3-22-2016

Language Use and Identity in the Cuban Community in Russia

Maria Yakushkina

Purdue University, myakushk@purdue.edu

Daniel J. Olson

Purdue University, danielolson@purdue.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/lcpubs>

Recommended Citation

Yakushkina, M. & Olson, D. J. (2017). Language use and identity in the Cuban community in Russia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(1), 50-64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1159686>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries.
Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

Language use and identity in the Cuban community in Russia

Maria Yakushkina and Daniel J. Olson

Purdue University

640 Oval Dr., West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA
myakushk@purdue.edu, danielolson@purdue.edu

Abstract

A significant body of research has begun to explore the association between language and identity, a relationship that becomes more complex when considering multilingual communities. Important for this field, a number of studies have examined the interrelation between language and identity in the Cuban population in the USA, a case in which dominant (English) and minority language (Spanish) interaction has largely resulted in language maintenance and a positive correlation between language use and ethnic identity. While the Cuban population in Russia shares cultural and historical background with the well-studied US Cuban community, key differences allow for the examination of the role of several external factors (e.g. community size, lack of contact with monolingual speakers) on patterns of language use and identity. Employing quantitative survey methods and qualitative sociolinguistic interviews, the present study examines language use and language identity in the Cuban community in Russia, including both first and second-generation speakers. In contrast with the US Cuban community, results illustrate a shift towards the dominant language (Russian). Considering language and identity, results show the development of a dual identity, particularly among the second-generation speakers. The contribution of external factors on patterns of language use and identity is discussed.

Keywords: Ethnic identity; language use; bilingualism; identity construction; heritage languages

Introduction

The multicultural and multinational nature of a modern society presupposes the coexistence and constant interrelations of dominant and minority linguistic communities. In this respect, areas such as language attitudes, patterns of language use, and the connection between language and identity have received considerable attention in a wide range of dominant-minority language communities and interactions (e.g. Boswell, 2000; Fuller, 2007; Hernández, 2009; Lamboy, 2004; Pérez-Leroux, Cuza, & Thomas, 2011; Pieras-Guasp, 2002; Ramírez, 2000; Roca, 2005; Zentella, 2002, 2007).

One of the most well-studied examples of these dominant-minority community interactions is the Cuban community in the United States, specifically in Miami-Dade County, Florida. This community has been a source for a wealth of sociolinguistic research, from which a number of consistent findings have emerged: (1) With respect to *language attitudes*, the Cuban population has been shown to have a positive attitude towards Spanish, for both *affective* (i.e. language use as means of establishing or maintaining connections, emotional ties with a certain group) and *instrumental* (i.e. beneficial influx of the language in such areas as job and career opportunities, economic development for an individual) components (Beckstead & Toribio, 2003; Boswell, 2000; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Lynch, 2000; Ramirez, 2000; Roca, 2005); (2) Considering *language use*, both Cubans and monolingual American English speakers recognize the importance of Spanish-English bilingualism, owing to the high level of Spanish language instrumentality in US Cuban context (Boswell 2000; Garcia & Diaz, 1992; Otheguy, García & Roca, 2000); and (3) The construction and maintenance of Cuban *identity* has been widely promoted by the influence of the two mentioned above factors, namely - positive language attitudes and a high level of bilingualism, with the Spanish language being an indicator of in-group solidarity and a marker of Cubans' ethnic distinctiveness (Alfaraz, 2002; Solé, 1982). Taken together, these aspects encourage Spanish language use among the

successive generations of speakers and, as a consequence, lead to the development and maintenance of the Cuban identity in the context of a non-dominant language environment.

However, Cuban communities exist not only in the U.S. but also in other non-Spanish speaking environments, which have been given little, if any, attention in the sociolinguistic literature. Given the prominent role that the U.S.-Cuban community has played in previous research, a similar population (Cubans) in other dominant-language (non-U.S.) environments may serve as an important point of comparison. The present study focuses on such a case, namely, the Cuban community in a distinct dominant-language environment - Russia. Due to the specific characteristics of this community (e.g. population size, degree of contact with other Spanish speakers) and the unique cultural-historical background (e.g. positive Soviet-Cuban relations), this population represents a unique and thus relevant sociolinguistic situation for an analysis of language use and, consequently, its influence on identity construction.

The current study seeks to address two existing gaps in the literature, specifically the limited number of studies conducted with the Cuban population in a non-dominant environment other than the U.S., and the lack of sociolinguistic attention given to the Cuban community in Russia with respect to the ethnic identity construction in a multicultural environment. The results will serve to significantly enhance our understanding of the language-identity link, based on patterns of language use, and the processes of a language maintenance/shift in minority-language populations.

Theoretical background

A number of scholars have attempted to define the notion of identity, but this process poses certain difficulties, as identity represents a broad and complex construct consisting of various components, which are closely interrelated and mutually permeable. Broadly, identity can be defined as “a quality which is ascribed or attributed to an individual human being by other human beings” (Riley, 2007, p.86). While identity can be defined as ascribed by others,

still it is performed and recognized by individuals themselves on the basis of both internal and, predominantly, external factors. The term “identity” can be addressed with respect to two main ideas: individual awareness, which means distinguishing oneself from others or demonstrating one’s uniqueness as opposed to others, and social identity, that allows a person to affiliate oneself with a particular group(s) (Gudykunst & Schmidt, 1987; Kroskrity, 1999; Singh & Peccei 2004). The most common parameters on the basis of which people attribute themselves to a certain group include ethnicity (Alfaraz, 2002; Cislo, 2008), gender (Butler, 1990), age, residence, occupation, religion, politics, and language among many others (e.g., Riley, 2007; Spernes, 2012).

Ethnic identity

As a component of social identity, *ethnic identity* is also a complex and dynamic set of qualities (Cislo, 2008; Phinney, 1990; Riley, 2007), but differs from social identity as it is “focused more on common descent and on a cultural heritage shared because of common descent” (Joseph, 2004, p.162). As summarized by Phinney (1990), different scholars emphasize different aspects of ethnic identity: self-identification, feelings of belonging and commitment, the sense of shared values and attitudes, as well as cultural aspects of ethnic identity, including language, behavior, values, and knowledge of the ethnic group history. Crucial for the current study, it has been claimed that ethnic identity is “the most powerful type of identity claim one can make” (Joseph, 2004, p.168), due to the fact that visible differences related to ethnicity (e.g. skin color, body shape, facial features), as well as language, are strong enough to be immediately noticed and establish in-group and out-group affiliation.

Applying the idea of the group affiliation to the context of a society with dominant-minority ethnic communities and languages, two models for ethnic identity analysis have been proposed by Phinney (1990). The first model, *linear/bipolar*, represents an individual’s ethnic identity in the frames of a continuum from ‘strong ethnic bond with one group’ vs.

‘strong ethnic ties with the other group’. In short, the more a person affiliates oneself with one ethnic group, the less they identify with the other group. As such, dominant-minority interaction may serve to drive the process of assimilation, as individuals move along the continuum. The second model, *two-dimensional*, represents a more complex situation and states that strong relations with one’s native culture (in this case the minority community) do not imply rejection of the dominant culture and vice versa. More specifically, according to the proposed model, strong affiliations with both cultures result in biculturalism, affiliations with only the dominant culture indicate assimilation, whereas strong identification with only the native (minority) group is a marker of separation.

Language and identity connection

Various sociolinguistic studies have demonstrated that language and identity, social identity in general as well as ethnic identity in particular, are closely linked (e.g. Alfaraz, 2002; Bucholtz & Hall, 2003; Cislo, 2008; Hernández, 2009, Rothman & Rell, 2005). Moreover, these two concepts are related reciprocally, whereby language, being the medium for transmission of culture and values, influences identity, while one’s sense of identity influences language choice and patterns of language use (Gudykunst & Schmidt, 1987, Mendoza-Denton, 2004; Rothman & Niño-Murcia, 2008). It also should be acknowledged that the language component is not only a factor that impacts identity, but serves as a primary marker of identity. Language is a means by which a person clearly expresses their individual identity and defines oneself in the frames of a particular ethnic group (e.g. Bailey, 2007; Cislo, 2008).

In the context of a multicultural society with co-existing dominant and minority cultures and languages, language choice and language use can be seen as a primary marker of ethnic identity of a person or a group. Considering previous research, a number of factors have been shown to influence language use and, as a result, impact an individual’s identity. Among them, prestige/status of the language (Spernes, 2012), attitudes towards native

language (Pérez-Leroux, Cuza, & Thomas, 2011), language insecurity (Zentella, 2007), degree of bilingualism (Fuller, 2007), and native vs dominant language proficiency (Phinney, 1990), have all been shown to be relevant in determining language use. Taken as a whole, the concepts of language and identity are not only closely related to each other but also represent the situation of mutual influence and dependence. This interrelation can be seen and analyzed in terms of ethnic identity construction in the environment of the multilingual, multicultural society, which in its turn influences the overall concept of identity of an individual.

Language use and identity among the Cuban community in the U.S.

Several characteristics of the Cuban community in the United States have served to garner a degree of prestige for the community, including the historically “warm welcome” to the U.S. (Lipski, 2008), the high level of professionalism and education of first generation members (García & Otheguy, 1988), the large community size (United States Census Bureau, 2011), and the constant contact with the Spanish-speaking monolingual community (Lynch, 2000). These characteristics, considered to be crucial for patterns of language choice (Romaine, 1995), are relatively unique to the Cuban population in the U.S. and other Spanish varieties (e.g. Mexican, Dominican, Salvadoran) have not historically received a similar positive status (Bailey, 2007; Mohl, 1985). Collectively, these factors have contributed to overall positive attitudes towards the Spanish language (Lamboy, 2004; Lynch, 2000), a high instrumental value (Boswell 2000; Garcia & Diaz, 1992), and largely a trend towards language maintenance in the U.S. Cuban community (Roca, 2005; although for *gradual* language shift see Porcel, 2006).

These factors concerning use of Spanish language play an important role in the construction of Cuban ethnic identity in the United States. It should be noted that the Spanish language has been seen by Cubans as an indicator of in-group solidarity or “Cubanness” (see Solé, 1982), and serves as a means of ethnic identity preservation. Along with the sense of in-

group solidarity, the Spanish language is used as a marker of Cubans' ethnic distinctiveness, predominantly from other Caribbean ethnicities and language varieties (Alfaraz, 2002).

With respect to the interrelation of language and identity, Cubans in the U.S. have been shown to consistently evidence positive associations between language and identity. For example, in a study of language-identity among adolescents in Miami-Dade, Cislo (2008) found that that ethnic identity tends to be protective for Cuban adolescents and still plays a more important role than their developing "Americanness". The importance of ethnic identity for young Cuban-Americans impacts patterns of language use and promote native language maintenance (Cislo, 2008). Furthermore, while in the Cuban population language-identity association has been shown to function as a marker of in-group solidarity and "Cubanness", Bailey (2007) demonstrated that for the U.S.-Dominicans, Spanish does not serve as a strong cue to their Dominican identity. Considering the mutual influence of language and identity, it should be noted that the ethnic identity of the population, largely depends on factors such as the history of the immigration, size of the target community in the given environment, the degree of instrumentality of the native language, and the prestige of the given language variant in the community (Zentella, 2002), all of which may promote or impede formation of the strong ethnic group identity.

Cuban community in Russia

While the Cuban population in Russia, the focus of the current study, shares many obvious social and cultural aspects with the Cuban-American population, the two communities differ in several key manners. Most notably, these populations differ in terms of size, contact with monolingual Spanish-speaking communities, and the historical background and relationship between the two dominant communities (i.e. U.S. vs. Russia).

Considering the current demographics of the target population, the Cuban community in Russia, according to the official Russian Census Bureau survey (2010), is estimated to be 700 people, consisting of predominantly male population (82%). With respect to the question

of language use in the broader Russian population, only 150,000 individuals reported any knowledge of Spanish (0.1%). In comparison, nearly 1.8 million people identify as Cuban in the U.S., including 1.2 million in the state of Florida (U.S. Census, 2010). Regarding the overall use of Spanish in the U.S., approximately 38 million people report speaking Spanish in the home (13%), including 2.7 million in the greater Miami area (51%). In addition, Spanish is the most commonly taught foreign language (Alonso, 2006) and nearly 800,000 university students study Spanish annually (MLA 2013 Enrollment Survey). Furthermore, the Cuban population of the U.S. is exposed to Spanish-speaking populations considerably more frequently than Cubans in Russia due to the ethnic composition of the population, mass media, tourism and business purposes (Lynch, 2000).

Another aspect that makes the Cuban community in Russia unique is the history of the Soviet-Cuban relations. With roots in ideological similarities (i.e., the Cuban Revolution of 1959), active mutually beneficial relations between Cuba and Soviet Union were created during the period of 1959-1989 (Amador, 1984), and thus Cuba became the major partner and supporter of the Soviet Union in the West during the Cold War. In the USSR, overall positive attitudes towards Cuba led to creation of a favorable environment and strong support for the Cuban nation and exchange of personnel and ideas across military, economic, educational, and cultural spheres (Amador, 1984; Boughton, 1974; Dannenberg, 2006; Larin, 2007; Novikov & Chelyadinsky, 2012). Further evidence for the constant exchange of ideas and communication can be seen in the Spanish spoken in Cuba. For ideological reasons, a large influx of concepts from the socialist group and Russian language can be seen in the Cuban variety of the Spanish language, which are not present in the Spanish language varieties of the other Spanish-speaking groups (Perl, 1979). The “Russification” of the Spanish language (Bayuk, 1979) was typified by the emergence of certain concepts in the lexicon of the Cubans that were typical only for the Soviet reality. For example, the Russian term *dacha*, meaning “a summer house with a garden in the countryside” appeared in the Cuban lexicon as *la*

dacha (Watson, 2006). These lexical borrowings, including *el koljoziano* ‘collective farm’ and *el pionero* ‘pioneer’, among many others, serve as indicators of the mutual influence and strong relations between both countries, which impacted all spheres of life.

While the Cuban community in Russia shares many similarities with the Cuban population in the U.S., there could be noted a number of key differences with respect to the present situation of Cubans in Russia. These differences include size of the population, contact with Spanish-speaking monolinguals, and unique cultural and historical ties between Russian and Cuba.

Research aims

The current study seeks to analyze the patterns of language use and the connection between language and identity in the Cuban community in Russia. Moreover, drawing on the previous research on the U.S. Cuban population and the unique characteristics of the Russian Cuban community, this study analyzes the role of specific population characteristics (e.g. population size, contact with monolingual speakers, and historical context) on language use and the interrelation of language and identity. Language use and identity patterns are examined across two groups of speakers, first generation immigrants and second-generation immigrants (i.e. heritage speakers).

Methodology

To investigate the above research aims, a mixed method study, drawing both on quantitative questionnaires and more qualitative oral sociolinguistic interviews, were conducted with participants of Cuban origin residing in Russia. Responses were analyzed specifically with respect to patterns of language use and the interrelation between language and identity.

Participants

The study was conducted with sixteen participants, all of Cuban origin, born in Cuba, and currently residing in one of several major Russian cities (Moscow, etc.). Participants were recruited predominantly through personal networks and snowball sampling.¹

As the current study focuses on language use and ethnic identity, two different groups were established: individuals born in Cuba with both parents of Cuban nationality (henceforth the CC group)², and individuals born in Cuba with one of the parents of Russian origin (henceforth the CR group). Although all participants were born in Cuba, it is important to note that the characteristics of these groups roughly parallel the traditional distinctions between first and second generation (i.e. heritage speakers) immigrants (Brown, 2009; Ghuman, 1991; Moreno & Arriba, 1996). Specifically, the CC group immigrated at a later age ($M = 26.8$, $SD = 12.0$) than the CR group ($M = 6.4$, $SD = 3.2$).

The population was selected based on the following criteria: origin, education, occupation, and length of stay in Russia. The main defining factor was the country of origin. All participants were born in Cuba (Havana, Cienfuegos, Sancti Spíritus, and Moa), and later immigrated to Russia, but still have family or friends there. This criterion plays a very important role in language attitudes and identity, as ties with the homeland can facilitate language maintenance (Romaine, 1995) and positive attitudes towards the native language. Secondly, subjects were chosen according to their age and level of education. All the participants are adults (age range: 20-49, mean age: 29.1) and received university-level education either in Cuba or Russia. The final factor for creating participants' group was length of stay in Russia. Subjects were selected for the study on conditions that they either changed their country of residence to Russia or hold long-term residence permission for educational or work purposes.

¹ While the total number of participants in the current study is limited, this seems to be reflective population itself, with a small total population size (i.e. approximately 700, Russian Census Bureau, 2010) and a geographically diffuse community.

² Parent is defined as a primary care-giver residing in the household.

Presence of both similarity and diversity can be beneficial for the study as all of the above- mentioned factors explicitly or implicitly motivate certain patterns of language use and impact participants' identity. In this respect, these characteristics can provide broader range of experiences that represent the complex sociolinguistic situation. The participant demographics are illustrated in Table 1 (CC Group) and Table 2 (CR Group) below.

Table 1. *CC Group, Participant Demographics*

Gender	Age	Age of arrival	Length of stay (years)	Education in Russia (years)	Occupation	Marital status	Order of acquisition
Male	22	19	3	3	student	single	Spanish, Russian
Male	53	43	10	18	worker	married	Spanish, Russian
Male	24	9	15	14	office work	married	Spanish, Russian
Male	20	19	1	1	student	single	Spanish, Russian
Male	27	22	5	0	business	married	Spanish, Russian
Male	46	43	3	5	engineering	Cuban married	Spanish, Russian
Male	49	28	21	0	business	married	Spanish, Russian
Female	37	31	6	0	education (language instructor)	Russian married Cuban	Spanish, Russian

Table 2. *CR Group, Participant Demographics*

	Gender	Age	Age of arrival	Length of stay (years)	Education in Russia (years)	Occupation	Marital status	Order of acquisition
1	Female	27	6	21	16	education (english tutor)	single	Spanish, Russian
2	Female	25	11	14	11	office work	single	Russian, Spanish
3	Female	28	7	21	12	office work	engaged	Spanish, Russian
4	Male	25	8	17	1	laborer	Cuban single	Spanish, Russian
5	Female	24	6	18		office work	single	Spanish, Russian
6	Female	27	9	18	13	housewife	married	Russian, Spanish
7	Male	28	3	25	11	business	single	Russian, Spanish
8	Female	26	< 1	22	15	office work	married	Russian, Spanish

Materials and procedures

To investigate the research aims, a mixed method (i.e. quantitative and qualitative) approach was employed. First, a sociolinguistic questionnaire was designed, drawing on previous work (Bryman, 1988; Lamboy, 2004; Porcel, 2006), to elicit information on language use, as well as language and identity (see below for more detail). Second, for a more detailed qualitative analysis, oral sociolinguistic interviews (Berg, 2007; García, 2008; Miller & Dingwall, 1997; Starks & McRobbie-Utasi, 2001) were conducted with two of the original sixteen participants.³ This mixed method approach allowed for a more in-depth analysis of the research questions from differing perspectives.

Sociolinguistic questionnaire

The sociolinguistic questionnaire for the present study was predominantly based on the survey composed by Lamboy (2004) for the sociolinguistic study of Cubans, Dominicans, and Puerto Ricans in New York City, and modified for the purposes of this study. Broadly, the questionnaire consisted of two parts: patterns of language use and identity. The first part of the questionnaire is focused on background information, language proficiency, and integrative and instrumental language value. Background information included gender, age, place of birth, age of arrival to Russia, length of stay in Russia, stay in countries other than Cuba and Russia, educational level and location, occupation, and marital status. Self-rated language proficiency was evaluated on the basis of Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q) (Marian, Blumenfeld & Kaushanskaya, 2007). Such self-ratings of proficiency have been shown to correlate reliably with behavioral performance (e.g. Flege, MacKay, & Piske, 2002), a finding that extends to bilingual self-reporting (e.g. Flege, Yeni-Komshian, & Liu, 1999; Jia, Aaronson, & Wu, 2002). Lastly, integrative and instrumental values of the Spanish

³ It is acknowledged that the number of participants in the sociolinguistic interviews is limited. As such, results will focus predominantly on the quantitative data and qualitative data will be presented as complementary to this main analysis.

language, which bear significant importance in determining patterns of language use and maintenance, were addressed.⁴

The second part of the survey was focused on the aspects of identity of the Cuban population in Russia and included questions on self-identification (as Cuban or Russian), influence of the external factors on the Cuban identity (distance from homeland and the size of the community on the Cuba), and importance of Spanish proficiency as a marker of Cuban group identity. Due to the diversity of the participants' geographic locations, the survey was administered online. Surveys were offered in both Spanish and Russian.

Oral sociolinguistic interviews

The main goals of the oral sociolinguistic interviews are two-fold. First, interviews elicited more in-depth information on the participants' background, attitudes towards Cuba and Russia, language use, and the role of Spanish in their daily life in Russia, all of which is implicitly and explicitly connected to the issue of language use and identity. Second, the interviews were designed to complement the quantitative data obtained in the course of the study (McNamara, 1999).

Interviews with two participants were conducted in person in Voronezh (Russia), and lasted 40-60 minutes. Both subjects pertain to the CC Group but offer unique characteristics, important for considering various participant perspectives. Due to the diversity and broad nature of the topics covered, semi-structured sociolinguistic interviews were conducted in order for the interviewer to be able to elicit more in-depth information on the aspects that appeared to be more salient. Each interview was conducted in the language chosen by the participant (initially – Spanish) and was not restricted to the use of one particular language. The interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed.

Results

⁴ Additional information about the questionnaire, not included here due to space constraints, is available from the first author upon request.

Results are presented for language use and language identity, and focus predominantly on the quantitative data obtained from the sociolinguistic questionnaires. Data are presented for both the CC group (i.e. first generation) and the CR group (i.e. second generation). Qualitative data, collected from the oral sociolinguistic interviews, are included in a complimentary capacity.

Language use

Results for language use are presented in terms of language proficiency, affective value, and instrumental value.

With respect to language proficiency, the CC group reports native-like Spanish language proficiency in every surveyed aspect based on a 9-point Likert scale (1 = cannot read/write/speak/comprehend at all; 9 = can read/write/speak/comprehend perfectly Spanish): reading ($M = 8.6$, $SD = 0.7$), writing ($M = 8.3$, $SD = 1.4$), speaking ($M = 8.3$, $SD = 0.9$), and comprehension ($M = 8.6$, $SD = 0.7$). Considering Russian language proficiency, participants reported a lower level of proficiency in each aspect: reading ($M = 7.5$, $SD = 1.8$), writing ($M = 6.9$, $SD = 1.9$), speaking ($M = 6.9$, $SD = 1.9$), comprehension ($M = 8.1$, $SD = 1.1$). A paired t-test demonstrated that these differences were significant, with Spanish proficiency being significantly higher than Russian proficiency ($t(31) = 3.19$, $p = .003$).

The CR group, in contrast, provides a range of responses in terms of Spanish language proficiency: reading ($M = 7.5$, $SD = 1.8$), writing ($M = 6.4$, $SD = 2.6$), speaking ($M = 5.9$, $SD = 2.9$), comprehending ($M = 6.6$, $SD = 2.4$). Although the results for Spanish vary considerably between the target aspects of language, none of them approximate the highest margin of 8-9. With respect to Russian language proficiency, the CR group indicates high proficiency in every considered aspect: reading ($M = 9$, $SD = 0$), writing ($M = 8.7$, $SD = 0.4$), speaking ($M = 8.9$, $SD = 0.3$), comprehension ($M = 9$, $SD = 0$). Again, statistical analysis confirmed that the difference in proficiency was statistically significant, with the CR group reporting greater proficiency in Russian than Spanish ($t(31) = -5.54$, $p < .001$).

Table 3. *CC Group, Language Proficiency*

	Spanish M(SD)	Russian M(SD)
Reading	8.6 (0.7)	7.5 (1.8)
Writing	8.3 (1.4)	6.9 (1.9)
Speaking	8.3 (0.9)	6.9 (1.9)
Comprehension	8.6 (0.7)	8.1 (1.1)
Mean	8.45	7.35

Table 4. *CR Group, Language Proficiency*

	Spanish M(SD)	Russian M(SD)
Reading	7.5 (1.8)	9 (0.0)
Writing	6.4 (2.6)	8.7 (0.4)
Speaking	5.9 (2.9)	8.9 (0.3)
Comprehension	6.6 (2.4)	9 (0.0)
Mean	6.60	8.90

When two groups are compared, as seen in Tables 3 and 4, the CC group reports greater proficiency in Spanish whereas the CR group reports higher proficiency in Russian. Taken as a whole, the results for proficiency reveal that the CC group identifies as more Spanish-dominant, whereas the CR group is Russian-dominant. However, both groups evidence a relatively high degree of Spanish-Russian bilingualism, with participants reporting greater than average proficiency in both languages across all domains

Patterns of language use can be further subdivided into affective (e.g. friends and family) and instrumental components (e.g. economic development and transactional communication). To assess language use across these different domains, participants were asked to estimate the relative use of Spanish and Russian in different contexts (1 = use only Russian; 3 = use both Russian and Spanish equally; 5 = use only Spanish). Turning first to the affective component, specifically communication within the intimate domain, the CC group reports using both Spanish and Russian with family ($M = 3$, $SD = 1.4$), showing a preference for Spanish with Cuban friends ($M = 4.1$, $SD = 1.3$) and Russian with Russian

friends ($M = 1.4$, $SD = 0.7$). In contrast, the CR group showed a distinct preference for Russian across all aspects of the intimate domain: family ($M = 2.0$, $SD = 0.7$), Cuban friends ($M = 1.7$, $SD = 1.5$), and Russian friends ($M = 1.0$, $SD = 0.0$). When two groups are compared, the CC group reports using Spanish more extensively than the CR group in all domains – family, Cuban friends and Russian friends. The greatest difference in language use patterns can be noticed in the category of friends where the CC group differentiates two groups (i.e. Cuban and Russian friends), and varies language choice accordingly, while the CR group chooses predominantly Russian for communication with both groups.

Highlighting the importance of Spanish in the affective domain, the qualitative comment in Example 1 demonstrates the importance of Spanish within the family, most notably for members of the CC group (i.e. first generation).

(1) *CC01: I want my child to speak Spanish, as it is the language of his country* ⁵.

To assess the instrumental value of Spanish, participants were asked to evaluate the importance of Spanish in their current employment, in finding a job, and in general economic advancement (1 = not important; 5 = key factor). When the two groups are compared with respect to the instrumental value of Spanish, the CC group indicates a slightly greater importance of the Spanish language for their current jobs (CC group: $M = 2.3$, CR group: $M = 1.4$), which can be explained by the fact that several participants work as Spanish teachers; whereas the CR group indicates greater importance of Spanish for obtaining a job in Russia (CC group: $M = 1.9$, CR group: $M = 2.9$). In addition, both groups considered use of Spanish as not important for general economic advancement (CC group: $M = 2.6$, CR group: $M = 2.5$). As a whole, the overall instrumental value of the Spanish language can be described as low for both groups across all target areas. A number of comments from participants in the oral

⁵ Translations were conducted by the author and verified by a native Spanish speaker. Quotations in the original language are available in Appendix A.

interviews, as well as in open ended written responses, echoed this sentiment, as seen in Examples 2 – 4.

- (2) CC01: *If you live in Russia, speaking Spanish does not help with anything. It is obligatory to be dominant in Russian to get information from anywhere.*
- (3) CC02: *At the university all the professors speak Russian all the time. Nobody knows Spanish.*
- (4) CC01: *I speak Russian because I need to speak it...at the market, at the doctor's, at the immigration office.*

Language and identity

As a preliminary approach to the issue of language and identity, participants were asked to what degree they identified as Cuban and Russian (e.g. *Do you consider yourself Cuban?*) on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not at all, 5 = absolutely). The responses demonstrated that the CC group indicates almost absolute self-identification as “Cuban” ($M = 4.7$, $SD = 0.7$) as opposed to “Russian” ($M = 1.7$, $SD = 1.5$), a difference found to be highly significant ($t(7) = 4.58$, $p = .002$). In contrast, the CR group identifies similarly for both “Cuban” ($M = 3.6$, $SD = 0.7$) and “Russian” ($M = 3.6$, $SD = 1$) ($t(7) = 0$, $p = 1.00$). It should be highlighted that along with the responses representing self-identification as half-Cuban and half-Russian, with identity scores of 3 for both Cuban and Russian, a number of participants identified themselves strongly as both: Cuban and Russian (i.e. scores of 4/4 and 5/5).

Further addressing the issue of identity, subjects were asked to evaluate the role of the size of the community and the contact with monolingual Spanish speakers (i.e. distance from homeland) in their sense of identity. These specific characteristics were chosen as they represent points of departure from the Cuban community in the U.S. For the CR group, these external characteristics seem to play a minimal role in Cuban self-identification: size of the community ($M = 1.5$, $SD = 0.7$), contact with monolingual speakers ($M = 1.4$, $SD = 0.7$). The CR group also indicates a relatively minor role of these factors: size of the community ($M = 2.5$, $SD = 1.7$) and contact with monolingual speakers ($M = 3$, $SD = 1.4$). Although the CR

group indicated more of an impact of these external factors than CC group ($t(21) = -3.10, p = .005$), neither group indicated a overwhelming role of these external factors on identity.

Lastly, and perhaps the most direct measure of the link between language and identity, participants were asked about the importance of speaking Spanish for Cuban identity (1 = not important at all; 5 = absolutely important). Both groups reported that speaking Spanish is somewhat important for one's Cuban identity (CC Group: ($M = 3.1, SD = 1.6$); CR Group: ($M = 3.1, SD = 1.6$)) ($t(28) = 1.07, p = .292$). Again, the qualitative data supports this finding (Example 5)

- (5) *CC02: It is important to know the language in order to be Cuban. The basis of the language is Spanish but Cuban Spanish is different... not only in Cuba, in all the Spanish-speaking countries. Every country has a bit of just "mine"... this is "mine". And Cubans use a lot of words that in other countries where Spanish is spoken will not be understood, it's something that characterizes it. In order to be Cuban it is necessary to know the Cuban culture, dances, music well... If you listen to music, yes, it is rhythm, but if you do not understand the lyrics... you can dance but you do not feel the music. The lyrics of the music carry a lot.*

Summarizing the findings for identity, while the CC group seems to identify predominantly as Cuban, the CR group demonstrates a somewhat dual identification as both Cuban and Russian. While neither group considered the external factors to be crucial for identity, both groups evidenced some importance of the use of Spanish for Cuban identity. Results for both groups with respect to language and identity are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. *Language and Identity*

	CC group M (SD)	CR group M (SD)
<i>Self-identification^a</i>		
Self-identification as Cuban	4.7 (0.7)	3.6 (0.7)
Self-identification as Russian	1.7 (1.5)	3.6 (1)
<i>Impact of external factors^b</i>		
Influence of the distance from Cuba	1.4 (0.7)	3 (1.4)
Influence of the size of the community	1.5 (0.7)	2.5 (1.7)
<i>Importance of Spanish language^c</i>		
Importance of Spanish language proficiency for group identification	3.1 (1.6)	3.1 (1.6)

a. (1 = not at all; 5 = absolutely)

b. (1 = no influence at all; absolutely/significantly important)

c. (1 = not important at all 5 = absolutely important)

Discussion

While the Cuban community in the U.S. has been an important source for sociolinguistic research, most notably on patterns of language use and identity, the previously unstudied Cuban population in Russia represents an important point of comparison. Specifically, while the two groups share significant cultural and historical origins, key differences in the populations (e.g. size of the population, contact with monolingual communities, and historical background) present a unique opportunity to examine issues of language use and language identity. Thus, the goals of the present study were to analyze the patterns of Spanish language use of the Cuban population in Russia, to examine issues of language and identity,

The results indicated that while both first (CC group) and second (CR group) generation immigrants are proficient in both Russian and Spanish, the CC group can be considered more Spanish-dominant while the CR group is more Russian-dominant. While both groups report a low instrumental value for Spanish, the groups differ in their implementation of Spanish in the affective domains, name the CC group uses more Spanish in the intimate domain while the CR group strongly prefers Russian. With respect to language and identity, the CC group identified as strongly Cuban, to the exclusion of identifying as Russian, while the CR group illustrated a dual Cuban-Russian identity. Interestingly, neither group reported overwhelming influence of the external factors of community size and contact with monolingual speakers on their identity.

Language use

Taking into consideration the fact that the CC group and the CR group can be perceived as the first and second generations of speakers in a foreign environment, the pattern observed in the present study can be perceived as an example of a natural language shift towards dominant language in a given society which, according to previous studies, advances in succeeding generations (Lambert & Taylor, 1996; Lamboy, 2004; Porcel, 2006). This finding stands in contrast to the Cuban community in the U.S. A number of researchers

conclude that there is a tendency towards language maintenance in the U.S. Cuban community, an effect that even spreads Spanish to the dominant language community (Carter & Lynch, 2015; Lynch, 2000). Spanish is seen not only as the language of in-group communication, but is seen as potentially important for economic and educational advancement (Boswell, 2000; Ramírez, 2000; Resnick, 1988; Roca, 2005). Although the support for bilingualism seems (potentially) socio-economically conditioned, with upper and middle class families more likely to promote active bilingualism (Lambert & Taylor, 1996), what is clear is that Spanish in the U.S. context enjoys a significant level of instrumental value, potentially owing to regular contact with monolingual speakers and a large community size. While it is possible that the U.S. Cuban community may also experience linguistic assimilation (Porcel, 2006), such a transition is likely to be gradual. Interestingly, while neither the CC group nor the CR group indicated an effect of the external factors on their feelings of identity, there may be a clear role for these factors in patterns of language use. That is, while the U.S. Cuban and the Russian Cuban communities share a number of cultural and historical characteristics, the results of the current study offer clear, additional evidence for the importance of external factors, such as instrumental value of the language and community size, on language maintenance or shift.

A second relevant finding to emerge from the current study is the differentiation among various factors in the intimate domain, a finding that actually proved to be a distinguishing characteristic between the first and second generation groups. Specifically, while previous studies on language use that have included the intimate/affective domain have considered the domain as monolithic or have distinguished friends and family (Carranza, 1982; Garcia & Diaz, 1992; Joseph, 2004; Lamboy, 2004; Spernes, 2012; Taylor & Lambert, 1996), the current study showed clear differing patterns among two different categories of the friend construct. Specifically, while the CR group demonstrated a preference for Russian with all members of the intimate domain, the CC group clearly distinguished between culturally

Cuban friends, with whom they strongly preferred to speak Spanish, and culturally Russian friends, with whom they strongly preferred to speak Russian. While this distinction is not surprising, particularly in a minority language community, these results suggest that future work may benefit from a more nuanced approach to the larger categories of intimate and public domain.

Language and identity

The results obtained with respect to language and identity illustrate divergent patterns between the two groups, which can be summarized into the following tendencies. Considering direct self-identification, the CC group indicates relatively higher self-identification as “Cuban” and minimal self-identification as “Russian”. This finding illustrates a fundamental dichotomy between “Cuban” and “Russian” identity. Conversely, the CR group does not demonstrate this same dichotomy. As a whole, CR participants identify themselves as half-Cuban and half-Russian or, interestingly both Cuban and Russian reporting the highest levels of identification on both identity scales. With respect to the influence of the external factors on identity, i.e. size of the community and distance from Cuba, it should be noted that the CC group indicates lower dependence on external factors in creating a sense of ethnic identity than the CR group, although neither group indicated a strong impact of external factors. This tendency may be evidence of the CC group’s stronger sense of ethnic identity as being less susceptible to the influence of external factors in a foreign environment. Based on the analysis of the linguistic component of identity (i.e. Spanish language proficiency as an indicator of Cuban identity), it should be stated that both target groups express equally high relevance of the language, indicating that Spanish language proficiency is an important feature for self-identification as a part of the Cuban community.

Considering all the above analyzed aspects of ethnic identity of both groups, the justification of the two-dimensional model of identity, proposed by Phinney (1990), can be

noted, where strong relations with the dominant culture do not mean complete rejection of one's native culture and vice versa. Still, it should be stated that the CC group indicates overall stronger sense of Cuban identity than the CR group. Judging by the findings obtained for the CR group, such as self-identification as half-Cuban/half-Russian and both Cuban and Russian, the evidence of dual identity can be observed (Phinney, 1990). This phenomenon, or as it was defined by several scholars (e.g. Carreira, 2012; Ghuman, 1991) "hyphenated identity", can be characteristic of heritage speakers (CR group in the present study). Also, as adolescents are more susceptible to general external factors' (e.g. society, peers relations) with respect to the individual and group identity formation (Bailey, 2007; Erickson, 1993; Hurrelmann, 1988), early age of integration into a different, and subsequently dominant, cultural and linguistic environment can lead to the development of dual identity or trigger the process of gradual shift of identity towards the dominant in the society pattern. These social and relational factors clearly differentiate the two groups. The CR group immigrated at a younger age and underwent more education in Russia, a key period for socialization.

Lastly, due to the complex nature of the CR group's identity as well as patterns of Spanish language choice and use, the external factors may have been more influential for the second generation group than the first generation group, adding to the process of a shift towards or development of the dominant community's Russian language and identity.

Conclusion

The aim of the study was to analyze patterns of language use in connection with language-identity issues of two groups of the Cuban population in the Russian society: first generation immigrants (CC group) and second generation immigrants (CR group). This community can be considered a relevant for investigation population due its key characteristics, such as small size of the community when compared to the dominant groups in Russia, contact with monolingual Spanish speakers, and strong positive cultural-historical background of Soviet-Cuban relations.

With respect to their patterns of language use, in contrast to the U.S. Cuban population, the Russian Cuban community reports a typical pattern of language shift towards the dominant language, likely as the result of external factors such as community size, lack of contact with monolingual Spanish speakers, and low instrumental value of the Spanish language. Also of note, the CC group indicated a clear differentiation of language choice within the intimate domain, suggesting benefits of a more nuanced approach to investigations of the intimate domain. With respect to language and identity, the results of the study indicate a noteworthy identity distribution between the two groups: “Cuban” vs “Russian” opposition for the CC group and dual Cuban-Russian identity for the CR group. As these aspects can influence patterns of language use and the language-identity connection, they should be addressed more in-depth in future research.

The present study examined a minority community’s behavior in the context of a non-dominant environment, namely Cubans in Russia, a case that has not been addressed in the previous research. Thus, the findings of the present study can add relevant information to already defined patterns of language use and identity, specifically with respect to the well-researched case of Cubans in the U.S., and can be beneficial for further research in the sociolinguistic field of language use and language-identity relations.

References

- Alfaraz, G. 2002. “Miami Cuban Perceptions of Varieties of Spanish.” In *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology (Vol. 2)*, edited by D. Long and D. Preston, 27–38. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Alonso, C. 2006. Spanish: The Foreign National Language. *ADFL Bulletin* 37(2-3): 15-20.
- Amador, E. 1984. “Soviet-Cuban Collaboration in the 1970s.” PhD diss.
<http://www.dissercat.com/content/sovetsko-kubinskoe-sotrudnichestvo-v-70-e-gody>
- Bailey, B. 2007. Shifting Negotiations of Identity in a Dominican American Community. *Latino Studies* 5: 157-181.
- Bayuk, M. 1979. Language Changes: Random, Natural Process vs Politically Induced Changes. *University of South Florida Quarterly*, 17, 46-48.

- Beckstead, K., and A. Toribio. 2003. "Minority Perspectives on Language. Mexican and Mexican-American adolescents' Attitudes toward Spanish and English." In *Mi Lengua. Spanish as a Heritage Language in the United States*, edited by A. Roca and M. Colombi, 154-169. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Berg, B. 2007. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Boswell, T. 2000. "Demographic Changes in Florida and Their Importance for Effective Educational Policies and Practices." In *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic Issues and Challenges*, edited by A. Roca, 406-431. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Boughton, G. 1974. "Soviet-Cuban Relations, 1956-1960." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 16(4): 436-453.
- Brown, C. 2009. "Heritage Language and Ethnic Identity: A Case Study of Korean American College Students." *International Journal of Multicultural Education* 11(1): 1-16.
- Bryman, A. 1988. *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*. London: Unwin Hyman Ltd.
- Bucholtz, M., and K. Hall. 2003. "Language and Identity." In *A Companion to Linguistics Anthropology*, edited by A. Duranti, 368-394. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Carranza, M. 1982. "Attitudinal Research on Hispanic Language Varieties." In *Attitudes towards language variation: Social and applied contexts*, edited by E. Ryan and H. Giles, 63-83. London: Edward Arnold.
- Carreira, M. 2012. "Meeting the Needs of Heritage Language Learners: Approaches, Strategies, and Research." In *Spanish as a Heritage Language in the US: State of the Science*, edited by S. Beaudrie and M. Fairclough, 223-240. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Carter, P., and A. Lynch. 2015. "Multilingual Miami: Current Trends in Sociolinguistic Research." *Language and Linguistics Compass* 9(9): 369-385.
- Cislo, A. 2008. "Ethnic Identity and Self-esteem: Contrasting Cuban and Nicaraguan Young Adults." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 30(2): 230-250.
- Dannenberg, A. 2006. "Russian-Cuban Relations in the Post-bipolar Period." PhD diss. <http://www.ilaran.ru/?n=362>
- Erickson, E. 1993. *Childhood and Society*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Flege, J., I. Mackay, and T. Piske. 2002. "Assessing Bilingual Dominance." *Applied Psycholinguistics* 23: 567-598.
- Flege, J., G. Yeni-Komshian, and S. Liu. 1999. "Age Constraints on Second-language Acquisition." *Journal of Memory and Language* 41: 78-104.

- Fuller, J. 2007. "Language Choice as a Means of Shaping Identity." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17(1): 105-129.
- García, D. 2008. "¡En Esta Casa Se Habla Español! The Role of Language Ideology and Life Choices in Language Maintenance and Language Shift across Three Generations of a Cuban American Family in the United States." PhD diss. ProQuest Digital Dissertations (UMI 3332825)
- Garcia, R., and C. Diaz. 1992. "The Status and Use of Spanish and English among Hispanic Youth in Dade County (Miami) Florida: A Sociolinguistic Study, 1989-1991." *Language and Education* 6(1): 13-32.
- García, O., and R. Otheguy. 1988. "The Language Situation of Cuban Americans." In *Language diversity: Problems or Resource?*, edited by S. McKay and S. Wong, 166-192. New York: Newbury Publishers.
- Gardner, R., and W. Lambert. 1972. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-language Learning*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.
- Ghuman, P. 1991. "Best or Worst of Two Worlds? A Study of Asian Adolescents." *Educational Research* 33(2): 121-132.
- Gudykunst, W., and K. Schmidt. 1987. "Language and Ethnic Identity: An Overview and Prologue." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 6(157): 157-170.
- Hernández, J. 2009. "Measuring Rates of Word-final Nasal Velarization: The Effect of Dialectal Contact on In-group and Out-group Exchanges." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13(5): 583-612.
- Hurrelmann, K. 1988. *Social Structure and Personality Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jia, G., D. Aaronson, & Y. Wu. 2002. "Long-term Language Attainment of Bilingual Immigrants: Predictive Variables and Language Group Differences." *Applied Psycholinguistics* 23: 599-621.
- Joseph, J. 2004. *Language and Identity: National, Ethnic, Religious*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kroskrity, P. 1999. "Identity." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9(1-2): 111-114.
- Lambert, W., and D. Taylor. 1996. "Language in the Lives of Ethnic Minorities: Cuban American Families in Miami." *Applied Linguistics* 17(4): 477-500.
- Lamboy, E. 2004. *Caribbean Spanish in the Metropolis: Spanish Language among Cubans, Dominicans, and Puerto Ricans in the New York City Area*. New York: Routledge.
- Larin, E. 2007. *Political History of Cuba XX century*. Moscow, Russia: Vyshaya Shkola.
- Lipski, J. 2008. *Varieties of Spanish in the United States*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

- Lynch, A. 2000. "Spanish-speaking Miami in Sociolinguistic Perspective: Bilingualism, Recontact, and Language Maintenance among the Cuban-origin Population." In *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic Issues and Challenges*, edited by A. Roca, 271-283. Somerville: Cascadia Press.
- Marian, V., H. Blumenfeld, H., and M. Kaushanskaya. 2007. "The Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q): Assessing Language Profiles in Bilinguals and Multilinguals." *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research* 50: 940-967.
- McNamara, C. 1999. "General Guidelines for Conducting Interviews." <http://managementhelp.org/businessresearch/interviews.htm>
- Mendoza-Denton, N. 2004. "The Anguish of Normative Gender: Sociolinguistic Studies among U.S. Latinas." In *Language and Woman's Place*, edited by M. Bucholtz, 260-268. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, G., and R. Dingwall. 1997. *Context and Method in Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Modern Linguistics Association. 2013. "MLA Enrollment Survey." https://www.mla.org/enrollments_surveys
- Mohl, R. 1985. "An Ethnic "Boiling Pot": Cubans and Haitians in Miami." *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 13(2): 51-74.
- Moreno, L., and A. Arriba. 1996. "Dual Identity in Autonomous Catalonia." *Scottish Affairs* 17: 78-97.
- Novikov, P., and A. Chelyadinsky. 2012. "Russia – Cuba relations in 1991 – 2011." *International Relations and Foreign Policy* 3: 23-27.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., and A. Roca. 2000. "Speaking in Cuban: The Language of Cuban Americans." In *New Immigrants in the United States: Readings for Second Language Educators*, edited by S. McKay and S. Wong, 165-188. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pérez-Leroux, A., A. Cuza, and D. Thomas. 2011. "From Parental Attitudes to Input Conditions: Spanish-English Bilingual Development in Toronto." In *Bilingual Youth: Spanish in English-speaking Societies*, edited by K. Potowski and J. Rothman, 149-176. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Perl, M. 1979. "On the Situation of English Lexical Units in Cuban Spanish." *Studii si cercetari lingvistice* 30: 257-261.
- Phinney, J. 1990. "Ethnic Identity in Adolescents and Adults: Review of Research." *Psychological Bulletin* 108(3): 499-514.
- Pieras-Guasp, F. 2002. Direct vs Indirect Attitude Measurement and the Planning of Catalan in Mallorca." *Language Problems and Language Planning* 26(1): 51-68.

- Porcel, J. 2006. "The Paradox of Spanish among Miami Cubans." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10(1): 93-110.
- Ramírez, A. 2000. "Linguistic Notions of Spanish among Youths from Different Hispanic Groups." In *Research on Spanish in the United States: Linguistic Issues and Challenges*, edited by A. Roca, 284–295. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Riley, P. 2007. *Language, Culture and Identity*. London: Continuum.
- Resnick, M. 1988. "Beyond the Ethnic Community: Spanish Language Roles and Maintenance in Miami." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 69: 89-104.
- Roca, A. 2005. "Raising a Bilingual Child in Miami: Reflections on Language and Culture." In *Building on Strength: Language and Literacy in Latino Families and Communities*, edited by A. Zentella, 110–119. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Romaine, S. 1995. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Rothman, J., and M. Niño-Murcia. 2008. "Multilingualism and Identity: All in the Family." In *Bilingualism and Identity: Spanish at the Crossroads with Other Languages*, edited by M. Niño-Murcia and J. Rothman, 301-332. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Rothman, J. and A. Rell. 2005. "A linguistic analysis of Spanglish: Relating Language to Identity." *Linguistics and the Human Sciences* 1(3): 515-536.
- Russian Census Bureau. 2010. "Ethnic Composition of the Population." http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/perepis2010/croc/Documents/Vol4/pub-04-01.pdf
- Singh, I., and J. Peccei, eds. 2004. *Language, Society and Power*. London: Routledge.
- Spernes, K. 2012. "I Use my Mother Tongue at Home and with Friends – not in School!" Multilingualism and Identity in Rural Kenya." *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 25(2): 189-203.
- Solé, C. 1982. "Language Loyalty and Language Attitudes among Cuban-Americans." In *Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the United States*, edited by J. Fishman and G. Keller, 254-269. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Starks, D., and Z. McRobbie-Utasi. 2001. "Collecting Sociolinguistic Data: Some Typical and Some not so Typical Approaches." *New Zealand Sociology* 16(1): 79-92.
- Taylor, D., and Lambert, W. 1996. "The Meaning of Multiculturalism in a Culturally Diverse Urban American Area." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 136(6): 727-740.
- United States Census Bureau. 2011. "Population Estimates." <http://www.census.gov/popest/data/maps/11maps.html>
- Watson, M. 2006. "Post-revolutionary Cuban Spanish: Changes in the Lexicon and Language Attitudes Motivated by Socio-political Reforms." PhD diss. Washington: Georgetown University.

- Zentella, A. 2002. "Latin@ Languages and Identities." In *Latinos: Remarking America*, edited by M. Suárez-Orozco and M. Páez, 321-338. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zentella, A. 2007. "Dime con Quién Hablas, y te Diré Quién Eres": Linguistic (in)security and Latina/o Unity." In *A Companion to Latina/o Studies*, edited by J. Flores and R. Rosaldo, 25-38. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Appendix A (Qualitative data in the original language)

- (1) CC01: Quiero que él [el hijo] hable español porque es su lengua, su país.
- (2) CC01: Si se vive en Rusia saber español no ayuda en nada, es obligatorio dominar el Ruso para obtener información en cualquier lugar.
- (3) CC02: En la universidad los profesores hablan ruso todo el tiempo. Nadie sabe español.
- (4) CC01: Hablo ruso porque tengo que hablar...en el mercado, el médico, la inmigración.
- (5) CC02: Es importante saber el idioma para ser Cubano. La base del idioma es español pero el cubano ha cambiado mucho el idioma....no sólo en Cuba, en todos países de habla hispana. Cada tiene su poquito de “lo mío”...esto es “lo mío”. Y el cubano usa muchas palabras que en otros países, donde hablan español, no entienden, y algo que lo caracteriza. Para ser cubano tiene que conocer bien la cultura cubana, los bailes, la música...cualquier escucha la música, sí, es ritmo, pero si no entiende la letra puede bailar pero no siente la música. Las letras de la música llevan mucho.