

FRANCO-LATVIAN CHILDREN AND THE LATVIAN DIGLOSSIC SITUATION

JONATHAN DURANDIN

Jonathan Durandin, PhD, researcher
Centre of Cultural Research
Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences
Daugavpils University, Latvia
e-mail: jonathan.durandin@bluemail.ch
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1843-4080>

Dr. Jonathan Durandin is a researcher of the Centre of Cultural Research at Daugavpils University Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences. He earned a PhD degree in Language Sciences from the *Université de Franche-Comté* in Besançon, France. His main fields of research are foreign language didactics and sociolinguistics. Jonathan Durandin has researched the empowerment of teachers and learners of French as a foreign language and the social representations of language learning and learner autonomy at the university level in Latvia. He has conducted research on the influence of theatre practices on foreign languages teaching/learning in the university context. He is currently conducting research on Franco-Latvian children's social representations of their first languages and bilingualism.

ABSTRACT

Sociolinguistically, Latvia is an example of a conflicting diglossic situation between the Latvian and Russian languages. Most of the research carried out on this sociolinguistic context focuses on the language policies implemented previously and nowadays in this state and on the changes in the language practices and representations of members of the Latvian and Russian-speaking communities during the twentieth century and up to the present day. This paper looks at the same context from a different angle: its aim is to understand how the children of Franco-Latvian families attending school in Latvia view the Latvian diglossic situation and themselves in it and what influences their opinions. Referring to the Dell Hymes model of SPEAKING, the study is based on the analysis of interviews of four children, an 8-year-old Latvian-speaking boy and girl and two 10-year-old Russian-speaking girls attending school in Riga, the capital of Latvia. According to the analysis of their language practices and representations, the interviewed children place themselves in two distinct linguistic environments and value their French-Latvian or French-Russian bilingualism. Detailed analysis of the psychological and social functions that the children attribute to their first languages reveals that they do this to claim a daily life outside the Latvian-speaking context (Russian-speaking children) or to stand out from other people in Latvia (Latvian-speaking children). These two distinct strategies allow the children to place themselves on the fringe of the Latvian diglossic situation.

Keywords: Franco-Latvian children, bilingualism, language practices and representations, language psychological and social functions

INTRODUCTION

From the sociolinguistic perspective, Latvia is generally considered a case of a conflicting diglossic situation between the official language, Latvian, and a minority language, Russian. Most studies on this subject focus on policies and planning implemented in favour of either Russian or Latvian language during the different political periods through centuries and especially from the 1920s on (Hogan-Brun et al. 2008; Metzāle-Kangere and Ozolins 2005; Ozolins 1999; Veisbergs 2019), as well as on the evolution of linguistic practices and representations in Latvian and Russian-speaking communities (Dilans 2009; Pisarenko 2006; Priedīte 2005; Romanov 2000), after 1991, namely the restoration of independence of the Republic of Latvia.

This paper offers a unique analysis of Latvia's diglossic situation by focusing on children who speak Latvian or Russian but who are characterised by bilingualism shaped by another language, which has no relation to Latvian historical or sociolinguistic context. The focus of this paper is on children from mixed Franco-Latvian families. The French language is not a part of the evolution of the Latvian diglossic situation. French plays a marginal role in Latvia (Kibermane and Kļava 2016a, 57–70) and French presence is limited and generally visible only in Riga, where the Embassy of France, the French Institute and the Jules Verne Riga French school are located. These Franco-Latvian children belong to different linguistic communities. Depending on the case, they can be considered as a part of the Latvian-speaking or Russian-speaking community, or sometimes both, but also of the French-speaking community. Thus, the case of these Franco-Latvian children could make it possible to renew the study of this diglossic situation and the relationship between the Russian and Latvian languages. To this end, the following questions will be considered: how do these children view the Latvian diglossic situation and themselves in it? What does this bring to a new or different understanding of the current Latvian diglossic situation?

This paper focuses on four bilingual children, aged 8–10, through analysing in-depth interviews carried out by one of their parents on the child's first languages and bilingualism. Section 1 of the paper specifies the national historical sociolinguistic and sociocultural context which presumably has been influencing these children attitudes, social representations and discourse. In section 2, the

conceptual and methodological framework of the research will be detailed, including information on the participants and the interviews conducted. The presentation of the results will then show how the children attribute certain functions to their first (or native) languages in order to highlight their bilingualism in the Latvian context and to place themselves on the fringes of the Latvian diglossic situation.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Latvia is a country in North-eastern Europe with a population of 1.919,968 (Eurostat 2020). Its size is 64 589 km² about the same as Switzerland or Ireland (Orcier 2005, 12). Latvia has been a member of the European Union since 2004. Latvia shares borders with Estonia to its north, Russia to its east, Belarus to its south-east, and Lithuania – to its south; to its west, lies the Baltic Sea. Before the proclamation of the Republic of Latvia on 18 November 1918, the territory of this nation-state experienced various invasions or dominions for centuries: the proto-Baltic people (Prussians, Latvians, Lithuanians), the Livs, the Swedish Vikings, the German Teutonic Order, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Kingdom of Sweden and Tsarist Russia (Orcier 2005). It is in the Tsarist period that the current Latvian diglossic situation finds its sources.

By the end of the nineteenth century, a national awareness movement brought to life the idea of a Latvian culture as such and of territory specific to its culture and to a goal to create an independent Latvian state. At the end of World War I, this dream could become a reality and the Republic of Latvia was proclaimed. The Latvian population, society and state were characterised by the predominance of ethnic Latvians and their emerging culture. Minorities which made up around a quarter of the country's population including Russians (10% of the population), Jews (5%), Germans (3%), Poles, Belarusians and Lithuanians, were integrated into society and given the same civil and political freedoms and rights that the Latvian majority had (Champonnois and de Labriolle 2003, 200–202). Latvian was proclaimed the national language in 1918 and became the primary language used in political and public life. In 1935, the first language law of the Republic of Latvia (Ulmanis and Gulbis 1935) required the use of the Latvian language in all official, administrative, commercial and public acts and documents. However, communication with the municipal authorities could be carried out in Russian or German, if the local majority was constituted of Russian or German speakers. Minorities were allowed to teach their languages or use

them as languages of instruction in the schools they set up, to publish newspapers and literary works as well as hold meetings or religious gatherings in their languages, provided that these events were held as private.

World War II destroyed this relatively consensual cultural and linguistic balance among the majority and minorities living in Latvia. The secret German-Soviet pact of 1939 ensured organised repatriation of the 60000 Baltic Germans to Germany and during the war 90% of the Latvian Jewish population was exterminated. Finally, when the Soviets occupied Latvia in 1944, Yiddish and German languages had almost disappeared from Latvian territory. Demographic and sociolinguistic situations and language policies were to evolve into an intense conflict between the Latvian and Russian populations and languages.

After World War II and until the end of the 1980s, Latvia underwent a policy of sovietisation based on the industrialisation of the country and the Russification of society. The massive immigration of Slavic and Russian-speaking populations to urban centres transformed the ethnocultural composition of Latvia's society. The number of Russians in Latvia jumped from 8.8% of the population in 1935 to 34% in 1989. By 1989, the Slavic population represented 42% of the population. As a result, the percentage of the ethnic Latvian population decreased in parallel from 83% in 1940 to 62% in 1959 and 52% in 1989 (Champonnois and de Labriolle 2003, 212; Grenoble 2003, 103; Plasseraud 1996, 70). This demographic policy was supported by a language policy deliberately in favour of the Russian language (Grenoble 2003, 26). Latvian lost its status as an official language in favour of Russian that became established throughout the society during the Soviet period. According to Plasseraud (1996, 71), the rate of Latvian-Russian bilingualism among ethnic Latvians rose from 47.4% in 1959 to 65.7% in 1989, making them one of the most Russian-speaking peoples in the Soviet Union.

In 1988, a rebalancing of the sociolinguistic situation began with a decision of the Council of the Latvian SSR in favour of the Latvian language, which benefited from its national language status. Latvian language development and teaching activities were decided and its use was guaranteed in all sectors of social, cultural and administrative life, alongside Russian (Latvijas Padomju Sociālistiskās Republikas Augstākās Padome 1988). The situation turned completely in favour of Latvian with the restoration of Latvian independence on August 21, 1991. In 1992, a Language Law based on an ethnolinguistic policy was introduced to ensure the status of the Latvian

language as State language and a substantial institutional arsenal for its development, teaching and defence (Latvijas Republikas Augstākā Padome 1992). In 1998, the status of the Latvian language was strengthened by adding an article to the constitution guaranteeing that the state language of the Republic of Latvia is the Latvian language (Latvijas Republikas Saeima 1998). In 2000, the Law on the State Language was adopted, replacing the 1992 Law on Languages, establishing the Latvian language's principal status in the national territory and all areas of public and social life (Latvijas Republikas Saeima 1999).

The policy put in place, which is in effect to this day, recognised the rights of linguistic minorities to practise their languages in the private sphere but also within companies or in the national media, under the control of the authorities. Linguistic minorities could also teach their languages in private schools or dedicated public schools, albeit under the supervision of the Ministry of Education. However, peaceful yet virulent ethnolinguistic conflict developed in the 1990s between the Russian-speaking community and the Latvian authorities. This conflict, orchestrated or at least maintained by selected politicians and journalists, originated from loss of control over political and social life for the Russian-speaking community. In order to better understand this situation, it is necessary to emphasise that Russian speakers have felt discriminated politically and civically since the early 1990s. An exclusionary citizenship policy, based on nationalist rhetoric (Pabriks and Purs 2001, 72–73), was then implemented restricting access to Latvian citizenship only to those who were already citizens of Latvia in 1940 and to their descendants. Under the pressure of international organisations and with a view to accession to the European Union, new laws on citizenship were adopted, gradually lifting restrictions on the granting of citizenship (Droit 2005, 46). However, the government policy closely linked citizenship with the learning and use of the Latvian language, hence the requirement for applicants for citizenship to prove their proficiency in the Latvian language in a test that also included a cultural questionnaire (Latvijas Republikas Saeima 1993).

It is therefore understandable that the debate on the Law on Education of 1998 was also the perfect stage for a language conflict between Russian speakers and the Latvian authorities – a phenomenon that continued with the reforms implemented in minority education in the following years and during the 2000s. Pluča (2019, 199–201) explains that from 1995 onwards, minority education policy was oriented towards the introduction and development of Latvian

and Latvian-language teaching throughout schooling in state schools and by the end of the 2000s, teaching in Latvian accounted for 60% of the total number of courses compared with 40% for the minority language. In 2018, the Latvian Parliament amended the Law on Education to gradually extend the Latvian language education to all levels of schooling by 2022 (Latvijas Republikas Saeima 2020).

The Latvian diglossic situation has calmed down over the years. The results of quantitative studies carried out between 1996 and 2015 show increasing use and knowledge of Latvian among members of linguistic minorities (Priedite 2005) and a general trend that has been emerging since the early 2010s towards balanced societal bilingualism between Russian and Latvian (Kibermane and Kļava 2016a, 88–89). The use of Latvian has grown among members of linguistic minorities because they are increasingly comfortable in its use (Kibermane and Kļava 2016b, 100). Moreover, they have developed an increasingly positive attitude towards the Latvian language. It appears that “since regaining independence, the Latvian language has been acquired and language skills improved more and more not only in order to, for example, pass the state language proficiency attestation and get a job, but also because there is a need to use the Latvian language.” It should be noted that “especially in the younger generation of minorities, a higher level of language skills and a positive linguistic attitude are increasingly based on the desire to belong to Latvian society and the state, the desire to use the Latvian language in various communication situations is also growing” (Kibermane and Kļava 2016b, 102, 112–113).

Finally, the Latvian language has taken on a priority and stable role in formal situations involving interaction with administrations. The sociolinguistic situation seems to be slowly changing in favour of the use of Latvian, particularly under the influence of young people’s practices and attitudes. However, Russian is still a part of the linguistic landscape, particularly in everyday and informal communication situations and in specific contexts, including that of the capital. The sociolinguistic situation today is characterised by an accepted distribution of the status, roles and uses of the Latvian and Russian languages. A new linguistic landscape is taking shape in Latvia, characterised by a peaceful diglossic situation between Latvian and Russian. Under the impact of globalization, English plays an increasingly important role in this situation, especially at school and in the society, notably in Riga (Kibermane and Kļava 2016a, 57–70).

METHODOLOGY

The article looks at language situation in Latvia from the point of view of Franco-Latvian children living in Latvia and complement the work that was carried out in 2019 (Durandin 2019) by analysing qualitative research on children's social representations of their languages and bilingualism among them, i.e. their language social representations.

Social representation relates to any object, real or symbolic, and it is "a form of knowledge, socially elaborated and shared, having a practical aim and contributing to the construction of reality common to a social group" in relation to the object to which it refers. From the social representation of a given object, "the diffusion and assimilation of knowledge, individual and collective development, the definition of personal and social identities, the expression of groups, and social transformations" are defined. It is in this way that social representations "engage the social belonging of individuals with the affective and normative implications, with the related internalisations of experiences, practices, models of conduct and thought, socially inculcated or transmitted through social communication" (Jodelet 2003, 53). The best way to access social representations is to establish "a collection of individual discourses" (Moliner et. al. 2002, 5) through interviews and to carry out analysis of these individual discourses.

The individual discourses that are analysed are those of children between the ages of 8 and 11, since this period represents a time in life when people are integrating increasingly broad and varied instances of socialization and language practices. Children of this age are able to relate sociolinguistic experiences and situations and values from the family circle but also from other wider social circles, e.g., school, extracurricular activities, peer groups. Therefore these children are expected to present language representations that are built in a more or less elaborate way on the experiences and values they are confronted with in different instances of socialisation in Latvia, or even in France or elsewhere. The selection of the children to be interviewed is based on two main criteria: they belong to bilingual French-Latvian or French-Russian families with one parent of French nationality and the other of Latvian nationality, and they live mainly and attend school in Latvia. As discourse analysis has to be conducted in French – the researcher's native language – interviews are carried out mainly in this language.

For the research reported in this article, two children were interviewed in December 2018 – January 2019 and two others a year later. All of them live and attend school in Riga. Each child was interviewed

by their parent in French thanks to a precise, semi-directive interview guide (see Figure 1). The interview guide focused on each child's language practices in different social backgrounds as well as their thoughts and feelings about French, Latvian or Russian and about bilingualism.

Topics	Questions or reminders
Relationship to both languages	Since when do you speak Latvian-Russian/French? Which language did you speak first? When you first spoke Latvian-Russian/French, what was it about?
Practices in both languages: circles, domains and functions	In Latvian-Russian/French, when, where, who do you talk to? Do you listen? read? write? Do you do other things in this language? If necessary, give examples: counting, watching films, playing...
Relationship to both languages	What do you think of Latvian-Russian, French? How do you like this language?
Relationship to both languages	What do you like to do in Latvian-Russian/French? To speak? listen? read? write? Anything else? How do you feel when you speak, listen, read, write in Latvian-Russian / French?
Relationship to both languages	In your opinion, it is better to speak, listen, read, write, etc. in which language? Why do you think so? In your opinion, in which situation is it better to use Latvian-Russian? French?
Relationship to the language of schooling and the other language	How do you feel about using only Latvian-Russian/French in the school premises and Latvian-Russian/French outside?
Relationship to bilingualism (identity of the bilingual)	In your opinion, is it "special" to speak two or more languages? How so? Do you like it or dislike it? What do you like or dislike?
Experience and relationship to both languages, bilingualism (identity of carriers, possible identification)	According to you, how are the people who speak French? Latvian-Russian? both languages? other languages?
Experience and relationship to both languages, bilingualism (cognitive and sensory processing)	How do you think it works in the head and body of a person who speaks Latvian-Russian? French? Latvian-Russian and French in life? In your opinion, how does it work in the head and body of a person who speaks one language? several languages?

Figure 1: Interview guide

For the proper conduct of each interview, the interview guide was presented individually to each parent who took charge of the discussion with his or her child. This presentation in a preparatory meeting made it possible to obtain additional general information on each child's family and social environment (see Figure 2) and also to partly understand how the parent viewed his or her child's language practices. This allowed to carry out later a nuanced analysis of the interviews between child and parent by taking into account the positions of the two interlocutors.

Each interview took place in a familiar and pleasant environment for the child and the parent: at home (in the child's room or living-room) or in a quiet cafe. These configurations of interviews between a parent and a child allowed each of the participants to respect the expected forms of this type of interview while at the same time putting both parties in a position of trust. Children therefore did not hesitate to talk about their relationships to their parents or to their environment while focusing on their language practices.

The relationship of the participants to the French language was also taken into account in the analysis of the interviews. In each "linguistic" group, one child is interviewed by his French-speaking father while the other is interviewed by his mother whose first language is not French but Latvian or Russian. This has an incidence on the course of the interview and on the attitude of the interlocutors during the interview. Interviews conducted by French-speaking fathers are longer than those conducted by non-French-speaking mothers. Marija's interview lasts 24 minutes and Anna's almost 30 minutes, while Roberts and Alina's interviews are only about 15 minutes long. In interviews with fathers, both interviewees seem to pay less attention to answering questions without diverging and have more expressive freedom than in interviews with mothers. This may be explained by the fact that children give more detailed answers with Francophone parents because the relationship to the language of the interview, French, is not the same as with non-Francophone parents.

The primary parameter in this study is the native language(s) and languages used by children in their family and school circles. Anna and Roberts constitute a group of French-Latvian bilinguals where Latvian seems to have an important role. In contrast, Alina and Marija represent French-Russian bilingualism with several languages of schooling – Russian, Latvian or French. The difference between the two language groups is reinforced by the age difference: the two bilingual Franco-Latvian children are 8 years old while the other two are 10 years old.

Native languages	French and Latvian French-speaking father, Latvian-speaking mother		French and Russian French-speaking father, Russian-speaking mother	
Interviewee (pseudonym)	Anna	Roberts	Alina	Marija
Age at the time of the interview	8	8	10	10
Family situation	Married parents. She lives with her parents in Riga. Family languages are French and Latvian. Parents speak English and Russian to varying degrees.	Divorced parents, one younger brother (4 years old). He lives with his mother in Riga and sees his father during visits in Riga or on school holidays. His mother speaks Latvian and French with her children. His father speaks French with his children. The father speaks English and some Latvian; the mother is fluent in French, English and Russian.	Divorced parents, one older sister (13 years old). She lives alternately with both her parents (no detailed information on this matter). Parents used to speak French and English in the family. Currently, her mother speaks Russian with her children. She also speaks French and English. No information available on her Latvian language practice. Her father speaks French with his children. He speaks English otherwise. His knowledge of Latvian is not specified.	Divorced parents, one younger step-sister (2 years old) from her father's side. She lives alternately with both her parents: 2/3 of the time with her mother, 1/3 with her father. Parents used to speak English in the family, and each one spoke their own language with their daughter. Currently, her mother speaks with her in Russian. English is the spoken language within her father's family, but he speaks French to his daughter. The father's partner can speak Russian.

Native languages	French and Latvian French-speaking father, Latvian-speaking mother		French and Russian French-speaking father, Russian-speaking mother	
Interviewee (pseudonym)	Anna	Roberts	Alina	Marija
Schooling	Schooling in Latvian since pre-school (Latvian private/public schools)	Schooling in France for 1 year of pre-school, followed by 2–3 years of pre-school in Latvia. Schooling in Latvian since pre-school (Latvian public establishment)	Pre-school in Russian for 1 year then schooling in French (with some lessons in Russian and Latvian) at the Jules Verne Riga French school.	Pre-school at the Jules Verne Riga French school for 3 years, then schooling in Latvian and Russian in a public minority school in Latvia.

Figure 2: Profiles and language environments of the interviewed children

Dell Hymes model of SPEAKING (1977, 53–62) were used to conduct a discourse analysis based on the information parents provided about the circumstances of the interviews, the recordings they made of the interviews, and the transcripts of the interviews. This involved analysing the physical (time/place) or psychological framework of each situation (*Setting*). The *Participants* have been considered. It was necessary to situate socioculturally and in their relationships the persons and voices who contribute to the act of enunciation by speaking or not, present or physically absent. For each situation, its purposes and goals and its results were analysed, both in an overall perspective and for each participant (*Ends*). Were considered the Acts of utterances, i.e. their content and form, their style and the Key of each situation by identifying the tone used by the interlocutors and their attitudes. For each situation among *Instrumentalities*, the codes (linguistic, behavioural, socio-cultural) that were relevant for the participants and the *Norms* of interaction (interruptions and overlaps, silences) and of interpretation (according to socio-cultural presuppositions, the socio-historical context and the experience of each individual) were taken into account. Finally, it was necessary also to analyse the evolution of the Genre of discourse in each interview: short answers to a questionnaire, testimonies, free discussions between parent and child.

In particular, the use of certain deictics in children's speeches was analysed, for example, the personal pronouns "tu", "nous", "on". Thanks to these pronouns, the enunciator can mark his or her personal positioning in relation to others. In addition to this, the adverbs and adverbial locutions that specify the temporal location but also the different dates and periods that the children use as references were taken into account as well as the relationships that the children presented with the people and places they evoked.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The interviews and discourse analysis made it possible to study the children's language representations, focusing on their relationship with the Latvian diglossic situation. The first step was to assess their language practices and attitudes by identifying the circumstances in which they use their first languages and their relationship to them, to languages in general and bilingualism.

LANGUAGE PRACTICES IN LATVIAN OR RUSSIAN, AND IN FRENCH

Anna and Roberts often refer to the Latvian language being used with other children, mainly at school but also outside the school with other Latvian-French speaking children. This language is mainly used in games. Especially Roberts enjoys creative games that require writing in Latvian with some friends, with whom he also reads comic books. Latvian also allows children to communicate with each other, both orally and in writing by sharing notes, especially with classmates. Roberts does not present Latvian as the language of family communication clearly, whereas Anna does so in a seemingly paradoxical way: she states that she speaks Latvian with her French father at the beginning of her interview and only later mentions situations in which Latvian is used with her Latvian mother, emphasising the evening reading her mother does before Anna goes to bed. Both children present Latvian rather rarely and very superficially as a language used in the wider society, for example, with other children's parents or their parents' friends.

On the other hand, Marija and Alina do not report any practice in Latvian. Instead, they present their practices in Russian, which is the primary language within their family circles. Alina's family circle consists of her mother and sister, but she does not specify her practices in Russian with them. Marija is more precise on this point: she converses in Russian with her mother and grandmother, as well as reads with her grandmother. Both girls mention the fact that Russian is the language used with their friends at school. To this, Alina adds that she also speaks Russian with "girlfriends" who are "not from school" and she says: "I play with my girlfriends in Russian, normally."¹ Alina and Marija talk briefly about their individual Russian practices. They read and they listen to or watch programmes on YouTube channels (Marija) or television, without specifying the type of these programmes. Marija specifies that she prefers comic books, whereas Alina does not say anything about the types of books she reads. Finally, it is most likely that Russian is the language of externalised internal discourse used when playing. Alina likes to "invent games" in Russian while Marija says "I play, I talk with them, with my toys". The two girls make a few remarks about the use of their first language in Latvian society, with their parents' friends and also

¹ From here on, all quotations are translated from French.

with strangers they have met on the street. When her father asks her when, where and with whom she speaks Russian, Marija immediately quotes her family and friends, adding: "There are people who ask me to show something and so I too can speak with them in Russian." Later in the interview, she notices that everyone in Latvia speaks Russian with her. To the question "When is it better to use Russian and when French?" she answers that "Russian is better when you are in a cafeteria having a small coffee or something like that". To the same question, Alina gives the same kind of answer: "And, if you are in Latvia, it's still better to speak Russian because there are more people who speak Russian". One can notice that Anna and Roberts do not mention the use of their native language, Latvian, in everyday communication situations in society. As for Russian, Anna and Roberts do not evoke any practice in this language.

The language practices that the four children have in common are carried out in French. In this language, interactions with others are generally confined to the restricted family circle consisting of the father and a few members of the larger circle in France, such as grandparents, an uncle or cousins. The father is presented as the main interlocutor in discussions in French by all the children, but only Anna and Roberts watch film with their father at the cinema or home. Anna also discusses the pleasure of reading with her father or listening to stories that he reads to her. Marija, on the other hand, remembers learning to count in French with her father. Anna, Marija and Roberts more or less accurately position their mother to the francophone family circle of practice. As for the four children's French-speaking friend circles, they generally consist of a few bilingual or even French-speaking children and a few adults from the parents' friend circle. Only Anna presents her parents' French-speaking friends as her own and shows that she has personal activities with them, mainly games or creative activities. The other children report the adults as occasional interlocutors without giving details on the interactions they have in French with them. As for activities in French with other children, they mainly relate to games with two or three children for Anna and Roberts, and discussions for Alina and Marija. On this point, Alina stands out from the other children because she says that she speaks French "with the girlfriends who don't speak Russian". No doubt she is referring to her classmates at the Jules Verne Riga French school she attends. The other children, for their part, say they have contact with bilingual people. The subject of French at school is broached by the two children who have or have had regular contact with the Jules Verne Riga French school, Marija and Alina. The latter says very briefly that she speaks French with

her teachers, but does not talk about her school activities in French. Marija, for her part, recalls a teacher at the Jules Verne Riga French school whom she associates with exercises in writing in French. The children quite often present themselves alone in their practices in French. Roberts notes that he speaks French when he plays by himself. All the girls talk about reading in French as a regular activity. Marija specifies her favourite reading medium: comic strips. She also finds pleasure in watching YouTube channels in French. Anna, for her part, values the pleasure of recording herself reading a story or singing a song in French and listening to herself afterwards.

As for language practices in other languages, only Marija states this. She notes that she plays in French as well as in Russian, but also in “an imaginary language or in English”. At the end of her interview, she insists on the fact that English is very familiar to her: “English is almost one of my maternal languages, too”. She explains this by the fact that she has been hearing this language since her early childhood and “even on YouTube”. In conclusion, she notes that she is learning Japanese – a language that impresses her because she finds it “cute”. Surprisingly, while she is schooled in an environment where children of different nationalities live side by side, Alina makes no direct remarks about speaking languages other than Russian or French.

To sum up, the four children present language practices around their two first languages: French and Latvian or Russian. Considering the extent of the circles of use of these languages, and the variety and frequency of use in these languages, it can be deduced from their statements on bilingualism that Latvian or Russian are the dominant languages for these children, although French plays a significant role.

BILINGUALISM: A COMMONPLACE BUT VALUED PHENOMENON

All four children regularly present bilingualism as a commonplace phenomenon. For example, Alina considers that “it’s normal to speak several languages”. Anna thinks that adults speak three or four languages, whereas children at least two, “for example, English-Latvian, Russian-Latvian”. According to her, some children speak three languages, “for example, Russian-English-Latvian”. This commonplace phenomenon is beneficial for those who master it. Roberts notes that “it’s special because you can go to more countries and talk a lot, a lot with people”. Marija thinks “it’s really an advantage to speak two languages, three languages, four [...] because you will be able to understand more people since you are little”. Alina insists on the handicap of being monolingual, except for those who speak

English: "If you only speak one language, apart from English, you can't really talk to all the people". Roberts considers bilingualism very useful because it helps to develop knowledge about the world as well as about language systems. For him, bilinguals "know many, many, many more things than others who speak only one language. But if they learn another language, they also know a lot about that language." Marija talks about the fact that knowing one language makes one want to learn another.

As for their bilingualism, the four children emphasise it in their discourse. Thus, from their first answers to questions about their practices in one of their first languages, Anna and Marija insist on their two first languages. Anna states that she speaks Latvian with her father – not a priori the most representative speaker of this language – and with other Latvian-French bilingual children. Her answer blurs the language reference points and helps to promote the Franco-Latvian bilingual model. Marija does the same when her father asks her, as the first question of the interview, to explain on which occasions she speaks Russian or French. She answers: "When I am in France, I can have thoughts in Russian, but it's just that in Latvia, I can have thoughts in French and it depends where I am and who is speaking to me". She states further on in her interview that she likes to speak two languages. When Roberts' mother asks him at the very beginning of their interview how he feels when he speaks Latvian or French, Roberts answers: "I like both languages". Alina insists on the need to practise her bilingualism, even at the Jules Verne Riga French school: "I find that speaking when I'm at school all the time in French wouldn't be very cool. I like to speak different languages even in school".

Alina and Marija show their bilingualism in a positive light by placing their two first languages on an equal footing. However, this does not allow them to conceal the fact that it is the locally-established language that is predominant in their practices, which they master better than French and which they often prefer. For example, Marija believes that she started speaking both French and Russian simultaneously; to her, there is no chronological first language. In a series of questions about which language "is better to use" in each language skill (i.e. speaking, listening, reading, writing), she tries not to differentiate between the two languages, for example, she states "I think it's normal to speak both languages [...]". For listening and reading, she answers that "it's the same". As for reading, she says that she does not know which language she is more comfortable in. On the other hand, she admits that she has a better command of and feels more comfortable writing in Russian than in French. How-

ever, when it comes to saying how she feels in one language or another, she makes no difference between them – she feels “good, comfortable” in both languages, adding: “Because they are my languages. They are my two favourite languages.” Even though Alina has a reserved attitude towards French, the language of her schooling, she still tries to give it prominence in comparison with Russian, but without any real success. Thus, while she lists with ease all the things she likes to do in Russian, when it comes to French, she hesitates and searches for her answer, repeating the question aloud before answering “I don’t know”. Finally, Alina ends up saying: “Well, I like reading more in French. [...] But there are a lot of words I don’t understand, so for me it’s good. I like to read in French. Voilà!” When asked how she finds her two first languages, she avoids judging the French language by giving it, without conviction, characteristics similar to Russian: “For me, it is a little easier than Russian. But what do I think of it? Well, it is beautiful, and that’s all.” Only Marija and Alina apply this strategy of erasing the differences between their two first languages and valuing their bilingualism as an undividable whole.

Furthermore, the four children use another strategy to enhance the value of the French language and their bilingualism. This strategy is based on what this author considers to be the principle of attributing psychological and social functions to the languages that make up their bilingualism. The idea is to assign similar functions to these languages or, if this is not possible, to give them complementary functions. Some of these functions can be identified in the language practices presented above, while others will be discussed here on the basis of new cases.

The functions most often assigned to their languages are the communicative functions. According to the children’s statements, languages often enable them to exchange information or ideas with other people. These contacts or exchanges are usually presented at an interpersonal level, but they can also be presented at a social level in Latvia, France, or elsewhere in the world with strangers in public places, or with members of a given social group, such as teachers or classmates’ parents. This interpersonal communicative function can often be seen in statements on language practices with family or friends, as in Marija’s statement: “If I don’t speak both languages, I can’t understand one of my parents”.

The affective function of languages is identifiable when a language allows a child to express or feel emotions in a relationship with themselves or with others, mainly their parents. This is quite often the case in Anna’s interview, especially when she talks about reading together or sharing songs with her parents, in French and Latvian.

Globally, the schooling function of a language is little or not presented by the children. It is even sometimes rejected by Alina and Roberts for whom the status of French as a language of schooling seems to weigh on their relationship with that language. As cited earlier, Alina does not seem to want to abandon Russian in favour of French at school. In a conversation with his mother, Roberts tries to make her understand that he does not like the French teaching that she imposes on him:

Roberts' mother: Okay. And what do you like to do in French?

Roberts: Huh. In France or in French?

Roberts' mother: In French.

Roberts: Not much.

Roberts' mother: Really?

Roberts: Yes.

However, Roberts uses the learning function of French to enhance its value: this language allows one to develop one's knowledge of the world or language systems in general. A language can also have a recreational function, which appears in particular in language practices related to audio-visual media, such as listening to audiobooks (Marija's pastime) or watching videos on YouTube. Reading comic books or books also has a recreational function, virtually in all children. It can also be seen with Roberts that comic book reading can have an interpersonal communicative function, for example, when he reads comic books in Latvian with his friends.

Two other functions, attributable to languages, exist but are difficult to identify in the language practices presented earlier. One of them appears in individual language practices that Anna or Marija particularly highlight. Both children seem to pay attention to their voices in their first languages and derive aesthetic pleasure from them. Anna enjoys singing certain songs because "they are good to hear, when you hear them". She records herself in French and then listens to herself again and says: "I like to hear how I speak". Marija, after indicating that Russian and French are her "two favourite languages", explains that she "really likes the sounds" in Russian, that she can change her voice in French and that she can have a "really soft voice" in both languages. It seems that listening to oneself speaking or singing is a part of a process of becoming aware of one's singularity which comes through the pleasure of the sounds one produces. In fact, this personal identity function is observable in the activities in which children handle or learn language or in their conception of such handling and learning. This is what can be understood thanks to Roberts, who does not talk about aesthetic work with his languages and who rejects school work on French. Nevertheless, he confidently

presents his conception of the acquisition of his first languages. According to him, these languages are innate because they are brought to him by his parents and their relationship. For example, he explains that he spoke Latvian when “Mummy married Daddy” and spoke French “because Mummy married a Frenchman”. Later, he explains his bilingualism in these terms: “it works because you were born with two parents, one from France and one from Latvia. That’s it.” Roberts sees his bilingualism as a genetic inheritance, while Anna and Marija see it as a personal construction. If every language is a vector of identity construction (Marc 2005, 48–50), it seems that the work that each person does on their first language(s) or their conception of this work is part of their personal identity construction.

This is what leads us to another identity function of languages that arises in language practices with others or in what children say about these practices. This function is easily identifiable in certain statements about practices in French or their bilingualism characterised by French. At the beginning of his interview, after having said that he loves his two first languages, Roberts remarks: “When I speak in French, in my school, I think everyone says *woah!* and they would like to know how I do that”. When her father asks her if it is special to speak French, Anna answers “Yes. [...] Because I like it and there are not many children who speak French, it is rare”. Elsewhere in her interview, she says she prefers French to Latvian, for a reason, which has to do with her relationship with another French-Latvian-speaking child: “I speak more French with R. when there are other children [...] when we have things, little secrets. All those things.” All this reveals the fact that language allows the individual to place themselves in society and give them a singular status, to be different. In this case, French allows either to have a positive and special image among the children at school or to have intimate socialisation apart from the large Latvian-speaking friend circle. On the contrary, a language can be used not to distinguish oneself from a given group but to integrate into that group. This appears on one occasion in Anna’s interview. After characterising the people who speak French, based on examples of activities she does with them, she clarifies her views on “Latvian speakers” as follows: “They too are nice, we communicate, we’re all together. We are together, we understand each other.” In this case, Anna points out that Latvian, beyond the fact that it is used for communication, makes it possible to create a sense of belonging among Latvian speakers, to create a group identity.

These few examples reveal what can be called the sociocultural identity function of languages and highlight the relationship that a function given to a language may have within a given sociolinguistic

and sociocultural situation. The identity that a person attributes to themselves should mark their sociological or even ideological position in relation to that situation. What do the psychological and social functions attributed to their languages show about the relationship that children have with the diglossic situation in Latvia?

Functions that relate to the Latvian diglossic situation as a whole are the interpersonal and overall communicative functions of languages, the sociocultural identity function, and their schooling function. All the functions favoured by the children are identified, splitting these functions per language, then further distinguishing the two groups, formed by Anna and Roberts on one side and Alina and Marija – on the other.

	Function attributed to the Latvian language by	Function attributed to the Russian language by	Function attributed to the French language by	
Interpersonal communicative function	Anna Roberts	Alina Marija	Anna Roberts	Alina Marija
Overall communicative function in Latvia	Anna Roberts*	Alina Marija	Anna Roberts*	Alina* Marija*
Overall communicative function in...		Alina: Russia	Anna and Roberts: France, worldwide	Alina and Marija: France
Personal identity function		Marija	Anna Roberts	Marija
Sociocultural identity function	Anna* Roberts		Anna Roberts	Alina* Marija
Intrapersonal affective function		Marija	Anna Roberts*	
Interpersonal affective function	Anna		Anna	
Schooling function	Anna*	Alina* Marija*	Roberts	Alina Marija
Learning function	Anna		Roberts	Alina
Recreational function	Anna Roberts	Alina Marija	Anna	Alina* Marija

* implicitly attributed or superficially evoked function

Figure 3: Distribution of psychological and social functions of languages among the children interviewed

CHILDREN'S SUBJECTIVE LINGUISTIC ENVIRONMENTS

When analysing the language schooling function, it is noticeable that the children make no mention of the fact that several languages are used in their classes. This seems logical for Anna and Roberts, who are in a Latvian-speaking environment. However, they do not seem to consider Latvian as the language of schooling – they do not speak about it. Marija does not mention her classes in Latvian at all. She speaks very little of the ones that focus on Russian, and the only aspect she points out is that she writes in Russian at school. As for French, she remembers learning to write in this language at school. Alina quickly mentions that the Russian classes bore her because she has to concentrate on details that seem useless to her; she does not talk about her classes in French. It has been seen that Roberts complains about his home-schooling in French. Furthermore, no child mentions their English classes, even though they exist. Thus, the children concern themselves with the details of their learning of or in their first languages rather superficially.

They talk significantly more about the fact that their first languages fulfil their interpersonal communicative function with friends at school. This function, as presented throughout the four interviews, is perfectly fulfilled by the three languages in their interpersonal relations in Latvian or Russian and French in the family circle and in the circle of friends. It is remarkable that these interpersonal contacts do not take place in a secondary language: Latvian for Russian-speaking children, and vice versa. This suggests that the children place themselves in two distinct linguistic environments.

Looking at the communicative function of languages in the Latvian context, i.e. the fact that they enable exchange with strangers or members of an identified social group, it appears that here, too, the children place themselves into two distinct linguistic environments. This conclusion can be drawn from the fact that the children talk about their interactions in their “local” first language or French with strangers or little-known people. Anna says that she uses Latvian with all her friends’ parents, suggesting that they are all Latvian speakers. Marija and Alina insist on the usefulness of Russian compared to French to communicate in Latvia, Marija even stating that everyone speaks Russian to her in Latvia.

It appears that by placing themselves into two distinct linguistic environments, the children are outside the Latvian diglossic context, they deny its existence: there is no contact between Latvian and Russian, and there are no differences in their status and usage since the other language does not exist.

ELEMENTS OF THE LATVIAN DIGLOSSIC SITUATION

There are few indications that children are in contact with speakers of other languages outside their family or friend circles, for example, Roberts says that he speaks Latvian “with [friends’] Latvian mothers and fathers too”. His answer implies that he meets parents of other nationalities or who speak other languages, but he does not discuss this subject any further. Anna notes that “there are not many children who speak Latvian, there are more who speak Russian, English and all that” in Riga’s playgrounds or parks. Marija mentions a situation of contact with “people who speak Latvian”. These situations of contact with allophones, therefore, exist in the children’s lives but they make minimal mention of these, or, like Alina, not at all.

Furthermore, when they talk about these kinds of situations, they point to a problem with it. For example, in the exchange Anna had with her father after her statement on the absence of Latvian kids in playgrounds in Riga, she acknowledges that the children at her school and people whom she meets on the street speak Latvian, but she insists that the children on playgrounds do not. She, without a doubt, has a problem with this: she cannot establish contact with these children and play with them. Roberts, for his part, hardly ever discusses subjects related to the communicative function of the Latvian language. Perhaps he doubts too that it fulfils its communicative function in Latvia, especially since he emphasises another deficiency concerning its sociocultural identity function:

Roberts’ mother: Okay. And what do you think of the Latvian language? What do you think of it?

Roberts: ... (*Whispers*)

Roberts’ mother: Tu drīksti pateikt dažas lietas arī latviski.²

Roberts: I find it, um, *tautistu*, *tautisku*...

Roberts’ mother: What does that mean?

Roberts: Because... well... in Latvia, we also sometimes speak a little bit of the Russian side. (*Whispers*) And that’s it...

It is probable that Roberts is repeating a statement that he has picked up from one of his socialisation circles without understanding or mastering the elements that make up this discourse. Indeed, he is first of all mistaken about the term that he should use to characterise the Latvian language (*tautistu*). He then gives it a more or less a clear adjective, *tautisku*, which means that it is the language “of the

² From Latvian “You can say something in Latvian, too”.

people” or “popular”. Subsequently, the link he makes between what he has just said about Latvian and “the Russian side” is not precise. He presumably wishes to speak of the fact that the Latvian language is involved in the building up of a cultural group, or even an ethnic nation, and that the Russian language or Russian culture in Latvia hinders this process. Whispering implies that he is embarrassed to talk about it, perhaps because he cannot correctly master the concepts involved and the lexicon corresponding to them. It is likely that he also feels that the subject is problematic and should not be addressed out aloud.

On one occasion, Marija tells her father about a problem she came in contact with Latvian speakers concerning the communicative function of the Russian language in Latvia:

Marija’s father: Okay. In your opinion, in what situation is it better to use Russian?

Marija: I don’t think it’s when I’m with people who speak Latvian because they don’t like Russian too much. So, I can speak at home, in a library, but very, very quietly... well, silently.

Children cannot define and analyse the Latvian diglossic situation exactly, but some of them focus on elements of the sociolinguistic situation that disturb them or pose problems for them. Roberts and Marija seem to consider contact between Russian and Latvian or between the speakers of these languages as conflicting and disturbing. The societal multilingualism that characterises the streets of central Riga seems to annoy Anna.

STRATEGIES OF PLACING ONESELF ON DIGLOSSIC SITUATION

How do these children position themselves in relation to the problems posed by the sociolinguistic situation in Latvia? How can be explained the fact that Alina does not talk about this subject at all? Two strategies of placing oneself on diglossic situations are identifiable among the four children.

In the extract above from Marija’s interview with her father, she reveals her opinion under the guise of presenting a fact: Russian is not accepted as a language of socialisation by Latvian speakers, posing a problem for her relating to the sociocultural identity function of Russian in Latvia. She cannot express herself in Russian; she cannot show her Russian identity. Faced with this situation, she advocates discretion. As noted by the interviewee, Russian can be used within the family circle but not in public; if used in public, it should be done so in a discreet way, especially in cultural establishments. Following

this same strategy of discretion, she insists on the functions of her French-Russian bilingualism which relate to interpersonal contacts or personal development. As a symbol of this, here is a quotation where she highlights the personal identity function of her first languages, based on a historical characteristic of French-Russian bilingualism: "I can say that these two languages are a little bit put together because before in Russia, in the families that were really rich. So, they used to speak in French with their children, with their parents. So, they were speaking French and Russian". For Marija, it is probably a question of using a historical fact rather than a personal opinion to show that her bilingualism distinguishes her socially and culturally from other people in Latvia. By this historical reference, she neutralises the importance of Russian in her bilingualism. She does the same when she states that she favours personal plurilingualism in which French and English have an important place. When making this statement, she also includes Japanese – a language that fulfils an affective function in relation to herself, since she loves it because it is "cute". It seems that by loving and discreetly living her Russian and plurilingual linguistic practices and identity, she distances herself from the Latvian diglossic context. Alina seems to cultivate this strategy even further by complementing it with a disinterest in or denial of Latvian diglossia. Indeed, unlike the other three children, she presents her language practices in situations of communication with friends or family members with little context and thus insists on the interpersonal communicative function of her languages. Even though she notes that Russian is a useful language for socialisation in Latvia and Russia, she makes no specific remarks on the communicative or identity functions of the languages that would allow her to show what she thinks of the sociolinguistic situation in Latvia. Moreover, she states that in her daily life, she applies both French and Russian as languages of socialisation, schooling or recreation, but these languages do not seem to participate in her affective life or in the construction of her identity, which is probably not the case in practice. In conclusion, it appears that Alina, same as Marija, is distancing herself from Latvian diglossic context and any conflict situations that it may pose by highlighting the Franco-Russian bilingualism of everyday life.

As for Latvian-speaking children, they understand that Latvian is not the only language that can fulfil functions of communication in the society, competing with Russian and, according to Anna, sometimes even English. Faced with this situation, the two children more or less explicitly take up the discourse which imposes Latvian as the language of the state and nation. However, they do not take

a clear personal stance on this, probably because they are not able to, or they do not want to. This can be seen in the extract where Roberts whispers about Latvian as an ethnic language and of “the Russian side” in Latvia. Note that this notion also appears in Anna’s comments on Latvian speakers: “They too are nice, we communicate, we are all together. We are together, we understand each other”. This statement shows that Anna considers both the communicative function of the Latvian language in Latvia and its cultural identity function by implicitly referring to the Latvian diglossic situation. She does not clearly state her position. Either she wants to show that everyone who speaks Latvian integrates into the Latvian linguistic and cultural group – one that is considered to be the Latvian nation by the authorities and many people – or she highlights the fact that she belongs to the Latvian linguistic and cultural community and therefore stands out from the Russian-speaking linguistic group. These two hypotheses can be combined, which seems highly probable given its bilingualism with French. The two children are doubtful about the overall communicative and the sociocultural identity functions of Latvian.

This leads them to value their French-Latvian bilingualism. French fulfils personal and sociocultural identity functions and marks Anna’s and Roberts’ singularity in Latvia. The French language also has an interpersonal communicative function in Latvia and abroad which allows them to evolve outside the Latvian-Russian diglossic context. Moreover, French allows Anna to have an affective relationship with herself, while it allows Roberts to have an affective relationship with others. Finally, their French-Latvian bilingualism helps both children to stand out in the Latvian diglossic context or to open up to various sociolinguistic contexts both locally and internationally.

None of the four children expresses a clear and personal ideological position regarding the Latvian diglossic situation. However, one can note that the two Latvian-speaking children seem to be looking for one. They take up elements of the official discourse favouring Latvian in this situation, but they do not fully understand or assume them, probably because the diglossia issue is beyond them. It is probably for this reason that all children adopt the same social position: they put themselves as much as possible on the fringe of the Latvian diglossic context. For this purpose, they seem to adopt two strategies based on their bilingualism with French: Latvian-speaking children stand out from other people, and Russian-speaking children make themselves discreet in order to live normally while speaking Russian.

CONCLUSION

A discourse analysis based on the notion of language representation was carried out, taking into account the psychological and social functions that Franco-Latvian children attribute to their first languages. This allowed to understand how these children give meaning to their bilingualism in the Latvian sociolinguistic context or how they position themselves in relation to the existing diglossic situation in Latvia. The children highlight their bilingualism with French, a neutral language in this diglossic situation. They can thus disengage themselves from this situation. This author hypothesizes that they probably do so to avoid suffering or fostering any social tensions that this situation brings and that they may experience or feel, quite possibly without understanding them. It remains to be seen whether this phenomenon of disengagement persists when individuals grow up or exists among adults. Moreover, it would be interesting to investigate whether this phenomenon also develops when bilingualism is built up with a language that is neutral in relation to the diglossic situation and is a foreign language for the child, i.e. a language learned at school or acquired through practice, such as English in Latvia.

The development of this kind of bilingualism among the population could help to smooth out the diglossic conflict that Latvian society has experienced so far. However, the disengagement of bilinguals from the diglossic situation could, as in the case of Anna-Roberts and Alina-Marija, consolidate the constitution of two distinct worlds with two separate linguistic and cultural communities that would use a neutral lingua franca. The result would then be the exact opposite of what the Latvian authorities are seeking to achieve, i.e. the integration of linguistic minorities through their Latvianisation. A considerable amount of work can be done in this respect when it comes to Latvia's language education policy and on the choice of the first foreign language compulsory at school: English, Russian or a range of several languages?

REFERENCES

- Champonnois, S. and De Labriolle, F. (2003). *Dictionnaire de la Lettonie*. Crozon: Editions Armeline.
- Dilans, G. (2009). "Russian in Latvia: An Outlook for Bilingualism in a Postsoviet Transitional Society." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 12 (1), 1–13, Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802149481>> (accessed May 2020).

- Droit, E. (2005). "Lettonie, les russophones entre intégration et repli identitaire." *Le courrier des pays de l'Est* 1052 (novembre-décembre), 42–49.
- Durandin, J. (2019). "Comment des enfants franco-lettons vivent-ils et comprennent-ils leur bilinguisme en Lettonie? Perspectives de recherche sur leurs représentations." In: Berchoud, M. (dir.) *Bi-plurilinguisme et éducation. Comparaisons internationales*. Louvain-la-Neuve: EME Editions, 75–140.
- Eurostat. (2020). Population on 1 January by broad age group and sex. Available at: https://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=demo_pjanbroad&lang=en (accessed May 2020).
- Grenoble, L. A. (2003). *Language Policy in the Soviet Union*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hogan-Brun, G., Ozolins, U., Ramoniené M. and Rannut, M. (2008). "Language Politics and Practices in the Baltic States." *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 8 (4), 469–631, Available at: <[https://doi.org/DOI: 10.2167/cilp124.0](https://doi.org/DOI:10.2167/cilp124.0)> (accessed May 14, 2020).
- Hymes, D. H. (1977). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*. Oxon: Tavistock Publications Limited.
- Jodelet, D. (2003). "Représentations sociales : un domaine en expansion." In: Jodelet, D. (ed.) *Les représentations sociales*, 7^{ème} ed. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 47–78.
- Kibermane, K. and Kļava, G. (2016a). "Valodas Latvijā: valsts valoda, valodu prasme, valodas izglītībā." In: Lauze, L. and Kļava, G. (eds.) *Valodas situācija Latvijā: 2010/2015. Socioligvinstisks pētījums*. Rīga: LVA, 35–92.
- Kibermane, K. and Kļava, G. (2016b). "Valsts valodas lietojums sociolingvistikajās jomās." In: Lauze, L. and Kļava, G. (eds.) *Valodas situācija Latvijā: 2010/2015. Socioligvinstisks pētījums*. Rīga: LVA, 93–122.
- Latvijas Padomju Sociālistiskās Republikas Augstākās Padome (1988). *LPSR Augstākās padomes lēmums par latviešu valodas statusu*. Available at: <<http://www.vvk.lv/index.php?sadala=135&id=167>> (accessed June 2020).
- Latvijas Republikas Augstākā Padome (1992). *LR likums par grozījumiem un papildinājumiem LPSR Valodu likumā*. Available at: <<http://www.vvk.lv/index.php?sadala=135&id=165>> (accessed June 2020).
- Latvijas Republikas Saeima (2020). *Izglītības likums*. Available at: <<https://likumi.lv/ta/id/50759>> (accessed June 2020).
- Latvijas Republikas Saeima (1993). *Pilsonības likums*. Available at: <<https://likumi.lv/ta/id/57512>> (accessed June 2020).

Latvijas Republikas Saeima (1999). *Valsts valodas likums*. Available at <<https://likumi.lv/ta/id/14740>> (accessed June 2020).

Latvijas Republikas Saeima (1998). *1998. gada 15. oktobra likums "Grozījumi Latvijas Republikas Satversmē"*. Available at: <<https://likumi.lv/ta/id/50292>> (accessed June 2020).

Marc, E. (2005). *Psychologie de l'identité. Soi et le groupe*. Paris: Dunod.

Metuzāle-Kangere, B. and Ozolins, U. (2005). "The Language Situation in Latvia 1850–2004." *Journal of Baltic Studies* 36 (3), 317–344. Available at <<https://doi.org/10.1080/01629770500000121>> (accessed May 2020).

Moliner, P., Rateau, P. and Cohen-Scali, V. (2002). *Les représentations sociales : Pratique des études de terrain*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Orcier, P. (2005). *La Lettonie en Europe*. Riga: Zvaigzne ABC.

Ozolins, U. (1999). "Between Russian and European Hegemony: Current Language Policy in the Baltic States." *Current Issues in Language and Society* 6, 6–47. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1080/13520529909615534>> (accessed May 2020).

Pabriks, A. and Purs, A. (2001). *Latvia, the Challenges of Change*. London and New York: Routledge.

Pisarenko, O. (2006). "The Acculturation Modes of Russian Speaking Adolescents in Latvia: Perceived Discrimination and Knowledge of the Latvian Language." *EuropeAsia Studies* 58 (5), 751–773. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1080/09668130600732100>> (accessed May 2020).

Plasseraud, Y. (1996). *Les Etats baltes*. Paris: Montchrestien.

Pluča, V. (2019). "Valsts valoda un māzakumtautību skola." In: Veisbergs, A. (ed.) *Valoda un valsts*. Valsts Valodas Komisija. 10. sējums, Rīga: Zinātne, 198–208.

Priedīte, A. (2005). "Surveying Language Attitudes and Practices in Latvia." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 26 (5), 409–424, Available at <<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630508668413>> (accessed May 2020).

Romanov, A. (2000). "The Russian Diaspora in Latvia and Estonia: Predicting Language Outcomes." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 21 (1), 58–71, Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630008666394>> (accessed May 2020).

Ulmanis, K. and Gulbis, V. (1935). *Likums par valsts valodu*. Available at: <<http://www.vvk.lv/index.php?sadala=135&id=166>> (accessed June 2020).

Veisbergs, A. (ed.) (2019). *Valoda un valsts*. Valsts Valodas Komisija. 10. sējums, Rīga: Zinātne.