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Abstract

This thesis presents the first in-depth qualitative study of Russian complementary schools in Scotland. The fieldwork was conducted from November 2013 to April 2015 in four Russian schools in Scotland (in Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen and Dundee). The thesis offers novel insights and contributes to existing theoretical, methodological, and empirical research on migrant communities through a novel lens of heritage language complementary schools. It brings a new focus to existing work in this area through its consideration of language preservation as the key factor supporting this group of Russian-speaking parents to be involved in different types of social networks and socio-cultural transnational activities.

Heritage language preservation is a negotiable process which flexibly responds to the interests of the parents, teachers and pupils who participate in the activities of the Russian schools and contribute to shaping their aims. These interests can be considered as the main driving forces for a wide range of aspects of the Russian schools’ everyday life such as educational programmes, styles of teaching, the social relationship between members and additional cultural events organised by these schools. Russian-speaking communities bring together individuals with a range of characteristics (including different paths to migration, skills and educational levels, national identities, plans for settlement in the UK/Scotland). The present study has shown the importance of this diverse composition of Russian-speaking communities to the everyday operations of the Russian schools. By using the Russian schools as a context, the thesis brings a new angle to understanding how social networks emerge and develop in this particular migrant group, which has previously been characterised as lacking strong social bonding and bridging connections (Kopnina, 2007; Molnar, 2011).

In addition, the findings contribute to the discussion of socio-cultural transnational activities provided by complementary schools (Willis, 1992) and their role in migrant community development (Moskal & Sime, 2015). Expanding on the existing literature in this area, the thesis investigates heritage Russian language learning as a two-way process influencing both the transnational activities emerging around the Russian schools, and the Russian-speaking community in Scotland itself.
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Introduction

The initial concept for my thesis emerged after a workshop held by Glasgow University about the advantages which academia can bring to the local community, and the implementation of research results into social practices. I had arrived in Scotland about three years before that workshop, and had experience in volunteering. I worked as a volunteer at the Russian Centre in Scotland, ‘Haven’, which provided educational services for Russian-speaking people in Glasgow who wanted their children to study Russian. I was quite familiar with the life of the school community and had ambitions that my research could bring a real improvement in the process of heritage language preservation in the Russian-speaking community. However, what I found was not just related to language preservation; it also revealed various complexities surrounding relationships, information exchange and transnational activities. I believe that the present thesis will provide valuable contributions to the existing theoretical, methodological and empirical discussions and research on the nexus of heritage language preservation, the social networks emerging around complementary schools, and the socio-cultural transnational activities which exist alongside heritage language preservation.

The Background to the Research

Over the last two decades, patterns of migration, not only across Europe but on a global scale, have changed dramatically, following the end of state socialism in Eastern Europe and the subsequent process of EU expansion (Vertovec and Cohen, 1999; Stenning et al., 2006). According to official statistics from the International Organization for Migration, the number of international migrants worldwide is estimated at 244 million. This means that approximately 3% of the world’s population are migrants. This number seems relatively small, but the growth of the global migrant population has become significant over the last decades, at a rate of approximately 41% from 2000 to 2015 (IOM, Global Migration Trends, 2015). The number of mobile people travelling around the world has increased significantly due to the growth of the tourist industry, the expanding activities of transnational companies (for instance, by having branches in more countries) and new types of education and cultural exchange (IOM, World migration report, 2010). This ‘new’ movement seems to be a temporary and cyclical flow which is very different from classical migration, which has previously been investigated as a one-way flow to a host country (Brettel & Hollifield, 2007). The rapid development and implementation of new technologies such as the Internet
and budget phone calls along with improvements in transport technologies have shortened
distances between countries and provided technical bases for strengthening social links
between migrants and their relatives in their home country. Migration has created structural
links between the sending and receiving societies, thus blurring national borders (Basch et
al., 2003). These significant changes have had a substantial impact on migration studies and
require the revision of the relationship between migrants and their local destinations, as well
as renewed consideration of world connectedness (Castles, 2010).

Traditional approaches, which have divided countries into sending and receiving societies
have become less useful due to the increasing contraflows across different borders, leading
to the blurring of migration patterns (Castles, 2010). Globalisation, along with overarching
changes in political and socio-economic systems, has created the conditions for the
intensification of international migration and the emergence of a new migrant situation in
the world.

The variety of factors influencing international migration and the consequences affecting
nation states and worldwide systems have resulted in an interdisciplinary approach to
migration studies. Contributions to the development of migration theory have been made by
a wide range of disciplines, such as economics, geography, demography, history, political
science, law (in the context of migrant regulation), sociology, psychology, cultural studies
and anthropology. An analysis of recent developments in migration studies reveals
significant shifts from economic reasons and consequences to the growth of interest in socio-
cultural aspects of migrant life (Brettel & Hollifield, 2007).

Nowadays, in terms of economic theory, migration is investigated as a part of globalization
processes which extends far beyond questions about the push-pull factors of migration
(Castles & Miller, 2003). Recently, a socio-cultural approach has become more deeply
embedded in migration theory due to the need to analyse and understand the new realities of
a global world (Mau, 2010). A focus on ‘push and pull factors’ in migration scholarship has
been replaced by closer attention being paid to migrants’ living experiences (Ryan, 2014).
The academic focus has thus shifted from counting migrant people at the macro level to
investigating the everyday life of different migrant communities at the micro level. My thesis
contributes to migration theory through a very detailed study of a particular group of
migrants, namely Russian-speaking people in Scotland.
The diversity of Russian-speaking migrants abroad

The diversity of the Russian-speaking migrant population is grounded in a comparatively long history beginning in the pre-Soviet period. The number of Russian speakers among ethnic non-Russian populations grew with the expansion of the Russian Tsarist Empire’s borders (Kolstoe, 1995: 39). In Soviet times, the number of Russians who were outside the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR) and also other Russian-speaking populations who culturally/linguistically associated themselves with Russia continued to increase (Polian, 2004). As a result of an intensive public assimilation policy, Russian became a heritage language for a wide population with diverse ethnic backgrounds.

Historically, Russian-speaking migration is closely related to significant transformations in socio-political structures such as the Russian Revolution, the Civil War in Soviet Russia, the Second World War, and perestroika. These great transformations divided society into opposing social groups, and in its turn this division influenced the diversity of Russian speakers living abroad (Codagone, 1998; Glenny & Stone, 1990; Snel et al., 2000). The collapse of the USSR was a crucial turning point influencing the make up of Russian-speakers abroad and introducing new paths and patterns of migration. The newly independent Baltic states became members of the European Union and their citizens received the right of free movement within the EU. Some Russian speakers using this path arrived in Scotland without a requirement for special registration or visas. At the time of my fieldwork, Russian speakers from the Russian Federation and other post-Soviet countries such as Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, Ukraine, and others still needed visas to enter the UK, and could come to Scotland as highly skilled specialists, partners of European citizens, or as asylum seekers. In this situation of a dramatically diverse community, the shared Russian language played the role of a significant marker of belonging to this group (Laitin, 1998: 15).

Practices of heritage language preservation and transmission to the next generation can be seen as core processes in uniting Russian-speaking people abroad, and involving them in local and international networks. Recognizing the importance to migrants of speaking their native languages and ensuring that their children are fluent and literate in them, the majority of migrant studies have focused on micro factors at the family level (Kenner, 2010; Conteh et al., 2007; Baylet & Schechter, 2003) or on macro factors, such as the political context for using a particular language (Pauwels, 2005; Ceginskas, 2010). The operations of minority
ethnic schools have been less investigated than families’ teaching practices. Some studies in these schools do exist, mostly in the context of Chinese and Spanish communities (Li, 2006; Kenner, 2010; Chen, 2007; Francis et al., 2010; Tozun & Williams, 2009; Strand, 2007). The Russian schools in Scotland have not been studied in depth, partly because they only have a relatively short history of operating; for example, in Scotland, the oldest Russian school was established in 2004, and at the time of fieldwork only six Russian schools operated in Scotland. Other authors, such as Judina (2014) and Kliuchnikova (2016), have also used complementary language schools, for example the Russian school in Edinburgh, as field sites in their research, but they have not studied Russian complementary schools as such. Judina (2014) used the Saturday Russian School “Russian Edinburgh” as a location through which to recruit parents to participate in a project which explored ‘the construction of nation identity performed by members of Russian-speaking communities living in Scotland through the analysis of intergenerational narratives and conversations between parents and their children appearing in families in everyday situations’ (2014: 10). Kliuchnikova did not study the Russian school itself either, but visited the Saturday Russian School “Russian Edinburgh” to study ‘the way linguistic factors influence personal trajectories and community-building patterns of Russian-speaking post-Soviet migrants in the UK’ (2016: 11). She analysed data from three interviews which represented material relating to Russian-language weekend schools in the North East of England, and one interview in Edinburgh (an additional case study for the purpose of comparison). The main data corpus of her study was collected from 34 interviews with Russian-speaking migrants in the North East of England (2016: 61), the majority of whom had no particular links to Russian complementary schools.

The originality of the present thesis therefore lies both in its specific focus on Scotland, as a still largely under-researched destination in terms of migration to the UK, and in its focus on Russian complementary schools not only as field sites but also as a subject of analysis. Scotland is a distinctive location for migration research within the UK. This part of the UK has its own government strategy for migrant integration, its own educational environment, and its own regulations supporting charitable work. Considering these differences between England and Scotland, the latter was selected for this case study in order to enable an intensive examination of nearly all the Russian schools operating in Scotland. This thesis presents the first in-depth qualitative study of the operation of Russian language complementary schools in Scotland.
Aims of the thesis and research questions

The proposed study aims to examine the processes of preserving the Russian language in Scotland’s Russian-speaking community through the activities of Russian complementary schools and to analyse the relationship between language preservation, migrant networks, and the transnational activities emerging in Russian schools in Scotland.

More specifically, the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- How do Russian schools operate in Scotland? Which practices are employed by them to teach the Russian language and create a Russian-speaking environment?

- What kind of parental motivations strengthen the preservation of the Russian language and attendance at Russian schools?

- What kind of social networks emerge in Russian schools, and how do they interplay with those schools’ development?

- How do Russian schools create, and contribute to, the transnational activities of Russian-speaking families in Scotland?

Contributions of the thesis

This thesis seeks to provide new contributions to existing theoretical, methodological and empirical research by exploring the nexus of heritage language preservation, social networks and transnational activities. My findings will represent an important contribution to existing studies of heritage language preservation as a socio-cultural process based on living migrants’ experiences, which has been related to the complementary schools. It contributes to migration studies by presenting research on Russian-speaking migrants’ experiences of attending Russian schools in Scotland. Moreover, the thesis analyses these migrants' experiences and interactions in the Russian schools, thus adding to our understanding of how these migrant organisations work and interplay with the lives of the Russian-speaking families whose children attend these schools.
Theoretically, by drawing on three separate research strands, the thesis fruitfully links heritage language preservation concepts with social networks theory and a transnational approach. The combination of these theoretical approaches seeks to add to migration studies debates on how heritage language preservation, social networks and transnational activities are occurring at a site which has not been investigated before. The strength of the resulting theoretical approach lies in the fact that it does not prioritise the views and perspectives of ‘heritage language preservation’ as an educational process with a cultural component. Moreover, it offers a view of heritage language preservation as a lived experience of migrants and everyday practices in ethnic minority schools. Each of the empirical chapters in the thesis develops both the theoretical and empirical argument. In doing so, the contribution to the theoretical knowledge in the field of migrant studies is made through the detailed empirical insights drawing on my case study of Russian schools in Scotland.

Methodologically, the thesis provides a concrete example of how the normal routine in Russian schools can be examined as a flexible negotiation process which attempts to combine the interests of key stakeholders: children, parents and teachers (Francis et al., 2010). The study was carried out in four cities in Scotland: Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen and Dundee. The fieldwork was conducted between 2013 and 2015. The main body of empirical data consists of transcribed open-ended interviews and field notes. I interviewed the parents whose children attend these schools, Russian teachers, and the directors of the Russian schools. I undertook participant observations of the Russian schools’ routine activities in classrooms and school corridors, as well as of extra-curricular Russian activities organised by the schools. To gather valuable information about children’s involvement in transnational activities, I used a visual analysis of children’s pictures about Russia and Scotland. I further drew on published materials produced by the schools such as educational programmes, materials and leaflets. The data from interviews was complemented by information about the Russian schools’ lives taken from the schools’ websites. During my study of the Russian schools in Scotland, I created a methodological strategy to investigate the complexity of the interplay between heritage language preservation, social networking,

---

1 I used the word director rather than head teacher as a way of showing that the main duties of this position were linked to administration rather than teaching.
and transnational practices, which can be implemented with some modification in the future to examine these processes in other complementary schools.

Thesis overview and structure

Chapter 1 sets out the theoretical frameworks within which the study is situated and which form the basis for analysis. A critical examination of the existing literature on heritage language is given in order to justify why this approach is considered potentially fruitful in a study of Russian language learning among Russian-speaking migrants whose children attend Russian schools in Scotland. Revealing the limitations of investigation in heritage language preservation as only an educational process, social networks theory and transnational approaches are introduced as additional theoretical tools to understand the complex mutual interplay between heritage language learning, migrant community life, and the international connections of families. The chapter concludes with a review of prior studies of the Russian-speaking population in the UK, focusing on the aspects which are further developed in the empirical chapters.

Chapter 2 systematically outlines the methodology deployed in the research process. It begins by providing a description of the Russian schools in Scotland as field sites. These Russian schools in Scotland are special parts of the migrant community which provide a wide range of services for migrants mixing Russian teaching with socialising, information exchange, and transnational activities. In reviewing the existing literature related to studies of migrant communities, I justify my chosen empirical strategy which combines interviews, participant observation and a visual analysis of children’s drawings. The chapter concludes with a discussion of several ethical issues encountered due to my position as a migrant researcher.

Chapter 3 explores Russian schools in Scotland both as field sites and as research subjects. By analysing respondents’ perceptions and observing Russian school practices, I discuss a wide range of factors influencing the schools’ development and their capacity to support heritage language preservation, social networking and transnational activities for the Russian-speaking community in Scotland. I suggest that, consequently, the operations of complementary schools should be investigated as 'negotiation processes' which are very flexible and depend on constellations of interests shared by the migrant community.
Chapter 4 explores parents’ motivations for teaching their children the Russian language in Scotland and for attending Russian language Saturday schools. It begins by exploring parents’ beliefs and attitudes concerning Russian as a home language spoken among family members, then moves on to Russian language use in a wider context. Then, the investigation moves on to an examination of migrants’ motivations for sending their children to complementary schools. This focus on heritage language preservation has been relatively rare in migration studies. The present study investigates the links between migrants’ general motivations for teaching their children Russian, and for sending them to complementary schools. I argue that parents’ motivations for sending their children to complementary schools highly depends on the offers made by these schools, such as more effective ways of learning Russian, certified qualifications, and other additional non-educational activities.

Chapter 5 focuses on the study participants’ experiences of interactions with other parents, and/or teachers inside the Russian schools. Drawing on social networks theory, I discuss the variety of relationships found between the parents, as well as some social networking processes which were underpinned by routines of the Russian schools. The analysis is developed using examples from the observations of exchanges of information amongst parents’ networks. By observing discussions between newly-arrived and more established migrants, I investigate exchanges of knowledge based on various types of cultural interpretations. In the Russian schools, informal communications were accompanied by a formal flow of information from local specialists invited to the schools at meetings with parents. In examining the parents’ needs and desires and how the Russian schools deal with them, I demonstrate the linkages between migrant social networking and the complementary schools’ operations in order to account for the complex ways in which they interplay with each other.

Chapter 6 shifts the focus of analysis to the ways in which Russian schools explicitly or implicitly provide resources for socio-cultural transnational activities. Through revealing the symbols, values, and experiences which emerged from observation of the schools’ everyday lives, I analyse the transnational nature of the teaching process, communications in the classrooms, and the cultural events linked to the Russian schools’ activities. This analysis is further developed through an exploration of the children’s perceptions of the connections between Russia and Scotland through the children’s art. Using a visual analysis of children’s pictures, I explore the kinds of symbols they use in their representations of both countries,
and how these symbols connect with various activities provided by the Russian schools in Scotland.

The thesis concludes with a summary of the empirical and theoretical findings of the study, then some reflections on the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research.
Chapter 1. Heritage Language Preservation, Social Networks and Transnational Activities: Theoretical Framework

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the opening up of its borders and the ensuing political, economic and social changes, the number of Russian-speaking migrants living abroad has grown sharply (Denisenko, 2012). Many Russian speakers migrated from Russia and other former Soviet states, and formed groups of migrants which included people with different ethnic/national backgrounds, identities, and attitudes towards Russia. However, they share the Russian language, which can be used as a significant marker of belonging to this group (Laitin, 1998: 15). Practices of heritage language preservation and transmission to the next generation can be seen as a core process in the reproduction of Russian-speaking communities as a social group with a shared language, social norms, and culture. To date, these have not been widely investigated.

This chapter consists of three parts, which together set out the theoretical frameworks underpinning the study. It begins with a justification of why the concept of heritage language is potentially fruitful in studying Russian language learning among Russian-speaking migrants living in Scotland. In this section, I present and critically review various strands in the existing literature which are relevant to the key features of my research subjects, such as families’ heritage language preservation practices, and complementary schools as heritage language providers. In highlighting that heritage language preservation is more than just an educational process, the next section of this chapter explores social networks theory as an additional theoretical tool with which to understand the complex mutual relationship between heritage language learning and migrant community life. The chapter then moves on to consider transnational approaches to migration in investigating the role of heritage language in the international connections within and between families, and the transnational activities of migrant communities. The chapter concludes by providing a brief historical context explaining the role of the Russian language as the lingua franca for a diverse worldwide Russian-speaking population. Before moving on to the methodological chapter, the last subsection of the chapter reviews previous studies of the Russian-speaking population in the UK, focusing on the aspects which complement, and/or are further developed by, the results of the present research.
1.1. Heritage language preservation in migrant communities

Language is a significant element in social processes, providing communication tools and supporting a symbolic system for the exchange of meaning between members of the same socio-cultural group (Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 1982). Migrant communities have their own language systems, which can be seen as closely related to questions about the different social functions of language, such as supporting core values and a community for minorities (Block, 2007); socialising members into a migrant community through language use; creating identities and self-identities (Miller, 2000; Schüpbach, 2009); and assisting international communication (Duff, 2015). This part of the chapter begins with a discussion of the definition of language usage within migrant communities, followed by a critical examination of the terms ‘heritage language’ and ‘heritage language education’. Next, the discussion investigates language preservation practices within migrant families, and explores the support for these practices through attendance at ethnic minority schools.

1.1.1. Heritage language and social identity

There is a long history of debate among educators, community activists and policymakers about the rights of migrants to educate their children in their own language (Leeman, Rabin, Román-Mendoza, 2013). These debates have coincided with academic discussion of the different ways of defining and labelling the languages which are shared by particular migrant communities (Brutt-Grifler & Makoni, 2005; De Bot & Gorter, 2005; Wiley, 2005). The concept of heritage language which has emerged from these debates is particularly useful to the present study of migrant language preservation practices in Russian schools in Scotland.

Heritage language as a concept emerged alongside a (re)consideration of the use of other terms such as minority, ethnic, indigenous, second, and community language. Heritage language teaching has been identified as a distinct subfield of applied linguistics and language pedagogy since the 1990s (Valdés, 2005). At present, however, the concept of heritage language is employed in a broader spectrum of contexts, not only in the educational arena, but also in debates about identities, community life, human rights, and other subjects. In highlighting the socio-political status of a heritage language and the collective rights of the heritage language speakers as a group, some approaches define heritage language as a language which is somehow opposed to national languages (Duff & Li, 2009). While this approach created a broad definition of the heritage language, Hornberger and Wang provided
a more focused one, defining heritage language learners as ‘individuals with familial or ancestral ties to a language other than English who exert their agency in determining if they are heritage language learners of that language’ (2008: 6).

The majority of the discussions in migrant studies are based on the assumption that heritage language education is aimed at the transmission to the next generation of a shared ethnic identity through the study of language (Doerr & Lee, 2013; Hornberger & Wang, 2008; Wiley, 2005). In these approaches, ethnocultural identity is considered to be embedded in language (Francis et al., 2009). The notions that learners enrol in heritage language classes in order to (re)claim their ethnic identity, or are motivated by ‘an identification with the intrinsic cultural, affective, and aesthetic values of the language’ (He, 2006: 2) are assumed in many studies (Bailey, 2000, 2005; Mendoza-Denton, 2008; Palmer, 2007).

However, according to Leeman (2015: 100), ‘it is only in the past decade or so that researchers have begun to conduct empirical research specifically on the relationship between identity and heritage language education’. This shift in focus from the assumption of a direct relationship between heritage language and identity to a more nuanced exploration of that relationship has led to considerations of the ways in which heritage language speakers construct, negotiate and perform their identities in various social contexts, and of the role of educational practices in shaping identities. In reviewing the empirical studies conducted over the previous five years, Leeman revealed the agentive role of heritage learners through two lenses: investment, and imagined communities (2015). Heritage language learners’ estimations of the material and symbolic resources or cultural capital which can be provided by this language are shaped by different factors, each of which will be discussed in detail in the next subsection. The imagined community, in Leeman’s view, refers to the desire of learners to belong to social groups which share their heritage language, and which may have additional similarities which are valuable to those learners: ‘The investment and imagined community recognise the identities that learners aspire to, as well as their current sense of themselves’ (2015: 107).

The heritage language concept has been critiqued for its apparent suppression of the multiple identities of migrants, reducing these complexities to a single identity – their heritage (García 2005: 605). Yan (2003: 100) suggested that the term ‘heritage language use in bilingual education’ highlights the specific importance of the self-identities of heritage language learners. The shifting and contextual nature of identities were also shown in Park’s (2011)
study, which illustrated the ways in which subjectivities varied amongst and between individuals. As has been noted by several authors (Doerr & Lee, 2013; Hornberger & Wang, 2008; Wiley 2005), the identity constructed through heritage language education has a complex nature which also depends on the relationship between heritage language learners, teachers and researchers. Therefore, the present study views heritage language learning as a flexible, negotiable process of performing identities in communications (Cummins, 2001), which is mutually constitutive, multiple, dynamic, and subject to change (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2004).

Following agentive approaches to the investigation of heritage language learning, I explored the attitudes of Russian-speaking parents towards Russian as an investment, and as a core of the Russian-speaking community. In contrast with Leeman’s work, I focused on families’ decisions regarding their children’s language learning rather than on the individual choices in relation to language made by adult heritage language learners.

1.1.2. Factors influencing heritage language preservation practices

The reasons for heritage language learning have been quite thoroughly investigated among different migrant groups living in various countries. Prior studies have found that the set of factors influencing a family’s heritage language preservation decision can be split into individual and social levels (Kloss, 1966; Clyne 1991; Kipp, Clyne & Pauwels, 1995). On the individual level, the factors that play a significant role are age, place of birth, gender, education and qualifications, marriage patterns, the reason for migration, the length of residence in the host country, the knowledge of English, and the language variety in the family (Luykx, 2003; Valenzuela & Unzueta, 2015; López, 2013; Schüpbach, 2009). Social factors can be subdivided into the following elements: the size and distribution of the migrant groups; the language policies of the host community, and the position of the language in the value system of the immigrant group (Pauwels, 2005, Ceginskas, 2010). In terms of language use, heritage language is often assumed to be a primary source of emotional support, as well as a significant element in communication with relatives and compatriots (Sahoo, 2006; Miller, 2000). In contrast, the dominant language in the host society is commonly viewed as a vital tool for social mobility and to be a necessity for a better future in the host society for migrant children (Doomernik 1997; Remennick, 2012). However, current research has revealed new tendencies in family choices where parents have begun to associate better prospects with international careers for their children (García, 2011). The
intensity of home heritage language use and education is directly related to family members’ understandings of, and attitudes towards, the benefits of language knowledge for current and future life. In my research, I investigated the complexity of perceptions of the Russian language held by Russian-speakers living in Scotland who also have very diverse identities and connections with their countries of origin. Chapter 4 discusses this further, along with the wider array of motivations for heritage language learning and its use, both within and outside migrant families.

Ethnographic studies of migrants have investigated how different family members may influence the maintenance of heritage language practice at home (Kenner, 2010, Conteh et al., 2007, Bayley & Schecter, 2003). The leading role in teaching children heritage language is played by the mother. From Luykx’s (2003) point of view, heritage language preservation in the family is a gender-based process, linked to gendered styles of communication. Gender-based strategies that offer explanations and maintenance of children’s exposure to Russian have additionally been explored in Russian-speaking communities in the UK (Kliuchnikova, 2016; Judina, 2014; Pechurina, 2010). Dailey-O’Cain and Liebscher highlighted that communication in the heritage language between mothers and children tends to involve increased emotional elements (2011).

Other family members also influence heritage language practices at home. The role of fathers in making decisions about heritage language practices at home has been less investigated, and here the focus often shifts to ‘mixed’ families where parents belong to different cultures. Piller (2001) observed that families in which both parents are migrants tend to be more willing to use their heritage language, and to teach their children in that language than families where only one parent is a migrant to the host country, and the other is not. Extended families with many members residing in the host country have more opportunities to provide bilingual education in the heritage language, thus underpinning developed communication systems (Sorace, 2012). Recent sociological studies have also shown the substantial contribution of grandmothers in the educational process of children with whom they can share heritage language activities such as playing and reading books together (Lomsky-Feder & Leibovitz, 2010).

Relatives still residing in the country of origin can also influence family practices regarding heritage language learning and usage. Maintaining relationships with extended family members living abroad seems to be a key family value among many groups of migrants.
Morawska (2004), who investigated Russian-speaking families in Philadelphia, found that communication with relatives living abroad played a significant role in heritage language learning. The relationship between heritage language preservation and transnational family activities is more deeply explored in section 1.2, where I explore the implementation of a transnational approach in the investigation of heritage language preservation.

Studies investigating the social factors in heritage language maintenance have shown that the family’s decisions are more important than other elements outside the parental home, which can only become involved in language learning if the household decides to initiate them (Pauwels, 2005). Complementary schools, which emerge as a result of parents’ desire to teach children their heritage language, can be considered one such social factor. The image and reputation of heritage language in a society can also play a significant role in encouraging migrant families to teach children this language (Schmid, 2001; Bayley & Schecter, 2003). Heritage language use outside the family circle depends on the language, and varies between countries (Kopnina, 2005; Morawska, 2004; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Horenczyk & Kinunen, 2011; Doomernik, 1997; Salmenhaara, 2008; Remennick, 2002). The higher the value a heritage language has in the host country, the better its chance of transmission to the next generation of migrants. In the present study, reviewing the societal factors for heritage language preservation which had been investigated in other migrant studies gave me deeper insight into what reasons emerged outside of families which can encourage or interfere with heritage language transmission.

The existence of both a comparatively large group of parents who would like to teach children their heritage language and a friendly social environment produced by the local community towards particular heritage learners together creates the necessary preconditions for establishing complementary schools. The functions and specifics of these schools in support of heritage language preservation will be discussed in the next section.

1.1.3. The role of ethnic minority schools in supporting heritage language preservation

Complementary language schools have a key role to play in processes of heritage language preservation, as well as in providing important opportunities for migrant social networking and transnational activities. This base in an ethnic community, and operation outside of mainstream schooling, are usually used as common criteria in the identification of these
types of schools. Such schools can take a wide range of organisational forms, caused by the diversity of the ethnic communities themselves (Abdelrazak, 1999; Jenkins, 2008), making it difficult to accurately estimate their numbers. Strand argued that in 2008, ‘the number and size of supplementary schools in the UK are unknown; there exist no official records or national surveys of such schools’ (2008: 2). Similarly, no official information about the number of these schools in Scotland could be found, because community organisations do not need to gain any special registration to provide this type of education.

The second complicated issue for researchers is the terminology used to describe ethnic minority schools, which are interchangeably called complementary, supplementary, or community schools. I share the definition created by Issa and Williams, who suggested that:

‘Complementary’ is an appropriate term for these organisations, reflecting the way they support what goes on in mainstream schools and their role in enhancing children’s learning (Issa and Williams, 2009: 1).

The term ‘community’ is widely employed in describing local communities’ educational services, which do not necessarily share any particular ethnic features, and are not necessarily related to migrant children. The term ‘supplementary’ has become outdated because the main function of supplementary schools was the provision of support for ethnic minority children to learn English in a friendly native language environment (Li, 2006).

The classification of complementary schools in the UK created by Li (2006: 76-77) has demonstrated how these organisations could possibly be investigated. The key factors influencing the types of these complementary schools revealed by Li were: firstly, the historical context; secondly, the specifics of an ethnic minority community in the UK; and thirdly, the official responses to challenges surrounding the emergence of new educational institutes. Li showed how the establishment of complementary schools has been dependent on the socio-political conditions in the UK as well as on a reaction to mainstream educational institutions in different communities regarding different educational activities. According to Li, the current wave of complementary schools in the United Kingdom emerged as early as the 1980s. The main characteristics of this group of schools was a broad range of ethnic communities involved in a process ‘to maintain their linguistic and cultural heritage’ (Li, 2006: 78), and official recognition of the need for cooperation between mainstream and
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complementary schools. Based on the time of their establishment, the Russian schools in Scotland belong to this current wave of complementary schools. Keeping in mind the factors highlighted by Li, I investigated the respective roles of Russian-speaking parents, the wider Russian-speaking community in particular cities, and other local and international organisations in creating and supporting these schools.

The importance of complementary schools in teaching the native languages of migrant communities and introducing pupils to heritage culture have been highlighted in a large body of research (Dove, 1993; Wang, 1996; Reay and Mirza 1997; Hall et al., 2002; Strand, 2002; Martin, Creese & Bhatt, 2003; Rutter, 2003; Zhou and Li 2003; Chow, 2004; Creese et al., 2006). However, more recent studies have shown that complementary schools’ activities and functions are wider than just educational issues (ed. Conteh et al., 2007). Bearing in mind the history of their creation and their declared aims, complementary schools should be classified in the category of ‘community institutions’ rather than solely as educational organisations. As has been argued by White (2011: 189), Polish Saturday schools ‘performed many other functions, maintaining Polish identity and creating a sense of a ‘home from home’’. In the study of ‘the role that Chinese language schools play in responding to the educational needs of Chinese youths in public schools’, Sun (2014: 75) found that participation in complementary education helps migrant families to be involved in processes of development of cultural and social understandings, as well as in the creation of new values and the negotiation of new identities.

Questions of identity return us, however, to a discussion of the process of its negotiation. In following Leeman’s approach (2015) to investigating the complex relationships between participants within the heritage language learning process, complementary schools can be explored as a result of these negotiations. Using the example of Chinese schools, Francis and her co-authors showed how parents and teachers construct these schools in terms of their purpose, functions, and benefits for learners and communities (Francis et al., 2010). In their study, the process of construction was regarded as comprising ‘a variety of instrumental explanations, and explanations concerning the support and replication of language, ‘culture’ and identity’ (Francis et al., 2010: 114). The authors explored ‘the importance of learning the Chinese language in terms of identity; Chinese language as an ‘ethnic capital’ in the neoliberal marketplace; Chinese school as a positive ‘community space’” (Francis et al., 2010: 114). The authors highlighted the strong bond between the complementary schools
they investigated and Chinese culture/ the Chinese community, and some elements of their analysis can also be deployed in the investigation of other complementary schools.

The overwhelming majority of existing Russian studies have been concerned with the linguistic aspects of the Russian language, or have examined Russian-speaking community life without focusing on heritage language preservation (Kliuchnikova, 2016; Judina, 2014; Pechurina, 2010; Morgunova, 2007; Kopnina, 2007). As a result, little insight has been gained into the ways in which understandings of the preservation of Russian language in Scotland might be nuanced by taking account of the migrant social networks and transnational socio-cultural practices surrounding the Russian schools. The Russian schools in Scotland are complementary educational organisations set up by the Russian-speaking migrant community outside of mainstream educational provision. Using the approaches created by Leeman (2015) and Francis et al. (2010), I therefore explored how Russian-speaking pupils, teachers and parents construct Russian schools in Scotland. Looking at the educational processes in the Russian schools, I firstly focused on questions of parents’ and teachers’ beliefs and perceptions regarding the Russian language, Russian education, and the Russian-speaking community’s influence on Russian schooling in Scotland. Secondly, I looked at the kinds of benefits parents and teachers believed that learners and communities would gain. Thirdly, I examined how they negotiate their identities, create social norms, and reproduce Russian cultural symbolic meaning. During their interactions, members of Russian schools’ communities are involved in different social networks and transitional activities which tend to form an integral part of heritage language learning in complementary schools. The next subsection discusses social networks theory and transnational approaches in more depth in relation to their application in the investigation of Russian schools in Scotland.

1.2. Language as tools for social networking and socio-cultural transnational activities

Insights from social network and transnational theories are useful in demonstrating the ways in which heritage language preservation can be investigated and discussed. Migrants attending complementary ethnic schools have begun to interact with other participants and become involved in complex networks which connect them with families (both mixed families, and those where both parents are migrants) and official organisations. I will return to the discussion of the complexity of migrant networks supporting heritage language
learning in Chapter 5. The ways in which migrant families and the Russian schools can support transnational activities and strengthen their community identity is discussed in Chapter 6.

1.2.1. Insights from studies of migrant social networking

Social networks theory is an interdisciplinary academic field which has been impacted by social psychology, sociology, statistics, and other disciplines. The core of this theory is that social structures can be imagined as sets of social actors, and that the ties and interactions between actors are of key importance (Granovetter, 1983). The dynamic nature of this model has been especially fruitful in studies seeking to understand the complexity of migrant life. Initially, this theory was used to explore the systematisation of migration flows (Faist & Ozveren, 2004), and the connections between different countries (Castles & Miller, 2003; Jordan & Duvell, 2003). Nowadays, social networks theory is widely employed in investigations of the communications and interpersonal relationships of migrants (Ryan & Mulholland, 2014; Dedeoglu, 2014). The tendency within migration studies to take networks for granted (Boyd, 1989; Castles and Miller, 2003; Jordan and Duvell, 2003; Faist and Ozveren, 2004) has been replaced by detailed investigations into how these networks form (Vasey, 2016), operate, and provide different types of information and assistance (Morosanu, 2016).

The research focus on the functioning of migrant networks has led to the emergence of new questions about the importance of cultural similarities in maintaining relationships between individuals. Early studies employing social networks theory for migration studies, assumed that migrant networks were primarily based on ethnicity (Putnam, 2000) and shared heritage language as a pre-condition to entering into different types of networks (Boyd, 1989; Mesch 2002; Bakewell, 2010). However, further investigations have shown that the links between ethnicity, heritage language and migrant social networking are not straightforward, and can have a wide range of variation, especially in multi-ethnic diverse communities (Erel, Ryan & Angelo, 2015). In my study, I explore the role of Russian as a shared heritage language in creating social networks within a multi-ethnic Russian-speaking community living in Scotland.

The networking nature of social capital is a widely used approach which highlights the importance of social interaction and integration (White, 2016; Ryan, 2016; Häuberer, 2011; Field, 2008; Castells, 2007; Pichler, 2007 Putnam, 2000; Coleman, 1990). According to
Dekker and Uslaner (2001: 4), ‘social capital is about the value of social networks, bonding similar people and bridging between diverse people, with norms of reciprocity’. Investigations into the development of social capital in migrant communities have shown how migrant networks can shape migration systems and integration processes (Gurak & Cases, 1992; Aguilera & Massey, 2003; Zetter, Griffiths & Sigona, 2006). In this thesis, I employ the concept of social capital in two different ways. Firstly, I investigate how Russian-speaking parents, who possess different types of social capital, interact with other parents and with the Russian teachers at the schools. Secondly, I explore how differences in parents’ social capital influences the Russian schools’ development.

Migrants' motivations for involvement in different types of networks depend on the various kinds of objectives which they seek to achieve (Eve, 2010: 1233), and on the activities which are accessible to them (Ryan, 2007). The unique features of migrant networks can be shaped by their needs (Ryan, 2007), by cultural experiences (Erel, 2010), and/or by shared social norms and values (Grzymała-Kazłowska 2005). The importance of Saturday schools and toddler groups ‘as a source of friends’ has been indicated by White (2011: 189) who investigated the Polish community and Saturday schools in the UK. The desire of Russian-speaking parents to teach their children Russian and to meet other parents could be explored as a starting point for the creation of specific social network clusters based on interpersonal relationships and similar needs in the education provided by the Russian schools.

The configuration of the clusters depends on different factors, including the basis of the interactions. Developing Putnam's (2000) distinction between ‘bonding’ and ‘bridging’, Dedeoglu expanded these definitions and offered a triadic model which includes bonding, bridging and ‘linking’ (2014: 18). In her vision, the following things take place: 1) bonding capital facilitates the sharing of resources under the constraints of the norms and values defined by family, friendships or ethnic groups; 2) bridging promotes the transcendence of one's social focus to that of a broader society; and 3) linking can be considered an even more general concept of relationships, based on institutional arrangements between different social groups. In this typology of networks, the focus shifted from investigation of the membership of social networks to exploration of the types of relationships promoting different values. Bonding networks were defined as promoters of solidarity, trust and confidence; bridging was used to refer to intergroup connectedness, communal stability, and expanded configurations of trust as a resource for economic and community development;
and linking concerned the exchange of power, wealth and status among different social
groups (Dedeoglu, 2014: 18). Using this classification as a starting point, other researchers
have shown how complex and dynamic this structure is (McGhee, Trevena & Heath, 2015).
Belonging to the same ethnic group cannot be taken for granted as an automatic basis for
bonding networks to form. Meanwhile, migrants and non-migrants can be involved in
bonding networks sharing social values such as solidarity and personal trust, and through
participating in joint activities such as heritage language preservation. I explore how, by
organising different types of activities, Russian schools influence the values shared between
their participants, and in doing so influence their social networking.

In exploring the critical role of relationships within social networks, migration scholars have
employed a modified version of Granovetter's approach to networks as structures with strong
or weak ties (Granovetter, 1983). The strength of these ties can be measured by ‘a
combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding),
and the reciprocal services which characterise the tie’ (Granovetter, 1973: 1361). Previously,
migration scholars debated the types of ties that form on the basis of their benefits for
migrants (Boyd, 1989). However, more recently, starting from these typologies, researchers
have paid more attention to the different ways in which social networks function (Moroşanu,
2016). By keeping in mind the distinction between weak/strong connections and the
importance of their emotional intensity, I investigate the interactions between Russian-
speaking parents, and the various types of social networks which have been established on
the basis of their relationships. In the context of the Russian schools in Scotland, the present
study reveals great variation in the functioning of social networks, and in their links with the
educational routine and cultural activities organised by these schools.

The importance of considering the dynamism of networks was indicated by Boyd (1989) and
has since been furthered, for example, by Ryan (2011). She highlighted that ‘the networks
that migrants encounter when they first arrive are unlikely to remain static especially if
migrants experience social and geographical mobility within the ‘host' society' (Ryan, 2011:
707). The temporal nature of migration flows may also exert a significant influence on the
diversity of migrant communities and the social networking taking place amongst them.
According to previous research into the structure of migration, migrant communities from
post-socialist countries have been split into different groups based on the duration of their
stay in host countries. For example, Galasinska (2010) shows how Polish ‘old’ migrants
distanced themselves from groups of newcomers, positioning them based on the timing of their migration having been before-communist, communist, or post-communist. Similar issues relating to the diversity of attitudes towards migrants from different waves are explored in section 1.3., below, regarding Russian migration to the UK. However, the duration of settlement can also influence networking. Ryan (2011) demonstrated how newcomers integrating into local society might weaken their connections with ethnocentrically oriented networks due to their changing interests and needs. Drawing on Ryan’s idea, Chapter 5 explores in more depth how Russian speakers establish their connections with other migrants, and non-migrant families whose children attend the Russian schools in Scotland.

Taking into account the spatial and temporal dynamism of social networks raises questions about migrants’ engagement in different types of networks. In turn, these issues should be expanded by understanding how migrants’ social ties with different types of people – including both migrants and non-migrants – provides them with access to various kinds of resources in different situations. The Russian schools, as meeting points, create environments for potential interactions between parents from migrant and mixed families. To investigate parents’ interactions and the motivations behind them, I used the approaches created by Erel, Ryan and Angelo (2015), who highlighted the instrumental aspects; and Boccagni and Baldassar (2015), who focused on emotional aspects of social networking. In practice, instrumental and emotional aspects are interconnected and difficult to separate.

The core of the instrumental approach (Erel, Ryan & Angelo, 2015) is migrants’ need for assistance which can be received through particular networks. In its turn, the needed assistance can be provided in the form of supportive action or shared information (Oakley, 1992). A significant number of migrant studies have been devoted to the influences of migrant networks on labour markets (Harvey, 2011; Cole & McNulty, 2011; Shortland, 2011). Migrant networks were investigated as pull factors for migration providing the first access to the labour market (Avenarius, 2012; Lancee, 2012). Later research has shown how migrant networks can provide information about better working spaces, and access to them (Czaika & Varela, 2015, Vasey, 2016; Morosanu, 2016). However, the effectiveness of this assistance depends on the resourcefulness and power of specific types of networks. I explore the ability of the networks surrounding the Russian schools to provide assistance in this manner.
Other than assistance in job searching, migrant networks can provide information about a wide range of social services, such as medical or educational (Coleman, 1990). Addressing these issues, previous research findings have focused on mechanisms of distribution, and the factors influencing information flows. Migrant social networks can provide better help in overcoming language barriers for newcomers than official services (Kennedy, 2008). In addition, migrants united by social networks can also assist newly-arrived migrants to overcome cultural barriers (Taggart, 2017). The more experienced and longer settled migrants can play a significant role in providing cultural based explanations of the differences in health or education between the sending and receiving societies (Guma, 2015).

Lastly, the present study will focus on the emotional aspects of social networking (Malyutina, 2013). Previous studies in this field which have explored emotional support have referred to the quality of the relationships between the members of networks (Choi et al., 2012), social networks as safe and comfortable spaces (Boyd, 1989; Ryan, 2011; Svašek, 2010), and the prevention of social isolation (Li, 2006; Farnsworth & Boon, 2010). Studies of emotional support have looked at shared trust (Morosanu, 2016), cultural similarities (Kliuchnikova, 2016), social norms, and psychological compatibility within social networks (Rabikowska, 2010) as key elements of interactions between migrants and their building of strong or weak ties.

In the present study, the term ‘networks’ will be used in defining the structure of ties; the definition of networking will emphasise the process of formation and operation of a web of relationships. Taking into account the complexity of employment of social networks theory for migration studies, the present study focuses on the network processes related to heritage language preservation as a two-way interaction. On the one hand, knowledge of the heritage language gives its speakers opportunities to be involved in social networks. On the other hand, the benefits of this involvement can encourage families to support heritage language learning activities for their children. In the Russian schools, I observed interactions within the social networks based on groups of Russian-speaking and non-Russian-speaking parents, and noted how knowledge and emotions were balanced. This study contributes to the academic debate about migrant social networking by demonstrating the interconnections between relationships, networks, and the information sources which have formed around the Russian schools in Scotland.
1.2.2. Language as a basis for socio-cultural transnational activities

Heritage language by its nature provides opportunities for the creation of expanded social networks, which bind migrants to their roots in their countries of origin. The concept of transnationalism as a kind of networking was first introduced in social sciences to describe new types of economic activities being undertaken by international companies, and was then subsequently integrated into migration theories (Bonin et al., 2002). Starting from the investigation of economic problems, the contemporary theory of transnationalism is based on an interdisciplinary approach uniting different previous concepts. In migrant studies, transnationalism was defined as “the process by which immigrants build social fields that link together their country of origin and their country of settlement. Immigrants who create such social fields are designated "transmigrants”” (Glick Schiller et al., 1992: 1).

The precursor to transnational theory seems to be found in the migration systems approach (Kritz et al., 1992: 15), which was one of the first concepts highlighting the importance of paying attention to the linkages between countries, and analysing their interconnections. In contrast, the broader debates on transnationalism have focused on deterritorialized nation-states and new types of social formation which need special social markers of belonging to specific groups, such as shared heritage language (Basch et al., 2003). The core of migration transnationalism is the concept of a transnational space which is constructed through the daily lives and activities of migrants, connecting and positioning themselves in more than one country (Glick Schiller and et al., 1992; Castells, 1996). As Faist states:

The concept of transnational spaces covers diverse phenomena such as small transnational groups, transnational circuits and transnational communities. Each of these is characterised by a primary mechanism of integration: reciprocity in small groups, exchange in circuits and solidarity in communities. (Faist, 2000: 3)

The circulation of goods, people and information across national borders has led to the emergence of a transnational social field located in a newly constructed social space (Basch et al., 2003).

In its development process, transnationalism went through stages akin to the general steps of migration theory as a whole, which moved from an economic perspective to a more expanded socio-cultural point of view, and then on to the current definition of social transnationalism (Mau, 2010). One of the latest versions of the definition of social
transnationalism, which was introduced by Mau (2010), aims to emphasise a micro-perspective focusing on ‘the life worlds of individuals’ (Mau, 2010: xv). Social transnationalism provides a new lens for investigations of everyday migrant activities.

Socio-cultural transnational activities can be classified as a wide array of social and cultural transactions through which ideas and meanings are exchanged across borders. These could include activities such as visiting and maintaining contacts with family and friends in the country of origin, joining international organisations connecting the country of residence and the country of origin, participation in cultural activities, watching TV and films from the home country, etc. (Al-Ali et al., 2001: 623; Itzigsohn & Saucedo, 2002: 769; Snel et al., 2006: 293; Jayaweera & Choudhury, 2008: 95). In contrast, Portes has argued that the connections between countries are not sufficient criteria in themselves for employing a transnational approach to describing such activities. According to his position, transnational activities can be defined as ‘those that take place on a recurrent basis across national borders and that require a regular and significant commitment of time by participants’ (Portes, 1999: 464). More systematic and structural ways of investigating socio-cultural practices were developed using the concept of socio-cultural transnationalism (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002: 768) to refer to transnational activities which recreate ‘a sense of community that encompasses migrants and people in the place of origin’. This approach intertwines transnational activity and transnational community, and defines them with reference to each other. The activities provided by the Russian schools met both the criteria of the regularity of cross-border connections, and the importance of the creation of an imagined community of Russian language learners. Bearing in mind the previous research which confirmed the fragmentation of the Russian-speaking population abroad (Kopnina, 2007; Molnar, 2011), this thesis employed the concept of the transnational community as an imagined, aspirational idea (Leeman, 2015) rather than a rigid group of migrants with a strong sense of belonging. Chapter 5 discussed the variety of levels of belonging to the Russian-speaking population which were demonstrated by different groups of Russian-speaking parents whose children were attending the Russian schools in Scotland.

The concept of a transnational community can be employed in many different contexts, such as the connections between countries, expressions of group identity, social groups with particular characteristics, as a synonym of society, ideological cases, and group solidarity (Willis, 1992; Guarnizo & Díaz, 1999; Remennick, 2002; Mannitz, 2015). On the one hand,
A transnational community could be identified as a group of people who are related to social worlds that span more than one place. A significant element of such understandings of transnational community might be said to be the dense networks reaching across national borders created by immigrant groups, which allow them to support their dual lives (Portes, 1997: 812). On the other hand, a transnational community brings together migrants through sharing some form of identity, often based on a place of origin and its cultural heritage, including language. Looking at communities from this point of view, we return to the discussion about networks, but on a different level, with a stronger focus on patterns of transnational communication, and on the exchange of resources and information, along with participation in socio-cultural transnational activities (Vertovec, 2001: 573).

In response to transnational community-based demand, complementary schools can provide a wide range of socio-cultural transnational activities (Francis et al., 2010), which can be investigated from different points of view. Moskal and Sime (2015) explored Polish complementary schools as a part of the transnational communities of Polish migrants in the UK. Duff (2015) focused on the role of the Chinese government in providing support for the Chinese language in Chinese complementary schools in the UK, and earlier, Willis (1992) investigated the features of transnational culture provided by complementary schools.

Despite growing interest in the transnational approach, questions about the position of this concept within existing academic debates still exist. These problems were noted by Vertovec, who argued that ‘the field of transnational migration is not yet very well theorised in relation to preceding concepts and policies surrounding assimilation, acculturation, cultural pluralism, integration, political inclusion and multiculturalism’ (2001: 577). Faist introduced a definition of transnational syncretism as the ‘diffusion of culture and the emergence of new types - mixed identities’ (Faist, 2000:13). The meaning of transnational syncretism is closer to the meaning of the integration strategy in Berry’s typology, which defined the integration strategy as striking a balance between the migrant’s own cultural identity and the process of adjusting to the new culture of the host society (1997: 9-10). Berry’s concept of integration can be developed by looking at transnational practices as the ways in which migrants maintain connections with their country of origin but stay in the host country.

Transnational practices are based on ‘migrants’ orientation’ and ‘hybridity’ in the ‘sociocultural domain’ (Vertovec, 2009: 150), and have a substantial impact on their
integration strategies. Activities can be considered to be transnational if they occur regularly (Portes, 1999), establish a sense of community among heritage language speakers (Leeman, 2015), and link their participants with heritage language speakers living abroad (Itzigsohn and Saucedo 2002). The concept of hybridity offers a descriptive approach (Pieterse, 1995); as was noted by Mamattah, “the notion of hybridity has entered social science discourse as a mechanism to aid the understanding of “difference” in varying contexts” (2009: 26). In the present thesis, I used the concept of hybridity to describe one of the pedagogical approaches used in the Russian schools, to provide a picture of Russian complementary schooling in Scotland, although pedagogy in the Russian schools was not the focus of my analysis.

However, in looking at socio-cultural practices which were developed by the Russian schools, I preferred to use a transnational approach to highlight the main focus of my investigation. To contribute to the academic discussion, it can be argued that in complementary schools, regular activities which aim to encourage heritage language learners and to provide them with opportunities to belong to the same language community living in the host country and abroad can be considered as socio-cultural transnational practices. I argue that the socio-cultural transnational activities which are supported and organised by the Russian schools are an integral part of heritage language education and social networking. These activities met the criteria of transnational approaches outlined above (Portes, 1999; Leeman, 2015; Itzigsohn and Saucedo 2002). The Russian schools provide regular Saturday meetings for their participants, thus forming some networks for heritage language speakers (Leeman, 2015). The knowledge of the Russian language and culture provided by the Russian schools gives pupils opportunities to communicate with Russian-speaking relatives and friends living abroad (Itzigsohn and Saucedo 2002). This research therefore investigates the variety of forms of socio-cultural transnational activities supported and organised by the Russian schools in Scotland through observations of their formal educational programmes, teaching activities in the Russian classes, and corridor conversations between members of the Russian schools’ communities or during community events. The focus was on building understanding of how teachers, parents and pupils bridge different socio-cultural elements from Russia and Scotland to enable the Russian schools to develop as transnational organisations with their own cultural environment, which is neither Scottish nor Russian but is, instead, transnational.
1.3. Studying the Russian-speaking community

The diversity of the Russian-speaking population has a comparatively long history beginning from the pre-Soviet period. This subsection provides a brief introduction to the history of dissemination of the Russian language among the populations of Russia and beyond in pre-Soviet, Soviet and post-Soviet times. This contextual information can be helpful for understanding the diversity of Russian-speaking identities and parents’ expectations concerning Russian language learning in Scotland. This section finishes with a review of studies devoted to the Russian-speaking community living abroad with a primary focus on the Russian speakers living in the UK.

1.3.1. The Russian language as lingua franca

The concepts of heritage language, migrant social networks and transnationalism quite often rely on the notion of ethnic identity as a factor encouraging cooperation between migrants. A fairly large number of studies have identified a direct connection between heritage language and ethnicity (McGinnis, 2005; Hornberger, 2005). In contrast, the worldwide Russian-speaking population is made up of people from diverse national and ethnic backgrounds as a result of various socio-political and historical processes and factors. Before moving on to an analysis of Russian as a heritage language for Russian-speaking migrants in Scotland, it is important to remind ourselves of the historical aspects of the dissemination of the Russian language among people belonging to different ethnic and national groups.

In the pre-Soviet period, the number of Russian speakers grew proportionally with the expansion of the borders of the Tsarist Empire. The new territories included in the structure of the Russian Empire were influenced by several factors which increased the numbers of Russian speakers. On the one hand, in this time, the out-migration of Russians from the ‘core’ to the ‘periphery’ was encouraged and supported by the Tsarist state:

It is tempting to speculate how many Russians would have ended up outside the Russian core area if the regime had not tried to influence the movements of its subjects in either way’ (Kolstø, 1995: 39).
On the other hand, local populations who had been newly incorporated into the Russian Empire came under the influence of the Tsarist public assimilation policy based on government support for the Russian language (Press, 2007). The Russian language enjoyed the status of the official language of the country and also played the role of *lingua franca* for all nationalities who lived in the expanding Russian Empire (Aref’ev, 2012).

The scale of dissemination of the Russian language in Soviet times continued to increase because, as has been observed: ‘Throughout its existence the USSR was a country of intensive population mobility’ (Polian, 2004: 2). The out-migration of Russians, which had started in pre-Soviet imperial times, continued through the Soviet period having been encouraged and enforced in different ways, such as through large-scale state modernisation projects (Lewis, 1971), ethno-political plans (Dragunskii, 1993), and via the forced resettlement of certain population groups (Polian, 2004). Russians who arrived in non-Russian Soviet republics formed a new part of the population where knowledge of the Russian language provided them with some social and economic privileges (Brubaker, 1996). As a result of these processes, the number of Russians living outside the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR) increased, as did other Russian-speaking populations who culturally and linguistically associated themselves with Russia:

Between 1897 and 1970 the Russian population outside the area of the RSFSR increased by more than 15 million. As a result, more than 21 million Russians now resided in the fourteen non-Russian republics.’ (Kolstø, 1995: 46)

The state educational policy targeted the increased literacy of the whole population, predominantly in the Russian language. This centralised educational policy was implemented from the 1930s onwards, after an initial period of ‘korrenizatsiia’ where national languages were supported and encouraged to the detriment of the local languages of the other republics (Aref’ev, 2012). The Russian language, as in pre-Soviet times, continued to play the role of the *lingua franca* of the Soviet Union, as all the Soviet population were encouraged to learn this language.

The collapse of the USSR was a crucial point in the history of the Russian language’s dissemination and employment. The newly independent states began to implement their own cultural and linguistic policies with a dramatic effect on the local Russian-speaking populations. In all the post-Soviet successor states, the Russian language has played a significant role in the political and economic situation (Gorham, 2006; Pavlenko, 2008,
Smith, 2002). For example, in the Baltic states (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania), the view of Russian as the language of the oppressor or occupant contributes to the attrition of Russian and the evidenced decrease in the number of Russian-speakers (Latin, 1998). In contrast, the elevated status of Russian as a language of social prestige, economic development and urbanity has been witnessed in Belarus, Kazakhstan, and other Central Asian states, and has contributed to Russian language maintenance. An additional issue is that in 1991, a significant number of Russian speakers who lived in Soviet Republics other than the RSFSR had to make a choice regarding whether to remain in the newly independent country or move to the Russian Federation. Making a choice to return to the Russian Federation was painful to these groups of Russian speakers because they had often been born in their current place of residence (other areas in the former RSFSR), or had left the central Russian regions a long time ago, and many also chose to remain (Flynn, 2004). Overall, the process of separation of newly independent countries from the USSR contributed to an increase in the numbers of Russian-speaking people migrating both within the post-Soviet space and more widely around the globe. As a result, in multi-ethnic migrant contexts, “Russian retains its role as a *lingua franca* in interpersonal communication” (Pavlenko, 2008: 76).

The Russian-speaking migrants who have arrived in Scotland from Russia and elsewhere have formed a very diverse and complicated group of people with complex, various nationalities, ethnicities and citizenships, but who are united by Russian as their heritage language.

1.3.2. The Russian-speaking community living in the UK

Academic studies of Russian-speaking migration to the UK have been fewer in number than investigations of the experiences of other Central and East-European migrants (Pechurina, 2014). The share of Russian-speaking people in the UK’s general migration flow is relatively smaller than many other diasporic groups. In 2013, a UK ONS team responded to a request from Pechurina “that the estimated number of the Soviet born migrants was small and unreliable; they had too low a number of contacts to include them in the output” (2017: 30). She suggested the use of different criteria for measurement, such as 1) the number of people who consider Russian as their main language (67,366 in England and Wales in 2011); 2) the number of Russian-born migrants (40,000 in 2011); 3) the number of Russian nationals
(27,000 in 2011); 4) the number of people who state that the USSR was the country of their birth (1873); 5) those who considered themselves USSR nationals (1150).

According to Scotland's Census of 2011, the Russian language was used at home by 6,001 people; 2,180 recorded Russia and 90 the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as their country of birth. However, Scotland’s Census 2011 did not ask a question about nationality and did not contain information on Russian-speaking migrant workers with special visas, or those who had been educated in Scotland. The difficulty in obtaining correct measurements has been mentioned by numerous scholars who have investigated this topic (Pechurina, 2017; Kliuchnikikova, 2016). In describing the families whose children attend Russian schools in Scotland, the present thesis also traces the wide range of migrant paths used by them to arrive in Scotland.

The difficulties in investigating Russian-speaking migration which have been mentioned by numerous prior scholars (Kopnina, 2007; Kliuchnikova, 2016; Pechurina, 2017; Byford, 2009) have also been related to specific qualities of this group as a research subject. In Russian migration studies, a wide range of definitions can be used, including Russian migrants, Russian-speaking migrants, Russians or Russophones, people born in the USSR, post-Soviet migrants, and others. The complexity of these possible definitions is related to different factors, some of which are rooted in the history of Russian migration into the UK. From a historical perspective, Russian-speaking migration is closely related to significant transformations in socio-political structures within the countries of origin. In the twentieth century, four waves of Russian-speaking migration to the UK can be identified (Codagone, 1998; Glenny & Stone, 1990; Snel et al., 2000). The first wave was associated with the 1917 Revolutions and the subsequent Civil War in Soviet Russia. The second wave of Russian-speaking migration occurred after the Second World War. The third wave was formed by people from the USSR leaving the country before its collapse. The current, fourth wave of Russian speakers who have arrived in the UK is associated with the general movement from Russia and other post-Soviet countries which has occurred since the transformation of the post-Soviet space. A significant proportion of these Russian speakers have been able to move under EU free movement rights as they are citizens of the Baltic States (especially Latvia and Lithuania). All the respondents in the present research belong to the fourth (and most

recent) wave of migration. In this study, the term ‘Russian-speakers’ is used to highlight that parents whose children attend the Russian schools in Scotland may have arrived from different countries, but all of them would like their children to learn Russian.

The Russian-speaking population living abroad is often characterised as non-homogenous and having a contradictory nature (Kopnina, 2007; Morgunova, 2007). The complexity of this group of migrants is attributed to different factors, such as the social background of community members (nations, countries of origin, time of arriving in the UK), and their differing attitudes towards the USSR and Soviet culture and to the current politics of the Russian Federation. The numbers of lines which can be used to separate this group of migrants calls into question the way in which the concept of community or diaspora can be employed in the investigation of Russian migration. The employment of self-identification approaches (Kopnina, 2005, Morawska, 2004), in which respondents identify their belonging to particular groups, has shown that Russian-speaking migrants very rarely use the words ‘community’ or diaspora in their interviews. The majority do not recognise themselves as a part of a large group of Russians living abroad, preferring instead to concretize their membership in narrower social groups (Cheskin, 2012).

The flexible belonging of Russian speakers to different community groups and the blurred borders of these groups can be explored using the concept of negotiating identity as a process of representation in communications (Cummins, 2001). The present thesis does not directly apply questions about the identity of families whose children attend Russian schools. However, the focus on the role of the Russian schools in the process of uniting the Russian-speaking community is closely related to questions about markers of belonging, and the common features and interests of the people involved in heritage language preservation.

Despite the highly fragmented and contradictory nature of the Russian-speaking population living abroad as has been outlined above, Russian speakers continue to interact with one another, and to form social groups with distinctive characteristics. One of the key features of these social groups is the shared use of the Russian language as an important tool of diasporic exchange and cooperation (Byford, 2009). As Kliuchnikova has argued, “shared language can also be viewed as an active social factor which plays an important role in migrant identity formation” (2016: 32). Following Kopnina (2005), who suggested that Russian migrants abroad could be better described as sub-communities with temporary involvement and participation in special events or projects, I explore in the present study
how heritage language preservation practices can still be a basis for the development of some kind of community.

The latest studies of Russian-speaking identities have explored the shared past and memory practices in relation to the USSR, as one of the main common grounds for perceived commonality (Cheskin, 2012; Judina, 2014; Pechurina, 2015). However, many current Russian-speaking migrants do not have any direct experience of living in the USSR, so their cultural background might be explored with reference to the concept of the ‘imaginary’ USSR offered by Byford (2009). He demonstrates the cultural mythologies and reconstruction of a common Soviet past in the new migrant context. The feeling of the Soviet state as a social value seems to be an emotional background factor for common discussion. The present study therefore explores the ways in which the memories and beliefs of Soviet education might inform respondents’ expectations of the Russian schools in Scotland.

The Russian language can play an important role in the establishment of ‘informative and communicative unity’ (Kliuchnikova, 2016) which integrates migrants who share a common language within social networks (Adoni et al., 2006; Zilberg & Leshem, 1996). Russian speakers’ access to informal networks has been highlighted as an important resource for them in the successor states of the USSR (Commercio, 2010). Networking remains relatively significant in importance for Russian-speaking migrants living in other countries (Remennick, 2002: 515). However, the Russian-speaking community is characterised by low levels of relationships and regular face-to-face intergroup integration amongst its members (Kopnina, 2005; Remennick, 2007). This observation has been explained in a number of ways, starting from the macro level of empire mentality (Shlapentokh et al, 1994), continuing to structural antagonism between the Russian migrant waves (Freynkman-Khrustaleva and Novikov, 1995: 50) and finally on to an analysis of the lack of a current ‘established community’ (Kopnina, 2005: 88). The Russian schools in Scotland can thus be explored as special places which help migrants to overcome the initial barriers to interaction between old, settled and newly-arrived Russian-speaking families.

The role of the Russian language as a tool for communication has increased due to the invention of Internet technologies and the decreasing prices for these services – a phenomenon which is traditionally associated with transnational communications. In planning to employ the transnational approach for this study, I briefly looked at the research which had used it before in the analysis of Russian speakers in the UK. As was expected,
the transnational dimension of the Russian-speaking population has been explored since the emergence of the fourth wave of migration when Russian-speaking migrants legally received the right to visit, or even return to, their country, and migration therefore lost its previous one-way direction. Employing the concept of transnationalism gives the research the opportunity to focus on types of activities which could qualify as transnational, and which promote and underpin transnational space for this group of migrants. Considering that “the Russian population in Scotland is not well integrated”, Mamattah argued that “applying the framework of transnationalism can help to define more precisely the characteristics which describe this community” (Mamattah, 2006: 16). This was useful in my study in alerting me to the possibility that the transnational dimension of the activities organised and supported by the Russian schools might significantly influence the everyday lives of the Russian-speaking parents.

Despite the fact that Russian-speaking migrants represent a dramatically diverse social group which has stronger centrifugal forces than centripetal ones, the Russian language has remained an integrating factor in uniting Russian speakers through diverse heritage language practices. The present study explores the ways in which heritage language practices have emerged in the Russian schools in Scotland, and the ways in which they include networking and transnational activities which help Russian-speakers to create a variety of types of ‘belonging’ from participation in social networks, uniting with close friends, and/or involvement in virtual anonymised interactions through the Internet. Bearing in mind the complexity of the Russian-speaking population across the world, and especially in the UK, this study investigates the variety of strategies used to denote belonging to Russian school communities in Scotland.

Conclusion

To sum up, while there is much to commend theories of heritage language, there are also significant criticisms which need to be examined. Expanding Leeman’s (2015) approach to exploring the complex relationships between heritage language speakers, teachers and wider social groups and the ways in which these can influence heritage language learning, I explore some of these issues further through my study of the Russian schools in Scotland. Drawing on the work of a number of migrant scholars shows that heritage language preservation
cannot be reduced to only linguistic and educational processes. It has significantly wider implications related to everyday migrant family lives and socio-cultural environment in particular host countries. As a part of everyday family life, Russian language preservation should be considered as a flexible and spontaneous process depending on a variety of factors rather than a developed language strategy. Whilst the family decision to preserve a heritage language is difficult to overestimate, there is some gap in the investigation of the role of complementary schools in this process (Strand, 2007). Following the logic that heritage language learning is wider than just an educational process, it can be argued, that complementary schools are not only providers of education but may also play a key role in community life (Li, 2006). By drawing on constructivist approaches (Francis et al., 2010), I was able to conceptualise the operation of the Russian schools as a negotiating process between parents, teachers and pupils who construct these schools in terms of purposes, functions and benefits for learners and Russian-speaking communities in Scotland.

The second section of this chapter attempts to bring together the theoretical insights from network theory and the transnational approaches into a workable framework for the study of heritage language preservation. Drawing on the work of a number of researchers of migration shows that social networks which have emerged through shared heritage language practices have specific features. Based on the previous work of Ryan and Boyd I created my framework for investigating networking in the Russian schools as a dynamic process, which is influenced by relationships between attendees and their needs, with particular attention to nuances of their expectations towards Russian language education for their children.

The specifics of migrant networks - binding the migrants with people and ideas from their countries of origin - demanded the consideration of a transnational approach. My theoretical framework for studying the Russian schools drew upon the concept of socio-cultural transnational activities which can be implemented in complementary schools’ life (Francis et al., 2010). Following Willis (1992) the complementary schools can be investigated in terms of their ability to create transnational culture as part of the heritage language learning. However, the transnational activities supported by the complementary schools are not only implemented as part of educational processes but also have wider implications for transnational communities of migrants in Scotland (Moskal & Sime, 2015). Combining these two approaches, I have investigated heritage Russian learning as a two-way process
influencing both the transnational activities emerging around the Russian schools and Russian-speaking community in Scotland.

While the previous two sections were devoted to migrant studies in general, the last part of this chapter focused on the particular migrant group – Russian-speakers in the UK. The contemporary learning of Russian in the Russian-speaking community in Scotland should not be studied in isolation from historical perspectives, showing how Russian played the role of lingua franca for a wide range of national groups during the Tsarist and Soviet periods creating the diversity of Russian speakers and their heritage which exists today. A brief description explaining how Russian-speaking migrants arrived in the UK aims to prepare the reader to understand the cultural and ethnic diversity of respondents. In addition, this contextual part provides some cultural and historical background for interpretations of interviews in which Russian-speakers referred to some linguistic, cultural and historical common knowledge.
Chapter 2: Methodological Approach: Investigating Russian Complementary School Communities

The processes of heritage language preservation, social networking and transnational activities in migrant society are dynamic, and sometimes contradictory. They are sensitive to the current local, international, political and economic contexts. As such, a careful approach is required when researching them in the field. While Chapter 1 reviewed the previous research in this area, the present chapter systematically outlines my research methodology, including an explanation of my choice of field sites, descriptions of these, and reflection on my position as a migrant researcher. In developing my research approach, I consulted a range of existing studies of migrant communities, which helped me in selecting appropriate methodological approaches and understanding how different methods could be combined.

2.1. The Russian schools as field sites

As discussed in the previous chapter, the Russian-speaking migrants who arrived in Scotland from a range of different countries have formed a diverse migrant community, within which the Russian schools play a very important role. The first subsection of this chapter provides a detailed description of my four field sites, comprising four Russian complementary schools operating in Scotland, with a discussion of their connection with the Russian-speaking communities and the Russian services accessible in the different places. Next, an overview is provided of the Russian-speaking families whose children attended the Russian schools. Finally, in order to acknowledge and understand the diversity found among my potential respondents, I discuss how this might influence the study findings (Snow, Morrill & Anderson, 2003).

2.1.1. Research locations

A web search for Russian schools in Scotland showed that very active schools operate in Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Dundee. Thus, these four cities were chosen for investigation as potential field sites. In addition to web-searching, I looked at the official register of organisations which could potentially provide education services for Russian-speaking people in Scotland. A search of the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator database found only 11 registered charitable organisations with the words Russia/Russian in
the title, including five organisations which could be classified as community schools. As a result of my investigation, four Russian schools were included in the research sample: “Russian Edinburgh”; a Russian school based in the Russian Centre in Scotland Haven located in Glasgow, Russian school Slovo in Aberdeen, and the Dundee Russian school. In Glasgow, a second Russian school operates, based in the Orthodox Church, but this was not part of my study sample because its religious focus meant that it was less directly comparable with the four secular Russian schools which were selected for study. In Aberdeen, the Slovo Russian school was included in the research because the Lomonosov Russian school had been established later than Slovo, and had not been registered as a charity through a transparent process of regulation.\textsuperscript{4} Several groups providing Russian language classes can be found in other places in Scotland, but their number of pupils and teachers, and organisation of educational processes means that they cannot be identified as formally established schools, which were the focus of this research. Following Li (2006), it could be argued that the operation of the Russian schools in Scotland depends on the characteristics of the migrant community in particular place.

Edinburgh is not only the capital of Scotland; it is the capital of the Russian-speaking community in Scotland. All my informants across four cities agreed that Edinburgh has the most developed infrastructure supporting the international multilingual lives of different cultures, including Russian. The number of international events provided in this city is significantly higher than in other places in Scotland. In Edinburgh, Russian culture is supported by several well-established organisations, such as the Dashkova Centre based at Edinburgh University, the City Council, the Russian Embassy, and the Scottish-Russian Forum. The Edinburgh Russian-speaking community is one of the bigger communities in Scotland due to the size of the city, and to specific aspects of the migration process. Edinburgh has more highly skilled Russian-speaking specialists, with long-term visa settlement in Scotland, than each of the other three cities in my study (Judina, 2014).

The most mature Russian School in Scotland is “Russian Edinburgh”, which opened in 2004. It has operated without any breaks for over a decade. As a result, it was the only Russian school, with a ten-year-old tradition of practice at the time of my fieldwork, in 2013-15. The earliest pupils are now graduates. This school offers a full teaching cycle from preschool to

\textsuperscript{4} Parents and teachers who participated in my interviews preferred to use the locations of particular Russian schools rather their full name. In my research I therefore also used the synonyms Dundee Russian school, Russian school in Dundee, “Russian Edinburgh” and Russian school in Edinburgh.
the most senior class. The longest–serving teachers at this school have also established specific teaching methods and approaches. “Russian Edinburgh” is registered as an educational charity, with its principal objectives wholly focused on education. However, “Russian Edinburgh” is also involved in Russian-speaking community life, and its charter also aims “to encourage the integration of all Russian-speaking persons living in Scotland.”

Glasgow is not the capital of Scotland, but according to the latest census it is the largest city in Scotland, with 11.2% of the total population of the country (Scotland's Census, 2011). Glasgow has been twinned with the Russian city Rostov-on-Don since 1986. At Glasgow University, Russian language teaching has a long tradition based on one of the first departments of Slavonic studies to have been established in the UK. There are two Russian restaurants and two Russian shops in the city. Glasgow is the centre of Russian Orthodox Church activities in Scotland because it is the main place of residence of the Russian Orthodox priesthood in Scotland. Glasgow has a very active Russian cultural life, which is sustained by regular visits by Russian artists, singers and circuses. The Russian language is a vital part of the communication process in Glasgow’s Russian-speaking community. The choice of Glasgow in this study was not only made because of the size of the Russian-speaking community, but was also due to my previous personal and occupational experience, which was mentioned in the introduction to this thesis.

The Russian school in Glasgow, which was opened in the basement of the Russian Centre in Scotland Haven (RCS Haven) in 2004, is the second oldest Russian school in Scotland. RCS Haven opened in September 2004 as an official registered charity, and a few months later opened its doors firstly to members, and then to anyone wishing to attend the Russian school. RCS Haven operated continuously as a charity but was temporarily closed in 2006 due to resource issues. It restarted again in 2007. At the time of my fieldwork, the most experienced teacher had approximately five years’ continuous experience. RCS Haven obtained registration as an SQA educational registered centre in 2012, and at the time of the research, was the only school with this status in Scotland.

Aberdeen is the third biggest city in Scotland, with a population for Aberdeen City of 224,970 in 2012 (Aberdeen City Council Area - Demographic Factsheet, 2014). The international population in Aberdeen is also bigger than in most other places, and has very specific features as a result of its local job market and energy sector, in which global companies employ many international specialists.

The Russian school in Aberdeen was organised as an informal group without registration as an official charity in 2006. In 2010, due to a conflict between the members of the informal group, the original team split into two groups. According to the opinion of one of the founding members who I interviewed as part of my fieldwork, this group of teachers was divided between people who wished to be registered as a charity, and those against this idea. One group created the registered charity Slovo (Russian Educational and Support Centre).\(^9\) The other group operates as a Lomonosov Russian school without formal registration.

Dundee is Scotland’s fourth largest city, with a population of 143,390 people.\(^10\) The city has a well-developed industrial sector. In Dundee, the median gross weekly pay of full-time employees is less than in the other three cities and in Scotland as a whole (Information & Research team Dundee City Council, 2010). Due to socio-economic conditions, the migrant flow to Dundee is significantly less than to Edinburgh or Aberdeen or Glasgow. There are Russian shops and Orthodox Christian services; however, according to the Scottish-Russian Forum website which collects and displays information about Scotland, there are fewer Russian events, such as music concerts, than in the other cities included in this study.\(^11\)

The Russian School in Dundee is the youngest Russian school in Scotland, having started as a branch of “Russian Edinburgh” in 2011. As a result, it received support from the oldest Russian school in its initial establishment, such as creating educational programmes and providing introductory sessions and teacher training. Officially, the Russian School in Dundee remains a branch of “Russian Edinburgh”, although it now operates as an independent charity. However, according to information from OSCR – the Scottish charity

regulators - the objectives of the Russian School in Dundee are the same as those of “Russian Edinburgh”.

Comparisons between these four Russian schools are drawn out in the following empirical chapters (Chapters 3 – 6) to highlight, where relevant, variations in respondents’ reflections on a broad range of social factors which exist in the various locations. These include different paths to migration and settlement, such as highly-skilled professionals versus lower-skilled ‘labour migration’ and/or politically motivated moves, flexible future plans to move or to stay ‘fixed’ in place, and planning a longer-term future in the UK/Scotland.

2.1.2. Russian-speaking families whose children attend the Russian schools

Previous studies (Laitin, 1998; Kopnina, 2005; Remennik, 2008) have suggested that families’ decisions to teach their children the Russian language depend in some ways on the parents’ education, occupation, age and migration strategies. Russian schools do not keep records of such characteristics, but I asked the directors of each of the Russian schools in the study sample to make some estimations in the above categories. In addition, my participant observations and more informal discussions with teachers and parents revealed a number of relevant and interesting insights. According to my participant observation, women were the most visible parents regularly attending Russian schools. When I came to the Russian schools looking for parents, I found some men who usually accompanied their partners. In this case, I was able to use information about fathers’ participation in Russian school life through my observations of their discussions in the schools’ corridors and information about their opinions, which were provided by both mothers and teachers. When I tried to contact the fathers directly, they usually referred me to their wives as the authoritative family member who could speak about the education of their children. The fathers’ common choice to delegate to the mothers the key responsibilities for, and authority to, recount family practices fits with a wider pattern of gendered negotiation of parenting in Russian society, as has been described, for example, by Kay (2006). In Russian-speaking society, the socially and culturally constructed role of mothers in family decision-making assumes that they are more deeply involved in their children’s upbringing than fathers, meaning that mothers are assumed to be more naturally able to answer questions about their children’s upbringing. The findings of several authors, such as Kliuchnikova (2016: 68) and Kraftsoff and Quinn (2009) have confirmed that this pattern seems to continue when Russian-speaking families have migrated abroad; the studies showed that mothers often play the definitive role in
deciding on Russian language learning for their children. This is not the same situation as is found in other migrant communities. According to Ruth Lingxin Yan, who conducted a survey about parental perceptions on maintaining heritage languages (2003: 101), the dominant role of mothers was found in Chinese-speaking and Spanish-speaking migrant communities, but fathers were main drivers for heritage language learning in Hebrew-speaking and Arabic-speaking migrant communities. As a result, in the present thesis, when I talk about ‘parents’, I am mostly referring to mothers, whose interviews formed the major part of my data. The dominance of mothers among the parents visiting the Russian schools tends to influence the complex relationships and social networks emerging around the Russian schools, as discussed in Chapter 5.

A tendency shared across the four schools in the study sample was the growth in the number of children of preschool ages attending who were from mixed families where only one parent speaks Russian. According to the estimates made by the directors of the Russian schools, these families constitute around half of the Russian schools’ community, with slight variations between schools. This growing proportion of mixed families within the Russian-speaking communities surrounding the Russian schools tends to create a unique condition for promoting the advantages of developing bilingual language skills in children (Harding-Esch & Riley, 2003; García, 2009), as discussed in Chapter 3. Social networking is further investigated in Chapter 5.

The groups of parents connected to each of the four Russian schools also each have their own specific features, which reflect the particular characteristics of the Russian-speaking communities living in each city. Significant differences were observed from city to city in the parents’ professional backgrounds, current forms of employment, and experiences of migration. The Russian-speaking community in Edinburgh has a much higher proportion of people educated to high levels and with academic degrees - some of them hold visas for highly skilled specialists.12 Others are now British citizens after long periods working in jobs which are perceived by the Russian-speaking community as prestigious, such as jobs at universities, or in multinational companies. According to the parents and teachers in the Edinburgh school, the majority of the parents there have University-level education.

As I was told by the director of the Russian school in Glasgow, the Russian-speaking community in that city unites people from many countries of the former USSR, such as the Baltic States, Belarus, and Kazakhstan, and has the largest share among the four sampled cities of refugees from these countries. An additional distinctive characteristic of the Russian school in Glasgow is that a smaller share of parents there are working in professional occupations than in the Russian school in Edinburgh. During participant observation and interviews with parents, the problems of integration into local society and job hunting were discussed more frequently in Glasgow than in Edinburgh. As was noted by the director of the Russian school in Glasgow, this school has a higher proportion of children born in Scotland, who have attended the Russian complementary school from an early age.

The main feature of the Aberdeen Russian-speaking community is a high number of specialists connected with oil companies. These families usually do not plan to settle in Scotland for the long term, due to the types of employment contract offered in this sector, and often move on to other countries to work. In 2013, the director of the Russian school in Aberdeen highlighted in her interview that this school contains a higher percentage of pupils who were educated in mainstream Russian schools before moving to Scotland than can be found in other Russian schools in Scotland.

People from the Baltic States, who, as EU citizens currently have the right to move freely across the EU, form the majority of the Russian-speaking community in Dundee. From the interviews, it emerged that they usually worked in the different factories located around Dundee. At the time of my fieldwork, the Russian School in Dundee was only three years old, and was still quite small. It seemed that all the parents knew each other. According to information given to me by parents, Russian classes were most often attended by children who had been educated in the Russian language as part of the Baltic state school educational programmes, where Russian was the second language in mainstream schools.

2.1.3. Selection of classes and teachers for involvement in the study

Parents whose children attended the Russian schools in Scotland represented different social groups according to their countries of origin, period of migration, duration of their life in Scotland, age, occupations, backgrounds, family structures, and other factors. As Chapter 1 discussed, Russian-speaking migrants cannot be treated as a homogenous category. The variety among these groups significantly influences their attitudes towards Russian language...
preservation, their desire to be involved in migrant social networks, and their level of involvement in transnational activities. By conducting fieldwork in four schools, each linked to distinctive and diverse communities of teachers, parents and children, I was able to explore the influence of these ‘variations in the obtained data’ (Bryman, 2012: 219).

While I sought to understand how the different experiences of respondents in relation to the Russian schools impacted on their perceptions of the heritage language preservation, I set some parameters focusing on stages of heritage language preservation (Protassova, 2012). I focused my attention on two groups: families and teachers providing education for children aged 5-6 years, which I refer to as the ‘youngest class’ throughout the thesis, and - at the opposite end of the scale – teenagers, who populate the senior classes in the Russian schools. I chose the first group because, according to Molnar (2011), in Russian-speaking families, children aged five or six who begin to attend mainstream school maintain their language competence in English faster than the mother tongue used in family life. At this stage of children’s growth, Russian-speaking families can encounter the problem that their children can lose their ability to speak the Russian which they spoke before starting mainstream school. The group of teenagers is also interesting in understanding the motivation of heritage language learners. As Okita (2001) noted, studying heritage language at this age can be used as an opportunity to distinguish themselves from their friends and classmates by doing something unique which could help in their self-affirmation, and in finding their own position in the social environment.

Both classes (the youngest and the most senior) are also interesting from an educational point of view, and regarding the choice of teaching programmes. In the classes for young children, I explored the kinds of educational programme chosen in the Russian schools, and how these correlated with the teaching styles and practices found in mainstream schools in Scotland. The senior classes in the Russian schools showed the final results of their education in terms of what kind of knowledge was offered by the Russian schools in the last stage of education, and what kind of certificates are granted.

Fieldwork plans based on an investigation of these two groups were used in the selection of classes for observations, and interviews with teachers and parents. However, once in the research field, the sample of respondents was extended due to informal interactions with teachers and parents from other classes (Miller, 2000). After introducing myself and explaining my role as a researcher and the purpose of my research, several people who were
outside the initially selected groups became interested in expressing their opinions about various topics and issues under discussion. Many of their points of view were noted in my observation diary, and these enriched my analysis.

2.2. Research design

Bearing in mind the diversity of the Russian-speaking community and the complexity of the activities of the Russian schools in Scotland, this section discusses the different methods used for data collection. The first subsection describes the mixed methodological approach employed in the study. The subsequent sections discuss the specific issues which arose as a consequence of these choices, and their influence on the interpretation of the data gathered.

2.2.1 Mixed methods approach

As Chapter 1 discussed, the main stakeholders of the Russian schools are parents, teachers, and the children who attend these schools. Each of these groups is involved in, and contributes to, heritage language preservation, social networking, and transnational activities to different degrees. To address the diversity of the Russian schools’ communities and the complexity of the investigated processes mentioned above, a mixed qualitative method approach was chosen. I incorporated the following methods into the research design:

- Different types of interviews with parents and teachers, to form the main body of analysis;
- Participant observation in the Russian schools’ corridors and classrooms;
- Analysis of a selection of pictures drawn by pupils attending the Russian schools;
- Analysis of the Russian schools’ teaching materials and programs.

The fieldwork was conducted from November 2013 to April 2015. I had opportunities to visit the Russian schools once per week, except on public holidays and during mainstream schools’ holidays. By the end of my fieldwork I had collected the following data: 13 face-to-face and two skype qualitative interviews with parents; 10 face-to-face and 2 skype in-depth interviews with teachers providing services in Russian schools, and five in-depth interviews with directors and founders of the Russian schools (a full list of participants is included in Appendix 1). I carried out participant observation on 12 occasions in school corridors, on eight occasions in classrooms, and on four occasions at community events.
organised by Russian schools. I also attended New Year celebrations in the Russian schools in Glasgow and Edinburgh, the international language day in Aberdeen, and a music festival organised by the Russian school in Dundee.

Interview is widely employed as a method for the investigation of migrant communities, and has shown reliable and valid results (Roberts, 2002; Flynn & Kay, 2017; Moskal, 2014). The motivation for heritage language preservation is very flexible and deeply immersed in everyday life, and may be based on low levels of reflexivity (Weber & Horner, 2012). In this case, parents may face difficulties in answering direct questions. The loosely-structured interview is more flexible and friendly for the respondents, who will be able to tell their own life story and describe the role of heritage language preservation as a part of their everyday life (Forsey, 2008). Initially, a list of questions for parents in an interview guide was prepared, with a range of themes/questions (Appendix 2) which I planned to address, but I approached this flexibly, led by the previous responses and interests of the participants.

Compared with parents, teachers are professionals who are more confident in school life, so answering questions in a way which would follow the initial guidelines was less difficult for them. Semi-structured in-depth interviews employed an interview guide (see Appendix 2) to steer the conversation onto a particular topic and ask several questions, but the teachers could also choose their own ways to answer, and to follow their own logic.

While the data gathered from interviews with parents and teachers formed the largest part of my empirical data, this information was not thought to be entirely sufficient in understanding heritage language preservation. According to Ceginskas (2010), parents’ and teachers’ explanations cannot be fully understood without observations of their behaviour in the Russian schools’ environment, due to the complexity of the social factors influencing the self-representations of the interviewees during contact with a researcher. My observations in the Russian schools’ corridors gave me deeper insights into the social networking taking place amongst the Russian-speaking migrants involved with the schools through observing interactions between groups of parents. I had the opportunity to note some socio-cultural nuances which emerged during discussions of different topics related to the migrants’ everyday life, and in comparisons drawn between Scotland and the parents’ countries of origin. In addition to my weekly visits to the Russian schools, I observed several community events organised outside the Russian complementary schools’ core activities, which were
helpful in understanding the transcultural and emotional aspects of the life of each Russian school’s community (Dewaele & van Oudenhoven, 2009).

Whereas the observations in the Russian schools’ corridors produced some clarity of understanding of the parents’ opinions and behaviours, the observations in the classroom provided a deeper understanding of the teachers’ points of view and practices. Merging participant observations in classrooms with teachers’ interviews also provided the opportunity to compare what teachers said about their approaches to, and plans for, educating the children, and the actual teaching situation which depends not only on the teachers' plans but also on the structure of the learning groups and the pupils’ knowledge levels. Additional analysis of visual educational materials and school programs was also useful in revealing cultural specifics in the learning process and the regularity of their employment.

Since my focus thus far was mainly on adults’ opinions, I wanted to find a way to investigate the pupils’ involvement in the education process. The children's opinions needed to be carefully considered, so they were approached via observations in the classrooms and the employment of visual methods, such as the analysis of drawn pictures (Moskal, 2010). In the classrooms, I observed the language interactions and the children’s reactions to different requests from their teachers. As part of my investigation of the children’s involvement in transnational practices, I chose to analyse the pictures they drew for a competition called “Russia and Scotland together”. I discuss this process in more detail below.

The utilisation of a mixed methodological approach based on qualitative methods facilitates a deeper understanding of language preservation, social networking, and transnational activities as ‘socially constructed through the interaction between discursive practices and individual agency’ (Stella, 2010: 47). The strategies for obtaining information included in my chosen mixed methods provided me with a wide range of benefits as well as some limitations, each of which will be discussed in the next sections.

2.2.2. Qualitative interviews

During the fieldwork, I carried out interviews in the Russian schools’ corridors, in public places outside the Russian schools, at parents’ homes, and via Skype. A wide range of factors related to different research locations can influence research findings, such as accessibility, convenience, safety, and the focus of attention of participants (Brannen, 2005; Mason, 2006;
Seidman, 2013). Conducting interviews in various places thus provided me with a deeper understanding of the findings and helped me to recognise the influence of particular venues on the results of the interviews, as discussed in this section.

Each of the four Russian schools was the site for my initial encounters with a particular Russian school community. As field sites, the schools provided access to a high concentration of potential informants. Parents waiting for their children in school corridors often had time to chat with me. After receiving permission from the directors of the Russian schools to make contact with the school communities, I then had the chance to approach any person in the school corridors for conversation. Parents were usually very friendly, and they rarely rejected my invitation to participate in the research project. In addition to 32 formally recorded interviews, I shared casual conversations with approximately ten respondents. As a result, an estimated 42 people were involved in the research; this number represents around one-fifth of the total members of the four Russian schools’ communities.

Interviewing people in schools raises the problem of gatekeepers when, for example, a director who gives the researcher permission to contact respondents may influence respondents’ opinions (Campbell, 2010). To reduce this possibility, I asked the directors’ permission to interview parents, but I retained the choice of who to speak with, without the directors’ help in finding specific people. As a result, and in line with the ethical approval granted for my study, the school directors were not informed of which parents were interviewed. The other factor which could potentially affect the findings was the activity of parents in school life. According to Yadov (2003), more socially active people are more likely to become involved in research projects. This link between parents’ levels of active participation in school life and the structure of the groups of interviewed parents was managed by a specific strategy. During the first visits to the school, I interviewed parents who were actively involved in the school routine, and who stayed in corridors to help teachers, such as by taking small children to the toilet, cleaning black/white boards or organising lunch times. Those who were more active in the school felt more confident about school life and were generally more open to conversation. In the second stage of the research, I invited other parents who were not so active in school life, and usually did not choose to stay at school waiting for their children, to participate in the research project. I met them in the school and arranged to meet again in a public place or at their home. In reality, it was
harder to organise these meetings than meetings with active members of the school. On average, only one in three of these arranged meetings took place.

The school interviews were more homogeneous in length, structure and more strictly followed the initial interview guide than interviews which took place at respondents’ homes. The school interview guide included questions about the following aspects: families’ strategies of migration; their attitudes towards Russian language/culture and children’s Russian language education; the participation of family members in local Russian-speaking community life, and maintaining relationships with Russian-speaking relatives abroad. The school environment motivated people to say more about school problems, and less about their families and personal life. The accompanying reduction of information about family biography was compensated by interviews with less active parents in their homes.

Respondents who agreed to be interviewed at a later date had more time to prepare for the discussion because they were aware of the research and its topics due to being given the plain language statement, and had already made the decision to meet me. Public places were often a little noisy, but the occasion to drink tea or coffee together gave additional opportunities to reduce the formality of the conversation and be closer to ‘informal’ chatting. These interviews can be described as a ‘conversation with a purpose’ (Burgess 1984: 102), as is often the case in qualitative research (O’Brien, 2010).

Face-to-face home interviews were conducted in Edinburgh and Glasgow because these cities are closer to my place of residence. Building trust to a level appropriate for a home invitation was easy in these cities. The home interviews were carried out in the kitchen, following a well-established Russian tradition (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004; Kopnina, 2005). ‘Kitchen discussion’ required a longer time, and generated significant amounts of details not directly relevant to the research questions. Nevertheless, this type of interview allowed an analysis of the role of emotion in heritage language preservation.

In addition to the traditional face-to-face interviews, I conducted four Skype interviews which had been negotiated at meetings in the Russian schools, mostly in Aberdeen and Dundee. Consent forms were signed during the initial meetings with potential respondents, when the time for the Skype interview was also arranged. Skype interviews have many

33 See Appendix 2 with interview guide
advantages and disadvantages, which have been partly analysed by different researchers (Sullivan, 2012; Bertrand & Bourdeau, 2010; Guldberg & Mackness, 2009; Hanna, 2012; Hay-Gibson, 2009; King & Horrocks, 2010; Saumure & Given, 2012). Body language plays an important role in face-to-face conversation by giving visible markers of informants’ unspoken attitudes (Poland, 1995). Skype usually shows the face of interlocutors or the top part of their body, so this picture was a little restricted. However, people actually appeared to be more comfortable and open than they were during the face-to-face interviews. One of the reasons for these interactions was not only that they could take place at a convenient time and place, but also the specific nature of Skype communication. Almost all the Skype respondents in this project use this software for communication with their relatives living abroad. At a subconscious level, Skype may be perceived as a friendly tool. For example, one of the respondents who appeared very critical and cold towards the idea of participating in this project at our first meeting, later changed her mind during the Skype interview and spoke in a friendlier way. During a Skype interview with one of the teachers, she answered questions and sent a link to interesting educational materials which were discussed. The Skype interviews were longer than the face-to-face interviews carried out while parents waited to collect their children at the end of the school day, and were more informative because the parents’ attention was not distracted by something happening in the school corridors, which was quite often the case at school. The Internet connection was unstable only once (very briefly), and it did not significantly affect the conversation. Furthermore, this new technology allows not only speaking on Skype, but also recording conversations using a computer program which is more advanced than a basic digital recorder.

An assessment of the balance between the advantages and disadvantages of Skype interviews showed the significant benefits of using this method for both interviewer and interviewee. Internet technologies create a new environment and space for communication which is often as valued as normal face-to-face communication, and may even replace face-to-face interactions to some extent in future in particular types of research (Nedelcu, 2012).

2.2.3. Participant observation in the Russian schools

While the interviews described above produced a significant amount of data, I started my interactions with the Russian schools with observations, which generated initial ideas about selection procedures and access to respondents. Participant observation is a well-developed
method of data collection in research projects about migration, especially in complementary schools (Martin et al., 2007). However, as one of the aspects of Educational Anthropology, most participant observations in schools have been done for the purpose of improving the educational process (Hornberger & McCarty, 2012). Prior researchers have formed different analytical models to investigate interactions in the classroom (Kumpulainen, Hmelo-Silver, and César, 2009), highlighting the importance of cooperation between members of the learning and teaching process (Calderón, 2002). Another aspect of observations in schools relates to linguistic research, which focuses on using teaching methods to overcome educational problems when studying foreign languages (Marten & Mostert, 2012). I adopted these methods in observing the Russian schools, but with a somewhat different focus. For the purposes of my research aims and questions, more attention was paid to observing social-cultural aspects than educational assessment or evaluating teaching processes. The same principles were employed in the investigation of teaching materials, which were considered to represent sets of visual cultural symbols.

The participant observations were performed in two classrooms in each Russian school. For each visit, I sought and received special permission from the school directors and made advance arrangements with the class teachers. My observations in the classrooms could be classified as ‘participant observation’ (Forsey, 2010) due to my involvement in educational game activities and some teaching assistance. This low level involvement helped me to build some trust and break the barriers which might otherwise have emerged if the children and teachers had seen me as an internal assessor (Johnson, Avenarius & Weatherford, 2006).

While observing the teaching process, the following elements were noted:¹⁴ 1) the language used to begin communication during the main body of teaching for the clarification of topics which were difficult for learners; 2) discipline requirements concerning children's posture and ways of sitting at school tables; 3) cultural specifics of explanations, and the examples used for clarification; 4) facilitating conversation; 5) the proportion of time spent in group and individual exercises; 6) sets of educational games; and 7) the emotional aspects of teaching. During the observation of children's behaviour in classrooms, the following aspects were recorded: 1) the number of pupils in class; 2) the gender proportion; 3) the number of Russian and English names of the learners; 4) the children's pronunciation; 5) the children's

¹⁴ The proforma of participant observation is enclosed in Appendix 3.
reactions to their teacher’s explanations; 6) common cultural assumptions; and 7) emotional aspects and relationships between children.

The set of teaching materials was analysed from different perspectives, such as: 1) the types of textbooks (who the authors were; where and when they were published); 2) the proportion of teaching materials published for the mainstream schools operating in the Russian Federation, and special materials for teaching Russian as a foreign language; and 3) the cultural symbols used in the classrooms.

The participant observations in the Russian schools’ corridors were quite flexible in terms of access to these audiences. After receiving permission from the directors to visit the Russian schools, I could visit them as many times as I wished. These corridor participant observations were based on principles similar to the classroom observations, with the main focus on socio-cultural interactions. During these observations, I tried to note different elements such as a general description of the situation; topics of conversations; and the general atmosphere of any discussions. I also made notes on my own reflections, and commented as a researcher on any additional issues which emerged during the fieldwork.

This combination of different note taking strategies gave me the opportunity to compare the relationship between the topics of conversation of observed people and my behaviour as a researcher. The more precisely scientific I tried to be – strictly following different formal procedures with the introduction of my research, taking notes during my observations – the more serious the topic of discussions chosen by the research participants became; for example, people preferred to talk about education. In contrast, my participation in common school activities such as preparing tables for school lunch, helping parents to open small bottles of juice, and playing with the youngest children while their older siblings were studying in the Russian school, all enriched my data collection with further informal data about Russian school community life. The topics of discussions were slightly different in these cases; for instance, everyday routines such as visits to beauticians, cafés, and theatres emerged. Participation in these informal activities prevented me from making detailed notes in real time, but gave me the opportunity to lessen the distance between myself as a researcher and the school community (Johnson, Avenarius & Weatherford, 2006).
In summary, the range of participation in observation was an evolutionary process rather than an *a priori* chosen strategy. Active participation in the observation process was found to be a more natural way to integrate into each different Russian school community.

2.2.4. Visual methods: analysis of children’s drawings

In addition to the qualitative interviews and participant observation carried out, I analysed the pictures drawn by the children and their descriptions of what they had drawn and why, in order to achieve a more nuanced understanding of how the Russian schools operate. Children’s attitudes towards their schools are key factors in the functioning of any school, especially ethnic minority ones, due to the voluntary basis of attendance, in contrast with mainstream schools where attendance is compulsory. However, the inclusion of children’s opinions in research materials is an especially challenging task due to the specifics of communication between the researcher and children, and the interpretation required (Noble, 2016). As a compromise between the desire to involve children’s opinions in my research and the potential barriers to doing so, I employed methods used by Moskal. She investigated the integration of Polish migrant children into local life by analysing their pictures about home (Moskal, 2010). The effectiveness of qualitative visual research methods of working with children has been shown by several researchers (Young & Barrett, 2001, Literat, 2013; Scherer, 2014), who noted that young participants struggle to express themselves through words for a variety of reasons.

In practice, the implementation of the image-based approach (Gernhardt, Rübeling & Keller, 2013; Hall, 2010; Lorenzi-Cioldi et al., 2011; Rübeling et al., 2011) faced some organisational barriers. The first was how to encourage the families attending the Russian schools to be involved in my project. The Russian schools have a very dense teaching programme, due to only operating on Saturday, and it was difficult to organise additional class time for these activities. Drawing a picture during class time may create pressure on some young children who need more time to express their ideas. Some children needed their parents’ help to express their opinion clearly. After several consultations with the directors of the Russian schools and teachers, it was decided to organise a competition. The children were given about three months to voluntarily participate in the competition. According to the rules, the children had to draw two pictures - one about Russia, and one about Scotland. In addition, they were asked to provide a short explanation of what they had depicted and why. If a child had difficulties with writing down their ideas, they were allowed to get help
from their parents. Otherwise, they wrote their explanations themselves. In the competition, 44 drawings were submitted by 27 participants: five from Aberdeen, six from Edinburgh, 12 from Glasgow, and four from Dundee. All the participants had connections with the Russian schools and attended classes at one of them. The pictures were available online for anybody who wanted to be involved in the allocation of the audience choice award. To analyse the pictures, I used the children’s explanations of their drawing(s) alongside data obtained from the interviews with parents and from my participant observations in the Russian schools. The main analytical foci of this part of the analysis were the investigation of how children express the connections between Scotland and Russia through their drawings, and what kind of influences could be traced from the Russian schools’ activities. Despite arguing that these links exist, it was difficult to prove how a particular Russian school had inspired the group of children who attended this school. However, several key features were mentioned in Chapter 6.

2.3. Researcher positionality, ethics and language in the research process

Before moving on to discuss the study’s findings, my role as a researcher of Russian speakers in Scotland is discussed in this section with some careful consideration and evaluation of its potential impact on the data obtained (Gawlewicz, 2016). The links between the researcher and the researched can influence research results in different ways (Carling et al., 2014; Kim, 2012; Matejskova, 2014; Nowicka and Cieślik, 2014). In this subsection, the focus of attention will be on the different dimensions related to the ethical dilemmas of my position as a researcher: the cultural and language commonalities between myself as a researcher and my respondents, and the translation issues which occurred due to using both Russian and English as languages of fieldwork, analysis and writing throughout the study.

2.3.1. Ethical dilemmas and the positionality of a migrant researcher

In the introduction to this thesis, I briefly mentioned my previous personal and occupational experience which relates to the discussion about insider research and the influence of my position within one of the Russian schools. In 2008, I took the role of volunteer project manager in RCS Haven, a wider charitable organisation which has helped the Russian school with administrative issues such as gaining PVG forms for teachers, hiring rooms for Russian
classes on Saturday, organising the accreditation of the SQA Russian Higher, and other paperwork. After starting my PhD, I transferred my duties to another project manager and helped RCS Haven only in emergencies. I have never been a teacher or trustee in this organisation. A reflexive approach demands an awareness of the distribution of power between researcher and researched (Hodkinson, 2005). To avoid any distortion of my data, I carefully considered this issue. Initially, I had planned a narrower focus of research, only on Glasgow’s Russian-speaking community, and intended to conduct participatory action research in the Russian school in Glasgow. I later enlarged my research field and included three other Russian schools in Scotland into the analysis for many reasons, including the consideration of potential risk of bias due to my connections to the Glasgow Russian school.

Formally, the research respondents were not under my control, or in any subordinated relationship. According to formal regulations, we were all in an equal position. However, indirectly and subconsciously, some of the teachers from the Russian school in Glasgow may have perceived me as an influential person due to the type of activities I had previously taken part in at RCS Haven (Ortiz & Fránquiz, 2013). To avoid this potential risk, I interviewed teachers currently working at the Russian school in Glasgow, but also others who had worked there before the beginning of my fieldwork. The teachers who had finished their work in the Russian schools were outside any school hierarchy. Talking to those teachers who had left the Russian school made me aware of which issues might be considered sensitive by the current teachers, and enabled me to carefully revise my interpretation of the obtained data.

The relationships I had with parents from the Russian school in Glasgow were also quite complicated. At the beginning of my fieldwork I was also a mother of a four-year-old boy who attended the Russian school in Glasgow, so I knew some parents from his class and I expected that some of them might hesitate to contact me, as described by Yuan in analysing the process of interviewing friends and relatives (Yuan, 2014). To avoid these problems, I did not invite parents from my son’s class to participate in my research. Instead, I invited parents in the Russian school in Glasgow with whom I had not previously had any significant contact, and who did not know me directly, to take part in interviews.

I understand the importance of acknowledging my subjectivity and biases. However, I am also aware that the significant amount of insider research in the field of education (Hellawell, 2006) shows that it is possible to mitigate potential risk arising from insider status (Greene,
2014). When I, as a researcher, and my respondent knew something in common about the Russian school in Glasgow, I followed the tactic of Chavez (2008) and asked how we could explain to other Russian teachers or parents who had not yet visited this school.

My position as a member of the Russian-speaking community, a volunteer at the Russian Centre in Scotland Haven and as a mother teaching her child Russian provided me with a richer account of the findings arising from the methods employed, as will be discussed further in the next subsection.

2.3.2. Influence of shared cultural background on fieldwork

The wide range of positions which I had held as a migrant researcher enriched my data, but also raised issues in making interpretations of other cultural codes (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 2011). As Grossman (2002) warned, the fact that my participants and I shared some similarities in our migration stories, and/or cultural and linguistic backgrounds, may cause the emergence of a false feeling of similarity. There is a need also to be aware of, and to consider, the influence of differences and potential tensions; for example, in relation to professional background, education, national identity, etc.

The specifics of the Russian-speaking identities which were discussed in Chapter 1 influenced the communication between my respondents and I in different ways. As noted at the start of the methodological chapter, a significant proportion of the respondents were people who had migrated from former Soviet states other than the Russian Federation. They had a broad range of attitudes towards both the USSR and modern Russia. Sharing the experience of childhood and education in the USSR helped me to more easily manage the discussion about schooling in general. We shared many humorous memories about our school times during childhood, in areas such as discipline, uniforms, and teachers’ demands of pupils. When a respondent mentioned elements or practices of the Soviet education system which were familiar to both of us, this helped me to better understand parents’ and teachers’ expectations of the operation of Russian schools in Scotland. For other, younger parents who had not had the experience of studying in Soviet times, the main focus of negotiations was formed around the comparison between different systems of teaching Russian in different post-Soviet countries. The respondents told me about how the Russian language was taught in their countries of origin, which had become independent after the disintegration of the USSR in 1991. The larger cultural distance between these respondents
and I caused more detailed explanations to be provided by respondents, which in turn also enriched my data. The central tension which occurred due to the differences between my country of origin and my interviewees’ countries of origin, was related to the current political relationship between the Russian Federation and other countries of the former Soviet Union, such as Ukraine. The Ukrainian crisis occurred at the end of my fieldwork, but some tensions were noticeable. I therefore avoided this topic in discussions with the respondents.

The closest distance between my respondents and me was achieved when I positioned myself as a parent who is interested in bringing up a bilingual child in Scotland. Opening up the interview with an introduction about my own family helped me to build a rapport faster and more efficiently, through sharing similar problems in relation to Russian language learning which had occurred in my family as well. My research topic, heritage language preservation, helped me to establish a rapport with the Russian teachers. They participated in discussions more willingly, especially when these were about educational strategies, due to their interests in achieving better results in teaching the Russian language to children in Scotland. The teachers’ attempts to show their Russian school in the best light were understandable, but less productive in terms of the interviews. My main task as a researcher in such instances was to find a way to switch the interview from a reporting mode to a discussion about their personal vision and opinions (O’Brien, 2010). I only very rarely made reference to my role as one of the assistants of the Russian school in Glasgow, and only when speaking with directors of the Russian schools who were interested in practical questions, such as finding grants, problems in hiring buildings for schools, contacts with city councils, and the Russian Consulate General in Edinburgh. They perceived my visit as an opportunity to discuss the integration of Russian schools in Scotland, which helped me to more deeply understand the connection between Russian schools and other official organisations.

My wide range of positions helped me to deepen my understanding of heritage language preservation as educational process in the Russian schools (Johnson, Avenarius, & Weatherford, 2006). However, the careful consideration of, and comparison with, other sources to avoid bias and subjectivities in my findings showed that my position as a migrant, a mother of a Russian-speaking child in Scotland, and a former assistant in the Russian school in Glasgow was helpful in reducing the distance between myself as a researcher and my respondents. In contrast, belonging to different countries of origin could create potential tensions. My position as a migrant researcher is significantly framed and marked by my
native language, the use of which needs special consideration (Gawlewicz, 2016), as is discussed in the next subsection.

2.3.3. Choice of language for interviews with the Russian-speaking community

In spite of the high level of ethnic and national diversity of my interviewees, they all preferred to speak Russian, and occasionally used English words or sentences during our conversation to express ideas. The choice of the language to be used to interview members of migrant communities has quite often raised questions about validity and subjectivities in the obtained data (Birbili, 2000; Temple, 1997, 2008; Temple and Young, 2004). In continuing the discussion about a natural or ‘neutral’ choice of language (Reyes, 2018), I argue that the choice of the Russian language for my interviews was inevitable to avoid some distortion of meaning.

The major factor which influenced this choice of language for the interviews was the topic of conversation (Kliuchnikova, 2016). Parents who had decided to educate their children in Russian had thereby accepted and supported some communicative traditions of the Russian-speaking community. The choice of the Russian language for communication was expected as part of the Russian cultural environment produced by the Russian schools. For bilingual speakers, which the majority of my respondents were, the choice of language is a political act in intercultural communication (Mueller, 2007). Using the official language in the ethnic community builds an official distance between communicants. If a Russian-speaking researcher had made the decision to use the English language in interviews with the Russian-speaking community, this could have created additional barriers, and decreased trust between researcher and researched (Byford, 2012). It would have been particularly artificial in my case, where the respondents were aware that I share Russian as a native language.

An additional factor which also influenced the choice of language for the interviews was the level of English language proficiency held by the interviewees. As noted by Pavlenko and Malt (2010), the level of proficiency tends to be quite subjective, and depends on the confidence of the respondents. During the interviews, most of my respondents mentioned some difficulties in studying English. These issues were especially important for those who had arrived in Scotland more recently. This group of migrant families with difficulties in the English language seems more vulnerable, and needs more attention from the researcher (Molnar, 2011). Using the English language in this conversation would have risked creating
increased tension and pressure on these families. Furthermore, it would also have led to a dramatic loss of meaning due to potential difficulties in expressing their real feelings and opinions.

In an English-speaking environment, use of the native language of both communicants from ethnic minority communities not only increases the clarity of the shared information, but also plays the role of cultural marker, helping the interlocutors to identify commonalities (Byford, 2012). Using the native language for both sides, researcher and researched, provides the opportunity for them to use a broad range of proverbs, idioms, and associations based on the cultural similarities between the speakers. At the beginning of the interviews, I used short jokes which helped me to make our conversation more comfortable and relaxed for the respondents. During the interviews, my respondents widely used the name of popular Russian geographical places, referred to popular jokes and anecdotes from Russian cartoons and films, and mentioned some famous Russian authors. If I was able to recognise these cultural codes, it made our discussion deeper and more fruitful (Seidman, 2013).

My research focus on the emotional aspects of relationships between members of the Russian schools’ communities also raised questions about the reflection of emotions in a particular language. Ways of expressing emotions form the core of culture in every society (Larina, 2012). Understanding emotion is a particular challenge for researchers conducting research in a foreign language (Kay & Oldfield, 2011). In contrast, for me as a native-speaking researcher working in migrant communities, the issues tended to be in relation to the management of emotion. Some of my respondents treated participation in the interview as an opportunity to talk about their problems and share their pessimistic view of current life, as described by Malyutina (2013). I was a careful listener, but also avoided supporting and sharing these emotions, attempting instead to be as neutral as possible (Greene, 2014).

To sum up, the decision to collect my data in Russian, the shared language for the Russian-speaking community, was deeply embedded in my position in the research. The choice of the Russian language for the interviews improved my communication with the respondents, but also opened up questions about translation issues which can influence the validity and subjectivity of constructed knowledge (Gawlewicz, 2016). These issues relate to presenting my findings in an English language academic environment, as the next subsection discusses.

2.3.4. Translation issues in analysis and writing
Issues of translation are interconnected with the debate about positionality and language (Carling et al., 2014; Kim, 2012; Matejskova, 2014; Nowicka and Cieślik, 2014), but also have their own specifics in relation to the knowledge production process (Riessman, 2008). In my research, I followed the approach that translation is a process of decoding of cultural meaning (Wong & Poon, 2010), reproducing the logic of interlocutors in another cultural environment (Fathi, 2013) and representing others (Temple, 2008). Careful consideration of the translation process helped me to increase my awareness of its role in shaping data (Temple and Koterba, 2009). In this subsection, I discuss the implications of collecting data in one language and writing texts in another, contributing to the discussion on translation in the research process (Claramonte, 2009; Kim, 2012; Squires, 2009; Temple and Young, 2004; Wong and Poon, 2010). In doing so, I primarily address issues concerning the practicalities of translation.

All the interviews in this study were carried out in Russian and then transcribed in Russian. Two software programs were used to analyse the resulting data – LEKTA and NVivo. LEKTA was used to reveal the structure of the collected information based on the Russian language, then the NVivo was used to manage the coding manually. In NVivo, all the data were kept in Russian, but all the coding and analysing procedures were in English. Coding data in English helped me to structure texts in English, while keeping the transcripts in the original Russian protected the cultural meaning for the next stage of reporting – including the speech of participants - into my texts in English.

Researchers often employ verbatim quotations of participants’ speech, and they do so for a variety of reasons, including illustrating a point; giving a voice to participants; providing evidence; and deepening readers’ understanding (Corden & Sainsbury, 2006). The problems of the cultural translation of participants’ speech into academic quotations are widely discussed in the ethnographic literature (Naples, 2003), where the question of how to protect the original cultural meaning from acculturation through academic retelling is of particular significance. The language of the respondents should be interpreted and demonstrated in academic writing, while ensuring the protection of the original cultural meaning. This protection assumes that the cultural meaning of informants’ speaking in Russian should be translated in non-academic English.

Some translating issues can be softened by the preservation of terms in the original language (Tannen, 1982). This approach is less popular in cross-cultural research (Mueller 2007;
Stella, 2010), but this strategy can contribute to challenging the dominance of Anglo-American perspectives in migrant studies (Waters, 1999) and the privileged status of English within them. In my thesis, I have included, in translated citations, transliterated original Russian words (with explanations), such as the names of characters from Russian fairy tales, traditional Russian crafts, and geographical places in Russia and other former Soviet republics.

Research exploring language preservation, especially in the case of the Russian-speaking community, is sensitive to linguistic and cultural diversity (Pavlenko, 2016). To avoid the loss of cultural meaning during the translation process, I chose to approach and conduct cross-cultural research with the assistance of an interpreter (Choi, Kushner, Mill & Lai, 2012). This meant that I initially translated the quotes before professional translators checked them. We discussed our final merged professional translation against the knowledge and meanings I had received during the fieldwork. Language is deeply involved in marking the social status of respondents, the sense of which can easily be ‘lost in translation’ (Williams, 2006). In my text, some quotations were accompanied by background information about respondents, whose speech was used to point out her/his social status or specific attitudes towards language use. Nevertheless, while carefully representing respondents from the cultural point of view, I excluded from the quotations any information which might compromise the respondents’ anonymity.

To sum up, the importance of giving careful consideration to issues around language, labelling, representation and translation in cross-cultural research on school migrant communities is difficult to overestimate. I understand that my research can give tentative, partial and contingent answers to these questions. However, I also entirely agree with Stella (2010: 22) that ‘these issues need to be openly acknowledged and addressed, in order to produce narratives accountable to the communities studied, and to establish relations that create opportunities for genuine dialogue and exchange across linguistic and cultural boundaries’. During the discussion set out in all the empirical chapters of this thesis, I bore in mind the advantages and limitations of my involvement in the translating process, carefully checked translated quotes, and added some explanation and contextual information where this was required (Gawlewicz, 2016).
Conclusion

This chapter has described the rationale behind the selected research design and its subsequent development by discussing the specifics of my study of Russian complementary schools and the communities surrounding them. The first subsection explored the challenges related to the complexity of the Russian schools as fieldwork sites. The detailed description of these organisations created a framework for a discussion of the sensitivity and reflexivity of the research methods chosen to explore a diverse multicultural migrant group. This included critical reflections on the selection procedure for respondents, and their contribution to the collected data.

The second subsection presented the research design, which was based on a mixed methodological approach with qualitative methods at its core. The mixed research design was discussed as a suitable empirical strategy for studying the heritage language preservation, social networks, and transnational activities surrounding the Russian schools. The study was located within the wider literature and debates on the methodological issues associated with conducting qualitative interviews, undertaking participant observations, and analysing children’s drawings. In describing the way in which the actual fieldwork was conducted, I offered critical reflections on various situations which occurred in the field research and their influences on my findings.

The chapter finished with a discussion about my own positionality as a migrant researcher and the impact of this on my study of heritage language preservation. Starting with key ethical questions, I explored the wider literature on research positionality, shared cultural background, shared language, and translating issues.

Overall, this chapter has introduced and defended my chosen methodological approach to studying heritage language preservation, social networks and transnational activities in the Russian schools in Scotland. In doing so, it contributes to the debate about appropriate methods and strategies for studying the language preservation practices of diverse multicultural migrant groups. The following empirical chapters present the main results arising from this considered approach to the research process.
Chapter 3. The Principles of Work of the Russian Complementary Schools in Scotland

This chapter explores Russian schools in Scotland as cultural spaces which create opportunities for heritage language preservation, social networking and transnational activities among Russian-speaking people in Scotland. By analysing respondents’ perceptions of Russian school practices, as well as my own observations as researcher, the chapter discusses the wide range of factors influencing the schools’ development and their capacity to support the heritage language preservation, social networking and transnational activities. Previous studies of heritage language preservation have shown that complementary schools perform a wide range of functions, such as introducing pupils to heritage culture, teaching the native languages of migrant communities, and providing supplementary support to mainstream education (Dove, 1993; Wang, 1996; Reay and Mirza, 1997; Hall et al., 2002; Strand, 2002; Martin et al., 2003; Rutter, 2003; Zhou and Li, 2003; Chow, 2004; Creese et al., 2006). Studies concerned specifically with the Russian-speaking community have often focused on Russian culture and identity (Kopnina, 2005; Doomernik, 1997; Kliuchnikova, 2016). Russian schools have not previously been analysed as specific social institutions that create spaces for local and transnational interactions. An exploration of Russian schools in Scotland is therefore necessary in order to discover and investigate their role in heritage language preservation in relation to the development of migrant networking and transnational activities within the school context.

The main aim of the present chapter is to introduce the Russian schools in Scotland to readers as flexible and dynamic communities created through interactions between their members. The first part of the chapter presents an investigation of the establishment of the Russian schools described in the study, focusing on their founders, and their local and transnational nature. Following this overview of the formal structures, I move on to explore the respondents’ perceptions of the Russian schools in Scotland in order to understand what the parents expect from these schools, and what the teachers can offer them. The diverse range of parents’ attitudes to the teaching of the Russian language in Scotland are met by the possibilities available to teachers to deal with these requests, creating different types of relationships between the different stakeholders involved in heritage language preservation. Bearing in mind the diversity of stakeholders’ interests, the final part of the chapter describes the variety of the educational approaches which can be observed in the Russian schools in Scotland. This chapter focuses predominantly on setting the context for further discussion
about parents’ motivation to preserve heritage language (Chapter 4), their involvement in social networks (Chapter 5), and the transnational activities (Chapter 6) surrounding the Russian schools, which would be more difficult to understand without knowledge of how the Russian schools operate in Scotland.

3.1. The Russian schools’ operation as a process of negotiation

Following the view of language learning in complementary schools as forming part of the negotiated process between stakeholders (Francis et al., 2010), I explored how Russian-speaking parents, teachers, pupils and founders construct the Russian schools’ lives, taking into account their interests, expectations and involvement in various types of activities. For the purpose of this analysis, this section is divided into four parts, starting with the founding members of the Russian schools in Scotland then moving on to parents’ and teachers’ impacts on the schools’ development before finishing with an exploration of the relationships between the members of the Russian schools’ communities. In reality, all four aspects are closely related to each other. The Russian teachers try to consider the parents’ attitudes towards, and perceptions of, Russian learning, while the parents, in turn, follow the teachers’ suggestions. The wide range of interests in, and attitudes towards, the Russian schools in Scotland produce a complex and dynamic negotiating process between all the participants of heritage language preservation.

3.1.1. Founders and supporters of the Russian schools

All the directors of the Russian schools involved in my study mentioned that the initial idea for these schools came from concerned Russian-speaking parents. Parents were, and remain, the main agents of the Russian schools’ development. The majority of the current Russian schools’ directors are the second generation of school management, as they were not the founders of these organisations, and therefore do not have detailed first-hand information about how their Russian schools were opened. In some cities, I was able to make contact with the founders of the Russian schools, and invite them to participate in the study, but in other places it was not possible to do so as they had left Scotland. However, participant observation, and interviews with parents and teachers helped me to gain some insight into how the interests of stakeholders shaped the development of the Russian schools. A common response to questions about the reasons for the opening of Russian schools from parents was:
At one point, the parents all met together and decided to teach their children. Why did they make this decision? I don't know but what I do know is that it is natural to want to teach your child. (Alexandra, parent, Glasgow)

Very similar answers were received in Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and Dundee. However, in each of the cities where Russian schools operate, a different combination of parents’ initiatives and external support was observed.

In Edinburgh, the Russian school was opened with the support of one of the leaders of Scottish – Russian civic bilateral relations, who is British. Later, in 2007, she created and headed another charity – the Scottish-Russia Forum (SRF). According to several longer serving teachers the founder of the SRF had extensive knowledge about the operation of Scottish systems as a Russian teacher in mainstream schools, and had developed social links with different official organisations. During her speech at the 10th anniversary of the Edinburgh Russian School, she spoke of how the first parents “met in a room together and decided to create a school for their children”. This case therefore offers an example of the successful convergence of parents’ motivation and enthusiasm with the managerial knowledge of a local professional who was able to create and promote opportunities for effective cooperation with local authorities.

The Russian School in Edinburgh has also received external financial and political support which helped it to overcome several difficult moments in the school’s development. This support has come from a wide range of actors with different levels of activity, from the local level (City Council, Edinburgh University) to the international (Consulate General of the Russian Federation in Edinburgh) and transnational (SRF) levels. Edinburgh City Council provided the Russian School in Edinburgh with rooms free-of-charge in a local mainstream school which acts as a community centre at weekends. This community facility provided services for several complementary language schools (not only Russian), and with this type of support they were able to avoid financial pressures from the outset. The Russian school in Edinburgh has no official affiliation with Edinburgh University, but some University staff are also teachers at the school.

As was noted by one of the Vice-Consuls of the Consulate General of the Russian Federation in Edinburgh during a meeting with Russian teachers in 2013, the Consulate helped the Russian school in Edinburgh by providing learning materials and textbooks, supporting exchange visits to Edinburgh by teachers from Russia, and facilitating international
cooperation with mainstream schools in Russia. In 2013-2014, during my fieldwork, “Russian Edinburgh” was not involved in any active fundraising activities. One member of the school committee explained that:

We pay small professional fees to our teachers and charge parents small fees, too. We have more than a hundred pupils this year. In this case, we do not depend on payments from any particular parent or funding from grant providers. (Mikhail, Member of the school committee, Edinburgh)

This combination of resources – support from Edinburgh City Council, and payments received from a relatively high number of parents, seems to provide the basis for more freedom in the operation of this school than in others. As Mikhail explained, the school committee felt free to establish their own educational programme and school rules. The Russian school in Edinburgh is the only one of the Russian schools which has a waiting list for children, and it has a practice of refusing to enrol new pupils at the discretion of the school committee if the request was placed at an inappropriate time or the class is full.

In Glasgow, the initiative to create a Russian school emanated from parents who were members of Russian Centre in Scotland Haven (RCS Haven). As described in Chapter 2, this centre was established by Russian-speaking migrants to provide a wide range of support for migrant communities, such as translating services, ESOL English classes, advice services, organising Russian cultural events, and so on. The Russian school was opened in the basement of the Russian Centre in Scotland Haven. As I was told by several parents who had attended this school since its beginning, initially this Russian school was supported by Russian-speaking people who had their own businesses in Glasgow, and who helped the school to find rooms and initially covered the rent. According to Glasgow City Council policy, complementary minority schools do not have the opportunity to use mainstream school rooms free-of-charge, and must instead pay rent. RCS Haven was very active in its fundraising, which helped it to achieve grant support not only for educational needs but also for the social integration of migrant communities into Scotland, to expand cultural heritage activities, and for some transnational activities. The centre has been supported by funding at both the UK and Scottish levels15 from bodies such as Children in Need, The Robertson Trust, RBS, Families Community Awards, and also by international funds such as

15 Full information about grants received can be found on the charity website www.rcshaven.org.uk in the section ‘partners and sponsors’ [Accessed 23.09.2016]
Multilingual Awards and Russkiy Mir. The Russian school community in Glasgow is involved in a wide range of activities organised by RCS Haven. However, the high rents charged for classrooms exert added pressure on the school’s operation, and make the Russian school more active in searching for additional resources.

The founders of Slovo in Aberdeen spoke at length about their reasons for creating the school, highlighting the enthusiasm of parents with small children. The school was created by people working at Aberdeen University who not only had knowledge of teaching, but were also very well integrated into local society, and who employed their own local social resources to create the school. As Inna, one of the founders of the Russian school in Aberdeen, said:

When we were opening our Russian school, I asked my friends from Aberdeen University, and they gave me a lot of very valuable suggestions and helped to find premises. (Inna, teacher, Aberdeen)

Aberdeen City Council does not provide any support for Slovo, and the school also has to pay rent for classroom facilities. The centre is also dynamic in its fundraising activities, which are mainly oriented towards transnational aspects of the school’s events. They have received support from Russkiy Mir, and Awards for All Scotland for their promotion of Russian culture.

The Dundee Russian School was created by the activities of small groups of parents who wanted to teach their children Russian, as was explained by several of the parents during their interviews. The main driver behind the creation of the school was their director, who contacted “Russian Edinburgh” for assistance in setting up the school. The Russian-speaking community in Dundee is smaller than that in the other three cities. The cooperation with other Russian schools in Scotland has helped the Dundee Russian School to develop and join a wider range of activities.

We were created with the help of the Russian school in Edinburgh and continue to cooperate with others. We are quite small but together with the Russian school in

---

16 In June 2007, President Putin signed a decree establishing the Russkiy Mir Foundation, for the purpose of “promoting the Russian language, as Russia’s national heritage and a significant aspect of Russian and world culture, and supporting Russian language teaching programs abroad.” http://russkiymir.ru/en/fund/index.php [Accessed 14.09.2015]

17 Information about grants was found online at: http://slovo.org.uk/scotland-collaboration-project [Accessed 23.09.2016]
Aberdeen applied to Russkiy Mir for organising conferences and children’s events and won. It is great to be together. (Irina, parent, Dundee)

According to information on the school’s website and Facebook, the school’s fundraising is well established, but mostly stems from Scottish organisations (Al-Maktoum College, Foundation Scotland).18

Support for Russian-speaking communities abroad from official Russian organisations began in 2007, when the President of the Russian Federation signed a Decree establishing the Russkiy Mir Foundation. The first step was to support Russian schools in neighbouring countries - Kazakhstan, Ukraine, the Baltic States, and other post-Soviet states. Then, support was extended to educational centres in Europe, in countries such as Germany, France and the UK. Large Russian international organisations such as the Russkiy Mir Foundation and Rossotrudnichestvo19 supported the work of Russian schools by partially financing the acquisition of textbooks, the payment of teachers’ salaries, and providing them with modern information sources about present day Russia.20 Vasilisa, who is a teacher at the Russian school in Edinburgh, mentioned that she used these materials for her lessons, and that the children liked them:

Very often I give children texts to read which I take from magazines including those which are provided by Russkiy Mir. There are stories about unusual people. They like very much to read texts about people who selflessly organise something. The priest in a small village who organised a club for children, difficult teenagers that children could relate to. Articles are discussing both big and small achievements in Russia. (Vasilisa, teacher, Edinburgh)

As was confirmed by the directors of the Russian schools who had received grants from Russkiy Mir Foundation, their reports to this fund, as required, provided descriptions of organised events and the numbers of participants, but do not include information about the content and the quality of Russian teaching. The Russkiy Mir Foundation has supported the Russian schools in Scotland as community builders rather than as educational centres required to meet a set standard of Russian teaching. The main objectives of official Russian

19 Rossotrudnichestvo is an autonomous Russian federal government agency under the jurisdiction of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It operates in Central Asia, Latin America, and Eastern Europe. This agency was created by President Dmitry Medvedev in 2008 with the aim of maintaining Russia's influence in the Commonwealth of Independent States, and to foster friendly ties for the advancement of Russia's political and economic interests in foreign states. http://gbr.rs.gov.ru/ [Access 14.09.2015]
organisations, as declared on their websites, were to help compatriots abroad and to expand the number of people learning Russian. As Byford has argued, ‘the involvement of the Russian state has proved itself a significant force in the UK field of Russian diasporic entrepreneurship and community-building’ (Byford, 2012: 733). However, despite applying for, and accepting, support from the Russkiy Mir Foundation, the Russian schools in Scotland have maintained their independence, separating Russian state support from the right to develop their own educational and cultural activities, as has been noted by Byford (2012) and Ryazanova-Clarke (2017).

As my findings show, the Russian schools’ development in Scotland has been a complex process, encompassing both formal/institutional and more informal/social aspects. In Scotland, the Russian schools are social institutions which have been created within the formal frameworks regulating Scottish charities, but also shaped by informal practices depending on the interests of stakeholders such as parents and teachers. The formal rules shape the management structure of the Russian schools, along with the volume of financial and social resources which can be used in heritage language preservation, creating an environment for social networking and transnational activities. However, the formal rules have a relatively small influence on the actual content of the educational process, which mostly depends on informal negotiations, as will be explored in the next section of this chapter.

3.1.2. Parents’ expectations and attitudes towards the Russian schools

Since the beginning of the Russian schools, parents have played a significant role in the construction of their everyday operations, by supporting the emergence of rules and social norms (Francis et al., 2010). The diversity of Russian-speaking parents’ backgrounds, described in Chapter 1, produced a wide range of attitudes towards the Russian schools. Some parents had great ambitions for their children's educational achievements, and wish to see the Russian schools as strong and serious educational centres providing a high level of educational standards. Other parents, in contrast, were simply happy that their children wanted to learn Russian, and attend the Russian school just for fun. This diversity of parents’ expectations towards the Russian schools increases the complexity of the schools’ operations, and the strategies they have adopted to develop approaches and activities which will be acceptable to, and appropriate for, the majority of their stakeholders.
Parents who were concerned about their children’s achievement of high level proficiency in the Russian language more often expected teaching styles and activities which reminded them of their own education. In the Russian school in Glasgow, I observed a conversation between parents. One of the members of this conversation said:

I consider that my child has to work more during a lesson, I do not like it if they simply play and watch cartoons. (Extract from field notes of observation, the Russian school in Glasgow, Lidiya)

Lidiya and her husband are Russians with a lengthy experience of migration, having arrived in Scotland after living in other countries. They both have University degrees from Russia. The husband works at Glasgow University, while Lidiya focuses all her energy on organising the child's development. She makes great demands not only of the Russian school, but also of her child's education in general.

During the discussion, another mother, Natalya, who has a Scottish husband and is raising her son in a mixed family where communication is generally in English, challenged Lidiya’s opinion:

For me, the most important thing is that he wanted to study, it is so difficult to force him to do it if it is something he doesn't want. I understand Lidiya, but if the programme is arranged as she suggests, I’m afraid that my son will find it difficult to study. I’m so glad that it’s possible to keep hold of my language [Russian] even just to some extent. (Extract from field notes of observation, the Russian school in Glasgow, Natalya)

The children of both these parents attended the same class, and their teacher mentioned that this caused some problems. I asked the directors of other Russian schools if they had experienced a similar situation, and if so, how they dealt with it. The majority answered that they tried to organise different groups of pupils to meet their educational needs and their parents’ demands. From my participant observation, it seems that the Russian schools with larger numbers of pupils managed the parents’ demands more successfully because children could be divided into several classes according to age, and knowledge of the language. For example, the Edinburgh Russian School manages ten groups of children. One child, who came to the Russian school in Scotland from a school in St. Petersburg, travels to Edinburgh from Glasgow because the Russian school in Glasgow does not offer appropriate classes for her age and her level of Russian. In Aberdeen and Dundee, the Russian schools have mixed pupil groups made up of similarly aged children, but with varying levels of understanding
of the Russian language; it is difficult to divide them into several classes due to the small number of children in attendance. If a class has a small number of children but wishes to divide them up according to needs or language knowledge, the school community will have to pay rent for additional rooms and new teachers. The Russian school in Glasgow took an intermediate position between the Russian schools in Edinburgh and Aberdeen, as it offers four classes according to the children’s age and level of knowledge, similar to the Edinburgh Russian school. Another three classes are united, mixed pupil groups like those in the Russian school in Aberdeen.

While the quality of education provided by the Russian schools plays a significant role in encouraging Russian-speaking families to attend them, the second factor mentioned by members of the Russian schools’ committees was parents’ involvement in school life. It seems that the longer-standing members of the school community more frequently perceive the Russian school as something created by them, akin to their own business:

> We did it all together. We organised this school for our children and for us. Anybody who would like to join can join. If we were not able to help our children to learn together, nobody would organise this school for us. (Alina, parent, Glasgow)

Alina is a parent whose child has attended the Russian school in Glasgow since 2008. She is the head of the parents’ committee, which is deeply involved in processes of financial decision-making and organising events at the school. Similar attitudes were expressed by a member of the parents’ committee at the Edinburgh school. Parents who are actively involved in school life tended to use words such as ‘we’ and ‘together’, and did not present their opinions as being in opposition to the opinions of the Russian teachers and directors. Some groups of Russian speakers shared both roles - parents and teachers - as well as helping to provide some special subjects such as music, drama, history, and art.

However, not all parents played equally active roles in the Russian school’s community life or perceived themselves as the Russian schools’ community members. During my interviews and observed conversations at these schools, some parents drew a clear line between themselves and the Russian schools. Lyuda’s opinion illustrated that position:

> We pay money, and the school has to provide an appropriate quality of teaching (Lyuda, parent, Edinburgh)
This family were newcomers to the Russian school; her son had started to attend recently at the time of the interview. Lyuda referred to her husband’s opinion: “he thinks that the £65 which we pay for the semester could be paid later when our child is older when the school is better able to teach rather than being about play”. It seems that she perceived the Russian school as a commercial service. In this case, she did not feel that she should undertake any obligations to the Russian school except for payment, and did not feel obliged to participate in non-educational school activities.

The parents’ motivations for sending their children to learn Russian in a complementary school and parents’ attitudes towards involvement in social networks are discussed in more detail in Chapters 4 and 5 respectively. In this subsection, I have argued that the wide range of parents’ demands on schools and their own readiness to be involved in school life to varying extents increases the complexity of construction of the Russian schools. The interests of parents who perceive themselves as community members in a social club met the opposite point of view, of parents whose positions are closer to that of consumers of educational services. The diversity of parents’ expectations towards the Russian schools creates new challenges for teachers, and may also coincide with, or contradict, their positions towards Russian education in Scotland, as is explored in the following subsection.

3.1.3. Teachers’ positions towards the learning process

In the absence of a formal equivalent to the Curriculum for Excellence,\(^1\) and without formal control over the educational process by governmental bodies, teachers’ knowledge of, and position in, complementary minority schools are crucial factors in their development (Creese, 2005). As has been suggested by previous studies (Wu, 2006; Cortazzim and Jin, 1996) complementary school teachers’ approaches to teaching, and the ways in which they implement their methods, are shaped by their own experiences and identities.

The structure of Russian-speaking communities living in Scottish cities is reflected not only in the numbers and variety of pupils in Russian schools, but also in the teams of teachers. The size and educational level of the Russian-speaking community in Edinburgh has created a situation where the number of people who would like to work as teachers, with the

---

\(^1\) The Curriculum for Excellence is the Scottish curricular framework for learning and teaching in state schools. The Russian schools operating in Scotland do not have special regulation from any Scottish educational authority.
appropriate skills and knowledge, is greater than the number of places and classes operated by the school. As a result, the Russian school in Edinburgh has a selection procedure for candidates who would like to become teachers there. By contrast, in Dundee, the number of such specialists is smaller, and it is therefore more difficult to find a highly qualified teacher, meaning the school committee invites parents to take on some of the school’s teaching positions.

According to my interviews with the directors of the four schools, they prefer to invite highly qualified people to teach, but many different factors influence the choice of teaching staff. Among the cross-section of teachers interviewed, there was considerable variety in experience and skill level. Two held formal diplomas for teaching Russian; two had language-oriented professional diplomas from UK universities; four had diplomas for teaching English language; one was a professional linguist; one a professional psychologist, one had a postgraduate degree in pedagogy, which is the Russian equivalent to PhD, and three teachers held Higher Diplomas from Russia - but without language specialisation (Appendix 1). Amongst these teachers, only one had work experience in both the Russian and Scottish mainstream education systems. The mix of educational backgrounds also influenced the teaching methods and materials in providing Russian language lessons for children in Scotland.

While parents influence the Russian schools’ life through their expectations and involvement, Russian teachers construct Russian schooling based on their vision of educational programmes. The majority of the interviewed teachers thought that the core of the Russian school model is a set of textbooks which structure the process of teaching, dealing with parents’ expectations. This subsection provides a brief description of the tools which help the teacher to construct the teaching process. In the Russian schools in Scotland, I found four types of textbooks: 1) classic textbooks approved by the Russian Ministry of Education for mainstream schools in the Russian Federation; 2) modern Russian textbooks published in Russia as additional materials for the classic textbooks; 3) textbooks for teaching Russian abroad; 4) Russian textbooks written by English authors for learning Russian as another language (RSOL).  

---

22 The last type of textbooks – Russian textbooks written by English authors to teach Russian as another language (RSOL) was less popular in the Russian schools because the number of pupils for whom Russian is not a native language was very small.
During my fieldwork, the textbook by Ramzaeva\textsuperscript{23} was one of the most popular and well-known in the Russian schools involved in my study. This book was approved by the Russian Ministry of Education for mainstream schools in Russia, and belongs to current mainstream teaching in the Russian Federation. It takes a traditional, structured approach to learning and teaching which contrasts with the Scottish curriculum for language learning. One of the teachers referred to her previous experience of teaching in schools in the Russian Federation:

\begin{quote}
I also use it [Ramzaeva], yes. It is good for me because I teach native Russian-speaking children. I don't take those who are absolutely without any knowledge about the Russian language. Not that I wouldn't take them, it's just somehow it turns out that only native Russian-speaking children come to my class. For this reason, I also use these textbooks. (Zoya, teacher, Aberdeen)
\end{quote}

As Zoya told me, half of her pupils had previously attended mainstream Russian schools before moving to Scotland, and were experienced in using similar textbooks. In this case, both the teacher and her pupils continued to work in a learning style similar to that maintained in Russia.

Another key factor, in addition to providing continuity of Russian teaching and learning, seemed to be the teachers’ tendency to refer to the Russian Federation educational system as the source of authority for the Russian-speaking community in Scotland. Some teachers argued that using textbooks from mainstream schools in Russia to teach children in Scotland is important for the complementary schools, and provides them with professional sources. As I was told by the Russian teacher in the oldest class in “Russian Edinburgh”:

\begin{quote}
Depending on the level of the pupils I take on, I can try to select the program which will suit most of the pupils. That means that when the pupil has reached that level, then they can join the group using that textbook… There is a system, a system of teaching Russian approved by the Russian Academy of Sciences. Professionals worked on it for years, and it is the basic system for teaching Russian at elementary schools. (Valentina, teacher, Edinburgh)
\end{quote}

It seems that Valentina considers the textbooks approved by the Russian Academy of Science as symbols of “a gold standard” of Russian education. Valentina’s position can be understood as connected with her previous experience of teaching Russian before arriving in Scotland; she is familiar with the educational programmes in Russia and possesses the experience necessary to adapt the textbook materials to the children’s needs. Nevertheless,

\textsuperscript{23}The first version of this book was published in 1987. At present, schools in Russia use the 17\textsuperscript{th} edition of this textbook.
this research found that teachers with no experience of teaching in the Russian educational system also sometimes use textbooks approved by the Russian Ministry of Education. In these cases, using this textbook plays a symbolic role in the interactions between teachers and parents. A young teacher with only a few months’ experience working in the Russian School in Glasgow said that: “Parents wanted the textbook, it looks more professional” (Anna, teacher, Glasgow). According to my participant observation in the school corridors, when communicating with parents Anna is slightly hesitant in her new role as a teacher. She is deferential to parents’ wishes in explaining her choice of textbook, and perhaps sees it as a way of gaining their confidence in her professional skills.

However, more traditional Russian textbooks written for mainstream schools in Russia are not adapted for Russian schools abroad. As some of the Russian teachers noted, the contents of these textbooks are based on the assumption that the readers know a wide range of facts, such as the names of native Russian birds, animals and plants, Russian fairy tales, and Russian geography. These issues are discussed in Chapter 6 in relation to the transnational elements of heritage language preservation. To take into consideration this gap between the children’s knowledge and the content of these books, Russian teachers in Scotland also tried to use other types of Russian textbooks, including modern textbooks published in Russia as complementary learning material for mainstream schools in the Russian Federation. The main idea of these textbooks is to create an innovative approach which takes into consideration the individual interests of pupils studying Russian. These books are less popular with Russian teachers in Scotland than the other types discussed above. Valentina used one of these textbooks as a complementary source to the main ones:

> Because we are oriented on the Russian school system, we use the Russian primary school textbooks: Ramzayeva and Akhremenkova's textbooks. The last one is the textbook for additional education. But, this textbook helped me in very many parameters and I use it for my senior classes in the Russian school here. We finished using the textbook of the Russian Language for the 7th class in Russian schools, written by Guneeva and Komissarova. (Valentina, teacher, Edinburgh)

Valentina has extensive experience of teaching Russian to children living abroad. As she said during her interview, she had friends who worked in mainstream schools in the Russian Federation. This connection helped her to stay informed about the wide range of more modern textbooks, including those used in non-governmental educational establishments in Russia. In contrast to the more traditional Russian textbooks approved by the Russian Ministry of Education for mainstream schools in Russia, these textbooks, advertised as
innovative in the Russian Federation, are less known to parents in Scotland. Consequently, the Russian teachers did not refer to parents’ opinions as a motivation for using these textbooks.

After the collapse of the USSR, a new type of textbooks - for teaching Russian abroad – were written and published by special publishing houses such as “Russian Language Courses” and Zlatoust Publishing House. These textbooks were positioned by the publishers as teaching materials for teaching Russian as the native language for children living outside Russia. As such, they are clearly labelled as separate from the mainstream Russian educational system. As was noted by the head teacher of the Russian school in Edinburgh, the representatives of these organisations came to the school to advertise their new textbooks:

But, I added to it (the classic textbook) using this textbook (for schools abroad) because it’s a good source of complementary material. It’s useful in a one off lesson. I usually use parts of it, not all the lessons; mostly those which are relevant to the subject of my lesson. (Viktoriya, teacher, Edinburgh)

These textbooks were often mentioned by teachers who were concerned about the problems of adapting ‘classic’ textbooks to the realities of Scotland.

While textbooks were often mentioned by the teachers when I asked them about the schools’ educational programmes, the Internet was also mentioned as allowing more flexibility and creativity in teaching Russian in Scotland. The main arguments which teachers gave for using Internet resources in their lesson preparations were to increase children’s motivation to study, and to have more fun while learning. As a teacher from Aberdeen noted: “I began to look on the Internet for some things more interesting for children than examples from textbooks to prepare my lessons” (Evgeniya, teacher, Aberdeen). The Internet was also mentioned as an additional source with which to complement traditional textbooks: “I use Ramzayeva's textbook as a basis, and all the rest has been from the Internet” (Lada, teacher, Dundee). In general teachers with fewer qualifications and shorter experience in teaching children Russian mentioned the Internet more often. According to participant observation,

24 The publishing house “Russian Language. Courses” was established in 1993, succeeding the former Soviet publishing house “Russkii Yazyk”. It specialises in publishing teaching aids for those who study Russian as a foreign language. “We offer a great variety of textbooks and readers, books on history and culture, as well as manuals on the methods of teaching Russian as a foreign language” [Accessed 25.09.2016]. Zlatoust Publishing House has specialised in the field of Russian language for foreigners for 20 years. [Accessed 25.09.2016].
Internet material was also used more often in classes where there was a higher diversity in the children’s knowledge, and where the teachers therefore used a differentiated approach to teaching.

The Russian teachers, like the Russian-speaking parents, have diverse professional backgrounds, meaning that they offer a broad range of methods of teaching Russian in Scotland, from strictly following the rules of the Russian Education system to flexible approaches which are created more independently. However, the everyday practices of the Russian schools tend to be a dynamic process constructed via interactions between all the members of the Russian school community.

3.1.4. Relationships in the Russian school community

The parents were the main drivers in the establishment of the Russian schools, because their decisions to educate their children in these schools was the key factor in the initiation of Russian schooling in Scotland. However, further down the line, their involvement in the Russian schools has become more complicated and dependent on various relationships. It could be argued that the make-up of relationships in the Russian schools significantly affects the process of teaching and learning.

The parents’ involvement in school life was noted as a major factor in a child’s progress in all four Russian schools. This involvement might be as small as an informal chat with a teacher, or as formal as membership of a parents’ council. Parents’ councils had been founded in all four observed schools, but the range of their functions was quite varied - from organising lunch venues and supporting discipline in school corridors, to full involvement in debates about the teaching programmes. According to the directors of the Russian schools, the everyday learning routine is usually managed by interpersonal communication between teachers and parents. Parents’ councils participate more in organising school events and wider activities.

The majority of the teachers who answered questions about the principles underpinning their teaching methods pointed out that they took parents’ wishes and suggestions into consideration. However, the extent to which they did so varied according to the specific interpersonal relations between teachers and parents at their school. Thus, one of the teachers at the Russian school in Glasgow said: “I am ready to listen to the parents’ wishes; together
we will think something up” (Vera, teacher, Glasgow). Vera did not possess a Russian teaching qualification, and took the opportunity to become a teacher at the Russian school when her daughter moved up to a more senior class. Vera had only worked in the Russian school for one year, and did not feel very confident at the time of the research. Her flexible position was probably also linked to some Russian teachers’ common belief that mothers can perform better as teachers of their preschool aged children than professionals. One Edinburgh teacher argued that: “mothers know their children at this age better and can create a successful partnership with the Russian school” (Veronika, teacher, Edinburgh).

Another strategy, where the teachers were taking parents’ advice and recommendations into consideration but continuing to follow their own understanding of the teaching process, could also be found in the Russian schools. For example, Antonina, who was a teacher of one of the most senior classes in Glasgow, said:

Yes, I attentively listen to the parents’ wishes. I invite them to contact me after my lessons. However, I am a professional teacher who is responsible for teaching the children, so I shape the program itself (Antonina, teacher, Glasgow).

During her (relatively lengthy) interview, Antonina repeatedly highlighted the priority of her own decisions in teaching choices over parents’ suggestions. She truly believed that parents should trust a teacher as a professional, and should not question her routine work. Interviews with parents from her class showed that the majority of them understood and highly appreciated her position. Antonina has long experience of working with children in Russia, and has held a special management position in the Russian school. In 2012-2014 she was an SQA Coordinator in the Russian school in Glasgow, during a period when this school organised and held the Russian Higher exam. Antonina’s connections with two educational systems had helped her to develop her approach to teaching Russian to Scottish children. Both of the present examples (Veronika and Antonina) demonstrate the complexity of power distribution in the relationship between parents and teachers (Kenner, 2010) which can be impacted by a broad range of factors. However, in all four Russian schools, as pointed out by the directors, parents and teachers who participated in my interviews, the formal hierarchy was less important and influential in the decision-making process than the informal relationships with parents and the personal reputation of a particular teacher.

Another type of relationship which is crucial to the operations of the Russian schools is the relationships between the children attending them. As has been noted by Wang (2008), one of the major factors in opening complementary schools was the creation of a friendly
environment while also dealing with the educational needs of migrant children. The parents expect from the Russian schools not only a higher level of educational quality than would be possible in learning language at home, but also some opportunities for their children to socialise with other children of similar ages and interests. For example, Kseniya, who is mother to a four-year-old boy, explained that:

…our problem is that we do not have boys (in the class) with whom he can play. One time he attended a class where there were only girls, but he was upset and always complained. (Kseniya, parent, Dundee)

The Russian school in Dundee is quite small, and at the time of the research it did not have other boys of similar age and levels of Russian to Ksenia’s son, a situation which appeared to have had an impact on the child, who wanted to play with other boys.

The problem is therefore not only in the number of pupils, but in establishing good relationships between the children, a factor which was also mentioned by teachers and parents in all four Russian schools as one of the major elements in establishing the motivation to study the Russian language and progress in it. As one of the longest serving teachers in the Russian school in Edinburgh told me:

At present, the atmosphere in the class is very positive, as boys and girls politely communicate with each other. It is very important that we do not have the problems with personal communication that were happening before, when I started to teach this class. When the atmosphere in class is good for the children, they will want to come to the Russian school. They will want to communicate in Russian. [Now], it is comfortable for them. They like to attend my lessons. (Valentina, teacher, Edinburgh)

During the interview, she touched on an interesting issue regarding changing the relationships between children by creating a distinctive learning environment with special types of social norms and behaviour. Valentina told a story about how she had changed the children’s attitudes towards the relationships in her classroom, and tried to make them more friendly:

It is very important to involve children in a special culture of communication. At the beginning of my teaching, I felt uncomfortable due to the pupils’ behaviour and their relations to each other, which was not at all nice and courteous. Now, the situation has changed. All the pupils greet each other and say goodbye. Their relations have also changed and become very friendly. On 8 March (International Women’s Day, which is widely celebrated in Russia) the boys gave a rose to each girl. The boys brought the flowers in advance and the girls received a lot of attention and gifts. They felt like little
princesses. It is an educational moment for boys to behave as men respecting women. (Valentina, teacher, Edinburgh)

Valentina thus implemented some Russian traditions, such as the celebration of International Women’s Day, to improve the relationships between the children in her class. As noted by Leeman (2015), it helps to create solidarity between pupils as learners of as heritage language in the classroom. To do that, Valentina used culturally specific ideas such as the building of proper relationships between boys and girls in a Russian-speaking environment.

Relationships as a clue to community life and the operation of ethnic minority schools have been explored by many authors (Hernández, 2010; Kopeliovich, 2010; Gardner, 2012). On the one hand, a large community can provide its members with a wide range of resources for the ethnic minority school (Chen, 2007; Schüpbach, 2009). On the other hand, a smaller group is more likely to support closer and more informal relationships (Galasinska, 2010). For example, in the Russian School in Edinburgh, the teachers do not know all their colleagues. Teachers’ meetings are organised annually, or semi-annually. In Dundee the situation is the opposite; all the teachers know each other and can discuss school problems on any given day without formal meetings. It seems that when the number of pupils and teachers grows, the school community tends to become less integrated, and the process of negotiation in everyday school life becomes more complicated and requires the establishment of formal rules.

During the process of negotiation between all the stakeholders involved in the schools’ lives, the Russian schools produced an informal agreement and common practices which have served as the basis for merging the interests of the majority of their participants. The next section of the chapter discusses the ways in which the different informal agreements found in the Russian schools were implemented in school practices.

3.2. Educational practices: implementation of different approaches

The Russian schools in Scotland are free to create their own educational programmes, as many other complementary schools in Scotland do (Issa & Williams, 2009). Approaches to teaching heritage language cannot be standardised, because every community is different, with diverse needs which are supported by heritage language learning and teaching (Kagan & Dillon, 2008: 151). As was discussed in the previous section, Russian-speaking parents
and teachers have a wide range of viewpoints on the operation of, and learning provided within, Russian schools. These are implemented differently, not only across the four Russian schools in Scotland which form the study area in this research, but also across different classes in the same school.

Upon embarking on the following discussion, an explanation of its scope is necessary. The discussion refers to parents’ and teachers’ assumptions about educational systems in different countries rather than actual educational systems. Russian migrant parents appear to feel nostalgia about schools in Russia or the former USSR, and the school rules in their childhoods. The majority of them were not, however, familiar with the current school situation in Russia or other former Soviet states, as I gathered from their interviews. One respondent had maintained strong contact with the current mainstream schooling system of the Russian Federation, and appeared accurate in her understanding and evaluation of both the Russian and the Scottish systems. This was in stark contrast to people for whom a Russian school was part of their own childhood memories. In addition, according to participant observations, some parents were not fully aware of how the Scottish school system works. My findings show that several approaches employed in Russian schools were implemented by different teachers, who brought some elements of Scottish or Russian educational practices, in different extents and combinations, into their teaching.

3.2.1. Traditional approaches to teaching Russian as native language

The nostalgic mood of Russian-speaking parents when recalling Russian education and teachers’ knowledge of, teaching experience, and qualifications in, the USSR or their country of origin, can create distinct attitudes to Russian learning. I use the term ‘traditional’ here due to parents’ references to their childhood and common perceptions about Russian learning. It seems from the interviews that some parents and teachers honestly believed that the Russian educational system has some advantages over the Scottish system, and the parents attending Russian schools expressed these preferences. They appraise the Russian educational system very highly, and wish to see some of its methods utilised in Russian schools in Scotland:

The parents encouraged their children to attend the Russian schools because the status of Russian education is still great, and parents remember that children in the USSR were well taught. (Valentina, teacher, Edinburgh)
Valentina’s opinion about parents’ motivations matches her ‘traditional’ approach to teaching Russian in Scotland, which was described above in the discussion of the textbooks employed in Russian lessons in the Russian schools in Scotland.

Some reference to the Russian teaching tradition could be found by observing Valentina’s work in the classroom. For example, she entered the class and welcomed the children, who subsequently stood up at her entrance. When asking questions, the children used her patronymic name (the politest form by which to address a teacher in a Russian school). She paid a relatively high level of attention to discipline during the lesson by comparison with other teachers in the Russian schools. Pupils in her class had to raise their hand before answering a question. The amount of individual work for pupils visibly outweighed team activities. During the lesson, Valentina preferred to use printed posters containing grammatical rules which were very similar to the visual material that reminded parents of their own school childhood. The style of these posters is strongly formal and, in her opinion, highlights the serious intentions of the educational process.

The parents from her class appreciated this style of teaching, and highlighted the importance of serious, professional teaching, which they associated with the ability of the Russian teachers to provide Russian language lessons in a ‘traditional’ style. The child mentioned above who travelled from Glasgow to Edinburgh for Russian lessons every Saturday attended Valentina’s class. The mother of this child believed that this quality of education definitely met the educational needs of her child, who had arrived recently from Russia and had experience in studying Russian in a mainstream school in the Russian Federation. Another mother whose child attended Valentina’s class had left Russia about ten years previously, and had had the experience of living in the USA, where her son had also attended a Russian school. In her opinion, the Russian school in Edinburgh provided “serious education, professional teaching and programme, and it did not look like a small community supported by the church, as it was in the USA” (Valeriya, parent, Edinburgh).

Parents’ demands for traditional styles of teaching more often emerged in migrant families whose children had previously attended mainstream schools or nurseries in Russia, or in other post-Soviet countries before their arrival in Scotland. For example, Kseniya is originally from Latvia, and she arrived in Scotland with her Russian husband. Their child attended a Russian kindergarten in Latvia, and arrived in Scotland with some knowledge of the Russian language. Her beliefs in the advantages of the Russian educational system are
based on an assumption about the level of knowledge that children should have at particular ages. For example, highlighting the advantages of the Russian school, she said:

Parents cannot understand why pupils in P4 do not know what we knew at this age. Maybe they don't want their children just to be equal to them, but think that if they knew something at the age of eight, then their children should know more, not less. (Kseniya, parent, Aberdeen)

Kseniya did not have any actual information about modern mainstream schools in Russia. Her assumptions about traditional Russian education seem to be based on her childhood memories, and a nostalgic reconstruction of schools in the USSR (Byford, 2009).

According to my observations in the classrooms, teachers who preferred to follow traditional styles of teaching actively employed textbooks and other teaching materials provided by the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation. Such a traditional style of teaching is based on the perceptions of some parents and teachers who prefer to identify their pupils as native speakers of the Russian language. This approach has a wide range of implications, which both influence the creation of educational plans for the Russian schools, and support some of the cultural expectations which are shared between members of the Russian-speaking community. The Russian symbols which have been implemented into the teaching process have helped school communities to highlight their ‘Russianness’, a phenomenon which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4 in relation to families’ motivation to educate their children in Russian. Comparisons of the interviews carried out at the same Russian school show that the traditional approach is not adopted by the Russian schools as a whole organisation across every class; rather, it is the individual result of negotiations between teachers and parents from a particular class. However, the more the parents and teachers supported ideas about the values and benefits of the traditional style, the more likely it was that this style would be accepted by newcomers as a part of the image of the Russian school.

3.2.2. Employing pedagogical approaches from the mainstream Scottish education system in teaching Russian

Teachers’ and parents’ beliefs in the advantages of traditional Russian education sometimes conflict with children’s attitudes towards these educational traditions. The children attending the Russian schools are deeply immersed in the Scottish educational system, which is closer to them due to the everyday schooling practices they are used to, especially in the case of children who were born in Scotland and thus lacked any experience of attending another
type of school. Parents and teachers who did not support the idea that the Russian school in Scotland should reproduce the traditional Russian style of teaching argue that their children cannot be recognised as native Russian-speakers. In their opinion, Scottish Russian-speaking children have a completely different language environment than children living in Russia, meaning that they should be taught differently in Scotland.

A teacher from Glasgow noted that some children have difficulties learning Russian, so she did not want to complicate matters further by implementing a formal style or emphasising discipline:

I see how children become more active when they meet something which they are familiar with. On the other hand, they can refuse to participate in some Russian learning activities if they find them too different from their own everyday mainstream school routine. (Anzhelika, teacher, Glasgow)

Anzhelika has a very good level of experience with children in Scotland, is well educated and - from my participant observation in her class - uses many methods similar to those applied in Scottish preschool groups, but with Russian content. Having come to her class, children have to find a card with their name on it, and turn it. They sing Russian songs that are similar to English nursery rhymes; for example, a popular song about different parts of the body, to which children point when they sing. During the lessons, they can freely rise and move around the class, and the teacher prefers to give them group tasks, awarding asterisks and stickers for correct answers. Pupils do not bring textbooks to lessons because they use printed materials that are handed out by the teacher for their homework, so the children are familiar with the educational practices used in this Russian class because they use the kind of pedagogy that they experience in Scottish nursery/early years’ classrooms.

Translating English material into Russian while keeping the same education routine is possible if the teacher has some knowledge of the Scottish educational system. However, it is quite a demanding task for the Russian school to find Russian native teachers with specific Scottish school/educational qualifications and/or a deep understanding of the Scottish education system.

After participant observation, I spoke to some of the mothers whose children attended this class, and asked them about the teaching. The majority of the mothers were satisfied, particularly highlighting its simplicity for the children.
My daughter started school (Scottish mainstream school) this year. We were very worried about how she would manage in two schools. But, our teacher helps the children a lot. It is quite useful for both schools. (Alla, parent, Glasgow)

During the interview, Alla did not refer to traditional Russian education at all. She was more worried about the successful integration of her daughter into the mainstream school environment. From her point of view, the lack of contradiction between the teaching in the mainstream and complementary schools was more important to her family than the speed and accuracy with which her daughter learns Russian. This coinciding of interests between teachers and parents regarding a specific approach to teaching Russian leads to reducing the components of the Russian educational traditions. It also may have some impact on the cohesion of the Russian-speaking community by dividing Russian-speaking parents into two opposite groups: those who prefer the traditional Russian, or more Scottish oriented styles of teaching. To avoid this contradiction, some Russian teachers try to create a hybrid approach, which is discussed below.

3.2.3. Hybrid approach: deal with the complex identity of heritage learners

Both approaches – the traditional Russian and more Scottish-oriented, are based on different perceptions about children in the Russian schools, and about whether or not they should be treated as native Russian-speakers. A similar point was discussed by Garcia (2005), who showed that heritage learners have special language knowledge and identities which are closely related to the heritage-speaking community life. The Russian schools tried to avoid these difficult questions about identity, preferring to use the term ‘bilingual education’. This use of the term ‘bilingual education’ immediately raised many questions for me, given the wide academic debate about what a proper bilingual education means. However, I have not sought to explore bilingual education as a special educational field in my research (Hoffmann, 1991). Rather, following Garcia (2005), who implemented the term ‘bilingual heritage education’, I explore how the Russian schools in Scotland deal with the complex identity of their community members and try to find a balance between the preservation of Russian heritage and integration into Scottish local educational routines.

From this point of view, I prefer to use the term ‘hybrid educational approach’ to describe the opinions of the parents and teachers who mentioned both the Russian and Scottish
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systems during their discussion of their children’s Russian language learning. For example, Veronika, the Russian teacher from Edinburgh, noted that:

I like the discipline and systematic approach in the Russian school and the creativity in the Scottish tradition. I would like to use them both. (Veronika, teacher, Edinburgh)

During her lessons, Veronika used Zaytsev’s cubes (a modern technique of learning to read, which is seen as a Russian educational innovation). At the same time, she paid more attention to different educational games, such as Rainbow games, that contain both Russian and English versions. During lessons, many videos and posters including those in English were used, but all the discussions took place in Russian. Veronika did not have any experience of teaching in Scottish schools, but she knew about Scottish mainstream school education, being a mother of two children who was actively involved in the mainstream school attended by her children.

However, the effective integration of key features of the Scottish and Russian educational systems generally requires special teaching materials and teaching knowledge. According to Protassova (2008), one of the leading experts in teaching Russian as heritage language whom I met in Edinburgh in 2014, the numbers of professional linguists possessing this knowledge is quite small. Understanding of the necessity for a teacher in heritage language to obtain specialised knowledge and skills has only developed quite recently (Kagan & Dillon, 2001, Protassova, 2008). The idea is that an official teaching qualification obtained outside the host country (in Russia, or other post-Soviet countries) quite a long time ago is not enough to teach children in the Russian schools in Scotland. A similar suggestion was made by Vasilisa, a teacher from the Russian school in Edinburgh:

I would like to suggest that teachers pass a professional development course. Now there are online courses, distance learning. There is an opportunity to receive the certificate; it is necessary, and it is very useful for them. (Vasilisa, teacher, Edinburgh)

28 Vasilisa mentioned a course organised by the Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, a Russian organisation which provides support for Russian schools working abroad. The participants on this programme had the opportunity to participate in online lessons, and obtained a certificate at the end of the programme. http://pushkin.institute/en/about/ [Accessed 15.12.2017]
Vasilisa is a professional psychologist who previously worked as an editor for a journal in Russia, and taught Russian stylistics to journalists in Russia before arriving in Scotland. She published her own textbook on learning Russian abroad. During her interview, she regretted that “the group of people who understand that the Russian language tuition abroad very often requires special, more flexible approaches is quite small”. Her opinion coincided with part of the closing statement at the conference for Russian teachers abroad organised in London by the ‘Znanie’ Russian school in 2010:

Russian schools abroad really need more specific professional help from different organisations which reflects the complexity of these schools’ tasks and challenges. (Conference Resolution, London 2010)

Most of the Russian teachers with whom I spoke agreed that there was a necessity to have additional training. However, as with other complementary schools (Conteh et al., 2007), there is a lack of training resources available to Russian teachers in Scotland. The teachers I interviewed complained about a lack of time, because some of them work during the week, and not only in the educational sector. Other respondents expressed regret that most of the available training is provided in London.

The hybrid way of teaching Russian found in Scotland tends to be more strongly connected with the transnational activities of the Russian schools, which are explored in detail in Chapter 6. This approach requires professional teachers with a reasonable level of awareness of both the Russian and Scottish systems. The educational approaches offered by the Russian schools in Scotland to parents not only have their own educational peculiarities, but also cultural varieties based on different parents’ and teachers’ attitudes towards heritage language preservation. The Russian schools offered parents some forms of more ‘traditional’ Russian teaching in Scotland, but the schools also tried to be as flexible as possible in meeting the parents’ expectations, which are often complex and dynamic, as the next chapter explores further.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided an overview of the context of the research findings by describing the four schools which constituted the fieldwork sites where the data was obtained. The Russian schools in Scotland have been created in a period characterised by weak financial governmental support to complementary schools, but also by active socio-cultural politics
promoting cultural diversity in the country. The Russian schools have emerged from parent-led volunteer initiatives with support from various local organisations. In general, the formal structures of the schools were influenced by Scottish organisations such as the Scottish Charity Regulator, City Councils, and/or funding organisations. The international organisations which support Russian learning abroad appeared later and had a relatively small impact on the development of the Russian schools in Scotland.

Since the creation of the Russian schools in Scotland, the parents have remained the key drivers and decision-makers in the schools’ development, as well as being paying customers for these services. Starting from a small group united by a common idea, the parents have since grown to become a diverse social group with a wide spectrum of interests concerning Russian schooling in Scotland. The perceptions of Russian schools expressed in the data gathering varied from that of a strong educational centre based on solid formal educational plans, to an informal social club providing a space for a wide range of social interactions. The differences in these perceptions influence the nature of parents’ interactions with the Russian schools. So, parents act as consumers of educational services, or as community participants involved in different social interactions. These positions tend to have a dynamic nature, and can change according to changing circumstances. The whole spectrum of parents’ motivations is explored in the next section, but this chapter has introduced the variety of parents’ visions. This discussion is related to the interconnections between parents and the Russian schools, and is continued in Chapter 5, which is devoted to the topic of social networking in the Russian-speaking community.

The variety found among parents’ perceptions was complemented by the diversity among the Russian teachers who also had various qualifications, teaching experience, and capacity to be involved in heritage language preservation. The teachers’ positions towards the Russian teaching in the Russian schools in Scotland influenced their choice of educational plans and textbooks, as well as other teaching materials.

The Russian schools try to be as flexible as possible in dealing with the different opinions of their members. Teachers and parents agreed that good relationships between everyone involved in heritage language learning could influence the learning process and increase families’ motivation to attend the Russian schools. However, routine interactions between parents and teachers were flexible, and mostly depended on the reputation and authority of individual teachers or parent groups. In community-based schools where attendance is not
compulsory as it is in mainstream schools, positive relationships between children also played a significant role in those children’s motivation to study Russian and willingness to be a part of Russian-speaking community.

The teaching approaches realised in the Russian schools tend to be the subject of processes of negotiation between parents and teachers. Both sides try to shape the teaching process according to their own beliefs, attitudes to, and evaluations of, the Russian and Scottish educational systems. Negotiations between parents and teachers produced a variety of approaches to teaching Russian which could be observed in the Russian schools in Scotland, including the traditional Russian teaching style; attempts to employ the advantages of the Scottish system of teaching Russian, and hybrid approaches. The traditional Russian style is mostly based on nostalgia, and the belief of some Russian-speakers in the advantages of the Russian educational system, a matter which is explored in more detail in Chapter 4. It seems that these people want to reconstruct a ‘proper’ Russian school in Scotland for native Russian-speaking children. The other approaches represent the opposite positions, based on the assumption that Russian-speaking children living in Scotland are different from native Russian-speaking children living in Russia, meaning that there is a need for teaching practices adapted from Scottish mainstream schools. The hybrid approach tries to soften the identity questions of native or non-native Russian learners through offering the concept of ‘being bilingual’. The discussion of the operations of the Russian schools creates potential for the further investigation of parents’ motivation in encouraging their children to learn Russian in Scotland, as represented in the next chapter.
Chapter 4. Parents’ Motivations for Encouraging Their Children to Learn Russian in Scotland

While the previous chapter explored key aspects shaping the operation of the Russian schools in Scotland, this chapter moves on to investigate parents’ motivations for sending their children to the Russian language Saturday schools in order to learn Russian. The motivation for heritage language preservation has been explored by a number of previous researchers as a way of understanding the everyday practices of migrant communities in different countries (Salmenhaara, 2008; Higgins, 2009; Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2011). These authors have argued that heritage languages tend to be at the core of community identity, and key tools for personal and group transnational activities. Special attention has been paid to the personal or societal factors influencing family decisions (Wei, 2008). Research into personal factors has focused primarily on the different practices in the home which support heritage language education (Kenner, 2010; Conteh et al., 2007; Bayley & Schecter, 2003). By contrast, societal factors are mainly connected with the educational policies and practices in mainstream schools, along with public attitudes to cultural educational diversity in the host countries (Pauwels, 2005; Ceginskas, 2010).

My research has shown that families have complex motivations for teaching their children the Russian language, both at home and in the Russian Saturday schools. This chapter is structured to reflect the themes emerging from my empirical data, and can be compared in parts to findings in the wider literature (Kloss, 1966; Clyne 1991; Kipp, Clyne and Pauwels, 1995). The discussion starts by exploring parents’ beliefs and attitudes concerning language use at home among family members, which can influence their decision to preserve the heritage language. Then, Russian as the ‘home’ language is discussed with regard to issues of everyday family communication and the transmission of social values from parents to children. The final part of this first section explores parents’ desire to connect their children with relatives living abroad who do not speak English, as a motivation for studying Russian. This motivation, to support socio-cultural connections with countries of origin, can also be analysed as part of a set of transnational practices and identities, and is discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

The next section of the chapter is dedicated to exploring parents’ motivations for teaching their children Russian as a means of employing this language in a wider context, not only within the family. The parents' arguments reflect several themes, including the values of
what they termed ‘bilingual education’, and the economic and cultural advantages that the parents believe knowledge of Russian will bring to their children. The final section of the chapter explores parents’ motivations for sending their children to the Russian schools in Scotland. The motivations for sending children to the Russian schools interrelate, but do not fully coincide with, the motivations for studying Russian in general.

4.1. Beliefs and attitudes concerning language use at home among family members

Motivations for heritage language preservation in migrant communities seem to be sensitive and emotionally driven, rather than based on logical reasoning about the benefits which could bring knowledge of mother tongue in host country. The dominant role of families in first language acquisition, has been explored in different types of studies such as socio-linguistic, educational and particularly migration studies (Higgins, 2009; Dailey-O’Cain&Liebscher, 2011). The choice of the first language for children strongly depends on the parents’ attitude towards the use of language at home, and communication between children and parents (Tuominen, 1999). As discussed in more detail below, my findings show that the majority of migrant families who make the decision to teach their children the heritage language, see it as a common sense decision, which needs no further discussion or explanation. This result aligns with the findings of several studies exploring heritage language preservation in other ethnic minority communities (Francis et al., 2010; 2009; Lu, 2001).

Families’ everyday practices of using the Russian language at home depend on a wide range of factors. These might include Russian-speaking parents’ attitudes towards Russian as a heritage language, different family structures, and differing degrees of contact with relatives living abroad. Bearing in mind the cultural and ethnic diversity of the Russian-speaking families in Scotland, I investigated how the Russian language as a part of everyday life functions as a tool for communication, a carrier of emotions, and a means by which to uphold certain cultural and social norms which are integrated into family life.

4.1.1. Parents’ attitudes towards the Russian language

As touched upon in Chapter 2, the families whose children attend the Russian schools in Scotland vary considerably in terms of their nationality, citizenship, and patterns of migration. Parents’ choices of language for their children tend to correlate with the parents’
self-identification. Parents can attach themselves to their Russian roots more strongly by self-identifying as Russian, or more softly and indirectly by referring to Russian as their first language.

Some families had migrated directly from their country of origin to Scotland, while others had wider experiences of living in different countries. Although most of the families attending the Russian schools had some Russian roots, self-identification within this group is very complex. The complexity of the relationship between Russian nationality and Russian citizenship, and overall Russian identity – both in the civic and the ethnic sense – was discussed in Chapter 1. During the interviews, only one respondent directly identified herself as Russian in terms of referring to her Russian nationality:

Firstly, I will never refuse my nationality: I am Russian. If I had left Russia when I was a small girl, maybe I wouldn't have had such a memory. (Ulyana, parent, Aberdeen)

In our long conversation, she referred to two characteristics of the Russian-speaking community around her, the age when people had arrived in Scotland, and their country of origin. Ulyana was about forty when we met. She was born in Russia, then migrated directly from Russia to Scotland. She believed that her age and her country of origin were the main reasons why she felt Russian, and that the Russian language was the natural way to educate her child. The quote above from Ulyana was her answer to my question of why she had decided to teach her child Russian and attend the Russian schools.

A similar opinion was expressed by Lyuda, who, like Ulyana, arrived in Scotland directly from Russia. She said: “The fact that I am Russian, and my child won't speak Russian, isn't right” (Lyuda, parent, Edinburgh). According to the social norms shared by Lyuda, Russian people should teach their children Russian without any specific explanation, just because it is ‘right’ to do so. Despite the fact that more than half of my interviewees were from Russia, I did not find many direct explanations from them regarding why they wanted to teach their children Russian; indeed, it seemed that they did not relate the language to their sense of identity. As has been noted by several authors (Francis et al., 2010; 2009; Lu, 2001), for parents like Ulyana and Lyuda, this decision is obvious, and therefore does not require further discussion in their families or with other people.
Parents born in the USSR who had lived in one of the newly independent states such as one of the Baltic States, Ukraine, or Kazakhstan after the Soviet Union collapsed, most often referred to themselves, or their partners, as Russian, after alluding to the complexities of describing their nationality. For example, in answering my questions about her motivation to teach her children Russian, Ekaterina described the Russian roots of her husband by referring to the complexity of Russian identification in Latvia:

My husband is also from Latvia, but he is Russian. Maybe you know that in Latvia there are many Russian people - about half the population. He was born in Latvia, but his father is from Southern Russia. (Ekaterina, parent, Aberdeen)

Ekaterina spoke Russian fluently, but during the interview she said: “Did you hear my Russian language? It is not a mother tongue for me”. Her attitude towards the Russian language brings us back to the discussion about complexity of the feeling of belonging and identity attached to heritage language (García, 2005). In Ekaterina’s story about her family’s roots, the Russian language can be considered as a heritage language for her children’s family as well. However, her attitude towards Russian is different from Lyuda’s and Ulyana’s, for whom Russian and their native language are the same.

Alisa, who is from Lithuania, also mentioned the complexity of identities amongst her family members and the long path of migration they had followed:

I am Lithuanian, from Lithuania. My husband was born in Russia - he's a Muscovite, but he lived for a long time in Israel. (Alisa, parent, Glasgow)

This quotation also demonstrates part of Alisa’s answer to my question about the reasons she had for deciding to teach her child Russian. It seemed obvious to her that if she and her husband speak Russian, their child should be able to do so too.

Some parents preferred to avoid declaring their identity or nationality, instead referring to Russian as “our first (perviy) language” (Darya, parent, Aberdeen). Similar arguments can be found in Kseniya’s answer to my question about why she had decided to teach her child Russian. She told me about the complexity of language use in her family, and the nationalities of her relatives, referring to Russian as the first language:

Ukrainian is the second language for me. I am from Kharkov, near the Russian border, where the majority of people speak Russian. My parents are Russian and arrived in
Ukraine. We all communicate in Russian. I learned Ukrainian at school, but for me, it is my second language. (Kseniya, parent, Dundee)

As revealed in Cheskin’s research about Russian-speaking identity (2012) in Latvia, the majority of Russian speakers do not accept the term ‘Russian-speakers’, more often identifying themselves as Russian (Russkii). Russian-speaking migrants living outside the former USSR use the word Russkii in a broad sense, to describe their ethnic belonging. The Russian language plays the key role of the core of identification of the Russian-speaking migrant community in Scotland, as in other countries (Morawska, 2005; Remennick, 2002).

Thus, the Russian language is a part of the heritage of Russian-speaking parents who wish to send their children to the Russian schools in Scotland. This heritage is deeply rooted in the history of their families, and was inherited from the nearest generation (fathers or mothers) or from a previous generation (grandfathers or grandmothers). The Russian language as part of the heritage of Russian-speaking people living in Scotland was formed in a wide range of countries, not just the Russian Federation, but also in the USSR and its successor republics. The diversity of this heritage has resulted in a complex range of motivations and reasons why Russian-speaking parents wish to teach their children the Russian language.

4.1.2. Building understanding between family members in Scotland

The Russian language plays several important roles in a migrant family’s life: it acts both as a tool for communication, and as a means of transmitting cultural values. In the first instance, parents prefer to describe their use of Russian at home as an easy way for all the family members to communicate. In the second instance, some parents express the belief that employing Russian at home can create a specific cultural environment which helps them to solve certain problems in their relationships with their children.

4.1.2.1. Russian as a tool for family communication

Languages are used and combined in a variety of ways among the families linked to this study: in some families both parents are native Russian speakers, while in others, one parent may be a native Russian speaker, while the other has learned Russian as a second language as a resident of one of the former Soviet Republics. In a third group of families, one partner is a native English speaker, with either very limited or no knowledge of Russian. Families
where both parents know Russian well generally prefer to speak Russian at home more often than families where one parent has a very limited knowledge of Russian, because it is easier for all family members who knew the language before migrating to Scotland. However, when referring to the simplicity of communication in Russian at home, the parents often revealed additional, more nuanced reasons for doing so:

We have been in Scotland for about two years. My husband and I arrived together, as he was transferred to Aberdeen from Tumen (in the Russian oil region). He is Russian, and came to Scotland due to a work contract. My son was only taught for half a year at school in Russia, while my daughter studied at school in Russia for around 3 years. (Zhanna, parent-teacher, Aberdeen)

In this family, both children obviously knew Russian before arriving in Scotland. For such families, the question about learning Russian has been naturally transformed into a question about the preservation of that knowledge after their arrival in Scotland. As Zhanna said during her interview, according to the father’s work contract, they would have to change their location, and perhaps even return to Russia. This uncertainty about the family’s future location brings with it an additional motivation to maintain their children’s ability to reintegrate into the Russian education system. They therefore continued to use Russian as their ‘home’ language in Scotland.

In another family where Russian was used as the main language and the simplest way to communicate at home, the explanation was differently nuanced:

Yes, at home we speak Russian, not Hebrew. Because for us it is easy, we all know Russian. (Darya, parent, Aberdeen)

This family arrived in Scotland from Israel with their child, who already knew both Russian and Hebrew. Darya and her husband had preserved Russian as the heritage language for their child after their migration from Russia to Israel. During the interview, Darya highlighted that her family has a long history of migration without long-term settlement in any country. When her family arrived in Scotland, the children quite quickly learned to speak English. However, at home, Darya’s family continued to speak Russian for family communication. She observed that: “we could move to a new country again, but Russian as a mother tongue helps us to understand each other regardless of where we live” (Darya, parent, Aberdeen).
The complex identifications of Russian-speakers in Scotland lead to variations in language use at home. In migrant families from the Baltic States, several languages could be used at home, with Russian as one of the ‘home’ languages:

Our family is interesting, at home we speak Russian and Latvian. (Ekaterina, parent, Aberdeen)

Lithuanian and Russian. I speak to my daughter in Lithuanian and to her dad in Russian. I speak to him in Russian very often. Or else, I speak in Lithuanian - because he knows Lithuanian very well - and he answers in Russian. (Alisa, parent, Glasgow)

In this case, employing Russian at home seems to reflect a multi-lingual reality within the family.

In families where only one parent knows Russian well, they more often prefer to speak English, or another language known to all the family members; for example, Spanish, Latvian or Italian. Using Russian when one parent does not understand it may cause conflict and misunderstanding. As one such mother, Lyuda, explained:

My husband took offence that we sat at the table and spoke only Russian. Or, is it necessary to translate each word? But, if we all know English, why, it is inconvenient. If we are together, we speak English. If I am alone with my child, we speak Russian, and he switches easily. (Lyuda, parent, Edinburgh)

Ulyana also chose to speak to her child in Russian when they were alone, to avoid family conflict. Her husband did not actively oppose the idea of their child learning Russian, but he was uncomfortable at being ‘left out’, and did not see it as being important in the way Ulyana does. For her, it was ‘unnatural’ to speak English if she did not have to do so with her son:

When my husband is at home, he does not like the fact that he can’t speak Russian. I felt that it was not comfortable for him when he did not understand what I said, if I switched to Russian. When he is not at home, I change my language. It is somehow unnatural for me to speak with my son in English if there is no need. (Ulyana, parent, Aberdeen)

Ulyana thus found a compromise in her family communication, but communicating in Russian with her child seems to be her natural preference.

The concept of language switching (Valdés, 2005; Pavlenko, 2008) explains how members of families in which multiple languages are spoken communicate with each other, creating
new types of everyday linguistic practices as they do so. In Scotland, communication in Russian between family members can help children to receive some sense of accepting Russian as their native language. As the next section explores, the involvement of children in this communication is important due to the role of heritage language preservation in establishing and maintaining family relationships (Pavlenko, 2005).

4.1.2.2. The Russian language in developing family relationships

Some of the parents involved in my study expressed the belief that using the Russian language at home helps them in being emotionally closer to their children. From their point of view, a family’s mutual understanding can be achieved through speaking Russian. These parents perceive the language as a carrier of shared cultural values (Byram, 2008; Kramsch, 2011) which can be passed to their children through learning Russian.

A number of parents who identified themselves as Russian perceived the Russian language as part of a culture which provides them with common ground within their family, and helps family members to understand each other. The fear of losing a common cultural background with their children can be a special motivation for families to teach their children Russian. As Darya mentioned:

Of course, it is probably an internal fear for parents that their children will forget their native language. The language in which they spoke when they were born; the language of their fathers and grandfathers. Perhaps it is some internal fear that here, in an altogether different culture, children will quickly absorb [other cultural values]. Perhaps there is a general thought that parents want to keep culture and language links with their children. As, of course, language bears culture. (Darya, parent, Aberdeen)

The loss of a sense of belonging to Russian culture may, in some way, be associated with the fear of losing a close relationship, based on a deep, mutual cultural understanding, with their children in the future.

According to some groups of parents, reading Russian books, watching Russian TV, and attending Russian theatre and musical performances also play an important role in establishing the notion of Russianness for children, in turn creating closer relations between family members:
What does Russian culture mean? I cannot explain to somebody what the cartoon ‘Nu pogodi’\(^{29}\) means, because it is only we who know. So, the communication we share is easier than with foreigners. (Darya, parent, Aberdeen)

There is a common assumption that culturally-based communication also extends the relationship between parents and children (Dewaele & van Oudenhoven, 2009; Faist, 2000; Francis et al., 2010). Parents who read Russian books together with their children more often so that they will share common knowledge derived from popular Russian fairy tales, believe that doing so can help them to achieve a better relationship in the future:

Yes, I want him to know the same fairy tales as I know, to read the same books which I have read, so that we understand each other. And why not? (Alina, parent, Glasgow)

According to my observation and her explanation, Alina did not have any difficulties with the English language. She can choose to speak with her son in Russian or in English. Her main concern was not about the language barriers between Russian parents (herself and her Russian husband) and her Scottish born son, but about the possibility of a lost opportunity of knowing “something important together to make them feel themselves Russian” (Alina, parent, Glasgow). It seems that from her point of view, sharing her interest in a wider Russian culture can help her family to develop a better mutual understanding.

Another mother, Alexandra, expressed her fears more directly: “I don’t like to lose my children, it’s as though they are becoming completely British people” (Alexandra, parent, Glasgow). Alexandra had lived in several different countries. She noticed that helping her son to learn Russian by reading books together with him gave her the confidence she needed to maintain a mutual understanding with her child. When we met, she mentioned her daughter. Keeping in mind her previous experience with her son, Alexandra told me how she had bought her daughter the Russian books which she had loved as a child:

When my daughter started to attend the mainstream Scottish school, she began to speak Scottish, to look Scottish, and to think like them. I felt that I had lost her, and that I should do something to prevent a gap from growing between us (the Russian-speaking parents) and her. (Alexandra, parent, Glasgow)

---

\(^{29}\) Nu pogodi is a cartoon which debuted in 1969, and was very popular in the USSR and Eastern block countries. The core of series was the comic adventures of Wolf and Hare, which have similarities with the cartoon characters Tom and Jerry in the west. However, the cartoon has a wide range of elements with symbolic meanings, such as references to popular music, and scenes referring to the Soviet culture and past.
Alexandra was afraid that a Scottish education was causing her daughter to become more distant from her, but hoped that by doing some Russian activities together, this could be prevented and that they would be brought closer together.

The majority of parents did not directly complain about the Scottish education system affecting their family relationships; however, during conversations in the school corridors, some of the parents noted with some regret that their children seemed to be overly independent, not taking into account their parents’ opinion or listening to their advice - especially during the teenage years. Problems in communication between parents and teenagers are, of course, well documented (Barnes & Olson, 1985; Konovalova, 2017; La Valley & Guerrero, 2012). However, some Russian-speaking parents complained that their teenage children did not like to listen to them due to the weakness of their parents’ English language proficiency. This finding reflects wider studies about first and second generation migrant families (Ryan et al., 2013; Levitt, 2009). In this case, different Russian learning activities - such as reading and discussing books together with their children – allow the parents to create quality family time in which they can show their children that even without speaking perfect English, they nevertheless know lots of new and interesting things. As such, in a conversation in the school corridor, one of the parents in Dundee pointed out that was she was very glad when her teenage son said: “Mum, I didn’t have a clue that you’re so clever!” (Diana, parent, Dundee) after discussing a book they had read together. Up until that point, her son had constantly rejected all her remarks on the subjects taught in his Scottish school. Another parent from the Glasgow school told the story of how her seven-year-old son had started learning Russian, then realised that “mum can speak Russian better than me”, immediately raising her son's opinion of her.

Parents find themselves in a conflicted situation, as they wish their children to integrate into their new way of life as quickly as possible, but at the same time, they do not want to lose touch with them. They believe that heritage language preservation can help them to overcome these barriers. At the same time, and as is discussed further below, through organising family activities related to the use of the Russian language, the parents can create a special social environment which can help them to feel more comfortable in Scotland, and which can support connections with Russian-speaking relatives and acquaintances living abroad.
4.1.3. Relationships with relatives who cannot speak English

A common motivation for learning Russian amongst parents in all the Russian schools included in my research was the wish to facilitate communication with relatives and friends who cannot speak English, and/or who remain in the home country (Boyd, 1989). Supporting relationships with extended family members living abroad seems to be a very important family value among the Russian-speaking community (Morawska, 2005). Russian-speaking families who maintain connections with their non-English relatives do so using a wide range of means, such as communication via Skype, by telephone, and by visiting their home countries during holidays. These types of activities were quite often used as a way of encouraging children to study Russian. For example, Lyuda, knowing about the good relationship between her son and his grandmother, referred to it as the main motivation for her child to study Russian:

My mother does not speak English. I say to my son: how can you speak to your grandmother, aunt and other relatives in Russia without knowing Russian? (Lyuda, parent, Edinburgh)

This was the reason she offered to her young son for continuing to learn Russian when he encountered some difficulties and wanted to stop studying it. His relationship with his grandmother was very important to him, so he continued to learn the language.

A popular explanation given by the Russian-speaking parents was that some of their relatives did not know English, and it was difficult for them to study it due to their age, or their place of residence:

I have many friends in Russia; his grandmother is there, and he has to talk to her. The grandmother speaks poor English. Now she is at such an old age that she also won't [be able to] learn English even if she wanted to. (Ulyana, parent, Aberdeen)

Ulyana visits Russia every summer for three or four weeks. In her opinion, although her son “considers himself half non-Russian” (his father is Scottish), he still likes to visit his grandparents and Russian friends, and to communicate with them in Russian.

Another parent from Dundee also stated that she wanted to help her children to speak Russian with their relatives, especially with their grandmothers:
Because my mother doesn't communicate in English, I want them (my children) to communicate with my family in Russian. (Kseniya, parent, Dundee)

Kseniya arrived from Ukraine and married a Scottish man several years ago. However, her relatives in Ukraine continue to use Russian as the main language of communication, so she would like to teach her children Russian to support this relationship.

Communication with Russian-speaking relatives can motivate not only Russian speaking, but also Russian writing activities. Written communication between children and relatives occurs very rarely, and is usually linked with special events, such as birthdays or New Year. Nevertheless, it does happen, and it has also helped parents to motivate their children to learn to write in Russian, a skill which is assumed to be harder than speaking Russian:

He has to get into the right frame of mind. He doesn’t really like it, of course, but if needs be, a card or a brief letter to his grandmother – it happens once or twice a year - he can do it. (Ulyana, parent, Aberdeen)

According to some of the parents, the motivation to study Russian to help communicate with relatives living abroad is quite effective, because children like to communicate with their relatives and friends; after studying Russian, this communication improves:

He has friends in Russia. I noticed that after studying Russian, here in Scotland, he felt more confident in Russia in speaking with others, and he really enjoyed it. He already knows Russian quite well. I won't say that it is very good, but it is enough to communicate and express his thoughts. He can talk in shops in Russia. He doesn’t hesitate; he has no language barriers. I have also become more confident. If a situation occurred where he needed Russian, I am sure he would be able to speak it. (Ulyana, parent, Aberdeen)

Her son’s ability to speak confidently with other Russian native speakers and express his opinion is valued by Ulyana, as it shows the results of learning Russian. Her son can chat with his relatives, and play with his friends when the family go back for holidays in Russia. In this case, nobody mentioned the level of his Russian language skills, the size of his Russian vocabulary, or the grammatical correctness of his Russian. Ulyana is certain that her efforts to encourage his communication with Russian-speaking people abroad can help her child to connect with the Russian-speaking world in general in the future.

The parents involved in my study expressed the belief that their transnational activities encourage their children to study the Russian language and to find Russian friends. A
knowledge of Russian also gave their children the opportunity to be involved in informal social networks which, according to their parents, could be beneficial in future. Despite the fact that families play the dominant role in heritage language acquisition, the success of their decisions in this process is highly dependent on the wider context in which the Russian language can be employed.

4.2. Values, practices and beliefs associated with language in a wider context

The use of the Russian language at home is a trigger for children in early heritage language development (Pauwels, 2005). However, the future use of this knowledge also depends on the image and reputation of the heritage language in a society. The more value a heritage language has in the host country, the better the chance that it will be transmitted to the next generation of migrants (Schmidt, 2001; Bayley & Schecter, 2003). Heritage language use outside the family circle depends on the language, and varies between countries (Kopnina, 2005; Morawska, 2004; Jasinskaia-Lahti, Horenczyk & Kinunen, 2011; Doomernik, 1997; Salmenhaara, 2008; Remennick, 2002). However, the prior research on parents' expectations regarding, and explanations to, their children of the benefits of knowing several languages is still quite limited in scope and extent.

The majority of the parents involved in my research said that they believed that knowing several languages is beneficial for children outside the family, and something which is highly valued around the world. The necessity of studying Russian was also mentioned by some parents in the context of world economics. The other reason for studying Russian which was pointed out by some parents during the interviews was the value of Russian culture across the world. By exploring these complex motivations, I investigated how parents envisaged a space for Russian language usage outside the family, and what kind of elements were most important to them.

4.2.1. Value of being bilingual

The beliefs of the Russian-speaking parents involved in my study that ‘good parents must provide bilingual development for their children’ could also be found in other studies about immigrant families’ attitudes towards heritage language preservation (Moin, Schwartz & Leikin; 2013: 115). In my study, some of the participating parents took a pragmatic view of studying two languages, which they explained to me in a variety of ways. These parents
emphasised that learning Russian in addition to English was their preferred approach, rather than making it their children’s mother tongue. In this case, Russian was an obvious choice for study, but was not prioritised for other cultural or personal reasons. Some parents could not explain why being bilingual was perceived as beneficial, and just referred to broad educational issues as a common assumption. For example, Lyuda said:

I think it is a big advantage for children to know several languages for their wider education. If children are taught a second language, it will, of course, be a plus. (Lyuda, parent, Edinburgh)

Lyuda did not explain the specific benefits of being bilingual. From observations, it seemed that contact with Russian relatives living abroad was more important to her. However, when discussing the attitudes of her Scottish husband (who cannot speak Russian) towards teaching their child in Russian, she mentioned that he did not have a cultural attachment to the Russian language. He was convinced by pragmatic arguments, which she agrees with.

This explanation in relation to non-Russian speaking partners was also found in an interview with Kseniya, who mentioned the advantages gained by bilingual children when describing her husband’s attitude towards educating their child in Russian:

My husband wants the child to study Russian because bilingual children are more developed, as different studies have shown. (Kseniya, parent, Dundee)

As described above in section 4.1.1., Kseniya perceived the Russian language as her first language. She believed that studying an additional language would be beneficial for her child, and this belief was shared by her husband.

When explaining the benefits of bilingualism, some parents referred to a belief that learning another language is seen as a desirable practice across the world:

I feel sorry for those people who don't support (their native) language. Around the world, people try to learn a second language. (Valeriya, parent, Edinburgh)

Valeriya is highly educated, and would also like to ensure that her children are very well-educated people. She assumed that a high level of education was a common value with a very broad social context, accepted by most people in different societies.
The mobile lifestyle and transnational movement from one country to another can also influence Russian-speaking parents’ attitudes towards studying several languages, including Russian. The Russian-speaking parents I spoke with had a wide range of migration histories. Some had migrated around several countries - not just from their country of origin to Scotland - and had experience of living in several different places, as discussed in Chapter 2. With reference to this rich migration experience, the parents pointed to the benefits of the knowledge of languages in the future:

I want the child to know (Russian). Even if he doesn't yet understand that it’s necessary for him, knowing some languages will actually be to his advantage in the future. (Darya, parent, Aberdeen)

Darya’s initial idea of teaching her children to speak Russian so that they can communicate with Russian-speaking friends and relatives was accompanied by a belief that any language can be seen as a form of future social capital. During her interview, she described her life in Israel and her attempts to keep speaking Russian with her child, who was born in Israel and knew Hebrew better than Russian having regularly attended a local kindergarten. Darya also talked with regret about the fact that her children were starting to forget Hebrew. This family has ample experience of living in different countries.

The image of an unstable future was brought up quite often in migrant discourse as they imagined inevitable unpredictable (and mostly negative) events. According to some of the parents’ beliefs, instability can be successfully overcome with educational knowledge, including bilingualism, as the following quote illustrates:

Now, as everything fails, everything is unstable. Money depreciates, real estate prices still haven’t returned to normal after the previous crisis, and already a new one is around the corner. It is probably worth putting your investment into yourself. (Extract from the field notes of a conversation overheard during an observation at the Russian school in Glasgow)

Having experienced difficult times due to migrating, and having to adapt to, and settle within, a new environment, the migrants in this study were especially sensitive to the issue of stability. Some of them said that finding a more stable and predictable way of life was one of the major reasons why they had moved to another country (see also Galasinska, 2009).
Some groups of parents viewed bilingual knowledge as integral to wider education and values. In this group, knowledge of a second language is recognised as an indicator of a high level of education, with the status of an asset:

How can I help my children to integrate better into this society? I can only offer them my help to know more, some additional languages. (Extract from the field notes of a conversation overheard during an observation at the Russian school in Dundee)

In short, the parents themselves feel responsible for helping their children to achieve a better education, by assisting them in learning an additional language.

The academic debate about the benefits for children of being bilingual has demonstrated a variety of possibilities, such as early cognitive development, successful performance throughout the educational process, multilingual communication, better employability, more cultural flexibility, and greater tolerance towards others (Grosjean, 2015; Harding-Esch & Riley, 2003; Sorace, 2012). According to Garcia (2008), some migrants who wish to pass on knowledge of their heritage language to their children highlighted the value of being bilingual to avoid marking their mother tongue merely as a language of the migrant community. The Russian-speaking parents who preferred to focus on the benefits of studying Russian emphasised that their native language can be helpful in the worldwide context, as the next section describes.

4.2.2. The Russian language in the global market

In my research, parents’ explanations of the benefits of knowing Russian to their children living in Scotland quite often started from their assumption of the role which the Russian language plays in global economic processes. The influence of a wider language context in parents’ decisions to support heritage language learning was discussed in Chapter 1 (Kopnina, 2005; Morawska, 2004; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Horenczyk & Kinunen, 2011; Doomernik, 1997; Salmenhaara, 2008; Remennick, 2002). As was discussed earlier, and in Chapter 1, Russian identity is not always linked with Russia as a state, but rather with a Russian-speaking space without clear borders.

The economic benefits of knowing Russian mostly related to parents’ expectations of a better job for their child. In discussing the motivation to study Russian for reasons of employment
in a wider context, the majority of the parents believed that knowing the language would be beneficial in future career development. As Irina mentioned:

They (children who studied Russian) have more options in finding work, maybe, something better. They have more chances to broaden their horizons and opportunities. (Irina, parent, Dundee)

Irina did not specify what kind of job would be more open to Russian/English-speaking children, but she believes that Russian can open up a wider sphere of choices to them. For some parents, wider horizons are defined by the number of Russian speakers in the world, which can be considered an important factor in a global market.\textsuperscript{30} As Ekaterina said:

Many people in the world speak Russian. Language will never hold a person back. (Ekaterina, parent, Aberdeen)

Ekaterina's family speaks three languages at home (Russian, Latvian and English), and for them Russian is also important because of its popularity in the world.

More specific references were made associating the usefulness of the Russian language in future work and careers directly to the Russian Federation’s labour market. Parents who referred to these job opportunities for Russian speakers highlighted the Russian Federation’s position as an energy producer and a large market for other businesses.

Besides the oil industry, especially now there are so many other businesses within Russia. It will never stop. (Ulyana, parent, Aberdeen)

This point of view was more often found in the Russian school in Aberdeen, where more participants had real connections to Russian business due to their work in the oil sector.

A similar economic motivation has also been found in Chinese complementary schools (Francis et al., 2010). Russian-speaking parents demonstrated opinions similar to those of the Chinese parents when discussing the role of economics in their countries in terms of the

\textsuperscript{30} Roughly 260 million people around the world can speak Russian, making it the most widely spoken of all the Slavic languages. \url{http://www.themost10.com/widely-spoken-languages-in-the-world/} [Accessed 14.08.2017]
global market. One teacher from the Russian school in Glasgow summarised the parents’ opinions, highlighting the presence of the Russian language in the global world economy:

Opportunities naturally come when that person settles further, gets an education, and gets a job. Especially when the language is in the Top 10 of world languages, i.e., it is a language which many people speak, not just in one country, but in many other countries. Some of these countries have gas and oil, which are connected with an important economic area. People come for work and they should study Russian. (Anastasiya, teacher, Glasgow)

When the Russian-speaking parents talked about the Russian market, there appeared to be respect for Russian economic power and opportunities. However, in response to direct questions about whether they wanted their children to find work in Russia, the majority of these parents answered that they did not. There therefore seemed to be a contradiction between parents’ explanations of the economic reasons for studying Russian and their actual future plans and hopes for their children. A similar situation was described by Ryazanova-Clarke (2015) as a systematic conflict between meaning attribution to Russian with regard to its transnational ‘pride’ and ‘profit’.

Russian-speaking parents from other countries in the former USSR also noted the economic importance of Russian language knowledge in their own countries: “Now, it is hard to find work without Russian in Latvia” (Darya, parent, Aberdeen). In explaining the economic profit to be gained by knowledge of Russian, Darya mentioned its importance to employability in her country of origin, rather than Russia’s status as a global market actor.

Knowledge of the Russian language is also seen to provide additional advantages in terms of a future career as an additional layer of professional knowledge, and as an opportunity to possess a unique qualification. A teacher who participated in the discussion about parents’ and children's economic motivations to study Russian noted that:

Of course, they can use language in their careers. For example, I asked my students a question: when they wish to study Russian, why do you need Russian? Someone told me that they wanted to go for international journalism, then go to Russia. Knowing Russian will give them additional opportunities. (Lada, teacher, Dundee)

This pragmatic view occurred more often during discussions with parents of children in older classes. These pupils have already begun to think about their careers as a part of their mainstream school activities, and in making school subject choices. They have studied
Russian for longer than other pupils, and their families offer more developed explanations for learning Russian. The value of knowing Russian is interconnected with specific children’s plans for future study after secondary school, and their perceived future job.

On the one hand, parents’ references to the Russian language as a tool for widening their children’s career opportunities tended to be a projection of the parents’ aspirations for their children’s futures. On the other hand, the parents believe that transferring knowledge of the Russian language to their children can help them to overcome the main barriers which the parents met themselves. However, parents’ beliefs about the employment of the Russian language in the global market are quite hazy, and based on subjective assumptions rather than on economic facts or statistics. A more pragmatic approach to studying Russian was evident in families with teenagers who had begun to think about their actual career path.

4.2.3. The value of Russian culture in the world

While the perceived economic benefits of studying Russian are based on parents’ understandings of the role of the Russian language in the global world, the perceived socio-cultural benefits are based on parents’ assumptions about the worldwide recognition of Russian culture. At present, ‘the Russian culture abroad is a well-developed area of study’ (Kliuchnikova, 2016: 18) due to the history of Russian emigration in the 20th century (Bethea & Frank, 2011; Wanner, 2008). The heritage language existing outside of its ‘mother country’ is at the core of the concept of culture ‘in exile’ (Williams, 1972). In its turn, the concept of a heritage language highlights the significant distinction between learning Russian as a foreign language and learning Russian as a mother tongue, but in a common English-language environment. Russian as a heritage language plays a special social function as a carrier for particular cultural values which are recognised as being part of Russian heritage by the Russian-speaking community (Levin & Shohamy, 2012).

Parents hold overlapping beliefs in the intrinsic value of the Russian language as an entity, and in the value of acquisition of Russian culture. In the opinion of many of them, the Russian language is the natural core of Russian culture, so in learning Russian, children naturally absorb some Russian cultural traditions. Some parents simply stated that they were taught that the Russian language and culture are the greatest in the world. For example, Viktoriya, who is not only a teacher in the Russian school in Edinburgh but also a mother of two children who were born in Poland, argued that:
Honestly, I do not know why I would like my children to speak Russian. We have been taught that the Russian culture and the Russian language are greatest in the world. We would like to pass this message on to our children. (Viktoriya, teacher, Edinburgh)

Viktoriya is originally from Russia, and her husband is from Poland. In explaining her motives for teaching her own children Russian, she referred to the common cultural knowledge formed in the USSR. These beliefs seem self-evident, and are similar to previous parents’ explanations that they should teach their children Russian because they themselves are Russian.

When mentioning the cultural importance of the Russian language, the parents usually referred to its richness: “A great language, a rich language” (Ekaterina, parent, Aberdeen). Passing the Russian culture to their children can be viewed as part of the parents’ obligations to them (Kliuchnikova, 2016). Ekaterina highlighted the role of a mother providing cultural opportunities for her children:

The mother is a bridge between Russian culture and her children, to whom she wants to transmit [that culture]. (Ekaterina, parent, Aberdeen)

However, the Russian language not only provides access to Russian culture in the international context, but also plays an important role in creating a feeling of belonging to the Russian-speaking community in Scotland. In answering questions about the common features of Russian-speaking families who would like their children to learn Russian, the parents referred to similar attitudes to Russian culture, and to the Russian language. Ekaterina described that as ‘the common feature’:

Maybe the common feature for all of us is that parents think that it is important to preserve Russian culture and language in their children. Of course, the language carries the culture. (Ekaterina, parent, Aberdeen)

The parents who used the word ‘culture’ to explain their motivation for teaching their children Russian referred to a wide range of meanings of this term. Some of the parents who were interviewed referred to Russian classical literature and Russian history as set features of Russian culture. In their opinion, belonging to Russian culture can be considered as an indicator of a wider sense of community identity for Russian-speaking parents. In explaining the reasons for educating her children in Russian, Ulyana noted that Russians value children's cultural development very highly:
But usually, Russians like to associate themselves not only to literature, but also to the arts, to dancing, to drawing, and music. It is a feature of our national culture. We want our children to be developed in all aspects. (Ulyana, parent, Aberdeen)

According to Ulyana, the parents' desire for the all-round development of their children - including knowledge about art, dancing, drawing and music - is linked with Russian cultural traditions. Ulyana associated herself not only with the small community of parents attending the Russian schools, but also with the worldwide Russian-speaking community.

As has been argued by Kliuchnikova, the development of Russian culture abroad tends to depend on Russian-speaking migrant integrity as a group (2016: 22), and was clearly expressed in the first wave of Russian migration to the UK in the 1920s in the wake of the October Revolution and the establishment of the new Soviet government. The parents involved in my research represent the fourth wave of Russian-speaking migrants in the UK (which started in the 1990s), for whom the question of community integration is less important (Komarova, 2007) than it was for earlier waves. Images of Russian culture among these parents often seem hazy, and are not the key reason for their children studying Russian. However, the cultural aspects of heritage language preservation are regarded as very important as an indirect motivation for teaching children Russian in Scotland, and tend to create a multicultural environment.

4.3. Motivations for learning Russian in a complementary school

The motivations for learning Russian in Scotland and the motivations for learning Russian in a Saturday complementary school have very complex interrelations. The interviewed parents quite often started to speak about Russian learning in general, before switching to Russian school attendance and then returning to a general discussion about the Russian language. However, this motivation can be described separately from an analytical point of view, due to differences in the parents’ arguments. During our discussions, the parents gave more reasons for learning Russian in the complementary school environment than for studying Russian in general. The attendance schedule (every Saturday) and payment for these services seemed to be important resources which are needed in special negotiations leading to agreement between all family members if a family wishes to send their children to a Russian school. Following the parents’ logic, the following subsections discuss how the motivation to attend a Russian school and to learn Russian at home can complement each other.
4.3.1. Delegation of parental authority in Russian education to Russian schools

After making a decision about heritage language preservation, families start to build their own educational routine, which will depend on a wide range of factors (Clyne, 1991; Kipp, Clyne and Pauwels, 1995). The debate about the effectiveness of home heritage language learning have been a focus for many previous researchers (Higgins, 2009; Dailey-O’Cain & Liebscher, 2011). However, the connection between home and school learning in heritage language preservation has been investigated less thoroughly, perhaps in some way due to the lack of complementary schools in a specific location. Therefore, the present research particularly focused on the link between learning Russian at home and attendance at the Russian schools among Russian-speaking migrants in Scotland.

The effectiveness of home education tends to have some connection with the age of the children learning the heritage language (Baker, 2001; Cummins, 2000; Golberg, Paradis & Crago, 2008). Tips and ideas on how a mother can best teach babies and toddlers Russian at home were quite popular as a theme in the discussions observed in the Russian schools’ corridors. Most of the mothers in my study believed that in early childhood, mothers can produce a better level of education than anyone else due to their special connection with the child (Kliuchnikova, 2016). I observed mothers enthusiastically exchanging knowledge about Russian games and early development activities for young children. However, parents also complained that when children get older, teaching them becomes more difficult. According to the experience of one mother, even a toddler will listen to their parents with less attention than that which they give other people.

This opinion could be found among Russian teachers who are also parents, with most trying to avoid teaching their own children in their class, preferring to pass them on to other teachers:

I wouldn't like to teach her in my class, as there are some discipline problems, and she listens to me less than her teacher. It is just normal for children at her age. (Zhanna, parent-teacher, Aberdeen)

My daughter attends another class; I did not start to teach this class, because she was here. She does not listen to me now. (Vera, parent-teacher, Glasgow)

The other significant factor connected with the life cycle of the family tends to be time. The mothers who spoke with me quite often commented that they had stayed at home and looked...
after their children when they were first born for about three years, until they received the right to local council funding for a nursery place. In some migrant families, this time can coincide with the period of adaptation they experience after arriving in a new country.

These mothers who told me their stories highlighted that on the one hand, they did have time for their children, but on the other, they did not have enough money to travel around the city or pay for different early learning services for their children. When their children began to attend nurseries, the mothers were able to return to work and earn their own money. Some of the mothers pointed out that this had helped them to pay for their children’s attendance at the Russian school to support their language education, but they also regretted that they had less free time for their children at home:

It is difficult for me to be engaged in it, as I am not in the house all of the time. (Irina, parent, Dundee)

As Irina told me in her long interview, she would like to have a job in Scotland, but due to her lack of the English language knowledge she could find only low-qualified positions with long hours. This upset her, because she felt that she could not pay sufficient attention to her family, including teaching her children Russian.

Another mother, Kseniya, who was in a better working position regarding her salary and working hours, also mentioned a connection between starting her job, and her children starting to attend the Russian school in addition to learning Russian at home:

I have two jobs. I began working in August, and I work 18.5 hours a week. My daughter is three now, and she attends the Russian school. (Kseniya, parent, Dundee)

While Irina was upset at reducing the time she spent with her family due to her long hours at work, Kseniya faced an additional challenge. After her child had started nursery, Kseniya and her child had less time for Russian because in the evening the family speaks English. Her Scottish husband cannot speak Russian, and the family speak English at home:

The English language is dominant in our family. I communicate with my husband in English. Our children are in an English environment: English TV, all around the nursery, and at school, [communication is] only in English. But, I would like my children to know Russian. (Kseniya, parent, Dundee)
These quotes are included in this subsection because they were given in direct response to the question of why the mothers had decided to send their children to the Russian school. Parents from families where Russian is not the family language also mentioned the Russian school as a special environment which can compensate for the lack of Russian conversation at home. This reason for attending the Russian school was also mentioned by one of the Russian teachers. When we discussed the motivations of mothers from mixed families, Zoya offered the following observation:

Mums who marry local men particularly bring their children to the Russian schools for support in the Russian language, and to help them to educate their children in Russian. (Zoya, teacher, Aberdeen)

Zoya taught the oldest class, which was attended by teenagers with different family backgrounds, and had long experience of teaching children from mixed families.

The family decision to speak Russian at home has not prevented the loss of the Russian language for some children. Instead, this situation can occur when children meet language difficulties in mainstream schools, and pay more attention to English than to their native language. Alina's story is an example of this; she has two children, one born in Russia who arrived in Scotland in his teens, and the other born in Scotland. The settling-in period was difficult for her family, and during this time they paid more attention to teaching the first child English than Russian. At present, he is fluent in English and cannot speak Russian. After that, Alina decided to pay equal attention to both languages studied by her second child – English and Russian – and brought her son to the Russian school, which helped him to maintain his knowledge of the Russian language.

To sum up, the motivation for sending a child to learn the Russian language in a complementary school tends to be a development in the family language approach (Moin, Schwartz & Leikin, 2013). Many different situations at home, such as the parents’ confidence in their own abilities as teachers for their children, their ideas about what constitutes a sufficient amount of time for learning, and the irregular use of Russian at home, create a wide range of motivations for sending children to Russian schools. However, these parents’ aspirations also significantly connect to their evaluation of how the Russian schools can ‘top up’ their home resources in teaching their children Russian. Teachers’ professional knowledge and ability to teach children Russian grammar was perceived by parents as one of these resources, and is discussed in the next section.
4.3.2. Access to professional resources

Complementary schools which have been opened to provide additional community support for educating migrant children can accumulate special educational resources, including teachers and special materials, to help families improve the effectiveness of their heritage language preservation (Wang, 1996; Zhou and Li, 2003; Creese et al., 2006). While Chapter 3 explored the parents' expectations and attitudes towards the Russian schools, this subsection is related to the previous discussion but has a slightly different focus, and pays more attention to the reasons for learning Russian in the Saturday school.

Some parents believe that they can teach their children to speak Russian, but that to create solid Russian language knowledge, children should be taught by professional teachers:

I can teach her at home, but there (in the Russian school) they are professional teachers who have more experience than I do. (Darya, parent, Aberdeen)

In Chapter 3, which discussed the variety of professional backgrounds among the people working as teachers in the Russian schools, I clarified what different parents recognised as indicators of professionalism. As Darya said in our interview, experience of teaching children Russian in Scotland is more important than a teacher holding a particular diploma or certificate from the Russian Federation or any post-Soviet states.

Professional knowledge in Russian teaching is quite often associated with Russian grammar. However, the majority of textbooks on teaching Russian abroad suggest that the teacher should focus on language communication skills (Protassova, 2012). In contrast, those parents who perceived the Russian school as a resource centre would prefer that their children gain grammatical knowledge from the school programme. Requests for the Russian schools to provide a stronger focus on Russian grammar were more often found in Russian-speaking families who mostly used Russian at home, and hoped that their children were already gaining communication skills through this everyday conversation. In families using English as a home language, the parents who sent their children to the Russian schools paid more attention to their children’s communication skills, and rarely mentioned the issue of grammar. The parents’ desire for grammar teaching was mentioned by Zoya:

The parents are attending the Russian schools to give their children [a grounding in] Russian grammar. (Zoya, teacher, Aberdeen)
Later in the interview, Zoya indicated that she found grammar teaching a challenge because of the differences in the knowledge levels among the pupils in her class. However, she still attempted Russian grammar exercises with her pupils, because these are an important requirement for some groups of parents.

The other possible reason why some parents viewed the Russian school as a valuable resource centre may have been linked to difficulties in raising bilingual children. While Sorace and Ladd (2005) argued that migrant families should pay special attention to native language transmission while the dominant language in society may be acquired naturally, some parents whose children attended the Russian schools wanted to ensure their proficiency in both languages. Parents raising bilingual children have various concerns about the process, and in particular, the difficulties that might occur in education due to the parallel process of learning two languages (Schwartz, 2012). During the participant observation in the corridor, some of those fears were observed. Three mothers expressed worries that their children had begun speaking later than their peers. One mother told a story about when the nursery staff had decided that her child had a diction problem, but a specialist in hospital refused to diagnose the child due to his bilingualism. Some of the mothers stated that their children confused letters from the English and Russian alphabets. During participant observation, this group of parents noted that they wanted their children to attend Russian school so that they might gain assistance in, and knowledge of how to, naturally - and without contradiction - educate their children in two languages.

The parents’ point of view, and the Russian schools’ responses to the parents’ fears, were summarised by one of the Russian teachers in Edinburgh who pointed to the connection between the two languages as one of the main tasks of education provided by the Russian schools:

From my own point of view, as someone who is competent in two languages, it is scientifically necessary to have a professional start in studying both languages, in order not to confuse them. At a seminar in Frankfurt, one of the speakers said with absolute accuracy that if the child grasps half of the first language and half of the second, then they don't develop. And, if this situation remains the status quo, the two languages don't form a unit. It doesn't give anyone well-developed language skills. When there is fragmented knowledge of one language and fragmented knowledge of another language, this is very bad and influences the child’s thinking and their ability for abstraction. (Valentina, teacher, Edinburgh)
Valentina has extensive experience of working in the Russian school, and has taught several groups of pupils. She felt very confident in discussing parents’ motivations for sending their children to the Russian school, and was clear in her vision of the challenge of studying Russian in an English-speaking environment. Valentina did not directly comment that Russian home education carried a greater risk of creating a fragmented knowledge of Russian; however, this view was implicit when she described what kind of educational methods should be employed for successful learning in two languages, and what kind of teaching practices can be used to reduce the confusion of letters between the two alphabets.

The motivation to attend the Russian school as a centre of professional knowledge coincides with some of the general motivations for studying Russian in Scotland - such as support for teaching children to be bilingual, and the economic reasons which were discussed in subsections 4.2.1. and 4.2.2. In the first instance, the parents believe that learning more than one language at the same time requires assistance from certain specialists. In the second, parents wish to give their children a level of Russian knowledge which will be adequate for them in professional contexts in the future. This demand from some groups of parents tends to have a significant impact on the schools’ activities and role in heritage language preservation. In line with such demands, the Russian schools have attempted to develop educational activities which will provide pupils with a level of qualifications which are officially recognised by universities, companies and employers, as discussed below.

4.3.3. Obtaining official certificates

In order that their children might (in future) utilise the Russian language in a broader context within their careers, some parents have asked the schools to provide evidence of their knowledge. The certificates for Russian language which are issued by the educational authorities in Scotland or England can legitimise the study of Russian in Scotland, and increase its status from that of a community language to a language which can be used in seeking professional international employment. The opportunity to receive an additional GCE or an SQA Russian Higher was noted in all four cities in this study as a practical reason for attending the Russian schools.

Zoya, a teacher from Aberdeen who noted these demands from parents, explained that this certificate can increase a students’ chance of gaining entry to university:
Many children want to sit the Russian exam in order to obtain additional grades for university. (Zoya, teacher, Aberdeen)

In Edinburgh, Veronika, a Russian school teacher, highlighted this motivation as key to encouraging teenage students to study Russian. In this situation, community learning achieved the same level of official recognition as other subjects taught in mainstream schools:

Teenagers who are in their last years at mainstream schools are given a wide range of preparation for state exams, and this reason [receiving an additional grade] is quite practical and clear. In contrast with previous discussions about the benefits of knowing Russian in Scotland, this additional grade gives Russian-speaking children notable and visible advantages. (Veronika, teacher, Edinburgh)

Veronika also said that she did not teach the oldest class but had developed quite strong connections with parents from different classes. In her opinion, the exam motivation is definitely stronger than other motives for attending the Russian schools.

Antonina, a teacher from the Glasgow school, also mentioned the Russian certificate as an important part of the educational motivations of parents and children:

Our students have great advantages over others who would like to pass an additional language exam. However, success in terms of exam results depends not only on natural language knowledge, but also on understanding the rules for that particular test. (Antonina, teacher, Glasgow)

Antonina had two years’ experience of teaching children who went on to pass this exam. In comparison with Veronika, she not only noted the advantages of the exam, but also the importance of Russian school attendance. Antonina argued that learning Russian at home is essential to, but not sufficient for, Russian exam success. In Glasgow, I observed a discussion between a mother whose oldest child passed the exam last year and parents with children in the middle classes who will have these opportunities in the future. Some of the participants asked why it was necessary to attend a preparation session, if this exam was designed for Scottish people who do not know Russian as well as their children, who are native speakers. The following arguments were offered: “the teacher knows the rules of the exam”; “all the exam instructions are in English, and it is not easy to follow these instructions”; “everybody needs practice”; and “it is an SQA requirement to pass all the prelims and go through the official SQA systems registration before you take the exam”.

Parents and children attending Russian schools in order to achieve that additional certificate tended to assume that the Russian school was an official organisation which had registered as an educational centre with the right to conduct this exam. However, at the time of my fieldwork, only two Russian schools provided these opportunities - Edinburgh and Glasgow. All the teachers with whom questions about future school development was discussed conveyed the importance of this exam in heritage language studies; nevertheless, in 2015 the Scottish Qualification Authority made the decision to discontinue Higher Russian in Scotland so, in turn, the Russian schools were planning to move to the GCSE and GCE system which operates in the rest of the UK as a recognised Russian qualification. This recognition played several important roles both among the Russian-speaking families and the Russian schools. This motivation was shared by both parents and children, and therefore helped families to create a common decision according to their desire for heritage language preservation. In addition, it helped the Russian schools and parents keep their teenagers attending Russian classes.

Conclusion

This chapter has revealed complex motivations among parents for educating their children in Russian and encouraging them to attend the Russian complementary schools in Scotland. The motivation to attend the Russian schools has been shown to be secondary to, and built upon, the desire for heritage language preservation in general. Parents’ decisions about heritage language preservation tend to be strongly linked to their choices regarding the use of this language in the family where there is at least one Russian-speaking parent.

The parents’ attitude towards the Russian language influences their perceptions of its usage inside and outside the family. Accordingly, educating children in the Russian language can preserve opportunities for parents to speak Russian at home, and help to support the communication between children and their Russian-speaking relatives abroad. In addition, within some migrant families, heritage language can help parents to create a special cultural place of mutual understanding between family members.

Parents’ motivation for using the Russian language in a wider social context tends to be linked to their perception of Russian as having a relevant place in the wider world. When parents were discussing the additional opportunities available to people who have studied Russian in Scotland, they highlighted the worldwide advantages of knowing several
languages, and the economic and cultural benefits of learning Russian. However, some parents’ explanations of these advantages did not refer to the basic relationship between Russia and Scotland. Being migrants themselves, the Russian-speaking parents offered to their children their visions of how a connection with the wider Russian economic and cultural space can be beneficial to them in Scotland.

The motivation for their children to attend Russian schools tends to reflect parents’ desire for good learning resources and an environment which families cannot necessarily provide themselves for their children studying Russian at home. The Russian schools were perceived by some parents as being an added benefit to those parents who do not have the time, or qualifications, necessary to teach their children at home. The parents’ motivation to send their children to a Russian school was therefore linked with their intention to give their children opportunities to use the Russian language outside home. The Russian schools were perceived by some parents as a part of the local education system, especially when the Russian schools provide exam preparation for certificates which are recognised by UK universities.

Even though this chapter has explored the main motivations for Russian language learning, part of the motivation for children to attend Russian schools is related to the socialisation and social networking processes of Russian-speaking parents and their children. The following chapter discusses the kinds of strategies employed by Russian-speaking families involved in different types of social networks, the related consequences of a variety of heritage language preservation activities, and how the Russian schools assist them in this process.
Chapter 5. Social Networking and Information Exchange in the Russian Schools

One of my research questions is related to the social networks emerging in the Russian schools. While the previous chapters discussed the variety of social background among the parents and their motivation for heritage language preservation, this chapter moves on beyond educational matters to examine the benefits to parents in sending their children to attend the Russian schools. These parents’ motivations are wider than merely encouraging their children to study the Russian language. In addition to heritage learning as their main activity, the Russian schools also provide a place where parents can create their own social networks, helping them to socialise and exchange their experiences of living in Scotland. Bearing in mind the diversity of the Russian community, this chapter explores how these networks develop, the roles they play, and the ways in which they complement heritage language preservation. The arguments presented here come primarily from my participant observations, although I also refer to the interviews I conducted with both parents and teachers. During my visits to the Russian schools, I observed intergroup communications and asked questions about relationships between parents. The observation of natural flows of communication allowed me to investigate migrant networking as a process by which new contacts are established, and existing ones maintained, in the context of the Russian schools. I also identified various topics which were being discussed by parents and in group discussions which reflected different aspects of migrants’ experiences in Scotland and in their countries of origin. My subsequent analysis of my observation diary revealed in more detail how the networks in the Russian schools provide migrant families with a variety of information in specific areas.

As discussed in Chapter 1, the social networks approach plays a significant role in investigations of a wide range of aspects of migrant everyday life in the host country (Oakley, 1992; Czaika & Varela, 2015; Vasey, 2016; Morosanu, 2016; Kennedy, 2008; Svašek, 2010; Rabikowska, 2010). Starting from societal factors of migration (Boyd, 1989; Mesch, 2002), a focus on migrant networking has been developed at the personal level (Ngo et al., 2014; Lomsky-Feder & Leibovitz, 2010). In my research, I have employed the approach described by Ryan, who argued that:

The nature of social networks may best be understood by focusing on the relationship between the actors, their relative social location and the available and realisable resources. (Ryan, 2011: 708)
Drawing on this notion, I begin this chapter by exploring the social networks I observed through a discussion of the variety of relationships between the parents of children attending the Russian schools. Chapter 3 made a passing reference to the importance of friendly relationships, which engage children to study Russian and increase teaching productivity through cooperation between teachers and parents, teachers and children, and between pupils. However, the establishment of relationships between parents is also significant not only in shaping education processes, but also in its effects on the Russian schools’ community itself. In the second section, I explore the links between different types of social networks and the parents’ engagement in school life. My analytical focus is on understanding how the Russian schools have united parents, and how parents’ networks evolved as a result of their involvement in the Russian schools’ operations.

The third section goes on to explore the ways of sharing information and access to informational resources deployed by different groups of parents due to their involvement in a variety of social networks both within and beyond the school community. Observation of these parents’ informal conversations in the school corridors provided me with a deeper insight into the roles played by different parents to facilitate the discussion, and the ways they used to share information, experiences and sometimes advice, on the basis of which people could develop their own solutions for particular migrant problems. In addition to providing spaces where these informal conversations could occur, the Russian schools also organised formal information events to help parents to understand various aspects of local life and establish contacts with representatives of official organisations.

5.1. Social networking process in the Russian schools

The Russian schools provide opportunities for parents to become involved in various networks which cut across their different experiences and social positions. As Chapter 2 discussed, the parents whose children attend the Russian school come from very diverse social groups. However, despite the fact that these networks are complex and dynamic, the Russian schools provide particular social spaces which unite these groups. The process of how these networks have been created and the relationships between their members form the focus of my analysis.

When I arrived in the Russian schools, the first meetings were more often with active parents who enthusiastically communicated with each other and were also easily accessible to me as
a researcher. When I asked them about their relationships with other parents whose children were attending the Russian schools, they often defined themselves as ‘best friends’. Alisa, a parent from the Russian school in Glasgow, described the situation as follows:

The majority of our friends are from the Russian school. There are several families who are our friends. We have our own circle; we are friends with them. We often phone each other and chat about anything. (Alisa, parent, Glasgow)

Having developed relationships with other parents from the Russian school in question, the parents from this group highly appreciated the friendships they had made there which gave them a special feeling of closeness, describing those in their relationships as ‘our circle’, ‘our people’. Here, it is worth exploring some of the specific meanings attached to the use of the word ‘friend’ in Russian. In Russian culture, the word for friends, druž’ya, is used to highlight the special quality of relationships between people in inner circles of close friendship who share some intimate feelings (Efremova, 2006). Studies in numerous societies have supported the universal nature of friendship, but cross-cultural variation in friendship patterns has also been found (Bell & Coleman, 1999). This fact seems especially essential in understanding relationships in migrant society (Boyd, 1989; Ryan, 2011; Svašek, 2010). Studies focusing on Russian relationships abroad have shown that Russian migrants demonstrated greater permeability of self-other boundaries than local people (Goodwin, 1995). Russian migrants believe that their friendships are closer than those of local people, and that they have a closer attachment to their friends (Sheets & Lugar, 2005). Those who described other parents at the school as ‘friends’ were thus, in using this word, describing a very close, intimate set of social bonds which some of the other parents did not necessarily share.

The main features of such a network connecting people who have formed close friendships in the Russian schools’ spaces include mutual emotional attachments and regular contact, both during school hours on a Saturday morning and at other times outside the Russian schools. These families have developed friendships not only between parents but between their children too. Darya described the situation below:

But those of us who decided to stay (at school) are making friends, we communicate with other families as a whole; our children are friends. (Darya, parent, Aberdeen)
Darya also encouraged her children to build relationships with other children from Russian-speaking families who were attending the Russian school. During my visits to the Russian schools, I observed how parents agreed on joint activities for their children after school. The Russian schools therefore provide a space which may be used to strengthen relations between these families, both through establishing multiple connections between the different generations involved in the Russian schools’ routines, and by establishing the means to create opportunities to meet up outside school. Referring to Eve’s idea about importance of relationships for social networking existing in specific places (Eve, 2010: 1232), the extension of these relationships outside the Russian schools can be recognised as a key characteristic of this network which distinguishes them from other parents who prefer to meet only within the Russian schools’ activities.

After asking some of the parents who their friends from the Russian schools were by occupation, I found several examples which show that similarities in children’s ages can be an important factor in the networking of parents from different social classes. While migrants tend to seek friends of a similar social class background (Rabikowska, 2010), it is apparent that social class divisions in a migrant community can be overcome if a parent is looking for a friend for their children who can be involved in various family activities.

In contrast with the relatively small group of parents who supported strong friendships, most of the parents noted that they have several acquaintances in the Russian schools. This group avoided using the word friends *druz’ya* to describe their relationships with other Russian-speaking parents. Instead, in Russian culture the word for acquaintances, *znakomye*, is used to emphasise that a person, while known, and perhaps liked, is not a close friend (Kuchenkova, 2017). In one of the Russian schools, Valeriya described her relationships with other mothers, highlighting that she sees them occasionally because they only meet while their children are attending lessons at the school:

> Nowadays, the Russian school replaces other social activities, we see other mums here, sometimes we go to a café together, but only on Saturday; we do not usually see each other on other days. (Valeriya, parent, Edinburgh)

The Russian schools play an important role in planning weekend activities and developing social networks involving groups of acquaintances. Attendance at a Russian school brings benefits for children, as they learn the Russian language as well as the communication and socialising which occurs between parents. However, this group of parents rarely extend their
interactions with Russian-speakers during the week; instead, they only communicate with
them on Saturdays when the Russian schools operate, in contrast with closer networks of
friends who meet more often. The parents who fall into the category of acquaintances rather
than friends never mentioned that they attend the Russian schools to find friends, as was
observed in closer networks of friends. Valeriya told me that she is very sociable, and
interacts with people from other nationalities. She did not come to the Russian school to find
friends here, as some other Russian mothers had done. Valeria explained that:

Some people communicate only with Russians, but I have a lot of local friends. I am
Russian; one girl is from South Africa. My husband is not Russian. (Valeriya, parent,
Edinburgh)

She and her Scottish husband are involved in quite developed social networks, but also
support several Russian connections. Another parent, Ulyana, also preferred to highlight her
relationship with local people, for example, rather than with Russian-speakers:

I cannot say that I have a lot of Russian friends. Actually, in the beginning when I
arrived, I looked for Russian-speakers and tried to build some relationships. At present
it is easier, because I have many local friends. It seems that I have acquired roots here.
I know many Russian-speakers through the Russian school. (Ulyana, parent,
Aberdeen)

The extension of the range of local friends can emerge as a result of growing migrant
confidence and overcoming of language barriers, as “the more social contacts migrants have,
the easier it becomes for them to establish new ones” (Ryan et al., 2008: 682).

The second interesting fact obtained from the interview with Ulyana was the connection
between the length of stay in the host country and her attitude towards social networking
(White & Ryan, 2008). During the interview, Ulyana repeatedly highlighted the differences
between her relationships with Russian-speakers and with local people, when she arrived in
Scotland (17 years ago) and at present. These relationships have had a dynamic nature, and
have thus conformed to notions of blurred temporal borders between networks of friends and
acquaintances (Eve, 2010). It seems that Ulyana also considered her friendships with non-
Russian speaking local people as a symbol of her successful integration, which in turn helped
her to feel that her family is now rooted in Scotland.

Networks of acquaintances are more likely to be found in Russian schools than networks of
strong friendship. Acquaintance networks include parents of more diverse nationalities, jobs,
lengths of settlement in Scotland, home language use, and knowledge of Russian and English languages than networks based on strong friendships. Fauser and her colleagues (2015) also pointed out that migrant networks of acquaintance united people who preferred to communicate with each other infrequently. The common goal of teaching their children Russian unites these people. The diversity of people involved in these networks expands the opportunity for information to be distributed through them, as is discussed in the third part of this chapter.

The Russian schools provide an opportunity for parents to socialise but, understandably, not all parents take up this opportunity. Many parents, especially in the larger schools such as those in Edinburgh and Glasgow, prefer not to be in close contact with other members of the school community; these parents were also less accessible for interviews and observations. They generally prefer to leave their children at the Russian school and do not wait for them in the corridors. The absence of parents in the school corridors does not necessarily mean that they do not like to communicate with others, but they may have other priorities at that time:

We attend the Russian school every second Saturday due to my work shifts. My husband also told me that he would bring us and wait somewhere on my day off. (Lyuda, parent, Edinburgh)

Lyuda arrived in Scotland six years ago, and had to divide her time between work and her child on Saturdays. Her Scottish husband did not impede her desire that their son learns Russian, but neither did he actively support the idea of spending every weekend at the Russian school, preferring to wait for his wife elsewhere. Lyuda is the driving force for their child to learn Russian, and she tried to balance different types of family activities, such as learning Russian and being with English-speaking relatives. The parents who have decided not to be part of the Russian schools’ community seem to have other priorities (Ryan, 2011: 715), and communication with Russian-speakers is less important for them than it is for the group of parents described above as groups of friends or acquaintances. Nevertheless, the wider circle of contacts which parents like Lyuda bring from beyond the Russian schools is also helpful for the schools’ communities. The parents from the schools who were involved in wider social networks with local Scottish people may play a special role in assisting newly arrived parents to source information about various aspects of local life, as is discussed in the third section of this chapter.
The complexity and density of the networks which exist in the Russian school’s challenges previous explanations of Russian-speaking migrants’ networking processes, which have usually focused on migrants’ experiences in particular geographical locations without a strong focus on migrant social institutions, such as minority schools (Kopnina, 2005; Morawska, 2004; Ngo et al., 2014; Lomsky-Feder & Leibovitz, 2010). The Russian schools provide a specific kind of environment where people have access to networks uniting ‘close friends’ or ‘acquaintances’. The analysis of the Russian-speaking parents’ experiences shows an interesting interplay between the opportunities provided by the Russian schools and the ways in which the parents take advantage of them. As the next section explores, the networks existing around the Russian schools have a dynamic nature, and their development also influences the numbers and shared beliefs of Russian-speaking people whose children attend the Russian schools.

5.2. Interplay between parents’ networks and Russian schools’ activities

Parents’ networks play a significant role in the creation and functioning of the Russian school community, through advertising and supporting school activities. The approach taken in previous research to examining the composition and function of social ties (Avenarius, 2012; Dahinden, 2005; Ryan, 2011) suggests beginning by investigating the cultural specifics of a particular migrant community, along with their members’ attitudes towards cooperation, before moving to the complexity and dynamism of the migrant networks. As Dedeoglu (2014) observed, social networking can depend on cultural specifics of a particular migrant community, and the attitudes of their members towards cooperation. The Russian-speaking community living abroad has been described as non-united and non-homogeneous by several authors (Kopnina, 2005; Mamattah, 2006; Judina, 2012; Kliuchnikova, 2016). Sharing the same language tends to be an important but insufficient reason for Russian-speaking migrants in the UK to make initial contact with other Russian-speakers. The perception that Russian-speakers are neither united nor inclined to help compatriots, can be found in Valeriya’s interview:

It seems to me that there is something in the culture. Some nations always help each other, but Russians envy each other. I have been in America, and here (in Scotland) is the same: we do not have connections between Russians. (Valeriya, parent, Edinburgh)

Despite this view, the opportunities for newcomers to Scotland to make their first contact with Russian-speaking people is higher in the Russian schools’ corridors than outside the
schools, in contexts such as in the streets or shops. The Russian schools provide safe places for meeting people who are willing to communicate with each other:

I cannot imagine where and how we would be linked with other Russian speakers. Russians are different. The other day I spoke with a girl who works at our school; she said that when her baby was young she tried to contact other Russian speakers in the playground, inviting them to meet again, to come to her home for tea, but they answered: “No, we have enough acquaintances, we do not need more”. In general, if you meet such people once, you will be reluctant to approach others. It is obvious that people will give up. (Zoya, teacher, Aberdeen)

The analysis of this example refers back to the debate about the low levels of relationships and lack of face-to-face intergroup integration among Russian-speaking migrants abroad (Kopnina, 2005; Remennik, 2008) described in Chapter 1. In this own experience, feelings of “not being welcome to communicate” (Zoya, teacher, Aberdeen) occur due to a high level of separation of Russian-speakers, and a low level of trust within Russian society (FOM, 2003).

Given the above examples, the importance of the role of the ethnic minority schools in social networking increases, especially for heterogeneous communities. It was apparent from my participant observation that the different Russian schools have different facilities for social networking. For example, in Dundee and Glasgow both schools have special rooms set aside where parents can stay together whilst waiting for the end of Russian lessons for their children. During my interviews, the directors of both these schools highlighted that the schools’ committees had deliberately decided to provide parents with a designated area in which to socialise while waiting for their children. The teachers from these schools also often mentioned the importance of friendship between parents in the Russian schools to create a Russian language environment for their children. In contrast, the Russian school in Edinburgh does not provide such rooms for parents. The idea of working with parents was also rarely mentioned in this school by teachers. During my visit, the Russian school in Aberdeen was in transition, as it was about to move to a new location. This school did not have a set place for parents to meet, although the parent committee and teachers discussed this opportunity as something to consider when choosing new facilities for teaching, and it was also mentioned in their interviews.

The social networks around the Russian schools tend to work as sources of two-way communications. Some parents come to the Russian school to find social contact, while
others join the Russian school due to existing friendships. In this case, the Russian schools provide the opportunity to support and strengthen their current relationships. In the opinions of those involved in the networks who had bonded with friends, a desire to find friends can be one of the reasons why parents attend the Russian schools in Scotland:

Most people come here (to the Russian school) not only for their children, but also to get acquainted with other Russian-speaking people, to find a circle of contacts for ourselves. (Darya, parent, Aberdeen).

According to Reimer and colleagues (2008), the strong bonds which characterise networks with friends which are also required in personal and open relationships between members, tend to create closed groups which put up barriers to newcomers. However, the data gathered by the present research shows that closed groups of friends more willingly attended the Russian schools, stayed in school corridors during their children’s Russian lessons, and were more often found on parent committees or in parent groups supporting the Russian schools’ activities. As a result, they often become the main core of the Russian school’s community. It also appears that the closed (but active) group had started to change their networking strategy to help the Russian schools to involve new members. This was done with the purpose of supporting the schools’ growth, and coincides with Ryan’s idea about the dynamism of migrant networks (Ryan, 2011) that change through migrant life. The original strong bond networks between close friends have thus begun to transform into multiple networks with different types of connections, where strong ties are complemented by weaker connections with the arrival of newcomers to the Russians schools.

The Russian schools also enhance networking processes through the various types of relationships which emerge between parents whose children attend the same class. The general tendency observed in each of the four Russian schools was that the flow of newcomer families was bigger in classes for the youngest children than in any other classes. In other words, pupils who had recently enrolled in Russian schools were more likely to have been born in Scotland than to have arrived with their parents at an older age. Every year, the Russian schools take on a new group of children who have reached an age appropriate for attendance. The mothers of these new pupils more often stay in the Russian school’s corridors or nearby, to support their children’s integration into their new school environment:
I am waiting here because he is so small, and we agreed with the teacher that I would stay here a few times until he forgot about me. (Extract from field notes of observation, Dundee school)

As some of the Russian teachers from Glasgow and Dundee explained, parents can pick up their child at any time if they feel uncomfortable, or children can spend a little time with their parents if they need to, then return to the classroom. The Russian schools naturally encourage newer parents to stay in the corridors, and thus to integrate with other parents. My observations identified an interesting group dynamic. The parents whose children attend the same class preferred to keep close and communicate primarily with each other. However, they would also spontaneously start to communicate with other parents, so the Russian schools indirectly encouraged newcomers to join some of the social networks.

The Russian schools unite parents not only through regular meetings, due to the routine nature of pupils’ attendance at Russian classes, but also by organising different school events. In Aberdeen, for example, Darya perceived the Russian school as being the main centre for Russian cultural events in the city. She noted that:

"Unfortunately, everything revolves around the school. There is nothing much left beyond it. (Darya, parent, Aberdeen)"

A quick Internet search shows that in Aberdeen, some other places do organise Russian events,31 but this parent seems not to be involved in any other Russian-speaking migrants’ social networks which have formed outside the Russian school her children attend. This point of view could also be found among parents in Dundee where, for example, Kseniya commented that: “Generally, everything comes from the Russian school” (Kseniya, parent, Dundee). For some parents, through their participation in their children’s activities, the Russian school was the only place where they had found any links with the Russian-speaking community:

"Russian events for adults are not interesting for us; we are mainly interested in children’s events, as we do not have time otherwise. (Lyuda, parent, Edinburgh)"

Lyuda explained that the main reason for her participation in Russian events was that her priority was to give her children opportunities in the first place, and then to involve her family in such activities.

Thus, it can be argued that the Russian schools should be considered as places for networking, and also as organisations based on networks. To achieve sustainable growth, the Russian schools offer places for networking which unites closer friends, acquaintances, or people who have otherwise minimized their contacts with other members of the school community by providing formal and informal support for this networking. The complexity of this relationships to, and within, the Russian schools influences the types of information which informally and formally emerge there, and which are distributed through these networks, as discussed in more detail below.

5.3. Informal exchanges of knowledge and social support

This part of the chapter discusses the wide range of information shared within the social networks operating in the Russian schools. During my observations, I investigated how migrants discussed their cultural differences and the changes in their lives in the new location, with reference to their experiences in their countries of origin. Approaches highlighting the networking nature of migrant communities have been widely employed in migration studies, which have paid specific attention to the importance of social interactions for integration into local and ethnic minority society (Castells, 1996; Putnam, 2000; Coleman, 1988). The implementation of social networks theory which was discussed in Chapter 1 can be used to investigate how migrant networks influence access to different informational resources (Gurak & Cases, 1992; Aguilera & Massey, 2003; Kindler, Ratcheva and Piechowska, 2015). As Eve has argued, ‘migrant new networks are shaped by the needs they have, which are not always shared by locals’ (2010: 1236). Following on from this, I investigate how the social networks emerging among the Russian schools can provide different types of information needed by Russian-speaking migrants, through both informal discussions, and the formal events organised by the Russian schools. Most of the conversation between parents I observed in the Russian schools focused on education systems, healthcare issues and social support, employment practices, and negotiating daily life. According to Dedeoglu (2009), this range of topics can be influenced by the composition of the networks. As Chapter 2 discussed, the majority of the Russian-speaking parents who enrol their children in the Russian schools were women. To add to the academic
discussion about migrant social networking, I explore how the diversity of parents’ migrant experiences, and the Russian schools’ activities, influence the distribution of information about local social services and everyday life.

5.3.1. Information about education systems

One of the most popular topics for discussions in the Russian school corridors were the Scottish and UK education systems in comparison with those in the parents’ countries of origin. This was partly the result of the common interest of most of the attendees to provide what they saw as the best education possible for their children in Scotland. This high level of interest in education has been found by prior research not only in the Russian-speaking community but also among other migrant and minority ethnic groups:

…a higher degree of social mobility through educational achievement… is an important priority for the majority of new arrivals and first generation minority ethnic long-term settled people. (Hickman, Mai & Crowley, 2012: 142)

One of the discussions which I observed several times in different locations was a debate about the best mainstream school for newly arrived families. My analysis shows that parents in the Russian schools tend to value their children’s achievements highly. In the Russian school in Glasgow, I observed how newly arrived parents asked others about “the right choice of where to live in Glasgow” (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Glasgow). Anton, one of the fathers who participated in this discussion, said that he had arrived in Glasgow several months ago, and his family was looking for a place to settle permanently. Several parents who joined the discussion described different places in Glasgow and shared their experiences of living there. Instead of comparisons between different places, the parents who advised Anton agreed that he should firstly look for ‘better’ schools, because the price of houses and the pleasantness of neighbourhoods appears to correlate to the quality of the local mainstream Scottish schools. I heard a similar opinion expressed in the Russian School in Edinburgh when Valeriya said: “We have a good place to live near to a wonderful school” (Valeriya, parent, Edinburgh). This discussion echoed Judina’s findings (2014: 198-207) that Russian-speaking people paid more attention to their children’s education than to living in a neighbourhood close to Russian-speaking people.
The suggestion of choosing ‘better’ schools usually needs some explanation for newly arrived parents in terms of how they can compare the local schools. Anton received some help in the form of informative answers from Marina, who worked as a teacher in a primary school near Glasgow. She tried to explain to him the structure of the education system in Glasgow, where schools are divided into primary and secondary; the connections between the schools; the grading systems for school exams; and how this information can be used in the evaluation of school performance in choosing a school for his child. During this discussion, Marina played the role of a cultural interpreter and a conduit of local knowledge, introducing Anton to the Scottish education system. The information provided by Marina was likely to be accurate due to her local work experience. Anton received some initial information which helped him to move further, and to search for more information on the Internet. The differences between the education systems of the host countries and countries of origin quite often cause uncertainty in migrant parents and prompt them to find ways to become more familiar with the local education systems, which represent a new challenge for them to understand (Kraftsoff & Quinn, 2009; Heath, McGhee & Trevena, 2011).

When I asked the participants if they had tried to receive some of this information outside the Russian schools, several of them answered that they had searched the Internet and asked their local neighbours. However, the main difficulties they had encountered in getting answers were poor knowledge of the key vocabulary and specific terminology. For example, one mother noted that she did not know what school performance tables meant, and searching on the Internet for better performing schools in her city was difficult for her. Another respondent complained that she could not understand the difference between a nursery, preschool classes, and early education classes, and that her knowledge was insufficient to recognise the differences based on website information. In the Russian school, both respondents received explanations, some key words for searching, and the name of a useful website from other parents.

The involvement of migrants in local neighbourhood networks plays an important role in the process of their integration by providing them with valuable information (Kloosterman & Rath 2001; Malyutina, 2013). However, some types of culturally inflected information cannot be effectively shared between migrants and local neighbourhood networks due to the different cultural traditions at play, and differences in social norms (Kohlbacher, Reeger &
Schnell, 2015; Ryan, 2011). This discussion about the best school in the city can be viewed as one example of confused communication caused by differences in cultural traditions:

Scottish people are so proud of their education and so polite that they do not like to upset anybody. Several times I asked my neighbours about the best school, but they answered that all our schools are good because the Council controls them. (Extract from the field notes of an observation at the Russian school in Aberdeen)

The interpretation of this personal opinion can be used to highlight some interesting issues related to the ways in which this information is shared and valued (Ryan, 2011). According to Kyle (1999), the effective distribution of culturally sensitive information through social networks requires a level of trust and similarity in cultural traditions. In the Russian schools, the parents mentioned that they have opportunities to ask direct questions without fear of being seen to be rude. The parents willingly told me about their experience of school selection for their children, and other advantages about their places of residence.

The second popular topic in the Russian schools was the interactions between Russian-speaking families and local families who attend the same local mainstream schools. As has previously been noted by Edwards (2004) and Ryan (2011), mainstream school contacts are particularly important for migrant mothers as opportunities to access networks including local people. However, in my observations of their discussions, the migrant parents mentioned that they faced a wide range of difficulties in contacting their local schools, not only due to language barriers but also due to differences in their own schooling experiences. Several respondents said that they did not want to look silly by asking questions which might seem obvious to others:

They (parents from our mainstream school) knew it all because they studied here. In answering my question about how they knew that lessons finished earlier on the last day before school holiday, they just shrugged their shoulders and I felt like a complete idiot. (Extract from field notes from an observation at the Russian School in Dundee).

The migrant parents seemed to understand each other due to the similarity of their mainstream school experiences and their common assumptions about the local schools. Shared experiences as important factors for establishing initial interactions may result in more stable network relationships (Francis et al., 2010).

Extensive discussions observed in the Russian schools showed that Russian-speaking families shared similar values related to the education of their children that can help them to
participate in such discussions more freely, and to ask other participants questions. The Russian school is therefore seen by some parents as a good starting point for finding information which might help them to improve their choice of local mainstream schools and their understanding of how local schools’ communities operate.

5.3.2. Healthcare issues and social support

The process of migration can be strongly linked to the health issues which arise due to changes in lifestyles, traditional environments, and emotional pressures (Diler, Avci & Seydaoglu, 2003). Previous studies exploring healthcare issues and mutual support among migrant families have shown that women are generally the main actors in such networks and discussions (Dedeoglu, 2009). Their role as the main actors in integrating their families into social services has been investigated by several authors (Ehrenreich and Hochschild, 2003; Salaff & Greve, 2004).

My observations in the Russian school corridors revealed similar cultural factors regarding access to medical services among the Russian-speaking diaspora in Scotland (Ivashinenko & Schatalina, 2009). However, due to the connection with Russian schools, the parents in the schools’ corridors more often discussed their children’s health than the adults’ health. The fragmented chatting revealed many common issues, such as a lack of comprehension of the organisational structure of the NHS; migrants’ perceptions of this system; and communication problems between migrants and medical staff.

The organisational structure of the NHS is different from the structures of the health services in the Russian-speakers’ native countries. Although in Scotland a wide range of programmes and information have been produced by the NHS which have been specifically tailored to migrant communities, a lack of knowledge still exists (Taggart, 2017). The newly arrived parents were keen to ask longer-settled parents a number of questions related to different uses of the local healthcare system. I observed several times in different schools how newly arrived Russian-speaking parents discussed the prescription of paracetamol, which they received from their GPs. Remembering their experiences of consumption of other

---

32 The Scottish healthcare system consists of several components: GPs, providing primary care and hospitals providing specialist and secondary care (Robson, 2011). The key differences between Scotland and post-Soviet countries' healthcare systems lie in access to specialist examinations. In many countries of origin of the Russian-speaking migrants, patients are still able to access specialists without the need for a doctor’s referral.
medications in their home countries, these Russian-speaking parents felt confused by this advice. A similar situation was found by Guma, whose Czech and Slovak study participants viewed the prescription of the painkiller paracetamol as ‘opposed to remedies treating the causes of ill health such as antibiotics which doctors would ‘normally’ prescribe to patients in Slovakia/Czech Republic’ (Guma, 2015: 181).

Historically in the USSR health care system was provided only by the state organisations and promoted the idea of public value of population health (Akopyan & Tikhomirov, 2011). After the collapse of the USSR, ideologies around medical care provision have changed, but some of the older values may continue to shape the medical culture and expectations of migrants who have arrived from post-Soviet countries towards healthcare in Scotland. The cultural clash between what newly arrived parents expected from local healthcare was observed to cause anxieties and stress. For example, one of newly arrived parents complained that in Russia doctors prescribe a wide range of medicine, but in Scotland, GPs had only suggested paracetamol on various occasions. The parents who had lived in Scotland for a longer time offered a wide range of suggestions and explanations of how the local system works. Oksana, who had lived in Glasgow for three years, said: “here we can buy a lot of medications which are recommended by the pharmacy”. Sharing similar experiences of using the Russian healthcare system with parents who referred to the use of paracetamol, Oksana offered her own explanation of this situation in Scotland:

Here (in Scotland), the doctor is not biased and will not recommend medication from only one firm, as happens in some countries where doctors have contracts directly with pharmaceutical companies which, of course, is a form of corruption. (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Glasgow)

The migrants’ problems in communication with their GPs have some similarities with the barriers to their contact with mainstream schools, such as language related issues. Some newly arrived parents told me about difficulties in correctly describing their own experiences, problems and symptoms. For example, one of the Russian-speaking mothers, Olga, complained: “I know my health problems, I was treated for a long time in Latvia and I do not understand why here my GP did not trust me” (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Aberdeen). The information received by Olga from her GP contradicted her previous diagnosis, along with all her assumptions about appropriate treatment. That, in turn, caused fears and uncertainty in her own ability to clearly express her problems to her GP. One of the other mothers, who referred to her own successful
experience in overcoming communication problems with GPs, tried to explain to Olga that the local health system had a different classification of medical conditions: “Nothing is right or wrong; it is simply different” (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Aberdeen). Another Russian-speaking parent suggested: “You did not recover from this chronic medical condition in Russia, so why not try a new way in Scotland?” (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Aberdeen). The reactions of longer settled migrant families showed that their familiarity with the local healthcare system and acceptance of local rules had changed over time (Mamattah, 2009), and that this experience can be used to reassure newer arrivals.

The second big health-related issue for discussion related to childbirth, and was particularly pertinent to mothers’ experiences and networks. Experiences of early motherhood can be considered as one of the driving factors for seeking and sharing information and instrumental support between migrant mothers (Bell & Ribbens, 1994). In the Russian schools, I also observed how mothers enthusiastically chatted about their experience of childbirth in Scotland and gave advice to pregnant mothers. Lena, who was 35 at the time of giving birth in Scotland, shared her experience of hospital:

> Before coming to hospital, I was in a complete panic as to how I could speak with medical staff in English; I would probably forget all my English words in this situation. However, they did not ask me anything; they just attached some medical monitors, and everything was good. (Extract from a conversation in the Russian school corridor in Glasgow, Lena)

Lena’s main concern was the language barrier in a specific situation, but her trust in a high level of medical technology could be given as a reassuring example to other pregnant mothers who were also worried about their ability to communicate in this situation. During this discussion, the parents compared medical systems in different countries, and pointed out that Scotland had a higher level of medical technology than their countries of origin.

On the one hand, many migrants consider the high level of systematisation and information provision for patients as an advantage, especially for those who have English language learning difficulties. On the other hand, due to their nostalgic cultural references, migrants expected more personal communication between doctors and patients:

> For every question you have, they give you a leaflet. Of course, that’s good because you can read everything again at home with a medical dictionary to help you to
understand everything, but it’s hardly appropriate after an operation when you have to take your children’s hands to reassure them that everything is OK, and it’s not possible to ask anyone anything. (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Glasgow)

References to personal experiences seemed more convincing for women participating in such discussions than the leaflets given to the migrant women in surgeries. Since they missed this personal interaction with their doctors, they in some ways received it by interacting directly with other Russian-speakers who had shared similar experiences.

During my visits to the Russian schools, I observed several discussions about the operation of community medicine and its relationship with general practitioners and hospitals in the NHS. For example, some of the mothers were confused about the roles and duties of health visitors:

I didn’t understand for a very long time that you must have a health visitor. I can go to her on Mondays with all kind of issues, and if anything is serious or wrong then she sends me to the GP. If it’s not serious though, where can I go? (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Dundee)

I observed several discussions about these issues in different Russian schools. In the opinions of the participants in these discussions, a key issue was the relationship between families and health visitors. One of parents described her experience:

Yes, we are not natives, she (the health visitor) heard our accent, seemed to be surprised by my questions, and then disappeared. We saw her a few times, no more.

Another parent who participated in this discussion replied that:

I think she understood that I am a foreigner and urgently needed her support. She (the health visitor) was so helpful and so kind in providing me with a lot of information. She also helped me to register at the pharmacy for free prescriptions. (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Glasgow)

My observations of discussions between Russian-speaking parents revealed a rich variety of situations occurring in everyday lives of migrants, along with significant differences in families’ responses to them. The relationships between medical staff and patients have tended to be at the core of studies in the sociology of medicine (Cox & Marland, 2013). In contrast with research projects done among the mainstream population, ethnic minority groups more often consider these situations through the lens of their migration experience.
and the relationships between migrant groups and local communities (Guma, 2015: 175-179). The first mother assumed that her status as migrant was one of the disadvantages which raises barriers between her family and health visitors, but the second opinion contrasts with her point of view as the second woman assumed that her migrant status caused the local health visitor to pay more attention to her. Both participants referred to their identity as migrants, and to cultural differences, but came to different conclusions concerning their interactions with local services providers. However, by sharing their experiences, the mothers were helped in making sense of a system that was new to them. The involvement of these mothers in the social networks around the Russian school provided them with the opportunity to talk about their problems more freely and referred to experiences common to other parents from their countries of origin.

The parents not only shared advice about medical issues; I also often observed that they exchanged medication which they had bought in their countries of origin. The Russian schools thus play the role of safe places where people are not afraid to purchase medicines and receive them from others who are not close family friends.

The concerns and anxieties expressed by the Russian-speaking mothers tended to be deeply rooted in cultural differences and their previous experiences of using healthcare systems in their native countries. The cultural clash between what they expected and what they experienced in Scotland caused them some uncertainty which was amplified by the gaps in their knowledge of the local system, and by language barriers. The Russian schools provide a friendly environment where mothers with questions about health issues can discuss them with other Russian-speaking parents. Having similar shared cultural experiences tends to be the key factor in building understanding of the problems and giving advice. Predictably, not all explanations were correct from a medical professional point of view, and not all problems found solutions, but in the Russian schools, migrant parents have the opportunities to build their sense of familiarity with the local healthcare system and to explore different strategies in relation to different encounters.

5.3.3. Information about economic practices

While a significant body of literature has shown the importance of social networks for migrant occupational attainment (Lancee, 2012; Morosanu, 2016), in the Russian schools’ corridors, economics-related practices were discussed less than educational and social
aspects. My participant observations found that some parents did not like to reveal their current occupational status, and avoided being involved in discussions about work. In trying to avoid displaying their own personal economic position, parents from the Russian schools preferred to discuss more general topics, such as ways of searching for jobs, overseas qualifications, and embarking on self-employment.

In the Russian schools, I observed how newly arrived parents often asked about the work of job centres and recruiting companies in helping migrants to find appropriate jobs. While some of this information is widely accessible via the Internet, one of the parents was looking for special advice which he felt could only be obtained from people who had previously had a similar experience. He was not satisfied with his level of English, but was looking for other ways to secure employment which had been successfully used by migrants with limited knowledge of the language:

The Russian-speaking people who have already found a job maybe know something which will be helpful for me. I know my language is not good enough, but I would like to find any job to support my family. (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Dundee)

A lack of communication competence in the migrant community has been widely investigated as a key barrier to the labour market (Low Pay Commission, 2010: 95; Green et al., 2005; Erel, 2009; Battu & Sloane, 2002). The network emerging around the Russian schools provides migrants with useful information about some Scottish organisations which will more willingly hire migrant workers due to their ability to speak in several languages. One of these cases was a discussion about call centres which were working with Russian-speaking clients, and employed Russian speakers:

I did not even know about call centres here which work with the CIS (post-Soviet countries including in the European Asian Union). The girls here told me about that. (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Glasgow)

The discussion about call centres naturally led me to explore the question of what kind of jobs are valued by parents as highly-skilled, and seen as having a positive social image. Following Nowicka (2014), it can be argued that migrants’ skills, qualifications and abilities alone are less important than how they are interpreted, valued and enacted, both in the country of origin and in Scotland. As I was told by a ‘long-settled’ migrant, newly arrived parents tend to fill their CVs with their experience, and to highlight their career path
achievements, but this CV may not be suitable to apply for many jobs in their new country, as the requirements are different:

I think a lot of Russian-speaking migrants are perceived by employers as overqualified for the positions they apply for. Generally, employers tend to be afraid rather than impressed to employ these people, and obviously they prefer to have local staff. 

(Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Edinburgh)

This discussion exemplified some of the contradictions which exist between the different value systems in the host country and the migrants’ country of origin. As demonstrated by the above quotes, according to migrants’ cultural understanding gained from their countries of origin, their high and broad level of education should be perceived by employers as a benefit. However, the ‘long-settled’ migrants more often shared the opinion that in the UK’s work culture, specific knowledge and skills tend to be more valued, especially for low- and middle-qualified jobs. Research into work culture suggests that this difference may produce more labour market entry barriers for migrants due to misunderstandings about what kind of skills are required by potential employers for particular vacancies (Wood et al., 2009; Heath and Cheung, 2007; Hoque and Noon, 1999).

One of the solutions for improving CV writing suggested by Lyuda was to avoid including information not related directly to a specific job description into CVs, especially if this skill would be more appropriate for a higher position:

I simply talked to one of our mothers, and we got to talking about work. I saw her difficulties in getting a job. Even in shops, there are peculiar requirements too. I asked her to give me her E-mail, so I could share the experience of how I passed the interview with her. There are rather strict rules; it is necessary to answer questions not as you might think, but as they require you to do so. (Lyuda, parent, Edinburgh)

Although Lyuda was a less active member of the Russian school community, she willingly shared her own knowledge about how to succeed in a job interview with other parents in the Russian school. While Laczik (2014) and Nowicka (2014) discussed the ways in which migrants can undervalue their own skills, the Russian schools’ communities struggled with another problem: adaptation of their knowledge to the Scottish labour market.

One of the newcomers to Scotland struggled to understand how employers could check the information provided in a CV. The experience in her country of origin was that her whole job history was recorded in official documents – with an employment record book
(trudovaya knizhka) completed by her previous employers forming the main source of information about her previous employment. In Scotland, in the opinion of the parents who offered advice based on their previous experiences, the procedure is completely different. A candidate does not need to record all his/her employment history on their CV, but can instead select appropriate roles or experience for inclusion. Initial interviews with employers, and references, were more important than official records in obtaining a job.

A commonly held belief amongst migrants revealed by my observations and consistent with Williams’ findings (2004) is that a suitable job in Scotland would be hard to find without obtaining UK qualifications. I observed several situations where participants discussed with regret that they have many qualifications which did not help them to find an appropriate job. Some researchers have noted discrimination against migrants in the workplace (Bonn, 2015; Mannila & Reuter, 2009). However, the discussions which I observed in the Russian schools did not usually attribute blame to employers personally; rather, they demonstrated understanding of the employers’ positions.

This discussion about the work opportunities information being shared within the Russian schools’ networks would not be complete without raising the question of vacancies within ethnic communities (Dedeoglu, 2014). In the Russian schools, requests for information about potential jobs can be found significantly more often than real instances of this type of vacancy. As I was told during my interviews, the Russian school administrations do not have the right to advertise Russian-based services. Nevertheless, the parents are free to talk with others, and to informally let people know about their personal initiatives, such as in hairdressing, manicures, massage, cooking, sewing, and child-minding. However, in comparison with Kyle’s study, which investigated the social capital and transnational entrepreneurship established by migrants (1999), the businesses carried out by parents from the Russian schools could not be recognised as self-employment. Rather, in a similar way to Dedeoglu’s study amongst Turkish women in London, these activities were extensions of their domestic roles which were being used as sources of additional family income, rather than being the main breadwinning activities (Dedeoglu, 2014: 179).

33 Trudovaya knizhka - an employment record book in the USSR and the Russian Federation. This is an official personal document recording the employment status of its owner over time and is used for checking his/her job experience.
Within the Russian school communities, those women with enough free time tried to offer others their services. The Russian schools can thus indirectly help people to create links with potential customers. These links bring both advantages and disadvantages; involvement in a common network can help parents to provide their services informally. For example, several women who provided massage and hairdressing services at their homes because they did not have office facilities preferred to invite people who were already known to them. However, the price for these services were usually lower than the market rate. I was told by one of these providers that she had moral problem in charging Russian-speaking parents due to seeing them as friends.

The exchanges of information about employment practices which I observed in the Russian schools demonstrated the importance of shared cultural backgrounds and experiences in job searching in beginning these conversations. During informal discussions, migrants who had already found a job advised others currently looking for vacancies as to how they could use their migrant background and experiences to their best advantage. Acting as cultural interpreters, the informal advisors shared their views about the strengths and weaknesses of Russian-speaking migrants in the Scottish labour market. Social networks related to the Russian schools were used to distribute a wide range of information assisting newly arrived migrants to increase their employability, and raising their confidence about the prospect of finding work, but may have had little or no impact on those migrants actually obtaining jobs.

5.3.4. Emotional support and integration into daily life

A reader of the previous subsection might get the impression that the Russian-speaking parents are highly motivated participants coming to the Russian schools for practical reasons. However, this impression may only exist due to the researcher’s attempts to organise the obtained data around chosen themes through thematic analysis. Although the parents can receive a wide range of valuable information from informal and friendly communication, most of the chatting among them was difficult to classify. These discussions covered an extensive range of everyday aspects of life, from TV news to neighbourhood gossip. I decided to include them in my investigation about social networks after one of the interviews. When I asked my respondent to describe her feelings about being in Scotland: she answered: “in Scotland, everything was strange (chuzhoe) for me, I didn’t even know where I could park my car to avoid breaking any formal rules or informal agreements” (Evgeniya, teacher, Aberdeen). In describing her feelings in this way, she did not refer to
any specific topic such as education, employment or health. She was, rather, upset about some very basic everyday routines: “I had to learn to cook again due to the difference in products and the food traditions of my new local relatives. I felt so helpless” (Evgeniya, teacher, Aberdeen). The interconnection between practical and more emotional aspects of life can be found in different studies which explore migrants’ experiences and understandings of ‘normality’ (Rabikowska, 2010), their social security (Erel, Ryan & Angelo, 2015; Flynn and Kay, 2017; Kay and Trevena, 2017), and emotional support (Boyd, 1989; Malyutina, 2013; Morosanu, 2016).

Migrants’ processes of negotiating ‘normality’ can be understood as ‘social processes contributing to the organised structure of reality’ (Rabikowska, 2010: 285). During the informal chats I observed in the Russian schools’ corridors, the parents, in fact, were not only passing the time, it could be argued that they also improved their confidence in barely visible steps which helped them to maintain their own lifestyle, and avoid depression and social isolation. Meeting people with similar backgrounds can help to overcome invisible barriers to integration into local life. During one of my visits just before Christmas, the parents discussed Christmas dishes and exchanged recipes. They helped each other to organise their everyday lives by adapting their household skills and knowledge to their new life in a new country. For example, one of the parents said that:

I missed some of our dishes; it was so delicious to eat them during the New Year dinner. It was a part of the celebrations. I cannot cook them here because I do not know the translations for all the ingredients, and cannot find them in local shops. (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Edinburgh)

Other parents suggested that she should find Eastern European food shops or look on the Internet for the ingredients, and pointed out that similar things sold in local shops can be used to replace some traditional ingredients. As in the situation with the exchange of medication, some parents buy traditional Russian spices in their countries of origin when they travel, which are then exchanged between families.

Other significant emotionally loaded issues for migrants concerned their assumptions about what represents polite behaviour in the Scottish context. The theory of politeness constructed and developed within a sociolinguistic approach (Lakoff & Ide, 2005; Larina, 2009) has been widely used in migrant studies (Crozier, 2003; Braunmüller, 2013). In this approach, ‘politeness’ can be recognised as ‘invisibility and following the subtlety of norms and
practices or scripted behaviour that is culturally specific’ (Erel, Ryan & Angelo, 2015: 42). In everyday practice, migrants meet different challenges and situations where they try to demonstrate their politeness by integrating ideas about being polite in their countries of origin and in the host society. Some of the parents at the Russian schools had a feeling that their assumptions about politeness did not fully match the social norms formed in the local environment. In the Russian schools’ corridors, they shared their experiences with other parents. One of the parents described feeling confused at a bus stop:

After my arrival in Scotland, I was very confused about how locals identified the order in which people were queueing for the bus. I could not see any clearly visible row of people. (Extract from field notes of observation, the Russian school in Aberdeen)

This situation occurred just after arrival of these Russian-speaking parents. Another parent who participated in this discussion explained that:

They may stand spontaneously, but they remember who was at the bus stop before them; we should also develop this skill to look around us. (Extract from field notes of observation, the Russian school in Aberdeen)

Giving attention to other people in public spaces, and appropriate responses to their behaviour, were assumed by migrant parents to be important social skills. Polite social behaviour is rooted in cultural traditions which differ in Scotland and migrant countries of origin (Larina, 2009). However, conversations in the corridors at the Russian schools helped newly arrived Russian-speaking parents to adjust these skills by receiving explanations from ‘long-settled’ migrants who had had similar previous experiences.

Migrant families often need emotional support due to a wide range of factors including language barriers (Choi et al., 2012), and cultural differences (Kliuchnikova, 2016). The Russian schools function as a safe space where parents can discuss their feelings and fears with others who may have found themselves in similar situations. It could be argued that the social networks which emerged around the Russian schools have quite high levels of emotional elements, as shown in the parents’ discussions. Emotions play a significant part in building relationships between Russian-speaking parents; sharing common emotions based on similar cultural backgrounds supports migrant well-being during their daily routines.
5.3.5. Information events organised by the Russian schools

The Russian schools not only provided support for informal exchange of information between different migrant families, but also arranged some formal workshops and consultation sessions for parents to improve their knowledge about Scotland, and help them to integrate into local life. In order to deal with the parents’ concerns and wishes, the Russian schools organised these formal events to address questions which were often raised during informal communication, regarding education, the health system, employability, and emotional support.

Despite the fact that the Scottish Government prides itself on providing a wide range of information for migrants, this system is still developing, with current research into migrant experiences highlighting ‘a lack of information, limited awareness of their entitlement and a general anxiety about engagement with welfare and support services’ (Taggart, 2017: 5). On the other hand, advice service providers also ‘reported difficulties connecting with some migrant groups’ (Taggart, 2017: 5). In highlighting the importance of word-of-mouth in migrant information exchange, most authors (Simone, 2004; Ryan et al., 2008; Flint, 2009) point out the risk of potential distortion due to out-of-date or inaccurate information.

In order to address the needs of their members, the Russian schools organised information events providing opportunities for more or less formal communication between parents and local specialists who are experts in a wide range of local service areas. These events not only provided the information required by parents, but also helped them to overcome the cultural and language barriers which may be preventing them from accessing local knowledge. During these events, the parents have the chance to ask questions to Scottish specialists.

I was told about these event in the Russian school in Aberdeen, and I participated in workshops organised by BEMIS in the Russian School in Glasgow. The main topic of discussion was the work of Parents’ Councils in mainstream schools. During an observation, I saw how Russian-speaking parents who did not know about Parents’ Councils interacted with those who knew about, and participated in, them in the mainstream schools attended by their children. In comparison with the discussions in school corridors, this discussion was

---

less active, and some parents preferred not to ask questions directly of the guest speaker but to consult other participants at the end of the session. This could be interpreted as having been due to a lack of confidence (Cox, 2000). As one parent said: “I am not ready yet to contact the officials as I do not want to demonstrate a lack of knowledge” (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Glasgow). However, other parents acted as facilitators and cultural translators and clarified some aspects of the guest speaker’s presentation for other participants. The formal communication was supported by an informal exchange of knowledge.

The formal meetings in the Russian schools were devoted not only to educational matters, which are naturally close to the educational goals of these schools, but also to other issues of concern to Russian-speaking parents. In order to address migrant needs in understanding how the healthcare system works, the Russian schools in Glasgow and in Aberdeen invited some local specialists from the NHS, including some GPs. As was discussed above, there are often some difficulties in communication between newly arrived migrants and their GPs. I did not attend the meeting which was held in the Russian school in Aberdeen, as the event was organised to form part of the framework of a wider project at that school. However, I received some comments from one of the teachers there, who emphasised that the event was an attempt by the Russian school to respond to parents’ requests and also to create some connections with local organisations:

We did that because our parents wanted to know more about the local healthcare system, and I also think it is important for our school to participate in such events. (Evgeniya, teacher, Aberdeen)

In addition, I observed a similar meeting at the Russian school in Glasgow, during which it seemed that parents overcame language and cultural barriers and asked the questions that they deemed essential. The GP who was invited to this meeting, Mariya, was educated in Scotland and worked in one of Glasgow’s GP surgeries, but is originally from Georgia (a former Soviet republic). She did not speak very good Russian, but she had some knowledge about health services in post-Soviet times. The common experiences in using post-Soviet healthcare systems seemed helpful for some parents in overcoming their cultural barriers and ask important questions. Some of the questions asked by the parents were similar to topics of their discussions in the school's corridors, such as questions about paracetamol.

However, Mariya steered the discussion more towards an explanation of how migrants can gain access to healthcare specialists rather than searching to explain the cultural differences between the two systems, a comparison I had observed in the Russian schools’ corridors. Mariya’s professional experience, and the involvement of the Russian school in organising this meeting, thus created an opportunity for Russian-speaking parents to receive professional information in a more comfortable way, a situation which is of great significance to migrants (McGhee, Trevena & Heath, 2015).

Informal conversations between Russian-speaking parents about increasing their employability showed some gaps between the key desire of the parents to find a job and the weak capacity of the Russian schools’ communities to assist them in doing so. The Russian schools also tried to cover this gap by organising English classes, writing surgeries for improving CV writing, and consultations for job interviews, by offering references for volunteers in the schools, and by distributing information from potential employers. The Russian schools, registered as Scottish charities, were also sometimes able to establish links with Scottish organisations working in the local labour market. As several directors of the Russian schools told me, the schools received some information from Scottish employers who were interested in hiring Russian-speakers for various projects. In such cases, the Russian schools acted as mediators between the Scottish organisations and the Russian-speaking parents, helping both sides to communicate more effectively. A similar situation was found by White (2011: 192) who also considered the Polish Saturday schools as ‘link to UK service providers’. As has been noted in earlier studies (Leonard & Onyx, 2003; Moroşanu, 2013), the networks formed through migrant community organisations can bring advantages to their members which they cannot achieve outside these organisations. It seems that the Russian schools tried to enlarge the capacities of the Russian-speaking parents’ networks by involving Scottish organisations in these interactions.

The Russian schools provided valuable information about different aspects of local life, but the main agenda of their extracurricular events was devoted to the promotion of Russian culture, as well as social networks. In merging these goals, the Russian schools became involved in providing emotional support for Russian-speaking parents. Russian food tastings were quite popular in the Russian schools, and serve as one example of such cultural events.

These events organised by the Russian schools showed the Russian cultural food tradition and allowed Scottish parents and their relatives to taste a wide range of Russian dishes cooked by Russian-speaking parents. Despite the fact that a Russian cultural café or restaurant can be found in each of the fieldwork locations, the parents rarely mentioned these places and did not often visit them. During the Russian food events, Russian-speaking and local Scottish parents were involved in communication which helped them to establish new relations with other members of the Russian school community. According to the parents I spoke with, in comparison with the local Russian restaurants, Russian schools provided a friendlier and more comfortable atmosphere for socialising where “people treat each other rather than trying to sell/buy food” (Extract from field notes from observations at the Russian school in Glasgow). Sharing food has a long-rooted tradition in different cultures, including Russian culture, as an act of creating friendship and a demonstration of respect for guests (Blank & Howard, 2013). It helps participants to gain insight into their cultural differences, and to establish or develop their social networks.

In looking at the wide range of events organised by the Russian schools, I asked teachers why these events were organised if they were not directly connected with education. The main reason given by the respondents was summed up by Evgeniya: “it is important for us to help each other and to be together” (Evgeniya, teacher, Aberdeen). The position of Russian schools in the social landscape is twofold (Vasey, 2016). Firstly, the Russian schools are migrant organisations created by, and for, migrants, in the main. However, as registered Scottish charities, the Russian schools have opportunities to build connections with local Scottish organisations and institutions (e.g. healthcare providers; mainstream schools, employers, etc.), and to share these resources with their members. In the Russian schools, formal events support informal social networks, not only leading to increased information exchange, but also encouraging the creation of new connections between migrants, local people, and organisations.

Conclusion

The observations in the Russian schools presented in this chapter show that parents interact in a wide range of ways, and gain a wide variety of benefits and forms of support and information from their engagement with the schools. The Russian schools create the conditions for supporting diverse social networks which unite people by their relationships, common interests, and need for advice which, in its turn, helps the schools to attract a broader
audience and to underpin their growth. As Boyd (1989) noted, the networks supported by ethnic associations depend on their activities and their goals. It could be argued that the involvement of Russian-speaking parents in heritage language preservation can create and support one of the most diverse and complex types of networks (McGhee, Trevena & Heath, 2015).

The dynamic nature of the social networks linked to the schools forms part of a two-way communication process which helps the Russian schools to grow. The existing social networks can encourage new pupils to attend the Russian schools. In turn, the weekly routine in the Russian schools both formally and informally promotes cooperation between parents and strengthens the relationships between families. By providing a place for meetings and ensuring regular contact, the Russian schools enrich migrant social networks and influence their transformations. Newcomers to the Russians schools gain opportunities to become involved in multiple networks with different types of connections.

Parents’ sharing of the same educational goal, to provide a Russian-speaking environment for their children, creates a basis for initial conversations between them. The parents’ motivation to teach their children Russian is usually combined with a desire to establish connections with Russian-speaking adults too. My observations in the Russian schools’ corridors showed the diversity of ways in which the Russian schools’ communities responded to the everyday problems of their members. The main topics discussed between parents related to the concerns and fears they experienced due to cultural clashes between their previous experiences and their expectations towards local life in Scotland. The sharing of similar experiences is perceived by parents as an important factor in establishing initial trust, and helps them to overcome barriers in seeking information (Guma, 2015).

Depending on the topic and context of a discussion, parents with various experiences of problem-solving can play the role of cultural interpreters, assisting others in understanding and accepting different aspects of local life. The members of the Russian-speaking community who played the role of a cultural interpreter usually had a positive experience of living in Scotland, and were able to refer to some common practices experienced by the migrants when they lived in the country of origin.

Furthermore, the social networks which emerged around the Russian schools can help in sharing information about educational and healthcare systems, although this was observed
to be less the case with employment opportunities. Most conversations about sensitive issues for migrant parents were quite emotional, and provided both opportunities for knowledge exchange, and emotional support. For parents, being among migrants with similar problems and feelings created a special space for informal conversations which helped them to join different networks. By participating in these networks, the parents are able to be a potential source of information and a cultural interpreter for others. Thus, the growth of migrant social networks around the Russian schools increases the pool of informal knowledge.

In response to the parents’ requests and needs, the Russian schools also organised formal events where the parents were able to meet local Scottish specialists. These meetings helped to bridge information gaps (and also provided new evidence of its existence), as was discussed in informal conversations among parents. The Russian schools thus created a comfortable place where Russian-speaking parents could ask the professionals questions and also receive some support and clarification from other Russian-speaking parents. In this way, professional resources were backed up by cultural explanations and emotional support. The cultural events organised by the Russian schools promoted Russian cultural traditions while also uniting the Russian-speaking community within particular Scottish contexts. This role of the Russian schools, as transnational organisations, is discussed in detail in the next chapter.
Chapter 6. Transnational Practices Promoted by the Russian Schools in Scotland

While the previous chapters have explored the roles of the Russian schools in heritage language preservation and social networking, the present chapter shifts the focus of analysis to the ways in which the Russian schools explicitly or implicitly provide the resources necessary for transnational activities. Focusing the investigation on the everyday life and practices of the Russian schools in Scotland, I revisit much of the data discussed previously, this time through a ‘transnational lens’. As discussed in the first chapter, at present the transnational approach represents a wide range of concepts based on the idea that transnational migrants could be identified as people engaged in creating and maintaining a connection between host countries and their country of origin (Vertovec, 2009; Glick-Shiller, 1999; Castles, 2010). The range of interpretations and descriptions of links which could be assumed as transnational is growing (Bacigalupi & Ca´mara, 2012; Fauser et al., 2015; Nedelcu, 2012). The present discussion will focus on socio-cultural transnational activities which, according to the findings outlined earlier in this thesis, are more closely related to heritage language preservation than political or economic linkages.

As outlined in chapter 1, socio-cultural transnational activities can be classified as a wide array of social and cultural transactions through which ideas and meanings are exchanged across borders. This process can include activities connecting with the migrants’ country of origin, such as maintaining contacts with family and friends, joining international organisations, participating in international cultural events, and watching television from the country of origin (Al-Ali et al., 2001: 623; Itzigsohn & Saucedo, 2002: 769; Snel et al., 2006: 293; Jayaweera & Choudhury, 2008: 95). Some of these kinds of activities were found in the Russian schools in Scotland. As was discussed in Chapter 4, maintaining relationships with relatives and friends living abroad was a significant factor in motivating families to transmit their Russian language knowledge to the next generation. Watching Russian TV and using Russian internet assists the parents in encouraging their children to learn Russian.

The Russian Schools’ work can be regarded as transnational due to their global connections as well as the nature of their regular activities (Portes, 1999: 464). The process of heritage language preservation is closely linked to supporting and creating transnational culture, which was defined by Willis (1992: 73) as ‘a shared pattern of learned, transmitted socialization (symbols, values, and experiences) generated from a setting characterised by multiple participants, languages, and ethnic backgrounds’. It is widely recognised that
language and culture are closely intertwined, but the main questions addressed by the present research were: what cultural forms have emerged from heritage language preservation, and how can they be bound to transnational activities? In this research, I use the term ‘culture’ to refer to the culture constructed by the Russian-speaking parents, Russian teachers and children in accordance with a transnational approach.

A study by Itzigsohn and Saucedo have highlighted the importance of socio-cultural transnational practices in relation to the creation of a sense of community (Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002: 768). White (2011) directly used term of transnational activities for describing Saturday schools; she argued that ‘a particular important transnational activity for many parents was sending their children to Polish Saturday school (2011: 192). The transnational approach has some nuances of implementation into studies of the Russian-speaking communities abroad. As has been noted by wider studies of the Russian identities of people living abroad (Cheskin, 2015; Kliuchnikova, 2016), in everyday practices, references to Russia and Russians can have different meanings. One is linked to Russia as a state, and another, using the word “Russia”, actually refers to the Russian cultural/linguistic space which cannot be confined within particular borders. The complexities of Russian culture mean that care must be taken when developing an understanding of ‘transnational culture’ within the Russian-speaking community in Scotland. In my study, I do not seek to define precisely what kind of cultural belonging is represented by the cultural norms, traditions and rituals which were observed in the Russian schools in Scotland. My focus instead is on understanding how parents whose children attend the Russian schools in Scotland use certain cultural symbols to produce a specific cultural space which exists in Scotland, but which refers to other cultural/linguistic spaces, and how this specific culture helps the community to encourage their children to learn Russian and preserve their attachment to Russian-speaking groups. As such, I use the term ‘transnational practices’ to refer to cross-border cross-cultural activities which do not have a clear connection to the official state, but which do have links with a broader cultural/linguistic space (Kliuchnikova, 2016).

The present chapter explores the complex role of the Russian schools operating in Scotland in processes of creating cultural resources and space for transnational practices. This exploration will be achieved by revealing the symbols, values, and experiences which emerged through interviews observations of the schools’ everyday lives and special events,
and which can be used in analysing the transnational nature of these practices. The first part of the chapter discusses the transnational practices used in the teaching process and emerging in the classroom, as well as the symbols and transnational aspects created through the cultural events related to the Russian schools’ activities. This analysis is mainly based on the observations carried out of eight classrooms in the four Russian schools in Scotland, interviews with the Russian teachers and parents, and observations of the cultural events organised by the Russian schools.

The second part of the chapter is devoted to an exploration of the children’s perceptions of the connection between Russia and Scotland, as expressed through their art. In the drawing competition described in Chapter 2, the children were asked to represent both Russia and Scotland, and to write a brief explanation of their work. As was discussed in the methodology chapter, some children found it difficult to express their opinions on such an abstract topic as links between countries. A visual analysis of the children’s pictures was therefore used to reveal the kinds of symbols they used to represent both countries, and to explain how these sets of symbols could be connected with the various activities provided by the Russian schools in Scotland.

6.1. Socio-cultural transnational practices developed through the education process

This part of the chapter discusses the diversity of the transnational cultural values and symbols which were created during the educational process. Observations of socio-cultural transnational practices emerging through the communication between teachers, parents and children demonstrated how participants in the heritage language preservation process renegotiate their mutual understanding of Russian cultural elements in the Scottish environment. The Russian schools can be investigated as ‘an arena for conscious choice, justification and representation’ of a transnational culture (Appadurai, 1990: 18). As organisations and providers of multicultural education (Gollnick & Chinn, 1986; Banks & Banks, 1989), the Russian schools produce transnational cultural elements which are fluid and ‘radically context-dependent’ (Willis, 1992: 77).

A substantial proportion of the lessons in the Russian schools in Scotland focuses on recreating images of Russia, and allowing children to merge these with their experiences of their life in Scotland. These topics were partly covered in Chapter 3 during the analysis of
the Russian language teaching methods in Scotland. In this section, returning to the previous discussion, teaching and learning in Russian are explored from the angle of the transnational practices emerging in the Russian schools in Scotland.

6.1.1. Russian folk and fairy tales for migrant children

My observations in the classrooms and my analysis of the Russian schools’ programmes revealed that Russian fairy tales are included to some extent in the teaching process in all four schools. Previous studies on the role of folklore in national cultures (Bauman, 1992: 35) have suggested that fairy tales can be considered as important elements in support of shared tradition and shared identity. Fairy tales, as tools for education, are also strongly embedded in the Russian cultural tradition (Lukjanenko, 2003). According to my findings, Russian fairy tales are widely read by Russian-speaking families. The belief in the importance of reading Russian fairy tales to children is strong among Russian-speaking parents in Scotland. This implementation of Russian folklore in the heritage language preservation process emerges as a natural way of introducing Russian culture to children. However, this introduction of Russian folklore occurs in the Russian schools operating in Scotland and cannot be ‘content-independent’ from the Scottish cultural environment (Willis, 1992: 72). Using Russian folklore as part of teaching Russian language within a Scottish educational context creates the necessary preconditions for establishing transnational socio-cultural practices.

The knowledge of Russian fairy tales also creates a certain degree of identification with Russian-speaking societies, along with a sense of belonging to the Russian-speaking community in Scotland. During interviews with the teachers and parents, characters from Russian fairy tales were described using words like ‘elementary’, ‘basic’, ‘popular’, and ‘well-known’. This can be interpreted as a demonstration that knowledge of these characters is defined as a marker of belonging to that culture:

Our children are, of course, different. They don't know any of the elementary fantastic characters which are known to the children who live in the former Soviet Union. I have considered this component. They cannot know elementary things, because they live in another environment. (Lada, teacher, Dundee)

It was also observed in the Russian schools in Glasgow and in Aberdeen that those children who knew some Russian fairy tales were surprised that some of their classmates did not.
They also received some notions from their parents that all Russian children know these stories.

The parents and teachers from the Russian schools shared the common opinion that fairy tales are better acquired at an early age. Children who did not read fairy tales in their childhoods did not seem to understand them in later years:

If you didn't absorb it in your childhood, all these images will seem a little bit alien, strange to you; similar to us reading Scottish, Celtic fairy tales. (Vasilisa, teacher, Edinburgh)

The parents’ and teachers’ beliefs about the cultural importance of Russian fairy tales for children’s learning seem to be the key reason for including these materials in the content of the Russian lessons. This is due in part to the Russian heritage of the learning process itself. However, this decision also met with some difficulties due to the children’s level of Russian knowledge, and because the bulk of their vocabulary is related to modern Russian usage. As part of a historical tradition, folklore is written in ‘old fashioned’ grammatical forms, and incorporates the names of old things which are no longer in use. The Russian fairy tales included in the Russian lessons tended to be adapted by the teachers at the schools according to modern grammatical rules and vocabulary. The most common adaptation was to exclude some of the old-fashioned Russian grammatical forms from the main body of the text and replace them with new versions of verbs and nouns, or to use explanations and pictures of the historical objects concerned. Vasilisa acknowledges this and adapts her use of fairy tales as a tool for language teaching accordingly:

In my lessons, I treat the implementation of folklore with care. I practically never use original folklore stories; only their modern modifications, because the children don't know ‘old’ fairy tales and there are some ‘stiffened’ grammatical forms in them which are not understood by them. They don't know that these forms aren't used in the language now. I tried to very carefully select the Russian fairy tales, and adapted the language according to the children’s knowledge and modern Russian usage. (Vasilisa, teacher, Edinburgh)

In using the Russian fairy tales in the educational process, the Russian schools focused more on the transmission of specific values and Russian symbols than on the language competences of the children. As Antonina, the Russian teacher of the senior class at the Russian school in Glasgow, said:
Yes, I also agree that the Russian fairy tales can be difficult to understand for our children. We often watch Russian cartoons together to improve their understanding of a particular story. I asked several questions that helped to relate the content to a modern situation. However, there were basic questions of good and evil. (Antonina, teacher, Glasgow)

Developing her explanation about fairy tales generally, not only in the Russian context, Antonina noted that “nowadays, original ancient fairy tales look quite violent and sad”. She mentioned the Russian story about Kolobok, which ends with Kolobok being eaten by the fox. Antonina also told me about some funny situations in her early days in the Russian schools. She gave children the Russian fairy tales about the marten for home reading, but this prompted some parents to complain about her choice of the story, in which a marten ate other animals. Antonina understood and explained the parents’ desire:

I understand their [parents’] concerns; they did not like the fact that the Russian fairy tales were looked at by their children as aggressive and brutal stories. We, adults, would like to introduce to our children to the best selection of the Russian stories. In addition, in Scottish mainstream schools, teachers also avoid including the brutal stories into educational materials. We, the Russian schools, should not be very different from them. (Antonina, teacher, Glasgow)

It seems that the selection of folklore included in heritage language preservation has to be sensible of the cultural environment in host countries. The Scottish cultural environment increased teachers’ awareness in introducing an ideal selection of Russian fairy tales representing the best parts of Russian culture to the children.

In keeping with the teaching practices used by parents at home, Russian fairy tales were included in the Russian learning programmes for the youngest classes, where children enjoyed listening or reading stories and played together. During a classroom visit, I observed how Veronika, a teacher from Edinburgh, used Russian fairy tales and games during the lesson. The children had fun when they listened, read, and performed the Russian fairy tales together.

Selected and adapted Russian folklore for children mainly educated in a Scottish environment have taken on an important role as a marker of belonging to Russian culture, as it was perceived by the Russian-speaking parents and Russian teachers. Russian fairy tales are also seen as fun activities which can unite Russian-speaking children in the Russian-speaking community in Scotland. As is shown in section 6.2, the children remember the
Russian characters as symbols of being Russian, and treat them as markers of Russian culture introduced to them at home and at the Russian schools.

6.1.2. Russian classical literature in complementary schools

Russian classical literature can be considered as another example of the ways in which transnational cultural elements are negotiated through the preservation of Russian as a heritage language. The use of Russian literature in the Russian schools in Scotland was discussed in Chapter 3 in the context of educational practices and models of teaching. Some aspects of Russian culture were also investigated in the discussion in Chapter 4 of the values, practices and beliefs associated with the Russian language in a wider context.

During my observations in Russian classes and interviews with teachers and parents, I analysed how reference to Russian classical literature helps to create transnational socio-cultural practices in the Russian-speaking community in Scotland. These can be recognised as transnational practices because the choice of the corpus of literature is based on parents’ and teachers’ assumptions that this knowledge is important in supporting the identity of the migrant community, and that it also has a connection with their cultural heritage worldwide (Lovell, 2000). Following Willis’ concept of transnational culture as a shared pattern of learned, transmitted symbols, values, and experiences which are context-dependent (1999: 73-77), in this research I unpicked the processes of negotiation, reconstruction and representation of the corpus of Russian classical literature in the Russian schools in Scotland.

Predictably, as was found with the Russian fairy tales, children studying at the Russian schools in Scotland were introduced to, and knew, fewer books written by Russian classical authors than do pupils living in Russian-speaking countries. During interviews and observations in the classrooms, I found that Pushkin, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Chekhov were the most popular Russian classical authors among the Russian school community in Scotland. Their names have worldwide popularity, and symbolic meaning as markers of Russian cultural identity (Bagno, 2008: 214). The name of one of these popular Russian classical authors, Pushkin, came up in most interviews on this topic with both parents and teachers. A common attitude towards Russian classical literature among respondents is represented in the following fragment from my interview with Lada, a Russian teacher from Dundee: “Pushkin is a worldwide brand. If you say that you read Pushkin, this is your business card” (Lada, teacher, Dundee). The symbolic practices and cultural mythologies of
reading Russian classical literature were formed in late Soviet and post-Soviet discourse (Lovell, 2000). According to Orlova (2010), this reading continues to play the role of a marker defining self-identification, the sense of belonging to a social group, and cultural identity in the wider context of world culture. Russian classical literature remains significant for Russian-speaking people living in the UK. As Kliuchnikova suggests:

Reading of Russian literature, especially the 19th and turn-of-the-20th-century classics is reinterpreted in the new, migrant context as a way of ‘recharging’ one’s sense of belonging to Russophile culture in general”. (Kliuchnikova, 2016: 87)

However, much of the corpus of classical Russian literature, which is well known across the world, was written a long time ago, in the 19th century. This fact unavoidably creates a need for a wider historical knowledge among readers and an acquaintance with Russian history. As was noted by several teachers and parents, similarly to reading Russian fairy tales, Russian classical literature does not offer the most useful texts in terms of learning vocabulary. However, it serves different purposes, such as giving the children a sense of Russian culture, and establishing some roots with the Russian-speaking community. As one of the parents from the Russian school in Glasgow observed:

The time for reading and understanding isn't enough, it is necessary not simply to read in Russian, but to read something Russian. (Alexandra, parent, Glasgow)

Alexandra’s reference to “something Russian” returns us to the discussion in Chapter 4 about the role of the Russian language as a tool for interaction between people who have similarities in their cultural knowledge due to reading the same books.

During literature lessons in the Russian schools, the children gain some knowledge of the Russian history and geography mentioned in various books, which are necessary in understanding the books’ contents:

Sometimes we have texts which concern the fine arts, some historical things, poets; not even the texts or poems written by them but, rather, the stories of where Pushkin studied at the Lyceum. They learn about St. Petersburg. (Veronika, teacher, Edinburgh)

The historical and cultural knowledge given to children in the Russian lessons represents a reconstruction of historical images of Russia, and provides them with some idea of the
people living there. Classical Russian literature plays the role of a rich linguistic source and a tool for the representation of Russia in the worldwide context. As Bagno states:

> Russian novels provided Western European readers with everything necessary for conceptualizing the Russian national character. Millions of people who have never been to Russia and who live in various parts of the world have quite a clear idea of its inhabitants thanks to the knowledge gained from the novels of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. (Bagno, 2008: 214)

A similar approach to the representation of Russian literature for students was found in the explanations which the Russian teachers gave to children for why they should study Russian classical literature in Scotland, even if the pupils have a poor general knowledge of the socio-cultural contexts. Referring to the popularity of Russian literature across the world, the teachers encouraged the pupils to be involved in the reading community of lovers of classical Russian literature without borders. As Anastasiya commented, “The Russian classics are known throughout the world” (Anastasiya, teacher, Glasgow).

Teaching Russian as a heritage language differs significantly from teaching it as a foreign language. Both teaching approaches have cultural components which include the study of Russian literature. The selection of Russian authors in the teaching of Russian as a foreign language is usually based on worldwide recognition of their work, while the choices of Russian authors whose books were studied in the Russian schools in Scotland were mostly based on parents’ and teachers’ assumptions about classical Russian literature. This choice mostly referred to parents’ and teachers’ assumptions about classical Russian literature. According to Lovell (2000: 157), the reading of classical Russian literature can help to cover the ‘lack of shared symbols that could successfully create a common identity’. The Russian schools in Scotland avoid referring to Russia as a state, and instead employ cultural symbols which have a wider world context and a transnational nature. However, the images of Russia drawn only from classical Russian literature are less helpful in maintaining socio-cultural connections with modern-day Russia. The Russian schools in Scotland also give children a knowledge of Russia which is developed during the special lessons described in the next subsection.

6.1.3. Reconstruction of images of Russia in the classroom

In contrast with Russian fairy tales and classical Russian literature, which are each recognisable worldwide as cultural tools (Kennedy and Roudometof, 2002), and represent
key parts of Russian cultural heritage, information about the modern Russian world is more contentious. As was discussed in Chapter 3, the Russian schools in Scotland do not have a common regulatory body; neither do they have any national curricular framework for teaching children. The materials about Russia which are included in the teaching plans depend completely on the choices of a particular Russian school community.

The information received by children during the lessons in the Russian schools is likely to shape not only their knowledge about the country, but also their attitudes towards Russia and their desire to belong to a community of Russian-speakers in Scotland. As has been noted by Risager (2007), the linguistic resources used during language lessons are not neutral to the culture. From a cultural perspective, teaching a language can reconstruct images of the origin country as ‘related to the symbols, myths, and resources through which we constitute a common culture and through the appropriation of which we insert ourselves into this culture’ (Kellner, 2003: 7). The specific information which is selected and introduced to children in Russian schools about modern Russia creates an image of the country which is subjective, flexible, and potentially even far removed from the ‘real’ scenario.

Most of the Russian schools in Scotland provide children with contextual information about Russian geography, flora and fauna:

Today they learned about rivers in Siberia, and what their names are. These aspects of the language learning are different, and parents appreciate that. (Valentina, teacher, Edinburgh)

During the interview, Valentina highlighted the importance not only of the linguistic competence of the heritage language preservation, but also of the socio-cultural component of this process. In her opinion, during lessons in the Russian schools, the children receive knowledge which introduces Russia to them as a large country with many resources and interesting places. Information about geographical phenomena in Russia can be provided to children in Russian lessons which focus mainly on language learning, or in separate lessons where world geographical phenomena are discussed in the Russian language, with additional examples from Russia:

I think these lessons with examples from other subjects are more interesting for children because then they have opportunities to learn about, and discuss, various topics. For example, in one of my classes we spoke about volcanoes. I mentioned Kamchatka as a good example of a part of the world where volcanoes are very active.
It is interesting for the students as it not just ‘drilling’ grammar structure [into them] but improving their knowledge in general, and in the context of Russia. This kind of knowledge is applicable always and anywhere. (Zoya, teacher, Aberdeen)

In implementing this approach, based on merging the knowledge received by the children from different sources, the teachers try to increase the children’s interest in learning Russian and also to help them to build cultural awareness. These lessons also create the value of learning through using the Russian language in an immersive context, thus gaining the cognitive benefits that the context confers (Kagan & Dillon, 2001).

Other topics about Russia which were often identified during my classroom observations, were related to the historical and contemporary periods of achievement in the fields of space exploration, scientific research, and sport. Describing her lessons, Vasilisa said:

I always try to bring in some of the well-known achievements in Russia. And there are a lot of such achievements: in science, in space, and in sport. (Vasilisa, teacher, Edinburgh)

As was noted by several teachers from different Russian schools, this information is perceived by children as easier to understand than, for example, some of the historical content of classical Russian literature. Some of this material is familiar to children from their mainstream Scottish schools, and from the Internet. This image of Russia as a country renowned for its historical achievements is reproduced by Russian schools, and is similar to representations of the Russian Federation and Soviet Union found abroad (Feklyunina, 2016; Ryazanova-Clarke, 2015).

A socio-cultural component which was initially used for educational purposes also helps to create an image of Russia which can be beneficial in uniting the Russian-speaking community in Scotland. According to Anastasiya, a teacher at the Glasgow school, “positive information about Russian achievements helps children to feel proud of their family roots and wear their Russian identity with pride” (Anastasiya, teacher, Glasgow). Using information about modern Russia as a linguistic resource, the Russian schools create an image of the country as a large multicultural territory with many natural resources, fabulous flora and fauna, and interesting places. As shown in subsection 6.2 below, children from the Russian schools can use these symbols to construct their own image of Russia. However, during lessons, the Russian schools attempt not only to provide information about the country, but also to create emotional responses of belonging to a Russian-speaking
community in some ways, which helps to engage children to learn Russian and to support a connection to their roots. The social space which emerges as a result of the Russian schools’ practices reaches beyond Scottish and Russian boundaries and consists of an ongoing exchange of educational ideas and cultural symbols employed during the study of the Russian language. Teaching children in the Russian schools was also accomplished via additional activities, such as cultural events uniting children and parents. These are explored below.

6.1.4. Children’s participation in cultural events

The observation of cultural events in the Russian schools allowed me to gain insight into cultural symbols and representations used to create a shared space which could be attractive to families living in Scotland and interested in participating in Russian cultural events. As part of an in-depth ethnographic approach, I sought to recognise the cultural nuances present. However, I also understood how difficult it is in the modern world to identify cultural elements as belonging to a particular country (Kellner, 2003). Therefore, I found Risager’s (2007) perspective useful, as he suggested paying less attention to the historical origins of cultural phenomena, and more to their employment in a particular migrant community, in this case in the representation of mutual cultural understanding with reference to the larger community associated with the Russian cultural/linguistic space. While the previous subsections have shown how transnational socio-cultural practices emerge through the teaching process in Russian lessons, this subsection discusses specific activities such as the Russian schools’ cultural events, which also facilitate the process of reconstructing a Russian cultural space and negotiating what it means to the Russian-speaking people living in Scotland.

My findings show that all the Russian schools in Scotland in the study sample pay relatively high levels of attention to cultural elements of Russian learning, which are produced in different forms of expressive arts such as drama, music lessons, or children’s performances. The use of these socio-cultural practices aims to motivate children to study the Russian language and to boost the number of Russian-speaking people who would like to be involved in Russian cultural activities. For example, in the Russian school in Aberdeen, children and adults have the opportunity to be involved in performances:
Our school does many things, because every few months there are some additional activities. We have drama for the oldest children and adults who are interested in theatre who have more free time. These adults usually have slightly older children than the average age in our school. (Evgeniya, teacher, Aberdeen)

This Russian school seems to have found their own way to create opportunities for families with teenagers to be involved in common Russian cultural activities, through participating in the school theatre. The Russian school in Dundee also offers its members additional cultural activities, with Russian music and songs. Lada, a teacher from Dundee, described the activities which were organised by her Russian school:

We have a choir, and guitar classes. Children who are not very interested in learning Russian are keen to attend music lessons. At the end of the year, we organise the final performance. (Lada, teacher, Dundee)

Similar examples were found in the Russian schools in Edinburgh and Glasgow, who have wider access to professional resources, and who invited professional singers and performance artists to organise their school events. The Russian school in Edinburgh has close connections with the Russian children’s theatre, with pupils, teachers, and parents all helping to create Russian productions.

However, the use of these cultural elements should not be interpreted as implying that the Russian schools only have the goal of ensuring that their pupils are acquainted with Russian music and other performing arts. As one of the teachers said: “we use Russian music to highlight the Russianness of the cultural space created through learning the music in this school and to make it fun for children”.

The Russian schools do not only teach the Russian language; they also create cultural spaces where children can use this language in special contexts and feel part of a group of people united by common interests and unspoken social norms. The children’s involvement in Russian cultural events depends on their ages and their proficiency in the Russian language. Those in the youngest groups, who may have difficulty in speaking Russian well in public, participated in performances with their teachers and put on short pantomimes or dances. References to transnational culture can be made by using visual elements and music introduced to the children as part of Russian cultural traditions:
We would like all children to participate in our celebration together. I think it is important for them to feel that together, we make a small contribution to the common celebration. (Extract from observation field notes from the Russian school in Glasgow)

The classes with an average age of seven performed some short fairy tales, such as The Turnip, which they had read in their Russian lessons. To perform this fairy tale, the children said brief lines in Russian and acted out the main characters. In order to be involved in the event which was introduced as a Russian fairy tale, children and teachers created their own visions of how to make the main characters of this story (such as Grandfather, Grandmother, Granddaughter, a Small Dog, a Cat and a Mouse, who together pull the turnip) look more Russian. To represent the Grandfather, they chose a cap with ear-flaps, and for the Grandmother a headscarf with flowers because Dedushka (Grandfather) and Babushka (Grandmother) are associated with these Russian clothes.38

The oldest group of children who are involved in drama classes were able to perform long passages of dialogue and produce a more ‘professional’ performance in Russian. In the spring celebration, the oldest group from the Russian school in Glasgow performed fragments from “Bad Advice” by Grigory Oster.39 This popular modern Russian book is based on the idea that some children prefer to behave in the directly opposite way to their parents’ advice. Russian native readers can follow the amusing situations and understand the jokes. The children who study Russian abroad need a certain level of Russian knowledge, as otherwise they may have some difficulties in following the author’s ideas. However, the gap in language proficiency can be covered by visual support such as vivid actions and bright scenery.

The children not only learned their lines in the performance but also decided how some satirical characters, such as the Russian Cleaner, should look. The children decided that the Russian Cleaner should wear big wellington boots, an apron, and hold a large mop. When I asked one of the participants in this performance why they had decided that, the girl who played this role answered that “it’s funny, and other people watching this scene would understand that it is not Scottish” (Extract from observation field notes from the Russian school in Glasgow). This girl was born in Glasgow and usually visits Russia for her annual

38 In fact, it is extremely difficult to argue what kinds of decoration or costumes can be strongly recognised as distinctively Russian. From my point of view, it is more important that the Russian-speaking people who live in Scotland use these symbols to highlight their belonging to the Russian cultural traditions.

summer holidays to stay with her grandmother and uncle in a small Russian village. She did not have detailed knowledge about everyday life in Russia. However, in her opinion, the Russian context can be displayed differently from the Scottish one, so she and her friends decided to highlight these differences by choosing funny clothes and a mop instead of a modern vacuum cleaner, for example. The analysis of this representation of the Russian context in the performance demonstrates that children do not just carefully reproduce the scene, but they also create their own vision of how to make these ideas clearer to the other children and parents who are watching the show.

The Russian schools located in the different Scottish cities have various different celebrations throughout the year. All the schools celebrate the Russian New Year as the main party to finish the year, and it is perceived as the main non-religious event. The interview guide did not contain any direct questions about the events which are celebrated by the families, but before Christmas, when I carried out my participant observations, several parents mentioned that their children have Christmas parties in their mainstream schools before the school holiday. Previously, some of the Russian schools in my study tried to organise a New Year celebration after 1st January, so that they would be closer to the Old New Year tradition. The main argument for this was that the choice of a date around 14th January could more clearly highlight the Russian nature of the celebration. Most of the Russian New Year parties for adults organised outside the Russian schools were held around 14th January.

At present, the date for the children’s Russian New Year celebration is linked to the last Saturday of the Russian schools’ operation before the school break. One of the teachers noted that organising a celebration just after the break is difficult, because its core is the children’s performance and they will have forgotten their roles after a long holiday. If the teachers had decided to make time for rehearsals, the celebration would have had to move far away from the original date to the end of January. As a compromise between Russian and Scottish traditions, the children’s Russian New Year celebration was therefore moved to the date

40 In the Russian cultural tradition, there are two dates for New Year – 1st January, and the Old New Year or the Orthodox New Year on 14th January. The second celebration tends to be an informal traditional festivity, and is celebrated according to the Julian calendar. The Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic officially adopted the Gregorian calendar in 1918, but the Russian Orthodox Church continued to use the Julian calendar. New Year became a Russian holiday which is celebrated in both calendars. However, the Russian-speakers living in Scotland also celebrate Hogmanay as part of their New Year celebration, and Christmas. This means that the mixture of cultural traditions created during the celebration of these events can be useful in the analysis of the transnational practices which have emerged as a result of these activities.
related to their winter break in Scottish mainstream schools. This compromise in the choice of date for Russian New Year celebrations allowed the Russian schools to keep a part of the Russian tradition, but to integrate it within the Scottish cultural environment.

The content of the Russian New Year performance also has a hybrid nature, as it merges elements of Russian and Scottish cultures. All the Russian New Year celebrations organised by different Russian schools were narrated in Russian. However, some schools provided a list of the items of the programme and brief descriptions of what was happening on stage in English, because some of the parents and relatives invited to these events did not know Russian. The use of both languages helped the Russian schools in Scotland to unite the Russian-speaking community with non-Russian speaking parents and their relatives, who also wished to be involved in cross-cultural events.

For the Russian New Year parties, the halls were decorated with snowflakes and sparkling tinsel which, in the participants’ opinions, symbolised a Russian winter but also referred to some Scottish traditions. The compulsory elements of all the celebrations were a Christmas tree, *Ded Moroz*, *Snegurochka*, and New Year presents. The Christmas tree is usually put up in the centre of the hall to allow room for dancing around it. The performance usually contains several elements, such as a concert prepared by the pupils and teachers, a brief New Year show based on a fairy tale plot, cheerful competitions between participants, traditional tea with Russian dishes, and New Year presents for all the children. Despite the language differences, all the participants were able to understand all of these elements.

In my observation of these events, it became clear that all the parts of the celebration, such as the songs and symbols involved, were not simply a random representation of Russian culture. Instead, these highly stylized forms of visual culture had the function of transmitting a coherent message to children that Russian culture is unified around specific symbols, folklore, songs and dances. As one of the parents said, Russian-speaking children in Scotland need to be introduced to the idea of being Russian, but this knowledge should be adapted in a flexible way to the Scottish reality:

---

41 *Ded Moroz*, or Father Frost, is the Russian version of Santa Claus. He is typically dressed in a long, Russian-style red coat, lined with white fur. *Ded Moroz* has a long white beard, and is accompanied by his granddaughter, Snegurochka (the Snow Maiden). She is a young, blonde, rosy-cheeked girl who is always smiling. Her job is to assist *Ded Moroz* to distribute gifts to the children in her wintry outfit.
We would like our children to know some Russian traditions. Yes, most of them do not know what Russian winter means, but I hope we are able to explain it to them, and get closer to each other. (Extract from the field notes from an observation of the celebration of the Russian New Year organised by the Russian school in Glasgow)

To organise cultural Russian events in Scotland, Russian traditions were adapted to the children’s wishes and pitched at their level of understanding of the culture. For example, according to the lifelong tradition, New Year presents for children usually contain different sweets. Initially, the Russian schools tried to order special sets of Russian sweets, such as Russian chocolate. However, as the number of children who have arrived from abroad to the Russian schools in Scotland has declined, the schools changed the content of the gifts from original Russian sweets to Scottish sweets, which the children are more used to. The host country and the traditions of the heritage country thus came together to create a new cultural space.

The cultural events organised by the Russian schools help to unite families who willingly participate in these activities:

The Russian school organises many events; when there is a party, we always go all together as a family. (Diana, parent, Aberdeen)

The parents from the Russian schools sometimes play the role of actors or observers during the cultural events organised by the Russian schools. However, the parents who were not performing themselves helped their children at home to study their part of speech or prepare their costumes. According to Antonina, one of the teachers at the Glasgow school, “these parties were organised not for outside viewers, but for the people who were actively involved in helping the pupils to learn their roles for the scenes” (Antonina, teacher, Glasgow). In referring to Russian cultural symbols as forming part of cultural events organised by the Russian schools, families have begun to create a new type of socio-cultural practice, helping their children to learn the Russian language, and to use symbols associated with the Russian cultural space.

On the one hand, the cultural events organised by the Russian schools were deeply embedded in the educational process; on the other hand, they served the dual purpose of uniting the Russian-speaking community living in Scotland and of transmitting social values of belonging to this social group to the children. These important features show that the Russian schools in Scotland are involved in the process of reproducing a transnational cultural space.
and transnational socio-cultural practices, as was discussed at the start of this chapter (cf. Willis, 1992; Francis et al., 2010; Itzigsohn & Saucedo, 2002). Through actively participating in cultural events, children receive knowledge about how they can use the symbols of the Russian cultural space, behave as Russians, and share the same spoken and unspoken social norms. The Russian schools’ efforts to reproduce a transnational cultural space are tested in the next section, which presents the results of the analysis of the children’s drawings about Russia and Scotland.

6.2. Transnational aspects of migrant children’s self-expression through art

As part of my investigation of children’s involvement in transnational practices, I chose to analyse the pictures they drew for a competition called “Russia and Scotland together”. According to the competition’s rules, the children were required to draw two pictures - one about Russia, and the other about Scotland. In addition, they were asked to provide a short explanation of what they had depicted, and why. Younger children were allowed to seek help from their parents to write their ideas if needed. The participants in the teenage group wrote their explanation themselves. The benefits and limitations of this way of obtaining information were described in detail in the methodology discussion in Chapter 2.

I have found that making images based on themes from both countries helps children to generate a creative imagination which contains some transnational and cultural elements. As has been described above, in my research transnational culture is defined as a set of shared values, beliefs and social norms which unite the families attending the Russian schools, and which features cross-border references. The analysis of drawings was divided into three sections based on categories adapted from Moskal (2010), Noble (2016), and Davis (1993), as described in the methodology chapter. I began by looking at pictures about Scotland to analyse how children draw to make sense of the world around them. Next, I examined the drawings on Russia, considering the children’s knowledge that may not have been verbally articulated, by looking for signs of their employment of common symbols and emotional responses. Finally, I looked at the links joining the images of both countries. In these, the children employed common cultural symbols of the two countries to produce their own creative vision and use their experience of life along with their cultural knowledge, which they received from their families, Russian lessons, and from their wider social context in Scotland. All three parts of the competition analysis aim to explore how children create their vision, and what kind of elements can be interpreted as transnational.
6.2.1. Scotland through the eyes of children

The children’s pictures about Scotland impressed me by their wide range of plots and creative ideas, which are difficult to describe systematically. According to the approaches created by Arnheim (1966) and Gardner (1980), the employment of common symbols (such as a piper, Nessie, or a thistle) in children’s drawings can be interpreted as a weak connection with the real world around them. On the other hand, the representation of Scotland as a part of children’s everyday lives, via landscapes, relatives, or their home, can be interpreted as markers of their high level of belonging to, and embeddedness in, Scottish society (Noble, 2016: c 99). The set of children’s pictures has a more complicated structure than this binary opposition, but I used this idea as a starting point to investigate how children can express themselves through visual art, especially regarding their feelings about being in Scotland.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of drawing</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piper</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nessie</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistle</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elves</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep with the Scottish flag</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of the pictures sent to the competition contained recognisable symbols of Scotland. Some of them appear quite often in advertising promoting Scotland at international events, such as a piper, Nessie, and a thistle. The hypothesis about the difficulties children faced in explaining their choice was confirmed by my observations, as the majority of the children were unable to explain why they had drawn particular pictures. However, the children who chose Scottish symbols for their pictures more often referred to common knowledge and widely accepted images:

---

42 In Scottish folklore, Nessie is a large dragon-like lake monster, possibly a surviving dinosaur, which reputedly inhabits Loch Ness in the Scottish Highlands.
Scotland is associated with Scottish national kilts and bagpipes; therefore, I have drawn a piper. (Alexander, 11 year old, Aberdeen)

A piper was often drawn on a white sheet of paper, and looked more like a symbolic drawing than real piping man. In contrast, Nessie was usually represented in a colourful woodland combining a recognisable Scottish symbol and the Scottish countryside. In these cases, Nessie looked more like an animal than a stylized image. Nessie was more frequently selected by girls. One of them said that she wanted to draw Nessie because it is fun. The pictures of thistles had clear connections with the official symbol of the Commonwealth Games in 2014 in Scotland. Several children mentioned it when they were describing their pictures:

The thistle is the symbol of Scotland. It is a story about Captain Bristle, who departed with several thistle plants on his ships which he planted in all the Commonwealth countries in memory of Scotland. He planted the last thistle near his house and called it Clyde. I wanted to draw this story. (Alla, 6 year old, Aberdeen)

Alla was born abroad, and arrived in Scotland with a Russian mother and a local Scottish father four years ago. She attends the international school as her mainstream education as well as the Russian school. Her mother was one of my interviewees and demonstrated high interest in educating her daughter in Russian. This family arrived in Scotland from Germany, and at the time of the research did not know how long they would stay in Scotland.

The second set of pictures can be interpreted as imagining Scotland as a place for living, with a focus on its special features, such as home, nature, fields and castles. The children from the younger age groups preferred to draw something around them, and one explained their choice as being that “it is my house, my mum and dad, the football club where I play” (Igor, 6 year old Glasgow). Teenagers more often represented Scotland through different landscapes. The children from Edinburgh liked pictures with castles in the mountains. The participants from Dundee preferred to draw landscapes with woods and fields, with agricultural machines. In depicting distinctive landscapes and more local environmental features, children reflected upon their vision of the host country, at the same time including images from their immediate surroundings:

Scotland is a country of mountains and hills. In the autumn, we admire golden fields. I like to watch the working tractors as they harvest. (Iliya, 11 year old, Dundee)
I like small fishing villages in Scotland. I like to watch the water move in the sea and to see the reflections of houses in the water. (Polya, 9 year old, Dundee)

Following Wang (2015), who studied the differences between pictures of home and host countries produced by migrant children, I also found that some children from the Russian schools focused on their surrounding reality when representing Scotland. However, the analysis of full set of drawings demonstrated a more nuanced palette of opinions, as is discussed further in the next section.

6.2.2. Images and motifs chosen by children in drawing pictures about Russia

Fewer Russian images were used by the children in their drawings than those about Scotland, though they displayed a wide range of topics: common symbols, Russian fairy tales, animals, New Year, landscapes, and still-life. In contrast with the images of Scotland, most of the children have relatively little experience of living in Russia. Their perceptions of Russia and Russian culture therefore tends to be based on visual symbols popular in Scotland and in some families’ experiences. Comparing the pictures which were created by pupils from different Russian schools, it could also be seen that some of the schools had an influence, especially on the oldest group of participants in the competition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of drawing</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matryoshka</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian fairy tales</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheburashka</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals (Bears, wolf)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian New Year</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still-life with vodka</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the images of Scotland, matryoshka, a nested doll which is a common image of Russia, was more popular among children than other Russian symbols. According to their drawing skills, children composed basic or complex images employing forms of matreshka. The smaller children preferred to use the shape of a matryoshka which is “similar to a pear and

---

is easy to draw” (Valya, 6 year old Aberdeen). One boy used the form of a matryoshka to create a picture about the Russian New Year associated with winter and Russian characters. This type of picture has echoes of the Old Russian style of painting. He was able to creatively join common Russian symbols – matryoshka, and the Russian New Year celebration - which were also introduced at a Russian cultural event for children in the Russian school.44

The second most popular topic among the children drawing pictures of Russia was Russian fairy tales. Returning to our discussion about children’s reading, which was introduced in Chapter 3, and the role of Russian fairy tales as analysed in subsection 6.1, these pictures also demonstrate the importance of Russian folklore in children’s introduction to Russian culture. Children enjoy these stories, and use them as markers of Russia. Children of all ages in the competition liked to draw characters from Russian fairy tales. The younger children chose the images such as Kolobok.45 The oldest ones drew more complex pictures, such as Baba Yaga and Zmey Gorynych.46 As one child noted, “these colourful images very clearly represent Russia because everyone knows they are Russian characters which are nice to draw” (Elena, 10 year old, Edinburgh).

In Table 2, above, I allocated the image of the Russian character Cheburashka, created by Eduard Uspensky (1965), to a separate category. These pictures were drawn by three pupils from the Russian school in Glasgow who had read this book in their Russian lessons during the school term. From a pedagogical perspective (Arizpe et al., 2014), these pictures and observations in the classrooms confirm the idea that the Russian schools provide children with some cultural elements which can unite them as participants in the same events, such as lessons about this character, and help them to create a similar vision of Russia. Despite the fact that Russian fairy tales are assumed by Russian parents and teachers to be effective tools in children’s acquisition of Russian culture, reading relatively modern Russian literature can also build some cultural bridges, and can therefore be employed as symbols of a transnational culture which unites the Russian-speaking community abroad and its place in the Russian cultural space.

44 This picture is analysed in more detail in subsection 6.2.3.
45 A similar fairy tale with a pancake rolling off has also been recorded in Germany and Nordic regions. The plot is similar to The Gingerbread Man in the English tradition
46 Baba Yaga is a fearsome old witch who symbolises some dark sides of magic, but often helps different heroes. In Russia, a dragon-like creature, Zmey Gorynych, has three heads, is green, walks on its two back paws, has small front paws, and spits fire.
The inclusion of animals in drawings of Russia has several different explanations, including a wide range of associations about something ‘Russian’. The children who used a bear in pictures about Russia explained it in different ways. A boy from a fully Russian family drew a bear as a symbol of Russia and associated it with the country’s scale:

Russia is the biggest country in the world. A large part of the country is covered by forests. The biggest animal is a bear. It is the symbol of Russia. (Andrew, 9 year old Dundee)

The children from Dundee depicted nature and animals more often than the children in the other schools. One of the pupils from Aberdeen also drew a bear against a white background. This picture looks like a common symbol which is widely used at official events in the Russian Federation. In contrast, some children from the Russian school in Glasgow drew images of bears as part of Russian fairy tales. Their bears were represented with barrels of honey among the birch woods. The bear as a Russian symbol has ambiguous associations outside the Russian Federation, as it showcases the positive features of the country, such as power and wildlife, but can also be negatively linked with aggression (Rossomakhin & Khrustalev, 2008). Some children from the Russian schools used images related to some official Russian symbols but placed them in a Scottish environment, make them more natural and even closer to Scotland.

The drawing competition was organised after the New Year celebrations, and some of the children were “impressed by the celebration of Russian New Year” (Kostya, 9 year old, Glasgow). The main characters in these pictures were Ded Moroz and his Fairy Goddaughter, the Snow Maiden (Snegurochka). One young child, Igor, drew his family around the Christmas tree and said that he would like to represent the whole family together, including his grandfather and grandmother who live in Russia. Igor associated Russia with his grandparents, and with an attractive event like the New Year celebration which was held close to the date of the competition. He visits Russia twice per year, and thus has the opportunity to see the country, but he usually goes there in summer, so Igor did not have any experience of celebrating the New Year with his Russian grandparents. This example fits with Itzigsohn’s and Saucedo’s approach (2002: 323), who argued that: ‘transnationality… refers to a series of material and symbolic practices in which people engage that includes both countries as reference points’. Igor referred to Russia (following the rules of the children’s competition) by merging his home connections with relatives living in both
countries with an event which was introduced to children as Russian in the Russian school in Scotland.

The Russian landscape drawn by two of the children was quite distinct from the Scottish one. While in their depictions of the Scottish landscape, the children drew what they were seeing around them, the Russian landscape played the role of a background for other elements, such as bears. Children sketched birches and winter woodland, which in their minds are markers for Russianness.

The Russian-speaking children living in Scotland constructed images of Russia by recalling their knowledge from families and the Russian schools. Not having the feeling of being at home in Russia due to living in Scotland, they instead imagined and constructed images of Russia by creatively merging different common symbols. They did not represent Russia as an official state – none of them used the Russian flag, or any state emblems, in their art. The Russian images constructed by the children were more sensitive to various cultural symbols, combining both those more generally known in the world and those created or transmitted directly by their families and at the Russian schools in Scotland. The Russian schools thus create a way for children to be a part of a wider Russian cultural/linguistic space (Cheskin, 2015), and provide some of the resources necessary in the creation of a transnational culture, which can emerge as a result of using these resources in everyday life in Scotland.

6.2.3. Cultural bridges between images of both countries

Children create visual art across diverse cultures, and many of them imbue their creations with meaning (Alland, 1983). In the context of the present study, the analysis of a pair of pictures about Russia and Scotland created by one child can give us a deeper understanding of the interconnection of these visions by showing the meaning expressed by children who drew images of both Russia and Scotland, and exploring the links between these pairs of pictures. The similarities and differences in images of the countries were recorded and then combined in different themes, based on the coding systems given in the tables created in subsections 6.2.1. and 6.2.2. Some participants in the drawing competition drew pictures only about one country, while others sketched more than two pictures. All these pictures were analysed separately as drawings of Russia/Scotland in subsections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2. In the current section, I seek interconnections between these drawings, and select only pairs of pictures representing both countries. I therefore chose 17 pairs of pictures which represented
both countries and could be classified according to the previous coding systems. In these
drawings, the children created links between the images.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Russian and Scottish fairy tales</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Common symbols of Russia and the landscapes of Scotland</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Common symbols of Scotland and Russia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Russian fairy tales and official symbols of Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Russian New Year and Scotland’s landscape</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

The frequencies of different patterns in pairs of children’s pictures about Russia and Scotland together

Analysis of these pictures together deepened understanding of the children’s perceptions about both countries. One of the interpretations raised questions about what Nessie was, and if these visual symbols are related to the Scottish symbolic system or to something else. Those children who joined Nessie with Russian fairy tales sketched it against a green background with some amusing elements. They not only put both characters together; they also gave them some similarities: for example, Nessie and Cheburashka wear the same hats. The green background for Nessie has something in common with the forests which the Russian fairy tale characters inhabit. Using these elements, children can create their own fairy tales with a combination of Russian and Scottish characters. One artist explained that “I drew Nessie and Cheburashka in the same hats because they can play together and can be friends” (Kseniya, 5 year old, Glasgow).

Two boys joined different styles in pictures of a New Year Card. On the Russian side, there were Ded Moroz and his Fairy Goddaughter Snegurochkа, while on the Scottish side, elves were sketched bearing gifts for children. Both pictures were followed by similar descriptions submitted with the drawings; for example, “I like Christmas in Scotland and the New Year party in the Russian school. It was good” (Leonid, 9 year old, Glasgow). Both boys attended the Russian school in Glasgow, but in different classes. Leonid is from a family that arrived in Scotland from Ukraine, while Kostya is from Lithuania. The boys were born in countries other than Russia and their families both had long migrant paths before settling in Scotland. They therefore did not have strong connections with Russia. It seems that the boys’ imaginations were influenced by the activities organised within the heritage language preservation process. The children’s New Year performance organised by the Russian school
was introduced to these pupils as a Russian event, and offered the children a memorable cultural experience.

The drawing pattern of joining some of the common symbols of Russia and Scotland’s landscape shows how feelings about Scotland as home can be amplified due to the limited amount of knowledge the children have about Russia. These pairs of pictures (pattern 2 in Table 3) contain matryoshka and the children’s homes, as well as a Russian bear and a green landscape. More often than in other cases, this combination of pictures was sketched by young children from mixed families, with local fathers who provide a strong family connection with Scotland, and Russian-speaking mothers who try to introduce Russian culture to their children. These children saw Scotland as their home country, and did not have strong connections with Russia. The strong influence from the Russian schools was also not found as it was in the New Year example above. However, these children also operate with some images of Russia, and try to incorporate them into their everyday lives.

The next group of pairs of drawings which contained common symbols of both countries (pattern 3 in Table 3) were also quite popular in the children’s imagination. However, as was noted before, none of the children used the official Russian state symbols; rather, they preferred cultural ones. There were three pairs of matryoshkas and pipers, and one picture of a matryoshka and a thistle. Usually, children preferred to work with similar coloured or white backgrounds, balancing both parts of the set of pictures. These types of paired pictures were drawn by the children from Aberdeen, who are of different ages and from different classes. However, most of these children were born outside both Scotland and Russia, and had arrived in Scotland fairly recently. Several of them study in international schools in Aberdeen for their mainstream education. According to Wang (2015), these children are unlikely to have a strong emotional attachment to both Russia and Scotland. At the time of the drawing competition, these pupils just used symbols representing both countries, and operated by received knowledge about them. However, the socio-cultural transnational activities provided by the Russian schools and families helped these children to select popular symbols which coincided with other symbolic meanings occurring in the Russian school community in Scotland.

Two pictures and their explanation created by one boy from Dundee were particularly noticeable because he provided a detailed description of what he had depicted. He drew one picture with a very detailed Scottish landscape, and the other was an elaborate Russian New
I live in Scotland. My mother is Russian; therefore, I often spend school holidays in Russia. I like Russia in the winter very much. In the winter in Russia it is very cold, there is a lot of snow. Children ride sledges, skate, and ski. For the New Year, a Christmas tree is decorated, and Father Frost with the Snow Maiden will give gifts if you tell them a poem, sing a song or dance. On the eve of the Russian Orthodox Christmas (6th of January) everyone goes to church. There are a lot of beautiful icons, candles burn in a circle, church songs are sung by the church choir, and bells ring. In Scotland snow is rare, but there is a lot of greenery. I love Scotland very much, with her flowers, lakes and transparent water, highlands with springs, with lochs and small houses, and of course, kilts (tartan) and bagpipes. As my mother says, two types of blood flow in my veins: Russian and Scottish; therefore, Russia and Scotland are my favourite countries, my homelands! (Ivan, 11 year old, Dundee)

The active transnational activity of a family maintaining strong regular connections with Russia helped this boy not only to gain knowledge about Russia, but also to foster a feeling of belonging to both countries. However, he not only produced two images of the countries, he also created his own vision in merging two different seasons in two different colours: white and green. He employed ideas about winter as a distinctive feature of Russia, and a green landscape as a key characteristic of Scotland, which highlighted their otherness. Both parts of the drawing have strong emotional contexts in referring to a sacred sense through imagery such as a church on the Russian side and mountains in Scotland. This boy was born in Scotland, and has a mixed family with a local father and a Russian mother. Through his drawings, he demonstrated his transnational identity to others. His transnational space as created in his art merged the different cultural elements in his own unique innovative, visionary way, without reproducing any official international symbols.

In analysing the pictures joining Scotland and Russia, I would like to highlight that none of the children portrayed any conflict between the two countries. Not all the children were able to draw images about both countries. Nevertheless, using their knowledge and skills, the children who sketched both countries were able to create multiple different links between them. Traces of family influences were found in all the children’s drawings, especially emotional aspects, and feelings of belonging to a particular country. In their turn, the Russian schools in Scotland are apparently able to provide knowledge about Russia which influences the children’s imagination. Together, parents and Russian schools are a source of ideas in helping to introduce children to Russian fairy tales, literature, and celebrations of Russian culture.
Conclusion

In creating a sense of belonging to Russian culture, the Russian schools employed a wide range of tools and methods, starting from the Russian lessons, and encompassing family cultural events involving all the school members in their production. The community cultural bonds (Mannitz, 2015; Itzigsohn and Saucedo, 2002) established through preservation of the heritage language in Russian schools in Scotland inspire emotional feelings of belonging to the worldwide Russian cultural heritage, and help Russian-speakers in Scotland to feel that they share certain socio-cultural values.

In the Russian schools, the teaching programmes include both Russian folklore (for younger children) and classical Russian literature (for older children). This way of teaching seems to ensure their membership of a worldwide socio-cultural community of Russian-speakers, and transmits specific kinds of knowledge of that community relating to its status, historical roots, and values. Despite certain tensions between advancing language abilities and socio-cultural elements, these elements were still implemented. This highlights the importance allotted to this kind of transnationalism by the Russian schools. Further, the introduction of Russian cultural elements into the operations of the Saturday Russian schools has been influenced by the Scottish cultural environment (Willis, 1992). As a result, the culture which is formed with the support of the Russian schools in Scotland has a transnational nature due to its references to elements of both Russian and Scottish cultures (Willis, 1992; Itzigsohn & Saucedo, 2002). The transnational materials and symbolic practices produced through the teaching process create the basis for bringing a transnational culture into the everyday lives of migrant families in Scotland.

A sense of transnational culture can also be found outside the Russian lessons. The importance which the Russian-speaking community attaches to a sense of belonging inspires the Russian schools to organise a range of cultural events. Although these events are aimed at introducing the children to Russian cultural rituals, influences from different cultural traditions can also be found. These transnational elements emerge due to the influence of various factors, such as involving the Scottish relatives and friends of Russian-speakers, adapting the performance for the language abilities of children and transnational experiences, and the varying tastes and identities of the children themselves. The compromises in the choice of date for the Russian New Year celebration, the topic of the displays, and the invited characters, such as Ded Moroz and Snegurochka, allow the Russian
schools to maintain some Russian traditions, but to set them up within a Scottish cultural environment. Children involved in the performances also actively use both Russian and Scottish cultural symbols to design their own scenarios in the New Year shows.

In the Russian schools, pupils are not only introduced to Russian culture as a socio-cultural component of studying Russian as a foreign language, but are also involved in creating a transnational culture. This was demonstrated by the analysis presented in this chapter of the pictures about Scotland and Russia drawn by the pupils from the Russian schools in Scotland. The pupils from the Russian schools were capable of producing their own original vision of how it was possible to join their Scottish life experience to the Russian knowledge they had received at the Russian schools and from their family. The transnational cultural space created in their Russian lessons gave them access to different resources, such as emotional support, a set of cultural symbols which they could use to make their own images of the countries, and specific knowledge of practical needs and social models for behaviour as Russians in a Scottish environment. The preservation of Russian as the heritage language in the Russian-speaking community in Scotland thus creates some socio-cultural practices which act as a bridge for the Russian-speaking community in Scotland into the wider Russian cultural space. As the chapter has shown, the children themselves are also involved in this process of creating transnational culture.
Conclusions

This thesis has provided an empirically-grounded understanding of the role of Russian schools in heritage language preservation amongst Russian-speaking migrants in Scotland. It brings a new focus to existing work in this area through its consideration of language preservation as the key factor supporting this group of Russian-speaking parents to be involved in different types of social networks and socio-cultural transnational activities.

Heritage language preservation

Heritage language preservation cannot be reduced to only linguistic and educational processes (Doerr & Lee, 2013; Hornberger & Wang, 2008; Wiley, 2005). It also has significantly wider implications related to everyday migrant families’ lives and socio-cultural environments in particular host countries. The main corpus of literature devoted to heritage language preservation has focused on the interplay between two identities: one which is attached to the native language of migrants, and another which is formed by influences arising from migrants’ integration into local life in host countries (Leeman, 2015). At the same time, the heritage language is taken for granted as an operational tool and cultural carrier for certain ethnic groups like Polish or Chinese people who have similar countries of origins and attachments to those countries (Bailey, 2000, 2005; Mendoza-Denton, 2008; Palmer, 2007). In the case of Russian studies, Russian as a heritage language has a complicated nature and brings together people from different countries and nations.

The examination of the literature devoted to heritage language preservation showed that the main academic focus had been on families’ decisions to preserve a heritage language. Whilst the importance of this family decision is difficult to overestimate, there are some gaps in investigations (and thus, knowledge) of the role of complementary schools in this process (Strand, 2007). Complementary schools should be considered not only as education providers, but also as special places for organising community life (Li, 2006). Following a constructivist approach (Francis at al., 2010), I conceptualised the everyday life of the Russian schools as a negotiating process between the parents, teachers and pupils who construct these schools in terms of purposes, functions and benefits for learners, and of Russian-speaking communities in Scotland.
The Russian schools operating in Scotland deal with a variety of requests from parents with a diverse range of assumptions about what Russian education abroad should be. My findings show that heritage language preservation is a negotiated process which flexibly responds to the interests of all participants. The school founders, parents, teachers and children working together reconstruct different models of cooperation and community learning which suit their needs, qualifications and resources. All these components may complement or contradict one another. The parents’ perceptions and expectations of the Russian schools varied from a strong educational centre based on solid formal educational plans to an informal social club providing a space for a wide range of social interactions. The parents could act as consumers of educational services, or as community participants involved in different social interactions. These positions have a dynamic nature and can change in different circumstances.

The comparison between the Russian schools in four Scottish locations (Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen and Dundee) shows that the Russian schools’ operations depend on the structure and characteristics of the local migrant community. The work of the Russian schools depends on various factors, including the numbers and initial knowledge of the children wishing to study Russian; the numbers and qualifications of the Russian teachers in a particular city; and the composition of the parents who attended Russian schools. The present study has shown the importance of this group of parents’ diverse socio-cultural capital linked to their different paths of migration and settlement, ranging from highly-skilled professionals who may have more flexible future plans (e.g. in Edinburgh and Aberdeen) to lower-skilled ‘labour migration’ and/or politically motivated moves (e.g. in Dundee and Glasgow) where people may be more ‘fixed’ in place and planning a longer-term future in the UK/Scotland. Russian-speaking parents possessed a wide range of social capital, and demonstrated a wide range of different attitudes towards the preservation of Russian as a heritage language. The previously explored tendency to assume that parents with a higher level of socio-cultural capital make greater demands and more actively claim Russian education for their children (Kraftsoff & Quinn, 2009) cannot be applied in an uncritical manner in research into heritage language preservation. Indeed, as the present findings show, the links between parents’ socio-cultural capital and their participation in the everyday life of the Russian schools are not straightforward. However, this diversity does have a clear impact on the negotiation processes and everyday operations of the Russian
schools, encouraging the schools to create certain policies in order to respond to a wide range of parental demands and expectations.

The teaching approaches used in Scotland’s Russian schools tend to be the result of processes of negotiation between parents and teachers. Within these negotiations, parents quite often succeeded in persuading the teachers to adapt their proposed activities, thereby proving to be more powerful than the teachers in certain instances, as well as having different relationships to those between parents and teachers in mainstream schools. The hierarchy and the balance of power between teachers and parents in the decision-making process of the educational structure was dynamic and dependent on various factors, such as the cultural capital of parents, their assumptions about ‘proper’ Russian education in Scotland, and the professional knowledge and authority of the teachers within the Russian schools’ communities. As a result, due to differences in teachers’ and parents’ positions towards Russian education in Scotland, teaching approaches varied from the ‘traditional’ Russian teaching style to styles which also employed the advantages of the Scottish educational system for teaching Russian, resulting in a hybrid approach.

The traditional Russian style was mostly based on parental nostalgia, the beliefs of some Russian-speakers in the advantages of the Russian educational system, and their desire to reconstruct a ‘proper’ Russian school in Scotland for native Russian-speaking children. The second teaching style was based on the assumption that Russian-speaking children living in Scotland can be thought of differently from native Russian-speaking children living in Russia, so there was a need to deploy teaching practices adapted from Scottish mainstream schools. The hybrid approaches tried to soften the connotations of Russian as a migrant language through offering children and their parents the concept of being bilingual.

After starting as parents’ initiatives, at present the Russian schools operate as Scottish charities with different connections to Scottish and International organisations. The latter provide a wide range of resources for heritage language teaching to the Russian schools. This study’s findings demonstrate that heritage language studies begin from home learning, which obviously happens in early years when Russian-speaking families make a choice to use Russian as one of their home languages, and encourage their children to join them. The Russian-speaking community has demonstrated a wide range of motivations for families’ language strategies, including seeing the Russian language as part of national ethnic identities, parents feeling a duty to pass it to children, or in more practical ways, parents
wishing to share knowledge with children for their future careers. Some of the Russian-speaking parents try to avoid labelling Russian as a heritage language, preferring to use the term ‘first language’. In doing so, Russian-speaking parents try to find some additional confirmation that the knowledge of Russian can somehow be valuable inside families, and recognizable as a valuable asset in Scotland as well. One of these solutions was to bring children up as bilingual. Russian schools do not provide what could be considered bilingual education, but their goal is to encourage bilingualism as a valuable asset in a diverse cultural society in Scotland, and to help the schools to position themselves a little more broadly than simply as migrant organisations, as they not only serve migrants’ needs but also support bilingual families. This helps the Russian schools to play, either directly or indirectly, the role of interlocutors between the different social networks involving migrants and Scottish people, and local and international organisations.

Social networking

Recognition of Russian schools as a special place for migrant community interactions brings the theoretical insights from network theory into a workable framework for the study of heritage language preservation. The social networks which have emerged through shared heritage language practices have specific features (Boyd, 1989; Mesch 2002; Bakewell, 2010). Following Ryan (2011) and Boyd (1989), this study’s framework was created for investigating networking in Russian schools as a dynamic process influenced by relationships between attendees and their cultural needs, which are wider than only education for children. After the collapse of the USSR, a high level of divergence between cultural traditions could be noted in countries which were previously united in a single state (Fassmann & Münz, 1995). The Russian-speaking community in Scotland has created different social networks through which to reconstruct their common visions and some united values which can support their relationships as friends, acquaintances, or simply as speakers of the same language.

The operation of the Russian schools in Scotland is underpinned by the social networking of their stakeholders. The heritage language preservation and the social networking which emerged around the complementary schools are mutually related and can be investigated from the point of view of how they enrich or contradict each other. On the one hand, the existing social networks can encourage new pupils to attend the Russian schools and promotes cooperation between families, children and Russian teachers. On the other hand,
for newcomers the Russian schools provide opportunities to be involved in multiple networks with different types of connections, and to improve the relationships between the members of the schools’ communities. By providing a place for meetings and ensuring regular contact, the Russian schools formally and informally influence the everyday lives of the Russian-speaking families involved in the process of heritage language preservation.

The Russian-speaking networks occurring in the Russian schools create comfortable spaces for cultural interactions based on shared knowledge and the beliefs of the Russian parents. The sharing of similar experiences initially helps parents to establish trust and to overcome barriers in seeking information (Guma, 2015). My observations in the Russian schools indicated that their social networks provided more information about educational and healthcare systems, and less about employment opportunities. In addition to practical information, the social networks which emerged around the Russian schools also provided emotional support to deal with the problem of social isolation faced by migrants (Farnsworth, & Boon, 2010). As well as teaching children, the Russian schools organise formal information events helping Russian-speaking parents to contact experts in local social services, such as general practitioners, teachers from local schools, and social workers. The ways in which the Russian schools deal with parents’ requests show the advantages of merging professional knowledge and interactions between fellow parents, where a sense of shared ‘culture’ helps in discussing difficulties, and in the dissemination of information. The social networks which have emerged in the Russian schools produce and support feelings of belonging among groups of people who understand each other due to the similarity of their positions as migrants, and their shared goal to educate their children in Russian. My findings demonstrate a variety of cultural insights and fears which were willingly discussed by parents with different migrant experiences and local connections. By using the schools as the context, the present study brings a new angle to understanding how social networks are created and functioning among this specific migrant group, which had previously been described as lacking strong relationships (Kopnina, 2007; Molnar, 2011). It also can bring academic discussion of other ideas about the linkages between the formal and informal roles of the Russian complementary schools in Scotland. The Russian schools are institutions which have been formally constituted, have their own authority and access to other formal institutions, and also provide the framework within which informal networking and formal provision overlap.
Transnational activities

Another specific aspect of migrant networks, their binding of migrants with people and ideas from their countries of origin, demanded the consideration of a transnational approach. My theoretical framework for studying the Russian schools drew not only upon the discussion about networks but, on a different level, placed a strong focus on their ability to support patterns of transnational communication, and to facilitate exchange of resources and information along with participation in socio-cultural transnational activities (Vertovec, 2001:573). My thesis contributes to the discussion about socio-cultural transnational activities which can be implemented in complementary schools’ operations (Francis et al., 2010). The study combined two approaches: it explored the features of transnational culture provided by the complementary schools (Willis, 1992) and the role of the complementary schools in transnational communities of migrants in Scotland (Moskal & Sime, 2015). Expanding this approach, I investigated heritage Russian language learning as a two-way process influencing both the transnational activities emerging around the Russian schools, and the Russian-speaking community in Scotland itself.

Transnational activities can also be considered an integral part of heritage language education. My findings show that references to Russian culture and history during Russian lessons in Russian schools in Scotland are significantly wider than the socio-cultural components taught to learners of Russian as a foreign language. Russian-speaking families have different connections with relatives who live abroad and cannot speak English. In this case, the Russian language for children in Scotland can represent emotional attachments with grandparents and Russian friends. The Russian schools support transnational cultural experiences and knowledge for the children for many reasons, such as dealing with parents’ suggestions and comments regarding what they would like their children to know about Russia; and teachers’ assumptions about adaptations of Russian literature to the knowledge of pupils learning Russian in Scotland.

Russian schools also try to expand the use of the Russian language outside families, and to give children a wider knowledge of Russian culture in the world, returning us to questions about transnational culture. Following Willis (1999), it can be argued that Russian schools not only translate Russian culture, but also create opportunities for pupils to form transnational cultures of their own. Analysis of the notes generated from participant observations of the entertainment produced by pupils and their drawings and pictures about
Russia and Scotland confirms that they did not simply reproduce knowledge obtained from their families and Russian schools. The present study contributes to the understanding of transnational socio-cultural activities involving pupils attending Russian complementary schools, and demonstrates the ways in which creatively merged Russian and Scottish traditions can help Russian-speaking children to express their cultural heritage.

Interrelations between heritage language preservation, social networking and transnational activities in complementary schools

The everyday life of the Russian schools in Scotland was investigated using complementary and sometimes overlapping analytical frameworks of heritage language preservation, social networking and transnational activities. In real life, the processes being investigated are difficult to separate from one another. As I have shown in my research, Russian learning in Russian complementary schools in Scotland can be considered a form of heritage language preservation due to its connections with the Russian-speaking community, who play the role of heritage keepers (Leeman, 2015). Acquiring knowledge of a heritage language gives learners opportunities to be involved in a range of social networks: with their Russian-speaking families and relatives living in Scotland and abroad; with the Russian-speaking community emerging around the Russian schools in different places in Scotland; and with the worldwide Russian-speaking population. In turn, the benefits of involvement in different social networks can encourage families to support heritage language learning activities for their children.

Each of the Russian schools included in my study made significant efforts to support social networking through organising cooperative activities between children and teachers, teachers and parents, and between parents. All the investigated schools in some way, whether formally or informally, helped Russian-speaking migrants not only to educate their children but also to access valuable information about local life, to overcome their experiences of social isolation, and so on. These findings coincide with Hornberger’s (2005) theory about heritage language learning as a comfortable space which can create a feeling of belonging to a social group which shares a heritage.

The transnational nature of heritage language learning was evidenced through the motivation of parents and the content of the education programmes provided by the Russian schools. Maintaining connections with Russian-speaking friends and relatives, especially
grandparents, was one of the main reasons given by parents in explaining their decision to teach their children the Russian language in Scotland. Knowledge of the heritage language implies knowledge of the socio-cultural components. However, the Russian schools not only provided information about Russian culture; they also used cultural events to unite Russian-speaking parents around the schools. My thesis provides an empirically grounded understanding of how Russian schools in Scotland reconstruct the children’s Russian heritage, with reference to what parents and teachers mean when they refer to the ‘Russian culture’ and ‘proper’ Russian education which should be preserved in Scotland and transmitted to their children.

The Russian-speaking people involved in the everyday life of the Russian schools in Scotland had very different points of view on the importance of Russian as a heritage language. These views were shaped by a range of factors, such as parents’ ethnic and national backgrounds; the diversity of parents’ and teachers’ cultural capital; differentiations in the paths and goals of migration they had experienced; and variations in Russian-speaking families’ structures, including local Scottish partners and relatives living abroad. To deal with these diversities, the Russian schools produced some common strategies related to the structure of this community and the contents of their educational programmes. My findings show that in the context of the nexus of heritage language preservation, social networking, and socio-cultural transnational activities which emerged in the Russian schools, parents and teachers were involved in these processes at different levels.

In each of the investigated Russian schools, three groups of parents could be found, representing a core of active people, a close periphery, and a distant periphery. A core of active parents acted as the primary drivers of a particular process, such as the working of the school or networking. In relation to heritage language learning, they expressed their Russian identities more confidently. Their strong attitudes towards the Russian language as a heritage language more often led to support for traditional approaches to teaching Russian as a native language. In social networking terms, the core was often formed by a group of close friends. In socio-cultural activities, they could appear in the groups of organisers of cultural events, and were parents who asked teachers to give their children more information about Russia. However, the core of active people was sometimes formed from people who were more active in all these investigated processes, or only in some, or even just in one. For example, some of the parents who formed a group of close friends and represented a core of
networking in one of the Russian schools nonetheless did not view Russian language learning as a part of their children’s heritage. They did not clearly express their Russian national identity, and did not have strong attitudes towards the Russian language. Socialising with other Russian-speaking parents was more important to them than heritage language learning for their children. Those who were active in organising socio-cultural transnational activities could also be very different in terms of their social networking activities and attitudes towards heritage language.

The groups of Russian-speakers who formed a close periphery usually did not deny the Russian language as their native language, but their position was less strong than the position of the core active people. In social networking, they more often described themselves as a group of acquaintances than as close friends. In terms of their involvement in the socio-cultural transnational activities organised by the school, this group was usually involved in helping children to prepare for performances. These parents, in negotiation with teachers, were more inclined to support a hybrid educational approach linking Russian and Scottish pedagogical approaches to teaching the Russian language. Similar to the core of active participants, these parents often belonged to a variety of different types of close peripheral positions. For example, parents in loose social networks based on acquaintanceship could be found in the core group supporting Russian as a heritage language, but at the same time be more distant with regard to involvement in socio-cultural transnational activities.

The distant peripheral group of participants in the everyday life of the Russian schools had quite loose connections with each other. They more often considered Russian as their first language, but avoided calling it a native language. In negotiation with teachers, this group was more oriented to support pedagogical approaches in teaching Russian which borrow elements from the mainstream Scottish education system. These parents paid more attention to the parts of Russian culture which are recognisable worldwide than specific knowledge of aspects of Russian history or culture which would commonly be shared in Russia. In social networking, the distant peripheral position was expressed through avoiding contact with other parents during the Russian schools’ operating hours. In keeping with the other two groups discussed above, a particular person in this group may not be involved in social networking, but at the same time may actively participate in socio-cultural transnational activities.
The diversity of the Russian schools’ members reflects the complexity of parents’ positions towards heritage language preservation, social networking, and socio-cultural transnational activities. These levels of involvement are also flexible and dynamic. People sometimes start from a core position and then move gradually to a looser connection with Russian social network as part of an integration strategy when contacts with Russian-speakers are slowly replaced by the expansion of connections with local people (Ryan, 2011). On the other hand, after joining as newcomers, new members of Russian schools sometimes move into the core group of activists. This dynamic picture contributes to the new perspective of investigating community life, as a series of flexible relationships between members. While the core of the active group best fits the traditional concept of community (Willis, 1992; Guarnizo & Díaz, 1999; Remennick, 2002; Mannitz, 2015), the distant periphery also exists and should be considered as an important part of community building (Kopnina, 2007).

The Russian schools which united members with different positions towards heritage language preservation, social networking, and socio-cultural transnational activities also brought together people with very different personal and political histories and associations with or dissociations from the Russian state. For this reason, the schools tried to avoid potentially controversial topics, such as political matters related to the Russian Federation. Similarly, the parents tended to avoid such discussions in the school corridors. The Russian schools were very careful in their selections of historical and political information for their syllabus. The schools chose apoliticisation as a way of dealing with the geographical and national diversity of their members.

Reflections on this study and further research

Qualitative research inevitably produces more empirical material that can be interpreted in the frame of a single thesis. In this case of a study of Russian schools in Scotland, the wide range of collected materials also could not be interpreted in full due to the necessity to tighten the research focus and protect the structure and clarity of the thesis’ main arguments. Questions relating to the Russian language are so deeply rooted in the everyday lives of the migrants that during the interviews, Russian-speaking parents and Russian teachers discussed a wide range of related issues. Due to the research focus on the interplay between heritage language preservation, social networking, and transnational activities, several
possible directions were cut from the development of the analysis, such as the connection between the heritage language preservation and the migration strategies of Russian-speaking families, including their strategies of integration into Scottish society. This topic was partly discussed in Chapter 5 in the section on information exchange.

Other interesting issues, which could be explored further, relate to the parents’ values of education as social advancement for their children, and the role of Russian language learning in this process. Additional significant issues which were only partly covered were the influence of local Scottish partners in the education of their children in Russian, and information exchange about local services. I did not carry out interviews with those groups of parents who were less involved in the Russian-speaking community due to their lack of knowledge of Russian. So, data was collected about these issues mainly via interviews with their Russian-speaking spouses. The level of investigation of a migrant family could be expanded to explore the Scottish cultural environment, and the attitudes of local people towards the Russian language and Russian-speaking people who use this language in Scotland in public places. I did not speak with local people, so I only know about their reactions from the comments made by my Russian-speaking informants. Comparisons with Russian-speaking communities living in countries other than Scotland may also be very fruitful in highlighting the importance of the national context for heritage language preservation. I just mentioned these questions in Chapter 1, but there is evidently a need for wider international research focusing on these issues.

In addition, the Russian schools in Scotland, as recently emerged migrant organisations, raised multiple questions relating to a wide range of topics which can be explored from educational, school management, community development, cultural, and other perspectives. In pointing out that the Russian schools are not regulated by any government educational body, I intentionally avoided any evaluation of the quality of teaching in the Russian schools, because this was not the focus of the present research. However, this topic spontaneously emerged during the interviews with parents and teachers due to the high importance of these questions for those attending these schools in addition to, or as a replacement for, studying Russian at home. The materials collected from the fieldwork could be used as a basis for the further analysis of Russian schools as educational institutions.

My main period of fieldwork took place between 2013 and 2015. However, during the interviews I conducted, I realised how important the particular time of the investigation was
in the context of political and cultural influences in migrant studies. The Russian-speaking community in the UK has their own long history, and is deeply affected by political situations elsewhere in the world; I briefly described these issues in Chapter 1. My research was completed before the Ukrainian crisis and the implementation of sanctions on the Russian Federation. I only observed the beginning of the process, when Ukrainian groups of migrants were challenged to make decisions about their interactions with the Russian-speaking community in the UK. Some Ukrainian people remained part of the Russian-speaking group, while others left.

Bearing in mind the importance for the Russian-speaking migrants of their shared experiences of the USSR (Byford, 2009); it would be interesting to investigate how this reconstruction changes over the time. The older generation of Russian speakers who lived in that period has begun to be replaced by a new generation of Russian speakers who only know about it through parents’ and grandparents’ stories. In view of this, it would be interesting to research how the common values, norms and traditions which formed the core of cultural interpretations for current Russian-speaking migrants in the UK will change in the near future. I offered a tentative discussion of these issues in the empirical chapters, but the present research lacked sufficient data for a full examination of the dynamics of these processes.

The time factor is also very important to the Russian schools’ development. On the one hand, as part of the Russian-speaking community, the schools are highly dependent on the migration flow of Russian speakers to the UK, and its dynamics. On the other hand, as educational organisations they have developed and changed during the time of their operations, having passed through spells of flourishing and relative decline. It would therefore also be worthwhile to look at this process in several years’ time to check if the Russian schools have closed after the number of Russian-speaking families arriving in the UK has reduced, or if they have been able to attract the second generation of pupils: children whose parents attended the Russian schools in their own childhood. A closer examination of the aspects mentioned above, such as extensions of the research context and temporalities, may be engaging for further investigation in heritage language preservation.

Contribution to practice
Having started the present thesis with practical issues, it now returns to some practicalities at its end. The findings presented in the thesis have implications for future governance and practice in the Russian schools in Scotland, and in other organisations which support complementary schools. Because of this research and my role in this process, I had contact with the Edinburgh Russian Embassy and Rossotrudnichestvo in London, who asked me to provide them with the insights gained from this research. I have done that in the form of a policy paper analysing the development processes of the Russian schools in Scotland. They responded and cooperated in their own way, by drafting their own paper and organising several workshops for the teachers from the Russian schools in the UK which helped me to disseminate the results of my research. The people who run the Russian schools were also present, and discussed their own practice.

In November 2014, I presented my initial findings at the Russian teachers’ conference organised by the Russian school in Dundee with support from Russkii Mir. My presentation initiated a discussion about the goals and programmes of the Russian schools and their flexibility in adjusting to the different ambitions of parents. I was told that some Russian teachers had used our common insights to improve their teaching. I also presented my results at different events involving academics and practitioners who work in heritage language preservation. These events also confirmed the importance of understanding that Russian-speaking schools are not only migrant community initiatives, but also form part of the Scottish education environment. Supporting the Russian schools, and organising cooperation between them and local schools can also be a great opportunity to deliver the Scottish Government’s policy ‘Language Learning in Scotland: A 1+2 Approach’, which is “aimed at ensuring that every child has the opportunity to learn a modern language (known as L2) from P1 until the end of the broad general education (S3)”.

I hope that this thesis can make some contribution to the ongoing process of development of the Russian schools in Scotland.

47 Rossotrudnichestvo – the Federal Agency for the CIS, compatriots abroad and international humanitarian cooperation.
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Appendices
Appendix 1: List of participants in the research
Russian teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Type of interview</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Position at the Russian school</th>
<th>Countries of birth</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anastasiya</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td>former teacher</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>University degree awarded in Russia (not in Modern languages), short courses for Russian as a foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian language focused university degree awarded in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonina</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40 - 50</td>
<td>teacher in senior class</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>University degree in the Russian language and Russian literature awarded in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anzhelika</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40 - 50</td>
<td>Director, teacher</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>University degree in modern Languages (not in Russian) awarded in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>preschool teacher</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>University degree awarded in Russia (not in Modern languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasilisa</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40 - 50</td>
<td>former teacher</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>University degree in linguistics awarded in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronika</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>preschool teacher</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>University degree awarded in Russia (not in Modern languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentina</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40 - 50</td>
<td>teacher in senior class</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>University degrees (one in linguistics, one psychology) awarded in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viktoria</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>teacher in senior class</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian language focused university degree awarded in the UK, PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40 - 50</td>
<td>Director, teacher</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>University degree awarded in Russia (not in Modern languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evgeniya</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>Director, teacher</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>University degree awarded in Russia (not in Modern languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhanne</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>preschool teacher</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>University degree in Modern languages (including English) awarded in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoya</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>teacher in senior class</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>University degree in Modern languages (including English) awarded in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inna</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40 - 50</td>
<td>former teacher</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lada</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>preschool teacher</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>University degree in Modern languages (including English) awarded in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>teacher in senior class</td>
<td>Belorussia</td>
<td>University degree in Modern languages (including English) awarded in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40 - 50</td>
<td>Director, teacher</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>University degree awarded in Russia (not in Modern languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50 - 60</td>
<td>One of school founders</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>University degree awarded in Russia (not in Modern languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Type of interview</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age range</td>
<td>The class attended by child</td>
<td>Relationship and family status</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>Married, 2 children</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alina</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>Married, 2 children</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisa</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>Married, 1 child</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alla</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>preschool</td>
<td>Divorced, 1 child</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>preschool</td>
<td>Married, 1 child</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valeriya</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>senior class</td>
<td>Married, 1 child</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyuda</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>preschool</td>
<td>Married, 1 child</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyubov</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>Married, 1 child</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darya</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>preschool</td>
<td>Married, 2 children</td>
<td>Latvian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>preschool</td>
<td>Married, 1 child</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekaterina</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>Married, 3 children</td>
<td>Latvian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulyana</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>Married, 1 child</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irina</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>Married, 2 children</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kseniya</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>preschool</td>
<td>Married, 1 child</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamara</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>preschool</td>
<td>Married, 1 child</td>
<td>Latvian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Guides for the in-depth semi-structured interviews (in Russian)
Guide for interviewing parents whose children attend the Russian schools

О себе
1. Не могли бы Вы для знакомства рассказать немного о себе и своей семье?
2. Когда Вы прибыли в этот город? Где Вы жили до этого?
3. Почему Вы решили сюда приехать?
4. Чем Вы и члены Вашей семьи сейчас занимаются?
5. Почему Вы выбрали этот вид деятельности?
6. На каком языке Вы говорите дома, со своими друзьями?

О Русском языке
7. Почему Вы считаете важным обучение Вашего ребенка русскому языку? Что это дает детям, живущим в Шотландии?
8. Почему Вы приняли решение привести ребенка в Русскую школу?
9. Что, по-вашему мнению общего у родителей, которые хотят обучать детей в русской школе?
10. Вы знаете, русскоговорящих мигрантов, которые не хотят учить детей русскому языку? Почему они не хотят?
11. Какие основные сложности возникают у Вас с тем, чтобы водить детей в Русскую школу? Какие трудности есть у других родителей?
12. Вы помогаете своим детям в изучении русскому языку дома? Если да, то как?

О русских мероприятиях
13. Вы знаете других русскоговорящих людей в Вашем городе? Как Вы с ними познакомились? Как часто Вы с ними контактируете?
14. У Вас есть русскоговорящие друзья? Если есть, то кто они? Как Вы познакомились?
15. У Ваших детей есть русскоговорящие друзья? Вы помогаете своим детям общаться с русскоговорящими детьми?
16. Участвуете ли Вы в русских мероприятиях? Если да, то какие из них Вам наиболее запомнились? Если нет, то почему?
17. Вас интересуют события, происходящие в стране из который Вы приехали? (Если респондент приехал не из России). Интересуют ли Вас события, происходящие в России?
18. Вы общаетесь с людьми, живущими в России, а также в стране из которой Вы приехали? Как часто и каким образом? Это для Вас важно? Если да, то почему?
19. Хотели бы Вы быть вовлечены в различные мероприятия, соединяющие Вашу родную страну и Шотландию, Россию и Шотландию? Почему?

О Шотландии

20. Как Вы чувствуете себя в Шотландии?
21. Разговариваете ли Вы по-русски в публичных местах? Если да, то как реагируют окружающие?
22. Помогает ли Вам знание русского языка в Шотландии?
23. Как, по Вашему мнению, складываются отношения между Шотландией и Россией?
24. Что, по Вашему мнению, способствовало бы росту популярности русского языка среди русскоговорящего сообщества в Шотландии?

Спасибо за участие в исследовании!

About yourselves

1. Could you tell me a little about you and your family?
2. When did you come to this city? Where did you live before?
3. Why did you decide to move here?
4. What is your main occupation? What is the main occupation of your partner? Are your children at School? If not, what do they do? (go to university/college, work, etc.)
5. Why did you choose this type of work?
6. What language do you speak at home and with your friends?

About Russian Language

7. Why do you think it is important for your children to study Russian? What kind of opportunities could bilingual children living in Scotland have?
8. Why did you decide to enrol your children at the Russian school?
9. What, in your opinion, do parents who want their children to study at the Russian school have in common?
10. Do you know any Russian speaking migrants who do not wish for their children to learn Russian in a Russian language-school? If yes, why not?
11. What do you think are the biggest challenges faced by families attending the Russian school?
12. How do you help your children study Russian language?

About Russian activities
13. Do you know other Russian-speaking people in Glasgow? How did you meet them? How often do you keep in contact with them?
14. Do you have Russian speaking friends? Can you tell me a little bit about them? How did you meet them?
15. Do your children have Russian friends? Do you help your child to socialise with Russian speaking children?
16. What kind of Russian related events do you participate in? Could you give us an example, please? If not, do you mind telling us why not?
17. Are you interested in news and events from your home country? (If the respondent is not from Russia) Are you interested in news and events from Russian?
18. Are you in contact people living in Russia or your home country? How, and how often do you usually contact them? Is it important for you? Why do you feel that way?
19. Would you like to be involved in activities bridging your home country and Scotland and/or Russia and Scotland? Why do you feel that way?

About Scotland

20. How do you feel about living in Scotland?
21. Do you speak in Russian in public? If yes, how do people react to you speaking Russian in public?
22. Is your ability to speak Russian an advantage or disadvantage in your profession?
23. How do you think relations between Scotland and Russia are developing?
24. What would make the biggest difference in increasing the popularity of the Russian language in Scotland among Russian speaking people?

Thank you for your participation in our research!

Guide for interviewing teachers of the Russian schools

О себе

1. Расскажите мне, пожалуйста, немного о себе и своей семье?
2. Когда Вы приехали в этот город? Где Вы жили до этого? Почему решили приехать в Шотландию?
3. Чем Вы занимаетесь, какова Ваша основная работа в Шотландии? Почему Вы ее выбрали?
4. Почему Вы стали преподавать русский язык в Шотландии вообще, и в русской школе в частности?
5. Как давно Вы преподаете русский язык в Шотландии? Как давно Вы работаете здесь в русской школе?

О преподавании русского языка
6. Какие организации, обучающие русскому языку в Великобритании и Шотландии Вы знаете? Какие из них Вы считаете наиболее эффективными и успешными?
7. Какие методы обучения и материалы Вы используете для подготовки к урокам русского языка?
8. Как соотносится языковая и культурная составляющая в Вашем преподавании?
9. Насколько, по Вашему мнению, ученики вовлечены в процесс изучения языка и культуры? Что помогает повысить их мотивацию?

О русском языке
10. Что дает родителям и детям, проживающим в Шотландии, обучение русскому языку?
11. Какие дополнительные возможности получают дети, изучающие русский язык?
12. Какие основные проблемы возникают при обучении двуязычных детей?

О школе
13. Как Вы считаете, какие причины побуждают родителей приводить детей в Русскую школу?
14. Вы знаете русскоговорящих мигрантов, которые не водят детей в школу? Как Вы считаете, почему они приняли такое решение?
15. Что общего у семей, которые привели детей в Русскую школу?
16. Какие основные сложности возникают у семей, которые приняли решение водить детей в русскую школу?
17. В чем Вы видите свою основную роль как помощника в обучении русскому языку?

О русских мероприятиях
18. Вы знаете других русскоговорящих людей в Вашем городе? Как Вы с ними познакомились? Как часто Вы с ними контактируете?
19. Посещаете ли Вы мероприятия для русскоговорящих в Вашем городе и какие?
20. Интересуетесь ли Вы тем, что происходит в России?
21. Контактируете ли Вы с людьми, живущими в России, а также в стране из которой Вы приехали?
22. Хотели бы Вы быть вовлечены в различные мероприятия, соединяющие Вашу родную страну и Шотландию, Россию и Шотландию? Почему?

O Шотландии
23. Как Вы чувствуете себя в Шотландии?
24. Разговариваете ли Вы по-русски в публичных местах? Если да, то как реагируют окружающие?
25. Помогает ли Вам знание русского языка в Шотландии?
26. Как, по Вашему мнению, складываются отношения между Шотландией и Россией?
27. Что, по Вашему мнению, способствовало бы росту популярности русского языка в Шотландии?

Спасибо за участие в исследовании!

About yourselves
1. Could you tell me a little about yourself and your family?
2. When did you come to this city? Where did you live before? Why did you decide to move to Scotland?
3. What is your main occupation? Why did you choose this job?
4. Why did you decide to teach Russian in Scotland, and in the Russian School in particular?
5. How long have you been teaching Russian in Scotland? How long have you worked at the Russian school?

About teaching Russian language
6. Which kind of organisations providing Russian language services in the UK are you aware of? Which are the most effective?
7. What teaching methods and materials do you use to prepare for lessons?
8. How do the linguistic and the cultural components of the language come together in your teaching?
9. In your opinion, how engaged are your pupils in learning language and culture? What helps to motivate them?

About Russian Language
10. What do you think parents and children living in Scotland get out of studying Russian?
11. What kind of extra opportunities could bilingual children have?
12. What are the key difficulties of teaching bilingual children?

About school
13. In your opinion, what encourages parents to bring their children to the Russian school?
14. Do you know Russian speaking migrants whose children do not attend the Russian school? Why do you think this is?
15. What do families who bring their children to the Russian school have in common?
16. What do you think are the biggest challenges faced by families whose children attend the Russian school?
17. What do you think is the most important part of your role as a teacher of Russian?

About Russian activities

18. Do you know other Russian-speaking people in Glasgow? How did you meet them? How often are you in contact with them?
19. What kind of Russian related events do you participate in?
20. Are you interested in what is going on in Russia?
21. Are you in contact with people living in Russia, or your home country?
22. Would you like to be involved in activities bridging your home country and Scotland and/or Russia and Scotland? Why do you feel that way?

About Scotland

23. How do you feel about living in Scotland? Do you feel settled here?
24. Do you speak in Russian in public? If yes, how do people react to you speaking Russian in public?
25. Is your ability to speak Russian an advantage or disadvantage within your profession?
26. How do you think relations between Scotland and Russia are developing?
27. What would make the biggest difference in increasing the popularity of the Russian language in Scotland among Russian speaking people?

Thank you for your participation!
Appendix 3: The proforma of participant observation

During the fieldwork at the Russian schools in Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Glasgow and Dundee I kept field notes recording my observations. During visits to schools I observed communications between parents, teachers and pupils in informal spaces and investigated the following:

- The common topics of discussion and narratives about Scotland and Russia;
- The complexity of language used;
- Life experiences;
- Attitude towards Russia/Scotland;
- Attitude towards Russian/Scottish schools;
- Involvement in transnational activities;
- Emotional aspects of communication.

In addition, I attended lessons in order to develop my understanding of

- The teaching process;
- Narratives and symbols used by teachers during the study;
- The complexity of language used by teachers;
- The complexity of languages used by pupils;
- Emotional aspects of communication.

All of these notes were anonymised from the outset.