, Polish and other Slavonic and East European languages, as well as related social, historical and cultural areas of study;
- Consider evidence on the sustainability of provision of Slavonic Studies and recommend steps that could be taken to avoid an undesirable reduction in the scale of provision and, where appropriate, to expand it.

LBAS questionnaire

1. What do you consider to have been the main achievements of the LBAS programme?
2. What problems did you encounter during the running of the programme?
3. How successfully, in your view, were the language-teaching elements integrated into the rest of the programme?
4. What steps can reasonably be taken to strengthen the language element of research in the area of Central and East European Studies?
5. How much success did you have in engaging users?
6. In this connection is there any useful advice or information that you can give me in connection with point 6 of the Terms of Reference?
7. What do you consider should be the main priorities of the LBAS (post-LBAS?) programme in the present funding situation?
8. Have you any other comments and observations on any topic relevant to the Terms of Reference of the review?

Please feel free to deconstruct, reconstruct and adapt this questionnaire as you consider appropriate.

I would be grateful if you return the completed questionnaire as an email attachment to me at John.Dunn@glasgow.ac.uk by 20 July.

Questionnaire sent to representative librarians

Report on the state of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK

Terms of reference

- Include a national audit of provision in Slavonic Studies in UK HE, including breakdowns of Russian degree intakes by level of entry: post A-level and *ab initio*, primarily;
- Include detailed information on employment destinations of Russian graduates;
- Consider the importance of Slavonic Studies, and Russian in particular, in terms of: defence and diplomacy, business and emerging markets, the European Union, multilingualism and multiculturalism;
- Recognising the wide student interest in the history, politics, geography and culture of the region, explore the need for appropriate language provision to support PGRs in these areas;
- Identify and highlight the benefits to the individual of understanding the history and cultures of others;
- Include perspectives and case studies from 'users' on the importance of these disciplines;
- Consider ways of strengthening successful individual units, while also investigating the scope for co-ordinating provision in, for example, a consortium, with the aim of making these and other units more resilient;
- In particular, the Review will explore the appropriateness of this for both Russian and also for the various other disciplines taught as options in Russian Departments, such as Czech, Polish and other Slavonic and East European languages, as well as related social, historical and cultural areas of study;
- Consider evidence on the sustainability of provision of Slavonic Studies and recommend steps that could be taken to avoid an undesirable reduction in the scale of provision and, where appropriate, to expand it.

Librarian questionnaire

1. Do you consider the present level of library provision for Slavonic Studies in the UK to be appropriate?
2. What changes have been taking place in this library provision in recent years and what changes do you expect to occur in the foreseeable future?
3. Given the pressure on resources, would it be appropriate to seek greater co-ordination between institutions in the area of library provision? If so, what would be best way of achieving this?
4. Do you consider it important for institutions with major holdings in the area of Slavonic and East European Studies to have a specialist librarian for the area? Are there any issues relating to the supply of, and demand for, specialist librarians in Slavonic and East European Studies that you wish to raise?
5. Are there any other issues relating to library provision in the area of Slavonic and East European Studies that you wish to raise?
6. The history of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK since the end of World War II has been characterised by cycles of expansion and decline, punctuated by reviews and reports that seem to be produced at ever more frequent intervals. Do you consider that there are any steps that can reasonably be taken to put this subject area in the medium or the long term on a more stable basis, thereby obviating the need for further reviews?
7. Do you consider that there is a case for drawing up a plan for the maintenance and development of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK in the medium and long term. If so, which stakeholders should be involved in producing such a plan?
8. Regardless of your answer to the previous question do you consider that there is scope for BASEES and other interested organisations to play a more proactive role in maintaining and developing Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK?
9. Have you any other comments and observations on any topic relevant to the terms of reference of this review?

Please return the completed questionnaire as an email attachment to me at:
John.Dunn@glasgow.ac.uk

I would be most grateful if the completed questionnaire could be returned by 27 July 2012.

John Dunn

Questionnaire sent to Trinity College, Dublin (no reply received)

Report on the state of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK

Terms of reference

- Include a national audit of provision in Slavonic Studies in UK HE, including breakdowns of Russian degree intakes by level of entry: post A-level and *ab initio*, primarily;
- Include detailed information on employment destinations of Russian graduates;
- Consider the importance of Slavonic Studies, and Russian in particular, in terms of: defence and diplomacy, business and emerging markets, the European Union, multilingualism and multiculturalism;
- Recognising the wide student interest in the history, politics, geography and culture of the region, explore the need for appropriate language provision to support PGRs in these areas;
- Identify and highlight the benefits to the individual of understanding the history and cultures of others;
- Include perspectives and case studies from 'users' on the importance of these disciplines;
- Consider ways of strengthening successful individual units, while also investigating the scope for co-ordinating provision in, for example, a consortium, with the aim of making these and other units more resilient;
- In particular, the Review will explore the appropriateness of this for both Russian and also for the various other disciplines taught as options in Russian departments, such as Czech, Polish and other Slavonic and East European languages, as well as related social, historical and cultural areas of study;
- Consider evidence on the sustainability of provision of Slavonic Studies and recommend steps that could be taken to avoid an undesirable reduction in the scale of provision and, where appropriate, to expand it.

A. Statistical information

Please insert student numbers in the tables below, as appropriate.

Please feel free to deconstruct, reconstruct and adapt the tables to suit your own particular circumstances and to ignore those parts that do not apply.

Where statistical data for previous years cannot be retrieved, it would be appreciated if you could supply any information relating to trends that may be available.

If the information is readily available, it would be helpful if you could give alongside totals a separate figure for students resident in the UK.

I. Undergraduate

I.1. Russian

	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
1 st year post A-level or equivalent					
1 st year <i>ab initio</i>					
2 nd year					
Year abroad					
3 rd year					
4 th year (if applicable)					
Subsidiary					

1.2. Other Slavonic and East European languages

Language	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
1 st year post A-level or equivalent					
1 st year <i>ab initio</i>					
2 nd year					
Year abroad					
3 rd year					
4 th year (if applicable)					
Subsidiary					

Language	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
1 st year post A-level or equivalent					
1 st year <i>ab initio</i>					
2 nd year					
Year abroad					
3 rd year					
4 th year (if applicable)					
Subsidiary					

Language	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
1 st year post A-level or equivalent					
1 st year <i>ab initio</i>					
2 nd year					
Year abroad					
3 rd year					
4 th year (if applicable)					
Subsidiary					

1.3. Non-language-based undergraduate courses in Slavonic, Central and East European Studies

	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
1 st year					
2 nd year					
3 rd year					
4 th year (if applicable)					
Subsidiary					

2. Postgraduate

2.1. Intensive postgraduate Diplomas (or equivalent) in a Slavonic or East European language

Language	2011-12		2010-11		2009-10		2008-09		2007-08	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT

2.2. Masters courses in Translation and/or Interpreting

Language	2011-12		2010-11		2009-10		2008-09		2007-08	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT

2.3. Other Masters courses

Course	2011-12		2010-11		2009-10		2008-09		2007-08	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT

2.4. Postgraduate (Research)

	2011-12		2010-11		2009-10		2008-09		2007-08	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
Masters enrolled										
Masters completing										
Doctoral enrolled										
Doctoral completing										

Do you offer any online or other distance-taught courses? If so, please supply details of the courses and student numbers.

If not, would you be interested in offering any such courses, if there were shown to be the appropriate level of demand?

B. Other information

1. In relation to Point 2

Please supply me with any information you have relating to employment destinations of graduates in Russian and (where applicable) other Slavonic and East European languages.

2. In relation to Point 4 (where applicable)

1. What arrangements do you have in place for providing language instruction to PGR students working in the areas mentioned?
2. Are there additional or alternative arrangements that you would wish to see in place and, if so, how might this be achieved?
3. What are your views on the relationship between language learning and research in humanities and social sciences areas other than literature? Would it be desirable for this relationship to be improved, and, if so, how might this be achieved?

3. In relation to Point 5

1. What specific benefits do you see the individual gaining from the study of the history and cultures of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe?
2. Are there any specific features of your provision that you would like to highlight as making a particularly important contribution to providing these benefits?

4. In relation to Points 7-9

1. Do you consider your existing provision in the area of Slavonic and East European Studies to be sustainable for the foreseeable future?
2. If so, are there any steps that could realistically be taken that would enhance your provision?
3. If not, what steps could reasonably be taken to make your provision sustainable?
4. Are you at present, or have you been in the past, part of any consortium arrangement?

5. If so, what are or were the advantages and disadvantages of the arrangement(s)?
6. If not, do you consider that a consortium arrangement might help to enhance your provision or to make it more sustainable? What might that consortium arrangement be?
7. Do you consider the balance between the provision for Russian and that for other Slavonic and East European languages to be appropriate:
 - a. in your institution?
 - b. in the UK and the Republic of Ireland as a whole?
8. Are you aware of any significant gaps or areas of under-provision in the area of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK and the Republic of Ireland?
9. Do you consider that the different funding regimes for universities being put in place in the different parts of the UK threaten the sustainability of Slavonic and East European Studies? What effect, if any, are these changes likely to have on the provision of Slavonic and East European Studies in the Republic of Ireland?

5. The international dimension

1. In what ways do the opportunities offered by EU programmes for student and staff mobility and the Bologna Process enhance your provision?
2. Do you consider that there might be ways in which these and other opportunities might be used in a more fruitful way? If so, how?
3. Do you consider that the implementation of the Bologna Agreement will lead in due course to significant changes in the provision of Slavonic and East European Studies, either at undergraduate or postgraduate level, and, if so, what might these changes be?
4. Do you consider that there are any international organisations that might have a role to play in maintaining or enhancing Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK?

6. General

1. In recent years many universities have undertaken restructuring exercises which have had the consequence, *inter alia*, of combining what were once independent departments into larger units, such as schools etc. If a restructuring exercise of this nature has taken place or is taking place in your institution, do you consider that, once the initial upheaval of change is out of the way, the results have led/will lead to an enhancement in the provision of Slavonic and East European Studies?
2. Given that even after such restructuring exercises different activities relating to Slavonic and East European Studies can find themselves in different administrative units, what do you consider would be the most effective administrative structure for maintaining and enhancing Slavonic and East European Studies in your institution?
3. As you will be aware, the history of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK since the end of World War II has been characterised by cycles of expansion and decline, punctuated by reviews and reports that seem to be produced at ever more frequent intervals. Do you consider that there are any steps that can reasonably be taken to put this subject area in the medium or the long term on a more stable basis, thereby obviating the need for further reviews?
4. Do you consider that there is a case for drawing up a plan for the maintenance and development of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK in the medium and long term. If so, which stakeholders should be involved in producing such a plan? Do you consider that

it would be appropriate for Trinity College, Dublin to be involved in any such planning process?

5. Regardless of your answer to the previous question do you consider that there is scope for BASEES and other interested organisations to play a more proactive role in maintaining and developing Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK and Ireland?
6. Have you any other comments and observations on any topic relevant to the terms of reference of this review?

Please return completed questionnaire as an email attachment to me at: John.Dunn@glasgow.ac.uk

I would be most grateful if completed questionnaires could be returned by 20 July 2012.

Report on the state of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK

Terms of reference

- Include a national audit of provision in Slavonic Studies in UK HE, including breakdowns of Russian degree intakes by level of entry: post A-level and *ab initio*, primarily;
- Include detailed information on employment destinations of Russian graduates;
- Consider the importance of Slavonic Studies, and Russian in particular, in terms of: defence and diplomacy, business and emerging markets, the European Union, multilingualism and multiculturalism;
- Recognising the wide student interest in the history, politics, geography and culture of the region, explore the need for appropriate language provision to support PGRs in these areas;
- Identify and highlight the benefits to the individual of understanding the history and cultures of others;
- Include perspectives and case studies from 'users' on the importance of these disciplines;
- Consider ways of strengthening successful individual units, while also investigating the scope for co-ordinating provision in, for example, a consortium, with the aim of making these and other units more resilient;
- In particular, the Review will explore the appropriateness of this for both Russian and also for the various other disciplines taught as options in Russian departments, such as Czech, Polish and other Slavonic and East European languages, as well as related social, historical and cultural areas of study;
- Consider evidence on the sustainability of provision of Slavonic Studies and recommend steps that could be taken to avoid an undesirable reduction in the scale of provision and, where appropriate, to expand it.

BASEES questionnaire

1. In relation to Point 3

1. Please let me have any observations you may have on the importance of Russian and Slavonic Studies in general for the various spheres of activity mentioned in Point 3.
2. Do you consider the present balance between the provision for Russian and that for other Slavonic languages to be appropriate? If not, what steps might reasonably be taken to improve the situation?
3. Do you consider that a case can be made for encouraging all students of Russian to study a second Slavonic language, either before or after graduation? If so, what would be the best way of achieving this?

2. In relation to Point 4

What are your views on the relationship between language learning and research in humanities and social sciences areas other than literature? Would it be desirable for this relationship to be improved, and, if so, how might this be achieved?

3. In relation to Point 5

What specific benefits do you see the individual gaining from the study of the history and cultures of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe?

4. In relation to Points 7-9

1. Do you consider the existing provision in the area of Slavonic and East European Studies to be sustainable for the foreseeable future?
2. If so, are there any steps that could realistically be taken that would enhance this provision?
3. If not, what steps could reasonably be taken to make the provision sustainable?
4. What do you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages of consortium arrangements?
5. Do you consider that there are specific areas where a consortium arrangement might be particularly advantageous?
6. Do you consider that the different funding regimes for universities being put in place in the different parts of the UK threaten the sustainability of Slavonic and East European Studies?

5. The international dimension

1. In what ways do the opportunities offered by EU programmes for student and staff mobility and the Bologna Process enhance the provision of Slavonic and East European Studies?
2. Do you consider that there might be ways in which these and other opportunities might be used in a more fruitful way? If so, how?
3. The implementation of the Bologna Agreement has led to far-reaching changes to university courses in most European countries, often imposed at short notice by central or regional governments. In the UK any such changes, if they are happening at all, are taking place much more gradually and in a much more disorganised fashion. Nonetheless, do you consider that the implementation of the Bologna Agreement in the UK will lead, in due course, to

significant changes in the provision of Slavonic and East European Studies, either at undergraduate or postgraduate level, and, if so, what might these changes be?

4. Do you consider that there are any international organisations that might have a role to play in maintaining or enhancing Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK?

6. General

1. In recent years many universities have undertaken restructuring exercises which have had the consequence, *inter alia*, of combining what were once independent departments into larger units, such as schools etc. From the information at your disposal do you consider that, once the initial upheaval of change is out of the way, the results have led to an enhancement in the provision of Slavonic and East European Studies?
2. Given that even after such restructuring exercises different activities relating to Slavonic and East European Studies can find themselves in different administrative units, have you any views on what might constitute the most effective administrative structure for maintaining and enhancing Slavonic and East European Studies?
3. The history of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK since the end of World War II has been characterised by cycles of expansion and decline, punctuated by reviews and reports that seem to be produced at ever more frequent intervals. Do you consider that there are any steps that can reasonably be taken to put this subject area in the medium or the long term on a more stable basis, thereby obviating the need for further reviews?
4. Do you consider that there is a case for drawing up a plan for the maintenance and development of Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK in the medium and long term. If so, which stakeholders should be involved in producing such a plan?
5. Regardless of your answer to the previous question do you consider that there is scope for BASEES and other interested organisations to play a more proactive role in maintaining and developing Slavonic and East European Studies in the UK?
6. Have you any other comments and observations on any topic relevant to the terms of reference of this review?

Please return the completed questionnaire as an email attachment to me at:
John.Dunn@glasgow.ac.uk

I would be most grateful if the completed questionnaire could be returned by 27 July 2012.

John Dunn

Appendix B

List of responses

A. Academic

1. University Departments of Russian or Slavonic Studies (or equivalent)

University of Bath
University of Cambridge
Durham University
University of Edinburgh
University of Exeter
University of Glasgow (CRCEES)
University of Glasgow (Slavonic Studies)
Imperial College London
University of Leeds
University of Manchester
University of Oxford
Queen Mary, University of London
University of Sheffield
University of St Andrews
University College, London (SSEES)

2. Language-based Area Studies consortia

CEELBAS (Dr Robin Aizlewood)
CRCEES (Prof Richard Berry)

3. Library representatives

COSEELIS (Dr Ekaterina Rogatchevskaia)
SSEES (Ms Lesley Pitman)

4. Devolved Governments and Funding Councils

Dr Stephen Farry, MLA, Minister for Employment and Learning, Government of Northern Ireland
Higher Education Division, Welsh Government (Ms Kathryn Worsey)
HEFCE (Ms Linda Allebon)

5. Other academic responses

Dr Piotr Blumczyński, School of Modern Languages, Queen's University, Belfast
Dr Mark Payne, Department of Educational Studies, University of Sheffield
Ms Tanya Riordan, School of Education and Continuing Studies, University of Portsmouth
Ms Jenny Carr, The Scotland – Russia Forum
Ms Ramona Gönczöl, SSEES, University College, London
Dr James Muckle
Dr Gregory Walker

B. Other responses

1. Institutional

Confederation of British Industry (Mr James Fothergill, Head of Education and Skills)
Directorate-General for Interpretation, European Commission (Mr Ian Andersen)
Directorate-General for Translation, European Commission (Ms Antje Plutte)
Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Eastern Europe and Central Asia Directorate (Ms Eleanor Spizewski)
GCHQ

2. Individual

IB
JC
Mr William Hackett-Jones
PP
AZM

In addition a number of acknowledgements and holding replies were received from individuals and organisations in both categories; unfortunately, for a variety of reasons, mostly connected either with time pressure or with difficulties in extracting data, these did not result in a substantive response.

Appendix C

I. Russian undergraduate numbers

University	2011-12					
	1 st year Advanced	1 st year Beginner	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Bath		28	29	28		16
Birmingham						
Bristol						
Cambridge	10	19	26	21		21
Durham	10	27	37	29		28
Edinburgh†	17	54	34		20	9
Exeter	3	13	18	13		13
Glasgow		39	31	15	16	10
Imperial College§	7	19				
Leeds	7	22	16	22		16
Manchester	15	22	50	Not available		30
Nottingham						
Oxford	15	11	27	27		21
QMUL**	14	5	14	0		14
Sheffield‡	38		24	16		28
SSEES, UCL***	19	34	62	33		41
St Andrews	6	52	32	5	20	13
Totals	161	345	400	209	56	260

University	2010-11					
	1 st year Advanced	1 st year Beginner	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Bath		32	18	17		19
Birmingham						
Bristol						
Cambridge	5	20	38	22		22
Durham	10	35	40	29		32
Edinburgh†	6	54	34	12		22
Exeter	7	12	15	13		17
Glasgow		45	34	8	9	11
Imperial College§	20	40				
Leeds	11	17	20	24		19
Manchester	19	32	32			21
Nottingham						
Oxford	24	9	23	25		34
QMUL**	13	9	19	0		4
Sheffield‡	19		20	30		25
SSEES, UCL***	19	42	39	34		29
St Andrews	5	61	34	9	14	14
Totals	158	408	366	223	23	269

University	2009-10					Final year
	1 st year Advanced	1 st year Beginner	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	
Bath		20	17	19		16
Birmingham						
Bristol						
Cambridge	12	31	34	21		21
Durham	14	35	29	24		20
Edinburgh†	19	46	26	23		18
Exeter	5	11	13	17		6
Glasgow		47	29	10	12	9
Imperial College§	0	17				
Leeds	6	21	20	22		20
Manchester	13	25	30			15
Nottingham						
Oxford	16	6	28	32		31
QMUL**	19	11	6	0		10
Sheffield‡	31		34	26		21
SSEES, UCL***	18	30	46	19		30
St Andrews	10	55	32	7	11	15
Totals	163	355	344	220	23	232

University	2008-09					Final year
	1 st year Advanced	1 st year Beginner	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	
Bath	1	18	19	17		16
Birmingham						
Bristol						
Cambridge	13	20	37	16		16
Durham	12	23	35	34		35
Edinburgh†						
Exeter	4	15	18	6		6
Glasgow		41	24	15	12	12
Imperial College§	39	7				
Leeds	6	20	25	19		16
Manchester	6	24	26			16
Nottingham						
Oxford	19	7	33	35		27
QMUL**	7	9	9	1		12
Sheffield‡	37		30	20		28
SSEES, UCL***	13	34	32	23		17
St Andrews	7	61	28	2	16	18
Totals	164	279	316	188	28	219

University	2007-08					
	1 st year Adv.	1 st year Beg.	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Bath	2	20	17	16		17
Birmingham						
Bristol						
Cambridge	20	24	23	16		14
Durham	7	27	20	32		28
Edinburgh†						
Exeter	5	15	7	6		14
Glasgow		46	25	12	18	8
Imperial College§	7	22				
Leeds	11	12	19	24		14
Manchester	11	15	16	Not available		14
Nottingham						
Oxford	25	12	33	28		24
QMUL**	14	5	11	1		14
Sheffield‡	44		28	28		13
SSEES, UCL***	13	21	35	15		32
St Andrews	6	44	24	2	17	15
Totals	165	263	258	180	35	207

Totals	
2011-12	1431
2010-11	1447
2009-10	1337
2008-09	1194
2007-08	1108

Notes to these tables:

* This column is used only for those Scottish universities that offer five-year Honours degrees with the pattern 2 years + year abroad + 2 years.

† Figures for Edinburgh are available only from 2009-10 onwards.

§ The advanced class at Imperial College is described as being for students with GSCE level or equivalent.

‡ The figures for Sheffield include only those students enrolled on a degree in which Russian is named in the title. In addition there are students taking a BA in Modern Languages; each year there are c. 6-7 students taking Russian as a major language and 2-5 taking it as a minor language.

** QMUL - Queen Mary, University of London

*** SSEES, UCL - School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College, London

2. Other Slavonic and East European languages

2011-12					
Bulgarian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Leeds Subsidiary					
Oxford Subsid.					
Croatian/Serbian (or Serbian/Croatian)	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Durham		N/A			10
Oxford Subsid.	2				
SSEES, UCL***	3		3		
Czech	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow Honours	1	2	0	0	1
Glasgow Subsid.	3				
Leeds Subsid.					
Oxford (Czech/Slovak)	7	5	4		2
Oxford Subsid.	1				
Sheffield‡	16	8	4		5
SSEES, UCL*** (with Slovak)	1	1			1
Estonian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†	4	1			
Finnish	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
St Andrews Option					
UCL/SSEES	3	2	1		1
Hungarian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†	1				
SSEES, UCL***					1
Latvian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†					
Lithuanian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†	2				
Polish	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Cambridge Open Languages					
Glasgow Hons.	3	2	1	5	2
Glasgow Subsid.	11				
Leeds Subsid.	5				
Oxford	1	2	2		1
Oxford Subsid.	2				
Sheffield‡	15	7	6		4
SSEES, UCL***					1
Romanian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***		2			
Slovak (with Czech)	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***		1			
Ukrainian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Cambridge Tripos		1			7
Cambridge Open Lang		2	6		
Oxford Subsid.	1				
St Andrews Option					
SSEES, UCL***	1	1			
Unspecified East European Language§	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***	5	3	1		2

2010-11					
Bulgarian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Leeds Subsid.					
Oxford Subsid.					
Croatian/Serbian (or Serbian/Croatian)	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Durham		12			6
Oxford Subsid.	2				
SSEES, UCL***	1	3			1
Czech	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow Hons.	4	2	0	2	1
Glasgow Subsid.	4				
Leeds Subsid.					
Oxford (Czech/Slovak)	5	4	2		4
Oxford Subsid.					
Sheffield‡	16	7	4		8
SSEES, UCL*** (with Slovak)	1				1
Estonian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†	1	2			
Finnish	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
St Andrews Option					
SSEES, UCL***	2	2	1		
Hungarian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†	3	1			
SSEES, UCL***		1			1
Latvian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†		2			
Lithuanian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†					
Polish	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Cambridge Open Lang.					
Glasgow Hons.	7	4	3	2	1
Glasgow Subsid.	2				
Leeds Subsid.	9				
Oxford	2	2	1		1
Oxford Subsid.					
Sheffield‡	15	10	3		7
SSEES, UCL***	2		1		2
Romanian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***	2				
Slovak (with Czech)	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***	1				
Ukrainian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Cambridge Tripos		1			5
Cambridge Open Lang	2	2			
Oxford Subsid.	1				
St Andrews Option	8				
SSEES, UCL***	1				
Unspecified East European Language§	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***	4	2	2		1

2009-10					
Bulgarian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Leeds Subsid.					
Oxford Subsid.					
Croatian/Serbian (or Serbian/Croatian)	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Durham		12			6
Oxford Subsid.					
SSEES, UCL***	4		1		1
Czech	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow Hons.	4	6	0	2	3
Glasgow Subsid.	5				
Leeds Subsid.	8				
Oxford (Czech/Slovak)	4	2	4		3
Oxford Subsid.					
Sheffield‡	17	8	6		8
SSEES, UCL*** (with Slovak)		1			1
Estonian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†	1				
Finnish	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
St Andrews Option					
SSEES, UCL***	1	2			
Hungarian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†	1			1	
SSEES, UCL***	1	2			1
Latvian	1 st year Adv.	1 st year Beg.	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†	1				
Lithuanian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†					
Polish	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Cambridge Open Lang.	2	4			
Glasgow Hons.	2	6	2	1	0
Glasgow Subsid.	4				
Leeds Subsid.	7				
Oxford	2	1	1		0
Oxford Subsid.	2				
Sheffield‡	16	7	6		5
SSEES, UCL***	1	2	1		1
Romanian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***					
Slovak (with Czech)	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***					
Ukrainian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Cambridge Tripos		0			3
Cambridge Open Lang	4	4			
Oxford Subsid.					
St Andrews Option	3				?
SSEES, UCL***					
Unspecified East European Language§	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***	1	3	1		2

2008-09					
Bulgarian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Leeds Subsid.	12				
Oxford Subsid.	1				
Croatian/Serbian (or Serbian/Croatian)	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Durham		7		8	
Oxford Subsid.	2				
SSEES, UCL***	2	1	1		
Czech	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow Hons.	9	1	1	4	0
Glasgow Subsid.	0				
Leeds Subsid.	13				
Oxford (Czech/Slovak)	2	4	3		4
Oxford Subsid.					
Sheffield‡	17	8	7		5
SSEES, UCL*** (with Slovak)		1	1		1
Estonian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†					
Finnish	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
St Andrews Option					
SSEES, UCL***	2				
Hungarian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†	3				
SSEES, UCL***		2			2
Latvian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†	1	2			
Lithuanian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†					
Polish	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Cambridge Open Lang.					
Glasgow Hons.	8	3	1	1	2
Glasgow Subsid.	3				
Leeds Subsid.	13				
Oxford	1	0	1		1
Oxford Subsid.	4				
Sheffield‡	15	10	4		6
SSEES, UCL***	3	1	1		1
Romanian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***	1				1
Slovak (with Czech)	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
UCL/SSEES					
Ukrainian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Cambridge Tripos		5			7
Cambridge Open Lang	2	2			
Oxford Subsid.					
St Andrews Option					
SSEES, UCL***					1
Unspecified East European Language§	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***	3	1	3		2

2007-08					
Bulgarian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Leeds Subsid.	16				
Oxford Subsid.					
Croatian/Serbian (or Serbian/Croatian)	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Durham		8			10
Oxford Subsid.					
SSEES, UCL***	2	1			3
Czech	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow Hons.	7	5	0	2	1
Glasgow Subsid.	0				
Leeds Subsid.	20				
Oxford (Czech/Slovak)	4	3	4		2
Oxford Subsid.					
Sheffield‡	19	9	4		5
SSEES, UCL*** (with Slovak)	1	1			
Estonian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†	2	2			
Finnish	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
St Andrews Option	3				
SSEES, UCL***					
Hungarian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†					
SSEES, UCL***	2		1		1
Latvian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†	2				
Lithuanian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Glasgow†					
Polish	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Cambridge Open Lang.					
Glasgow Hons.	20	5	1	4	1
Glasgow Subsid.					
Leeds Subsid.	16				
Oxford					
Oxford Subsid.					
Sheffield‡	18	7	5		4
SSEES, UCL***	2	1	1		2
Romanian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***	1				1
Slovak (with Czech)	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
UCL/SSEES					
Ukrainian	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
Cambridge Tripos					
Cambridge Open Lang	2	2			
Oxford Subsid.					
St Andrews Option					
SSEES, UCL***		1			
Unspecified East European Language§	1 st year	2 nd year	Year abroad	3 rd /4 th year*	Final year
SSEES, UCL***	1	3	2		4

Notes to these tables:

* This column is used for Scottish universities which have a five-year Honours degree with the pattern: 2 years + year abroad + 2 years; it is also used in a small number of cases where a subsidiary or open access case can be taken to advanced (3rd year) level.

† The response from Glasgow does not make this explicit, but it is assumed that these courses are taken mostly by postgraduates.

‡ The figures for Sheffield are approximate, since exact figures are not available for students taking the BA in Modern Languages (who form the majority of students taking Czech or Polish).

§ These are the combined figures for Russian and an East European Language and for an East European Language and French/German/Italian.

** QMUL - Queen Mary, University of London

*** SSEES, UCL - School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College, London

3. Postgraduate students

3.1 Taught

3.1.1. Intensive postgraduate Diplomas (or equivalent) in a Slavonic or other East European language

University	Language	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
Glasgow	Russian	4	4	4	8	14
Glasgow	Czech	3		1	1	
Glasgow	Polish				3	5
Glasgow	Czech for Social Sciences	1		2		
Glasgow	Polish for Soc. Sci.	2	2	1		
Glasgow	Russian for Soc. Sci.; four levels	14	8	12	12	8
Glasgow	Slovak for Soc. Sci.			2		
Totals		24	14	22	24	27
Subtotal	Russian	17	12	16	20	22
Subtotal	Czech	4		3	1	
Subtotal	Polish	3	2	1	3	5

3.1.2. Masters courses in Translation and/or Interpreting

University	Language	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
Bath	Russian	9	8	6	6	3
Durham	Russian			2	2	
Edinburgh	Russian		2	1	1	5
Exeter	Russian	1	2	5	0	1
Imperial College	Russian	2			1	1
Imperial College	Polish	5	5	4	1	5
Imperial College	Hungarian	0	0	0	0	0
Leeds	Russian	11	6	4	5	2
Leeds	Polish	3	4			
Manchester	Polish	6	4	3	4	3
Manchester	Russian	4	3	2	2	3
Sheffield	Czech	1		1		
Sheffield	Polish		3	2	1	
Sheffield	Russian	1	3	1		
Totals		43	40	31	23	23
Subtotal	Russian	28	24	21	17	15
Subtotal	Polish	14	16	9	6	8

3.1.2. Other Masters courses

University	Language	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
Glasgow	Russian, Central and East European Studies	18	11	20	22	13
Manchester			2	3	2	3
Oxford	MSt*	3	2	1	1	
Oxford	MPhil 1st + 2nd year*	3	4	3		
Sheffield		1				
St Andrews		1	2			
SSEES, UCL***	MA Russian Studies	14	26	17	14	8
SSEES, UCL***	MA Central + East European Studies)	8	7	6	11	11
SSEES, UCL***	MA Identity, Culture. + Power	8	5	9	12	
SSEES, UCL***	MA Russian + East European Literature + Culture				3	3
SSEES, UCL***	Other MAs	77	97	60	58	54
Totals		133	156	119	123	92
Subtotal	Language, Literature. and/or Culture	38	48	39	43	25

3.2 Research

3.2.1. Masters

University	2011-12		2010-11		2009-10		2008-09		2007-08	
	Enrolled	Completing	Enrolled	Completing	Enrolled	Completing	Enrolled	Completing	Enrolled	Completing
Cambridge	4	4	4	4	2	1	5	5	2	2
Durham	2					2	2			
Edinburgh	1	1							2	2
Glasgow (Slavonic Studies)	2	2	6	3	6		7	2	5	1
Leeds			4	5	1		1	1	2	
Manchester	2	1								
Cambridge	4	4	4	4	2	1	5	5	2	2
Totals	11	8	14	12	9	3	15	8	11	5

3.2.2. Doctoral

University	2011-12		2010-11		2009-10		2008-09		2007-08	
	Enrolled	Completing	Enrolled	Completing	Enrolled	Completing	Enrolled	Completing	Enrolled	Completing
Bath	2	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	
Cambridge	14	1	11	1	5	1	6	2	8	1
Durham	2		1		1					
Edinburgh	9	4	6		6	2	7	1	3	2
Exeter	2	1	3		2		1			
Glasgow (Slavonic Studies)	6		3		3		3		1	
Glasgow (Russian, Central and East European Studies)	N/A	6	N/A	3	N/A	1	N/A	3	N/A	5
Leeds	1		1							
Manchester	15	4	11		9	4	8	2	8	
Oxford	12	2	13	1	9	1	7	1	8	3
QMUL				1	1		1		1	
Sheffield	9		5	1	5	2	6	1	7	1
St Andrews	2		1	1				2		
SSEES, UCL***	59		65		49					
Totals	133	19	123	9	92	12	41	13	38	12

Notes to these tables:

*** SSEES, UCL - School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College, London

* Students enrolled for the MSt or the MPhil at Oxford study a new Slavonic language. The numbers taking each language are as follows:

Bulgarian:	2011-12: 1	2007-08: 1
Czech:	2011-12: 1	2008-09: 2
Polish:	2010-11: 1	
Russian:	2010-11: 2	
Ukrainian	2010-11: 1	

Contact us

The Higher Education Academy
Innovation Way
York Science Park
Heslington
York
YO10 5BR

+44 (0)1904 717500
enquiries@heacademy.ac.uk

ISBN: 978-1-907207-70-9

© The Higher Education Academy, 2013

The Higher Education Academy (HEA) is a national body for learning and teaching in higher education. We work with universities and other higher education providers to bring about change in learning and teaching. We do this to improve the experience that students have while they are studying, and to support and develop those who teach them. Our activities focus on rewarding and recognising excellence in teaching, bringing together people and resources to research and share best practice, and by helping to influence, shape and implement policy - locally, nationally, and internationally. The HEA supports staff in higher education throughout their careers, from those who are new to teaching through

to senior management. We offer services at a generic learning and teaching level as well as in 28 different disciplines. Through our partnership managers we work directly with HE providers to understand individual circumstances and priorities, and bring together resources to meet them. The HEA has knowledge, experience and expertise in higher education. Our service and product range is broader than any other competitor.

www.heacademy.ac.uk | www.twitter.com/heacademy

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Higher Education Academy. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any storage and retrieval system without the written permission of the Editor. Such permission will normally be granted for educational purposes provided that due acknowledgement is given.

To request copies of this report in large print or in a different format, please contact the communications office at the Higher Education Academy: 01904 717500 or pressooffice@heacademy.ac.uk

