

# The Vanishing Pronoun: A Case Study of Language Attrition in Russian

**Dmitri Priven**

*Polycultural Immigrant and Community Services  
and  
Seneca College*

This study presents a shifting pattern in the use of second person singular pronouns of address in Russian by adult Russian immigrants in Toronto. The newly developing pattern is treated as a case of L1 attrition. The observed changes to the pronominal system of Russian are discussed in the framework typically employed in language attrition literature, with reference to various linguistic phenomena such as lexical transfer, simplification of morphosyntax, markedness theory and competence vs. performance attrition. Reference is also made to sociolinguistic phenomena such as L1/L2 use in sociolinguistic domains, ethnolinguistic vitality and shift in cultural identity.

Cette étude signale un changement dans l'usage récent des pronoms de la deuxième personne du singulier en russe parmi les immigrants russes à Toronto et l'explique comme un exemple de l'érosion de la langue première. On analyse ce changement du système pronominal sous un double éclairage : linguistique — transfert lexical, simplification de la morphosyntaxe, théorie du marquage, érosion de la compétence ou de la performance linguistique; et sociolinguistique — usage de la langue première et de la langue seconde dans les domaines sociolinguistiques, vitalité ethnolinguistique et changements de l'identité culturelle.

## **Introduction**

Language attrition is a sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic phenomenon quite widespread in situations where two languages come into contact with each other. The subject of most of the attrition research, including the present paper, is attrition of the first language. Seliger (1996, p. 106) defines it as

temporary or permanent loss of language ability as reflected in a speaker's performance or in his or her inability to make grammaticality judgements that would be consistent with native speaker monolinguals at the same age and stage of language development.

It is important to note here that language attrition is not synonymous with language death in an individual. It is a *process* rather than a *result*. An important

---

Address for correspondence: Dmitri Priven, Polycultural Immigrant and Community Services, LINC Program, 3174 Eglinton Ave. East, 2nd Floor, Toronto, ON, M1J 2H5.  
E-mail: dimapriven@hotmail.com.

characteristic of language attrition in Seliger's definition is its possible temporary nature, as well as the fact that it may only affect performance rather than competence in a language. These characteristics of language attrition will be addressed further as applied to the subject of this study.

In this paper, I will look at a case of first language attrition in Russian from various linguistic, psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives adopted in the language attrition and acquisition literature. I will show how the paradigms interact to account for the changes in the pronominal system of Russian immigrants.

Among different language contact situations, immigration stands out in that it affords the researcher a variety of cross-sectional and longitudinal data on language change, and a great deal of that change has been attested as language attrition (see articles in Seliger and Vago, 1991a; Hyltenstam and Obler, 1989; among others). The fact that the immigrant's first language undergoes certain changes when it is used side by side with the language of the host country is layman's knowledge. It is interesting to note in this regard the attitude shared by many immigrants (based on anecdotal evidence and personal experience) towards their L1: once an immigrant is mature enough, no major change can ever happen to his/her mother tongue. Immigrant parents usually become concerned about their children's L1, especially when they start to realize that their children have attained native or near-native competence in the L2 at the expense of the L1. However, as has been found in this study, there are changes in adults' L1 that can be classified as language attrition. In fact, Andrews (1999) considers Russian in North America quite vulnerable to attrition in the long run, notwithstanding a constant influx of new immigrants from the mother country.

For the purposes of this paper, I will reassess, or examine from a different perspective, the findings of my survey (Priven, 1996) of the use of pronouns of address in Russian among immigrants from the former Soviet Union now living in Toronto. What prompted me to examine pronouns of address in immigrant Russian was my exposure to quite different patterns of their use among immigrants in Toronto, compared to their standard use in Russia. Like many European languages, Russian has two 2nd person singular pronouns, *ty* and *vy*, which, together with the suffixes of corresponding imperative verbs, have the typical informal/formal connotations respectively (Kasatkin, Klobukov and Lekant, 1991; Braun, 1988).

(1)	Informal	Formal
	<i>ty</i> 'you'	<i>vy</i> 'you'
	<i>chitai</i> 'read', imperative	<i>chitait'e</i> 'read', imperative
	<i>pasui</i> 'pass (the ball)', imperative	<i>pasuit'e</i> 'pass', imperative

Throughout this paper, T will refer to both the informal pronoun *ty* and the corresponding informal suffix of a verb in the imperative, while V will refer

to the formal pronoun *vy* and the corresponding formal verb suffix. In fact, the difference between T and V is not limited cross-linguistically to the degree of formality, and there may be a whole gamut of meanings and connotations attributed to the choice of one pronoun over the other (Braun, 1988; Shvedova, 1998). Moreover, the semantics of the T/V distinction in any language where it exists is not constant diachronically. According to Siriwardena (1992, p. 69),

In post-revolutionary [1917] Russian, as in other modern continental languages, change in pronominal usage took a different form because the binary structure was preserved, but the lines of distinction between the T and V forms were redrawn to mark the difference not between superiors and inferiors, but between familiarity and strangeness.

It seems natural, therefore, that the pattern of pronoun use in an individual who has migrated will not remain the same as it was in the home country, and there will be variation in pronoun use both diachronically within the same individual, and synchronically across the immigrant population. It is with this assumption in mind that I set out to investigate the issue. However, for the purposes of this paper, I will take the basic formality/informality semantics of T/V pronouns as the point of departure.

### **The Method**

A very important methodological consideration in this study is the distinction between competence and performance attrition. Sharwood Smith and van Buren (1991) maintain that in any kind of research on language attrition, a distinction between the loss of the underlying mental representation of a language (competence attrition) and the loss of control of that underlying mental representation (performance attrition) must be made. When designing an attrition assessment tool, researchers must be absolutely clear whether they will be probing attrition of competence or performance with it. Oxford (1982) presents a four-way paradigm of tests, with Direct/Indirect values on the horizontal axis, and Discrete-Point and Integrative values on the vertical. For example, in an *indirect discrete-point test*, specific (discrete) areas of the attriter's<sup>1</sup> underlying grammatical knowledge would be tested in the form of cloze exercises (indirectly), whereas in a *direct integrative test*, communication (integrative) skills are tested orally (directly).

It did not seem methodologically plausible to probe participants' underlying linguistic competence regarding the pronouns of address: their grammaticality judgements, especially after careful retrospection, may have been different from the way they use the pronouns in daily interaction. Moreover, because of the intricacy of the distinction between T and V pronouns, the participants would have had to question their own judgements, which would have

clouded the representation of their competence. That is why I originally opted for a direct integrative type of test,<sup>2</sup> which in this case would assess how well a person used the T/V pronouns in interaction with others. Obviously, such a test would probe performance mechanisms rather than competence. One might argue that a claim that there is attrition of the pronominal system based on evidence from participants' performance is a weak one, since it does not testify to any profound changes to their underlying competence. However, as stated in Sharwood Smith and van Buren (1991), competence cannot be probed without involving performance mechanisms. Even when one fills out a cloze test based on grammaticality judgements, it is performance mechanisms that turn those judgements into a completed test.

Having chosen a direct integrative test, I faced another methodological dilemma, the so-called observer's paradox (Labov, 1972). The construct that I wanted to elicit — pronouns of address — is used when addressing the interlocutor directly, so two or more participants at a time have to be tested or observed. Presence of the observer usually takes away the authenticity of the situation, which is crucial for eliciting the use of T/V pronouns. This is why I chose an unorthodox way of observing the participants. I observed the target group for a total of 30 hours while playing soccer with them and watching them play soccer, taking notes when necessary. Verbal exchanges between the players/participants during games and intermissions contained numerous instances of T/V pronouns, and since new players were joining every time we met, there were a variety of interactional contexts for T/V pronouns to be used in.

### **The Construct**

Primary language attrition implies deviation from or forgetting a certain norm in the L1, usually under influence from the L2 (Seliger and Vago, 1991b). In the case of attrition of the T/V distinction in Russian, I was looking for the situations outlined in Table 1, which lists possible situations in which deviations from the norm in pronoun use might be expected to occur. In effect, that means addressing players of certain age groups and degrees of familiarity with an inappropriate pronoun.

### **The Participants**

The study was conducted with 53 Russian males aged 18 to 52 who had been in Canada for anywhere between 2 months and 25 years, coming from all over Russia and the former Soviet Union, and from different socio-economic backgrounds. Being an “insider” and involved in interactions with the participants, I had access to data on the variables (age, socio-economic status, length of stay in Canada), which came up during chats. Table 2 stratifies the participants according to their length of stay in Canada and level of education, i.e. whether

**Table 1:** Possible deviations from the standard pattern of pronoun use

Norm	Deviation
V is used to address an older player	T is used to address an older player
T is used to address a younger player	V is used to address a younger player
V is used to address an adult stranger (new player) of any age <sup>a</sup>	T is used to address an adult stranger (new player) of any age

<sup>a</sup> excluding extreme age differences, e.g. a 50-year-old person would probably not address a 20-year-old person with a V pronoun.

they had university education. In fact, the majority of the participants in all length-of-stay groups were university-educated.

**Table 2:** Length of stay in Canada and education level

Length of stay	Total number of participants	University education	%	No university education	%
2 m–1yr	8	7	85	1	15
1–2 yrs	13	10	70	3	30
2–5 yrs	14	12	86	2	14
5–10 yrs	10	9	90	1	10
10+ yrs	8	6	80	2	20

Table 3 stratifies the participants according to their length of stay in Canada and age. The majority of the subjects were in the 26–40 age group.

**Table 3:** Length of stay in Canada and age

Length of stay	Total number of participants	18–25	26–40	41–55
2 m–1 yr	8	2	4	2
1–2 yrs	13	2	8	3
2–5 yrs	14	3	9	2
5–10 yrs	10	1	4	5
10+ yrs	8	–	2	6

### Data Analysis

Originally I was looking at the sociolinguistic implications of the patterns of the pronoun use, treating T/V as a sociolinguistic variable, much as William Labov did in his study of the post-vocalic [r] in New York (Labov, 1966). There was a certain degree of correlation between the choice of T or V and, respectively, speakers' socio-economic background, age and length of stay in Canada. In brief, the correlational analysis showed that the higher the participants' level of

education, the fewer instances of deviation from the norm they exhibited, which is demonstrated in Table 4. A one-tailed phi coefficient test was conducted ( $\phi = 0.12$ ,  $\chi^2 = 0.2$ ).

**Table 4:** Use of T/V pronouns and participants’ socio-economic background

	Occurrences of		Total
	inappropriate pronoun	appropriate pronoun	
University education	143	226	369
No university education	54	4	58
Total	197	230	427

Also, the younger the participants were, the more they deviated from the norm ( $\phi = 0.06$ ,  $\chi^2 = 0.3$ , also based on a one-tailed phi coefficient test), which is shown in Table 5.

**Table 5:** Use of T/V pronouns and participants’ age

Age	Occurrences of		Total
	inappropriate pronoun	appropriate pronoun	
18–25	98	21	119
26–40	65	141	206
41–55	34	68	102
Total	197	230	427

There was a striking overall tendency to choose T forms in V contexts but not V forms in T contexts, possible reasons for which will be discussed later on. In fact, there was not a single occurrence of a V pronoun in a T context.

The variable that is the most crucial for the investigation of language attrition processes is participants’ length of stay in Canada. Assuming that language attrition is a gradual process taking place over time, it can be assumed that the longer an immigrant has been in Canada, the more attrition of the distinction between T and V he/she will exhibit. This assumption is reflected in the data obtained. Table 6 presents the occurrence of deviations over the total number of utterances of T/V pronouns among different length-of-stay groups. As we can see from the table, the occurrence of inappropriate pronouns (deviation) increases with increasing length of stay.

In order to determine statistical significance of the percentages of deviation, *t*-tests were conducted for Groups 1 and 2 (2 months–1 year/1–2 years) and Groups 2 and 3 (1–2 years/2–5 years) respectively. The statistical significance of the percentages of deviation from the norm is presented in Table 7. As we

**Table 6:** Occurrences of T/V pronouns by length of stay in Canada

Length of stay	Total number of occurrences	Instances of deviation from norm	% of deviation
2 m–1 yr	76	17	22
1–2 yrs	115	36	31
2–5 yrs	119	70	59
5–10 yrs	65	40	62
10+ yrs	52	34	65

can see from the table, results for all groups except 4 and 5 are statistically significant.

**Table 7:** Statistical significance values of pronoun attrition by group (length of stay)

Group	<i>t</i> -value	Degrees of freedom	<i>p</i> -value
1 and 2	3.02	19	0.50
2 and 3	5.57	25	<0.01
3 and 4	2.70	22	1.50
4 and 5	0.60	16	>50.00

It is worth noting the drastic increase (from 31 to 59%) in the amount of deviation from the correct T/V paradigm exhibited by Group 3 (2–5 years in Canada). Why is it that this drastic increase should occur between two and five years in Canada? This question is addressed in the “Discussion”, where the notion of sociolinguistic domains emerges.

### Discussion

Why do Russian immigrants with a length of stay of two years or more increase significantly in their use of inappropriate T/V forms? I will look at a number of possible causes, one of which is *linguistic transfer*. Poulisse, Bongaerts and Kellerman (1984, p. 71) define transfer in a rather mathematical manner as “interpolation of another language”, which in language attrition means adjusting linguistic features of the disused L1 to corresponding feature values of the dominant L2. Seliger and Vago (1991b) give an example of the transfer of linguistic information from English (L2) into German (L1), which they refer to as *meaning extension*:

- (2) Sache ‘thing (abstract)’  
 Ding ‘thing (concrete)’  
 → Sache ‘thing (concrete and abstract)’

The distinction between *Sache* and *Ding* in German is reduced here to *Sache*, which in the attriter’s linguistic competence comes to mean ‘thing (concrete and abstract)’. The cause of this loss of distinction seems to be the fact that

there is no such distinction in the dominant L2 (English), so the pattern of underused German is modeled on the English one. Similarly, the distinction between T/V pronouns is lost in the speech of the attriters of Russian because in the dominant L2 (English) only one 2nd person singular pronouns exists:

- (3) ty 'you (informal)'  
       vy 'you (formal)'       → ty

However, whereas in the German example only the semantic distinction between *Sache* and *Ding* is lost, in the Russian example the loss is more profound. The choice of V over T signifies a social distinction one makes in discourse; when there is an increasing tendency to reduce the T/V dichotomy to just T, the social distinction might also cease to exist in the pragmatic competence of the attriter. This brings us to what seems to be a very fundamental question for inquiry into language attrition, addressed in Schmidt (1991): what happens first — the loss of a social distinction or attrition of a form? It seems to be a bit of a chicken-and-egg question, and in our case we can formulate it in the following way: did the linguistic transfer from English condition the emergence of a linguistic system with one pronoun, which caused the loss of the social distinction, or did the loss of that distinction (also brought about by lack of such a distinction in English) cause one pronoun to become redundant? We can speculate that attrition proceeds in both of these ways, but here is a curious parallel from Russian, taken from personal experience. In Russian, a common term of address of a younger person to an older one (or one in a position of power) is the first name plus the patronymic. This is also the way an older person would introduce him/herself to a younger person. This term of address is virtually non-existent among Russian immigrants in Canada; instead, they address each other by the first name, regardless of age (Braun, 1988, attests variation in the use of patronymics, but for purposes of demeaning). From personal inquiry, I have found that new immigrants start doing it because all the other immigrants around them do it. This seems to me a superficial cause; what seems more plausible is the fact that Russians perceive Canadians to be more informal in discourse, and in addressing others in particular, so the former adopt the more “informal” pattern of address. In this case, a discourse factor (degree of formality) definitely plays a role in the de-activation of patronymics in Russian.

I will, however, look at a purely linguistic explanation of the above-mentioned meaning extension, proposed by Seliger (1989a, p. 173). It is referred to as the Redundancy Reduction Principle:

If both languages contain a rule which serves the same semantic function, that version of a rule which is formally less complex [ . . . ] will replace the more complex [ . . . ] rule.



Adopting Seliger's framework for the pronouns of address, it can be claimed that Russian has a two-pronoun system ("rule"), while English has a one-pronoun "rule". Between the two "rules", the attriter would choose the less complex one — that is the English system, and impose it onto the Russian system.

The choice of a simpler system seems to be a logical one. But it does not quite explain which of the two Russian pronouns will be selected to constitute the "less complex" system. In order to try and answer this question, I will turn now to the notion of markedness, which is a well-researched phenomenon in language acquisition, but not that well researched in the attrition literature. However, language attrition is in many respects a mirror image of language acquisition, so much of the conceptual apparatus used in the acquisition literature should be applicable to attrition (Sharwood Smith, 1983).

The most important implication of markedness theory for acquisition (attrition) theory is that unmarked categories or systems are easily transferable. One well-known example of transfer of unmarked structures is the data on relative clauses (Schachter, 1974; Gass, 1980 for acquisition; and Seliger, 1989b for attrition). These studies demonstrate that the unmarked structure of relative clauses in Japanese, Hebrew and Arabic is preferred to the marked English structure (movement, no pronominal copy) in the interlanguage of the acquirers and attriters. In our case, the one-pronoun system of English is less marked than the two-pronoun system of Russian, so it is transferred into the Russian of the attriters, which is in line with Seliger's Redundancy Reduction Principle. But can markedness theory explain why the T pronoun is chosen? Can we assume that T is less marked than V?

According to Viberg (1993), the typologically unmarked lexical items are, among other criteria, more polysemous, more frequent in individual languages, and lexicalized in a greater number of languages. If these criteria are applied to T/V pronouns, V turns out to be the less marked one, because it is more polysemous (it has both singular and plural meanings, while T is only singular), more frequent in Russian (for the same reason), and lexicalized in a greater number of languages, existing whenever there is a one-pronoun language, as in English.

Perhaps, the explanation of the choice of T over V lies outside the purely linguistic sphere. Let us look at some of the sociocultural aspects of languages in contact. In her study of the patterns of use of Guarani and Spanish in Paraguay, Joan Rubin (1970), as reported in Hoffman (1991), employs Fishman's term "domains", which refers to particular occasions or settings determining language choice in a diglossic situation. Indeed, in Rubin's study, Guarani was reserved for informal, intimate, rural settings, whereas Spanish was attributed to urban, formal, serious circumstances. As far as the choice of the T pronoun in Russian is concerned, certainly in the diglossic speech of the immigrants, Russian is used mostly in informal domains, such as with family, friends and

the local community, so it has a more intimate feel to it. Therefore, we can speculate that the choice of the informal T pronoun to replace the original T/V dichotomy is conditioned by the informal domains associated with the use of Russian by immigrants.

The notion of domains can shed some light on the drastic increase in the percentages of deviation from the T/V paradigm, exhibited by Group 3. It seems that as far as this paradigm is concerned, language attrition proceeds most quickly during the period between two and five years in the host country. If we assume that during this period new immigrants have had a big leap in their L2 acquisition and have found jobs that would allow them to become more or less integrated into the host society, the balance between the L1 and the L2 in their sociolinguistic domains will also have shifted. For example, the domains of workplace and social interaction with co-workers will have emerged, and now immigrants will spend a considerable amount of time functioning in these domains. The amount of time allotted to domains associated with the L1 decreases, so that there is rapid L1 attrition during this time.

Another sociocultural notion behind first language attrition which is directly related to domains is immigrants' emerging new identity. As more domains originally reserved for the L1 are taken over by the L2, immigrants' cultural identity shifts from being strictly L1 to incorporating the L2, and in some cases the L2 identity takes over. Schmidt (1991) describes a situation when the Boumaa dialect of Fijian is lost by its speakers after they have worked or studied in the capital city, taking on the standard variety of Fijian and shifting their identity to that of city inhabitants. They keep this identity even after returning home, and continue to use Standard Fijian. Correa-Zoli (1981) states that shifting identity of Italian immigrants in the USA was responsible for the attrition of their Italian. The fact that they came from different regions of Italy, often with mutually unintelligible dialects, conditioned low subjective ethnolinguistic vitality (Allard and Landry, 1992) attributed to Italian and subsequent forced shift of identity to that of the L2 (English). Huffines (1991) compares L1 maintenance/attrition among sectarian speakers of Pennsylvania German (the Amish and Mennonites) and non-sectarian speakers of it. The language of the non-sectarian speakers, who are dispersed throughout the state, is quite vulnerable to attrition, especially among the younger generation, while there is virtually no L1 attrition among the sectarian speakers, who live in close communities and consider their L1 as part of their identity. A similar situation is described in Vanek and Darnell (1978) with regards to the Russian-speaking sect of Doukhobors residing in British Columbia. Interestingly, they report the same phenomenon as the one presented in this study: changes in Russian pronouns of address. According to Vanek and Darnell, one of the reasons that the younger generation of Doukhobors has lost the distinction between T and V is precisely because they do not identify themselves with their segregated

community anymore, and have adopted some of the values of the dominant linguistic environment.

### Conclusion

To conclude, let us return to the definition of language attrition given at the beginning of this paper. At the level of individual language, it appears we do have a case of attrition. The distinction between T and V, which are part of the structure of Russian, decreases in use over time. If we look at possible loss of this distinction as part of a general loss of Russian structure, it is clear that it would go in line with phenomena employed to describe language attrition such as transfer, redundancy reduction and markedness.

However, it is important to note that the phenomenon referred to here as attrition of the pronominal system among Russian immigrant males bears situational limitations. The informality of the circumstances under which the study was conducted (the game of soccer) may have influenced the results, presenting the general shift towards the informal pronouns. Perhaps, the participants' pattern of pronoun use is different in a different social situation, for example, in the context of a business meeting with other Russian speakers. Moreover, because of the nature of the observation, all participants were male, so the findings may not be representative of the language attrition processes occurring among Russian immigrants as a whole. In this respect, it would seem worthwhile to conduct a similar study among female Russian immigrants, in order to compare patterns of pronoun use.

Nevertheless, the correlation between the predominant choice of *ty* over *vy* and the amount of time spent in Canada indicates an element of language attrition in the new pattern of pronoun use. From personal interaction with Russian immigrants in Toronto and observation of their interaction in a variety of contexts over ten years, I have noticed a similar tendency towards choosing informal pronouns in formal situations. Pavlenko (2000), in her study of the conceptual aspect of bilingual memory, maintains that attrition of the L1 lexicon is caused by attrition of previously learned concepts and their replacement by L2 conceptual apparatus. In this case, two similar concepts from the L1 and the L2 do not coexist; the concept which is used in a greater number of domains becomes dominant. In the case of T/V pronouns, the concept of addressing the interlocutor with one pronoun only (coming from English) may become dominant for Russian immigrants over the Russian concept of choosing different pronouns for different interlocutors. However, Pavlenko (2000, p. 220) also cites the "coexistence of alternative conceptual representations for bilinguals who use their language in different contexts". In other words, the systems both with and without the T/V distinction may exist in the conceptual apparatus of the participants, and the distinction may be relaxed in certain domains and

re-appear in others. Further probing the use of pronouns of address among Russian immigrants, both male and female, in various social contexts will provide the empirical data to test the claim of language attrition.

Let us go back to the definition of first language attrition proposed by Seliger (1996) and quoted in the Introduction, and see whether the findings of this study can be categorized as language attrition according to the definition. As was mentioned earlier, this study did not intend to probe participants' attrition of underlying linguistic competence of the pronominal system of Russian. The observed new pattern of pronoun use may be a case of semantic extension, that is *ty* encroaching on the domain of *vy*. One may also argue that this is a case of the reduction of the T/V dichotomy. In any case, if we assume that the amount of time spent in Canada affects subjects' linguistic performance in a given situation, and that this effect may be of a temporary nature, that is, dependent on the situation, we can categorize the observed phenomenon as language attrition.

### Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Throughout this paper, the word "attriter" will be used to designate a person undergoing language attrition (first used in Anderson, 1982).
- <sup>2</sup> Oxford (1982) refers to direct integrative tests as highly reliable, but difficult to administer.

### References

- Allard, R. and R. Landry. 1992. "Ethnolinguistic vitality beliefs and language maintenance and loss." In *Maintenance and Loss in Minority Languages*. W. Fase, K. Jaspaert, and S. Kroon (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 171–195.
- Anderson, R.W. 1982. "Determining the linguistic attributes of language attrition." In *The Loss of Language Skills*. R. Lambert and B. Freed (eds.). Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 83–118.
- Andrews, D.R. 1999. *Sociocultural Perspectives on Language Change in Diaspora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Braun, F. 1988. *Terms of Address*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Correa-Zoli, Y. 1981. "Language of Italian Americans." In *Language in the USA*. C. Ferguson and S. Heath (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 239–256.
- Gass, S. 1980. "An investigation of syntactic transfer in adult second language learners." In *Research in Second Language Acquisition*. R.C. Scarcella and S.D. Krashen (eds.). Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 132–141.
- Hoffman, C. 1991. *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. London: Longman.
- Huffines, M.L. 1991. "Pennsylvania German: Convergence and change as strategies of discourse." In *First Language Attrition*. H.W. Seliger and R.M. Vago (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 125–137.

- Hyltenstam, K. and L.K. Obler (eds.). 1989. *Bilingualism Across the Lifespan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasatkin, L., E. Klobukov, and P. Levant. 1991. *Kratki spravochnik po sovremennomu russkomu yazyku*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
- Labov, W. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Oxford, R. 1982. "Technical issues in designing and conducting research on language skill attrition." In *The Loss of Language Skills*. R. Lambert and B. Freed (eds.). Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 119–137.
- Pavlenko, A. 2000. "New approaches to concepts in bilingual memory." *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 2, pp. 209–230.
- Poullisse, N., T. Bongaerts and E. Kellerman. 1984. "On the use of compensatory strategies in second language performance." *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 8, pp. 70–105.
- Priven, D. 1996. "Pronouns of address in Russian as used by male Russian immigrants in Toronto." Course paper. LING 3400.03, York University, Toronto, ON.
- Schachter, J. 1974. "An error in error analysis." *Language Learning*, 24, pp. 205–214.
- Schmidt, A. 1991. "Language attrition in Boumaa Fijian and Dyirbal." In *First Language Attrition*. H.W. Seliger and R.M. Vago (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 113–124.
- Seliger, H.W. 1989a. "Deterioration and creativity in childhood bilingualism." In *Bilingualism Across the Lifespan*. K. Hyltenstam and L.K. Obler (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 173–184.
- Seliger, H.W. 1989b. "Semantic transfer constraints on the production of English passive by Hebrew-English bilinguals." In *Transfer in Language Production*. H. Dechert and M. Raupach (eds.). Norwood, NY: Ablex.
- Seliger, H.W. 1996. "Primary language attrition in the context of bilingualism." In *Handbook on Second Language Acquisition*. W.C. Ritchie and T.K. Bhatia (eds.). San Diego: Academic Press, pp. 605–626.
- Seliger, H.W. and R.M. Vago (eds.). 1991a. *First Language Attrition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seliger, H.W. and R.M. Vago. 1991b. "The study of first language attrition: An overview." In *First Language Attrition*. H.W. Seliger and R.M. Vago (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–15.
- Sharwood Smith, M. 1983. "On explaining language loss." In *Language Development at the Crossroads*. S. Felix and H. Wode (eds.) Tübingen: Gunter Narr, pp. 49–59.
- Sharwood Smith, M. and P. van Buren. 1991. "First language attrition and the parameter setting model." In *First Language Attrition*. H.W. Seliger and R.M. Vago (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 17–30.
- Shvedova, N. 1998. *Mestoimeniye i Smysl*. Moscow: Azbukovnik.
- Siriwardena, R. 1992. *Addressing the Other*. Colombo, Sri Lanka: International Centre for Ethnic Studies.

- Vanek, A. and R. Darnell. 1978. "Doukhobor Russian language maintenance." In *Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism*. J. Fishman (ed.). The Hague: Mouton, pp. 401–422.
- Viberg, A. 1993. "Crosslinguistic perspectives on lexical organization and lexical progression." In *Progression and Regression in Language*. K. Hyltenstam and A. Viberg (eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 340–385.