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Abstract

The identity of the Third Wave Russian Diaspora has been misunderstood through the oversimplification of their ethnic and language identity. In addition, the methodologies of sociolinguistic fieldwork, including bilingual studies in the Russian Diaspora, contain essentialism at their core. The paper explores the problem of the essentialist identity in the study of the Third Wave Diaspora and how it is created and maintained. In the first part of the thesis, I unpack the history of the Third Wave Soviet émigrés to understand why they were essentialized as Soviet or Russian Jews before becoming immigrants and then the Russian Diaspora. As a way to open up the discussion of the problem of studying Russian diaspora as one group, I discuss the methodologies of several key scholars in this field. Then, I specifically look at lexical data that have been studied by scholars on the Russian Diaspora. I use lexical terms I gathered from Soviet dictionaries to analyze and deconstruct the interpretations by the previous scholars. My conclusion is that because of this oversimplification of the Third Wave Russian Diaspora and methodological tendency to essentialize identities in studies, the Russian Diaspora and the language as a result have also been essentialized.
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1. Defining the Third Wave Emigration

1.1 Introduction

The following paper will examine the Third Wave Russian diaspora through the lens that is viewed by the academic community and the resulting way that émigré speech is analyzed. In the first chapter, we will look at the definition of the waves of migration and who are characterized as part of the third wave. It is important to note that the Third Wave is identified as the Soviet Jewish, Russian Jewish and Russian émigré. Through understanding how this group was created, it will be clearer how the Russian Diaspora was established from the group was created. In the second chapter, we will address the theoretical framework of identity construction through the argumentation of Bucholtz and Hall in order to understand how and why essentialist identities are formed. By identifying and defining these groups, I will try to concomitantly deconstruct the essentialist ways that appear to be fixed and provide a space for the future discussion of the terms that scholars will use in their work concerning the Russian diaspora through a small culture approach. In the third chapter, the practices of data collections by several scholars in relation to the problem of essentialist methodologies will be compared and contrasted in order to gain a better understanding of how scholars such as Deborah Tannen avoid essentialist categorization. In the fourth chapter, I will analyze the previous studies that were carried out by scholars, who studied lexical use by Russian émigrés in the late Soviet
period, and apply my own analysis through research in Soviet dictionaries. Bringing together theories and methodologies of deconstructed identities from the previous chapters with the fourth chapter will open up a space where the Russian diaspora could be reimagined. Let us now begin with contextualizing the waves of emigration in a historical context.

1.2 Understanding the Waves of Emigration from a Historical perspective

Migration studies in scholarly work show that the rate of emigration from the territory of the Russian Empire significantly rose during the late 19th century (Joseph 1969: 22-32). In the previous decade, 39,284 people emigrated out of the Russian Empire to the United States and in the following decade from 1881-1890, the numbers multiplied to 213,282 (Joseph 1969: 22-32). The rise in numbers is due to the historical events concerning the Jewish population (Buwalda 1997: 5-26). Jews in the Russian Empire had an extremely difficult life. Anti-Semitic policies restricting and segregating the Jews were common during the rule of Peter the Great and Catherine II. As a result of Alexander II’s assassination in 1881, pogroms were initiated by local societies1 to pillage and burn Jewish villages in massacres. The struggles and persecution that Jews suffered from are thought to be one of the biggest reasons for the emigration of Jews during this

1 Some speculate also by the czarist government
period. Since that time until 1990, almost 3.5 million people immigrated to the United States, a great number of which were Jews.²

However, it is impossible to provide anti-Semitic reasons as the only motivation of emigration, considering the enormous changes that occurred in political institutions from autocratic empire, socialist federation to a “free” economic federation. The instability that continuously ensued throughout major historical moments such as the Russian Revolution and World War I and II affected millions of people in their identity in religion, political beliefs, and socio-economic background. People, who emigrated in the 19th century, had widely differing religious backgrounds, education levels, and cultures compared to those in the later periods.

Scholars, who have studied the migrations of people coming from the Former Russian Empire and Former Soviet Union, have broken up the periods of migration in the 20th century into three waves or exodus, although these terms represent various periods and populations for different scholars.³ Zvi Gitelman refers to the first period as the emigration of people in 1881 to the Russian Revolution of 1917. The first large waves of Jewish immigrants arrived in New York in September 1881, and shortly after, the

---
³ Buwalda refers to the emigration periods by first, second and third exodus and also refers to the first wave of the second exodus to begin in March 1971 while others such as Zvi Gitelman (and Dan Jacobs) consider the first wave to be between 1880s to 1920s, the second wave during the sixties and the third wave to begin in the 1970s in addition to his first definition of the three waves.
Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) was founded (Buwalda 1997: 11). From 1881 to 1891, a number of 41,365 Jews arrived, which is 20 percent of the entire population who emigrated from the Russian Empire (Pinkus 1988: 22-45). Four years following the Bolshevik Revolution, it has been estimated that 1.5 million citizens left Russia and people continued to emigrate until 1935 before the borders were sealed and emigration was prohibited (Heitman 1989: 115). It was not until the sixties and seventies that emigration was opened again.

The people, who emigrated in the 1960s, undoubtedly differ in many ways from those from the revolution and preceding years, but one cannot dismiss the fact that there are also distinctions among those who emigrated in the latter half of the 20th century as well. It is important to be aware of the change that occurred in emigration patterns in the Soviet-Jewish families because they represent a large percentage of those who emigrated. Therefore, the period that this paper will focus on will be the late Soviet period that includes parts of all three waves that Gitelman refers to as the third wave between 1971-1990 (Lewin-Epstein 1997: 1-18).

One of the controversies among scholars is the cause of emigration during the late Soviet period and to what degree internal and external affairs affected the emigration (Ro‘I 1997: 45-67). Nevertheless, immigration policies fluctuated as Soviet-U.S. relations fluctuated, changing the number of families who were allowed to leave.

The HIAV played a major role in financing and acculturating the Soviet Jewish émigrés in the late Soviet period.
the USSR or enter the United States. To better understand the historical context of this emigration period, it is important to understand the reasons for the difficulty of collecting accurate numbers of the emigration population. The realities of a closed society, international policies, bureaucratic barriers, immigration policies, and motivation of émigrés are among the prevalent factors presented in the following section.

1.3 Difficulty of Determining the Number of Soviet Émigrés

It is difficult to accurately classify the masses of people who left the country for several reasons. First, it is difficult to determine how many émigrés actually left the USSR between the seventies and nineties because the numbers recorded were not available or reliable from the Soviet Union. Second, when the borders were less stringent on allowing people to permanently leave during the fifties and sixties, the only way to leave the Soviet Union was to declare oneself as a Jew and state one’s desire to move to Israel. As mentioned before, these émigrés were referred to as being Russian-Jewish or Soviet-Jewish because the reason that they were allowed to leave depended on whether or not they identified themselves as Russian-Jewish. However, it is inaccurate to group all those who emigrated during this period as having a Jewish identity. Many were not Jewish but were spouses of those who were Jewish or had weak or nonexistent links to

---

5 Soviet Jews were able to apply for an exit visa after they got an official invitation from a relative or one who was a relative in Israel. More detailed information see Isurin 10.
Nevertheless, those who are considered to be part of the third wave were categorized as being ethnically Russian-Jewish or Soviet-Jewish. Gitelman (1981) interviewed 1,161 ex-Soviet citizens who left between 1977 and 1980 and were living in the United States, Israel or Germany. The following table shows the results of a survey of the religious identity of Soviet Jewish emigrants in the United States.

Table 1: Religious Identity of Soviet Jewish Émigrés in U.S.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither religious nor</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antireligious</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/no answer</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that almost half of the respondents did not consider themselves to have any connection with Jewish religion. Unfortunately, although the term Jewish may be limiting, scholars have no choice but to use this religious identification since

---

6 Several studies have shown that large numbers of Soviet Jewish émigrés did not associate themselves with Jewish practices after the first period of adjustment in Gitelman 1997, Gold 1994, and Fran Markowitz 1993.
there is no way to distinguish the motivations of the émigrés who left and whether or not they were Jewish or pretending.

Starting in 1974, families who received an Israel Exit Visa would change their route in Vienna which served as a transit destination, and travel to United States instead (Gitelman 1989: 163). During the mid-eighties, Soviet émigrés were allowed to enter on a Jewish visa to the United States if they had a living relative in the country. 55,000 people were allowed to enter the U.S. during the late 1970s and late 1980s. But because those who changed their destination from Israel to the United States would enter on a refugee status, those who were considered to be permanent aliens entering the country and those on refugee status were different. It has been recorded since 1971-1990, there have been 96,5728 individuals granted permanent resident alien status from the Soviet Union to the United States, but 190,870 Jewish refugees from the FSU (Former Soviet Union) have been recorded to have arrived in the United States(Refer to Appendix 3).9 The political and social factors mentioned above demonstrate the difficulty of collecting accurate numbers, and that it can be difficult to account for the identity and number of those who emigrated out of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, the U.S. census, U.S. Department of Justice, Israeli organizations and the HIAV have provided scholars with a visualization of what the soviet émigré was like. The following section will discuss how

international relations played a role in the unpredictable fluctuations of emigration numbers in both Soviet-U.S. relations as well as in Israel-Soviet relations.

1.4 Emigration, Policy Formulation and Implementation

There increasingly more Jews during the late Soviet period who, by the help of refusniks and other Zionist activists, were encouraged and galvanized to immigrate to Israel. Scholars contribute the Jewish national awakening in the Soviet Union to the Six Day war in 1967 (Friedgut 2003: 27-48). Israel’s victory in war raised Jewish nationalism in the Soviet Union, leading many more to move to Israel.

Following Khrushchev’s 1956 Secret Speech, the 1960s was the beginning of détente, and the Soviet Union made efforts to warm relations with the West (Goldman 1989: 145). This gave leverage to activists both within the Soviet Union and from Israel and the United States to negotiate with Soviet administrators to increase emigration numbers. In October 18, 1972, U.S.-Soviet trade agreement stated that Soviet Union would be included in the Most Favored Nation status. American businessmen could import Soviet goods at lower tariff prices than before, allowing them to compete with other producers (Goldman 1989: 147). It is not surprising then that as a result of their wishes to continue trade agreements and pressures coming from Western human rights organizations, emigration was briefly increased. In 1971, there were 13,022 emigrants; in
1972, there were 31,681; in 1973, there were 34,733. Emigration was allowed due to trading relations between the U.S. and Soviet Union.

In December 1974, the Jackson-Vanik Amendment was included in the Trade Act that stipulated that the “Most Favoured Nation status would only be granted to countries with non-market economies if they took steps towards free emigration” (Schifter 1997: 88). However, it took several more years before the numbers of émigrés actually dropped, and it was not until 1979 when the negotiated 51,320 émigrés would be allowed to leave (Goldman 1989: 215). This was due to the conflicts that arose between the branches of Soviet bureaucracy. In December 1979, when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, the United States was critical of this action and responded in several ways by increasing in arms expenditures and reinforcing nuclear weapons in Western Europe. Starting in 1980, the Soviet Union, in return, among other policies, restricted the number of emigration. (Jacobs 1981:6).

American and European Jewish organizations continued to actively fight for the rights of Jewish emigration. Due to negotiations in the mid-eighties, there had been

---

10 HIAS, Annual Report 1993 shows that in 1973, there were 1,773 Jews and in 1974, there were 4,110 entering the U.S. Schifter cites that authorized Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union had been 50,000 in 1979 but declined to 1,000 in 1983 and 1984 (Schifter 1997).
11 Goldman (1989). Refer to Appendix 3 in this paper. In 1974, there were 20,638 émigrés; in 1975, there were 13,221 émigrés, and as a result, of more negotiations with the trade agreement, the numbers annually increased until 1979, 215.
12 Indicates there were only 15,000 allowed in the first six months of 1980. In 1980, there were only 21,471 émigrés allowed to leave (See Appendix 3 in this paper).
13 There was a demonstration in December 1987 in Washington when 200,000 people demonstrated for free Jewish emigration.
serious changes made to the emigration policy in the Soviet Union and by 1987, they began to allow the *refusniks*\(^{14}\) to emigrate (Schifter 1997:91). Human Rights dialogue was common by this time and the Vienna meeting CSCE in the fall of 1986 played a hand in negotiations to increase the number of Jewish émigrés who were allowed to leave, especially those that had been requesting permission to leave for years. Schifter notes that the negotiations with the Moscow office was a long strenuous process that took numerous meetings and dozens of months of working with and pressuring the Soviet Union to raise the emigration numbers (Schifter 1997:93). Soviet-American economic relations indirectly influenced Jewish emigration, but emigration would not have been possible without Israel’s invitation.

In 1950, the Law of Return in Israel stated that every Jew was entitled to come to Israel (Dominitz 1997:113-127). In 1970, those who were non-Jewish spouses and descendants to the third generation were also allowed to enter the country on the Law of Return. Israel played a major role in organizing a movement to help and create an international awareness concerning Soviet Jews. They advocated the rights of Jews to gain access to the outside world and also eventually, facilitated the dropout phenomenon, which was briefly mentioned in the previous section. The definition of a dropout phenomenon occurred when a person from the Soviet Union would leave on an exit visa to enter Israel, but would ‘drop out’ at a transit station in either Austria or Italy.

---

\(^{14}\) Soviet citizens, many who were Jewish, who were not permitted to emigrate abroad
in order to immigrate into another country, among them the United States, Germany, and Canada. Until 1970, there were zero cases of dropouts. Between then 1970 and 1990 the dropout cases steadily increase, and in its peak in 1982, 81.4 percent of émigrés on an Israeli exit visa dropped out.\textsuperscript{15} The \textit{aliya} who were financially providing for the dropout émigrés transition was clearly resistant to this dropout phenomenon. However, they did not succeed in putting a stop to the dropout, made more difficult by the authorities in Vienna who did not prevent the change of destination.

\section*{1.5 Who were the Immigrants coming to the U.S.?}

In 1989, Ukraine was the Soviet republic with the highest number of immigrants arriving in the U.S. with 48.4 percent, then 21.2 percent from Russia, and the rest came from Belarus, Central Asia, Moldavia, Baltic, Azerbaijan, and Georgia.\textsuperscript{16} In this particular case, it is most likely that the “Russian Jews” who emigrated from Ukraine and Russia did in fact speak Russian as their first language. This is an important distinction to make in this paper as the immigrant’s identification with Russian will be a key factor in the studies examined.

It is clear that it is due to many factors that there is ambiguity in being able to identify who, when and how the Soviet émigrés arrived in the United States during the late Soviet period. It is also evident that because the visas of these émigrés were given

\textsuperscript{15} Refer to Appendix 5 for the numbers of dropout between 1968-92. Source: Jewish Agency for Israel Report 1993.

\textsuperscript{16} Gitelman, Zvi, 167. Please refer to Appendix 1 in this paper for the full percentages.
only to those who could prove they were of Jewish descent, the identity of this group was attributed as Soviet Jews. Within the Soviet Jewish identity, the communities that were built in the United States were often called Russian Jews to indicate both language and national identity. The emigration waves were often unsteady due to political reasons from both within and external international relations. By understanding that there are more nuanced factors at play and that scholars often simplify the groups of people for the sake of understanding the bigger picture, we must also acknowledge the possibility that these essentialized identities can be misconstrued by studies that study the Soviet émigrés as third wave Soviet Jews or the third wave Russian émigrés.

It is important to keep in mind that the groups that we refer to third wave Russian diaspora came from many different places from the Soviet Union, held varying occupations and lastly were placed in a number of different urban and suburban areas in the United States.17 The next chapter will examine the theoretical framework of constructing identity to better understand how and why identity can be constructed in an essentialized way. We will look specifically at the relationship between language and identity as the Russian diaspora is based on the common language they share.

17 Among many, the cities Russian speaking communities were placed in include Detroit, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, St.Paul, Brighton Beach, Los Angeles. (See Jacobs and Paul 1981).
2. Frameworks of Identity

Through Bucholtz and Hall’s article on their theories on identity construction through semiotic processes and tactics of intersubjectivity, I will present each of the definitions that they address as part of the identity construction process, but only some of these are applied to the identity process. In this chapter, we will look at how essentialism is prevalent in sociolinguistics and its importance in the field of linguistics. These theoretical concepts of identity are defined, as well as the Russian diaspora in the context of speech communities and communities of practice, and the linguistic aspects that result from this such as first language attrition and loan borrowing.

Mary Bucholtz and Kira Hall clarify the relationship between language and identity by reviewing key theoretical linguistic concepts to show how and why language is an integral part of the formation of cultural identity. They review processes that are central to defining identity in the fields of linguistic anthropology and semiotics. These include previously discussed terms such as practice, indexicality, ideology and performance and their new concepts termed as tactics of intersubjectivity. These concepts are important in this discussion because they not only provide a framework of identity, but also bring to light the natural inclination to essentialize groups of people, which still occurs despite the precautions against it (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 378).

Understanding and correcting the problems of essentialist models used in sociolinguistic
research on the Russia diaspora will provide a key to reimagining these communities using contemporary linguistic approaches to the construction of identities.

### 2.1 Sociolinguistics and Essentialism

The essentialist nature of methodologies is part of the discourse that is a continuous problem for those in the linguistic and anthropological field. Bucholtz and Hall agree that it is important to aim for non-essentialist methods, but also points out that the non-essentialist approach is not possible until the methods of studying identity are re-rooted in accurate definitions from where identity originates (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 375-386). They address the core problem that lay in essentializing identity in individuals and groups:

One of the greatest weaknesses of previous research on identity, in fact, is the assumption that identities are attributes of individuals or groups rather than of situations. Correlational perspectives on language often emphasize the distinctiveness of group patterns at the expense of variation across individuals within the group, or even variation within a single individual. But identity inheres in actions, not in people. As the product of situated social action, identities may shift and recombine to meet new circumstances (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 376).

The problems that arise in the essentialist categories arise from the direct and static association that have been made between identity and the individual or group, rather than acknowledging that it comes from the situational action of individuals and groups.

Deborah Tannen (1994) also extensively addresses the problem of essentialism in gender studies through her studies of conversation styles between men and women. Her
emphasis on the relativity of linguistic strategies in discourse analysis underlines the problem of essentialism defined above:

[L]inguistic features can never be aligned on a one-to-one basis with interactional intentions or meanings, in the sense that word can be assigned a meaning. No language has meaning except by reference to how it is “framed” (Bateson 1972, Goffman 1974). (Tannen 1994: 10).

Being in a position where she fully understands the essentialism that already exists, Tannen is careful to provide a method to root out the essentialist categories attributed to men and women in power relations (that is, the dominating characteristics of men and subordinated women), and slowly unravels these misconceptions through each study that she undertakes. Once such example is through her differentiation between a linguistic form (overlap) and a linguistic function (interruption) and concludes that all overlaps are not necessarily intention to interrupt and therefore, men are not always in an intentional position of dominance (Tannen 1994:76). In other words, these linguistic turns are attributed to the situations that emit certain conversational styles, or as Bucholtz and Hall would say ‘actions’, that tend to be used by men and women. The men and women do not in themselves denote degrees of power, and a style may denote opposite meanings based on the situation (Tannen 1994: 78). However, in the field of linguistic anthropology, there is a need for sociolinguistics to assess the people using social categories.
2.2 Strategic Essentialism

Bucholtz and Hall define essentialism as the “theoretical position that maintains that those who occupy an identity category (such as women, Asians, the working class) similar to one another and fundamentally different from members of other groups” (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 374). Of course, social categories of gender, race and class are often necessary components of studies of linguistics that are influenced by socio-cultural factors.

Bucholtz and Hall mention that these binary models “also provide a starting point for understanding ideological underpinnings of language, identity, interrelationship” and acknowledges the helpfulness of “strategic essentialism” where situations are oversimplified to initiate discussion but the definitions become more nuanced” (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 376).

Essentialism is a problem in the study of sociolinguistics that is currently being addressed and under heavy scrutiny by the scholars in the field itself. We saw how in gender studies, there is an explicit effort to tackle essentialism of men and women’s conversation by looking closer at the type of linguistic meanings before assigning them to gender identity. Although strategic essentialism is a temporary solution that makes scholars aware of the problem, it does not address the deeply ingrained attitudes toward the association between ideology of identity and its misconstrued relationship to the individual and groups. The next section will look at the steps of identity construction to
understand the shift that occurs when identity is essentialized. Understanding this identity construction will help us to understanding what Bucholtz and Hall’s mean by identity being attributed to the individual and groups, and the reasons it is likely for this to occur.

2.3 Processes of Identity Construction

Looking at identity as a social phenomenon, the four semiotic processes of identification are practice, indexicality, ideology, and performance, according to Bucholtz and Hall (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 378). Practice or habitus is defined by Bourdieu (1977) as the repeated action of everyday social activity that also includes language (Bourdieu 1977: 23). These practices may be an outcome of social agency where speakers are expected to engage in certain activities (again including language), which is considered to be a socialization into communities of practice (Ochs, Schieffelin 1995) (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 378). Consequently, identity is a result of habitus, which is determined by communities of practice that are not fixed and are ever changing (Bucholtz 2004 and Hall: 378). Therefore, the produced and practiced activities are not identical between all members of a cultural entity (since the basis of the determined practices differs from age, gender, and race), and it is impossible to say that a culture mirrors the language practices.

This becomes clearer in the next semiotic process of indexicality which “is a semiotic operation of juxtaposition where one entity points to another” (Bucholtz and
Hall 2004: 378). Indexicality derives from Peirce’s triadic model of signs that explains how meaning is interpreted. Peirce’s breakdown of semiotic signs is significant since the definition of indexicality refers to the relationship between Pierce’s object and sign. Icon, index and symbol are the “qualitative likeness between sign and its object” (Savan 1976:4-23). The index is “the sign related to its object via the object’s dynamic action on the sign, the symbol is “when the sign’s object is related to the sign primarily via the sign’s interpretant” (Savan 1976:4-23).

In the same way, “linguistic structures become associated with social categories not directly but indirectly through a chain of semiotic associations” (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 378). Since this step of indexicality is not self-evident, it results in the formation of social stereotypes based on language. The last process is ideology, which “organizes and enables all cultural beliefs and practices as well as power relations that result from these” (Bucholtz and Hall 2004:379). Indexicality functions as the process of turning practices into an ideological domain. The obscurity of the indexicality is one of the reasons that linguistic structures appear to be directly associated with social categories. Performance is the fourth process in Bucholtz and Hall’s review of construction of identity following practice, indexicality and ideology. It is considered to be “an aesthetic component available for evaluation” (Bauman 1977) (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 380).
Performance depends on ideology to render identity recognizable and legitimate and often highlights and exaggerates ideological associations (Bucholtz and Hall 2004:381).¹

Bucholtz and Hall’s terms of tactics of intersubjectivity are heavily influenced by Irvine and Gal’s three semiotic processes of *iconization, fractal recursivity and erasure.* These concepts illuminate the essentialization of identity construction through representation, ideology, and power relations. For Irvine and Gal, iconization becomes “the ideological representation of a given linguistic feature or variety as formally congruent with the group with which it is associated” (Irvine and Gal 2000:38). The process of iconization indicates that there is a developmental phase that occurs from the entity and the representation of that entity. *Fractal recursivity* is when the opposition in intragroup relations projects onto intergroup relations, and this fragmented structure allows identity to be produced and reproduced in both the intra and intergroup projects. *Fractal recursivity* occurs in response to the *iconization* and it “involves the projection of an opposition, salient at some level of relationship, onto some other level” (Irvine and Gal 2000:38). Finally, *iconization* and *fractal recursivity* inevitably reduces the original entity and creates an *erasure* which is “the process in which ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some persons or activities invisible” or the elimination of details that is inconsistent with a given ideological position (Irvine and Gal 2000:38). The process of erasure makes a distinction between the level of ideology against the

¹This follows the logic of Bucholtz’s idea of performance (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 381).
existence of an actual person or activity, and makes clear that there is an action taking place to exclude certain types of people to fit the ideology. Bucholtz and Hall notes that iconization is a form of essentialism since the actual practice may be removed from the imagined practices that ideology constructs (Bucholtz and Hall 2004:380).

2.4 Tactics of Identity Construction

Tactics of intersubjectivity provides a framework that describes why identity is created and further examines the social relations that individuals and groups exert on themselves and each other. Bucholtz and Hall define the following tactics in binary terms: adequation and distinction, authentication and denaturalization, authorization and illegitimation. All three binary forms have the potential of strengthening the ideology and power behind a dominant language and it also has the potential to subvert this authority.

The first and most relative binary term to the topic of this paper is adequation and distinction. Adequation is a “means of preserving community identity in the face of dramatic cultural change through this likeness” (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 383). It allows multilingual speakers to identify themselves within a place that speaks both languages. Adequation can describe the process of identity construction in the groups of émigrés who left the Soviet Union on visas that labeled them as Jewish. Despite the vast differences that existed between these individuals linguistically, religiously and culturally, the Soviet Jewish identity was built as an opportunity for those who wanted
to leave the Soviet Union. Also, the HIAV society and political organizations played a significant role in negotiating specific cases of people who wanted to leave the Soviet Union, although many who were on the visa did not identify themselves as Jewish (See chapter 1 of this paper). Once the émigrés arrived, this identity borne out of adequation continued in the same vein as the émigrés were identified based on the common language and religion, and thus an imagined community of the Russian Jewish diaspora materialized. On the other hand, distinction is where the salient differences occur and these distinctions are used to separate a group from another. Bucholtz and Hall writes that those with little hegemonic power tend to use this strategy (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 387).

Bucholtz and Hall explains that they chose to use authentication in the noun form instead of ‘authenticity’ in order to show the agency where the claim to realness is asserted, rather than to show one is more authentic than the other. Authenticity often manifests in attempts to form national identity, and in standardization of languages (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 385).

For example, in the 1920s, in the establishment of the Turkish Republic the revolutionary leader and first president of Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk banished the use of Ottoman Arabic Script and replaced it with the Latin alphabet. This was an attempt to build the Turkish national identity and concomitantly marginalize anyone who did not use the standardized language to the periphery. The standardization of
languages among other policies severed the connection that people may have had to their Ottoman past, including Islamic writings (where the religious writings, prayers and Koran were written in Arabic) (Brendemoen 1990: 454-94). This is how speakers activate essentialist readings in the articulation of identity and denaturalization. Denaturalization, on the other hand, challenges these essentialist assumptions. For example, the process of denaturalization has been studied in gender studies in great depth. Denaturalization can occur in the act of performance, when the proposed accepted or stereotyped identities are exaggerated, it challenges its assumptive connection to an individual’s identity (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 386).

Finally, authorization is legitimizing an identity through an institution or some authority figure. For example, the Australian aborigines used their language to show that they were part of one community in order to gain land rights even though the community is in fact multilingual and in fact, not tied to one language (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 386). An imagined identity was created to gain authorization. Examples where authorization occurs are in linguistic standardization, formal language and specialized jargon. Similar to authentication, authorization both contests and confirms dominant forms of power. On the other hand, illegitimation is the process of “removing or denying power that can support or undermine hegemonic authority”. The standardization of a language is an authorization of the standard language and illegitimation of the non-standard languages. Bucholtz and Hall illustrate the
illegitimization undermining hegemonic authority in the community of Germans living in Hungary. Because German is a language with economic benefits, the German Hungarians are able to illegitimize the authority of the Hungarian language (Bucholtz and Hall 2004: 387). The tactics of subjectivity reveal an interesting look at how identity is constructed and how tactics utilized in power relations explains the ideology that is formulated, iconicized, practiced and performed in the identity of nation states and politics.

     It is through the ideology of an imagined identity that the Russian diaspora is examined in the linguistic fields. I suggested how adequation is applied to the Russian diaspora and how émigrés identified themselves as part of the Russian diaspora as well as the way others labeled the group as the Russian diaspora. And essentialism appears when linguistic styles are treated as an equivalent to the entire Russian diaspora. This also results in the stagnation of the group disallowing the analysis to see the dynamic changes occurring in the speech community. Examining the speech communities and communities of practice will result in more accurate definitions of the linguistic styles of communication. We will further define the speech community and communities of practice that the Russian diaspora should be examined through as well as address the types of linguistic styles that are attributed to this multilingual community.

     Moreover, as it will become more evident in the later chapters, I believe that Holiday’s differentiation of small and large cultures is especially beneficial to the
discussion of the reconstruction of the Russian diaspora. Holliday writes that it has become the norm to consider cultures based on what he calls a “large culture paradigm” and instead suggests using a small culture perspective. When thinking and applying the large culture leads to make distinctions between groups based on ethnic, national and international cultural differences.

2.5 Speech Community and Communities of Practice

It is important to note that all language is communicated through a speech community or a community of practice. A speech community is “a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety” (Hymes 1974:43). Communities of practice (CoP) extend this definition outside of linguistic speech, and are defined as “groups whose joint engagement in some activity or enterprise is sufficiently intensive to give rise over time to a repertoire of shared practices” (Mcconnell-Ginet 1999:185). Speakers can be members of multiple speech communities and of CoP. In communities of practice, the members are subject to change and are not always part of the same community. Moreover, members in a CoP are not only subject to physical locations where the participants are in direct contact with each other, but they could be connected globally across borders.

Another important contribution to developing sociolinguistic theory was the concept of ‘communicative competence’. Dell Hymes wrote the following about the
importance of social behaviors: “A child from whom any and all of the grammatical sentences of a language might come with equal likelihood would be of course a social monster” (Hymes 1974: 75). This meant that a child, who merely learned the right grammatical words and structures would not be able to function normally in society. Rather, within the acquisition of language also contains an acquisition of social signals that determined the appropriate use of communication, which others in the same community also acquired. Communicative competence theory acknowledges that language is heavily influenced by surrounding social factors in a speech community and that it is subject to change. The concept enlarged the field of ethnographic studies of language in communities as there was a need to study the social behavior of specific communities by interacting with them and not merely theorizing them.

As sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics was still a burgeoning field, Weinreich’s theories during the 1950s served as a gateway into the concept of the social environment as an important factor in cross-cultural transfer, which he refers to as interference in language contact. He provided theories that related to the environmental influence of multilingual speakers on the language that they used. Weinreich wrote about interference as ‘deviation from the norms of either language which occurs in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language’ (Weinreich 1953: 1).

Andrews often cites Weinreich concepts of bilingualism and interference in language contact in his research.
He stresses the importance of addressing factors that are not purely concerning linguistics when studying bilingualism:

A full account of interference in a language contact situation, including the diffusion, persistence, and evanescence of a particular interference phenomenon, is possible only if the extra-linguistic factors are considered (Weinreich 1964: 3).

The sociolinguistic community addresses the study of languages in society with the accepted notions that multilingualism is common and attaches a valuable significance to these communities that use multiple languages. This is in spite of the monolingual perception that is given based on the dominant language due to the nation state ideology in countries such as England, Germany and France (Mesthrie 2000:38-39). There are in fact, around four to five thousand languages in the world but only about 140 nation-states. Also, half of the world’s population is bilingual (Romaine 1994:33-34).

The following is Kees de Bot’s definition of multilingualism:

Multilingualism refers to the existence of separate but interconnected subsystems in the larger language system. These subsystems interact constantly and continue to change due to variation in use and contact among the languages (De Bot 2009: 427).

Due to the dynamic nature of language, multilingualism is also dynamic and changes as the subsystems are in contact with each other. The fluidity of multilingualism also supports the constant changing of speech communities and therefore, the changes that occur in the identity that is formed.

2.6 The Russian Diaspora as Speech Communities

As mentioned before, the third wave Russian diaspora is made up of a number of different people, who have diverse backgrounds both in the previous community they
came from and the community they found themselves in the United States. These
diverse groups of people are seen as one speech community, the Russian diaspora, due
to their common language and period of time that they arrived in the country.
Moreover, the imagined community has an even stronger ideology due to both the
previously formed identity of an essentialized ethnic Russian and the common use of
the Russian language. Unfortunately, this identity creates a strong distinction from any
other type of social category that members may identify with and that are in conflict
with this identity. One could even say that identities of people who are from other soviet
republics, speaking non-Russian languages or even non-standard Russian appear
invisible and are eliminated in order for the iconicized identity to remain. This assumed
Russian diaspora is looked as one community and one of the linguistic styles that are
examined is the use of both Russian and English in a multilingual Russian-English
speaker. One of the interesting subjects that are looked at is first language attrition, the
effect of a second acquired language on an individual’s first language.

2.7 First Language Attrition

Primary language attrition is different from secondary language attrition. In
order to study the change of language, one needs to have a universal understanding of
the elements that are known in that first language, in other words, a baseline (Seliger
In primary language attrition, the stages of acquisition are known in grammatical constraints so it is possible to notice the changes that take place. It is however, sometimes difficult to tell whether or not the use of a secondary language in primary language use is L1 loss or simply the effects of language contact. For example, when there are conversations taking place among bilingual speakers, codeswitching and codemixing are expected to take place and therefore, are the external social expectations that result in certain types of language mixing (Bhatia and Ritchie 711, Pfaff 1979).

Within bilingualism, codeswitching is an integral part that emerges in all types of bilingual communities and language phenomenon that has been studied where there are two or more languages present in a speech community.

However, scholars have found that attrition can be distinguished when the codemixing occurs among monolinguals and the speaker does not have the ability to mix languages according to accepted norms (Seliger 1996: 611). For example, an example used by a L1 Hebrew speaker and his second language is English is used to exemplify this idea:

1) Ze lo ma sheaahn midabrim al
this not what that we (are) talking about
That’s not what we are talking about.

---

3 Other work done on L2 on L1 (Pavlenko, Jarvis, Cook, Romaine, Bhatia and Ritchie, Clyne, Andrews, Polinsky, Seliger).
In Hebrew, the prepositional word ‘al’ is not acceptable at the end of the sentence because it is always bound, and the placement at the final position would not be accepted. However, the speaker produces the sentence in this way because of its acceptability in English. This is what Seliger would consider to be a sign of language attrition as “the mixing leads to the nonobservance of language specific constraints of the borrowing language (L1)” (Seliger 1996: 611).

2.8 Essentialized Identity and Codeswitching

The study of codeswitching has been studied in depth by sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropologists (Gumperz 1972, Meyers Scotton 1994, Auer 1988, Milroy 1995). Codeswitching is a common occurrence in multilingualism and researchers have been attempting to find the functionality of codeswitching for decades. There have been important milestones in this research with the implementation of social settings such as participant, setting, and event, which were used to serve as strategies that would prompt the individual to codeswitch (Blom and Gumperz 1972: 409). These settings led to the term situational switching which is when the “alternation between varieties redefines a situation, being a change in governing norms, and metaphorical switching, where alteration enriches a situation, allowing for allusion to more than one social relationship within the situation” (Blom and Gumperz 1972: 409).4

4 Italics is my emphasis
Gumperz (1972) provides an example where these social settings could be applied is in a study carried out among residents in Hemnesberget, Norway. The informal dialect is Ranamal and the language used in educational settings is Bokmål. The students, who gathered in an informal setting at a house, were found to use the informal dialect Ranamal in conversation topics that were informal whereas they would switch to Bokmål when speaking more formal topics such as the academic arena. This switching occurred due to the change in topic which would be considered metaphorical switching. This explained the significant role in the motivation for codeswitching, rather than for arbitrary or insufficient ability of the speaker to communicate in one language.

Myers-Scotton (1988) took this a step further in providing a model called the Markedness model that could determine a speaker’s motivation to codeswitch because of a negotiation of power relations that could be deciphered by the predetermined context of a marked or unmarked language. Critics of the model have said that this model is essentialist in being able to predict the motivations of the speaker’s codeswitching based on previous assumptions made about the language and ethnic group, in other words, the group’s identity (Li Wei 1998: 158). Although the Markedness model provides a way to structure and organize the complicated use of codeswitching, the very nature of placing codeswitching into a formula consisting of associations made between the ethnic identity of the person and language choice places this method in a compromising position. Codeswitching within the Markedness model
has the potential to be misused when it is given significance based on the meanings given to the languages. I argue that the identity of the Russian diaspora is, in the same way codeswitching is, essentialized in the studies by having a preconceived definition of what loanwords mean within the diaspora.

The chapter was an exploration of Bucholtz and Hall’s theories on identity construction through semiotic processes and tactics of intersubjectivity. These terminologies allowed us to see the way that essentialism is prevalent in studies today. Tannen’s studies on gender differences demonstrated how it is possible to deconstruct essentialism through defining the previously assumed definitions and categories.

Defining the essentialism and its prevalence in sociolinguistics was important to acknowledge that it exists and that it occurs in every form and that there is a strong connection between language and identity. The problem of essentialism exists within every type of group that coalesces to identify themselves or is identified by others. We examined how the step of indexicality is invisible and the other forms of distinction become hidden and ‘erased’ to promote an ideological identity. Also, despite the complicated construction and multilayered identities that exist within the Russian diaspora, it is an identity that is viewed as one speech community. As a result, the linguistic aspects that are studied within this group may also produce essentialized conclusions in multilingual phenomenon in first language attrition and loan borrowings.
This is important to our paper and discussion because by understanding these terms of identity construction, we also understand how identity becomes essentialized and that this is a trend that can frequently found when associating language to the identity of a group. Now that the theoretical components are in place and we acknowledge that there are problems of essentializing identity in the Russian Diaspora, let us look at some practices of methodology within the linguistics and sociolinguistics field that will help us to contextualize the way that data is analyzed.
3. Best Practices in Data Collections

Assessing the various methodologies of collecting and analyzing data in cross-cultural studies in language plays a crucial role in maintaining objectivity. With a weak methodology, the data is compromised and the analysis is inaccurate. Unfortunately, when language is the source of data collected, it is easier to fall into a trap of the unconscious bias and result in projecting one’s assumptions on the subject. This can happen particularly in the field of discourse analysis, where ethnographic styles are utilized in language study. One of the difficulties that arise in methodology is maintaining that language is dynamic and that its meaning is ambiguous. This idea does not change for any subfield of linguistics or any other subfield for that matter.

In the next section, we will look at three studies that examine practices of methodology starting with the work of Deborah Tannen (1993). Then we will look at one of the key studies by linguist William Labov (1972), who is known for his variationist theory, and David Andrews (1999) who specifically looks at sociolinguistic work on the Russian Diaspora.

3.1 Tannen’s Methodology

Deborah Tannen’s use of methodology is worth examining because time after time, in every discourse analysis, she maintains the ambiguity of speech acts and its subjectivity to interpretation. I would like to review some of Tannen’s key points about the methodologies used to study individuals and groups based on gender and ethnicity.
in discourse analysis. In her book *Gender and Discourse*, she questions the methodology as well as the analyses that result from previous studies and refers to a methodology framework that is founded on looking at common misinterpretations of linguistic features, which she supports through several studies of her own. She overturns a major claim that men dominate women in conversation by looking at the communicative styles between genders. She redefines linguistic features to be interpretive in context rather than on a one-to-one basis. Through this critical investigation, one sees the social analysis of discourse studies with a fresh perspective.

Tannen uses the methodology that she adapted from her mentors Robin Lakoff and John Gumperz and considers the following methods as effective ways of conducting a study:

(1) tape recording naturally occurring conversations, (2) identifying segments where there might be an issue, (3) looking for culturally patterned differences in signaling meaning, (4) playing recording to participants, and (5) playing for other members of the same cultural group in order to discern a pattern of interpretation (Tannen 1994: 6).

In her book, Tannen demonstrates how she persistently uses these methodological approaches. Her first challenge is to look at men and women’s interaction from a different angle. There have been many studies that have proven the imbalance of power, attributing the dominant role to men and the inferior position to women due to their linguistic tendencies. Whereas previous work has shown that each of these linguistic strategies strictly signifies a sign of dominance or weakness, Tannen finds this analysis limiting and inadequate because she directs her attention to point to
three culturally patterned differences in signaling meaning. She reveals the polysemous nature of a speech act, where the speaker may intend solidarity and the listener perceives the intent to dominate. She further breaks down major assumptions about the speech styles in discourse analysis and shows that they are in fact relative to the context by applying point 3 to styles like *indirectness, interruption, silence, volubility, topic raising, and adversativeness*.

Another useful method she utilizes is point 2, which is to go back to recordings and identify segments that are problematic, which we will later discuss. Through this approach, I think she was able to redefine the fundamental understanding of the significance of interruption among men and women. Tannen’s reexamination of the interruptions that occurred in conversation allowed her to spot the bad definitions and pinpoint the good ones. What Tannen found was that overlapping and interruption must be distinguished since overlap is etic (from the outside) while interruption is interpretive. For example, there are acceptable and unacceptable (‘procedural’ versus ‘substantive’) types that are determined by the speaker’s perception, which are oftentimes determined by cultural perceptions (Tannen 1994: 58). Second, she defines interruption not as a single speech act but as a ‘joint production’ and cites other researchers who have agreed with this definition. She goes onto say that she found that many instances of overlapping were actually cooperative and not negatively perceived. This changes the entire discourse about men and women, challenging the assumption
that high frequency of interruptions by men does not necessarily mean that they are dominating in nature.

Finally, in chapter five, Tannen examines the issues of cultural variation and patterns of indirectness. Although this is a study that she admits are in its nascent stages and her subjects were not ideal candidates, her use of interviewing subjects after the study was significant. These are great examples of point 4 questioning participants of their perception and point 5 by questioning others in the same community how they perceived the recording. Tannen uses these two points in her conclusion: that communicative strategies are a reflection of an individual’s past connection and the key to what goes on in cultural assimilation. She concludes that “whenever people communicate they convey not only the content of their message but an image of themselves” (Tannen 1994: 192).

3.2 Labov’s Methodology

The second type of methodology will be examined was created by sociolinguist William Labov, who is known for his variationist theory. He opened many doors to the scientific study of linguistic variations in our speech communities and ties them to relevant social implications. Through looking at one of Labov’s most prominent work, the strength of his methodology can be seen through his explanation of cross cultural differences in language. Labov’s eminent work at Martha’s Vineyard shows how his practices insured uncompromising data. In this study (1962), Labov narrowed in on
specific linguistic variants in Martha Vineyard speech produced on the island in order to order to uncover the cause of differing pronunciations by certain groups of people.

Among the many linguistic variants he could have chosen in language, Labov chose the [ai] and [ay] diphthong based on three aspects he considers the most important in choosing a viable and important variable in a speech community. First, an item that is frequent should be chosen where the variable is distinctively heard and recorded. Second, the variable should be structural, and third, “the distribution of the feature should be highly stratified: … preliminary explorations should suggest an asymmetric distribution over a wide range of age levels” (Labov 1973: 8). Labov also mentions the importance of the word to be salient for the ones doing the study, as well as the participants “in order to study the direct relations of social attitudes and language behavior. But on the other hand, [he valued] immunity from conscious distortion, which greatly simplifies the problem of reliability of the data” (Labov 1973: 8). Labov was meticulous and precise in his efforts to mitigate the chances of an unconscious bias. Furthermore, he tried to create environments in interviews that would elicit natural speech with high frequency of the chosen variant.

The types of interviews he proposed were both informal and formal interviews. In order to study the feature systematically, he wrote that it was “necessary to devise interview schedules providing many examples of (ay) and (aw) such as casual speech, emotionally colored speech, careful speech, and reading style” (Labov 1973:12). In
formal interviews, there were questions concerning value judgments that elicited answers of emotionally stressed and unstressed variants and special reading and lists of words (LAME) that contained words with (ay) and (aw) phonemes. The informal interviews where they conversed with individuals in the streets in public were merely supplementary checks since they did not have as much value without the use of tape recordings.

In order to understand Labov’s findings, it is necessary to examine the methods. In his methodology, Labov looked at a number of social variables such as age, ethnicity, occupation, and the region of the island from which one came. The main finding was that native islanders from up-island and especially middle-aged young men of English descent distinctly pronounced the centralization of the diphthongs /ay/ and /aw/ so that it was pronounced more like /ai/ and /aw/. He concluded that the centralization by these groups was due to the fact that they wanted to distinguish themselves from summer tourists and claim their right as native islanders (Table 1.1) (Labov, 1973: 30).
Table 2: Centralization of (ay) and (aw) by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>(ay)</th>
<th>(aw)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Centralization of (ay) and (aw) by Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(ay)</th>
<th>(aw)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Table 2 and Table 3 from Labov, 1973: 23
Table 4: Centralization of Vowels (ay) and (aw) by Ethnic and Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age level</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>36  34</td>
<td>26  26</td>
<td>32  40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 60</td>
<td>85  63</td>
<td>37  59</td>
<td>71  100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 45</td>
<td>108 109</td>
<td>73  83</td>
<td>80  133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>35  31</td>
<td>34  52</td>
<td>47  88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>67  60</td>
<td>42  54</td>
<td>56  90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us look at one of these classifications, specifically, the ethnic groups. Among Labov’s participants there were 42 English descent, 16 Portuguese, and 9 Indian, and he provides a cultural background for each ethnic group. The first ethnic group was men of English descent, and those who spoke with a greater degree of centralization among young men lived in up-island and had decided to remain and work on the island versus the young men who lived in down-island and planned on leaving (Table 2.1). This was not particularly emphasized when talking about the other ethnicities, since as Labov pointed out, most of them stayed on the island throughout the year. The second ethnic group, those from Portuguese descent, showed a distinction between the older and

---

2 Table 2.2 and 2.3 from Labov, 1973: 26
younger generations but the younger generations had a high degree of centralization. Labov explained that it was due to their claim to prove their status as native islanders to others. The third ethnic group, those from Indian descent, was the least populated in Martha Vineyard and had married to non-Indian descent. Their results showed similar results between the older and younger generations as the Portuguese. The centralization for young men of Indiana descent showed that they had even higher centralization than the men of English descent.

These findings were the first in-depth ethnographic studies that found evidence supporting a connection between the choice of language and the speech communities. There is no denying that it was monumental to the study of sociolinguistic variants, leading others like Peter Trudgill to find significant findings on the linguistic variants within social class differences in the UK. Labov’s study was done in the sixties, and there are many now who see his approach as insufficient for more in-depth studies, due to limitation of classifications within speech communities.

3.3 Trudgill’s Methodology

Trudgill, like Labov, found correlations between speech variants and social identity in groups. His study was conducted in a speech community in Norwich (1972) and focused on the alternating use of the third person singular present tense. One would either use the standard form, ‘she sings’ or use the local dialect, ‘she sing’ without the –s inflection (Trudgill 1974:22). Trudgill uses the socioeconomic index to determine social
class, giving each informant an index score. The score was determined from a multiple-item index, which was based on Labov’s three-item index. Trudgill used the following six indicators: occupation; father’s occupation; education; housing; locality; and income (Trudgill 1978: 36). These indicators were determined based on the sociological work of others, and certain indicators were designated as more important than others.

Occupation is the best indicator of social position in any industrial society (Trudgill 1978: 37). Education and income were closely related to occupation, whereas housing and locality were less frequent but also used by sociologists as a social indicator. Finally, the income of the participant’s father was thought to reveal the social class in which one is born. Knowing the father’s income would also reveal the change of social class and enabled Trudgill to decipher whether social class had an effect on an individual’s linguistic styles. After assigning the various index scores to each indicator, Trudgill had five levels of social class: Middle-Middle class, Lower-Middle class, Upper-working class, Middle-working class and Lower-working class. His finding was that there was a large gap between the men who were Middle-middle class and upper working class, and that the former group was more likely to use the standard dialects (Table 2.2). The social class of the individual was determined by the individual’s father’s income. On the other hand, the working class spoke the nonstandard dialect because of their desire to associate with the lower working class. Interviews with the male participants on how
much they used standard dialect showed that those who were in the lower working class under-reported their use.

Table 5: Percentage of the Use of Third Person Singular by Social Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMC</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMC</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWC</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWC</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWC</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This led to Trudgill to further support his claim that men in the lower working class defined their identity away from the middle class. The problem, however, that arises when people are categorized based on such abstract categories such as father’s income and housing, is that it makes it easier to dictate their social identity on what that category may imply. For example, the housing score was assigned based on house ownership, age of house and house type. An owner-owned house was higher status than rented house and a newer house signified a higher status. Thus, Trudgill highlights the importance of closely observing how gender, class and age are defined are in each case.

---

3 Table 5 from Trudgill 1989: 62-63.
3.3 Methodology Practices in the Russian Diaspora

The third linguist we will look at is the work of David Andrews. Andrews writes in his book *Sociocultural Perspectives on Language Change in Diaspora*, about the way language change affects the third wave Russian community and the language interference that is occurring as a result both to their English and Russian. Studying language in diaspora communities proves to be more difficult because the social variables are not as stable. Since there are two languages and cultures in contact, these factors are constantly changing as well as their use, making it more difficult to study the same variant over time. Due to acculturation and assimilation of the speakers, as well as the initial differences in the cultures of the third wave émigrés, it is rather difficult to identify the speech communities.

In the chapter entitled *Third-Wave Loan Words, Neologisms and other Innovations*, Andrews looks at loan words and neologisms of Anglicisms in the speech of third wave Russian speakers. He does a comparative study, selecting from a large source of data collected in the last fifteen years in various third wave communities around the country and compares it to studies that he conducts himself. He does this in order to correlate his findings with previous ones and present new forms that he finds in his own studies. The following describes the types of methods he employs: recording natural conversation of informants’ homes, listening in on strangers’ conversation, and manually noting the ‘spontaneous speech of third-wave émigrés’. Andrews himself
admits the weakness of his methods, as most of his data was not recorded (Andrews 1999: 61).

The problem with these methods is evidently due to the subjectivity of his observations. For the data that was found to match with the previous found data, it may cause an observer to believe Andrews’ findings to be more reliable, but on the other hand, his use of previous data to compare to his own can indicate confirmation bias.

Here are a couple of examples he gives as comparative analysis. He compares a previous occurrence of the phrase в даун-таун v daun-taune ‘downtown’ and counters this with a phrase he recorded в самом даунтаун v samom dauntaun, ‘in the heart of town’ to show that the former borrowing declined whereas the latter did not. He proceeds to speculate that the speaker he recorded “most likely…chose to treat the borrowing as an indeclinable noun to underscore its foreignness and, along with that, the sociocultural differences between an American and Soviet city center” (Andrews 1999: 66). Here is another example he uses А другую собаку выпустить аутсайд?. A druguju sobaku vypustit’ autsajd? ‘Should we let the other dog go outside?’ The first explanation given for the use of the borrowing is that they were spoken in American contexts and therefore, the English word was more appropriate. The second explanation he gives is that there is an internal Russian motivation for using аутсайд autsajd. He again speculates that the speaker, who is from Moscow, “unconsciously avoids na dvor” and na ulice would not be fitting (Andrews 1999: 64). In both examples, he provides explanations that are
plausible based on cultural facts but that enters into the speaker’s metalingual processes without consulting the speaker himself.

Later, he does in fact question the participants about their choice of language to get the individual’s perspective. He observed the conversation of two industrial engineers, who previously worked together as engineers in Moscow and now worked at two different plants in the U.S. When they met up, they conversed in Russian about personal business but their conversation turned to exclusively English as they talked about their work. Andrews later questioned them about their choice of language to see why they choose to speak English. He did in order to find out their attitudes toward the use of English concerning terminology and whether or not employment played a role in their choice. This is certainly important to ask when a bilingual speaker code switches or uses word borrowings from another language. For an outsider to apply his own interpretation to the cultural reasons why the individual chooses the language would be unscientific (Andrews 1999: 75).

Having examined the previous methodologies by the various scholars, one can see similarities and differences in cross-cultural pragmatics that influence the analysis of the study. There are varying degrees of use of recording, interviewing participants’ metaphysical awareness, and employment of social categories.
3.4 Comparative Analysis

Tannen, Labov and Andrews record participants as a part of their study methods. As a part of the reliability and importance of recording participants, Labov specifically mentions in the same vein choosing a variable that occurs in frequency, and Tannen and Andrews also use this method. For example, Tannen studies the communication styles of overlapping and interrupting, body language among women and men (which are obviously fairly common and use frequent variables) and Andrews examines the lexicon use of daily speech used in the Russian diasporas in environments such as automobile, home, cuisine, Academe and employment.

However, whereas Tannen and Labov consistently use recordings as a necessary part of their study in order to seek out culturally patterned differences to signal meaning, Andrews uses manual notation and studies by other scholars in lieu of recordings. Although Andrews methods concisely summarizes the overall history of the use of Russian émigré speech communities and provides a window into the attitudes and beliefs of cross-cultural influences of second language on first language, his studies do not have sufficient empirical evidence to stand on its own.

Finally, Labov and Tannen use social categories such as gender, age and race to find significant differences between them. Tannen is careful not to attribute each type of linguistic feature to signify a characteristic of that particular gender, which is demonstrated through her method of replaying segments of the recording and also
playing back the recording to her participants and others in the same speech
community. She shows this through finding the difference between overlapping and
interrupting. Labov also believes in interviewing participants after the study in order to
gain perspective on the salience of the linguistic variable. Andrews only mentions one
case of finding significance in interviewing the speaker’s metalinguistic consciousness of
their chose between native and acquired language.

This chapter examined the differences that result from the types of
methodologies chosen by the mentioned scholars and in what ways the participants are
categorized. The approaches taken by Labov address the phonological variants that are
produced by native islanders on Martha’s Vineyard, using sound methodologies that
will support and corroborate the usage of the islanders’ vowel sounds. Trudgill’s
analysis of the plural marker –s in inhabitants of Norwich followed similar
methodologies. Despite the findings that were a significant work to that time period, the
division of social categories of the data created seems arbitrary and essentialist. Tannen
has similar methodologies to Labov and Trudgill that allow ways that keep the scholar
accountable through recordings and questioning participants. Furthermore, her
reexamination of data using these methodologies allowed her to question the categories
that have been made by previous assumptions made about gender differences. Andrews
studies looks at lexical discussion of the usage of the third wave Russian émigrés and
the analysis of previous studies are accurate summaries but at the same time, his
methods, which do not include recordings or interviews of participants, assumes the accuracy of these findings. Andrews uses the same methods of categorization of data. It is within the last study that we would like to focus more on, including other studies that have been previously conducted on the Russian émigré, in order to address questions about the social category that the Russian diaspora is placed in.
4. Data Analysis of the Russian Diaspora

There have been 10 published studies of lexical usage by the Russian adult émigré community in the United States during the Soviet period. More studies on the lexical usage by Russian émigré college students have been carried out in recent years (Brat 2001, Pavlenko 2003) but do not apply to our work as the time period we are looking at leads up to the breakup of the Soviet Union. The studies that specifically consider lexical borrowings from English into Russian diaspora speech communities are Olmstead (1986), D. Andrews (1988, 1999), and Benson (1957, 1960).

I will begin my analysis with a discussion of the methodology used by each study, followed by an analysis of the lexical items included in these studies and a comparison of the mentioned data with Soviet and other Russian Federation lexical sources. The dictionary sources I am using are Novoe v Russoj Leksike : Slovarnye Materialyj (1980) and Novoe v Russoj Leksike : Slovarnye Materialyj (1990), Slovar’ inostrannykh slov (1955), Slovar’ inostrannykh slov (1964), Slovar’ inostrannykh slov (1980), and Novye Slova I Slovari Novykh slov (1983).

My analysis will focus on a data set of 21 lexical items extracted from the works of D. Andrews, Olmstead, and Benson. Unfortunately, it is not perceptively clear the exact dates that the scholars elicited the data from. The dates range from 1984-1999,

---

1971-1981, and 1950s, respectively. The appendix provides the transcription and translation of each item that will be discussed in this section. Here is a list of the items in Cyrillic with their definitions with both definitions of the 1964 and 1980 edition for each entry:

1. АУТ [англ. Out вне; вон] – 1) положение в спортивных играх с мячом, когда мяч <<выходит из игры>>, т.е. вылетает за пределы установленной площадки; 2) команда судьи (рефери) в боксе, означающая, что упавший боксер объявляется вне боя, т.е. побежденным (см. нокаут).
3. АУТСАУДЕР [англ. Outsider] – 1) в капиталистических странах: а) предприятия какой-л. Отрасли производства, не входящие в монополистическое объединение предпринимателей этой отрасли (т. Наз. Дикие, посторонние); б) лица, спекулирующие на бирже, биржевые спекулянты-не-профессионал; 2) спортсмены, занимающие последние места в соревнованиях.
4. АПАРТМЕНТ [фр. < apartment квартира] – большая, роскошная комната, роскошная квартира. 1964
 АПАРТМЕНТ No entry for apartment in the 1980 version.
5. АПАРТА’МЕНТЫ [фр. < apartment квартира] - большое, роскошное помещение; *шутл. Квартира, комната. 1980
 АПАРТА’МЕНТЫ No entry for apartment in the 1964 version.
6. АВТОБАЗА – место стоянки и ремонта автомобилей и склад запасных частей и горючего. 1964
 АВТОБАЗА No entry for avtobaza in the 1980 version.
7. АВТОБУС [авто(мобиль) + (омни)бус] - многоместный пассажирский автомобиль общественного пользования, применяемый в городском и междугородном транспорте. 1964
 АВТОБУС [см. авто(мобиль) + (омни)бус] – многоместный пассажирский автомобиль вагонного типа, используемый для городского, пригородного, местного и междурегионного сообщения. 1980
8. АВЕНЬЮ [фр. avenue] - широкая улица, преимущ. Обсаженная по обеим сторонам деревьями (название, принятое во Франции, Англии, США и некоторых других странах). 1964
 АВЕНЬЮ [фр. avenue] в широкая обычно. обсаженная деревьями улица (название, принятое во Франции, Англии, США и нек-рых других странах). 1980
9. БЕК [англ. back задний] — защитник – игрок в спортивных играх с мячом, играющий на последней линии, вблизи ворот своей команды. 1964
1. БЕК [англ. back задний] уст. в спортивных играх с мячом – защитник. 1980

11. КОНДОМИНАТ, КОНДОМИНИУМ [лат. condominium кон с, вместе + dominium владение] – 1) совместное обладание, господство; 2) в международном праве- осуществление на данной территории государственной власти совместно двумя или несколькими государствами; обычно завершалось либо разделом территории, либо захватом ее одной из сторон. 1964

КОНДОМИНИУМ, КОНДОМИНАТ [лат. condominium кон с, вместе + dominium владение] - совместное обладание, господство; в международном праве – совместное осуществление на данной территории государственной власти двумя или более государствами. 1980

12. ФЕШЕНЕБЕЛЬНЫЙ [англ. fashionable] – роскошный, модный, изысканный. 1964

ФЕШЕНЕБЕЛЬНЫЙ [англ. fashionable] – отвечающий требованиям лучшего вкуса и моды, изысканный. 1980

13. ФРОНТ [нем. Front<фр. front буква лоб] – 1) воен.: а) сторона строи или боевого расположения войск, к которой военнослужащие (в строю) или части обращены лицом, имея правый фланг с правой стороны, а левый – с левой; б) район, где расположены действующие войска (в противоп. тылу); в) высшее оперативное объединение, состоящее из нескольких армий, под началством одного командующего; 2) участок массовых действий (например, ф.работ), а также область какой-л. деятельности (например, идеологический ф.); 3) атмосферный ф.- более или менее узкая переходная зона, расделяющая две воздушные массы: теплую и холодную. 1964

ФРОНТ [нем. Front<фр. front буква лоб] – 1) воен.: а) высшее оперативное объединение вооруженных сил на континентальном театре военных действий; б) обращенная к противнику сторона боевого порядка (оперативного построения) войск; в) сторона строи, к которой военнослужащие (в строю) или части обращены лицом (машины – лобовой частью); г) б) район, где расположены действующие войска в противоположность тылу; 2) участок массовых действий (например, ф.работ), а также область какой-л. деятельности (например, идеологический ф.); 3) атмосферный ф.- более или менее узкая переходная зона, расделяющая две воздушные массы: с разной температурой в атмосфере; тропический ф. – атмосферный фронт между тропическим и экваториальным воздухом. 1980

14. ПАРК [англ. park] – 1) большой декоративный сад, роща с дорожками для гуляния, с площадками для игр и т.п.; 2) место для стоянок и ремонта железнодорожных, трамвайных вагонов, автобусов и т.п.; 3) совокупность подвижного состава в той или иной отрасли транспортного хозяйства (например, автомобильный п.-наличные автомобили); 4) воен. а) место, оборудованное для стоянки боевых, специальных и транспортных машин, для обслуживания их и проведения при них занятий; б) стационарный или подвижной склад военно-технического имущества, иногда включающий также ремонтные мастерские; в) организационная единица в составе транспортных частей, ведающая подвозом боеприпасов и др. военно-технического имущества. 1964
ПАРК [англ. park] – 1) большой сад или роща с дорожками для гулянья, с цветниками, площадками для игр и т.п.; 2) место для стоянки и ремонта ж.-д., трамвайных вагонов, автобусов и т.п. (см. также депо 2); 3) совокупность однотипного подвижного состава (напр., автомобилный п.) или средств производства какой-л. отрасли промышленности (напр., станочный п.); 4) воен. территория, оборудованная для хранения, обслуживания и ремонта бронетанковой, автотракторной, артиллерийской и другой техники, а также стационарный или подвижной склад военно-технического имущества, иногда включающий также ремонтные мастерские. 1980

СЕЙФ [англ. safe букв. сохраненный, безопасный] – 1) несгораемый металлический шкаф или ящик для хранения секретных документов, денег, ценных бумаг и драгоценностей; 2) в банке – помещение (комната, подвал) с такими шкафами или ящиками. 1964.

СМОГ [англ. smog < smoke дым, копоть + fog густой туман] – густой туман, смешанный с дымом, копотью и т.п. в больших городах и промышленных центрах. 1980

СОФА [фр. sofa < ap.] – низкий, широкий диван. 1964

СОФА [фр. sofa-ap.] – низкий, широкий диван. 1980

ТАКСА [нем. Taxe<лат. taxare оценивать] – точно установленная государством или органами самоуправления расценка товаров или размер оплаты труда и улуг. 1964

ТАКСА [нем. Taxe<лат. taxare оценивать] – точно установленная государством или органами самоуправления расценка товаров или размер оплаты труда и улуг. 1980

ТРЕН [фр. traîne] – то же, что шлейф 1. 1964

ТРЕН [фр. traîne] – то же, что шлейф 1. 1980

УИК-ЭНД [англ. week-end < week неделя + end конец] – время отдыха с субботы до понедельника; поездки, развлечения в это время (в Англии, США и нек-рых других странах). 1980

ЯРД [англ. yard] – английская мера длины, равная 91,4 с.м. 1964

ЯРД [англ. yard] – единица длины в английской системе мер, равная 3 футам, или 91,44 см. 1980

ЯХТА [англ. yacht<гол. Jacht] – парусное, моторное или паровое судно различной формы и размера, служащее для спортивных целей (гонок) или для любительских плаваний. 1964

Once I have completed the comparative analysis with Russian-based sources of contemporary standard Russian, I will suggest an alternative explanation for understanding some of the data. My analysis will show that many of the so-called "new" words that developed in diaspora speech communities were already present in contemporary standard Russian in the Russian Federation and Soviet Union as attested in Russian lexical sources of that period."

The cases I will be examining at are focusing mostly on spoken word by the Russian adult émigrés where Russian and English are spoken. I am looking at several studies that address the phenomenon of lexical borrowing of English that occurs in Russian émigrés speech in America. One of the most important aspects to discuss before looking at the data is the scholars’ methodology and differentiation between a borrowed word as part of the Soviet lexicon (Contemporary Standard Russian, or CSR) and a new borrowed word in émigré speech (Contemporary American Russian, or CAR). Afterward, I will provide my own interpretation based on my research using Soviet dictionaries. CSR spoken by the people living in the Soviet Union and is currently the official language of the Russian Federation. CAR is spoken in the United States by Russian émigré speakers, who are in speech communities in the United States. Olmstead, Andrews and Benson consider that there are stages of CAR. As time goes on and the speaker is more assimilated into American culture, the spectrum reflects this in the language lexically, syntactically and phonologically.
4.1 Background of Soviet Dictionaries

The sources that were chosen for the data analysis are dictionaries that were published in the Soviet Union between 1955-1990. The two main dictionaries that contained the most words were from *Slovar’ inostrannykh slov* printed in 1964 and 1980. The 1964 edition was printed by Izdatel’stvo Sovetskaja enciklopediia ‘Publishing House Soviet Encyclopedia’ in Moscow and the latter printed in 1980 by Russkij jazyk ‘Russian language’ also in Moscow although the editors are the same. There are several interesting things to note about this dictionary. As one would expect, the earlier 1964 edition did not contain several words that were found in the 1980 editions. However, there were also several occasions where words that were in the 1964 edition were no longer in the dictionary. Second, it is important to note that the word entries appear in both editions but either have additional definitions that expand from the previous edition’s entry or eliminate certain entries. These editorial alterations are important to know when scholars are intent on finding the semantic of the borrowed word in the Russian language.

The latter two sources are *Novoe v Russoj Leksike: Slovarnye Materialy* 1980 and 1990 editions, edited by the *Akademija nauk SSSR* ‘Academy of science USSR’ and published by Russkij jazyk ‘Russian language’. The books list words that are considered to be new words and even words that have not been included in the dictionary. They also provide contexts in which the new words have been used in a very specific Soviet
context. The last source is Novye Slova I Slovári Novykho slov and printed by the Academy of Science in 1983. However, I only found one lexical item (аутсайдер) among the 20 listed in this edition.

4.2 Soviet Lexicon

I would like to make clear that all of the scholars write a section about the preexisting Soviet words that are already part of the Soviet lexicon. Due to the research on these words, Andrews, Olmstead and Benson initially exclude the foreign borrowed words (pre-émigré words) from the list of words before analyzed as borrowed émigré words. However, despite these precautions, I have found several words that should have been categorized differently. The scholars might have overlooked or perhaps assumed that the words are new Anglicisms in émigré speech or assumed the words simply were not used often enough in 'Russian society' to be considered part of the standard language. The following sections will review the scholars’ analysis of selected words that I have found to have different interpretations.

There have been a number of studies that looked at the Russian diaspora as a whole to examine the influence of English borrowings in the Russian speaker’s language. In Andrews’ (1988) dissertation, he writes about the language use of the third wave Russian diaspora:

English has already begun to influence the Russian speech of the third emigration. While they still maintain their native language, it unquestionably differs from the language they left behind in the Soviet Union as a result of new material things, concepts and experiences in the United States (Andrews 1988: 3).
The main idea in Andrews’ work aims to identify specific words that are affected by various new material things, concepts and experiences by Soviet émigrés. Andrews makes a good point as he continues to comment on the idea that “a living language adapts to the needs of its users” (Andrews 1999: 3). In other words, the importance of environment in the changes in language, and he acknowledges the foundational principle of the dynamic nature of language (Jakobson 1985:104). However, in the very next page, he seems to provide a controversial view of this perception of language. Andrews writes that he agrees with Olmstead in that “both Russian and American English have changed relatively little in the past few decades, and many instances of language interference in third-wave Russian were also common to the first and second emigrations” (Andrews 1988: 4).² There are two ways in which we can interpret this statement above to mean that Andrews was generally referring to the phonological and morphological changes that appear in Russian émigré speech.

On the other hand, if this broad statement is referring to lexical changes that have taken place, it is inaccurate: “According to Verbickaja (2001: 5), 9,000 lexical borrowings into CSR are registered between 1960-85, while almost 2,000 per year have been registered since 1986” (E. Andrews 2001:5), and also Roth supports this statement when he writes in the late 1980s that “… nowadays it is mainly English, that is to say American English, from which the Russian language receives new lexical material” (Roth

---

² He follows this statement by saying these common qualities are classic examples such as brat’ kurs and klass (Andrews 1988: 3).
1986: 107). Andrews and Olmstead data reveals important trends used by Russian émigré speakers but the statement above reveals that they treat Russian and English as languages that have hardly changed. By treating the two languages as two separate systems, it will also be clear that the examples they used referring to specific individuals result in standardizing the example to a characteristic of the Russian diaspora as a whole.

4.3 Benson’s Methodology

Benson (1957, 1960) compares the English loanwords that are used in American Russian, using examples from the immigrant Russian press as well as examples from the Russian speaking population in Cassville, New Jersey. He himself checks dictionaries of modern Russian and Soviet dictionary of loan words to eliminate borrowings that already existed in the lexicon. After he eliminated the words, Benson lists how he categorizes the words by considering the following:

1) borrowed word 2) English translation 3) indication if the loan is an extension, loan translation or hybrid compound; 4) enumeration of meanings of the SR original in case of extension or element-by-element translation of a loan translation if it does not coincide with item 2; hybrid compounds analyzed in detail (Benson 1957:258).

Benson’s data is from the fifties and sixties, so I looked at the 1957 edition of *Slovar’ inostrannykh slov*. I also found there are records of select words in the Russian National Corpus (RNC) from Benson’s in literature and spoken language in the Russian language during this time period. The appendix all the same defines words that Benson’s data finds to be only CAR words.
4.3.1 Benson’s Data

In his article on the American influence on the immigrant Russian press, Benson uses the methods (1-4) explained above to thoroughly analyze the English borrowed words in American-Russian Speech and distinguish those that are not part of the Soviet Russian lexicon. Despite this thorough look, I argue that his interpretations of the meaning of these words are debatable.

Benson considers there are three possible explanations for the use of the borrowed loan words. The first group of words consists of ‘unnecessary’ loans because there are clear SR equivalents. Benson mentions that some of these unnecessary loans in English are “obviously made when an already existing word was rarely used in the homeland because of cultural conditions” (Benson 1957: 261). On the other hand, the second group consists of words that have an “obvious need” to use new terms in English when referring to certain words like dzuk boks ‘jukebox’, frizer ‘freezer’, kvorta ‘quarter’ since these objects are American concepts and do not exist in the USSR (Benson 1957: 261). However, I think one cannot simply say that if English words are used, it means that it is solely due to the idea that it is an American concept and therefore, this word and concept does not exist in the Russian language. For example, let us look at the words among the list of words that Benson considers to be ‘unnecessary’ loans such as apartment and disk. According to the 1955 edition, both disk and apartment are found to denote the same meanings as they do in English:
I am not questioning the fact that Benson considers words such as *apartment* and *disk* to be words that were used in English with meanings that are applicable to the émigré’s life that differed from life in the Soviet Union. However, there should not be assumptions that the Soviet lexicon was devoid of this word lexical word. The ambiguity of whether a word is ‘unnecessary’ or ‘obvious’ begs the question of how the participants’ lexicon is identified.

### 4.4 Olmstead’s Methodology

Olmstead (1986) focuses on the effects of English words and phrase choices on Russian. His subjects include the Russian immigrant press, literature and participants who are considered to be Russian émigré. Olmstead devotes a section to discuss that people who are considered to be Russian émigrés are diverse, but does not mention in his methodology section, which republics or regions the participants come from nor the ages or education level. I will discuss the sources, stages of assimilation and the categorization of the loanwords. Olmstead’s sources of data are from the following:

1) everyday unselfconscious speech, unobtrusively recorded 2) elicitation from CAR speakers of features they themselves have consciously noticed in their own speech... 3) discussions in the émigré press of the fortunes of the Russian language... 4. Examples from the émigré press...5) examples from émigré literature...6) available secondary literature... (Olmstead 1986:103).

---

3 Refer to Appendix F
The sources that are used can be categorized in three broad stages of assimilation, which describe the progression that a person goes from foreign to assimilated and uses these stages to categorize the words used by Russian émigré speakers. **Stage 1** is defined as the beginning stages of the speaker’s introduction to the new language. The next stage occurs when the speaker uses Americanisms more frequently in their native language. And as the progression draws closer to the assimilated side of the spectrum, the speaker is less aware of any foreign association with the Americanism. The last stage in **stage 3** is considered to be speech spoken that only the historical or comparative linguist would identify anything unusual about their language. Based on the assimilation spectrum, Olmstead studies the Russian émigrés of the third wave\(^4\) that use words that would be considered part of the **stage 2** assimilation.\(^5\)

Almost all of these examples are what Olmstead considers are intermediate **stage 2 formations,** which I will also examine. The following criteria guide Olmstead in determining what would be considered a stage 2 post-émigré borrowing (Olmstead 1986: 99).

Olmstead observes the four ‘tendencies’ that post-émigré speech exhibits that enables one to distinguish Contemporary Standard Russian from contemporary American Russian (Olmstead 1986: 103). The first two points out that CAR occur more

\(^4\) He defines the third wave as the most recent emigration in 1980 according to the definition that is given by (Ripp 1984:1).

\(^5\) Andrews also adopts this standard of measurement and considers all of his subjects to be stage 2 (CAR II).
frequently through “vocal/spoken channels” and also “represent an overall higher text-frequency than in CSR” (Olmstead 1986: 103). The latter two points indicate that CAR tends to have more than just lexical borrowings with morphological and syntactic assimilation, and CAR tends to have “a higher proportion of ‘gratuitous’ borrowings—those that on the face of it seem unmotivated” because there is a “perfectly adequate native Russian equivalent” (Olmstead 1986: 103). Interestingly, this is a similar point that Benson makes in his interpretation that the words are ‘unnecessary loans’.

Just like Benson does, Olmstead acknowledges that there are pre-émigré borrowings (CSR) that have already been introduced into the Russian language. He mentions the difficulty of differentiating the pre-émigré words with the post émigré borrowings as they often similarly assimilate. Olmstead states that the groups that use an exaggerated amount of English borrowings should be considered important but at the same time, are considered to be ‘atypical subcultures’ in the Soviet urban life. The two that Olmstead mentions “are united by…the exaggerated role that foreignisms play in their language” (Olmstead 1986: 100). The first subculture consists of semioticians, who heavily use Anglicisms in publications in Tartu, Moscow and Leningrad, and the second group consists of younger teenagers and young adults who use Anglicized words as slang and jargon. Olmstead references these subcultures in order to show usages of Anglicisms that are unusual and infrequent in CSR. It is important to note how

---

these spheres are considered to be non-standard. Besides the two spheres mentioned, there have been other studies that have addressed similar types of ‘atypical’ spheres with a high frequency use of foreign borrowed words such as the technological and science industries (Grabowska 1973:185-201); sports terminology and Soviet youths (Schmemann 1984: 4), currency black-marketeers\(^7\) (Roth 1986:108), musicians and English-speaking Soviet citizens (Roth 1986:108) and as Superanskaja puts it, “В XX в. Английский язык в России становится основным источником заимствования новых технических, политических, спортивных и прочих терминов.” (Superanskaja 1968: 13). It is worth mentioning these spheres as I think it brings a valuable point in how the perception of these spheres creates a binary opposition between the uncommon and the standard Russian speaker.

4.4.1 Olmstead’s Data

In Olmstead’s data, the lexical borrowings include nouns, verbs, semantic interference, syntactic interference and code-switching. He lists the words and phrases in each of these mentioned sections grouped in nouns, verbs, phrases, and codeswitched words. In the noun section, a long string of words are classified as new post-émigré words due to semantic differences, or in other words, semantic extension. Among the words listed, I would like to look at the following words that Olmstead mentions: tren

---

\(^7\) Examples Roth uses include loans such as *baksy* ‘dollars’, *blek* ‘black man’, *klouz* ‘clothes’ (Roth 1986: 108)

\(^8\) Translation: “In the twentieth century, the English language becomes the basic source of new technical, political, sports and other expressions.”
‘avenue’, kondominijum ‘condominium’, sofa ‘sofa’ all appear in both the SIS (1964) and SIS (1980) albeit some with slightly different forms or definitions. In the dictionary, the meaning for train appears as трен in both editions as “ТРЕН [фр. traine]: то же, что илойф 1”. Next, there are two lexical items I would like to discuss for the loanword bas. Here are three entries from SIS:

AVTOBAZA – место стоянки и ремонта автомобилей и склад запасных частей и горючего” and the second entry “АВТОБУС [авто(мобиль) + (омни)бус] - многоместный пассажирский автомобиль общественного пользования, применяемый в городском и междугородном транспорте” and БАС [ит. basso букв. низкий] – муз. 1) самый низкий мужской голос; 2) певец, обладающий таким голосом; 3) низкий голос в музыкальном произведении; 4) духовой или струнный инструмент, исполняющий самые низкие партии” (all from the 1964 edition).

The first word is a location for buses to stop for repairs, the second is an actual bus and the third is the word for ‘bass’ low voice range. The interpretation for the last four words apartment, kondominium, aven’u, sofa is more straightforward as the forms from Olmstead’s sources are in the exact form that we find in the Soviet dictionary and can be found as апартмент, апартаменты, кондоминиум, авенью, and софа respectively. Remember that these words are considered to be loan word borrowings:

АПАРТМЕНТ [фр. < apartment квартира] – большая, роскошная комната, роскошная квартира”(1964) and “АПАРТА’МЕНТЫ [фр. <apartment квартира]- большое, роскошное помещение; "шутл. Квартира, комната” (1980); АВЕНЬЮ [фр.

---

9 Olmstead does not specifically refer to these words and interpret as Andrews does. The words front-jard is discussed later. The definitions of these words can be found in the appendix on page 59.
10 Tren [fr. Traîne]: ‘the same as, train’
11 Refer to Appendix F.
avenue] - широкая улица, преимущ. Обсаженная по обеим сторонам деревьями (название, принято во Франции, Англии, США и некоторых других странах). (1964); КОНДОМИНАТ, КОНДОМИНИУМ [лат. condominium < con, вместе + dominium владение] – 1) совместное обладание, господство; 2) в международном праве- осуществление на данной территории государственной власти совместно двумя или несколькими государствами; обычно завершалось либо разделом территории, либо захватом ее одной из сторон” (1964); СОФА [фр. sofa<ap.] – низкий, широкий диван (1964).12

For the word apartment, there are two different versions depending on the dictionary: in the 1964 edition, there exists apartment, in the 1980 edition, it is apartamenty. Olmstead considers that all of these words are newly borrowed words and considered to be pre-émigré words that were recorded as words which had found its way into CSR, either due to semantic extension of the Soviet meaning or because it did not exist in the Russian speaker’s vocabulary. The definitions of each of the words above shows the same meaning as it does in English. Rather than dismissing these words as post-émigré words, we should consider the possibility that the émigré speakers were using it from their Russian lexicon. I believe that Olmstead accurately categorizes these words as semantically extended, in the sense that the word used in an American context relating to the life of the Soviet émigré speaker; however, by acknowledging that the word is a semantically extended word, it dismisses any notion that this word existed as a part of the Soviet lexicon (which I just demonstrated that it was a part of). Therefore,
this process reduces findings in Soviet culture where these words are marginalized and part of an atypical subculture.

4.5 Andrews’ Methodology

As mentioned in Chapter 3, Andrews’ study (1988, 1999) comprises of data gathered over a period of fifteen years. He mentions in his dissertation that all the participants who he interviewed “were familiar with the standards of the contemporary literary language, based largely on the usage and pronunciation of educated speakers in Moscow and Leningrad (even those who were not actually reared in either of the two cities)” (Andrews 1988: 3-4). He also mentions that some of his participants are Slavistics specialists. Andrews focuses on looking at words that are loanwords, neologisms, and borrowings used by third wave Russian émigrés (the third wave that Andrews is referring to is émigrés) based on theories and definitions of what Weinreich (1979) refers to as language interference, Bloomfield’s (1933) definition of word borrowing, Olmstead’s stages of assimilation (1986), and Krysin’s (1965) categorization between foreign words and borrowed words. Andrews’ research on the topic is thorough both within previous studies that have been specifically on the language changes that includes all linguistic structures including morphological, phonological and lexical changes in Russian émigré speech in the United States and also on English and foreign borrowings in the Soviet Union.
4.5.1 Andrews’ Data

Andrews uses sections on “extra-linguistic factors” in Weinreich’s *Language and Contact*, discussed in Chapter 2 of this paper. Andrews discusses Weinreich’s philosophy about the individual bilingual, analysis of a bilingual group in a community such as the Russian émigré group, and his observations on borrowing language. He also reviews commonly known classic examples of studies that were carried out on Anglicisms in Russian émigré speech. Andrews’s studies differ from others because he focuses on the internal and external motivations that are based on an interest of examining “semantic and/or sociocultural factors which facilitate language interference” (Andrews 1999: 31, footnote 29). The words that are referenced as loanwords by Andrews are *parkovat’*, *fešenebel’nyi*, *smog*, and *sejf*.

Andrews mentions hybrid compounds which is "the addition of a native affix to a foreign root" (Andrews 1999: 32), and he notes that the Russian language has assimilated foreign words just like émigré language has also assimilated loanwords.

Andrews considers the word парковат’ *parkovat’* ‘to park’ to be a hybrid compound because it is an assimilated word from the English word park and the infinitive verb suffix оват’ *ovat’*. He considers low-frequency words that were used in the Soviet Union but used frequently by émigrés in the United States as an émigré Anglicism: “Far more important is the actual use of the word in the living colloquial

---

14 I will mention another hybrid compound later in the chapter regarding the word *bek-jard* and *front-jard*
language of the pertinent speakers” (Andrews 1999: 21). He supports this argument by two examples парковат’ *parkovat’* ‘to park’ and фешенебельный *fešenebel’nyi* ‘fashionable’, which he considered were low-frequency words. For the word парковат’, he supports his statement by the fact that it only appeared in the *Novae solve i značenija* ‘New Words and Meanings’ in 1984, and it did not appear the Ožegov dictionary until 1990. I also did not find any listing of парковат’ in the dictionaries, but the word *park* was listed with several meanings. I find (2)-(4) the most important:

ПАРК [англ. *park*] – 2) место для стоянок и ремонта железнодорожных, трамвайных вагонов, автобусов и т.п.; 3) совокупность подвижного состава в той или иной отрасли транспортного хозяйства (напр., автомобильный п.-наличные автомобили); 4) воен. а) место, оборудованное для стоянки боевых, специальных и транспортных машин, для обслуживания их и проведения при них занятий; б) стационарный или подвижной склад военно-технического имущества, иногда включающий также ремонтные мастерские. (SIS 1964).

Andrews impartially explains that scholars and émigrés speakers’ argue that this word парковат’ *parkovat’* was in fact used in the Soviet Union. Andrews even admits that he was approached by an émigré speaker at a conference who said that “everyone had been using these words at least since the early 1960s” (Andrews 1999: 21, footnote 13). But Andrews remains unmoved and reiterates that this was a low-frequency based on the fact that it appears in the 1990 edition of the Ožegov dictionary. Moreover, he writes that he finds the word фешенебельный in 1968 as ‘fashionable, deluxe’ but also says that it was little used. The definition I found in SIS (1964) was similar

---

15 Refer to Appendix F.
“ФЕШЕНЕБЕЛЬНЫЙ [англ. fashionable] – роскошный, модный, изысканный and more thoroughly defined in (SIS 1980) as “ФЕШЕНЕБЕЛЬНЫЙ [англ. fashionable] – отвечающий требованиям лучшего вкуса и моды, изысканный (SIS 1980).” The finding in the 1980 dictionary aligns my argument with the other scholars and émigré speaker, who believe that these words were more common than Andrew believes to be.

This will be a continual pattern that is shown in Andrews’ interpretations in that although his dictionary definitions often parallel my own, his interpretation stays within the framework that categorized the different types of loanwords. Andrews uses evidence of the uncommon use of the word in the Soviet Union and current use in the United States by the Russian Diaspora to indicate that words such as fesenebel’nyi and parkovat’ are émigré borrowings. The evidence that shows high-frequency use should not override the use of the words in the Soviet Union. The following word demonstrates that when a loanword is not considered to be used because of its infrequency in Soviet Union, the influence of English on Russian can be misconstrued.

Andrews considers the following word смог smog ‘smog’ as one of the “idiosyncratic and/or regional usages” that first gained usage in Southern California before spreading to other areas in the country. He mentions that the word was not used frequently in the Soviet Union and that “its use by émigré speakers undoubtedly a contributing factor” to its appearance in dictionaries of foreign words and in a English-

---

16 Refer to Appendix F.
Russian dictionary in the eighties (Andrews 1999: 68). What is interesting about this is that *smog* appears in SIS in the 1980 edition:

СМОГ [англ. *smog* < *smoke* дым, копоть + *fog* густой туман] — густой туман, смешанный с дымом, копотью и т.п. в больших городах и промышленных центрах. (1980)

The fact that it is in the Soviet edition in 1980 means that it was already a part of the Soviet lexicon during that time and exists not only to the influence of émigré speakers of English on Russian speakers back in the Soviet Union.

Lastly, Andrews reviews the sentence *это было место совсем сейф*, *eto bylo mesto sovsem seif* ‘it was quite a safe place’ in the context of referring to the safety concerns of a certain area of the city. Andrews explanation is that it is not gratuitous but there is a psychological factor involved in using *seif* and that “most Soviet city-dwellers, whether attributable to a lower crime rate or simply to a lack of pertinent statistics, had virtually no such concept” of what are safe or unsafe areas of a city (Andrews 1999: 62). This could provide as an explanation for the usage of *seif* in this context, although there is no indication that Andrews’ participant came from a city that defined the city as described above or that the participant currently lived in such a city. Moreover, it is even more difficult to claim that these psychological factors can be applied to Russian speaking émigrés from a Soviet city. I would like to point out the external motivation referred to above. As Andrews mentions, the word *seif* meaning ‘safe, metal strongbox’

---

17 Smog- [англ. *Smog* < *smoke* дым, копоть + *fog* thick fog] – thick fog, mix with smoke, soot and т.п. in big cities and industrial centers (SIS 1964) and also in SIS (1980).
has existed in Standard Russian. According to both the SIS (1964) and the SIS (1980), *seif* is defined as Andrews defines the word:

СЕЙФ [англ. safe букв. сохраненный, безопасный] – 1) негораемый металлический шкаф или ящик для хранения секретных документов, денег, ценных бумаг и драгоценностей; 2) в банке – помещение (комната, подвал) с такими шкафами или ящиками (1964).

Notice in the etymology of this word, however, it is written as the following:

“[англ. safe букв. сохраненный, безопасный]” (SIS 1964: 579). The noun *seif* is defined as an object that keeps valuables safe and also to be without danger. I would argue that there is a stronger connection between the characteristics of the Russian noun *seif* that is provides a place without danger and the adjective that describes a safe place rather than the psychological reason that Andrews suggests and he implies that all Soviet émigrés from cities would carry this attitude. I argue more analysis should be focused on previous existing definitions of *seif*.

4.6 Additional Examples

The following examples are ones that both Andrews and Olmstead use. Andrews’ interpretations are particularly interesting as he accounts for the émigré’s use of the word through socio-psychological analysis due to the dismissal of a lexical one.

The first example that was also mentioned in the previous chapter is the word *autsajd*

---

18 My translation. Seif [eng. safe. literally secure, without danger] 1) metal shelf or box for safekeeping of secret documents, money, valuable papers or valuable; 2) At a bank- a facility (a room, basement), with such shelves or boxes.
‘outside’. Andrews and Olmstead both observe the word *autsajd* as a borrowing in émigré speech. Andrews’ observation is that the speaker who was from Moscow avoided the use of the Russian word for outside ‘na dvor’ because it was considered non-standard and tainted with a rural connotation. There is also another instance that is interesting in the use of the word *na autsajde*. The word is used to indicate the outside instead of the Russian equivalent *na ulice* (meaning literally on the street). The *aut* ‘out’, *autsaid* ‘outside’ and *autsaider* ‘outsider’ are listed in SIS (1964). Andrews does mention in his footnotes that the word *aut* existed as a sports terminology but does not mention the existence of the word *autsaid* and *autsaider*20. The following words *аут*, *аутсайд* and *аутсайдер* are in the dictionary:

АУТ [англ. Out вне; von] – 1) положение в спортивных играх с мячом, когда мяч <<выходит из игры>>, т.е. вылетает за пределы установленной правилами площадки; 2) команда судьи (рефери) в боксе, означающая, что упавший боксер объявляется вне боя, т.е. побежденным (см. нокаут).


АУТСАУДЕР [англ. Outsider] – 1) в капиталистических странах: а) предприятия какой-л. Отрасли производства, не входящие в монополистическое объединение предпринимателей этой отрасли (т. Наз. Дикие, посторонние); б) лица, спекулирующие на бирже, биржевые спекулянты-не-профессионалы; 2) спортсмены, занимающие последние места в соревнованиях.

---

20 It is also interesting to note that out of the three words found in the SIS (1964) only *aut* is listed in SIS (1980).
Аут aut here is defined as a sports term as Andrews noted, аутсайд also refers to a sports terminology to define the act of stepping out of lines and аутсайдер аутсайдер refers to an outsider. The numerous meanings in the dictionary are dismissed by scholars, and it seems to increase their argument for the аутсайд by their identification of the émigré speaker as a prototype of a Soviet city inhabitant that rejects words such as на двор.

A final example that both scholars mention is the words Bek-jard 'back-yard' and front-jard 'front-yard'. I did not find any words that reference these words but I did find each of the separated words бек bek, фронt front, and ярд jard:

БЕК [англ. back задний] — защитник — игрок в спортивных играх с мячом, играющий на последней линии, вблизи ворот своей команды. 1964
ФРОНТ [нем. Front<фр. front букв. лоб] — 1) вен.: а) сторона строя или боевого расположения войск, к которой военнослужащие (в строю) или части обращены лицом, имея правый фланг с правой стороны, а левый – с левой; б) район, где расположены действующие войска (в противоп. тылу); в) вышее оперативное объединение, состоящее из нескольких армий, под начальством одного командующего; 2) участок массовых действий (напр., ф.работ), а также область какой-л. деятельности (напр., идеологический ф.); 3) атмосферный ф.- более или менее узкая переходная зона, разделяющая две воздушные массы: теплую и холодную. 1964
ЯРД [англ. yard] — английская мера длины, равная 91,4 см. 1964

These would be an example of what both Benson and Andrews mentioned above as a hybrid compound, which are examples of both pre-émigré and post-émigré borrowing.

---

21 Refer to Appendix F.
In reviewing the works of Benson, Olmstead and Andrews, I have identified the problems that occur in their interpretation in the words as newly borrowed words into the Soviet émigré speech. Benson’s analysis of the words *apartment* and *disk* as unnecessary loans, shows that there is a tendency to essentialize the language and participant. First, the Soviet émigré’s identity is essentialized by the construction of two separate subsystems of an English language and the Russian language. The words mentioned above are implied to be only part of the English language and therefore unnecessary in the Soviet lexicon. Second, when there is a linguistic phenomenon such as a borrowed word with a semantic extension or a loan translation, the word is differentiated as an English word and as a result, is assumed that the word is not part of the Soviet lexicon. Olmstead creates a similar pattern when he portrays words such as *bas, jakhta, apartment, sofa, kondominium* are ‘gratuitious’ borrowings. Although it is acknowledged that the words have been in existence in the Soviet lexicon, it is constituted as an English borrowing because of the semantic extension. Moreover, Olmstead indicates that the exaggerated uses of English that are found in subcultures of Soviet life are atypical. I believe the same essentialization of identity is taking place in this process of analysis. The ‘gratuitious’ borrowings indicate an essentialization of the language and the division between subcultures and the mainstream culture indicates an essentialization of the participant. Finally, Andrews’ analysis of the words as low-frequency versus high-frequency demonstrates similar analyses as the other scholars. By
categorizing parkovat’ and fesenebel’nyi by the frequency to demonstrate that it is an English word, and indicating the regional prevalence of smog in the United States spread to the rest of the country and eventually found its way to the Soviet Union, strongly suggests that Andrews is separating the English language and Russian language as separate systems. Second, by dismissing the influence of words in the dictionary such as аут, аутсайдер, and аутсайд, Andrews promotes the psychoanalysis of the émigré speaker’s internal motivation and essentializes his identity as a Soviet city inhabitant with insecurity about his linguistic use.
5. Conclusion

When I began the research of the Third wave Russian diaspora, I thought I would discuss how the Russian Jewish communities in the U.S. created speech communities and compare how their linguistic uses differed from each other. The more research I did, the more I realized that the identity of the diaspora was problematic because not only were the groups not all Russian, they were not Jewish either! I believe by questioning the identity construction and ideology that is created within identity of the Russian diaspora, it would be possible to further discuss how to reimagine how these speech communities and how they can be studied. In reimagining the diaspora, we should take into consideration several aspects that involve Bucholtz and Hall’s theories of identity and language and Holliday’s aspects of Otherization and Small Cultures.

In this paper, I attempted to identify how scholars and the academic community through the oversimplification of their ethnic and language identity have misunderstood the Third Wave Russian Diaspora. One of the most difficult issues that I have shown to be a problem is the methodology of sociolinguistic fieldwork, including bilingual studies in the Russian Diaspora, which contain essentialism at their core. In the first chapter, the historical context of the Third Wave Soviet émigrés demonstrated the complexity of where the Russian Diaspora from which they originated. The group essentialized themselves as well as the institutions that were attempting to bring them out of the Soviet Union. The methodology section introduced ways in which studies in the sociolinguistics field are aware
of the issue of essentializing groups and the work that has been carried out, in how to avoid essentialism in the language and identity formation in gender studies. More importantly, by identifying how the Russian Diaspora and the Soviet émigrés identity is formed based on adequation, it is possible to see how not only is the problem of essentializing due to the desire to assimilate into a common group, nor is it political institutions that attribute these identities, but it is due to the way the boundaries are drawn in the discussion of cultural differences.

Examining previous studies of lexical data that have been studied by scholars on the Russian Diaspora, allowed concrete data where the essentialism of a static identity resulted in mistaken static identity of the Russian Diaspora and overlooking certain aspects of the Russian language. Through this look I would like to suggest several possibilities of reimagining the Russian diaspora so that future studies on the group can be self-aware of the methodology used and apply non-essentialist methods to avoid seeing the group as one type.

5.1 Future Endeavors

In a similar fashion as Tannen’s study of gender and language, one should be more aware of the identity of the significance of place people as part of the Third Wave Russian Diaspora. As the complexity of the history of the immigration shows, it was very difficult to determine the number of emigrants leaving the Soviet Union, what ethnicities they were and how many even entered the United States. Their Jewish identity was also a very relevant question, considering that the definition of Jewish identity were widely different. It is important to know who the groups of émigrés were and distinctly and explicitly address the different ethnicities that exist within the
diaspora group. I suggest that detailed surveys should be used by scholars to find out background of the participants including ethnicity, number of years speaking English, and other knowledge of foreign languages.

Additionally, one of the strongest aspects of essentialism is the problem of otherizing, which is explored in depth in Holliday’s *Intercultural Communication*. In order to portray otherization Holliday gives the example of John and his new Amish neighbors in England. John otherizes an American Amish family that moved into an English neighborhood based on the cultural stereotypes that John already had about Amish people (Holliday 2004: 21-22). He assumed that because the family owned old furniture, dressed in plain clothes and did not own television nor were they allowed to read newspapers, that they were opposed to any kind of modernity. Later, John was proved wrong when they showed interest in watching television at John’s house. Holliday shows how a true representation of a group is prevented when there is a tendency to otherize or “to reduce people to less than what they are” (Holliday 2004: 21). This concept can be applied to the Russian Diaspora as there is also a tendency to reduce the ‘Russian’ diaspora and assume that all the members of the group have the same levels of Russian as well as the same capabilities of a standard Russian language. When that occurs, a process of otherizing materializes where not only the levels of Russian that are spoken are misrepresented, the interpretation of the words used is also considered to be either resembling a Russian person or losing their Russianess. In the data we looked
at in chapter 4, the scholars otherized the people’s use of the Russian language by otherizing them and the language they used. The words that they considered were undoubtedly English borrowings were in fact found in the soviet dictionaries in the 1960s and 1980s. I have proven how I hold a stronger case for the particular words I analyzed and proven that they were in fact part of the Soviet lexicon. Consequently, the conclusive interpretations of the speaker were greatly weakened and are debatable.

A solution to avoid this otherizing from happening would be if surveys of the participants were created with questions concerning their understanding and knowledge of the lexical items and whether they were aware of the foreign loan borrowing. In this way, the scholars would have a better idea of the capability and level of both Russian and English language, rather than measuring every speaker to a standard Russian. In the specific studies we looked at, I believe it would prevent scholars to make assumptions or conclude that the lexical items are new English émigré word borrowings when in fact the words were already part of the Soviet lexicon. Also, the designs of this survey would attempt to elicit these questions in ways that would make it difficult for the speaker to lie, for example.

My final suggestion would be in changing the structure and methodology of the cultural differences that exist in the Russian Diaspora as Holliday demonstrates in his article Small Cultures. He makes a case for studying the distinctions between cultural groups through a small culture lens because he believes that thinking and applying the
large culture leads to make ‘reductionist overgeneralization’ between groups based on ethnic, national and international cultural differences (Holliday 1999: 237). Holliday devotes his studies of small culture by analyzing groups in an educational context and classroom dynamics. Small culture “relates to any cohesive social grouping with no necessary subordination to large cultures” and “heuristic in the process of interpreting group behavior”. This means that the focus is not on finding generalizations related to ethnic, national and international borders, but small cultures seek to focus on cultures that are outside of those boundaries. As Holliday states, “a small culture approach is more concerned with social processes as they emerge” (Holliday 1999: 240). The idea of the importance of social processes in determining cultural differences is directly related to Bucholtz and Hall’s emphasis on the dynamic nature of an individual or group’s identity and it is attributed to situational actions. In the same way, the Russian Diaspora could be viewed by focusing on social groups that does not necessarily draw these ethnic boundaries among the Russian speaking diaspora, so that essentialist and reductionist assumptions about the Russian language or the Russian culture will not interfere with studying the language variability in U.S. immigrant speaking communities.

In order to do this, the label of Russian Diaspora should no longer be used so that the diaspora can be looked through a different set of lens without being compared to a larger Russian culture (or a standardized Russian language). Although these
methods must be developed, I think there are some useful suggestions in the possibility of reimagining the Third Wave Russian diaspora. And based on these ideas, it is not fitting for the Diaspora to be considered the Third Wave Diaspora because it aids to the misrepresentation of the group, otherizing and cultural stereotyping. It would be beneficial to create terms that are not based on aspects that differentiate culture by ethnicity or national.

As Holliday also mentions, scholars acknowledge the reductionist nature of analyzing and finding cultural differences between different cultures, but this aspect had not been examined to understand the processes of what makes these analyses reductionist. What Holliday is doing by his new concepts of small culture is greatly increasing the awareness of essentialist notions of large culture. And in the same way it is important to continue to question the way that Diasporas are studied as it will encourage and build methodologies for scholars to avoid analyses based on a foundation of assumptions and essentialism.
## Appendix A

Republics from which Immigrants came to U.S. (percent) 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republics</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>48.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>21.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belorus</td>
<td>16.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>4.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldavia</td>
<td>4.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic</td>
<td>2.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>2.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>0.3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table 1.3 from Zvi Gitelman, p33.
# Appendix B

Jewish Emigration from the USSR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968–1970</td>
<td>4,235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>13,022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>31,681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>34,733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>20,628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>13,221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>14,261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>16,736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>28,864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>51,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>21,471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>9,447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>1,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>1,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>1,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>2,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>2,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>2,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>3,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>8,155</td>
<td>18,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From October 1968–December 1987, 274,726 persons left the Soviet Union with Israeli visas. Approximately 165,817 of them went to Israel.


Source: Appendix 1 from Soviet Jewry in the 1980s, Freedman (1989)
Appendix C

The number of Jews from the Former Soviet Union, who entered the USA within the status of refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number entered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>4110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>6676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>6570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>7985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>13545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>31931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>18631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>8137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>11225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>38395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>32714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HIAS Annual Report 1993
Appendix D

Exit, Aliya and Dropout of Soviet/FSU Jews 1968-92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. Leaving USSR/FSU</th>
<th>No. Invitations Sent to Families</th>
<th>No. Immigrating to Israel</th>
<th>No. Dropouts</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>10,267</td>
<td>3,033</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>12,897</td>
<td>22,933</td>
<td>12,839</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>31,905</td>
<td>40,546</td>
<td>31,652</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>54,733</td>
<td>40,576</td>
<td>33,277</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>20,767</td>
<td>33,305</td>
<td>16,888</td>
<td>3,879</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>13,363</td>
<td>28,041</td>
<td>8,435</td>
<td>4,928</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>14,254</td>
<td>33,088</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,004</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>16,833</td>
<td>44,209</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>8,483</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>28,956</td>
<td>82,766</td>
<td>12,090</td>
<td>16,866</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>51,333</td>
<td>99,825</td>
<td>17,278</td>
<td>34,053</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>21,648</td>
<td>48,628</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>14,078</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>9,448</td>
<td>23,143</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>7,686</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>11,818</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>8,743</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>6,367</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>7,574</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>6,657</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>8,155</td>
<td>20,068</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>6,083</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>18,961</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>16,788</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>19,005</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>12,117</td>
<td>58,888</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>228,400</td>
<td>1,000,000(a)</td>
<td>183,400(b)</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>187,500</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>147,520(c)</td>
<td>39,980</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>122,398(d)</td>
<td>600,000(c)</td>
<td>64,648</td>
<td>57,750</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>101,887</td>
<td>65,953</td>
<td>66,145(g)</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>100,830</td>
<td>67,974</td>
<td>68,079</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jewish Agency for Israel Report, 1993; Report of the Jewish Agency's
Appendix E

From Slovar’ inostrannykh slov (1964)

1. Aut [eng. out vne; von] – 1) the position in a sports games with a ball, when the ball <gets out the game>, flies out the confines of the specified rules of the court;
   2) the team’s judge (referee) in boxing, acknowledging that the hit boxer enters outside the fight, in other words, defeated.

2. Autsajd [eng. outside]- the last attack- in a soccer and hockey team- the last play of line of attack.

3. Autsajder [eng. outsider] – 1) in capitalistic countries a) the corporation of some kind reproducing units, not entering in monopoly merger of manufacturers 2) a person, speculating on the stock exchange, exchanging profiteer-unprofessional
   2) sportmen, taking up the last place in a competition.

4. Bek  [eng. Back zadnij]- defender- a player in a sports game with a ball, playing on the last line, near the shoulder of his team


6. Fešenebel’nyj-[engl. fashionable]- luxurious, stylish, elegant

7. Front [germ. Front<fr. Front bukv. Lob] – 1) military: a) the side constructing or of the battle formation of troops, to who enlisted personnel or the part of identity, allowing the right flank from the right side, and the left flank- from the
left side b) the region, where the formation of active troops c) higher operating union, consisting of several armies, under the leader of one command 2) participant of a massive action (i.e. work), but also the region of any activity (i.e. ideological) 3) atmospheric – more or less a narrow transitional zone, dividing two airborne masses: warm and cold

8. Jard- an English measure of length, equaling 91.4 cm

9. Kondominium [lat. Condominium <con c, vmeste + dominium vladenie]- 1) joint ownership, dominance; 2) in international right- dispersion of a given territory by a state authority jointly by two or several publicly owned; usually proceeded to end either by partitioned of territory or seized of it by one of the parties.

10. Kort [eng. court] – field for the game of tennis

11. Metropolitan [fr. Metropolitain]- metro- city underground (in tunnels), aboveground (on overpass) or transiting by specifically allocated circuit of streets electric railroad for carrying passengers

12. Park [engl. park] - 1. A big garden or grove with roads for walking, and an area for playing and t.p. 2. A place for stationing and fixing railroads, tram wagons, buses and t.p. 3) an aggregate of similar flexible/agile composition. (for example, automobile p.) or device of the production of any kind of branch in the manufacturing industry (for example, machine tool). 4) milt. A place, that organized the keeping, maintenance and repair of armoured, automotive,
artillery and other equipment, but also stationary or flexible disposition of war-
technical property, sometimes including also repair workshop.

13. Sejf [eng. safe. literally secure, without danger] 1) metal shelf or box for
safekeeping of secret documents, money, valuable papers or valuable; 2) At a
bank- a facility (a room, basement), with such shelves or boxes.


16. žokej [eng. jockey] – professional horseman in jumping
Appendix F

Slovar’ inostrannykh slov (1980)

1. Apartmenty [<fr. Appartement kvartira]- more, luxurious accommodation;
   *playful name. Apartment, room.

2. Aut [<eng. out vne; von] – 1) the position in a sports games with a ball, when the ball <gets out the game>, flies out the confines of the specified rules of the court; 2) the team’s judge (referee) in boxing, acknowledging that the hit boxer enters outside the fight, in other words, defeated.


4. Boj- [eng. Boy lit. mal’čik]- in several countries- delivery boy in a hotel, on a steamboat; domestic aboriginal servant in colonies.

5. Disk [gr. diskos] 1. Plain, level circle, circular record; a subject in the view of the plain circle; 2) in light-weight athletic sports- lens shaped sport missile or dart. 3) store manual gun, automatic, receiving cartridge 4) with statutory d.- intra-articular sandstone grit in mandibular, sternal- clavicular and radioulnar joint; 5) record (usually long playing)

6. Fešenebel’nyj-[eng. fashionable]- answering to the demands for the best taste and fashion,
7. Front [ger. front<fr. front букв. Лоб] – 1. milt.: a) higher operative unionizing military strength on the continental theater of military action; b) directed towards the offense side of war order (operatively built) forces; ETC.


9. Karton thick, tough paper; use like bookbindery, packaging lining and insulating material.

10. Kondominium [lat. Condominium < con c vmeste + dominium vladenie] - 1) joint ownership, dominance; 2) in international right- dispersion of a given territory by a state authority jointly by two or several publicly owned

11. Park [eng. Park]- 1. A big garden or grove with roads for walking, with flowers, and an area for playing and t.p. 2. A place for stationing and fixing zh.d., tram wagons, buses and t.p. 3) an aggregate of similar flexible/agile composition. (for example, automobile p.) or device of the production of any kind of branch in the manufacturing industry (for example, machine tool). 4) milt. A territory that organized the keeping, maintenance and repair of armoured, automotive, artillery and other equipment, but also stationary or flexible disposition of war-technical property, sometimes including also repair workshop.

12. Parol’ [<fr. Parole word, speech] secretive word or phrase, that was applying for authorization of the people (in war service or conspiracy).
13. President [lat. Praesidens] 1) the main head of state in the majority of the country with a republican form of administration 2) elected head of a few societies, institution, for example, the Academy of Sciences 3) higher responsible person of a company, corporation in bourgeois countries.

14. Rekord- high rating/datum, achieved in sport competition, but also in any kind of domain of labour, service; high level, higher manifestation of someone.

15. Sejf- [eng. Safe]- 1) fire-resistant iron enclosure or box for the safekeeping of documents, money, valuable papers and valubles. 2) compartment, suitable for the safekeeping of money or valuables (in the bank or other institutions).


18. Ston- [eng. Stone]= singular mass in English system of measurement, weighting 14 pounds, equal to 6.35 kilogram


19. Uik-e’nd [eng. Week-end < week nedelia + end konets] – the time of relaxation from Saturday until Monday; trip, recreation during this time (in England, USA and a few other countries)
20. Žokej-[eng. jockey]- 1) professional horseman on jumping, specialist by training and exercise of a equestrian horse 2) in the circus- an artist, performing on bareback horse an equestrian acrobatic trick
Appendix G

1. Disk-Žokej- the lead of a discotheque. In 1980-1981 academic, training, education year by the request of the regional committee VLKSM in foundation/reference to the Orlovsk affiliation of Moscow State Institute of culture starts the work the department of social profession, preparing disc-jockeys.

   - English. disk-jockey

2. Parkovočnyj Related to a parking lot (stationing cars near sidewalk). And along all the central street assembles parking vehicles. The price- four forinta an hour (roughly speaking, 30 kopeks), the maximum time of parking- two hours. If the space is occupied more than the allotted time- requires a fine.

   - Parkova -> Parkovočnyj
Appendix H

NVRL (1990)

1. Front, a, m. 1. West front. About the Soviet troops, allocating to the West (to countries of Eastern Europe). From 1988 our country <was essentially reduced> their military disbursements, exit of troops from the country of Eastern Europe led to furthering of their reduction, however <the western front>, dominated the disbursements of the USSR.

2. Disk-zokej- Same as above

3. Metropolevets

4. Smog, noisy smog. City authority [Limi] didn’t hold hope, if not to end with a <noisy smog>, then at the very least weakening his action. In order they in a few regions tried to go not long ago even such a violent step, confiscation of the goods, which had sellers of plastic, which disagreeably loudly customer.

- From smog in the meaning of a <thick fog, missing with smoke, soot in big cities, industrious centers>
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