Research Article

Translanguaging in the Family Context: Evidence from Cyprus, Sweden and Estonia

Sviatlana Karpava[1], Natalia Ringblom[2] and Anastassia Zabrodskaja[3]

[1]University of Cyprus
75 Kallipoleos, P.O. Box 20537, Nicosia, 1678, Cyprus

[2]Stockholm University
Dalarna University
Universitetsvägen 10 E, Stockholm, 10691, Sweden
Dalarna University, Falun, 79188, Sweden

[3]Tallinn University
University of Tartu
Narva mnt 25, Tallinn, 10120, Estonia
Jakobi 2-412, Tartu, 51005, Estonia

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to highlight translanguaging practices in the home among bilingual/multilingual Russian-speaking children and their parents in Cyprus, Sweden and Estonia. Multilingual families are the focus of our research: 50 in Cyprus, 20 in Estonia and 50 in Sweden. Using parental written questionnaires with the focus on general background, socio-economic status and language proficiency, as well as oral semi-structured interviews and ethnographic participant observation, our study attempts to describe how family language policy is managed through translanguaging and literacy activities in multilingual Russian-speaking families in three different cultural and linguistic environments. Our results show both differences and similarities among Russian-speakers in the three countries, not only in their family language practices, but also in their attitudes towards the fluidity of language, language repertoires, translanguaging and Russian-language literacy. Russian-speakers incorporate a wide range of language repertoires in their everyday lives. Sometimes, such language contacts generate power struggles and the language ideological dimension becomes a key terrain to explore how speakers feel about the need to effectively attain a degree of multilingualism. Multilingualism and the maintenance of the Russian language and culture are usually encouraged, and parents often choose the one-parent-one-language approach at home. However, not all families make conscious choices regarding specific language management and may have "laissez-faire" attitudes to the use of languages in the family. We show how family language use and child-directed translanguaging can support, expand and enhance dynamic bilingualism/multilingualism, and reinforce and integrate minority language in a wider context: societal and educational.

Keywords: *code-switching, bilingualism, multilingualism, minority language, Russian*

Научная статья

Смешение языков в семейном общении (на примере Кипра, Швеции и Эстонии)

Светлана Карпова[1], Наталья Рингблом[2], Анастасия Забродская[3]

[1]Кипрский Университет
75 Kallipoleos, P.O. Box 20537, Никосия, 1678, Кипр

[2]Стокгольмский университет
Университет Даларна
Universitetsvägen 10 E, Стокгольм, 10691, Швеция
Dalarna University, Falun, 79188, Sweden

[3]Таллиннский университет
Тартуский университет
Narva mnt 25, Таллинн, 10120, Эстония
Jakobi 2-412, Тарту, 51005, Эстония

Аннотация

Целью данной статьи является рассмотрение практики общения между родителями и детьми в двуязычных и многоязычных семьях, где одним из языков является русский. В центре нашего исследования — многоязычные семьи на Кипре (50), в Эстонии (20) и Швеции (50). Используя письменные анкеты для родителей с целью получить информацию об их социально-экономическом статусе и владении языком, а также устные полуструктурированные интервью и этнографические наблюдения, авторы описывают языковую политику, которая осуществляется посредством развития межъязыкового общения и грамотности в многоязычных семьях в трёх разных культурно-языковых средах, показывают различия и сходства среди русскоязычных коммуникантов из этих трёх стран не только в их семейных языковых практиках, но и в их отношении к изменению языка, языкового репертуара, транслингвизму и русскоязычной грамотности. Русскоязычное население включает широкий спектр языковых средств в свою повседневную жизнь. Иногда языковые контакты порождают борьбу за власть, и идеологическое измерение языка становится ключевой областью для изучения того, каким образом достигается необходимая степень многоязычия. Многоязычие и поддержание русского языка и культуры обычно поощряются, и родители часто выбирают дома подход «один родитель — один язык». Однако не все семьи делают осознанный выбор в отношении использования конкретного языка и могут проводить политику «невмешательства» по отношению к языкам в семье. Мы показываем, как использование семейного языка и ориентированного на ребёнка транслингвизма может поддерживать, расширять и усиливать динамический билингвизм/многоязычие, а также укреплять и интегрировать язык меньшинств в более широком контексте — социальном и образовательном.

Ключевые слова: *переключение кодов, билингвизм, мультилингвизм, миноритарный язык, русский язык*

1. Introduction

Since the 2000s the Russian language has been emerging as a new lingua franca and "a commodity" in the former USSR republics and abroad (Muth, 2017; Pavlenko 2017; Suryanarayan 2017; Viimaranta et al. 2017; Yelenevskaya and Fialkova 2017) due to tourism, immigration, international marriages and in some cases — especially

in Cyprus — even cultural and religious ties, military and political cooperation, investments and transnational corporations (Filippov 2010; Kuznetsov 2010). In most communities in and outside post-Soviet space where Russian-speakers live, there is an ongoing discussion of the role played by the Russian language in children's education and linguistic backgrounds (Pavlenko, 2008; Ryazanova-Clarke, 2014).

Baker (2011: 289) considers translanguaging (hereafter TL) to be a great advantage in bilingual education for "deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter development of the weaker language, home-school links and cooperation, and integration of fluent speakers with early learners." According to Lewis et al. (2012), TL is the use of one language in order to reinforce another and to facilitate the learning of both languages by a bilingual. This paper will apply a broader view of TL since we see clear similarities in the language practices at school and at home.

Earlier we studied the self-reported assessment of the process of Russian and majority language choice at and outside the home (Karpava, Ringblom and Zabrodskaja, 2018). Our main goal here is to document TL strategy in three different linguistic environments and present everyday communication practices in these different contexts: Cyprus, Sweden and Estonia. We understand the linguistic environment as a totality of communicative conditions surrounding an individual and his/her linguistic community. The languages used in private interpersonal communication and in education greatly affect the ability of bilingual individuals and their families to cope with the demands of everyday realities. We aim to identify clear similarities and differences in the three countries: not only in family language practices, but also in attitudes towards TL.

In our paper, we give a definition of family language policy and TL in Section 1. These two approaches set the dual framework for our study. Section 2 introduces the diverse methodological approaches to the collection of bilingual practices based on the example of individual speakers in family settings. Section 3 gives a picture of three sociolinguistic contexts in which the results will be analysed. Section 4 presents the qualitative part: the use of languages in informal family conversations. The paper also presents and analyses the use of TL to reach interactional goals.

2. Family language policy and TL:
the theoretical position in the current study

Research on family language policy (hereafter FLP) aims to determine why some children grow up to be bilingual while others are monolingual, and how this is related to the ways in which parents promote their children's use of a particular language (Curdt-Christiansen, 2013). Since access to the minority language is often limited to the family, family interactions are very important for language maintenance. Following King et al. (2008), we define FLP as an integrated approach to how languages are managed, learned and negotiated within individual families. We place family at the central position as a main prerequisite for language maintenance. Applying the theories of FLP, we explore divergent language choice within the family context in connection with available linguistic resources.

Such phrases as: "Life with Two Languages" (Grosjean, 1982), "One Speaker, Two Languages" (Milroy and Muysken, 1995) and "One Mind, Two Languages" (Nicol, 2001) explain traditional practices of bilinguals. The two languages are always used

in different domains, on different occasions and/or with different people. The first language might be labelled as a heritage language (hereafter HL), by which we mean the language that is primarily spoken at home, the minority language that is acquired on the basis of interaction with naturalistic input. There might be quantitative and qualitative differences in HL input, as well as the influence of the societal majority language and differences in education (Rothman, 2009: 156). The other language is the majority language, e.g. the language of the environment, the official language of the country.

It is natural that during interactions languages become mixed. These combinations of two (or more) languages and / or varieties in the same conversation or sentence by bilinguals are called "code-switching" (see Gardner-Chloros, 2009: 4—5, who metaphorically compare it to "a window on speech and language" because it provides insight into what is communicated "beyond the superficial meaning" of a speech act).

But languages are not homogeneous, and a linguistic item cannot always be assigned to a particular language or dialect. Following García (2009: 45), we call "multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds" TL. By TL we mean the "flexibility of bilingual learners to take control of their own learning, to self-regulate when and how to use a language, depending on the context in which they are being asked to perform" (García and Li Wei, 2014: 80).

TL theory relying on a conceptualisation of bilingualism as dynamic, argues that there are not two interdependent language systems that bilinguals shuttle between, but rather one semiotic system integrating various lexical, morphological and grammatical linguistic features, in addition to social practices and features individuals "embody (e.g. their gestures and their posture), as well as those outside of themselves which through use become part of their bodily memory (e.g. computer technology)" (García, 2016; referred via Vogel and García 2017: 1). We support TL as a flexible approach to multilingual data analysis because it does not require sociolinguists to determine the grammar of code-switching or to look for possible constraints and their violation.

TL goes beyond code-switching and translation: it is focused on flexible bilingualism and multiple discursive practices (García, 2009; Blackledge and Creese, 2010). TL takes a heteroglossic and dynamic perspective on bilingualism and suggests that a bilingual person has one integrated linguistic system (Bailey, 2007; García, 2009; García and Li Wei, 2014; Otheguy et al., 2015; García and Lin, 2016). The two terms (code-switching and TL) are often used interchangeably by researchers and there is no consensus so far where to draw the line between the two. However, TL has mostly been discussed in the school domain. This paper aims to focus on a more general context.

With the definitions and theoretical discussions presented above in mind, let us now turn to the methodological discussions and data collection procedures.

3. Methodology and data collection procedures

In the systematic treatment of research methods in sociolinguistics, the main distinction is between quantitative (nomothetic) and qualitative (hermeneutic) research as distinct approaches. These approaches are not incompatible: mixed research is linked to the nature of a research question and the interests of a particular researcher (see

Dörnyei, 2011). The aim of our study is to investigate TL practices of bilingual (or multilingual) Russian-speaking children and their parents in Cyprus, Sweden and Estonia, at home, at school and in the community. We believe that our case study of language data requires not only qualitative and quantitative data but also ethnographic data, since that provides insights and details that would not be available otherwise. In research terms, such an approach is called triangulation or analysis of multiple sources of data because "researchers should not rely on any single source of data, interview, observation, or instrument" (Mills, 2003: 52). Dörnyei (2011) goes further and subdivides all data into three categories: quantitative, qualitative and language data. The latter is often subsumed under qualitative but not all qualitative data are language data. Differences appear not only in processing data but in how data are obtained and categorised.

We see our three case studies as tools for getting a "thick description". In addition, it is useful to compare these case studies in research on the attested TL phenomenon. In our research, there were 120 multilingual families: 50 in Cyprus, 50 in Sweden, and 20 in Estonia.

In Cyprus, 50 Russian-Cypriot Greek (mixed-marriage, middle socio-economic class) families (with Greek Cypriot husbands, Russian wives and Russian-Cypriot Greek bilingual children) were studied in terms of their FLP, identity, heritage language use, maintenance and transmission, as well as TL practices. The age of the parents was from 31 to 45 years old. The Russian-speaking adult females, the mothers of bilingual children, were from Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, Latvia and Moldova. Their children aged from 6 to 13 years old attended Greek-speaking schools. They had only 1.5 hours of Russian classes per week (Saturday schools).

Regarding family context, the recordings were done while children were in the kitchen or dining room with their parents during mealtime, when they were doing various activities together, playing, doing homework or communicating on various topics. This is an ongoing project. In this paper, we will present the case of one family with two siblings, Russian-Cypriot Greek bilinguals, whose mother is Russian-speaking and father is Cypriot Greek.

Observations of a TL situation are important because of the uniqueness and diversity of the contact situations under analysis. To reflect this diversity, the bilingual data we analysed came from three sources: questionnaires, interviews and participant observation of spontaneous everyday language practices. Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008: 34 and references therein) point out that "the most useful studies ... are often those that investigate patterns of language use across different types of data". During the fieldwork, we followed ethical procedures. The micro-ethnographers Varenne and McDermott (1998: 177) contend "it is not easy to capture people in the real time of their practice". This is why we first used parental written questionnaires with the focus on general background, socioeconomic status and language proficiency. Then we conducted oral semi-structured interviews with the Russian-speaking mothers, keeping in mind our attempt to describe how FLP is managed through TL and bilingual activities in the Russian-speaking families in three different cultural and linguistic environments. Besides, we had enriched our data with recordings of spontaneous speech in a family situation in the Swedish, Cypriot and Estonian contexts.

The Swedish material, in addition to 50 questionnaires and 18 interviews, included recordings of three bilingual siblings born and raised in Sweden to a Russian-speaking mother and a Swedish father. We tried to limit the scope of the recordings to the home-work situation where the elder sisters explained maths, Swedish and social science to their younger sister J. These siblings were particularly captivating since two of them received their education in English and we were also interested in how much English was used in their communication with each other and with their other sister who knew English but did not receive any education in it. In total, there were 11 hours of recorded speech.

In Estonia, a number of interesting bilingual phenomena were observed during the collection of informal conversational data from family settings. Not all 20 families who participated in the quantitative study agreed that recordings could take place in their homes during evening meals, preparation of school assignments or on any other occasion when the family members usually came together. Semi-structured interviews were carried out with 20 Russian-speaking mothers in their thirties — forties, with Estonian higher education. The families were selected through the network of the Estonian researcher. At the end of the interviews informants were asked for a permission to make recordings in their homes. Two mothers were enthusiastic that their families' language behaviour could become a resource for the examination of code-switching and TL (the informants, as laypeople, both referred to TL as multilingualism, the use of different languages). The mothers were given detailed information about the project "Sustainability of Estonian in the Era of Globalisation" and the future aim of sharing the data and its analysis in oral and written forms (in presentations and articles) with the researchers was explained. It was also agreed that in transcripts, any identifying information would be removed and the recordings would not be played publicly.

In total, we recorded 10 hours of conversations. After having transcribed the interactions, we decided to focus only on instances involving diverse language choices and switches between Russian and Estonian (as well as sometimes English).

From this introduction to the methodological part of our study, we now turn to the sociolinguistic context and the overall language situations in Cyprus, Sweden and Estonia.

4. Three settings — three different linguistic environments

Various languages are spoken in Cyprus, Sweden and Estonia but this study focuses on the language contact situation on a micro level involving the majority language of the country and Russian. The aim of the next three sections is to present the socio-linguistic contexts and factors that contributed to the development of present-day bilingualism among Russian-speaking communities settled in the countries.

4.1. Cyprus

The linguistic situation in Cyprus can be characterised as diglossic (Ferguson, 1959), bi-dialectal (Grohmann and Leivada, 2011) or bilectal (Rowe and Grohmann, 2013). The Greek Cypriot population uses two language varieties: Standard Modern Greek and Cypriot Greek. The island can also be considered multilingual as there are various immigrant and minority communities residing there. The Russian community is one of the largest immigrant groups in the Republic of Cyprus.

According to the Cypriot government census of 2011, there are approximately 11,000 people of Russian origin residing in Cyprus. Most of them arrived in Cyprus in the 1990s due to Soviet and post-Soviet immigration. The emerging role of Russian in Cyprus as one of the dominant and preferred foreign languages has led to some changes in the educational process and policy, as more and more Cypriots start learning Russian. Russian is even functioning as a lingua franca in Cyprus and it is perceived as a commodity (Eracleous, 2015).

In Cyprus, there are several private Russian-speaking schools. Russian is a foreign language in all public schools and tutor centres. This island is a highly touristic destination, and even the Cypriots are eager to learn Russian as it is an essential tool for finding a good job in international companies. The role of English in Cyprus should not be ignored as it is widespread in the former British colony. There is a debate about the status of English in Cyprus (Schneider 2003, 2007, and Buschfeld, 2013): whether it is a second language (Görlach, 1990, 1995; Graddol 1997) or a foreign language (Quirk et al., 1985; Schneider, 2007; Strevens, 1992). It is obvious that the linguistic situation in Cyprus is complex and unique and it affects the language choices and dominant language constellation of the Russian immigrant population.

Classroom observations showed that students in bilingual Russian-Cypriot Greek classes alternate languages. Russian-speaking teachers switch codes and use Greek, the dominant language, in order to make meaning comprehensible for Russian heritage students. The usage of Greek scaffolds the teaching of the Russian language in Russian heritage classes. This is in line with Lin and Martin's (2005) findings. Arthur and Martin (2006) call this practice the "pedagogic validity of code-switching". Teachers consider the TL pedagogical practice (Williams, 1994), or TL pedagogy (Blackledge and Creese, 2010) to be very effective in bilingual education. This makes it possible to create a TL space, and facilitates the interaction of bilingual/multilingual individuals and full use of the linguistic repertoire (García and Lin, 2016).

4.2. Sweden

In Sweden the official and dominant language of the country is Swedish. However, the country can boast a great linguistic diversity, with over 150 languages spoken there. Just as in Cyprus, many children grow up multilingual. However, Russians have never been a large immigrant group in this country, unlike Finns, Turks, Arabs, Syrians, Persians, Spaniards, Kurds or Somalis. Therefore, Russian is not a major immigrant language in Sweden. Today there are approximately 30,000 Russians living all over the country (Parkval, 2015: 276). Their number is increasing, but it is difficult to count the number of Russians since many residents are listed as coming from the former Soviet Union. The Russian-speaking immigrant community is very heterogeneous.

The children of Russian-speaking parents (just like the children of other linguistic minorities) are entitled to mother tongue instruction (MTI) for one hour per week. If Russian is actively used as a language of communication at home, the children receive a mark in MTI beginning with grade 6. MTI is supported by the Swedish government. Even though MTI is supported by the government and is a rather unique privilege given to bilingual children and their families in Sweden, not all of them take advantage of this opportunity. A lot seems to depend on the particular teacher and his/her ability to motivate students.

4.3. Estonia

In Estonia, the share of Russians is about 25%, while Russian-speakers make up 29.6%. Russian is spoken as the first language (or one of the first languages in the case of bilingual language acquisition) by not only ethnic Russians, but also by many Ukrainians, Byelorussians and members of other ethnicities who switched to Russian during the Soviet time. This group is heterogeneous, including diversity within the Russian-language community (the indigenous group vs. Soviet-era newcomers and their descendants), regional variation in language environments and inter-generational differences in language knowledge (see more in Ehala and Zabrodskaja, 2014; Zabrodskaja, 2015).

The position of the Russian-speakers in post-Soviet Estonia includes conflicting and contested narratives (see Zabrodskaja, 2015, p. 223 and references therein). According to the contemporary nationalising discourses, the first language is the main boundary feature between the titular group whose ethnic identity relies heavily on native fluency in Estonian, and the rest. Basic school education with Russian as a language of instruction is provided free of charge to all, but Russian-speaking parents often prefer language immersion or Estonian-medium schools because competence in Estonian has become heavily connected to access to higher education and professional career opportunities. In the Baltic countries, education is an important factor in the Russian language transition and shift (Zabrodskaja, 2015). When looking at TL practises, it is important to bear in mind that all Russian-speaking children have some knowledge of Estonian, even if they attend Russian-language primary or basic schools. They come into contact with Estonian every day while attending school. As the single official language, Estonian dominates as the only language of instruction on the secondary school level.

By shifting the focus to the findings of empirical studies on TL phenomena, we now turn to the results, which we present in extracts from data collected across the three countries. We will show how bilingual speakers use Russian and Greek/Swedish/Estonian to manage conversations. Our data combine languages and provide a holistic approach to TL practices.

5. TL practices of bilinguals from the perspectives of the users themselves

Linguistic identities of speakers are fluid, dynamic and flexible rather than rigid and clearly defined. Johnstone (2000) is one of those who point out that in sociolinguistics we often forget the importance of the individual speaker. To give a general picture of TL practices among Russian-speaking family members, it was important for us to get a picture of the different TL situations found among the Russian-speaking family members in Sweden, Cyprus and Estonia. Let us now turn to the examples where TL occurs without interrupting or disturbing discourse. While these examples may not be entirely typical for the whole Russian-speaking communities under study, they reveal some common features of the patterns of interaction between the children and the parents observed at home. It is possible, therefore, to examine TL by using a combined approach, where children and their parents are engaged in the Swedish, Cypriot and Estonian contexts.

5.1. The case of Sweden

In order to see how TL is used in everyday family communication, let us look at the following three dialogues, each indicating a very important aspect of TL practice. Our main interest here is the *communication process at home per se* when Russian heritage speakers discuss topics that are more cognitively loaded (for instance, when explaining homework and facts, and talking about the news). We want to understand what this can tell us about the people involved, the languages and the situations in which they are used.

In the extracts, the Russian part is in *italics*, and Swedish/Greek Cypriot/Estonian in bold. In the glosses and translations, Swedish/Greek Cypriot/Estonian items are in UPPER-CASE. English-language items are in bold and underlined. Phonologically and morphologically in-between items are underlined. COM% rows attempt to add to a more detailed analysis of the background of the interactions, which may help the reader to visualise the situation and its development turn-by-turn. In our extracts, we do not use conventions for the separation of language into sentences because we are studying code-switching and TL as units of analysis in spontaneous interaction.

Extract 1 highlights some of the main properties of TL where the individual languages (Russian and Swedish) are switched, code-switching is unconstrained and TL coincides with the interlocutors' contributions. It is clear that the overall decision to code-switch and to use TL is connected with the teenager's knowledge that her family members are speakers of both languages and active code-switchers themselves.

Extract 1:

Situation: teenager J is at home sitting on a sofa, talking to her boyfriend L. She is doing her homework: writing an essay about herself. Her mother and older sister S are in the kitchen.

J: **Vad ska jag skriva mer**? (Talking to L. over the telephone) "WHAT MORE SHALL I WRITE?"

M: *Что*???? "What?"

J. (to her boy friend): **Men! Jag kan visst engelska** "OF COURSE I CAN SPEAK ENGLISH" (L. on the phone has probably questioned this).

Vad sager du? (surprised) "WHAT ARE YOU SAYING!?"

J: Turning to her mother: *Можно*? "May I?"

M: *Можно* "yes, you may."

J: **Hallå**! **Ä**:… *Мама*! *Помоги мне*! *Ой*! **Oh nej**! *Мама*! (turning to her mum) "HELLO... mother! Help me! Oh! OH NO! Mother!".

M: *С чем тебе помочь*? "What shall I help you with?"

J: С *мой* **mellanår** "With my MIDDLE YEARS IN SCHOOL."

S: *С* **narcissismen** "with NARCISSISM" (COM% meaning that what she has just read is very narcissistic).

J: *Это мама написала половину*! "Mum has written half of it." (COM% talking only to S.)

(laughter).

J: **Mamma skrivit halva den där texten — det är därför det står så bra grejer om mig** (talking to her boy friend again) "MUM HAS WRITTEN HALF OF THIS TEXT — THAT'S WHY YOU CAN READ SUCH NICE THINGS ABOUT ME." (COM% J. is translating the utterance to L.).

Mom: *Котичек...* **skulle pappa skriva det**... (Darling... IF DAD HAD WRITTEN THIS ... COM% her mother is talking loudly in order to include even the boyfriend, who is on the phone) // "inclusion strategy".

J: **Skulle det inte finnas någonting** "THEN NOTHING AT ALL WOULD BE WRITTEN". (COM% J. laughs and says this to L. very loudly, looking both at her mother and her sister S. at the same time in order to include them as well. Here Swedish seems to be enough).

S: *Ладно, ничего* "It is okay." (pause) *Это* **tidningsartikel**, *а не ты* "it reads like a NEWSPAPER ARTICLE, not like you".

M: **Mmm...** *то есть я так пишу как* **tidningsartikel** "so I write like a NEWSPAPER ARTICLE?"

S: *Ты же пишешь свои статьи* "well, you are writing your articles, so...". COM% note that, in this sentence, the word "article" is in Russian.

This dialogue continues for 14 more minutes and after a while starts to include even more code-switching by J. Then all of a sudden J. says to L: "I am speaking like this so you can understand what it is about and I do not need to translate all the time." This function of TL — to include the speakers of both languages in the same conversation at the same time (when one of the speakers is over the phone and not physically present in the room) — has to the best of our knowledge not been noted in the literature earlier. However, we are aware of the fact that Grosjean (1982: 152), Baker (1995: 77), Appel and Muysken (1992: 118—120) and Auer (1995: 120) found that one of the pragmatic functions of code-switching is that different languages might be used for social purposes: to include or exclude interlocutors in a stretch of bilingual talk.

Let us take the next example of a conversation from the Swedish data. This dialogue highlights two important features of TL: comprehension and communication (see Toth and Paulsrud, 2017):

Extract 2

Situation: J. is doing her homework and her older sister S. is helping her.

S: **Åtta gånger tjogo sju** "TWENTY SEVEN MULTIPLIED BY EIGHT."

Сейчас делай тот же самый **uppgift**, *но вместо* **forti tre komma två** — **fjorton** "now you do the same TASK, but instead of FORTY THREE COMMA TWO it should be FOURTEEN."

J: *И что тут*? "and what is here?"

S: *Тот же самый* **uppgift** "the same TASK."

S: *Почему ты берёшь экс*? *Это не экс*! *Ты должна иметь* **samma** "why do you take X? It is not X! It should be the SAME."

S: *Ладно*, **fortsätt** "ok, CONTINUE."

S: **Fjorton**! "FOURTEEN." COM% angrily

J: *Почему* **Fjorton** "why FOURTEEN?" com% loud

S: **Fjorton** "FOURTEEN."

J: *Ну* **åtta**... "well, EIGHT."

S: **Ok ok fortsätt**! *Это просто глупый* **steg**, *но ладно* **fortsätt** "OK, OK, CONTINUE; it is a stupid STEP, but just CONTINUE." COM% S. is rather irritated at this moment.

S: *Нет*, **ett komma femtio sex** "no, ONE COMMA FIFTY SIX."

S: **Fortio fyra** "FORTY FOUR."

S: *Ты поняла сейчас математику*? "Did you understand your maths now?"

J: (Happily) *Да*! *Спасибо за помощь, С*! "Yes! Thank you for your help, S!"

This dialogue in Extract 2 focuses on language choice in doing homework in an environment where the participants have similar access to both languages. J's understanding would not benefit from a Russian-only or Swedish-only policy, and thus the girls challenge the myth of language separation and the necessity for it. While caretakers often insist on using one language at a time (see Ringblom, 2012), the girls used the language that is most accessible to them at the moment in order to meet their pragmatic needs. They transferred across the two languages to create meaning. As we see from this dialogue, the girls used Russian for common everyday vocabulary, but all mathematical terminology was in Swedish.

Language monitoring is also a common feature across educational contexts in Estonia and Cyprus where teachers (just like parents) encourage the students to keep their languages separate (cf. Ganuza and Hedman, 2017).

The languages might be chosen depending on the activity and interlocutor, as can be seen in the following bilingual example, which is a monologue that reveals a number of interesting features, for instance, the use of both English and Swedish languages, both English exclamations and content words (the child has received her education in English):

Extract 3

Situation: A child is describing a part of a film she has just watched to her mother:

Они... **tävlar om***... ну*! "They... COMPETE ON... well..."

Один берёт вот этот... ты знаешь такой инструмент ... там, где ставишь ноты? Вот эти черные? "One of them takes this... you know this kind of an instrument... The place where you put the notes... these black ones..."

И он хочет его **vika***,* и другой мальчик приходит и вот так «нет, ты не правильно»!

"And he wants to BEND it, and the other boy comes along and goes like this: 'no, not this way!'"

И потом они начинают драться и потом они падают... э на пол, и потом они э... **tillsamm**/// (togeth...) *ну они они... они целуются друг друга!* (SIC)

"And then they start to fight and then they fall... on the floor... And then they aaaa... TOGETH... ... well, they... they... THEY KISS OF EACH OTHER (COM% not they kiss each other).

И он же его ненавидел! "And that guy hated him you know!"

И это так chockande потому что он вообще не **verkade gay***, он такой мерзкий* **masculine** *такой ... ну, ты знаешь.*

'And this was so shocking since he did not SEEM gay (Eng) at all; he was disgustingly <u>masculine</u> (Eng) (COM% with English pronunciation)... well, you know what I mean."

И потом они **oh my God**/// *он так «Что?» и потом следующий день в школе он был вот так: тебе никому нельзя вот это говорить, вот это очень* **hemligt***, никому нельзя знать, что я* **gay** *ну как-то... но потом он пришёл в школу, и они сели ... ну он сел около б него, потому что это было единственное место и потом он вот так ногу вот так... к нему и потом руку вот так.*

"And then they oh my God (Eng)… he goes 'What?' and then next day at school he goes: 'don't tell anyone about this, it is a BIG SECRET/MYSTERY, no one should know I am gay'... kind of... And then he came to school and they sat down... well, he sat close to him since it was the only place and then he put his leg like this on him (COM% shows how) and then he put his hand like this" (COM% shows how).

M: *То есть второй тоже был гей, да*? "so the other guy was gay as well?"
J: *ДАААА*! "yeeeees!"
M: *А как фильм называется*? "and what was this film called?"
J: *Ну это **serie**, это не фильм*. "it is a SERIES, not a film."

The next dialogue illustrates the use of English between the two siblings. English is used just as naturally as Swedish since both girls received their education in English. Extract 4 discusses the short story competition at the International English School.

Extract 4

Situation: siblings are discussing a novel that the younger sister J has written about a murder, and her older sister tells her that the novels that win are usually about rather trivial things. Note the insertion of English even in the older sister's language (she has also received her education in English). The languages are mixed in a very uncomplicated manner; this way of communication seems to be rather natural and unmarked choice for the siblings:

J*: Она там стояла и он взял нож и **högg henne i magen** семь раз!* "She stood there and he took a knife and STABBED HER IN THE STOMACH seven times."

V: *Ты знаешь, все новеллы, которые выиграли, они были **mest banala** — про маму там, или про папу... Ну это жутко **mundane event** ...* "you know, all short stories that won were MOSTLY BANAL — about a mother or about a father. But this is a creepy mundane event."

5.2. The case of Cyprus

In the Cypriot part, we will analyse the spontaneous speech of Russian-Cypriot Greek children and their mother in a mixed marriage family (the mother is a Russian-speaker and the father is a Cypriot Greek speaker).

The data analysis of the (recorded) interviews showed that when Russian-speaking parents talked to their children or about their children, they might code-switch. They might use Greek (their L2) for concepts or terminology related to their everyday life and where they might not know the relevant word or concept in their L1, or due to high cognitive load and processing they might not be able to retrieve the exact word or translate it very quickly. Thus, they decided to use the Greek (L2) equivalent.

Cypriot Greek or Greek was the children's dominant language. It was often the case that while talking in Russian they inserted some words from the dominant language because they did not know (or could not quickly find) the equivalent in the heritage language. Even the parents tended to use Greek words instead of Russian equivalents. They got used to these words and terminology and other Russian speakers in Cyprus could easily understand them. Extracts 5—10 illustrate such cases.

Extract 5

*Мама, заверни бутерброды в **ασημόκόλλα*** "Mother, could you please wrap it in FOIL."

Extract 6

*Здесь хорошо, рядом своя **φρουταρία**.* "It is very good there; we have our own VEGETABLE SHOP nearby."

Extract 7

*Старший пойдет в **πρόδημοτική**.* "My older son will go to the PRIMARY SCHOOL."

Extract 8

Надо звонить в **δημαρχείο**. "You need to call the TOWN HALL."

Extract 9

Γραφείο ευημερίας *может помочь, если ты* **τρίτεκνη**, *я мать-одиночка*. "The OFFICE OF WELFARE can help if you are a MOTHER OF THREE CHILDREN. I am a single mother."

Extract 10

Я даже не знала, как готовить **κολοκάσι και φακές**. "I did not even know how to cook SWEET POTATOES and LENTILS."

Similar results have been shown by Zabrodskaja (2013), who studied Russian-Estonian code-switching and morphosyntactic contact-induced language change in Estonian Russian among young bilingual speakers (who were native speakers of Russian). In her study, insertional Russian-Estonian code-switching was also related to a number of pragmatic functions, among others switches of semantically specific vocabulary (Backus 2001 also discusses semantic specificity). According to Zabrodskaja (2013, p. 86), code-switching may occur because of the shortness of the Estonian equivalents, their high productive structure (compound nouns are very common in Estonian) and greater frequency in everyday speech in comparison with their Russian equivalents. Zabrodskaja (2013) even identified some lexical borrowings of Estonian (compound) nouns that had reached the stage where the borrowings had superseded the standard Russian equivalents, while others occurred alongside Russian nouns.

Both parents and children also used a lot of English words or terms, as English is a widespread language in Cyprus, as seen in Extracts 11—13. In these situations, when Russian mothers communicated with each other, they code-switched and used English terms that are widespread and accepted in Cyprus instead of Russian. The children heard their parents switching languages and saw this as a norm. This is in line with our previous finding that children hear the use of code-switching by their parents and start switching themselves (Ringblom and Karpava, 2019). It should be mentioned that very often Cypriots themselves code-switch between Cypriot Greek and English.

Extract 11

...по дороге, если свернуть с **highway**. "If you drive on the road and turn from the HIGHWAY."

Extract 12

Нужна страховка для **migration**. "You need insurance for MIGRATION."

Extract 13

Ребенок вчера потерял **residence permit**. "My child lost her RESIDENCE PERMIT yesterday."

Below, one case is selected to illustrate how a bilingual teenager switched from Greek to Russian at the end of her question when she explained what word she was asking for. Her mother supported her language choice and replied in Russian as well. It might be that, for both the teenager and mother, kitchenware and other supplies are emotionally connected with Russian because the Russian-speaking mother is passionate about cooking, actively involving both her daughters in it (cf. the Swedish examples,

where the Swedish and English terminology was used in a context where the Russian-speaking girls attended a Swedish-language school).

Extract 14

— **Μαμά** *πως ονομάζεται αυτό που εσυ κάμνεις* блинчики? "MUM, WHAT DO YOU CALL THE THING WITH WHICH YOU MAKE pancakes?"

— *Сковородка*? "A frying pan?"

Extract 15 shows the interaction among the daughters and the mother during their afternoon/evening meal. It seems that the initiator of TL is their mother and then, after the mother has introduced code-switching from Russian to Greek, one of the daughters switches to Greek as well. The reasons for TL could be the desire to express emotions or taste, to emphasise or to show solidarity with local culture and cuisine.

Extract 15

Mother: *Такой вкусный. Знаешь, почему я их* [апельсины] *не ем, потому что я всегда* **βαριέμαι να κόψω**. "It is so tasty. Do you know why I do not eat them [oranges]? Because I am always too LAZY TO CUT THEM."

S. (daughter 1): *Да, мамочка*. "Yes, mum."

Mother: *Я тоже люблю апельсины. У меня была проблема их порезать* **και δεν χορταίνεις εν το μεταξύ** *представляешь*. "I also like oranges. I went to the trouble of cutting them and you are STILL HUNGRY, BY THE WAY. Can you imagine?"

E. (daughter 2): **ρουφάς το αυτό ... ρουφάς το χημό από μέσα**. "YOU DRINK THIS... DRINK THE JUICE FROM INSIDE."

Mother: **δεν μπορώ να χορτάσω, θέλω άλλο** ... **επειδή είναι πολύ ζουμερό** *...вкусненько... a лимончик*. "I CANNOT STOP BEING HUNGRY. I WANT ANOTHER BECAUSE IT IS VERY JUICY... and a lemon..."

E. (daughter 2): *Какой твой любимый фрукт сейчас*? "What is your favourite fruit now?"

Mother: *Сейчас апельсин...* "Now, it is oranges."

S. (daughter 1): *Лучше шоколад... мне не нравится с лимоном. Я с лимоном только только лимонаду делаю*. "Chocolate is better. I do not like it with lemon. With lemon I only make lemonade."

E. (daughter 2): *И все так ем, мама... я лимон и грейпфрукт и все ем*. "I eat everything like this, mum. Lemon and grapefruit and everything."

Mother: *Короче, я куплю апельсины на выходных*. "In short, I will buy oranges over the weekend."

As we can see from Extract 15, the three speakers were clearly fluent enough to use both languages and the resources available to them. TL broke up the monotony of monolingualism. The analysis of the data revealed that the majority of the families tried to use and maintain their heritage language and to develop Russian-language literacy among their children. Their family language practices were characterised by TL, which enhances dynamic bilingualism at home. Extracts 16 and 17 (taken from the oral interviews) show that the mothers could implement TL if it served communicative purposes and facilitated comprehension of the interlocutors in a particular situation. The choice of the language by the speaker, English, Greek (Cypriot Greek or Standard Modern Greek) or Russian, depended on the listener and his/her command of a particular

language. This could be done on purpose, when the participants controlled their speech, or subconsciously, as it might be easier for them to retrieve a word or a phrase from L1/L2/L3 while speaking.

Extract 16

— *Хорошо, смешиваете ли вы два языка, русский или греческий?* "Well, do you mix two languages?"

— *Стараюсь не смешивать, но бывает...* "I try not to, but it happens..."

— *В каких ситуациях?* "In which situations?"

— *Если, допустим русские, которые знают греческий язык, то при разговоре мы можем смешивать, какие-то слова вставлять греческие...* "If, for example, the Russians know Greek, then during our conversation we can mix, and insert some Greek words..."

Extract 17

— *Часто ли вы смешиваете два языка?* "Do you often code-switch?"

— *С ребенком не часто, а когда в общении с киприотами часто, частенько, английско-греческий, да...* "With my child not often, but when communicating with Cypriots, often, English-Greek, yes..."

It should be noted though that some parents took a very strong position regarding the one-parent-one language (OPOL) strategy; they believed that it was the only way to maintain and transmit their heritage/minority language, as can be seen in Extract 18.

Extract 18

— *Смешиваете ли вы два или три языка?* "Do you mix two or three languages?"

— *Я не педагог по образованию, но мое мнение, этого не стоит делать, если говорить на одном языке, то на одном, так как, вот у меня подруга... она полностью с сыном, с сыном, а подруга с Латвии, она запретила вообще всем общаться на русском языке, так как в школе сказали у него проблема с* **ελληνικά**. *Я говорю, что ты делаешь, сын не говорит на украинском, на русском языке, а сейчас она стала смешивать языки и это не надо делать, но это мое, как-бы не знаю, мнение...* "I am not a teacher, but in my view, you should not do that; if you speak one language, you need to speak one language. For example, I have one friend... she is from Latvia and she has forbidden everybody to use Russian as at school she was told that her son had a problem with GREEK. I asked her 'what are you doing?' Her son does not speak Ukrainian or Russian, and now she has started to mix languages and you should not do that, but this is my view..."

5.3. The case of Estonia

There are a lot of examples of filling lexical gaps in Russian with Estonian insertions as better options than native equivalents. Very often Russian-speaking teenagers switch precisely because Estonian contains the most accurate term in connection with school or their extracurricular activities.

Extract 19

Situation: two bilingual siblings, a Russian-speaking mother and an Estonian-speaking father are having dinner together. In this family, it is common to discuss what each of the family members have done during the day. This is a school day.

Mother: *Ну что вы сегодня в школе проходили?* "What did you study at school today?" %com turns to her husband **Võta rohkem juurikaid**. "TAKE MORE BEETROOTS."

Daughter 1: **Ikka õppisime**. "WE STUDIED."

Daughter 2: *А мы не* **õppisime** "But we did not STUDY." %com she starts to laugh.

Father: **No jah. Teie kindlasti hängisite.** "WELL, YOU HUNG OUT" %com hängima < English hang out (an Estonian slang word).

%com mother looks astonished.

Father (turning to her and explaining): **Neil oli täna kinoskäik.** "THEY HAD A FILM DAY TODAY."

Daughter 1: **Mis asja?** *Опять?* "WHAT? Again?"

Daughter 2: **kadestada pole midagi. See oli tüütu muuvikas.** "DO NOT BE ENVIOUS. IT WAS AN ANNOYING MOVIE" %com muuvikas < English movie (an Estonian slang word)

Mother: *а почему* **tüütu**-*то*? "but why ANNOYING?"

Daughter 1: То есть учи там всяких **selgroogsed loomad, imetajad — roomajad**... "because we were studying all kinds of VERTEBRATE ANIMALS, MAMMALS AND REPTILES."

Father (interrupts and makes a joke): **Ja saabki varsti olla meil oma loomaarst!** "AND SOON WE WILL HAVE OUR OWN VETERINARIAN."

Mother: **Stopp**! *Нашли мне тему!* "STOP! They found a topic for me."

As we see in Extract 19, starting a conversation in Russian, the mother tries to implement a one-parent-one-language strategy. But she talks in Estonian with her husband. This fact might have facilitated the code-switching produced by daughter 1 (who might have been expected to answer in Russian). But code-switching might also have been caused by the fact that the girl was asked about school. TL was offered by daughter 2. TL was accepted by the mother, who also expressed herself using both Russian and Estonian. Her Estonian switch actually had a pragmatic function as she repeated a word said by daughter 2. It is interesting to note that the father spoke only Estonian and used an Estonian slang word (borrowed from English). His slang might have caused another Estonian slang word inserted by daughter 2.

Russian-Estonian code-switching or, more precisely, TL used by a Russian child or a teenager (in other words, younger family members) might function as a compromise to suit the older family members who have lower levels of competence in Estonian. This is demonstrated in Extract 20.

Extract 20

Situation: two siblings are working on their home assignments. A Russian-speaking grandmother has come to visit her daughter (their mother). She enters the girls' room.

Daughter 2: **ära pane seda lõppu** "DO NOT PUT THAT ENDING." %com she means that a case ending chosen was wrong.

Daughter 1: **Miks** "WHY?"

Grandmother (entering): *Ну, куколки мои, опять* <u>миксим</u> "well, my dolls, we <u>mix</u> again" %com миксим is a new creation from Estonian **miksima** "TO MIX" and a Russian ending of the verb that tells us that it is the "we" form (first person plural).

Daughter 2: **Ta grammatikat ei oska** "SHE DOES NOT KNOW THE GRAMMAR."

Daughter 1: **Miks** "WHY?"

Grandmother: **Oska** *соска* "[DOES NOT] KNOW nipple" %com word play with a bilingual rhyme.

Daughter 2 (starts to laugh): *Соска* **ei oska** "a nipple DOES NOT KNOW."

Daughter 1 (explains to her grandmother): *Она меня грамматике учит. Говорит, что я не умею* — **ei oska** — *а теперь ещё и соска...* **ise oled** *"*She is teaching me grammar. She says that I do not know — DO NOT KNOW — and now also there is a nipple ... YOU YOURSELF ARE.*"*

Among the youngest members of a family, TL exists naturally and often compromise or in-between forms are used to increase the similarity between Russian and Estonian and maybe even to become some sort of a "family language". Here we see that the grandmother used the word миксим "mix", which is a new creation, where an Estonian stem and a Russian ending can be separated (if we still wish to rely on a monolingual yardstick for the analysis of bilingual grammar).

It is evident that the code-switching produced by participants in the study depended a lot on the speakers' metalinguistic capacities and increasing competence in both languages. Functions and patterns of code-switching might change over time but their current manifestation communicates the idea that TL might serve as actual messages or even the unmarked language of a family interaction.

6. Conclusion

The aim of our paper was to describe and analyse the patterns of TL in the three Russian-speaking communities. This was a huge and challenging task, considering the diverse sociolinguistic situations and demographic compositions in Cyprus, Sweden and Estonia. Also, because of official language policy and regulations regarding minority languages, there is the impact of mass media and education and top-down attitudes towards societal and individual bilingualism, as well as bottom-up bilingual practices. Therefore, our results should be taken as strictly synchronic, representing a snapshot that does not reflect actual dynamics in TL processes.

Our results show both differences and similarities among Russian-speakers in the three countries, not only in their family language practices, but also in their attitudes towards the fluidity of languages, language repertoires and TL.

The Swedish data show that even though TL was a common practice in many families, it was still not always a fully acceptable strategy among the parents. The parents did not see it, in García's view (2009), as a choice of bilinguals, but were often still stuck in the language separation myth and saw language separation and balanced bilingualism as a necessity in order to be a real bilingual. Even though many parents wanted their children to separate their languages (Ringblom et al. 2018), the second generation (or young heritage speakers) were more relaxed about linguistic purism, seemed to see language as a means of communication and expressing their thoughts and ideas, used what seemed to be available to them at the moment, and did not think about the particular language (*я говорю как хочу* "I speak as I want" as 14-year-old J put it).

In Cyprus, TL seemed to be a frequent phenomenon among the Russian-speaking families, though some of the participants expressed a very strong negative view about code-switching and language mixing. A lot of participants had very good metalinguistic awareness and could control the implementation of TL for semantic and pragmatic reasons in particular contexts and situations. Others used TL subconsciously, just because

that was the easiest way for them to communicate, especially under the pressure of time. TL could also be an expression of solidarity with the interlocutors of a specific social group or network.

As our paper demonstrates, in Russian-speaking families living outside Russia and a Russian-language environment, one may find a highly complex linguistic reality. When looking at the role of language dominance in the direction of the switch, in Sweden, Swedish, Russian and English were used by children who were educated in English; in Cyprus, this involved Greek (Cypriot Greek/Standard Modern Greek), English and Russian, while, in Estonia it was Estonian and Russian. New loans, slang words in particular, might be inserted from English, but these were often Estonianised in terms of their phonetic realisation (this is a general trend for Russian-speakers in Estonia; see Zabrodskaja, 2009).

There is no one single FLP, but rather a number of policies that individuals use to cope with the demands of the linguistic environment and sociolinguistic realities. Russian-speakers incorporate a wider range of language repertoires in their everyday lives. Sometimes, such language contacts generate power struggles and the language ideological dimension becomes a key terrain to explore how speakers feel about the need to effectively attain a degree of multilingualism. Multilingualism and TL are usually encouraged and parents often support them at home.

We demonstrated how FLP and child-directed TL can support, expand and enhance dynamic bilingualism/multilingualism, and reinforce and integrate Russian as a minority language in a wider context: societal and educational. It is our hope that our research will enrich sociolinguists' understanding of TL, which occurs so frequently in bilingual Russian-speaking families.

Note
Authors 1, 2 and 3 all contributed equally and should be considered co-first authors.

REFERENCES

Arthur, Jo, and Martin, Peter. (2006). Accomplishing lessons in postcolonial classrooms: Comparative perspectives from Botswana and Brunei Darussalam. *Comparative Education*, 42, 177—202.

Appel, René, and Muysken, Pieter. (1992). *Language contact and bilingualism*. London, New-York, Melbourne, Auckland: E. Arnold a division of Hodder & Stroughton.

Auer, Peter. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In L. Milroy, P. Muysken (eds.), *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 115—135.

Backus, Ad. (2001). The role of semantic specificity in insertional codeswitching: Evidence from Dutch-Turkish. In R. Jacobson (ed.), *Codeswitching Worldwide II*. Berlin — New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 125—154.

Bailey, Benjamin. (2007). Heteroglossia and boundaries. In M. Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 257—276.

Baker, Colin. (1995). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, Colin. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Blackledge, Adrian, and Creese, Angela. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.

Buschfeld, Sarah. (2013). *English in Cyprus or Cyprus English? An empirical investigation of variety Status.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Curdt-Christiansen, Xiao Lan. (2013) Family language policy: Realities and continuities. *Language Policy*, 12, 1—6.

Dörnyei, Zoltan. (2011) *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ehala, Martin, and Zabrodskaja, Anastassia. (2014). Ethnolinguistic vitality and acculturation orientations of Russian speakers in Estonia. In L. Ryazanova-Clarke (ed.), *The Russian Language outside the Nation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, 166—188. doi: 10.3366/edinburgh/9780748668458.003.0007.

Eracleous, Natalia. (2015). *Linguistic landscape of Limassol: Russian presence*. MA thesis, University of Cyprus.

Ferguson, Charles A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word*, 15, 325—340.

Filippov, Sergey. (2010). Russian companies: the rise of new multinationals. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 5, 307—332.

Ganuza, Natalia, and Hedman, Christina. (2017). Ideology vs. practice: Is there space for pedagogical 'translanguaging' in mother tongue instruction. In B. Paulsrud, J. Rosén, B. Straszer and Å. Wedin (eds.), *New Perspectives on Translanguaging and Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 208—226.

García, Ofelia. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* West Sussex, UK.: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, Ofelia, and Li Wei. (2014). *Language, bilingualism, and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

García, Ofelia. (2016). *A sociolinguistic biography and understandings of bilingualism*. Unpublished manuscript.

García, Ofelia, and Lin, Angel. (2016). Translanguaging and bilingual education. In O. García, A. Lin and S. May (eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Encyclopedia of language and Education 5. New York: Springer, 117—130.

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Görlach, Manfred. (1990). The development of standard Englishes. In: M. Görlach (ed.), *Studies in the History of the English Language*. Heidelberg: Winter, 9—64.

Görlach, Manfred. (1995). Dictionaries of transplanted Englishes. In M. Görlach (ed.), *More Englishes: New Studies in Varieties of English 1988—1994*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 124—163.

Graddol, David. (1997). *The future of English?* London: The British Council.

Grohmann, Kleanthes, and Leivada, Evelina. (2011). Towards disentangling bi-x: metalinguistic awareness and competing motivations, paper presented at the 2011 UIC Bilingualism Forum, University of Illinois at Chicago (14—15 April 2011).

Grosjean, François. (1982). *Life with two languages. An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge, Mass., and London, England: Harvard University.

Jarvis, Scott, and Pavlenko, Aneta. (2008). *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. New York and London: Routledge.

Johnstone, Barbara. (2000). *Qualitative methods in sociolinguistics*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Karpava, Sviatlana, Ringblom, Natalia, and Zabrodskaja, Anastassia. (2018). Language ecology in Cyprus, Sweden and Estonia: Bilingual Russian-speaking families in multicultural settings. *Journal of the European Second Language Association*, 2, 107—117. doi: 10.22599/jesla.41.

Kuznetsov, Alexey. (2010). *Industrial and geographical diversification of Russian foreign direct investments*. Turku School of Economics Pan-European Institute Electronic Publication, 7.

King, Kendall, Fogle, Lyn, and Logan-Terry, Aubrey. (2008). Family language policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2, 907—922. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00076.x.

Lin, Angel, and Martin, Peter. (2005). *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lewis, Gwyn, Bryn Jones, and Colin Baker. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18, 655—670.

Mills, Geoffrey. (2003). *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher*. 2nd Edition. Merrill/Prentice-Hall: Upper saddle River, NJ.

Milroy, Lesley, and Muysken, Pieter. (eds.) (1995). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Muth, Sebastian. (2017). Russian language abroad: Viewing language through the lens of commodification. *Russian Journal of Linguistics* 21, 463—492.

Nicol, Janet. (ed.) (2001). *One mind, two languages: Bilingual language processing* (Explaining linguistics). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Otheguy, Ricardo, Ofelia García, and Wallis Reid. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6, 281—307.

Parkval, Mikael. (2015). *Sveriges språk i siffror*. Språkrådet Morfem.

Pavlenko, Aneta. (2008), (ed.) Multilingualism in post-Soviet countries. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11, 3&4.

Pavlenko, Aneta. (2017). Russian-friendly: How Russian became a commodity in the European service industry and beyond. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20, 385—403. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2015.1115001.

Pavlenko, Aneta. (2017). Linguistic landscapes and other sociolinguistic methods of Russian language research abroad. [in Russian: Iazikovie ladshafti idrugie sociolingvisticheskie metodi issledovania russkogo iazika zarubezhom.] *Russian Journal of Linguistics* 21, 493—514.

Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Leech, Geoffrey, and Svartvik, Jan. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Ringblom, Natalia. (2012). *The Acquisition of Russian in a Language Contact Situation: A Case Study in a Bilingual Child in Sweden* (doctoral thesis). Stockholm, Sweden: SU Press.

Ringblom et al. (2018) = Рингблом, Наталия, Забродская, Анастасия, и Карпова, Светлана. (2018). Challenges for the strategy 'one parent — one language': from the experience of bilingual

families in Sweden, Estonia and Cyprus. [In Russian: Vizovi dla strategii 'odin roditel-odin iazik': iz opita dvuiazichnih semei v Shvecii, Estonii i na Kipre]. In Nikulassi, A. and Protassova, E. (eds.), Multilingualism and Family [In Russian: Mnogoiazichie I Semia]. Berlin: Retorika GmbH, 37—48.

Ringblom, Natalia, and Karpava, Sviatlana. (2019). Family language policy, Russian language use, maintenance, and transmission in Cyprus and Sweden. In A. Mustajoki, E. Protassova and M. Yelenevskaya (eds.), *The Soft Power of the Russian Language. Pluricentricity, Politics and Policies*. Routledge: New York, 237—245.

Rothman, Jason. (2009). Understanding the nature and outcomes of early bilingualism: Romance languages as heritage languages. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13 (2), 155—163.

Rowe, Charley, and Grohmann, Kleanthes. (2013). Discrete bilectalism: Towards co-overt prestige and diglossic shift in Cyprus. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 224, 119—142.

Ryazanova-Clarke, Lara. (Ed.) (2014). *The Russian Language outside the Nation*. Russian Language and Society 1. Edinburgh, Scotland, UK: Edinburgh University Press. doi: 10.3366/edinburgh/ 9780748668458.001.0001.

Schneider, Edgar. (2003). The Dynamics of New Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language*, 79, 233—281.

Schneider, Edgar. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the world*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Strevens, Peter. (1992). English as an International Language. In B. Kachru (ed.), *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures* (2nd ed.). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 27—47.

Suryanarayan, Neelakshi. (2017). The role of the Russian language in India's healthcare sector. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 21, 515—529.

Toth, Jeanette, and Paulsrud, BethAnne. (2017). Agency and Affordance in Translanguaging for Learning: Case Studies from English-medium Instruction in Swedish Schools. In B. Pailsrud, J. Rosen, B. Straszer and A. Wedin (eds.), *New Perspectives on Translanguaging and Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 189—207.

Varenne, Hervé, and McDermott, Ray. (1998). *Successful failure*. Colorado, CO: Westview Press.

Viimaranta, Hannes, Ekaterina Protassova, and Arto Mustajoki. (2017). Aspects of commodification of Russian in Finland. *Russian Journal of Linguistics* 21, 620—634.

Vogel, Sara, and García, Ofelia. (2017). Translanguaging. *Languages and Literacies Online Publication* DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.181. Retrieved from: http://oxfordre.com/education/ view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264093-e-181.

Williams, Carol. (1994). *An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.

Zabrodskaja, Anastassia. (2009). *Russian-Estonian language contacts: Grammatical aspects of language use and change* (doctoral thesis), Tallinn: Tallinn University Press.

Zabrodskaja, Anastassia. (2013). Morphosyntactic contact-induced language change among young speakers of Estonian Russian. In I. Léglise and C. Chamoreau (eds), *The Interplay of Variation and Change in Contact Settings*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 77—106.

Zabrodskaja, Anastassia. (2015). "What is my country to me?" Identity construction by Russian-speakers in the Baltic countries. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 9, 217—241. doi: 10.1558/sols.v9i2.26885.

Yelenevskaya, Maria, and Fialkova, Larisa. (2017). Linguistic landscape and what it tells us about the integration of the Russian language into Israeli economy. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 21, 557—586.

Bionotes:
SVIATLANA KARPAVA (PhD) is a Lecturer in Applied Linguistics/TESOL at the Department of English Studies, University of Cyprus. She is a Management Committee Member of the "European Family Support Network Cost Action. A bottom-up, evidence-based and multidisciplinary approach" (2019—2023) as well as a working group member of the "European Network for Combining Language Learning with Crowdsourcing Techniques" Cost Project (2017—2021). Sviatlana participates in Erasmus plus project "Planting languages-seeds of success" (2019—2021). She is the general secretary of the Cyprus Linguistic Society (CyLing) and active member and research collaborator of Cyprus Acquisition Team. Her area of research is applied linguistics, syntax, morphology, semantics and pragmatics, first and second language acquisition, bilingualism, multilingualism and dialect acquisition, sociolinguistics, teaching and education.
Contact information: e-mail: karpava.sviatlana@ucy.ac.cy
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8416-1431
https://karpava.wordpress.com/

NATALIA RINGBLOM (PhD) is a Slavist affiliated with the Department of Slavic and Baltic studies, Finnish, Dutch and German at Stockholm University. She is also an educational developer at Dalarna University. Her main research interests include bilingualism, heritage language acquisition and maintenance, with a particular focus on Russian in Sweden. Her PhD dissertation defended in 2012 was devoted to the acquisition of Russian in a language contacts situation. Her current projects deal with family language policy, as well as heritage language acquisition and maintenance. Natalia is a member of a COST Project: "Enhancing children's oral skills across Europe and beyond". She has a long experience of teaching Russian and Swedish at various levels.
Contact information: e-mail: nari@slav.su.se; nri@du.se

ANASTASSIA ZABRODSKAJA (PhD) is a Professor of Intercultural Communication at Tallinn University. She works as a Senior Research Fellow in Sociolinguistics at the University of Tartu, in the project IUT20-3 "Sustainability of Estonian in the Era of Globalisation". In 2013—2017 she participated in the COST project "New Speakers in a Multilingual Europe: Opportunities and Challenges" and in 2019—2023 — in the COST project "The European Family Support Network: A Bottom-up, Evidence-Based and Multidisciplinary Approach". Her research deals with identity, intercultural communication, code-switching and linguistic landscape. She has published a monograph and numerous articles on bilingualism and language contacts.
Contact information: e-mail: anastassia.zabrodskaja@gmail.com

Сведения об авторах:
СВЕТЛАНА КАРПОВА (PhD) —- преподаватель прикладной лингвистики / TESOL на факультете изучения английского языка Университета Кипра. Она является членом Европейского проекта по вопросам поддержки семьи (2019—2023), а также членом рабочей группы Европейского проекта по изучению языка и краудсорсинга (2017—2021). Светлана участвует в проекте «Эразмус плюс» по развитию языков (2019—2021). Она является генеральным секретарем Лингвистического общества Кипра (CyLing) и активным членом и научным сотрудником группы по по изучению языков на Кипре. Область ее исследований — прикладная лингвистика,

синтаксис, морфология, семантика и прагматика, овладение первым и вторым языком, двуязычие, многоязычие и овладение диалектом, социолингвистика, преподавание и образование.

Контактная информация: e-mail: karpava.sviatlana@ucy.ac.cy
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8416-1431
https://karpava.wordpress.com/

НАТАЛЬЯ РИНГБЛОМ (PhD) — славист, преподает на кафедре Славянских и балтийских языков, финского и немецкого языка Стокгольмского университета. Является разработчиком программ высшего образования в университете Даларна. Основные темы научных интересов включают билингвизм, изучение и сохранение эритажного языка, в особенности русского языка в Швеции. В 2012 году защитила докторскую диссертацию об освоении русского языка в ситуации языкового контакта. Её сегодняшние проекты связаны с политикой семейного языка, а также изучением и сохранением русского языка в Швеции. Член Европейского COST проекта "Enhancing children's oral skills across Europe and beyond". Имеет большой опыт преподавания русского и шведского языков на разных уровнях.

Контактная информация: e-mail: nari@slav.su.se; nri@du.se

АНАСТАСИЯ ЗАБРОДСКАЯ (PhD) — профессор межкультурной коммуникации Таллиннского университета, старший научный сотрудник Института эстонского и общего языкознания в Тартуском университете, участник проекта IUT20-3 "Sustainability of Estonian in the Era of Globalisation". В 2013—2017 участвовала в Европейском COST проекте "New Speakers in a Multilingual Europe: Opportunities and Challenges", а в 2019—2023 — в Европейском COST проекте "The European Family Support Network: A Bottom-up, Evidence-Based and Multidisciplinary Approach". Сфера научных интересов — идентичность, межкультурная коммуникация, переключение кодов и языковой ландшафт. Автор монографии и многочисленных статей по билингвизму и языковым контактам.

Контактная информация: e-mail: anastassia.zabrodskaja@gmail.com