

Stephan Kessler / Marko Pantermöller (eds.)

# **The Social Status of Languages in Finland and Lithuania**

A Plurimethodological Empirical Survey on  
Language Climate Change



**PETER LANG**

**Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available online at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Printed with the support of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation)

Cover image: Amei Koll-Stobbe

ISSN 1863-723X

ISBN 978-3-631-79674-0 (Print)

E-ISBN 978-3-631-80742-2 (E-PDF)

E-ISBN 978-3-631-80743-9 (EPUB)

E-ISBN 978-3-631-80744-6 (MOBI)

DOI 10.3726/b16362

**PETER LANG**



Open Access: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial No Derivatives 4.0 unported license. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

© Stephan Kessler / Marko Pantermöller (eds.), 2020

Peter Lang – Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York ·  
Oxford · Warszawa · Wien

This publication has been peer reviewed.  
[www.peterlang.com](http://www.peterlang.com)

# Contents

Series editor's short introduction .....	7
Editors' Preface .....	9
<i>Yvonne Bindrim</i>	
On the Relationship between Language Attitudes and Linguistic Opinions in Finland .....	13
<i>Anastasija Kostiučenko</i>	
The Language Situation in Lithuania—Is There Anything to Worry About? .....	107
<i>Vava Lunabba</i>	
Language Climate in Finland .....	199
<i>Meilutė Ramonienė</i>	
New Trends of Multilingualism in the Lithuanian Urban Space: the Private Sphere .....	229
<i>Laima Kalėdienė</i>	
Lithuanian Language Policy: Past and Present Duel .....	259

Meilutė Ramonienė

# New Trends of Multilingualism in the Lithuanian Urban Space: the Private Sphere

**Abstract.** This article examines the linguistic behaviour of Lithuanian city-dwellers in the private sphere and the new trends of urban multilingualism in Lithuania. The linguistic repertoire is analysed—the use of languages at home, in mental processes (such as thinking or counting), and when using the media. The research is based on the data from three large-scale surveys carried out in 2007–12 in Lithuanian cities.

## Overview

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Surveys and data capture
- 3 Data analysis
  - 3.1 Population in urban Lithuania
  - 3.2 Languages used at home
  - 3.3 The ‘inner speech’ of city inhabitants
  - 3.4 Language choice using media
- 4 Conclusions

## 1 Introduction

Since the first decade of the 21st century, for the first time in history, the global urban population exceeded the global rural population, and the world population has remained predominantly urban after that. In 2014 as much as 54 % of the world’s population dwelt in cities (WUP 2014: 1). The urbanisation of this rate permits an estimate that in 2050 there will be up to 66 % of city-dwellers in the world (*ibid.*). Even though cities have always had notable ethnic, cultural and linguistic variety, the increasing urbanisation and the globalisation have significantly changed the linguistic environment in cities in the past few decades. The growing multilingualism and multiculturalism attract more and more attention of researchers from various countries. Various perspectives are taken to analyse linguistic behaviour, migration and linguistic change (Andersen/Thelander 1994), urbanisation and language shift (Thandefelt 1994), multilingualism and language contacts in urban areas (Siemund *et al.* 2013), linguistic superdiversity

(Duarte/Gogolin 2013), ethnolects (Sollid 2013; Muysken/Rott 2013), languages and identities (Sollid 2013) and other aspects. The studies are encouraged by the effect of globalization, increasing geographical migration and the change of its directions on the sociolinguistic situation in different countries.

Urbanisation and globalisation have had the greatest effect on the linguistic life of many countries. However, the sociolinguistic situation of the ex-Soviet republics has significantly changed in the last twenty years also due to socio-political reasons (Pavlenko 2008). After the fall of the Soviet Union and with Lithuania regaining its independence in 1990, the socio-political status and the social value of languages used by the population in the country have changed. Lithuanian was proclaimed an official state language already during the period of national revival in 1988, before the fall of the Soviet Union and the restoration of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania. Back then an article had been inserted in the Constitution of the still Soviet republic of Lithuania that had changed the status of Lithuanian language (Mikulėnienė/Palionytė 1997). Even if this *de jure* decision did not change the situation at the time, it was still a signal of the coming changes in social values of languages. The *de facto* changes have most significantly concerned Lithuanian and Russian languages, not only the status of these languages but also the knowledge and learning, the use and the language attitudes. These changes were first and most significantly seen in cities.

The sociolinguistic situation after the restoration of independence of Lithuania has already attracted the attention of researchers. Several studies have discussed the general linguistic situation, language use and social adaptation (Hogan-Brun/Ramonienė 2003, 2004, 2005a, 2005b; Hogan-Brun *et al.* 2009; Kasatkina/Leončikas 2003), education (Leončikas 2007; Bulajeva/Hogan-Brun 2008), language usage at work (Ramonienė 2011), at home (Ramonienė/Extra 2011a, 2011b), language use and identity (Ramonienė 2010; Geben/Ramonienė 2011; Brazauskienė 2010; Lichačiova 2010; Ehala/Zabrodskaja 2011, 2013; Vilkienė 2010), changes in the social values of languages (Ramonienė/Vilkienė 2016).

There have been quite a few studies on the change in position of the Lithuanian language in the life of ethnic minorities that live in Lithuania. A radical departure from the Soviet-era asymmetric bilingualism model that meant bilingualism of titular ethnicities and monolingualism of Russian-speakers has occurred. The new language policy influenced, in particular, language attitudes and behaviour of ethnic minorities, comprising about 16 % of Lithuania's population. Poles and Russians, the largest ethnic groups in Lithuania, who knew little or no Lithuanian before the restoration of independence, have modified their language practices which also influenced their language choice. Since 1988 there has been an increase in studying Lithuanian as a second language. Russian-speakers of

Lithuania—Russians, Poles and people of other ethnicities—have started to study Lithuanian. Lithuanian language courses have been organised for free for the employees of various companies and factories that have had Russian as a dominating language during the Soviet times. The new language policy of the country affected the linguistic repertoire of the population, their language preferences and their language use in many domains: in the public sphere, at work, in the higher education. The Law on State language, approved in 1995, has obliged to use Lithuanian for official communication. Linguistic changes in the public sphere started to influence also linguistic behaviour in the private sphere.

This paper aims to analyse the linguistic choice and the directions of multilingualism of inhabitants of Lithuanian cities in private communication. The goal is to study city-dwellers of different ethnicities in order to learn about their linguistic repertoires, the declared linguistic behaviour, language use in different domains: at home, in mental processes, e.g. when thinking, and when using media. This paper presents a detailed analysis of the linguistic behaviour in private life by the city inhabitants of Lithuanian ethnicity and by two major ethnic groups of Lithuania, Poles and Russians, who live in cities. The linguistic behaviour of ethnic groups that constitute only a small part of the whole population is only shown to give a general context, but it is not analysed in detail here. The use of languages rarely spoken, such as German, French, Ukrainian, Belarusian and others is also not studied in detail.

## 2 Surveys and data capture

This paper analyses quantitative data from two sociolinguistic research projects implemented in different urban areas of Lithuania. The project *Language use and ethnic identity in urban areas of Lithuania* was carried out in 2007–2009 in the three largest Lithuanian cities, namely, the capital Vilnius, the second largest city Kaunas and the seaport of Klaipėda.<sup>1</sup> The second project *Sociolinguistic map of Lithuania: towns and cities* has been carried out throughout 2010–2012 in such urban areas of Lithuania which are inhabited by at least 3,000 people having urban occupations.<sup>2</sup> Both projects are aimed at a large-scale study of the

---

1 The project *Language use and ethnic identity in urban areas of Lithuania* was funded by a grant of the Lithuanian State Science and Studies Foundation. The author of this article Meilutė Ramonienė was the initiator and supervisor of the project.

2 The project *Sociolinguistic map of Lithuania: towns and cities* was funded by a grant of the Research Council of Lithuania. The author of this article Meilutė Ramonienė was the initiator and supervisor of the project.

sociolinguistic situation in urban Lithuania and involve quantitative surveys and qualitative in-depth interviews. However, this paper will present only quantitative data.

The first project, *Language use and ethnic identity in urban areas of Lithuania*, involved two different surveys whose results will be discussed in this article. The first survey (hereafter S1) covered primary schools in Vilnius, Kaunas and Klaipėda. For its purposes, a special methodology from the *Multilingual Cities Project* (Extra/Yağmur 2004, 2005; Ramonienė/Extra 2011a; 2011b) was adapted to collect evidence on languages used in the private (home) domain. Application of the same methodology enables a reliable comparison of data across different West European urban areas as similar studies have also been carried out in Göteborg, Hamburg, The Hague, Brussels, Lyon, Madrid (Extra/Yağmur 2004) and other cities. The theoretical basis allows to compare findings from a sociolinguistic survey and describe the range of languages used at home, choice of languages, and vitality index of home languages (Extra/Yağmur 2004, 2005).

The methodology was used in large-scale surveys which aimed to cover at least 80 % of respondents under survey in primary schools (aged 8–10). The total sample was of 23,686 pupils in 189 schools. At Lithuanian state schools, the language of instruction can be Lithuanian, Russian, Polish, Belarusian. Therefore the survey included also pupils who are not instructed in the state language (Lithuanian). Even though the sample of the survey is dominated by the answers of pupils at Lithuanian mainstream schools (as Table 1 shows—84.3 % of all answers are of this set), 9.9 % of all answers are responses given by pupils at Polish schools, 3.9 %—by pupils at Russian schools, and 0.2 %—by pupils at schools that have other languages of instruction. Data processing was conducted at Tilburg University in the Netherlands.

**Tab. 1.** Languages of instruction for the total sample (N = responses)

Language	N	%
Lithuanian	19972	84.3
Polish	2350	9.9
Russian	924	3.9
Other	44	0.2
Missing	396	1.7
Total	23686	100.0

The second survey of the first project (hereafter S2) covered a representative sample of 2,037 respondents aged 15 or older, who were living in the three biggest cities, i.e. Vilnius, Kaunas and Klaipėda.<sup>3</sup> The questionnaire consisted of 64 questions. The major sections of the questionnaire were focused on officially declared mother tongues, knowledge of other languages and dialects, languages used in interaction with various interlocutors, and language attitudes.

The quantitative survey of the second project, *Sociolinguistic map of Lithuania: towns and cities* (hereafter S3) was carried out in all smaller towns of Lithuania. The representative sample of this survey contained 2,660 respondents.<sup>4</sup> It was partly based on the questionnaire of S2. More specifically, 31 questions out of 64 were selected so that the data from the surveys in large cities and small towns would be comparable. The quantitative data were processed with the SPSS software. The data of S2 and S3 was merged for the analysis of certain aspects and for getting a broader view of the whole urban area in the country. The joint data of these two surveys make up a total sample of 4,697 respondents.

### 3 Data analysis

#### 3.1 Population in urban Lithuania

Today's Lithuania has approximately 3 million inhabitants and more than half of them live in cities since 1970 (Vaitekūnas 2006: 154). According to the last census in 2011, 66.7 % of the population lives in cities. It is estimated that in 2050 cities will be the home for 75 % of the population of Lithuania (WUP 2014: 23).

---

3 The representative and quantitative survey was carried out by *TNS Gallup*.

4 The representative and quantitative survey was carried out by *AB Socialinės informacijos centras*.

**Tab. 2.** Ethnic groups in Lithuania

<b>Ethnic group</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Lithuanian	84.2
Polish	6.6
Russian	5.8
Belarusian	1.2
Ukrainian	0.5
Other	0.6
Not indicated	1.1
Total	100

*Source:* Census 2011. Ethnicities were declared by grown-up respondents. Children's nationalities were given by their parents.

According to the 2011 census, the majority of the population in Lithuania are Lithuanians; they account for 84.2 % of the population (see Table 2; by data of Census 2011). According to the data, people of 154 ethnicities lived in Lithuania. The major ethnic groups are Poles (6.6 % of the population) and Russians (5.8 %); groups of other ethnicities are rather small. The ethnic distribution of Lithuania's population is of clear regional nature. The cities are most multicultural. Vilnius was inhabited by people of 128, Kaunas by 85, Klaipėda by 77 different ethnicities. Among these major cities, the greatest ethnic diversity is found in Vilnius, as can be seen from the data presented in table 3. Klaipėda is the most Russian, and Kaunas is the most Lithuanian among these three cities.

**Tab. 3.** The population of the major cities by ethnicity (in per cent)

	<b>Lithuanians</b>	<b>Poles</b>	<b>Russians</b>	<b>Belarusians</b>	<b>Ukrainians</b>	<b>Others</b>
Vilnius	63.2	16.5	12.0	3.5	1.0	3.8
Kaunas	93.6	0.4	3.8	0.2	0.4	1.6
Klaipėda	73.9	0.3	19.6	1.7	1.9	2.6

*Source:* Census 2011.

### 3.2 Languages used at home

The majority of studies confirm that the home or family domain is a very crucial one concerning the linguistic behaviour (Fishman 2000: 95; Pauwels 2005; Rubino 2014: 56–57; Schwartz and Verschik 2013). The family is not only the place where the first language or languages are acquired but also where the

linguistic environment of the child is formed (Schwartz 2010: 172), as well as the basis of language attitudes and ideologies, are founded (King *et al.* 2008: 917). Family language policy and management affect the choice of language or dialect, its maintenance or shift. The role of the family is crucial for the maintenance of bilingualism or multilingualism, and intergenerational transmission of languages (Fishman 2000: 95). Fishman affirms that 'multilingualism often begins in the family and depends upon it for encouragement if not for protection' and that 'multilingualism withdraws into the family domain after it has been displaced from other domains in which it was previously encountered' (*ibid.*). King *et al.* (2008: 913) state that 'family patterns of language use and acquisition are both reflected in and reflective of societal patterns,' that family languages policies 'shape children's developmental trajectories,' and even 'determine the maintenance and future status of minority languages' (*ibid.*: 907).

### 3.2.1 Home languages declared by children

Due to the importance of language in the family domain, home languages in Lithuanian cities were investigated in all of the studies discussed in this paper. The situation is best revealed by the survey S1 conducted in the primary schools of the three biggest Lithuanian cities; S1 was focused on studying precisely linguistic behaviour in the home domain. The total number of pupils in the sample was 23,686.

Our survey covered the following dimensions:

- language skills and proficiency;
- choice of languages at home with different members of the family, particularly with the mother;
- language dominance: the extent to which the home language is spoken best;
- language preferences: the extent to which the home language is preferably spoken.

A question on ethnicity had been included in the questionnaire that was used at schools, but the question was left out in the questionnaire of the international project (Extra/Yağmur 2004: 412–413). Although the question of ethnicity is less transparent (Ramonienė/Extra 2011b: 39), 94.4 % of the pupils indicated their ethnicity. As can be seen in the data presented in Table 4 where eight most frequently indicated ethnicities are listed, the major set of participants of the survey were of Lithuanian ethnicity, some were Russian and Polish, and only a few pupils were of other ethnicities.

**Tab. 4.** Top 8 ranking of reported ethnic groups

<b>Nr.</b>	<b>Ethnic group</b>	<b>Total</b>
1.	Lithuanian	19138
2.	Russian	1901
3.	Polish	1157
4.	Belarusian	58
5.	Ukrainian	44
6.	Yiddish/Jewish	28
7.	German	24
8.	Romani	23

The total number of reported home languages is 37. However, when comparing this result with the outcome of analogous surveys conducted in multicultural European cities, we see less variety: e.g. 56 languages were mentioned in Madrid, 88 in The Hague, and 90 in Hamburg (Extra/Ramonienė 2011b: 24). It is worth highlighting the fact that the language most frequently mentioned by the pupils as to be used at home was Lithuanian: 21,073 pupils have stated they would use Lithuanian at home (cf. Table 5). It is natural that Lithuanian is the main language in Lithuanian families. However, as shown in table 6, Lithuanian was indicated to be used in the domestic domain not only by Lithuanian children but also, in fact, it is used in all other of the top 8 ethnical groups, i.e. by Russians, Poles, Belarusians, Ukrainians, Jews, Germans, and Roma.

**Tab. 5.** Top 10 ranking of reported home languages

<b>Nr.</b>	<b>Language</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
1.	Lithuanian	21073
2.	Russian	10139
3.	English	3180
4.	Polish	2006
5.	German	299
6.	Belarusian	232
7.	French	141
8.	Ukrainian	119
9.	Latvian	93
10	Armenian	28

Russian was stated to be the second most frequently used language. This was said by 10,139 pupils (cf. Table 5). Table 6 shows that Russian is not only used

in families of Russian ethnicity; Russian was indicated by children from families of all top 8 ethnic groups. This data shows that Russian which is a language that had a special status during the Soviet times is still known by people living in Lithuania, and it is used in the private domain not only by ethnic Russians but also by people of other ethnicities.

**Tab. 6.** The relationship between reported languages and top 8 ethnicity

Home language	Ethnicity							
	Lithuanian N 19138	Russian N 1901	Polish N 1157	Belarussian N 58	Ukrainian N 44	Jewish N 28	German N 24	Romani N 23
Lithuanian	18662	904	497	31	22	16	18	11
Russian	6707	1834	770	53	38	24	9	8
English	2730	190	62	6	7	5	4	2
Polish	626	238	953	11	4	1	1	
German	253	20	5	1			5	
French	116	10	2	1				1
Belarusian	95	53	26	22	1			
Latvian	69	6	2					2
Ukrainian	51	30	4		17		1	1
Spanish	24	1						
Armenian	21	3	2					
Italian	14	1				2		
Chinese	6	1	1					
Dutch	2							
Greek	2							
Hungarian	2							
Norwegian	2							
Sign Language	2							
Czech	1							
Danish	1							
Estonian	1							
Finnish	1							
Hebrew/Jewish	1	1				3		
Hindi	1							
Moldavian	1							
Swedish	1							
Turkish	1	1					1	
Unknown	1	3				1		

The Polish language, even though it is the mother tongue of the largest ethnic minority of Lithuania, takes only fourth place in the frequency list of domestic languages. To be the language used at home, Polish was indicated by 953 children out of a total of 1,157 children of Polish ethnicity. A fairly high number of Polish children indicated that they were using Russian (770 pupils) or Lithuanian (497) at home. This outcome supports results of other studies stating that Poles in Lithuania do not all consider Polish to be their mother tongue, that not all of them know it and that not all of them use it even in their private life (Geben 2010, 2013; Geben/Ramonienė 2011, 2015).

**Tab. 7.** Top 10 ranking of reported languages per city

Language	Vilnius N	Language	Kaunas N	Language	Klaipėda N
Lithuanian	8707	Lithuanian	9026	Lithuanian	3340
Russian	5605	Russian	2764	Russian	1770
Polish	1879	English	1364	English	518
English	1298	German	116	German	77
Belarusian	180	Polish	113	Ukrainian	42
German	106	French	40	Belarusian	22
French	81	Latvian	38	French	20
Ukrainian	50	Belarusian	30	Latvian	18
Latvian	37	Ukrainian	27	Polish	14
Romani	17	Romani	21	Armenian	9

It is important to point out that Polish is used at home mostly in Vilnius. In Vilnius, Polish is the third most frequent: it was mentioned by 1,879 pupils (see Table 7). In Kaunas, Polish was indicated by only 113 children, and in Klaipėda only by 14 pupils. This outcome is well understandable because the Poles who are the ones in Lithuania who mostly use Polish at home live mainly in Vilnius or in the Vilnius region.

According to our survey, the third most frequently used language in the overall list is English (cf. table 5). English ranks third of domestic languages in Kaunas and Klaipėda (cf. Table 7), whereas in Vilnius, where this spot is occupied by Polish, and English is in the fourth position. One might ask what families use English at home. Maybe they are immigrants that have come to Lithuania? If we take a look at the place of birth of the pupils' parents (see Table 8), we will see that amongst the domestic English users there are only a few pupils and parents that were born in the anglophone United States or the United Kingdom: only 12

children, 2 fathers and 2 mothers were born in the United States; and 10 children, 3 fathers and 1 mother were born in the United Kingdom.

**Tab. 8.** Place of birth of family members that use English at home (by country)

<b>Birth country</b>	<b>Pupil</b>	<b>Father</b>	<b>Mother</b>
Lithuania	3060	2712	2790
Russia	18	117	110
United States	12	2	2
United Kingdom	10	3	1
Poland	8	22	20
Belarus	5	34	34
Armenia	4	5	2
Ukraine	2	1	1
Israel	2	1	1
<i>Other countries</i>	10	34	16
<i>Unknown</i>	49	236	184
<b>Total</b>	<b>3180</b>	<b>3180</b>	<b>3180</b>

Moreover, at home, English rarely is the only language used (see Table 9), this indicates only 18 cases. Most commonly it co-occurs (see Table 10) with Lithuanian (such situation was indicated by 3,067 pupils) or Russian (indicated by 2,026 pupils). Children that most frequently reported to use English at home are Lithuanians, followed by Russians and, at a considerable distance, by Poles (see Table 11). When asked to mention the interlocutors whom the pupils use English with, the most frequent choice was ‘with best friends’, but even the number of these answers is not high: only 6.7 % of all who said they use English. In fact, the main use of English happens watching TV (65.8 %); and the majority of children have learned English at school (87 %). This use of English at home indicates that English is generally entering the home domain of the inhabitants of Lithuania, not only of anglophone families, and that in Lithuania common practice of children is English media consumption, but it is not English face-to-face communication.

**Tab. 9.** English used at home

	<b>Total</b>	<b>English only</b>
N	3180	18
Percentage	100 %	1 %

**Tab. 10.** Languages used at home together with English

<b>Language</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>
Lithuanian	3067
Russian	2026
Polish	221
German	160
French	89
Belarusian	58
Latvian	57
Ukrainian	35
Armenian	12
Italian	7
Spanish	6
Chinese	3
Dutch	3
Norwegian	3
<i>Unknown</i>	12

**Tab. 11.** Ethnicities reported the use of English at home

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number of responses</b>
Lithuanian	2730
Russian	190
Polish	62
American	9
English	8
Ukrainian	7
Belarusian	6
Latvian	5
Yiddish/Jewish	5
German	4
Armenian	2
Romani	2
Dutch	2
Irish	2
Tatar	2
<i>Missing</i>	144

### 3.2.2 Home languages declared by adults

Many researchers analysing linguistic behaviour in families distinguish different speaker roles: father, mother, child, grandfather, grandmother, grandchild, siblings (Fishman 2000: 95–96). Language choice and relationship based on (family) roles can reveal particularities of specific settings. In one domain, speakers of different generations might have different language competence, different linguistic repertoires and linguistic behaviour (Wodak *et al.* 2011: 450). We can uncover the linguistic situation and tendencies of its change in the Lithuanian urban space analysing how languages are used by different interlocutors in the home domain.

In the S2 and S3 surveys, there was a question about what language<sup>5</sup> do the respondents use to speak with younger and with older family members. The data analysis shows which languages are chosen in families of mixed ethnicities. This chapter deals with linguistic behaviour, of three major ethnic groups in Lithuania: Lithuanians, Russians and Poles. Firstly, the communication between interlocutors of the same generation—spouses and siblings—is analysed. Then the attention will be drawn to the communication with relatives of younger generations: children and grandchildren.

**Tab. 12.** Languages spoken with spouses and siblings (by ethnicity)

Languages	Ethnicities with siblings				Ethnicities with spouse			
	Lithuanians	Russians	Poles	Other	Lithuanians	Russians	Poles	Other
Lithuanian	99 %	32 %	26 %	20 %	99 %	46 %	36 %	44 %
Russian	3 %	93 %	50 %	76 %	7 %	83 %	54 %	82 %
Polish	1 %	1 %	74 %	5 %	1 %	2 %	55 %	9 %
Code-switching	2 %	11 %	21 %	14 %	4 %	20 %	24 %	25 %
Other languages	1 %	1 %	3 %	42 %	1 %	2 %	4 %	21 %

As shown in Table 12, monolingualism dominates the homes of Lithuanians: as much as 99 % of all Lithuanian families in cities affirm to communicate in Lithuanian to their spouses and siblings. A very small set of them says they

5 When responding to the question about language choice the respondents could choose not only one but all the languages they use with different interlocutors and in different situations.

communicate in other languages. Polish language to communicate with such interlocutors is used only by 1 % of Lithuanians; the Russian language is used a bit more (3 % use it with siblings and 7 % with his/her spouse). Very few Lithuanians declare code-switching (2 % with siblings, and 4 % with spouses) or that they were using any other language (only 1 %).

The situation is rather different in families of non-Lithuanian ethnicities. Respondents of the Russian ethnic group communicate in Russian first: 93 % of all Russians do so with their siblings, and 83 % with their spouses. The second most frequent language in the communication of Russians with relatives of their generation is Lithuanian: 32 % of all Russians chose it for talking to siblings and even more Russians—46 % of all—communicating with their spouse. Russians code-switch in their families a lot more than Lithuanians: 11 % of all Russians are switching languages speaking with siblings, and even one-fifth of the respondents do so with their spouses. Polish or other languages are rarely spoken in Russian homes, only 1–2 % of all Russians use Polish there.

The linguistic behaviour of Poles—the largest ethnic group in Lithuania—has been studied by several researchers. Lithuanian Poles, as well as other ethnicities, have experienced a significant Russification during the Soviet regime (Hogan-Brun *et al.* 2009; Geben / Ramonienė 2015). In that times, for quite a few Poles there was a tendency to switch to Russian; many Poles—especially those who were living in bigger cities—had pushed their children to attend a Russian-medium school and to do not use Polish but Russian in their private life. This language choice is demonstrated by the data of the surveys S2 and S3. Not, as one might expect, a set of nearby 99 % of all Poles, but only 74 % of them affirm to speak Polish to their siblings, and only slightly more than a half (55 %) of them, to do so to their spouses. Here, the Russian language is the one that competes with Polish in the homes domain of this ethnic community: as much as 50 % of all Poles state to talk Russian to siblings, and 54 % to do so to spouses. Poles tend to code-switch more than Russians (21 % of them indicated to do so with siblings, and 24 % to do so with spouses). A rather big set of Poles affirm to use Lithuanian in the domestic domain: 26 % of all Poles say to use Lithuanian with siblings, and 36 % say to do so with spouses. A small part of Poles have declared to use other languages: 3 % of all Poles say they do so with siblings, and 4 % of them—with spouses. The languages that are mentioned in this context as being ‘other’ are either Belarusian or a local vernacular which is called (*język tutejszy* (liter. ‘language from here’) or *po-prostu* (liter. ‘simple language’).

When analysing the communication of the Russian and Polish ethnic groups with the youngest members in the family, children and grandchildren, we can

notice tendencies that show a change in language choice. Lithuanian occupies a more significant position here: 55 % of Russians and 49 % of Poles indicate to use Lithuanian with children, while 50 % of Russians and 54 % of Poles declare using

**Tab. 13.** Languages spoken with children and grandchildren (by ethnicity)

Languages	Ethnicities with children				Ethnicities with grandchildren			
	Lithuanians	Russians	Polish	Other	Lithuanians	Russians	Polish	Other
Lithuanian	99 %	55 %	49 %	47 %	99 %	50 %	54 %	46 %
Russian	4 %	85 %	46 %	80 %	3 %	84 %	44 %	78 %
Polish	1 %	1 %	68 %	5 %	1 %	0 %	53 %	7 %
Code-switching	1 %	17 %	21 %	14 %	2 %	10 %	17 %	18 %
Other languages	1 %	0 %	2 %	19 %	2 %	2 %	4 %	16 %

it with grandchildren (see Table 13).

A significant part of the communication of both Russians and Poles consists of code-switching. According to the S2 and S3 data (see Table 13), 17 % of Russians and 21 % of Poles declare that they like to code-switch in situations when they talk to their children, somewhat less—10 % of Russians and 17 % of Poles—when talking to grandchildren.

According to the S2 and S3 data, the English language, though it is now becoming a part of the linguistic repertoire of Lithuanians who live in cities, is not popular in communication with relatives. A very small part of all respondents that is only 0.57 % declare that they speak English at home. On the other hand, previous studies have shown that English is more common in other domains, e.g. at work (Ramonienė 2014; Ramonienė/Vilkienė 2016; Vaicekauskienė 2010).

### 3.3 The ‘inner speech’ of city inhabitants

Language choice patterns can be understood from the language used in mental processes, i.e. in what language does one think, speak to oneself, dream, or count. The *inner speech* is of particular importance in situations of multilingualism when one is faced with language choice. Fishman (2000: 97) affirms that ‘there is some evidence from individual as well as from group data that where language shift is resisted by multilinguals, inner speech remains most resistant to interference, switching and disuse of the mother tongue. Where language shift is desired the reverse frequently obtains.’

The analysis of *inner speech* can help reveal the linguistic situation of Lithuanian urban spaces. The adults who participated in the survey were asked in what language do they think and count. Their answers show that the *inner speeches* of city inhabitants of the several ethnicities vary. Lithuanians usually indicate that they think in Lithuanian. This was the answer of 99 % of Lithuanians living in cities (see Table 14). 9 % of Lithuanians said they think in Russian, 4 % declared they think in more than one language, but they switch languages when they think. It is interesting that as much 7 % of Lithuanians have mentioned English as the language of thought.

**Tab. 14.** The language used when thinking (by ethnicity)

Language	Ethnicity		
	Lithuanians	Russians	Poles
Lithuanian	99 %	55 %	47 %
Russian	9 %	94 %	66 %
Polish	1 %	1 %	67 %
English	7 %	3 %	2 %
Code-switching	4 %	15 %	14 %
Other	1 %	1 %	1 %

The *inner speech* of ethnic minorities is more multilingual. The majority of Russians (94 %) declared they think in Russian. However, more than half of (55 %) said they also think in Lithuanian and 15 % that they switch from one language to another. English constitutes only a small part in this context—3 %.

In this linguistic context of thinking, the most interesting repertoire is that of the Polish ethnic group. Even though a large set of Poles, 67 %, said they think in Polish, however, an almost equal part (66 %) indicated Russian to be also their language of thought. About half of Poles (47 %) said they also think in Lithuanian, and 14 % of them, that they switch from one language to another. Only 2 % of Poles declared they think in English.

**Tab. 15.** The language used when counting (by ethnicity)

Language	Ethnicity		
	Lithuanians	Russians	Poles
Lithuanian	100 %	64 %	64 %
Russian	15 %	92 %	75 %
Polish	1 %	2 %	62 %
English	10 %	5 %	5 %
Other	2 %	2 %	1 %

Another question related to the *inner speech* was about the language that is used when the subjects are counting. As demonstrated in table 15, different language combinations are used for counting by city inhabitants of different ethnicities. All Lithuanians said they count in their mother tongue, some of them, 15 %, also count in Russian; 10 % of them mentioned English here. Russians also said they mostly count in their mother tongue—this was indicated by 92 % of people of this ethnicity. As well as for language of thinking, they said they also use Lithuanian when they count—this was indicated by 64 % of all Russians. Another 5 % of Russians indicated they use English when they count; 2 % of them use Polish.

As with all other cases, the Polish linguistic community has a different linguistic repertoire. The Poles also mostly indicated they use the language of their ethnic group (i.e. Polish) when they count, but the percentage is much lower than that of Lithuanians or Russians: only 62 % of all Poles. As many as 75 % of all Poles state they count in Russian, 64 % in Lithuanian, 5 % in English and 1 % in other languages. Therefore, in case of Lithuania's Poles, the linguistic repertoire for inner communication and mental processes is constituted of the language of their ethnic group (i.e. Polish), but it is in competition with Russian or sometimes Lithuanian.

**Tab. 16.** The language used when praying (by ethnicity)

Language	Ethnicity		
	Lithuanians	Russians	Poles
Lithuanian	99 %	22 %	20 %
Russian	2 %	90 %	7 %
Polish	1 %	3 %	92 %
Other	0 %	0 %	1 %

The domain 'religion' is related to the intimate communicative sphere. Table 16 shows data by different ethnic groups answering in which languages the subjects are praying. In this sphere all ethnic groups indicated they usually use the language of their ethnic group: 99 % of all Lithuanians, 90 % of all Russians, and 92 % of all Poles indicate to do so. As can be seen in Table 16, about one-fifth of Lithuania's ethnic minorities—22 % of the Russians and 20 % of the Poles—choose Lithuanian in this domain. However, Russian which Lithuanians or Poles sometimes choose in other domains is not popular in the domain 'religion'. Only 2 % of the Lithuanian and 7 % the Polish residents indicated Russian to use for praying.

### 3.4 Language choice using media

Media communication includes both public and private communicative dimensions; as Busch and Pfisterer put it, ‘it mediates between the public and the private sphere’ (Busch/Pfisterer 2011: 435). Even though media products are available publicly, their use and their reception happen in a private environment.

In the past few decades, the use of media has changed drastically. Nowadays, newspapers, weekly papers and other press are not read in the printed version any longer, but more frequently online, where interaction, comments and so on are possible. As Marshal (2011: 407) points out referring to the article of Lehman-Wilzig and Cohen-Avigdor (2004) on the internet’s usurpation of older media, ‘the Internet was a multi-medium that absorbed and transformed existing media.’ The internet has affected TV and other traditional forms of media; it is connected to new forms of interpersonal communication and personalised mediated explorations (Marshal 2011). ‘Whereas some two decades ago, relatively stable reception habits could be assumed as bringing together audiences into national, ethnic or other social communities, present media reception is more characterised by individual practices, which become more ephemeral and deterritorialised’ (Busch/Pfisterer 2011: 438). Therefore, the language choice for media reflects more private linguistic behaviour than the public one.

What languages are chosen for media Lithuania’s urban dwellers? It is worth looking separately at the reading of newspapers and magazines, the reading of books, the languages chosen when watching TV, the listening to the radio, and the surfing of the internet. The following paragraphs present a detailed analysis of the four languages used for media—Lithuanian, Russian, Polish and English—by the major ethnic groups (Lithuanians, Poles and Russians).

**Tab. 17.** Languages that subjects use when reading print media (by ethnicity)

Languages	Ethnicities							
	Lithuanians		Russians		Poles		Other	
	print	books	print	books	print	books	print	books
Lithuanian	99 %	99 %	81 %	65 %	79 %	66 %	68 %	54 %
Russian	25 %	30 %	91 %	96 %	84 %	84 %	92 %	91 %
Polish	2 %	2 %	4 %	4 %	48 %	59 %	7 %	7 %
English	17 %	21 %	14 %	17 %	8 %	13 %	12 %	16 %
Other languages	1 %	3 %	2 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	22 %	27 %

The results of surveys S2 and S3 show that the most frequent languages that are chosen by urban dwellers when reading newspapers and magazines are Lithuanian and Russian. As can be seen in Table 17, Lithuanian public prints are read by 99 % of Lithuanians, 81 % of Russians, 79 % of Poles, and 68 % of other ethnicities. Even though a large number of people who belong to an ethnic minority in Lithuania know Lithuanian—and especially these know it who are up to the age of 40, Lithuanian public prints are read more by Lithuanians than by non-Lithuanians.

The second most popular language chosen when reading newspapers and magazines is Russian. It is mostly chosen by city dwellers of non-Lithuanian ethnicity: by Russians (91 %), by other ethnicities—e.g. Belarusian or Ukrainian—(92 %), and (a little) fewer in number by Poles (84 %). A set of the Lithuanians also affirm they read prints in Russian as well but their number is significantly smaller than the number of inhabitants of other ethnicities who read Russian print media, to be exact, only 25 %.

Polish, even though it is the language of the largest ethnic minority, has not been preferred for reading newspapers and magazines. No more than 48 % of the Poles chose their language for this activity, so that, in comparison, they read Russian print media more frequently (84 % of them do so, as it has been mentioned above). People of other ethnicities do not frequently read prints in Polish—only 2 % of all Lithuanians, 4 % of all Russians, and 7 % of all other ethnicities do so.

Considering foreign languages, English is usually chosen to read newspapers and magazines: 17 % of Lithuanians, 14 % of Russians, 8 % of Poles, and 12 % of people of other ethnicities do so. Print media in other languages like, e.g. Belarusian, Ukrainian, German, or French are not popular among the city inhabitants, only about 2 % of them say they read the prints in such languages. A more significant difference can be noted when analysing only the answers of smaller ethnic groups, such as Belarusian, Ukrainian, Latvian, Armenian *etc.* About 22 % of them affirm to read the prints in 'other languages' as we combine the less frequently used languages in one category of Table 17.

A slightly different situation is revealed when analysing the language choice in the context of books to be read. Naturally, Lithuanians prefer to read books in Lithuanian (99 % of them do so). The percentage of Lithuanian language use to read books by people of other ethnicities is lower than that of reading the prints: 65 % of Russians, 66 % of Poles and 54 % of other ethnicities. As is the case with the prints, Russian, is very popular among the city dwellers of Russian ethnicity (96 %), Poles (84 %), and other ethnicities (91 %). Lithuanians read

Russian books (a little) fewer in number than townspeople of other ethnicities, only 30 % of all urban Lithuanians declared to do that.

**Tab. 18.** Languages that subjects use when listening to the radio or watching TV (by ethnicity)

Languages	Ethnicities							
	Lithuanians		Russians		Poles		Other	
	radio	TV	radio	TV	radio	TV	radio	TV
Lithuanian	99 %	100 %	88 %	92 %	85 %	92 %	84 %	90 %
Russian	52 %	72 %	95 %	97 %	90 %	95 %	94 %	96 %
Polish	5 %	8 %	7 %	8 %	60 %	61 %	12 %	12 %
English	25 %	39 %	14 %	25 %	13 %	19 %	11 %	24 %
Other languages	3 %	3 %	2 %	5 %	2 %	4 %	21 %	24 %

City inhabitants of Lithuanian ethnicity, as when reading print media or books, usually chose Lithuanian also when listening to the radio (99 % of them) or watching TV (100 of them)—see Table 18. However, city inhabitants of other ethnicities also choose Lithuanian for audio-visual media more often than they do for reading books or other print media. 88 % of Russians, 85 % of Poles, and 84 % of other non-Lithuanians affirm on listening to the radio in Lithuanian. Even more of them watch TV in Lithuanian: 92 % of Russians and just as much Poles do it, as well as 90 % of all people of other ethnicities. This data correlates with Lithuanian language skills indicated by non-Lithuanians. It can be seen in Table 19 that more non-Lithuanians affirm that they understand Lithuanian when hearing it verbally better (97 % Russians, 96 % Poles and 95 % other ethnicities) than in written form, not to speak about their productive language competence. Naturally, the visual context of the TV programme significantly facilitates the understanding of those whose Lithuanian skills are not very high.

**Tab. 19.** Lithuanian language skills of non-Lithuanians

Skills	Ethnicity		
	Russians	Poles	Other
Understanding	97 %	96 %	95 %
Speaking	91 %	92 %	82 %
Reading	86 %	90 %	76 %
Writing	82 %	88 %	71 %

The second most frequent language when listening to the radio as well as using other media is Russian (see Table 18). It is chosen by 90–95 % of all these city inhabitants who belong to an ethnic minority and often speak Russian. However, more than half of all Lithuanians (52 %) claim as well they listen to the radio in Russian. Even more city inhabitants watch TV in Russian, this was the answer of 97 % of all Russians, 95 % of Poles, 96 % of all other ethnicities. Also, a significant part of Lithuanians watches TV in Russian: 72 %. So the Russian language learned in the Soviet times is frequently used for media consumption by the city residents of Lithuanian ethnicity. However, the knowledge of Russian and its use for media depends on the age groups of the surveyed subjects. Table 20 illustrates how often city residents, who do not speak Russian as mother tongue, use Russian in the context of media. Russian is chosen more often by people who are older than 35—i.e. who have learned Russian at school in the Soviet era. City inhabitants of the younger generation (in the age between 25 and 35) who did not have Russian at school on a compulsory basis, use less frequently Russian for media, and the youngest group, 15–24 year-olds, say they used Russian a lot less frequently. They mostly use it to watch TV in Russian (55 % of them), less to listen to radio (39 % of them), even less to browse the internet (26 % of them), to read books in Russian (17 % of them), newspapers and magazines (14 % of them).

**Tab. 20.** Reported use of media in Russian (by age)

	15–24	25–35	36–45	46–55	56+
Books	17 %	29 %	36 %	38 %	40 %
Newspapers, magazines	14 %	26 %	36 %	35 %	35 %
Radio	39 %	56 %	61 %	60 %	52 %
TV	55 %	78 %	85 %	78 %	75 %
Internet	26 %	37 %	33 %	20 %	9 %

The third most frequent language in the context of TV or radio consumption by the city dwellers is English (see Table 21).<sup>6</sup> The number of choices is lower than Lithuanian or Russian, but some of the city inhabitants claim that they use English rather frequently. As it is in the case of the languages discussed

6 Among all 4,578 respondents of the surveys S2 and S3 who have answered the question about their mother tongue, there has been only one who affirmed that English is one of his mother tongues. Therefore, English has been a second or foreign language to all other subjects.

previously, English is more often chosen to watch TV, but less frequently to listen to the radio. Both for watching TV and listening to the radio, English is chosen by ethnic Lithuanians predominantly (39 % TV and 25 % radio). A small set of other ethnic groups also affirm they chose English for watching TV (25 % of all Russians, 19 % of all Poles, and 24 % of all other ethnicities) and for listening to the radio (14 % of all Russians, 13 % of all Poles and 11 % all other ethnicities). This result is not surprising because it essentially corresponds to the proportion of the declared knowledge of English among the different ethnic groups: 55 % of all Lithuanians, 45 % of all Russians, 31 % of all Poles, and 37 % of all respondents of other ethnicities declare they know English (Krupickaitė/Baranauskienė 2013: 29).

**Tab. 21.** Reported use of media in English (by age)

	15–24	25–35	36–45	46–55	56+
Books	49 %	27 %	9 %	7 %	4 %
Newspapers, magazines	35 %	23 %	9 %	7 %	4 %
Radio	50 %	31 %	15 %	10 %	4 %
TV	73 %	50 %	29 %	18 %	11 %
Internet	80 %	59 %	32 %	17 %	7 %

The fourth most popular language chosen for TV and radio is Polish. It is understandable that those who usually watch TV and listen to the radio in Polish are city inhabitants of Polish ethnicity, 61 % of them watch TV, and 60 % listen to the radio in Polish. A lot less, only 8 % of all Lithuanians and the same number of Russians, as well as 12 % of people of other ethnicities, watch TV in Polish, and only 5 % Lithuanians, 7 % Russians and 12 % people of other ethnicities listen to the radio in this language.

**Tab. 22.** Language use for the internet

Language	Ethnicity			
	Lithuanians	Russians	Poles	Other
Lithuanian	99 %	79 %	87 %	77 %
Russian	33 %	89 %	74 %	80 %
Polish	2 %	2 %	29 %	3 %
English	58 %	48 %	40 %	44 %
Other	4 %	1 %	1 %	17 %

An important facet of modern life is the internet. As in the case with other types of media, it is natural that Lithuanians (99 % of all them) browse the internet at Lithuanian pages (see Table 22). It is interesting though that Poles choose Lithuanian most frequently in comparison to other ethnic groups, 87 % of all Poles do so. There is another interesting aspect of how often Poles decide in favour of Lithuanian browsing the internet: it is the only domain where Lithuanian has the precedence over other languages (Russian, Polish). People of other ethnicities also choose Lithuanian browsing the internet, 79 % of all Russians and 77 % all other ethnicities do so.

The Russian language for browsing the internet occupies a far less important position than in the case of other media channels discussed here. Even the city dwellers of Russian ethnicity browse less web pages in Russian than they consume print media, books, TV, or the radio in this language—89 % of all answers given by Russian subjects show their favour to Russian for browsing the internet. Two other groups distinguished in our surveys, i.e. Poles and people of other ethnicities—who often speak Russian fluently or, at least, have a sufficient knowledge of Russian—do choose Russian rather frequently when using other media channels, but rarely browse the internet in Russian: 74 % and, respectively, 80 % of all answers show this.

Polish web pages are very seldom visited. Even people of Polish ethnicity very rarely browse the internet in Polish, only 29 % of them say they do so. Subjects of other ethnicities like Lithuanians or Russians give Polish only in 2–3 % of all instances as their response to the question in which language they do browse the internet.

Among all languages discussed here for browsing the internet, English has a special position. It is a lot more frequently used by city inhabitants of all ethnicities visiting web pages than for consuming other media. In the context of the internet, English web pages are most frequently chosen by Lithuanians: 58 % of them show this. Moreover, it is important to note that for ethnic Lithuanians the internet is the only domain in which English surpasses Russian that otherwise keeps the second position after Lithuanian in the ranking of language use regarding media consumption. 48 % of all Russians, 40 % all Poles and 44 % all city inhabitants of other ethnicities browse the internet in English. Though English does not surpass Russian in the general language choice by non-Lithuanians, just the internet is the domain where English is more often Used than in (the context of) other media.

Through analysing data on how the city inhabitants of different age groups use English (see Table 21), it is evident that the young generation browses the internet far more frequently than the older age groups. A particularly

distinguishable group is the youngest one—subjects aged between 15 and 24 years. In this group, 80 % of all answers report that the respondents browse the internet in English. They are the oldest respondents who least use the internet in English, namely they who are aged 56+. Only 7 % of all answers belong to this age group, but one should also bear in mind that in Lithuania elder people do not very often browse the internet in general (for more on that topic see Vaicekauskienė 2010).

## 4 Conclusions

The analysis of languages used in the private domain reveals a changing linguistic behaviour of Lithuanian urban dwellers in the communities of different ethnicities, the majority and the ethnic minorities.

The main language used by the majority, i.e. city inhabitants of Lithuanian ethnicity, is Lithuanian, 99–100 % of Lithuanians indicate to use it in private life. However, the study shows that city inhabitants of Lithuanian ethnicity had not forgotten the Russian language that they had learned well during the Soviet times when it was in use in many domains. Previous studies have shown that the Russian is rather often used by Lithuanians in the public domain, or at work (Ramonienė 2011; Ramonienė / Vilkienė 2016). The data analysed in this paper show that Russian is also used in the home environment, sometimes Lithuanians say to think or to count in Russian. Lithuanians affirm to use most Russian when using media: more than one-fourth claim to read books, newspapers and magazines in Russian, one third to use the internet, more than half to listen to the radio and as much as 72 % watch TV in Russian. So the best known foreign language to the ethnic Lithuanian city inhabitants—Russian language learned during the Soviet times—has not left their linguistic repertoire. However, the analysis of the linguistic behaviour of the different age groups shows an intergenerational change. The Russian language is a lot more frequently used by people of middle age and elders and a lot less by the younger age group. In the Lithuanians' linguistic repertoire Russian as a foreign language is being replaced by English. It is used not only for the official, work domain communication, as studies have shown (Ramonienė 2011; Ramonienė / Vilkienė 2016, Vaicekauskienė 2010), but it is entering the private life. English as the third most frequent language in the home environment is mentioned both by pupils and by adult respondents. One-fifth of the ethnic Lithuanian city dwellers read books, somewhat less read newspapers and magazines, one fourth listen to the radio in English, 39 % watch TV. English had a much stronger position than Russian for Lithuanians when using the internet, where it is used by as much as 58 % of city inhabitants of

Lithuanian ethnicity. A sign of intergenerational change is also the fact that English is used in all domains a lot more by the youngest age group of city inhabitants. It should also be noted that it is particularly the city inhabitants of Lithuanian ethnicity that use English rather frequently.

The data analysis shows a great change in the linguistic life of Lithuania's ethnic minorities. The official language—Lithuanian—has already entered not only the public communication that is regulated by the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania and the State language law, but it also constitutes a big part of private linguistic life. Russians of Lithuania, who used to be the majority in the fallen Soviet Union, after regaining Independence in Lithuania, have become a community of ethnic minority in the Republic of Lithuania, second minority group according to its size, after the Poles. The linguistic life and its change are related to this change of role in society. Despite the fact that their mother tongue is still known not only by their ethnic group, not only by other Russian-speakers but also by a large part of all inhabitants of Lithuania, other languages are incorporated into the linguistic repertoire of the Russian speaking group. It is understandable that the most popular language of their private life is the inherited Russian language (also see Ramonienė *et al.* 2017), that is used at home with various interlocutors, as the inner speech, and it is the most frequent language when using various media. The internet is the only domain where Russian is used less than in other spheres. Lithuanian occupies an important position in various contexts for the Russians. About half ethnic Russian pupils indicated Lithuanian as one of the home languages, and a big part of adults affirmed to not only communicate in Lithuanian with people from their close-circle but also to use Lithuanian when thinking or counting. One-fifth use it also when praying. It is worth noting that Lithuanian is used more frequently with the younger generation, children and grandchildren. Therefore, it can be foreseen that the position of the state language of Lithuania in Russian families will be more important in the future (also see Ramonienė *et al.* 2017). People of Russian ethnicity also use Lithuanian when using media: more than 80 % Russians read newspapers and magazines in Lithuanian, 65 % read books, 88 % listen to the radio in Lithuanian, 92 % watch TV. Therefore, for many Russians who are living in cities and in the Soviet times did not know Lithuanian or knew it very poorly, Lithuanian has an important role in their today's linguistic repertoire or linguistic choices also in their private life.

From the perspective of linguistic choice, the most interesting is the largest Lithuania's ethnic minority: Poles of Lithuania. During the Soviet times, many Poles had switched to Russian in so far as this language had a more significant socio-political status at the time, and in some families, a natural tradition

of passing down the heritage language (Polish) to the younger generation has been interrupted (Geben 2010, and 2013). Therefore, not by all Poles the native language of this ethnic group, i.e. Polish, is chosen for communication in the private sphere. In the family, only 55 % of all Poles speak Polish with their spouses and 74 % with siblings, 68 % with children, and 53 % with grandchildren. Only 62 % of all Poles say they count in Polish and 67 % think in Polish. A domain where Polish is used most is religion, as much as 92 % of urban dwellers of this ethnicity affirm to pray in Polish. In the private life of the Polish ethnic group, Russian is rather popular. Russian is used to speaking in the family (50 % of all Poles use it with siblings and 55 % of them with spouse), for thinking (declared by 66 % of all Poles) and counting (declared by 75 % of all Poles), for consumption of various media. The Lithuanian language plays an important role in the life of city respondents of Polish ethnicity. Both, pupils and adults of Polish ethnicity, claim that Lithuanian is a language used at home. It is used by adults with siblings (declared by 26 % of all Poles) and spouses (declared by 36 % of all Poles), with children (declared by 49 % of all Poles), and grandchildren (declared by 54 % of all Poles). These tendencies show multilingualism with Lithuanian that was not popular during the Soviet times in the linguistic life neither of Poles nor other non-Lithuanians and it is an important sign of a changing linguistic environment.

Changing multilingualism is also indicated by English that is rapidly entering the private lives of the city inhabitants. Lithuanians use English more often than the city inhabitants of other ethnicities. However, these ethnicities—Russians, Poles and others affirm to use English predominantly in the context of media consumption, especially when using internet. Therefore, Lithuanian cities see not only the rise of the social value of this globally used language but also its actual use in public as well as in private life.

It must be added that in Lithuania the urban socio-linguistic situation has been changing quickly in recent years, a particularly rapid change takes place in the linguistic repertoire and linguistic preferences of the youth. Therefore, it is necessary both to continue the observation of the linguistic choices and to research the changes using methods that have not still been used in our present studies.

## References

- ANDERSEN, Roger / THELANDER, Mats (1994): Internal migration, biography formation and linguistic change. In Bengt Nordberg, ed.: *The Sociolinguistics of Urbanization. The Case of the Nordic Countries*, pp. 51–86. Berlin–New York.

- BRAZAUSKIENĖ, Jelena (2010): Lietuvos rusų diasporos portretas [Sketches of the Russian diaspora in Lithuania]. In Meilutė Ramonienė, ed.: *Miestai ir kalbos* [Cities and Languages], pp. 107–24. Vilnius.
- BULAJEVA, Tatjana / HOGAN-BRUN, Gabrielle (2008): Language and education orientations in Lithuania: A cross-Baltic perspective post-EU accession. In Aneta Pavlenko, ed.: *Multilingualism in Post-Soviet Countries*, pp. 122–48. Bristol/USA–Toronto.
- BUSCH, Brigitta / PFISTERER, Petra (2011): Interaction and the Media. In Ruth Wodak / Barbara Johnstone / Paul Kerswill, eds.: *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, pp. 428–42. Los Angeles–London–New Delhi et al.
- CENSUS 2011.—*Lietuvos Respublikos 2011 metų visuotinio gyventojų ir būstų surašymo rezultatai* [The 2011 Population and Housing Census of the Lithuanian Republic]. On www at: [http://statistics.bookdesign.lt/esu\\_04.htm?lang=en](http://statistics.bookdesign.lt/esu_04.htm?lang=en) (accessed 22 April 2017)
- DUARTE, Joana / GOGOLIN, Ingrid I. (2013): *Linguistic Superdiversity in Urban Areas*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia.
- ЕНАЛА, Мартин / ЗАВРОДСКАЯ, Anastassia (2011): Этнолингвистическая в итальность этнических групп стран Балтии [The ethnolinguistic vitality amongst ethnic groups in the Baltics]. In: *Диаспоры* [Diasporas] 1, pp. 6–60.
- , — (2013): Ethnolinguistic vitality of ethnic groups in the Baltic countries. In S. Smyth / C. Opitz, eds.: *Negotiating Linguistic, Cultural and Social Identities in the Post-Soviet World*, pp. 45–85. Oxford–Bern–Berlin–Bruxelles–Frankfurt/M. et al.
- EXTRA, Guus / YAĞMUR, Kutlay (2004): *Urban Multilingualism in Europe. Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon.
- FISHMAN, Joshua A. (1964): Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry. In: *Linguistics* 9, pp. 32–70.
- , — (1966): Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry. In J. A. Fishman / V. C. Nahimy / J. E. Hofman / R. G. Hayden, eds.: *Language Loyalty in the United States*, pp. 424–55. The Hague.
- , — (2000): Who speaks what language to whom and when? In Li Wei, ed.: *The Bilingualism Reader*, pp. 89–108. London–New York.
- GEBEN, Kinga (2010): Vilniaus lenkų kalbinė savimonė, daugiakalbystė ir tapatybė [Linguistic awareness, multilingualism and identity of ethnic Poles in Vilnius]. In Meilutė Ramonienė, ed.: *Miestai ir kalbos* [Cities and Languages], pp. 153–73. Vilnius.
- , — (2013): Lietuvos lenkai ir lenkų kalba Lietuvoje [Polish people and the Polish language in Lithuania]. In Meilutė Ramonienė, ed.: *Miestai*

- ir kalbos II. Sociolingvistinis Lietuvos žemėlapis [Cities and Languages II. A Sociolinguistic Map]*, pp. 217–34. Vilnius.
- GEBEN, Kinga / RAMONIENĖ, Meilutė (2011): Особенности языкового поведения литовских поляков [The specifics of linguistic behaviour amongst Lithuanian Poles]. In: *Диаспоры [Diasporas]* 1, pp. 86–120.
- , — (2015): Language use and self-identification: the case of Lithuanian Poles. In: *Sociolinguistic Studies [Sheffield]* 9:2/3, pp. 243–67.
- HOGAN-BRUN, Gabrielle / OZOLIŅŠ, Uldis / RAMONIENĖ, Meilutė / RANNUT, Mart (2009): *Language Politics and Practices in the Baltic States*. Tallinn.
- HOGAN-BRUN, Gabrielle / RAMONIENĖ, Meilutė (2003): Emerging language and education policies in Lithuania. In: *Language Policy* 2, pp. 27–45.
- , — (2004): Changing levels of bilingualism across the Baltic. In: *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 7:1, pp. 62–77.
- , — (2005a): The language situation in Lithuania. In: *Journal of Baltic Studies* 36:3 (Special Issue: The Baltic Sociolinguistic Review), pp. 345–70.
- , — (2005b): Perspectives on language attitudes and use in Lithuania's multilingual setting, in language and social processes in the Baltic republics surrounding EU accession. In: *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 26: 5 (Special Issue: Language and Social Processes in the Baltic Republics Surrounding their EU Accession), pp. 425–41.
- KASATKINA, Natalija / LEONČIKAS, Tadas (2003): *Lietuvos etninių grupių adaptacija: kontekstas ir eiga [The Adaptation of Ethnic Groups in Lithuania: Context and Process]*. Vilnius.
- KING, Kendall A. / FOGLE, Lyn / LOGAN-TERRY, Aubrey (2008): Family language policy. In: *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2:5, pp. 907–22.
- KRUPICKAITĖ, Dovilė / BARANAUSKIENĖ, Viktorija (2013): Regioniniai kalbų vartojimo Lietuvos miestuose ypatumai [Use of Languages across Different Regions of Lithuania]. In Meilutė Ramonienė, ed.: *Miestai ir kalbos II. Sociolingvistinis Lietuvos žemėlapis [Cities and Languages II. A Sociolinguistic Map]*, pp. 23–53. Vilnius.
- LEHMAN-WILZIG, Sam / COHEN-AVIGDOR, Nava (2004): The natural life cycle of new media evolution: inter-media struggle for survival in the internet age. In: *New Media & Society* 6:6, pp. 707–30.
- LEONČIKAS, Tadas (2007): *Etniškumo studijos 1: Asimiliacija šiuolaikinėje Lietuvos visuomenėje: švietimo sektoriaus pasirinkimas [Ethnicity Studies 1: Assimilation in Contemporary Lithuanian Society: Choosing the Language of Education.]* Vilnius.
- LICHAČIOVA, Ala (2010): Vilniaus ir Klaipėdos rusų ir rusakalbių tapatybės savivokos ypatumai [Self-identification of the Russian and Russian-speaking

- population of Vilnius and Klaipėda]. In Meilutė Ramonienė, ed.: *Miestai ir kalbos* [Cities and Languages], pp. 125–52. Vilnius.
- MARSHALL, David (2011): Newly mediated media: understanding the changing internet landscape of the media industries. In Mia Consalvo / Charles Ess, eds.: *The Handbook of Internet Studies*, pp. 406–23. Oxford.
- MIKULĖNIENĖ, Danguolė / PALIONYTĖ, Jūratė (1997), eds.: *Lietuvos Respublikos valstybinė kalba* [The State Language of the Lithuanian Republic]. Vilnius.
- MUYSKEN, Pieter / ROTT, Julian (2013): Ethnolect studies in the German and the Netherlandic area. In Peter Siemund / Ingrid Gogolin / Monika Edith Schulz / Julia Davydova, eds.: *Multilingualism and Language Diversity in Urban Areas: Acquisition, Identities, Space, Education*, pp. 177–206. Amsterdam–Philadelphia.
- PAUWELS, Anne (2005): Maintaining the community language in Australia: challenges and roles for families. In: *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 8:2/3, pp. 124–31.
- PAUWELS, Anne / WINTER, Joanne / LO BIANCO, Joseph (2007), eds.: *Maintaining Minority Languages in Transnational Contexts*. Houndmills/Basingstoke.
- PAVLENKO, Aneta (2008): Multilingualism in post-Soviet countries: language revival, language removal, and sociolinguistic theory. In Aneta Pavlenko, ed.: *Multilingualism in Post-Soviet Countries*, pp. 1–40. Bristol–Buffalo–Toronto.
- RAMONIENĖ, Meilutė (2010), ed.: *Miestai ir kalbos* [Cities and Languages]. Vilnius.
- , — (2011): Kalbų vartojimas darbe didžiuosiuose Lietuvos miestuose [The peculiarities of language at work in the largest Lithuanian cities]. In: *Lietuvių kalba* [Lithuanian Language] (Internet journal, see <http://www.lietuviukalba.lt/index.php/lietuviu-kalba/article/view/40/86>)
- RAMONIENĖ, Meilutė / EXTRA, Guus (2011a): Multilingualism in Lithuanian cities: aims and outcomes of a home language survey in Vilnius, Kaunas and Klaipėda. In: *Kalbotyra* 3, pp. 59–77.
- , — (2011b). *Multilingualism in Lithuanian Cities. Languages at Home and School in Vilnius, Kaunas and Klaipėda*. Vilnius–Tilburg–Klaipėda.
- RAMONIENĖ, Meilutė / VILKIENĖ, Loreta (2016): Changes in the social value of languages in urban areas of Lithuania, 1990–2010. In Marian Sloboda / Petteri Laihonon / Anastassia Zabrodskaia, eds.: *Sociolinguistic Transition in Former Eastern Bloc Countries: Two Decades after the Regime Change*, pp. 263–92. Frankfurt/M.

- RUBINO, Antonia (2014): *Trilingual Talks in Sicilian-Australian Migrant Families. Playing Out Identities through Language Alternation*. London–New York.
- SCHWARTZ, Mila (2010): Family language policy: core issues of an emerging field. *Applied Linguistics Review* 1, pp. 171–92.
- SCHWARTZ, Mila / VERSCHIK, Anna (2013), eds.: *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction*. New York–London.
- SIEMUND, Peter / GOGOLIN, Ingrid / SCHULZ, Monika Edith / DAVYDOVA, Julia (2013), eds.: *Multilingualism and Language Diversity in Urban Areas: Acquisition, Identities, Space, Education*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia.
- SOLLID, Hilde (2013): Ethnolects in Northern Norway. From national negligence to local linguistic pride. In Peter Siemund / Ingrid Gogolin / Monika Edith Schulz / Julia Davydova, eds.: *Multilingualism and Language Diversity in Urban Areas: Acquisition, Identities, Space, Education*, pp. 63–94. Amsterdam–Philadelphia.
- TANDEFELT, Marika (1994): Urbanization and language shift. In Bengt Nordberg, ed.: *The Sociolinguistics of Urbanization. The Case of the Nordic Countries*, pp. 246–73. Berlin–New York.
- VAICEKAUSKIENĖ, Loreta (2010): Globalioji daugiakalbystės perspektyva: anglų kalbos vieta ir vaidmuo Lietuvos miestų erdvėje [Global prospects of multilingualism: the role of English in the Lithuanian urban space]. In Meilutė Ramonienė, ed.: *Miestai ir kalbos [Cities and Languages]*, pp. 175–203. Vilnius.
- VAITEKŪNAS, Stasys (2006): *Lietuvos gyventojai. Per du tūkstantmečius [Population of Lithuania. Over Two Milleniums]*. Vilnius.
- VILKIENĖ, L. (2010): Daugiakalbystė didžiuosiuose Lietuvos miestuose [Multilingualism in Lithuanian cities]. In Meilutė Ramonienė, ed.: *Miestai ir kalbos [Cities and Languages]*, pp. 27–70. Vilnius.
- WODAK, Ruth / JOHNSTONE, Barbara / KERSWILL, Paul (2011), eds.: *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Los Angeles–London et al.
- WUP 2014.—The United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs: *World Urbanization Prospects 2014*. On www at: <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/> (accessed on 02 January 2017).