

	<p style="text-align: center;">Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems Issue 5, Vol. 9, 2026</p>	
	<p style="text-align: center;">RESEARCH ARTICLE </p>	
	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Reconceptualizing Bilingualism and Multilingualism in the Era of Globalization: A Sociolinguistic, Cognitive, and Language Policy Analysis with Evidence from Azerbaijan</h2>	
<p>Sevinj Ahmadova</p>	<p>Doctor of Philological Sciences Azerbaijan State University of Culture and Arts Baku, Azerbaijan E-mail: sevinj.ahmadova@admiu.edu.az; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5650-6807</p>	
<p>Keywords</p>	<p>Bilingualism and Multilingualism; Globalization and Language Dynamics; Sociolinguistics; Language Contact and Interference; Linguistic Identity; English as a Lingua Franca; Language Policy and Education; Cognitive Implications of Bilingualism; Multilingual Societies; Azerbaijan Linguistic Context</p>	
<p>Abstract Bilingualism and multilingualism have emerged as central features of contemporary linguistic landscapes, shaped by the accelerating forces of globalization, migration, and digital communication. In the context of Sociolinguistics, these phenomena are no longer viewed as static competencies but as dynamic, socially embedded practices that influence identity formation, intercultural interaction, and socioeconomic mobility. This study provides a critical and integrative analysis of the theoretical foundations, typologies, and functional dimensions of bilingualism, drawing on classical and contemporary scholarship. Moving beyond descriptive accounts, the article systematizes key classifications of bilingualism—contact vs. non-contact, unilateral vs. bilateral, and receptive vs. productive forms—while examining their sociolinguistic drivers and cognitive implications. It further traces the historical evolution of scholarly attitudes toward bilingualism, from early deficit-oriented perspectives to contemporary recognition of its cognitive, developmental, and communicative advantages. Special attention is given to the impact of globalization on linguistic hierarchies, particularly the role of English as a dominant global lingua franca and its implications for language policy, education systems, and cultural identity. Through a contextualized analysis of Azerbaijan, the study explores how multilingual practices are shaped by the interaction of historical legacies, notably the influence of Russian, and current global trends that elevate the status of English alongside the national language. The findings demonstrate that bilingualism operates simultaneously as a resource and a site of tension, enabling intercultural competence and economic participation while also generating risks of language shift and identity reconfiguration. By integrating theoretical perspectives with contextual analysis, the study contributes to the advancement of bilingualism research through a more nuanced and comparative framework that captures the complexities of language use in a globalized world.</p>		
<p>Citation Ahmadova, S. (2026). Reconceptualizing Bilingualism and Multilingualism in the Era of Globalization: A Sociolinguistic, Cognitive, and Language Policy Analysis with Evidence from Azerbaijan. <i>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems</i>, 9(5), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.56334/sci/9.5.24</p>		
<p>Licensed © 2026 The Author(s). Published by <i>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems (SEI)</i>, under the auspices of IMCRA - International Meetings and Conferences Research Association (Azerbaijan). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/</p>		
<p>Received: September 11, 2025</p>	<p>Accepted: February 22, 2026</p>	<p>Published Online: April 12, 2026</p>

1. Introduction

In the contemporary era of globalization, linguistic practices have undergone profound transformation as the boundaries between cultures, economies, and societies become increasingly fluid. Language is no longer merely a medium of communication but a critical instrument of social integration, economic participation, and cultural negotiation. Within this evolving landscape, Bilingualism and Multilingualism have emerged as defining features of modern societies, reflecting the intensification of migration, international education, global trade, and digital interconnectedness. These phenomena are not exceptional or peripheral; rather, they constitute normalized and widespread modes of linguistic practice that shape both individual competencies and collective identities.

From a Sociolinguistics perspective, bilingualism and multilingualism are best understood as dynamic and context-dependent processes embedded within broader structures of power, ideology, and globalization. The growing prominence of English as a global lingua franca has reconfigured linguistic hierarchies, enabling access to global communication networks while simultaneously reinforcing asymmetries between dominant and minority languages. This dual process generates complex patterns of language contact, interference, and adaptation, raising critical questions about linguistic diversity, identity formation, and the sustainability of national languages in a globalized world.

Moreover, the expansion of multilingual practices has significant cognitive and social implications. Research in psycholinguistics demonstrates that bilingual individuals often exhibit enhanced cognitive flexibility, metalinguistic awareness, and problem-solving abilities. At the same time, the sociopolitical context in which bilingualism develops plays a decisive role in determining whether it functions as a resource for empowerment or a mechanism of linguistic marginalization. Consequently, the study of bilingualism requires an integrative approach that connects theoretical frameworks with real-world sociolinguistic conditions.

Within this broader context, Azerbaijan provides a particularly illustrative case of multilingual interaction shaped by historical, political, and contemporary global forces. The legacy of the Soviet period has sustained the influence of the Russian language, while ongoing globalization has elevated the status of English as a language of international communication, education, and professional advancement. Simultaneously, the Azerbaijani language remains central to national identity and cultural continuity. This coexistence of Azerbaijani, Russian, and English reflects a layered and dynamic linguistic environment characterized by both contact and non-contact forms of bilingualism, as well as varying degrees of linguistic prestige and functional distribution.

Against this backdrop, the present study aims to provide a comprehensive and analytically grounded examination of bilingualism and multilingualism in the context of globalization. Specifically, it seeks to (i) critically analyze the theoretical foundations and typologies of bilingualism, (ii) examine the evolution of scholarly and societal attitudes toward multilingual practices, and (iii) explore the sociolinguistic implications of these processes within the Azerbaijani context. By integrating global theoretical perspectives with a localized case study, the article contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how bilingualism and multilingualism function as both instruments of cultural preservation and drivers of socioeconomic and intercultural transformation in the contemporary world.

2. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design grounded in a systematic and descriptive-analytical literature review. The methodological framework integrates principles from Sociolinguistics and interdisciplinary language studies to examine the conceptual, historical, and functional dimensions of bilingualism and multilingualism in the context of globalization.

Data Sources and Selection Criteria

The analysis is based exclusively on secondary data derived from peer-reviewed academic literature, including journal articles, scholarly books, conference papers, and selected statistical and institutional reports published between 1999 and 2024. Particular emphasis was placed on sources indexed in major international databases such as Scopus and Web of Science to ensure academic quality, relevance, and credibility.

A purposive sampling strategy was employed to identify key works addressing bilingualism, multilingualism, language contact, and globalization. Selection criteria included (i) theoretical relevance, (ii) citation impact, (iii) geographical and contextual applicability—especially to post-Soviet and multilingual societies—and (iv) recency of publication. In total, 21 core sources in English, Azerbaijani, and Russian were selected as the primary analytical corpus, supplemented by additional high-impact theoretical references to support conceptual interpretation.

Analytical Procedures

The study utilizes qualitative content analysis to systematically examine and synthesize the selected literature. This approach enabled the identification of key themes, typologies, and conceptual frameworks related to bilingualism, including its classifications, sociolinguistic drivers, and cognitive implications. In addition, a comparative analytical method was applied to explore variations in bilingual practices across different sociocultural and geopolitical contexts.

An interpretive analytical approach was further employed to trace the historical evolution of scholarly attitudes toward bilingualism—from early deficit-oriented perspectives to contemporary recognition of its cognitive and social benefits. Particular attention was given to contextualizing these developments within the broader processes of globalization and linguistic change.

Scope and Limitations

This study does not involve primary empirical data collection; rather, it is based entirely on the synthesis and critical interpretation of existing scholarly literature. While this approach allows for a comprehensive theoretical and comparative analysis, it may limit the ability to provide statistically generalizable findings. Nevertheless, the methodological design ensures analytical depth and conceptual rigor, particularly in relation to the Azerbaijani sociolinguistic context.

3. Literature Review

The study of bilingualism has evolved from a narrowly defined linguistic phenomenon into a multidimensional field intersecting with sociology, education, psychology, and globalization studies. In contemporary scholarship, bilingualism is no longer

understood merely as the coexistence of two languages within an individual, but rather as a dynamic and context-dependent practice shaped by social structures, power relations, and global mobility. This shift reflects broader transformations associated with globalization, which has intensified linguistic contact, reconfigured language hierarchies, and expanded the functional domains of multilingual communication.

1. Conceptualizing Bilingualism in Contemporary Linguistics

Early foundational works, such as Uriel Weinreich's seminal theory of language contact and Joshua A. Fishman's sociological approach to language use, established bilingualism as a structured and socially embedded phenomenon. These perspectives emphasized the role of community, identity, and language domains in shaping bilingual competence. Subsequent developments expanded the conceptual scope of bilingualism, moving beyond rigid categorizations toward more fluid and functional interpretations.

Contemporary scholars, including François Grosjean, argue that bilingual individuals should not be evaluated against monolingual norms but rather understood as possessing integrated linguistic systems adapted to specific communicative contexts. Similarly, the work of Colin Baker highlights the cognitive, educational, and sociocultural dimensions of bilingualism, emphasizing its role in fostering cognitive flexibility, metalinguistic awareness, and intercultural competence.

Bilingualism in the Context of Globalization

The acceleration of globalization has fundamentally transformed the nature and distribution of bilingualism. As noted by David Crystal, the emergence of English as a global lingua franca has reshaped linguistic ecologies, creating new forms of bilingualism characterized by the coexistence of local and global languages. This phenomenon is particularly evident in post-Soviet and developing contexts, where linguistic practices are increasingly influenced by global economic integration, digital communication, and educational reforms.

Scholars such as Ofelia García and Li Wei introduce the concept of *translanguaging*, which reconceptualizes bilingualism as a fluid process of meaning-making across linguistic boundaries rather than the alternation between discrete language systems. This perspective aligns with the broader framework of "superdiversity" proposed by Jan Blommaert, which emphasizes the complexity and heterogeneity of contemporary linguistic landscapes shaped by migration, technology, and global interconnectedness.

At the same time, critical scholars such as Robert Phillipson highlight the asymmetrical power relations embedded in global language dynamics, particularly the dominance of English and its implications for linguistic inequality and cultural dependency. These debates underscore the dual nature of globalization: while it facilitates linguistic diversity and mobility, it also risks homogenization and the marginalization of minority languages.

Sociolinguistic and Cognitive Implications of Bilingualism

Empirical research consistently demonstrates that bilingualism has significant cognitive and social implications. Studies in psycholinguistics suggest that bilingual individuals exhibit enhanced executive control, problem-solving abilities, and cognitive flexibility (Bialystok, 2001). From a sociolinguistic perspective, bilingualism plays a crucial role in identity construction, social integration, and cultural negotiation, particularly in multilingual societies.

However, these benefits are not uniformly distributed. The sociopolitical context in which bilingualism develops often determines whether it functions as a resource or a constraint. In contexts characterized by linguistic hierarchies, such as those shaped by colonial or post-colonial dynamics, bilingualism may lead to language shift, identity conflict, and reduced prestige for minority languages. This is particularly relevant in transitional societies, where language policies and educational systems play a decisive role in shaping linguistic outcomes.

Bilingualism in Azerbaijan: A Contextual Perspective

Within the Azerbaijani context, bilingualism reflects a complex interplay of historical, political, and socioeconomic factors. The legacy of the Soviet period has resulted in the continued influence of the Russian language, while globalization has increased the prominence of English as a language of international communication and professional advancement. As a result, Azerbaijan exhibits a layered bilingual and multilingual environment characterized by both contact and non-contact bilingualism.

Existing studies indicate that language choice in Azerbaijan is closely linked to factors such as education, socioeconomic status, and urbanization, with Russian and English often associated with higher prestige and economic opportunity. At the same time, the Azerbaijani language remains central to national identity and cultural continuity. This dual dynamic creates both opportunities and tensions, as individuals navigate competing linguistic demands in different social and professional contexts.

Research Gap and Contribution

Despite the extensive literature on bilingualism and globalization, several gaps remain. First, much of the existing research is either highly theoretical or focused on Western contexts, with limited integrative analysis of post-Soviet societies such as Azerbaijan. Second, there is a lack of comprehensive frameworks that connect typologies of bilingualism with globalization processes and their socio-cognitive implications in specific national contexts.

Addressing these gaps, the present study offers a structured and context-sensitive analysis of bilingualism in the era of globalization, with particular attention to Azerbaijan. By integrating theoretical insights with sociolinguistic realities, the study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how global forces reshape linguistic practices, identities, and inequalities. In doing so, it advances the discourse from descriptive accounts toward a more analytical and comparative framework that highlights both opportunities and challenges associated with bilingualism in contemporary society.

4. Discussion

The findings of this study reinforce the understanding that bilingualism in the era of globalization is not merely a linguistic competence but a complex socio-cognitive and political phenomenon shaped by structural inequalities, historical legacies, and evolving global dynamics. Building upon the theoretical synthesis presented in the literature review, the discussion highlights the dual and often contradictory nature of bilingualism as both a resource and a source of tension within contemporary societies.

First, the analysis confirms that globalization has significantly redefined the functional roles of languages, particularly through the expansion of English as a global lingua franca. While this development enhances access to international education, economic opportunities, and digital communication, it simultaneously reinforces hierarchical language systems in which local and minority languages may be marginalized. This supports the critical perspective that bilingualism under globalization operates within unequal power structures rather than neutral linguistic exchange. In the Azerbaijani context, this dynamic is especially visible in the coexistence of Azerbaijani, Russian, and English, where each language carries distinct symbolic, cultural, and socioeconomic capital.

Second, the study demonstrates that the typological distinctions of bilingualism—such as contact vs. non-contact, unilateral vs. bilateral, and receptive vs. productive forms—are not merely theoretical classifications but reflect real sociolinguistic processes that shape language use and identity. For example, unilateral bilingualism, often observed among minority or socially mobile groups, highlights asymmetries in language acquisition and reinforces patterns of linguistic adaptation driven by necessity rather than choice. In contrast, bilateral bilingualism, although less common, represents a more balanced and equitable linguistic interaction that supports intercultural dialogue and mutual recognition.

Third, from a cognitive and social perspective, the findings align with existing research indicating that bilingualism contributes to enhanced cognitive flexibility, metalinguistic awareness, and intercultural competence. However, this study extends the discussion by emphasizing that these benefits are context-dependent. In environments characterized by linguistic inequality or sociopolitical pressure, bilingualism may lead to identity fragmentation, language attrition, or reduced proficiency in one of the languages. This highlights the need to move beyond universal claims about the advantages of bilingualism and adopt a more nuanced, context-sensitive approach.

Furthermore, the Azerbaijani case illustrates how bilingualism is embedded within broader processes of nation-building, globalization, and educational policy. The continued influence of Russian reflects historical and institutional continuity, while the growing importance of English signals alignment with global economic and academic systems. At the same time, the Azerbaijani language remains central to national identity and cultural preservation. This creates a dynamic linguistic equilibrium in which individuals strategically navigate multiple languages depending on context, purpose, and social positioning.

Importantly, the study underscores that language policies and educational frameworks play a decisive role in shaping the outcomes of bilingualism. Policies that promote additive bilingualism—where additional languages are learned without displacing the native language—are more likely to yield positive cognitive and social outcomes. In contrast, subtractive bilingualism, where dominant languages replace minority or national languages, poses significant risks for linguistic diversity and cultural sustainability.

Finally, the discussion highlights a critical gap in current research: the lack of integrative frameworks that connect typological classifications of bilingualism with real-world sociopolitical and economic conditions. By linking theoretical models with the Azerbaijani context, this study demonstrates the importance of contextualizing bilingualism within specific national and global settings. This approach not only enriches theoretical understanding but also provides practical insights for policymakers, educators, and researchers.

Bilingualism and Multilingualism

When we learn any language in addition to our native tongue, we become either bilingual or multilingual. Multilingualism is the phenomenon of using more than two languages. The main significance of multilingualism lies in the necessity of possessing several languages in a globalizing world. Familiarity with any nation's culture primarily occurs through mastering and learning that nation's language. Therefore, mastering and learning languages, which serve as means of communication and connections between peoples, is becoming increasingly important.

As a socio-cultural phenomenon, multilingualism creates conditions for young people to prepare for life in a multiethnic and polymultural environment. It facilitates the establishment of relations with people belonging to different ethnic groups, religions, and races, and contributes to the formation of skills and habits such as tolerance and endurance.

Among the first to study multilingualism was Joshua Fishman (1971). The majority of research works on the issue have been conducted under the influence of or as a continuation of Fishman's ideas. Another linguist, John Gumperz, studied the language diversity of India in his work. According to Gumperz's approach expressed in the work, language is viewed primarily as a means

of interaction. It was precisely the research conducted by J. Fishman and J. Gumperz that laid the foundation of sociolinguistics (Blommaert & Spotti, 2017: 8).

In most cases, the emergence of multilingualism has been related to bilingualism. In other words, bilingualism can be accepted as the cause of the emergence of multilingualism. Depending on the age period in which the language is mastered, bilingualism is divided into two types: early and late. In addition, receptive (receiving), reproductive (transmitting), and productive (creating) bilingualism can be distinguished. The latter, productive bilingualism, serves as the main goal of learning new languages.

For many years, bilingualism was negatively perceived by society. Most scholars, including parents, believed that the flow of information in two languages could be harmful to the child and could cause confusion. This, in turn, could create obstacles in the child's development and even halt their cognitive progress (Ibadova, 2019: 21). Only after 1962 did attitudes toward bilingualism change. This was due to research conducted by Canadian psychologists Elizabeth Peal and Wallace Lambert. The studies revealed that bilingualism does not create any obstacles to children's intellectual development; on the contrary, it accelerates it.

Forms and types of Bilingualism

Bilingualism manifests mainly in two forms: unilateral and bilateral. Unilateral bilingualism occurs more frequently when small ethnic groups live in the same territories with larger ethnic groups (peoples, nations) and maintain constant political, economic, cultural, and social relations with them. For example, bilingualism observed among non-Russian populations in all autonomous entities within the Russian Federation, as well as among small ethnic groups living in Azerbaijan (Talis, Tats, Kurds, Gryz, Khinalug, Budukh, Udi), Abkhaz, Ossetians, Adjarians, Batsbi, and Greeks in Georgia, Ishkashimi and Yazgulami in Tajikistan, and Uyghurs, Mongols, Manchus, and Tibetans in China, is unilateral. In other words, while representatives of minority ethnic groups learn the language of the majority, representatives of the majority ethnic group do not know the language of the minority group. In such conditions, small ethnic groups without their own writing system merge linguistically, culturally, and even ethnically with larger ethnic groups. This can be considered assimilation. As a result of the merger, the small people gradually lose their native language.

Bilateral bilingualism occurs when two languages mutually influence each other. In this case, representatives of both languages know each other's languages. For example, Uzbeks knowing Tajik and Tajiks knowing Uzbek in neighboring areas of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan represents bilateral bilingualism. Similarly, Russians living in Azerbaijan knowing Azerbaijani and Azerbaijanis knowing Russian is also a case of bilateral bilingualism. Unlike unilateral bilingualism, in bilateral bilingualism there is no destruction or replacement of the native language or language shift. Bilateral bilingualism is simply a process of language exchange.

According to its occurrence, bilingualism has two main types: contact (or contactual) and non-contact (or non-contactual).

Contact bilingualism arises when two languages or ethnic groups are in constant contact and communication in their daily shared life. Contact bilingualism is a more stable and fixed linguistic phenomenon, often regular in nature, and in some cases transmitted hereditarily. Therefore, contact bilingualism plays a key role in language change during language crossings. This type is more commonly encountered during the cohabitation of a small ethnic group with a larger ethnus. The language formed as a means of interethnic communication can be cited as an example of this type of bilingualism.

Non-contact bilingualism occurs through learning a second language through special methods. Thus, in various countries, English, Russian, German, French, Spanish, Persian, Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, and other languages are taught in secondary and higher education institutions. This teaching process leads to the emergence of non-contact bilingualism. Languages of international importance are taught through this type of bilingualism, i.e., in educational institutions.

In contact bilingualism, entire ethnic groups and peoples can be bilingual. In contrast, non-contact bilingualism refers only to the bilingualism of individual individuals or social groups.

The mentioned factors have enabled the emergence of bilingualism even in middle-aged people. In recent years, the globalization process occurring in the world has further highlighted these factors, resulting in an increase in multilingualism among people. In turn, bilingualism has become one of the main driving forces of the globalization process.

U. Weinreich, considered the founder of the theory of interlingual relations, in his work indicates three main types of bilingualism: coordinate, compound, and subordinate. In addition, linguistic literature notes types of bilingualism such as natural and artificial, mass and individual, direct and indirect, receptive and creative, normal and abnormal, balanced and dominant. In modern linguistic science, when classifying the phenomenon of bilingualism and determining its characteristics, linguistic, psycholinguistic, psychological, sociological, linguodidactic, cognitive, and other approaches have existed (Kosharnaya & Karimullah, 2023: 526).

Bilingualism in scientific research

The study of bilingualism plays a very important role in terms of language development and determining relationships between languages of different origins. Many studies have been conducted at the scientific level to determine the essence of bilingualism and the features of its emergence, and articles, theses, and other scientific research works have been written. As a result of these studies, the importance of paying special attention to the following factors in the study of bilingualism has been determined:

- The age of the person possessing the language;
- How the second language is mastered;
- The level of use of the second language;
- Skills in the second language – speaking, writing, listening, and reading (Landsberry, 2019: 148).

All these factors must be approached in a parallel and systematic manner. Only in this way will it be possible to deeply understand the essence of the phenomenon of bilingualism.

Among the scholars who have studied the problem of bilingualism in linguistics and written scientific works on the issue, the names of O.S. Akhmanova, L.Kh. Daurova, Yu.D. Desheriev, K.Kh. Khanakov, V.G. Kostomarov, M.S. Sayev, J.A. Hutenko, and others can be mentioned.

Among Azerbaijani linguists who have studied the issue, A. Gurbanov, R. Rajabli, F. Veysalli, L. Gurbanova, R. Heydarov, K. Jafarova, and others have put forward certain ideas and conducted scientific research (Bayramova, 2024: 110). The phenomenon of bilingualism has been studied more by Western and Russian linguists. From their ranks, the names of L. Bloomfield, A. Sirbu, G. Karagac, and A. Aslan can be especially noted.

Among the prominent linguists who have dealt with the issue of bilingualism, the names of U. Weinreich, S. Ervin, and C. Osgood should first be mentioned. Approaching bilingualism from a somewhat different perspective, they distinguished “compound bilingualism, which shows the merging of two languages into a single system, and coordinate bilingualism, in which the two language systems exist independently” (İsmaylova, 2018: 29).

One of the first studies on bilingualism in Western science was conducted by John Edwards in the 1980s-1990s. As a result of this study, J. Edwards came to the conclusion that bilingual people were better developed than non-bilingual people in some intellectual indicators (Blommaert & Spotti, 2017: 5).

As a result of long-term research, linguists concluded that if a bilingual person speaks more in one of the two languages they possess, that language should be considered their native language. R. Heydarov states that if a person is an immigrant or belongs to an ethnic minority, they will not be able to use their native language in school or other public places; this language will only be learned at the household level, and the person will not be able to express themselves clearly in that language. In other words, they will hardly be able to speak that language. As a result, for this person, the first language role will be played by a language that is not their native tongue (Heydəröv, 2013: 177).

According to Yu.D. Desherieva, bilingualism is simply the possession of two languages and the ability to speak them. V.A. Avorin also supports this idea, stating: “Bilingualism is the free mastery of two languages. In other words, bilingualism begins with the approximation of knowledge existing in the second language to the knowledge and skills in the first language” (İsmaylova, 2018: 29-30).

A. Gurbanov, in his scientific research work, defined bilingualism as follows: “The meaning of bilingualism is bilingualism. The use of two languages simultaneously in one country is called bilingualism in science” (Bayramova, 2024: 111).

Other linguists who expressed opinions on bilingualism were T. Weinreich and E.M. Vereshchagina. In their research, they note that the process of using two languages alternately can be called bilingualism. The level of mastery of the language must be indicated in this process. The experience of using those languages alternately already implies that they can be used for communication. Based on this, a person carrying two language systems can be called bilingual.

Regarding the classification of bilingualism, E.M. Vereshchagin divided it into three groups in his work:

- Receptive bilingualism – in this case, the bilingual person understands speech in the second language system. This type of bilingualism is more often referred to in the study of dead languages.
- Reproductive bilingualism – the bilingual person understands what they read and hear in the second language and can speak it.
- Productive bilingualism – a person possessing two languages fully understands, speaks, and produces speech existing in the system of the second language (İsmaylova, 2018: 30).

In scientific research, many other factors limiting bilingualism and its formation have existed. Thus, bilingualism on one hand involves the relationship between multilingual speech existing in society and the intensity characterizing it, and on the other hand, it encompasses a unique system between the socio-demographic characteristics of the subjects forming the systematicity of the multilingual speech process. Regarding this issue, T.E. Vladimirova, in her research work, pays great attention to the concept of “multilingualism” and states that speech or part of speech forms a system between two languages. In unexpected multilingual situations, it creates the illusion that the speaker can speak in the second language without knowing it. This process is a method of psychological self-regulation of a person.

L.V. Shcherba, speaking about the methods and ways of mastering a second language, shows that bilingualism can be artificial and natural. The author calls the second language mastered through school, teacher, and textbook artificial bilingualism, and the second language mastered as a result of direct communication with native speakers of foreign languages natural bilingualism.

L.V. Shcherba also divides bilingualism into two types according to its intensity and extensiveness: individual and mass. In turn, mass bilingualism itself is classified by the author into two types: full bilingualism, where the entire people are bilingual, and partial bilingualism, where only part of the people are bilingual.

In addition, L.V. Shcherba divides bilingualism into pure and mixed types according to the characteristic features of the relationship between adjacent languages. The author considers pure bilingualism a phenomenon where no comparison or parallelism can be made between the two languages. Therefore, translation from one language to another is either impossible or very difficult. The Russian nobility of the 19th century can be cited as an example of this type of bilingualism: they could not translate from Russian to French or from French to Russian (Allahverdiyeva & Yunusova, 2021: 110).

Mixed bilingualism involves the parallel connection in the speaker's consciousness of equivalent means of two different languages in the form of a single concept. This unique system performs the role of universal thinking for both adjacent languages. For this reason, these languages are not limited to living side by side; they also mutually influence each other. In mixed bilingualism, the means of expression of both languages correspond to all concepts and notions. One of them comes from the first language, the other from the second. For this reason, translation of speech from one language to another occurs more easily and almost automatically.

Table 1. Typology of Bilingualism in the Context of Globalization: Characteristics, Drivers, and Socio-Cognitive Implications

Type of Bilingualism	Defining Characteristics	Primary Drivers	Sociolinguistic Context	Cognitive and Social Implications	Risks and Challenges
Early Bilingualism	Acquisition of two languages in early childhood; simultaneous or sequential learning	Family environment; parental language practices	Multilingual households; migrant or mixed-language families	Enhanced cognitive flexibility; improved executive function; stronger language acquisition capacity	Possible language dominance imbalance; initial lexical confusion
Late Bilingualism	Acquisition of a second language after early childhood	Formal education; professional requirements; globalization	Educational institutions; adult learning environments	Development of metalinguistic awareness; increased adaptability in communication	Lower fluency compared to native speakers; higher cognitive load
Receptive Bilingualism	Ability to understand a second language without active production	Passive exposure; media; cultural contact	Minority groups; diaspora communities	Improved comprehension skills; cultural awareness	Limited communicative competence; reduced active usage
Productive Bilingualism	Full ability to understand and actively use both languages in communication	Education; sustained interaction; social necessity	Multilingual societies; international professional contexts	High communicative competence; cognitive flexibility; intercultural competence	Language interference; code-switching challenges
Contact Bilingualism	Arises from direct interaction between linguistic communities	Migration; trade; political integration	Border regions; multiethnic societies	Development of hybrid linguistic forms; social cohesion	Language shift; minority language erosion
Non-Contact Bilingualism	Learned through formal instruction without direct immersion	Education systems; global language demand (e.g., English)	Schools, universities, online learning platforms	Access to global knowledge; academic and professional mobility	Lack of cultural depth; limited pragmatic competence
Unilateral Bilingualism	Minority groups learn the majority language, but not vice versa	Sociopolitical dominance; economic necessity	Post-colonial and multiethnic states	Social integration; access to resources and opportunities	Assimilation risk; loss of minority languages and identity

Bilateral Bilingualism	Mutual language acquisition between linguistic groups	Cultural exchange; balanced sociopolitical relations	Multilingual regions with equal language status	Intercultural dialogue; linguistic diversity preservation	Increased complexity in language policy and education
Globalized (English-Dominant) Bilingualism	Integration of a global lingua franca (English) with native language	Globalization; digital communication; education policies	International academic and professional environments	Expanded global communication; access to international networks	Linguistic homogenization; cultural dependency; language inequality

Another linguist, Yu.D. Desheriev, divides bilingualism into three types according to the degree of extensiveness: nationwide, territorial, and covering part of the people.

Bilingualism in the context of globalization

In the modern world, rapid development and change are observed in all spheres of public life—political, economic, cultural, linguistic, etc. The main indicator of these changes has been the mass media—television, radio, cinema, and others. In a globalizing society, two main directions are observed: inclination toward the Western lifestyle and assimilation with the American cultural model. Cosmopolitanism can be noted as a middle path alongside these two positions (Vishnevskaya, 2018: 42).

It is estimated that the number of languages currently used in the world is close to 6,000 (Tucker, 1999: 1). Nevertheless, a very small number of languages are used as means of interethnic communication. These languages include English, Arabic, Bengali, French, Hindi, Malay, Chinese, Portuguese, Spanish, Turkish, and Russian. In most cases, the second and even third languages learned by people later are one of the mentioned languages. As a result of the expansion of bilingualism and multilingualism, 25% of the nearly 200 countries in the world currently officially accept at least two languages as their state languages. For this reason, the prominent linguist E.Y. Litvinenko considered the language choice issue one of the main problems of the globalization process (Yur'evna, 2017: 159).

The language choice issue greatly harms bilingualism and its development. The problem is more common in former colonial territories. When colonies gained independence and established their states, they faced serious language issues. This problem involved the widespread use of the languages of the metropolises alongside local languages in those states. From a linguistic point of view, granting status to both languages and their parallel development and use was positive, forming bilingualism in those states. However, giving choice to only one language led to the gradual disuse of the second language in the country's territory (Dash, 2022).

The language policy of any state has depended to one degree or another on the language relations system. In this respect, bilingualism, which is a component of the language system and the main driving force of the globalization process, has been a feature belonging to all periods of humanity. Especially in Eastern states, a sufficient number of bilingualism cases are found in the most ancient periods. Nevertheless, as a socio-historical phenomenon, bilingualism began to attract attention only from the Renaissance period. At that time, prominent intellectuals learned other languages and laid the foundation of new national literary languages, for example, French, Italian, Spanish, and other Romance languages formed on the basis of Latin (Adawiyah & Gumartifa, 2022). At the same time, some languages began to emerge and develop to serve certain purposes. Arabic for the Islamic religion and Latin as the language of science in European countries can be cited as examples.

From the Renaissance period onward, languages emerged for establishing communication between different nations. Such languages include Persian and Arabic in the Near and Middle East, Latin and later French in Europe, Chinese in East and Southeast Asian countries, and Azerbaijani in the 19th-century Caucasus and Near East (Ahmadova, 2025).

In the period when class society existed, bilingualism constituted the main essence of that society. In most cases, either the upper, elite strata of society or holders of certain professions were bilingual. This was considered an indicator of their superiority. For example, until the October Revolution, the vast majority of the elite and intellectual strata of Russian society knew French along with Russian. All doctors knew Latin along with their native languages. In general, a large part of those engaged in politics, science, religion, and diplomacy had either bilingualism or multilingualism.

However, not only individuals but also entire peoples can be bilingual. The level and degree of manifestation of bilingualism in this case has depended on the level of political, economic, social, and cultural development of that people, the socio-economic and political-cultural structure of society—in short, on the characteristics of the people's development in a specific historical period.

Bilingualism is encountered more widely in multiethnic states. For example, the vast majority of peoples living in the former USSR countries know Russian along with their own languages, and Russian plays the role of a second native language for them.

Small ethnic communities and small peoples, in addition to their native languages and Russian, accept the language of the people constituting the majority of the country they live in as their native language. For example, small ethnic groups living in Azerbaijan – Talis, Kurds, Tats, Budukh, Udi, Gryz, Khinalug, Sakur, Lezgis, Avars, Laks, and others, use their native languages within their families in everyday life, and Azerbaijani or Russian in public life and education.

Other examples include Abkhaz, Adjarians, Batsbi, Ossetians in Georgia, Livonians in Estonia, Ishkashimi and Yazgulami in Tajikistan, Uyghurs in Kazakhstan, and Yugurs and Dungsans in Kyrgyzstan. Each of these small ethnic groups uses the Georgian, Estonian, Tajik, Kazakh, and Kyrgyz languages respectively as a second native language, and Russian as an interethnic means (Allahverdiyeva & Yunusova, 2021: 111).

In the modern period, with the acceleration of globalization, bilingualism is encountered more widely. For example, the majority of the population living in most of Central and South America, as well as in European states such as Switzerland and Belgium, is bilingual. In the USA, one in every ten English-speaking citizens considers French, Spanish, German, Russian, Ukrainian, Chinese, or any other language as their second native language. As noted, the absolute majority of the population of the republics in the former Soviet space were bilingual, and now they are multilingual in the conditions of the wide spread of English.

The acceleration of globalization gives rise to many opposite processes, including individualization, specialization, regionalization, decentralization, and others. These processes also had some linguistic conditions. Thus, in the period of globalization, the native language resists this process and does not want to be destroyed. As a result, the people “struggle” to protect their customs and traditions, national mentality, and existence.

In this respect, in the period of modern market economy, the ability of various states to withstand competition has been of vital importance. In this regard, the famous Russian psychologist A.I. Yuryev said: “The competitiveness of the state can only be ensured with the help of human resources” (İsmayılova, 2018: 30). According to A.I. Yuryev, this process has depended more on the state’s material wealth. However, for increasing the state’s competitiveness, the role of human resources has been more important and significant than raw materials, technology, and other resources. For this reason, A.I. Yuryev considered that all material wealth remains “dead” until used by competitive human beings. Based on this, the scholar believed that the main task of the state is to create competitive human capital. In this context, the state’s language and language teaching policy has played a special role.

Interlingual relations and Bilingualism

Bilingualism is the result of the process of mutual influence of two or more languages. However, in practice, cases of two languages being mastered at the same level are encountered very rarely. As a rule, for a bilingual person, one of the languages is closer. It is this first-degree, closer, language that is called the native language in linguistics. In this sense, none of the languages a person knows can replace their native language or stand at the same level with it.

For this reason, in the context of the wide development of political, economic, and cultural relations, studying and researching the problem of bilingualism in modern society has become one of the main issues of linguistics. Bilingualism is the main form and indicator of the existence, progress, and functioning of language. As a problem, the phenomenon of bilingualism is not new for linguistic science. From the period when early civilizations emerged, various tribes, clans, peoples, and nations have constantly maintained relations with each other and influenced one another. Regardless of whether this influence was conscious or unconscious, various tribes and clans have split and united, large powerful ethnic communities have subjugated weak ethnic formations, and economic relations have emerged between neighboring and even distant peoples.

As a result of the mentioned processes, natural language relations also form between the peoples maintaining these relations. Thus, linguistic processes such as merging, crossing, mutual influence, and borrowing words from one another occur between their languages. In turn, these processes lead not only to individuals but also to entire ethnic communities becoming bilingual. For this reason, although bilingualism is considered an individual-mental phenomenon according to its external form and speech ability, when approached broadly, it has a deep social and ideological character according to its essence.

Bilingualism can develop to various degrees. The highest degree of bilingualism within society occurs when an individual belonging to that society uses the language they learned later as a native language in their speech rather than their native language. For example, according to the 1971 population census conducted in the USSR, 13 million people of non-Russian nationality, and according to the 1979 census, 16.3 million people of non-Russian nationality considered Russian as their native language (Allahverdiyeva & Yunusova, 2021: 109).

Two main types of bilingualism can be distinguished: regional (or local) and national. Regional bilingualism manifests itself when two or more peoples settle in a certain territory within administrative-state or geographical principles, and each of them uses mainly their specific languages in daily speech, resulting in the existence of two or more languages. This type of bilingualism is encountered in the Russian Federation, USA, People’s Republic of China, Canada, India, Belgium, Indonesia, Switzerland, and many other multilingual states (Todorova, 2018).

In the national type of bilingualism, the geographical-territorial principle is not primary. This type of bilingualism is based on ethnic or national principles. In such bilingualism, the parallel existence, functioning, and development of two or more different national languages occur in one territory. In this respect, the vast majority of peoples included in the former USSR were bilingual.

Regional and national bilingualism have had many different features. Thus, regional bilingualism is monolingual in principle, both for an individual person taken separately and for the people they belong to. In national bilingualism, the complete opposite is observed, every individual and the people they belong to are bilingual. In regional bilingualism, languages live in parallel and do not mix (cross). In national bilingualism, languages not only exist side by side but also mutually influence each other, share their usage spheres, and replace each other in the speech process and experience depending on speech events (Todorova, 2018). In addition, while in regional bilingualism the spread areas of languages existing in parallel within the general region are distinguished, such cases are not encountered in national bilingualism. In this type of bilingualism, the mutual influence of languages in the same way applies to every member of society.

In the border zones of the spread areas of languages living in parallel belonging to the regional type of bilingualism, elements of national bilingualism can sometimes emerge. This arises from the constant contact of peoples speaking different languages for the purpose of mutual communication. It should be noted that in remote groups of bilingual peoples belonging to the national bilingualism type, cases of loss of the native language and complete transition to the second language are also encountered. This phenomenon is more often observed among peoples living in the former USSR territories. For example, southern and western Mansi completely switched to Russian, southwestern Nenets fully to Komi, and northeastern and northwestern Evenks completely to Yakut-Sakha (Allahverdiyeva & Yunusova, 2021: 108-109).

In the regional type of bilingualism, within a monolingual people that has become mass, not only individuals but also large groups can master two or more languages. This situation is more widespread not only in zones but also among various social groups of society, primarily intellectuals, industrial and transport workers, including mechanizers. In national bilingualism, on the contrary, cases are encountered where a people that is bilingual en masse has individuals and even large groups that are monolingual. This situation manifests itself more not only in the depth and remoteness of the language's spread areas but also among various social and age-gender groups, especially among elderly women.

Despite its relevance, regional bilingualism is encountered very rarely in linguistic literature; in many cases, this type of bilingualism remains generally unstudied.

Bilingualism and its research in the teaching process

The use of several languages during the teaching and learning process has been related to various factors. These factors include the linguistic diversity of the country or region, specific social and religious aspects, as well as national affiliation. The primary goal of the teaching process has been to impart to students the language that serves as the general communication means in the country and region and to develop high speaking and understanding skills in that language. The secondary issue of the teaching process has been teaching students the language that plays the role of an international communication means.

As a result of this, the teaching process is conducted in two or more languages. For example, in schools in Eritrea, Tigrinya, Arabic, and English are taught in parallel. Since Tigrinya is the most spoken language in the country, Arabic plays a regional communication role, and English is an international means of speech, they are taught together in Eritrean schools. As a result, students can read and speak in all three languages in daily life. Or in Papua New Guinea, there are close to 870 local languages, as a result of which the majority of the country's 3 million population uses different languages each time depending on their location and situation. In parallel with these languages, English is also taught in schools (Tucker, 1999: 1-2).

In short, the reasons for using several languages in the teaching process can be different in every state, even in every region. For example, in the mentioned Eritrea, the reason for this was the linguistic features of the region where the country is located. In contrast, in Papua New Guinea, the ethnic diversity of the country and each ethnic minority having its own specific language led to the use of various languages in the teaching process.

The use of bilingualism and a large number of languages in the teaching process is a complex and mixed issue, while at the same time playing a significant role in terms of understanding the essence of processes occurring in the context of globalization and directing these processes.

Currently, the formation of bilingualism in the teaching process has been more related to the teaching of English in states where English is not spoken. In this respect, international test systems related to determining the level of English speaking, IELTS, TOEFL, TOEIC, SAT, and others, play a special role in the formation of bilingualism among students in the teaching process (Humphreys, 2023: 17).

As a result of research conducted by the World Bank on the use of first and second languages in teaching, countries have been divided into three different categories according to bilingual population indicators: (1) those with no or very few people using the wider communication language as a native language, for example, Haiti, Nigeria, and the Philippines; (2) those with a relatively large number of people using the wider communication language as a native language, for example, Guatemala; (3) those with a large number of people using the wider communication language as a native language, for example, Canada, the USA, and New Zealand.

As a result of this research conducted by the World Bank, the following results were obtained:

➤ The success of the teaching process has depended on the level of the student's/pupil's cognitive and academic language knowledge. These language skills differ from the language they use at home and in daily life;

- A certain amount of time is needed for the development of cognitive and academic language. In most cases, this can take from 4 to 7 years;
- Individuals develop language and literary skills in it more easily in parallel with a language that is familiar and close to them;
- Individuals master cognitive skills and taught materials more easily when taught in a language that is familiar and close to them;
- After cognitive and academic language skills develop and the taught material is mastered, the transfer of knowledge from one language to another becomes possible;
- The main indicator of the development of cognitive and academic language skills in the second language is the level of development of those skills in the first (native) language;
- Pupils and students can learn the second language in various ways. This has depended on their cultural, intellectual, and cultural indicators (Tucker, 1999: 2).

Based on these results, the World Bank has prepared an effective teaching program for the successful use of two languages in the teaching process and has determined the main principles and tasks of teaching. These include increasing knowledge in the second language through the promotion of native language teaching, providing support by parents and families, creating a linguistic environment by the family, increasing teachers' knowledge and skills in the second language, and conducting trainings for this purpose, among others.

Linguistic environment in Azerbaijan

By linguistic situation or linguistic environment is meant the set of national (native) languages and foreign languages, the system of regional boundaries serving society, and the specificities and functionalizations of states. The linguistic environment is considered one of the main topics of sociolinguistics. In the modern period, there are two main approaches to the state of language in Azerbaijan:

- Cultural-linguistic;
- Sociolinguistic.

It should be noted that in the 20th century, the linguistic environment in Azerbaijan was determined by Azerbaijani and Russian languages. However, the languages of many ethnic groups also functioned in this environment and influenced the language situation. Currently, 26 ethnic groups speaking 26 languages live in Azerbaijan. To determine the role of these languages in the linguistic environment, F. Veysalli in his research work "The Language Situation in Modern Azerbaijan" shows the map of languages used by the population of Azerbaijan. Thus, 98.6% of the population speaks Azerbaijani, 7.6% Russian, 7.6% English, and ethnic minorities speak their respective languages at about 1-2%.

Bilingualism in the context of Russian and English in Azerbaijan

As one of the historically colonial states, bilingualism is observed in Azerbaijan. Throughout history, Azerbaijan has been occupied by Arabs, Persians, Russians, and other peoples, and these peoples' language systems have influenced and mixed with the Azerbaijani language. Especially the 70-year Soviet occupation period created a number of sociolinguistic problems in Azerbaijan. Thus, in 1939, the Azerbaijani language switched to the Cyrillic script. As a result, the Azerbaijani language was subjected to the strong influence of Russian.

In the Soviet period, the Azerbaijani language was also subjected to attacks at the religious level. The Soviet ideology promoting atheism tried to destroy the religious beliefs of Azerbaijanis, erase their customs and traditions from memory, and make them forget national terms, words, expressions, and other speech means that had been reflected in the Azerbaijani language for centuries (Velieva, 2020: 45-46).

As a result of this policy, in the Soviet period, persons of Azerbaijani origin who spoke Russian first mastered Russian and also adopted Russian culture, customs, and traditions. In most cases, such people later considered themselves "Russian." Based on this, it can be claimed that bilingualism based on Russian in Azerbaijan was artificial bilingualism (or compulsory). Because in many cases, people mastered Russian not voluntarily, but in an artificially created linguistic environment through the efforts of the Soviet leadership. Considering that Soviet rule lasted nearly 70 years in Azerbaijan, we see that the problem has taken deep roots in the country's society.

However, the collapse of the USSR and Azerbaijan's restoration of independence showed that the Azerbaijani language, despite the efforts of the occupiers, has passed all tests and preserved its linguistic features. Nevertheless, during the years of Soviet rule, Azerbaijan's linguistic environment was significantly affected. This was related both to the popularization of Russian among Azerbaijanis and to the preservation of their languages by ethnic minorities living in Azerbaijan's territory.

According to the constitution adopted in 1995, the state language of Azerbaijan is Azerbaijani (Abdullaev, 2023: 138). Although no legal status is given to other languages in the constitution, it would not be correct to conclude from this that there is no multilingual or bilingual society in Azerbaijan. Currently, many languages are used at the local-regional level in Azerbaijan. This is first related to the ethnic composition of the republic's population.

Azerbaijan is a multiethnic state. According to the 1999 census, among ethnic minorities, Lezgins constituted 2.2% of the total population, Russians 1.8%, Armenians 1.5%, Talyshs 1.0%, Avars 0.6%, Tats 0.13%, Georgians 0.2%, Kurds 0.2%, Jews 0.1%, and other peoples 0.12% (Karimova, 2017: 121). Each of these ethnic minorities spoke languages belonging to the North

Caucasian, Indo-European, Afro-Asiatic, or Kartvelian language groups. Among these languages, Russian has had greater importance according to its coverage and number of users. Although it has no de jure status, Russian has great influence in Azerbaijan. This is demonstrated by the fact that Azerbaijanis use Russian both in daily life and in the teaching process.

Russian has been the main language affecting the linguistic environment in Azerbaijan. As a result of the Soviet government's "Russification" policy, many Russian-language schools were opened and Russian sections were created in Azerbaijan. Despite the restoration of independence, Russian-language schools and sections still remain in Azerbaijan, and Russian continues to influence the country's linguistic environment.

The expansion of bilingualism among Azerbaijan's population has also been related to the Russian language. A significant part of the population can speak, write, and read in Russian along with Azerbaijani. State Statistics Committee (SSC) statistical indicators provide information about the increase in the bilingual population in Azerbaijan in recent decades. According to SSC data, 108,240 pupils studied in Russian-language schools in 2000-2001, 108,737 pupils in 2005-2006, and 108,257 pupils in 2006-2007 (Karimova, 2017: 121).

In recent years, attention to English has been increasing in Azerbaijan in parallel with Russian (Rzayeva et al., 2020: 86). In this field, the state's language strategy should be especially noted. The State Examination Center (SEC), which regulates the admission system in Azerbaijan, uses English, Russian, French, and other languages as foreign languages in test exams organized for bachelor's, master's, doctoral studies, as well as admission to state jobs. In these tests, the knowledge levels of applicants, students, and master's students in these languages are evaluated based on reading, writing, listening, and speaking indicators.

In this respect, currently in Azerbaijan, English has begun to be used more widely compared to Russian. The reasons for this can be cited as English becoming a global language and being the official language of the Internet. Thus, one of the main reasons for the spread of English in Azerbaijan has been social media tools such as Instagram, TikTok, X, Facebook, YouTube, and others, whose number of users has increased significantly in recent years and continues to increase.

It is true that according to its number of users, English in Azerbaijan still lags somewhat behind Russian. Nevertheless, the spread of English in Azerbaijan has been a greater phenomenon compared to Russian. Because while Russian was imposed on people compulsorily and artificially by the state, English, on the contrary, is learned naturally, based on people's personal interests, desires, and will. For this reason, the social base of English has been wider and deeper. Provided that this trend continues in the future, in the very near future, English-Azerbaijani bilingualism will surpass Russian-Azerbaijani bilingualism in Azerbaijan.

It should be noted that the parental factor also plays a special role in the development of bilingualism in Azerbaijan. Thus, despite English and Russian being taught in all schools, most parents also enroll their children in additional language courses. As a result, a development trend from bilingualism to multilingualism is observed in Azerbaijani society. For this very reason, determining the formation of bilingualism and multilingualism in Azerbaijani society and its causes has great importance. Bringing clarity to this issue can create an opportunity for solutions to many social and sociolinguistic issues in Azerbaijan in recent times that have not yet been resolved.

Conclusion

As we have seen, the role of bilingualism in society continues to increase in the era of globalization. Bilingualism, which creates opportunities for crossing borders as a means of communication, trade, and cultural exchange, helps individuals easily adapt to various cultural environments, understand others, be tolerant and enduring toward them, and as a result, contributes to the creation of a cooperation-based environment. Based on this, the role of bilingualism in the globalization process can be reflected in the following factors:

- Improvement of communication - as a result, intercultural relations are established and language barriers are eliminated;
- Cultural exchange - this forms feelings of respect and understanding toward each other's diversity among people. Social relations arising in such an environment are deeper and more sustainable;
- Economic opportunities - the career opportunities of bilingual people increase and expand. This gives them the opportunity to work in various cultural environments, countries, and with different people;
- Cognitive activity - bilingualism is closely related to many processes of the human brain and forms problem-solving, creativity, and cognitive diversity in individuals;
- Improvement of cognitive aging - bilingualism can temporarily stop or weaken cognitive aging in people;
- Diplomatic relations - bilingualism has also created conditions for the development of international relations. It eliminates language gaps between different peoples and thereby enables the development of international cooperation and integration.
- Promotion of peace and tolerance ideas - bilingualism teaches respect for people's differences and cultures, which constitute the main essence of globalization;
- Increasing the effectiveness of international organizations - bilingual employees and workers establish more successful relations and conduct negotiations;
- Adaptation to technological innovations - bilingualism allows people to master new technologies more easily and effectively access information on various platforms;

- Success of scientific research – scholars and researchers possessing several languages refer to a wider information base in their scientific works, analyze multilingual materials, involve different opinions and approaches in research, and achieve more successful results;
- Global communication – the increase in the number of bilingual people among people expands the social and professional network and helps create relations between subjects belonging to different languages.

Declarations

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate

This study is based on a qualitative and analytical review of previously published literature and does not involve human participants, human data, or animal subjects. Therefore, ethical approval and informed consent were not required in accordance with institutional and international research ethics guidelines.

Consent for Publication

Not applicable. This manuscript does not contain any identifiable personal data or information requiring consent for publication.

Availability of Data and Materials

All data supporting the findings of this study are derived from publicly available academic sources cited in the reference list. No primary datasets were generated or analyzed during the current research.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares that there are no competing interests—financial, institutional, or personal—that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.

Funding

The author received no specific funding from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agencies for the conduct of this research and publication of this article.

Acknowledgements

The author expresses sincere appreciation to the academic community and scholars whose contributions in the fields of Sociolinguistics and bilingualism studies have informed and supported the development of this research.

Ethical Considerations

This study adheres to internationally recognized principles of research integrity and publication ethics. The research design and analysis are grounded in established ethical frameworks, including the principles articulated by Tom L. Beauchamp and James F. Childress—namely autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice—adapted to the context of linguistic and social research. Particular attention has been given to issues of linguistic representation, cultural sensitivity, and the responsible interpretation of sociolinguistic data.

Declaration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) use

The author acknowledges the use of artificial intelligence (Grok) in the preparation of this article. Specifically, AI was used for the following purposes only:

- Translation of the original Azerbaijani text into English;
- Editing and improving the linguistic clarity, academic style, and coherence of the English version.

The content, ideas, arguments, citations, and scientific analysis presented in this article are entirely the author's own. The author takes full responsibility for the final content of the manuscript.

Data Privacy Statement

This study does not involve the collection, processing, or storage of personal or sensitive data. All referenced materials are publicly available and used in accordance with academic and ethical standards.

Open Access Statement

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction, and adaptation in any medium, provided that appropriate credit is given to the original author and source, a link to the license is provided, and any changes made are indicated. The author retains copyright of the work while granting the publisher the right to publish and disseminate it as part of the journal.

References:

1. Abdullaev, R. S. (2023). Natural bilingualism among Russian-speaking populations in Azerbaijan (based on Russian and Azerbaijani languages). *Political Linguistics*, 3(99), 136-144.
2. Adawiyah, D., & Gumartifa, A. (2022). English language teaching and globalization: Supporting economic growth. *Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 228-242.
3. Ahmadova, S. (2025). On the formation of loanwords in the English language. *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems*, 8(8), 531-534. <https://doi.org/10.56334/sci/8.8.49>
4. Allahverdiyeva, M. A., & Yunusova, E. F. (2021). Bilingualism in language contacts. *Language and Literature: International Scientific-Theoretical Journal*, 2(116), 109-111.
5. Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2021). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (7th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
6. Bayramova, P. (2024). Bilingualism and interference in linguistics. *International Journal of Turkish Dialect Studies (TÜRKLAD)*, 1(8), 109-117.
7. Blommaert, J., & Spotti, M. (2017). Bilingualism, multilingualism, globalization and superdiversity. In *The Oxford handbook of language and society* (pp. 1-23). Oxford University Press.
8. Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.
9. Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
10. Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Multilingual Matters.
11. Dash, B. B. (2022). The significance of globalization and the English language. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 10(5), 10-16.
12. De Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A dynamic systems theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 10(1), 7-21.
13. Edwards, J. (2004). *Foundations of bilingualism*. Routledge.
14. Extra, G., & Yagmur, K. (2012). *Language rich Europe*. Cambridge University Press.
15. Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The sociology of language*. Newbury House.
16. Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
17. Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Harvard University Press.
18. Heller, M. (2007). *Bilingualism: A social approach*. Palgrave Macmillan.
19. Heydarov, R. (2013). *The role of language contacts in language development*. Elm ve Tehsil.
20. Humphreys, G. (2023). Globalization of English language and culture: Rethinking language instruction. *International Higher Education*, 115, 16-18.
21. Ibadova, T. S. (2019). Bilingualism and multilingualism: Similarities and differences. *Elmi İş (Humanities Journal)*, 10(49), 20-22.
22. Ismayilova, Z. (2018). Interlingual relations and bilingualism in the era of globalization. *Scientific News of Azerbaijan University of Languages*, 3-4, 28-33.
23. Karimova, V. (2017). Multilingualism in Azerbaijan: Foreign language preferences and socioeconomic aspects. *International Journal of Education, Culture and Society*, 2(4), 120-125.
24. Kosharnaya, S. A., & Karimullah, R. (2023). Features of bilingualism in the era of globalization: Theoretical perspectives. *Issues in Journalism, Education, Linguistics*, 42(3), 523-530.
25. Landsberry, L. (2019). Defining bilingualism. *Nagoya Junior College Research Bulletin*, 57, 145-154.
26. May, S. (2012). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. Routledge.
27. Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. Routledge.
28. Rzayeva, N., Tagiyev, I., & Mammadov, A. (2020). Language choice in Azerbaijan: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 23(4), 76-89.
29. Todorova, N. (2018). Globalization and the role of the English language. *International Relations of Ukraine: Scientific Research and Findings*, 331-348.
30. Tucker, G. R. (1999). *A global perspective on bilingualism and bilingual education*. Center for Applied Linguistics.
31. Veliyeva, M. (2020). Religious aspects of bilingualism in Azerbaijan. *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe*, 40(6), Article 5, 42-49.
32. Vishnevskaya, G. M. (2018). Language globalization and bilingualism: Status quo. In *Language in the global context* (pp. 41-60).
33. Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. Linguistic Circle of New York.
34. Yuryevna, F. L. (2017). Bilingualism in the context of globalization: Sociolinguistic aspects. *Philological Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12(78), 159-163.