

DOI: 10.31648/pw.10197

YURIY SEREBRIANSKY

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4585-0725>

University of Warmia and Mazury

LANGUAGE DISTINCTIONS IN RUSSOPHONE GROUPS OF THE POLISH SEGMENT OF FACEBOOK

ABSTRACT: The article examines the distinctions of the Russian language used by Ukrainians living in Poland. The study is based on the analysis of Facebook groups in the Polish segment, where both private and commercial messages are posted. The article presents the findings of an analysis of language insertions from the Polish language and other linguistic features of messages in online groups, specifically focusing on the use of toponyms and elements of speech etiquette of the Russian language. Additionally, data on the dynamics of changes in the number of group members and the frequency of Russian and Ukrainian language use in these groups from January to September 2022 are presented.

KEYWORDS: Russian language in Poland, Ukrainian language in Poland, language of social networks, Russian language outside Russia, Russian language, internet communication, language interference

Introduction

As a result of momentous historical events, the linguistic landscape of modern Poland has changed significantly in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. One of the main events that influenced the situation of the Russian language was the change in the country's language policy since 1989, when the study of the Russian language became no longer compulsory in schools and universities. According to published data, in 1986-1987, 83% of students had to take Russian as one their final exams in school, while in 2017-2018 this number was at only 1.7% of students (Pawłowski 2019, 165).

The events of the first decades of the 21st century also significantly impacted the language situation in Poland. This was mainly due to the influx of immigrants from Ukraine. According to the Central Bureau of Statistics (Główny Urząd Statystyczny 2020), the number of Ukrainian citizens in Poland in 2019 was 1,351,418, the number of Belarusian citizens was 105,404 and Russian citizens amounted to 37,030.

P. Levchuk (2020, 75) distinguishes six waves of Ukrainian migration to Poland, starting from 1891. They were the result of various factors. The fifth wave

of migration began in 2014 and was caused by military, economic, and existential reasons. Levchuk (2023) also writes about the sixth wave of Ukrainian migration, which began in 2022.

In terms of polylingualism among Ukrainians, several groups are distinguished (Levchuk 2023). Ukrainian emigrants speak both Ukrainian and Russian, most often possessing a command of both languages. Some researchers classify Russian as a pluricentric language (Shaybakova 2019, 257), and the phenomena of language interference are also studied within the framework of migration linguistics (Golubeva | Timofeeva 2016). Migration is a most important factor that contributes to the emergence of multiple loanwords in people's linguistic behavior. This problem is at the center of the present article: a study of lexical borrowings in the texts of Ukrainian emigrants published on the social networking website Facebook will be presented.

1. Lexical borrowings as a problem of migration linguistics

The second half of the twentieth century marked a significant increase in migration processes involving all countries, social strata, groups, and various spheres of social life. The current historical period is also characterized by an upsurge in migration activity, which is associated with both military actions in some countries and migration processes driven by economic reasons. The movement of migrants from one country to another inevitably leads to situations of interlingual (linguistic) interference. Observations of the phenomena arising from "language mixing" date back to ancient times, and more recent studies have examined linguistic interference between different language pairs (Sirbu 2015). Additionally, the discourse surrounding so-called global languages is emerging, and the impact of the spread of the Internet is actively being investigated.

A migrant's ability to communicate in the language of the host country plays a key role in their successful integration into the labor market and society. Language proficiency among migrants can be determined by their exposure to the host language, the efficiency of language acquisition, and economic incentives to learn a new language. These three components have been conceptualized in the literature as the three E's of the language acquisition process (Chiswick 1991; Chiswick | Miller 1995). During the process of learning the host country's language, interference situations arise depending on several factors. It is easier for a migrant to learn the host language if their native language is genetically closer to the target language (Chiswick | Miller 2001; 2005; Ispording 2014; Ispording | Otten 2014). The appearance of borrowed units in the text depends on the speaker's knowledge of the foreign language as well as their pragmatic intentions. The success of understanding foreign-language insertion depends on the semantic complexity of the text and communicative conditions (Hantov | Kananowicz | Nowożenowa 2021, 39).

Language, in turn, is a definite factor in migration processes. For example, knowledge of the language of the host country allows immigrants to obtain information more quickly, facilitates access to the labor market, and helps them learn about immigrants' rights, etc. (Palmer | Pytliková 2015, 127-153). A. Adserà and M. Pytliková (2016, 346) developed a 'linguistic proximity index,' which takes into account how many levels of the linguistic genealogical tree the languages of the host country and the country of origin share. The impact of migrants' age on language learning ability, teaching problems, and linguistic differences across immigrant generations has also been studied. The rapid emergence of internationalisms is characteristic primarily in online communication, where the dominant language today is English. The existence of terms like 'runGLISH,' 'spanGLISH,' 'franGLISH,' and 'denGLISH' indicates that we are dealing with a global phenomenon (Shilintcev | Abakumova 2021, 34). On the one hand, foreign language insertions appear in foreign language texts (L1 elements in L2), and on the other hand, borrowings are presented in native language speech (L2 elements in L1). Thus, Y. Glebova (2019) writes that the French speech of African migrants is rich in elements from the Bantu language.

One of the first publications on the topic of migration linguistics was Jane T. Reock's monograph (1953) on the waves of Hungarian immigrants to the USA. Analyzing the language situation in Germany, E. Nedopekina notes correlation between the knowledge level of Russian language and belonging to certain waves of migration, education level, and country of origin for the immigrants, native speakers of Russian language. (Nedopekina 2017, 236).

Analyzing the Spanish language situation in the USA, V. Maslyakov points out that the number of its speakers makes it possible to create language enclaves where immigrants communicate in Spanish, considering their stay in the U.S. as temporary, but the same work describes the interference of Spanish and English, referred to as *EspanGLISH* (in Spanish) and *SpanGLISH* (in English).

M. Błasiak-Tytuła (2013, 111) describes several forms of speech behavior of Polish immigrants in the UK. On the one hand, they use English on a case-by-case basis in official situations and in communication with the British, while speaking Polish in their family and friends' circle. On the other hand, the Polish speech of these immigrants displays an increasing number of English insertions, which gives grounds to speak about a mixed variant of the two languages, defined as *PonGLISH*.

Language interference in the speech behavior of immigrants is also widely studied in Germany, where, after more than twenty years, emigrants from Eastern Europe and Central Asia have only a basic command of Russian. Especially the Russian language of young people who grew up in Germany differs from the literary norm and contains many elements of German (Hamann | Witzlack-Makarevich | Wulff 2019, 173).

The intensity of the penetration of foreign-language words into the Russian language is due to several factors, including the increased volume of international contacts in all spheres of activity, the development of Internet technologies, and internal socio-cultural processes within the communities to which the speaking subject belongs. A significant increase in the number of foreign-language elements in modern Slavic languages is a manifestation of the process of linguacultural globalization and widespread bilingualism in society. The appearance of foreign-language elements in a language stems from the situations in which the language does not find or does not have time to find nominative means for a quick response to the changing realities of the surrounding world. This process can also be influenced by socio-psychological factors, active bilingualism, and language fashion (Artemov 2013, 26).

A. Golubeva and A. Timofeeva (2016) analyzes the peculiarities of communication on Internet forums among the modern Russian-speaking population of the Czech Republic. The literature (Makarov | Shkolovaja 2006) also points out that the study of language interference on the Internet is a new area of sociolinguistics, and this field holds great prospects due to the inevitable growth of migration processes and the increasing role of Internet communication, especially among immigrants.

2. Materials and methods

The article based on private and commercial messages in Russian languages, posted by migrants from Eastern Europe in Facebook during the period from January to October 2022. The following Facebook groups were analyzed:

1. Жизнь и работа в Гданьске (в Труймясте) ‘Life and work in Gdansk (Treesity)’
2. Українці в Ольштині | Вармінсько-Мазурське Воєводство | Українці в Olsztynie ‘Ukrainians in Olsztyn | Warmian and Mazurian Voivodaship’
3. Українці Pomorza, Warmii i Mazur – Українці Помор’я, Вармії та Мазурів ‘Ukrainians of Pomerania, Warmia and Mazury – Ukrainians of Pomerania, Warmia and Mazury’
4. ПОЗНАНЬ ☆ POZNAN ♥ Работа | жильє | услуги ‘Poznan. Work. Property rent. Services’
5. Труймясто в каждом из нас ‘Treesity in every one of us’
6. Русскоязычные в Труймєсте (Гданьск, Гдыня, Сопот) ‘Russophones in Treesity (Gdansk, Gdynia, Sopot)’
7. Ольштин для своїх | Ольштын для своих. Польща, оголошення ‘Olsztyn for our people. Poland. Announcements’

8. Русскоязычные в Троймясте и Поморском воеводстве. Гданьск | Гдыня | Сопот 'Russophones in Treesity and Pomerania voivodship. Gdansk, Gdynia, Sopot'
9. Работа в Польше 2022 | Вроцлав | Варшава | Познань | Щецин | Гданьск | Быдгощ 'Work in Poland 2022, Wroclaw, Warsaw, Poznan, Szczecin, Bydgoszcz'

The posts of two groups bringing together natives of Kazakhstan were also analyzed:
10. Казахи в Польше 'Kazakhs in Poland'

11. Казахстанцы в Польше (Kazakhstanians in Poland) 'Kazakhstanis in Poland'
The number of participants varies greatly between the groups from 3,862 (Українці в Ольштині) to 35,548 (Жизнь и работа в Гданьске).

Analyzed posts can be grouped into several main categories: 1) private job search or apartment rental posts; 2) commercial job offers; 3) commercial service offerings by private individuals; and 4) non-commercial posts.

The total volume of processed linguistic material consists of 69 lexical units. The necessary material for the study was obtained through direct observation and continuous sampling of relevant fragments from Russian texts. The empirical material, selected via systematic sampling, was analyzed using the descriptive analytical method. The most effective field research methods used to record the linguistic material include participant observation, direct observation, and interviewing. The method of linguistic attribution of borrowings was employed in the study of the empirical material. The comparative method was used to analyze linguistic variants, determining similarities and differences in their use. Quantitative counting of foreign language insertions was conducted using statistical methods.

3. Results of the study

3.1 Borrowings from the Polish language

Lexical borrowings from Polish represented include alternants, which are words that have corresponding equivalents in Russian, such as *кауция* 'pledge'. There are also lacunar borrowings, introducing into speech names that are absent in Russian. Examples of these include words like *умова* 'contract', *бадание встемпне* 'primary interview' and *кавалерка* 'one-room apartment'.

Borrowed units are represented by individual lexemes, such as *Грудзѣндз* (the name of a city), and word combinations, like *на Днепр, на Гданьск, от понедельника, машина под выкуп, недалеко Колобжега, з украинского на польский*. It's worth noting that many borrowed syntactic constructions are modeled after Polish syntax, and in some cases, Ukrainian syntax *с Києва на Польшу*.

Lexical borrowings belong to different lexico-semantic classes: 1) official business terms; 2) housing 3) toponyms representing complete insertions, e.g. *Грудзѣндз*; toponyms representing incomplete insertions, *Kartoszyno*.

1. Official-business terms (18 units): The use of official-business terms is driven by practical needs, such as drafting up documents, insurances, work contracts, etc. Below are some examples: *коинлист, полицялка, зерувка, мельдунок, умова оказьональна, бадание встемпне, умова злеценне, кауция* etc.

When transmitting Polish lexemes, authors of texts use not only transliteration, which involves replacing Latin letters with Cyrillic ones but also adapting Cyrillic to convey the peculiarities of Polish phonetics. As a result, Polish lexemes in posts and comments appear in several different phonetic versions. For instance, the word *уржонт* – *urząd* has no direct one-word correspondence in Russian, and the alternation of vowel sounds in the root makes it challenging to transliterate. This explains the presence of different forms for rendering the Polish word in the texts under consideration, such as *уржонт, уженд, урженд, уржонд, в уженд'е*.

It is worth noting the rendering of the Polish digraph *rz*, which is typically transliterated in Russian literary language as two separate letters. For example, some Polish surnames like *Пржевальский, Комиссаржевская, Бедржицкий, Бржевская* are often transliterated this way, even though in Polish, it is pronounced as [ж] or [ш].

In the collected material, there are examples of both transliteration of the digraph *rz* with two separate letters (*урженд, уржонд, в уженд'е*) and other forms of transliteration (*уржонт, уженд, and Район Пшиможже, Вжешч, недалеко Колобжега, Бжежно*).

The word *wniosek* meaning “statement” or “request” appears in two forms: *внёсек, внесек*. The second variant is due to the fact that the letter *ě* is practically not used in Russian texts. However, it's evident that this rule in this case leads to a distortion of the pronunciation of the borrowed word.

Morphological peculiarities of Polish loanwords come from the necessity of adapting Polish lexemes to the grammatical system of Russian or Ukrainian. One characteristic phenomenon of this type is the extension of the ending or suffix, as seen in the following examples: *вузковий, бадание, злеценне, мельдунок*.

In the study of the interaction between Russian and English on the Internet, O. Maksimova (2010, 84) notes that Russian linguistic innovations are characterized by the borrowing or modelling of significant elements after foreign patterns, which then become ‘roots’ for further word creation based on morphological variations. These variations are based not so much on visual perception but on the acoustic image created by the new word.

2. The second group of insertions is related to renting accommodation and preparation of relevant documents (5 units), including terms like *мельдунок* (1 unit), *кавалерка* (3 units), *кауция* (1 unit).

The borrowing of these lexical units is “institutionally conditioned” because “the structure of the destination society presents itself to the immigrant through the appropriate lexicon necessary to serve his communicative needs in the new country” (Shovgenin, 2007, 14).

3. Complete insertions, primarily Polish toponyms, are represented in the analyzed material (with 17 units). These include *Район Пишможе, г.Иновроцлав, Вжешч, на Заспе, район Витаминно, район Осова, по Труймясто, Околиця Гданьска, г. Сухы Лас, Плоньск, Бжежно, пишможе, Гданск, Ольштин, Гдыня хылония, Пруц Гданск Гданськ, Вжешч.*

The prevalence of the Cyrillic alphabet in Internet sources is typical for the Russian language abroad in general. However, there is no uniformity in the graphical appearance of words, as authors do not adhere to clear rules of transliteration. This reflects the current situation in general (Golubeva | Timofeeva, 2016).

In Russian-language texts of emigrants, there are also graphically non-adapted words, incomplete insertions, also referred to as barbarisms (25 units). For example: *Г. Kartoszyно (возле Гдыни), район rektorat, с границы Korczowa, склад żabka, город Bytow, в городе Pruszcz Gdanski, ул. Kartuska, город Wądzyn, Rawa Mazowec 50 км от Варшавы, из места Przemęt, г. Kartoszyно, склад Biedronka, Город Pótwysp Wadzyn, улица Fabryczna, не далеко от Ronda Srodka, по адресу Aleja Niepodległosci, Район Jezyce, Район Gdansk Wrzeszcz, в районе университета rektorat, Бжежно Город. Stupsk*

Gdansk, с границы Korczowa, Rawa Mazowiec 50 км от Варшавы, Познань, rondo Staroteka. As A. Golubeva and A. Timofeeva points out when analyzing the situation of Russian-speaking forums in the Czech Republic, the inconsistency in the written representation of certain borrowings can be influenced by the arbitrary choice of phonetic (transcription) or graphical (transliteration) principles of the fixation borrowings (Golubeva | Timofeeva 2016).

In addition to the direct assimilation of reality for migrants, the convenience of using borrowings plays an important role, aimed at simplifying communication. “Direct borrowings into Russian represent the simplest and most effective way of naming realities from a communicative perspective. This approach does not require additional efforts and allows for reference to the sociolinguistic space of their existence” (Shovgenin 2007, 17).

3.2. Language reflexes of Russian-Ukrainian interference

The overwhelming majority of users in the analyzed groups are Ukrainians. Therefore, we can consider the language situation in the groups within the context of the language situation in certain regions of Ukraine, taking into account language interference and changing conditions both in Ukraine and among Ukrainian migrants in Poland. An example of such linguistic interference is the following sentence found in a message: *Здравствуйте, хто может помочь с умовой найма жилья.* This sentence contains a request for help with the execution of a rental contract. Although it is written in Russian, as evidenced by the majority of Russian words used, it exhibits several peculiarities. Firstly, the author used the Ukrainian pronoun *хто* instead of the Russian *кто*. Secondly, they used the Polish word *умова* instead of the Russian word *договор*. This phenomenon is widespread in everyday speech communication among Ukrainians (see Del Gaudio 2015, 219; Zeller | Sichinava 2019, 108).

The phenomenon of semicommunication is observed in messages and comments, where communication between users in groups commenting on messages often occurs in two languages. Questions may be asked in Ukrainian and answered in Russian, and vice versa. Users leave comments on the majority of announcements in two languages, which may indicate the bilingualism of group participants. According to A. Kiklewicz and E. Kolosova (2016, 31), an important condition for the presence of semicommunication is a stable type of communication. And such a type of multilingual situation of communication is found within language unions. Announcements in Polish receive almost no comments but only reactions in the form of emojis, such as 'hearts' and 'likes.' Since users prefer to leave full written comments to messages in other languages, the use of emojis in messages in Polish may indicate an insufficient level of Polish language skills among group members and a language barrier. This is particularly noticeable because most advertisements in Polish are posted by representatives of Polish employers. The name and, consequently, the targeting of groups influence the ratio of the number of announcements in different languages. In groups where the word *русскоязычный* appears in the name, posts in Russian prevail (2:1), while in groups where the word *українці* appears in the name, there are more posts in Ukrainian (3:1). It's worth noting that during the study period, one of the groups changed its name from *Труймясто в каждом из нас...* to a hybrid version composed of the words 'Ukrainian...' to a hybrid variant composed of Polish and Ukrainian *Trójmiasto в кожному з нас... Гданськ, Гдиня, Соноп...* (changed on 12.10.2022). Nevertheless, messages in Russian continue to be published in the group, and users leave comments to the messages also in Russian.

Conclusion

The presence of a large number of Ukrainian migrants on the territory of Poland has changed the language landscape of the country, including an increase in the number of people using the Russian language in various fields, new areas of application of the Russian language have appeared, such as groups in social networks and messengers. The process of borrowing high-frequency and relevant vocabulary, significant for migrants, is influenced by the functioning within specific social structures (asymmetric bilingualism) and is a common characteristic of the Russian language spoken by those living abroad. The peculiarities of borrowing from Polish are primarily related to the fact that both Russian and Polish (as well as Ukrainian) belong to the group of Slavic languages. The linguistic closeness between these languages can also explain the relative ease of grammatical adaptation, especially when compared to other languages like English or German. This article provides a brief overview of the problem of studying linguistic interference and linguistic inclusions from Polish in the Russian language of Ukrainian emigrants in Poland. However, a more in-depth analysis is needed, both within the context of sociolinguistics and across other spheres of analysis.

References

- ADSERÀ, A. | PYTLIKOVÁ, M. (2016), *Language and Migration*. The Palgrave Handbook of Economics and Language. London.
- ARTEMOV, A. (2013), The Problem of Modernizing the Rules of Russian Transliteration of Czech Proper Names. In: *Novaja rusistika*. VII (1), 26-27. [Артемов, А. (2013), К проблеме модернизации правил русской транслитерации чешских и чехизированных имён собственных. В: *Новая русистика*. VII (1), 26-27.]
- BEASIAK-TYTULA, M. (2013), Ponglish jako przykład adaptacji językowo-kulturowej. In: *Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis Studia de Cultura*. V, 108-111.
- CHISWICK, B. (1991), Speaking, Reading and Earnings among Low-Skilled Immigrants, *Journal of Labor Economics*. 9, 149-170.
- CHISWICK, B. | MILLER, P. (1995), The Endogeneity Between Language and Earnings: International Analyses. In: *Journal of Labor Economics*. 13, 246-288.
- CHISWICK, B. | MILLER, P. (2001), A Model of Destination-Language Acquisition: Application to Male Immigrants in Canada. In: *Demography*. 38, 391-409.
- CHISWICK, B. | MILLER, P. (2005), Do Enclaves Matter in Immigrant Adjustment? In: *City and Community*. 4, 5-35.
- DEL GAUDIO, S. (2015), Ukrainsko-russkaya smeshannaya rech' "surzhik" v sisteme vzaimodeystviya ukrainskogo i russkogo yazykov. In: *Slovene*. 2, 219-220. [Дель Гауде, М. (2015), Украинско-русская смешанная речь «суржик» в системе взаимодействия украинского и русского языков. В: *Словене*. 2, 219-220.]
- ISPHORDING, I. (2014), Disadvantages of Linguistic Origin: Evidence from Immigrant Literacy Scores. In: *Economics Letters*. 123, 236-239.

- ISPHORDING, I. | OTTEN, S. (2014), Linguistic Barriers in the Destination Language Acquisition of Immigrants. In: *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*. 105, 30-50.
- GLEBOVA, Y. (2019), Inoyazychnyye vkrapleniya v yazyke immigrantov iz Kongo i Demokraticheskoy Respubliki Kongo vo Frantsii [dissertatsiya]. Belgorodskiy gosudarstvennyy natsional'nyy issledovatel'skiy universitet, 66-68. [Глебова, Я. (2019), Иноязычные вкрапления в языке иммигрантов из Конго и Демократической Республики Конго во Франции [диссертация]. Белгородский государственный национальный исследовательский университет, 66-68.]
- GOLUBEVA, A. | TIMOFEEVA, A. (2016), "Bydlim v Chekhii", ili spetsifika cheshskikh zaimstvovaniy na primere onlain-kommunikatsii russkoyazychnykh. In: *Novaya rusistika*. 7 (2), 47-63. [Голубева, А. | Тимофеева, А. (2016), «Быдлимы в Чехии», или Специфика чешских заимствований на примере онлайн-коммуникации русскоязычных иммигрантов в Чешской Республике. В: *Новая русистика*. 7 (2), 47-63.]
- HAMANN, K. | WITZLACK-MAKAREVICH, K. | WULFF, N. (2019), Russian in Germany. In: Mustajoki, A. | Protassova, E. | Yelenevskaya, M. (eds.), *The Soft Power of the Russian Language. Pluricentricity, Politics and Policies*. Routledge, 164-166.
- HANTOV, V. | KANANOWICZ, T. | NOWOZENOWA, Z. (2021), Oblicza lingwistyki XXI wieku. T. 3: "Swój" i "obcy" w języku, tekście i kulturze. Gdańsk, 39-40.
- KIKLEWICZ, A. | KOLOSOVA, E. (2016), Mezhkul'turnyye aspekty lingvistyki: Kodirovaniye informatsii v tekstakh. In: *Filologiya i kul'tura. Philology and culture*. 3 (45), 30-33. [Киклевич, А. | Колосова, Е. (2016), Межкультурные аспекты лингвистики: Кодирование информации в текстах, В: *Филология и культура. Philology and culture*. 3 (45), 30-33.]
- KIRILLINA, A. | GRITSENKO, E. (2011), The main models for describing language changes in the context of globalization. In: *Vlast'*. 5, 56-59. [Кириллина, А. | Гриценко, Е. (2011), Основные модели описания языковых изменений в условиях глобализации. В: *Власть*. 5, 56-59.]
- LEVCHUK, P. (2020), Trójjęzyczność ukraińsko-rosyjsko-polska Ukraińców niepolskiego pochodzenia. W: *Studia ligwistyczne i pedagogiczne*, Kraków. 5, 74-75.
- LEVCHUK, P. (lecture) (2023), Preferencje językowe migrantów wojennych z Ukrainy. In: *Konferencja Wojna na Ukrainie i jej społeczne, psychologiczne oraz polityczne konsekwencje*. Krasieczyn, 8-10 maja 2023. In: https://ibwu-konferencja.up.krakow.pl/wp-content/uploads/sites/113/2023/05/levchuk_krasieczyn_2023127015.pdf (accessed: 19.09.2023).
- MAKAROV, M. | SHKOLOVAJA, M. (2006), Lingvisticheskiye i semioticheskiye aspekty konstruirovaniya identichnosti v elektronnoy kommunikatsii. In: *Trudy mezhdunarodnoy konferentsii Dialog 2006*. [Макаров, М. | Школовая, М. (2006), Лингвистические и семиотические аспекты конструирования идентичности в электронной коммуникации. В: *Труды международной конференции Диалог 2006*.] <https://www.dialog-21.ru/media/1985/makarov.pdf> (accessed: 10.11.2023).
- MAKIMOVA, O. (2010), Yazyk v internet-kommunikatsii: Obshchiye zakonomernosti i natsional'no-kul'turnyye osobennosti (na materiale russkogo i angliyskogo yazykov). In: *Vestnik RUDN. Teoriya yazyka. Semiotika. Semantika*. 3, 84. [Макимова, О. (2010), Язык в интернет-коммуникации: Общие закономерности и национально-культурные особенности (на материале русского и английского языков). В: *Вестник РУДН. Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика*. 3, 84.]
- MASLYAKOV, V. (2011), Spanglish kak yavleniye yazykovoy mezhkul'turnoy kommunikatsii. In: *Yazyk i kul'tura*. 1, 53-55. [Масляков, В. (2011) Спанглиш как явление языковой межкультурной коммуникации. В: *Язык и культура*. 1, 53- 55.]
- NEDOPKINA, E. (2017), Sotsiolingvisticheskoye prostranstvo russkoyazychnoy obshchnosti Germanii. In: *Vestnik RUDN. Seriya: Voprosy obrazovaniya: yazyki i spetsial'nost'*. 14 (2), 236. [Недопкина, Е. (2017) Социолингвистическое пространство русскоязычной общности Германии. В: *Вестник РУДН. Серия: Вопросы образования: языки и специальность*, 14 (2), 236-238.]

- PALMER, J. | PYTLIKOVÁ, M. (2015), Labor Market Laws and Intra-European Migration: The Role of the State in Shaping Destination Choices. In: *European Journal of Population*. 31, 127–153.
- PAWŁOWSKI, A. (2019), The linguistic landscape of modern Poland: A return to the future? In: Schoonheim, T. | Van Hoorde, J. (eds.), *Language variation: A factor of increasing complexity and a challenge for language policy within Europe: Contributions to the EFNIL Conference 2018 in Amsterdam*. In: Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 159-183. <http://www.efnil.org/documents/conference-publications/amsterdam-2018/EFNIL2018-23-Pawlowski.pdf> (accessed: 18.08. 2023).
- РЕОСК, J. T. (1953), The Hungarian Community of New Brunswick, senior paper. In: *New Jersey College for Women*, 44-45.
- ШАЙБАКОВА, Д. Д. (2019), Плюрицентрический подход к анализу языковой ситуации. In: *Vestnik Moskovskogo Gosudarstvennogo Oblastnogo Universiteta*. 5, 163-164. [Шайбакова, Д. Д. (2019), Плюрицентрический подход к анализу языковой ситуации. В: *Вестник Московского государственного областного университета*. 5, 163-164.]
- ШИЛИНЦЕВ, А. | АБАКУМОВА, М. (2021), Denglish как резул'tat anglo-amerikanizatsii nemetskogo yazyka: perevodcheskii aspekt (na materiale perevodov angloyazychnykh tekstov). In: *Obshchestvo. Kommunikatsiya. Obrazovaniye*. 12 (1), 34-39. [Шилинцев, А. | Абакумова, М. (2021), Denglish как результат англо-американизации немецкого языка: переводческий аспект (на материале переводов англо-язычных текстов). В: *Общество. Коммуникация. Образование*. 12 (1), 34-39.]
- ШОВГЕНИН, А. (2007), Sotsiolingvisticheskoye prostranstvo russkoyazychnoy diaspory Germanii (na materiale russkoyazychnoy pressy FRG). *Volgograd*, 9-14. [Шовгенин, А. (2007), Социолингвистическое пространство русскоязычной диаспоры Германии (на материале русскоязычной прессы ФРГ). *Волгоград*, 9-14.]
- SIRBU, A. (2015), Language interference triggered by bilingualism, *Mircea cel Batran*. In: *Naval Academy Scientific Bulletin*. XVIII (1), 374-375.
- ZELLER, Y. | SITCHINA, D. (2019), The Russian language in Belarus and Ukraine. In: Mustajoki, A. | Protassova, E. | Yelenevskaya, M. (eds.), *The Soft Power of the Russian Language. Pluricentricity, Politics and Policies*. Routledge, 108-110.
- ZEMSKAYA, E. (2001), Yazyk russkogo zarubezh'ya: Obshchiye protsessy i rechevyye portrety. Kollektivnaya monografiya. In: *Vena: Yazyki slavyanskoy kul'tury. Venskiy slavisticheskiy al'manakh*, 35-43. [Земская, Е. (2001), Язык русского зарубежья: Общие процессы и речевые портреты. В: *Коллективная монография. Вена: Языки славянской культуры. Венский славистический альманах*, 35-43.]

