

A. Zabrodskaja

**ESTONIAN-RUSSIAN TRANSFER BY RUSSIAN-ESTONIAN
BILINGUAL STUDENTS**

Возрастающее использование эстонского языка русскоязычными студентами во внутригрупповом и межгрупповом общении делает их русский более похожим на эстонский морфологически, фонологически и структурно. Рассматриваемые переносимые элементы включают очевидное использование эстонского лексического материала (который охватывает ‘переключение кода’ или ‘заимствование’) и эстонских морфосинтаксических моделей (‘конвергенция’), т.е. когда включён не единичный эстоноязычный элемент, а когда вся морфосинтаксическая структура явно эстонская. Собранный языковой материал будет рассмотрен в свете теории переноса (Jarvis и Pavlenko 2008), переноса, вызванного контактом (Heine и Kuteva 2005), и манифестаций маттера и паттерна (Matras и Sakel 2007).

Acknowledgements

The research leading to these results was supported by Project EKKM09-85 under grant agreement “Vene-eesti ja inglise-eesti koodivahetuse ja koodikopeerimise korpuse koostamine ja haldamine” [Russian-Estonian and English-Estonian code-switching and code-copying corpora creation and management] and Project MJD96 “Transfer of morphosyntactic patterns in the Estonian-Russian contact setting”.

1. Introduction

Language transfer occurs not only in the direction $L1 > L2$ but from $L2 > L1$ as well. If the former is called ‘forward transfer’ (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008) or ‘substrate transfer’ (Odlin 2009), then the influences found in the use of $L1$ ‘reverse transfer’ (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008) or ‘borrowing transfer’ (Odlin 2009). According to Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008: 12) this is somehow forgotten although some recent studies have demonstrated a renewed interest in the topic (Andrews 1999; Cook 2003; Kecskes & Papp 2000; Major 1992; Pavlenko 2000). The exploration of this phenomenon may add new knowledge to the understanding of linguistic competence and native-speakerness (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008: 14). This paper addresses the fundamental question of how crosslinguistic influence, especially $L2$ influence, determines $L1$ use and change. In this paper ‘ $L2$ influence’ and ‘transfer’ are used as synonyms. Transfer is understood here as “the influence of a person’s knowledge of one language on that person’s knowledge or use of another language” (Pavlenko & Jarvis 2008: 1). The third alternative, crosslinguistic influence, is deemed to be a wider and more complex issue than the transfer of structural elements of language.

While the SLA literature is predominantly concerned with the transfer $L1 > L2$, contact linguistics deals mostly with the opposite direction. In the view of the bidirectionality of transfer, research on $L2 > L1$ impact is crucial (Pavlenko & Jarvis 2002). The situation of Estonian Russian where Russian-speakers are becoming bilingual exemplifies the importance of this transfer type. To date, there is no generally accepted understanding of how the $L2$ influence manifests itself in the use of $L1$. It is widely accepted, however, that learners exhibit systematic differences according to different $L1$ and $L2$ configurations (Ringbom 2007; Jarvis 2000; Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008).

Most of the empirical studies concerning L2 influence have focused on large Indo-European languages, particularly English, and the results are not automatically applicable to structurally and typologically different languages. The scope and occurrence of the different transfer types varies also from one language pair to another. Production or reception processes can be transferred between any languages, linguistic patterns and rules between languages which share a potential area for their application (Heine & Kuteva 2005; Matras & Sakel 2007; Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008).

Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008: 188) claim that they “are not aware of any research that has yet addressed the potential effects of either markedness or prototypicality on transfer in either the lateral or reverse directions”. The starting point of the present study is that language users can transfer some L2 features into the use of L1 and the presence of prototypical or marked constructions helps them to transfer some structures and meanings more likely than others. In any case, it is important not to ask only whether the influence of the learners’ L1 increases or decreases with L2 proficiency but what makes some features more transferable than others. The main focus of this study is some morphosyntactic changes in Russian as L1 use due to Estonian as L2 influence.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, I will briefly summarize main directions in the previous research on Russian-Estonian language contacts. After that in Section 3, I will explain methodology of the research. An issue I consider in Section 4 involves the ways that code-switching and transfer could be characterized in my data. In Section 5, the paper continues with an overview of the linguistic transfer subcategories detected in Russian-Estonian contact setting. Section 6 comprises discussion and a brief conclusion.

2. Previous research on Russian-Estonian language contact

Native speakers of Russian represent 31.7 % of the Estonian population according to the 2000 Population and Housing Census. Modern Russian-Estonian language contact can be characterized as ‘multiple’ because, on the one hand, Estonians have some competence in Russian and, on the other hand, after the restoration of the Estonian independence in 1991 Russians have started using the Estonian language extensively in all important functional domains of everyday life and public administration such as banking, police etc. (see also Verschik 2007). Although such sociolinguistic factors alone do not directly cause changes in both languages, they are ultimate causes of contact-induced language change because the contemporary sociolinguistic situation in Estonia has enhanced bilingualisation of local Russian speakers, a previously monolingual community, and their bilingualism, in turn, affects the language systems in contact. Internal and external sociolinguistic factors determine how Russian and Estonian are being used by bilingual users.

Within the past 10 years, a number of related quantitative and qualitative studies have been carried out to describe the outcomes of this language contact situation, such as Ehala (1994, 2009, forthcoming-a, forthcoming-b) on Russian influence on Estonian, and Verschik (2008) and Zabrodskaia (2009a, 2009b, 2009c) on Estonian influence on Russian; the latter refers to the emergence of a new language variety called Estonian Russian. The latter study shows that whole morphosyntactic patterns that often contradict monolingual Russian norms have been borrowed, e.g. the word order in NPs in the genitive case (Zabrodskaia 2010). Empirical data from Estonian Russian (Verschik 2004, 2006, 2008; Zabrodskaia 2009a, 2009b, 2009c) show that there are indeed constructions conventionalized in local Russian that do not follow monolingual grammar rules. Most of the studies are based on a limited number of tokens collected from natural usage situations in different contexts. There has been very little work done focusing on establishing what phenomenon could be labelled as Russian-Estonian code-switching and what transfer from L2 Estonian into L1 Russian is. This is where the current paper sets its primary goal.

3. Data collection

The paper is focused on the sociolinguistic dimension of transfer in the Russian-Estonian contact setting. The transfer of a number of Estonian morphosyntactic patterns into Russian is at the centre of investigation. The current study has a synchronic dimension.

Milroy (1987: 27) argues that “the objectives of a piece of research to a very large extent dictate methods of speakers’ selection”. In my case, it means that methods of bilingual informants’ selection necessarily need to be related to the research goals. The data for this particular study were collected by me among young Russian-speakers in Tallinn University and at the Narva College of the University of Tartu, that is, in bilingual Tallinn and the predominantly Russian-speaking North East respectively. The research was carried out in 2005–2009 (see Table 1).

Table 1: *Characteristics of collected data*

Years of collection	Type of data	Informants		
		age	number and gender	Russian and Estonian language knowledge
Tallinn University, Tallinn (bilingual environment):				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A bilingual capital where Russian-speakers constitute slightly less than a half of the population. • A large number of possibilities for multilingual communication. 				
2005–2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recorded, mostly individual, interviews, held in Russian and Estonian (45 hours), • Self-reported language use, • Analysis of written homework assignments (approximately 2000 handwritten pages), • Spontaneous everyday language practices. 	18–35	75 students: 65 females 10 males	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proficiency in Estonian differs: four come from bilingual families, 71 have acquired Estonian at school (Russian mother tongue and home language). • Graduated from schools with Russian as the primary language of instruction. • Equal proficiency in Russian. • Receive higher education in Estonian. • All can use Estonian in both official and unofficial situations, in oral and written communication.
Narva College of Tartu University Narva (predominantly Russian-speaking North-East):				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approx. 95.2% of the town population are Russian-speakers; • approx. 4.8% of the town population are Estonian-speakers. 				
2007–2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recorded, mostly individual, interviews, held in Russian and Estonian (55 hours), • Self-reported language use, • Analysis of written homework assignments (approximately 1600 handwritten pages), • Spontaneous everyday language practices. 	21–25	36 students: 30 females 6 males	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proficiency in Estonian differs: two come from bilingual families, 34 have acquired Estonian at school (Russian mother tongue and home language). • 34 students have graduated from schools with Russian as the primary language of instruction; two students from schools with Estonian as the primary language of instruction. • Equal proficiency in Russian. • Receive higher education in Estonian. • All can use Estonian in both official and unofficial situations, in oral and written communication.

The data come from recorded interviews, informants’ self-reported language use, and an analysis of written homework in Estonian and/or Russian. Held both in Russian and Estonian, interviews were individual as well as in-group. Having graduated from schools with Russian as the primary language of instruction, the informants have acquired Estonian in school and their proficiency in Estonian varies considerably. As all of the students have the Russian language as their mother tongue and home language, it can be argued that the informants have almost equal knowledge of their L1. They are all receiving higher education in the Estonian

language and use Estonian as their L2 in both official and unofficial situations, in oral and in written communication.

I subscribe to the view proposed by two experts in ethnomethodology, micro-ethnographers Varenne and McDermott (1998: 177) who notice that “it is not easy to capture people in the real time of their practice”. Cantone and MacSwan (2009: 262) complain that a researcher “cannot confidently assume that the absence of a form in naturalistic data means that the structure is not permitted; it may be absent because it *cannot* occur, or it may be absent because it *has not yet* occurred”. This means that it is important to use multiple sources of data because “researchers should not rely on any single source of data, interview, observation, or instrument” (Mills 2003: 52). In research terms, such approach is called triangulation. Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008: 34 and references therein) also point to the fact that “the most useful studies (whether intrasubjective or intersubjective) are often those that investigate patterns of language use across different types of data”.

To show the most possible exact and sufficient picture of students’ language behaviour, my data also include: various pieces of student work and curriculum material; a field diary (2005–2009); audio-recorded lectures, seminars, and students’ spontaneous everyday language practices; and interviews on the different topics (such as university, local life, language use etc with Russian-speaking students).

I would remark that when Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008: 206–207) speak about “the learning environment”, then they refer to formal learning, the degree to which the learner is concentrated on the formal properties of the language etc. In my paper I touch also upon the learning environment because (a) bilingual speech is detected in classroom contexts (at a university with Estonian as the language of instruction); (b) informants are speakers of Estonian as L2; (c) as a teacher, I could record the lectures and seminars in their entirety, and as an observer, I also had an access to casual speech behaviour of the students.

Sociolinguistic situations can change very quickly especially in a relatively new and dynamic society as in Estonia and new patterns of bilingual speech can supplant the previous ones. Although these new patterns and phenomena are relevant, their interpretation would gain a lot from our knowledge of the previous context. Collecting as much data as possible is necessary.

As my approach is qualitative, I primarily discuss what contact phenomena are registered at all and what kind of transfer we can detect. As the data are from two different localities, we can expect differences. However, there is no regional variation in the speech of students. This might be because Russian-speaking students study in universities with Estonian as a language of instruction. In other settings, this could be different but, as there is no research, this remains just an assumption at this point.

In the bilingual conversations and interviews with Russian-speaking students, Russian-Estonian switches are mostly intrasentential, i.e., within a sentence or within a clause, or, more rarely, intersentential, i.e., across two sentences or clauses. In Muysken’s (2000: 60–61) terminology, therefore, most switches are of the ‘insertion’ type, because Russian is a base language into which lexical items or NP, VP and other types of constituents are inserted from Estonian. Constituents could also be labeled as ‘alternation’ because boundaries are blurry between these two types of code-switching (CS), for instance, genitive constructions, compound nouns and other multiple word items.

To summarize, Russian-Estonian intra-sentential and constituent-internal or word-internal CS (or insertion) prevails in the corpus. Instances of ‘alternational’ CS, where Estonian and Russian remain relatively separate in the clause (see Muysken 2000: 96) and of ‘congruent lexicalization’, where Estonian and Russian jointly provide the grammatical structure of the clause, and the vocabulary also comes from both languages (see Muysken 2000: 122) can also be found. In my analysis, attention is paid to intra-sentential switches because this is where Russian and Estonian grammars come into contact.

4. CS or transfer

The purpose of this paper is to look at innovations occurring in mono- and bilingual speech of Russian-speaking students in two different sociolinguistic environments. Collected data reveal that transferred items can involve the combination of languages (code-switching or borrowing) and new creations. Innovations could have emerged as a result of multiple crosslinguistic influence. Here, it would be relevant to ask if transfer and CS are the same phenomena. Perhaps this question cannot be answered **unambiguously** because the terminological agreement has not been reached so far. In 2009, two papers completed by different researchers but with similar titles appeared. One is “CS and transfer: an exploration of similarities and differences” (Treffers-Daller 2009) and the other is “Transfer and CS: Separate territories but common concerns on the border” (Odlin 2009). Both authors conclude that CS and transfer could be manifestations of the same phenomenon, that is the influence of one language on another, but this should be further investigated. Treffers-Daller (2009: 60) also proposes that one should establish how speakers can control CS and transfer. Both CS and transfer of linguistic features can happen spontaneously and unintentionally.

The CS models focus too exclusively on lexical aspects and thereby tend to ignore the structural effects CS can bring about. A glance at the history of research so far makes clear though that interest in the grammar of CS cannot be separated from the sociolinguistic context because there is the connection between CS, structural changes caused by it, and sociolinguistic factors that make contact-induced language change possible *at all* (see Backus 2005). Sebba (2009: 56) states that the grammar of CS is definitely something more than two individual grammars put together. He suggests taking into account the notion of equivalent or congruent categories across languages.

The definition of CS as the alternate use of two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation (Grosjean 1982: 145) is broad enough to encompass any kind of language alternation. Myers-Scotton (2006: 234) defines intraclausal CS as any clause that includes elements from two or more languages. According to her, the elements that make a clause bilingual may be actual surface-level words from two languages as well as abstract rules.

It should be clear that CS and convergence are related in the sense that both are linked to the use of another language. I state that CS helps to account for what morphosyntactic structures are more likely to be converged and why. To differentiate between CS and convergence, I propose Toribio’s (2004: 172) classification of these factors, which I feel reflects best the findings of empirical studies in the area of contact linguistics to date: “The simultaneous presence of languages in CS further favors the searching for parallels between them, and hence promulgates the striving towards convergence”.

In my study, I take a similar approach to the investigation of CS effects on convergence in the area of morphosyntax. I would claim that Russian-Estonian data suggest that if the items are simply transferred from L2 into an L1 usage, without causing any changes in L1 syntax and/or other linguistic areas, then one can speak about CS but if transferred items cause any changes in L1 production, then such items can be seen as manifestations of transfer (in my case reverse transfer).

5. Transferred features in the data

Although reverse transfer can be detected in all areas of language use, Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008: 183 and references there in) believe that its effects seem strongest in phonology, lexis, and semantics. My data supports their statement very clearly. Each of these types of transfer detected in my data is discussed in the following subsections. In the examples, the Russian part of the sentence is in *italics*, Estonian in **bold** and in-between items that can belong to both monolingual variants are underlined. In the glosses and translations, Estonian items are in UPPER-CASE.

5.1. Phonological transfer

Growing use of L2 may cause “restructuring of the acoustic-phonetic space encompassing both L1 and L2” (Leather & James 1996: 279). Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008: 67) conclude that, in the reverse direction, segmental transfer is inclined to affect voicing or aspiration. There are a lot of examples with internationalisms in the data that exhibit Estonian phonological features in stress production. Let us analyze the clause *ty polučil di·plom?* ‘Have you received the diploma?’ The item for ‘diploma’ is an internationalism that is used in both languages but with different pronunciation. In standard Russian, it is pronounced with the stress on the second syllable *diplo·m* ‘diploma’, while, in Estonian, the stress is on the first syllable **di·plom** ‘DIPLOMA’. In the code-switched clause, the pronunciation was close to Estonian (not only stress on the first syllable but also the consonant *-d* was not as voiced as it would be expected in Russian).

It is a general tendency that stress in internationalisms in Estonia’s Russian (in so-called “monolingual speech”) shifts to the first syllable or, in any case, follows the Estonian model, e.g. *kasi·no* (< Est *kasiino*), not *kasino* ‘casino’ like in standard Russian. This phenomenon is more or less conventionalized. Such converged items as *lo·to* ‘lottery’, *di·plom* ‘diploma’, *se·minar* ‘seminar’, *ko·nspekt* ‘conspectus’ are typical examples. If a researcher does not know about the idiolect of the speaker, various explanations can be proposed. Based on my experience with Russian-speaking students whose speech I had a chance to observe, I think that in a seemingly monolingual utterance (such as *Ty poluchil di·plom?*), the item *di·plom* is more likely to be an Estonian item transferred into the Russian clause than a Russian item pronounced according to the Estonian rules. This is a common internationalism that has become almost identical across the two languages. And this fact, of course, makes the search for a possible explanation more difficult.

5.2. Lexical transfer

Lexical transfer is “the influence of word knowledge in one language on a person’s knowledge or use of words in another language” (Jarvis and Pavlenko 2008: 72). Russian-speaking students, who study in the Estonian language environment, use numerous Estonian (compound) nouns that belong to university domain. One of the students introduced herself during the interview like follows:

- (1) *Ja u čus’ na perv-om kurs-e magistratury v Narvskom*
 I study on first-LOC course-LOC magistracy-GEN in Narva-LOC
- kolledž-is, na special’nost’ “pedagog éstonsk-ogo jazyk-a” v*
 college-INES¹ on speciality:ACC teacher Estonian-GEN language-GEN in
- Russk-oj osnovn-oj škol-e, vtoraja special’nost’*
 Russian-LOC basic-LO school-LOC second speciality
- čelovekovedenije, inimese-õpetus.*
 human science HUMAN:GEN-SCIENCE

‘I study on the first course of a master program in Narva College, on the speciality “a teacher of Estonian in a Russian school”; my second speciality is human science, HUMAN SCIENCE’

In example (1), a student repeats the name of the second speciality, using the Estonian compound noun. She does it automatically, without any pauses or hesitations. My case studies

¹ Here, double marking of spatial relation occurs. As Auer (1999: 328) describes it, a grammatical function is marked by two functionally equivalent but structurally divergent strategies from the both languages. In this particular case, one semantic feature is expressed by a Russian preposition *v* (in) that adds locative content to the noun *kolledž* and an Estonian internal local inessive case-ending *-s*. See more on double-marking phenomenon in Zabrodskaia 2009: 233–234. Leinonen (1994: 230) describes similar instances where the same strategy is applied by a bilingual speaker, as the spatial relation is expressed by a Russian preposition and a Finnish adessive case-ending.

conducted in Narva and Tallinn revealed that such CS is very frequent in students' idiolects. According to the informants' self-reporting, the use of these Estonian (compound) nouns is caused by their shortness, their high productive structure and attractive ability to be formed from the context spontaneously (see also Verschik 2008: 118–135), as well as greater frequency in everyday speech in comparison with Russian equivalents especially in this domain. Some lexical borrowings of Estonian (compound) nouns have reached the stage where the borrowings have superseded the native, Russia's Russian, equivalents, while others occur alongside the Russian nouns and this justifies the use of continuum CS ~ lexical borrowing.

It remains beyond the scope of the present study to investigate with the help of psycholinguistic tools how Estonian compound nouns are interpreted by a L2 speaker. Maybe they are perceived as one content morpheme (or even a content word) by a learner (e.g. **keele-teadus** 'LINGUISTICS', **õppe-kava** 'CURRICULUM'). It is possible that an Estonian as L2 speaker does not form these words from two components but memorizes and uses such items as a whole, without analysing them into components.

There can be a debate over whether this principle is at work all the time, because in the cases where one of the components is a common internationalism (like **ainepunkt** 'CREDIT', **seminaritöö** 'WORK PAPER') it does not necessarily work. It is obvious that sometimes a Russian-speaking student can differentiate components of a compound noun. Otherwise it would be difficult to explain such hybrid constructions as *seminar-sk-ov* **peatük-ov** 'seminar-ADJ-GEN CHAPTER-GEN PL'.

Here, we have a situation where a Russian word *seminarskaja* meets with Estonian **seminaritöö** and the latter not only triggers the following Estonian word (the switch is facilitated by the common stem, an internationalism) in the sentence because of the sociolinguistic context (the Estonian equivalent is used more frequently than the Russian one in everyday spontaneous speech among students in this community of practice), but also brings along the Estonian word order, cf. the following monolingual equivalents:

RUS	<i>glav</i>	<i>seminar-sk-ov [rabot-y]</i>	'chapter:GEN PL seminar-ADJ-GEN [paper-GEN SG]'
EST	seminaritöö	peatükk-e	'WORK PAPER:GEN CHAPTERS:PART PL'

Thus, the morphological item and the syntactic rule are transferred into Russian – a word **peatükk** 'chapter' and a word order GEN PART PL.

In these instances, a speaker makes a difference between Russian language elements (an adjective and a noun) and its Estonian equivalents – compound nouns. A common stem, an internationalism *seminar* 'seminar' facilitates CS. This can be interpreted as potential evidence that L2 user of Estonian can recognize the components of a compound noun.

Still, I would be cautious in making radical far-reaching claims because it is not known what exactly happens in the head of a learner. To quote Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008: 74):

"For bilingualism and second language research, a fundamental question is whether the words we know in different languages are mentally interconnected with each other, both directly through inter-lingual word-word associations and indirectly through links to extralinguistic representations."

Data show that such lexical transfer puts speakers to show semantic lexical (or lexicosemantic transfer in Jarvis and Pavlenko's (2008) terminology) influence from Estonian on their use of Russian. They use Russian words with the meanings that reflect influences from the semantic range of corresponding words in the Estonian language. For example, *predmetnyj punkt* < **aine-punkt** 'CREDIT', literally 'subject point', cf. with standard Russian of Russia *kr'edit* 'credit'. Ringbom (2001) and Jarvis (2003) discuss similar instances where semantic influence can originate from a highly acquired L2.

Established expressions that belong to the university domain in the speech of Russian-speaking students can also play a role in structural changes as will be shown in the next subsection.

5.3. Semantic transfer

Concerning semantic transfer, my findings show change in progress (or *innovations*) in word order of Russian genitive constructions that have emerged under the influence of Estonian. The marked genitive construction loses its pragmatic markedness: N NOM + N GEN > N GEN + N NOM (see more examples in Zabrodskaia 2010). As a result, a once marginal word order becomes customary.

In Russian, the genitive (i.e. the possessor) is usually post-nominal (Timberlake 1993: 860). Colloquial Russian allows genitive inversion, i.e. the genitive precedes the nominative, in certain contexts. Zemskaja (1987: 150-151) asserts that the inversion can be pragmatically conditioned by the wish to bring the most important item to the first position. In example 2a, the Estonian modifier precedes a Russian head.

- (2a) *U nas segodnja sõnamoodustus-a lekcija jest'?*
 At us today DERIVATION-GEN lecture is
 'Do we have today the lecture on DERIVATION?'
- (2b) Monolingual Estonian:
sõnamoodustus-e loeng NOUN GEN + NOUN NOM
 DERIVATION-GEN LECTURE
 'LECTURE ON DERIVATION'
- (2c) Monolingual Russian:
lekcija po slovoobrazovani-ju NOUN NOM + NOUN PREP
 lecture on derivation-LOC
 'lecture on derivation'

This structure has multiple sources. The Russian word order would be *lekcija sõnamoodustus-a*. Here we have the Estonian order, which exists as an alternative (marked) word order in Russian, but has different frequencies. However, it occurs only in restricted contexts and is marked. This means that example 2a should not be interpreted as pragmatically conditioned. Although there is the possibility that the speaker intended to emphasize the particular lecture, influence of the Estonian word order is more likely.

In example 3a, a Russian modifier precedes an Estonian head.

- (3a) *Skol'ko seminar-sk-oj peatük-ov ty sdelal?*
 How seminar-ADJ-GEN CHAPTER-GEN PL you did
 'How many CHAPTERS of your work paper have you done?'
- (3b) Monolingual Estonian:
seminaritöö peatükk-e NOUN GEN + NOUN PART PL
 WORK PAPER:GEN CHAPTERS:PART PL
 'CHAPTERS OF THE WORK PAPER'
- (3c) Monolingual Russian:
glav seminar-sk-oj [rabort-y] NOUN GEN PL + ADJ GEN [NOUN GEN]
 chapter:GEN PL seminar-ADJ-GEN [paper-GEN SG]
 'chapters of the work paper'

In the Russian NP *glav seminarskoj [raboty]* 'chapters of the work paper' the noun is not obligatory because this kind of adjective is very often used as a noun in such contexts.

Finally, even a monolingual Russian phrase may follow the Estonian word order, as in example 4a.

- (4a) *Na éstonsk-om jazyk-e lekcija*
 on Estonian-LOC language-LOC lecture
 'Estonian language lecture'

(4b) Monolingual Russian:
Lekcija na éstonsk-om jazyk-e
 Lecture on Estonian-LOC language-LOC
 ‘Estonian language lecture’

(4c) Monolingual Estonian:
Eesti-keelne loeng
 ESTONIAN-LANGUAGE LECTURE
 ‘ESTONIAN LANGUAGE LECTURE’

In 4d, a schematic view of the two monolingual structures and the Estonian-influenced Russian structure is presented:

(4d) Monolingual Russian:	NOUN NOM + ADJ LOC + NOUN LOC
Monolingual Estonian:	ADJ + NOUN NOM
Estonian Russian:	ADJ LOC + NOUN LOC + NOUN NOM

Due to the fact that colloquial Russian does allow genitive inversion (i.e., the genitive precedes the nominative) in certain contexts, one could claim that it is wrong to analyze the examples as exhibiting Estonian word order. But if one agrees with the point that the examples 2a–4a do not give reason to suspect marked information structure on the part of the speakers, i.e. to emphasize the first element (i.e. the modifier), there is no reason to say that the speakers are using the marked Russian order to indeed say something that is pragmatically marked (see also Verschik 2008: 132–134 on similar cases). Instead, they use the marked Russian order because it is the unmarked Estonian order and that’s the grammatical change (or change in progress) under discussion.

To conclude, N GEN + N NOM word order is a marginally occurring construction that has become more frequent under Estonian influence and has lost its pragmatic force (i.e. the contexts of use and the semantics involved expand on the basis of the Estonian model).

The process can be described using Heine and Kuteva’s (2005: 44–62) formula “from minor to major use pattern”. Drawing on the empirical material, Heine and Kuteva (2005: 44) stress that although language contact sometimes leads to a new emerging pattern that did not exist in either monolingual variety, it is more common when there is already some (rarely used) collocation (in their terminology ‘minor use pattern’) that develops into a major use pattern under the influence of L2 (in their terminology ‘model language’).

Heine and Kuteva (2005: 50) conclude that “a widely observable process triggered by language contact concerns infrequently occurring, minor use patterns that are activated because there is a model provided by another language. Such patterns tend to be pragmatically and functionally marked, being restricted to specific contexts and associated with some specific function; but under the influence of the other language they come to be used more frequently and their function tends to be desemanticized – with the effect that they may turn into more widely used major use patterns. This is how new word-order structures can arise, in that speakers of the replica language [Russian – *A.Z.*] activates one of their minor use patterns that matches the word order of the model language [Estonian – *A.Z.*] and generalize it to a major, unmarked, pattern.”

This approach is related to a process identified by Matras and Sakel (2007: 830) as ‘pivot-matching’, that is the identification of a structure that plays a pivotal (changing) role in the model construction [the EL – *A.Z.*], and matching it with a structure in the replica language [the ML – *A.Z.*], to which this new role is assigned. Following Heine and Kuteva’s (2005) discussion, Matras and Sakel (2007) also suggest that the process itself leads to grammaticalization. Next, Matras and Sakel (2007: 852) add that the most powerful factor leading speakers

toward identifying potential pivots in the EL is the semantic potential of a structure in the ML to cover the (lexical or grammatical) semantics represented by the EL.

To conclude, my findings support very clearly the views presented above, i.e. a marked construction becomes unmarked and this is the contact-induced change. Colloquial Russian allows genitive inversion (i.e., GEN precedes NOM) in certain contexts. The contexts of use and the semantics involved expand on the basis of the Estonian model. The word order in genitive constructions (NOUN GEN + NOUN NOM) is a marginally occurring construction that has become more frequent under Estonian influence and has lost its pragmatic force in Estonia's Russian spoken among Russian-speaking students.

6. Discussion and conclusion

The general pattern that emerges from the presented examples is that stress or word order is determined by L2. I would draw attention to two aspects: 1) the phrases contain internationalisms, which are shared between the two languages and ease transition from one to the other, and 2) as for word order, pre-contact Russian already allowed the 'Estonian' order, albeit with special pragmatic meaning. Both these factors have proven relevant in other cases of language contact around the world (Heine & Kuteva 2005; Matras & Sakel 2007). The case of semantic transfer from Estonian to Estonian Russian variety where genitive constructions follow an Estonian word order (N NOM + N GEN > N GEN + N NOM) can be explained in the view of the mechanism that is involved when language-internal resources are employed to replicate an external model (Matras & Sakel 2007).

Russian-speaking students seek for elements that overlap in two typologically different languages (internationalisms or existing word order) and taking them as potential loci for transfer, employ L2 syntactic or phonological strategies.

As Mougeon et al. (2005: 99) point out, it is important to determine that the innovations or new patterns of transfer are not developments that could arise due to internal factors. In my study, this border is really blurred especially if we take the next statement as a starting point "convergence may result as well from pre-existing internally motivated changes in one of the languages, most likely *accelerated* [original emphasis] by contact, rather than a consequence of direct interlingual influence" (Silva-Corvalán 1994: 5). To make things more complicated while trying to differentiate convergence and transfer, to quote Treffers-Daller (2009: 71): "convergence is not necessarily externally motivated, whereas transfer by definition must be... transfer implies directionality ... transfer can lead to complexification (i.e. an unmarked feature is replaced by a marked feature)". It means that more data and deeper analysis is required. First, the extent to which innovations are spread in L2 speakers' language use needs to be established. If the spread is higher than among L1 speakers, then these are contact-induced innovations and not L1 internal changes. Also, in addition to the spontaneous corpus data, judgment data are needed to find out about acceptability.

Bibliography

- Andrews, D.: 1999, *Sociocultural perspectives on language change in diaspora: Soviet immigrants in the United States*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Backus, A.: 2005, 'Codeswitching and language change: One thing leads to another?', *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9 (3/4), 307–340.
- Cantone, K.F. & MacSwan, J.: 2009, 'Adjectives and word order: A focus on Italian-German code-switching', Isurin, L.; Winford, D; de Bot, K. (eds.), *Multidisciplinary Approaches to Code Switching*, Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 243–277.
- Cook, V.: 2003, *Effects of the second language on the first*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ehala, M.: 1994, 'Russian influence and the change in progress in the Estonian adpositional system', *Linguistica Uralica*, 39 (2), 177–193.

- Ehala, M.: 2009, 'Keelekontakti mõju eesti sihitisekäänete kasutamisele [Linguistic Contacts and the Use of Object Cases in Estonian]', *Keel ja Kirjandus*, 3, 182–204.
- Ehala, M. (forthcoming-a), 'Effects of imposition to variation in the Estonian object marking system', *Diachronica*.
- Ehala, M. (forthcoming-b), 'Transfer, hybridization and analogy in L2 usage: The case of Estonian object marking', *International Journal of Bilingualism*, Special issue on Transfer, Guest editors Jeanette Sakel and Jeanine Treffers-Daller.
- Heine, B. & Kuteva, T.: 2005, *Language contact and grammatical change*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jarvis, S.: 2000, 'Methodological Rigor in the Study of Transfer: Identifying L1 Influence in the Inter-language Lexicon', *Language Learning*, 50 (2), 245–309.
- Jarvis, S.: 2002, 'Topic continuity in L2 English article use', *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 387–418.
- Jarvis, S.: 2003, 'Probing the effects of the L2 on the L1: A case study', Cook, V. (ed.), *Effects of the second language on the first*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 81–102.
- Jarvis, S. & Pavlenko, A.: 2008, *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*, New York – London: Routledge.
- Kecskes, I., & Papp, T.: 2000, *Foreign language and mother tongue*, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Leather, J. & James, A.: 1996, 'Second language speech', Ritchie, W.; Bhatia, T. (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*, New York: Academic Press, 269–316.
- Leinonen, M.: 1994, 'Bilingual Speech in Russian and Finnish. A Case Study', Ureland, S. (ed.), *Language Contacts across the Baltic. Proceedings of the XIVth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics and the VIII Conference of Nordic and General Linguistic, August 16–21, 1993. Four Special Sessions. Gothenburg Papers in Theoretical Linguistics 72*, Göteborg: Göteborgs Universitet, 219–237.
- Major, R.: 1992, 'Losing English as a first language', *The Modern Language Journal*, 76, 190–208.
- Matras, Y. & Sakel, J.: 2007, 'Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence', *Studies in Language*, 31 (4), 829–865.
- Mills, G.E.: 2003, *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher*, 2nd Edition, Upper saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice-Hall.
- Milroy, L.: 1987, *Language and social networks*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mougeon, R.; Nadasdi, T. & Rehner, K.: 2005, 'Contact-induced linguistic innovations on the continuum of language use: The case of French in Ontario', *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 8 (2), 99–115.
- Myers-Scotton, C.: 2006, *Multiple Voices. An Introduction to Bilingualism*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Odlin, T.: 2009, 'Transfer and code-switching: Separate territories but common concerns on the border', Isurin, L.; Winford, D.; de Bot, K. (eds.), *Multidisciplinary Approaches to Code Switching*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 337–358.
- Pavlenko, A.: 2000, 'L2 influence on L1 in late bilingualism', *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 11, 175–205.
- Pavlenko, A. & Jarvis, S.: 2002, 'Bidirectional transfer', *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 190–214.
- Ringbom, H.: 2001, 'Lexical transfer in L3 production', Cenoz, J.; Hufeisen, B.; Jessner, U. (eds.), *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 59–68.
- Ringbom, H.: 2007, *Cross-linguistic Similarity in Foreign Language Learning*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Sebba, M.: 2009, 'On the notions of congruence and convergence in code-switching', Bullock, B.E.; Toribio, A.J. (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 40–57.
- Silva-Corvalán, C.: 1994, *Language Contact and Change*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Timberlake, A.: 1993, 'Russian', Comrie, B.; Corbett, G.G. (eds.), *The slavonic languages*, London – New York: Routledge, 827–886.
- Toribio, A.: 2004, 'Convergence as an optimization strategy in bilingual speech: Evidence from code-switching', *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 7 (2), 165–173.

- Treffers-Daller, J.: 2009, 'Code-switching and transfer: an exploration of similarities and differences', Bullock, B.E.; Toribio, A.J. (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 58–74.
- Varenne, H. & McDermott, R.: 1998, *Successful failure*, Colorado, CO: Westview Press.
- Verschik, A.: 2004, 'Estonian Compound Nouns and Their Equivalents in the Local Variety of Russian', *Scando-Slavica*, 50, 93–109.
- Verschik, A.: 2006, 'Convergence in Estonia's Russian: Directional vs. Static vs. Separative Verb', *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 10 (4), 383–404.
- Verschik, A.: 2007, 'Multiple language contact in Tallinn: transfer B2 > A1 or B1 > A2?', *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10 (1), 80–103.
- Verschik, A.: 2008, *Emerging bilingual speech: From monolingualism to code-copying*. London: Continuum.
- Zabrodskaia, A.: 2009a, 'Towards establishing the matrix language in Russian-Estonian code-switching: a corpus-based approach', Tsiplakou, S.; Karyolemou, M.; Pavlou, P. (eds.), *Language Variation – European Perspectives II. Selected papers from the Fourth International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 4), Nicosia, Cyprus, 17–19 June, 2007*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 225–240.
- Zabrodskaia, A.: 2009b, 'Evaluating the Matrix Language Frame model on the basis of a Russian-Estonian codeswitching corpus', *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13 (3), 357–377.
- Zabrodskaia, A.: 2009c, *Russian-Estonian language contacts: Grammatical aspects of language use and change*, Tallinn University dissertations on humanities, Tallinn.
- Zabrodskaia, A.: 2010, 'Morphosyntactic contact-induced language change in young Estonia's Russian speakers variety', Léglise, I.; Chamoreau, C. (eds.), *The interplay of variation and change in contact settings – Morphosyntactic studies*, Studies in Language Variation, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Zemskaja, J.: 1987, *Russkaja razgovornaja reč': lingvističeskij analiz i problemy obučenija*, Москва.