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The Russian Old Believers endured anathema, marginalization, imprisonment, and torture in the 17th- and 18th-centuries because of adherence to what they viewed as the purest forms of Russian Orthodoxy and culture. Tsarist-initiated social and economic discrimination led to large-scale involuntary out-migration of Old Believers from both the western and southeastern borders of the country. For two centuries, Old Believers existed as refugees in search of a permanent and tolerant home; one group of Old Believers made their way through China and Brazil to the United States as religious refugees with the help of the Tolstoy Foundation in 1964. However, while these Old Believers found religious refuge in a nation with vacillating tolerance of religious freedom, they encountered new complications of cultural and linguistic assimilative pressures and temptations – particularly for their children. In an attempt to continue their maintenance of high-fidelity cultural and linguistic transmission, a few families established a geographically isolated, closed community in South Central Alaska (SCAK) in 1968. Those families grew into a Village that has since evolved into a complex community, which demonstrates varying acculturative strategies.

In evaluating the fidelity with which SCAK Old Believers have maintained 17th century traditional (i.e., transmitted from parent to child) lifeways in the form of textiles, overt expressions of religiosity, and language in the form of both Russian and the liturgical language Old Church Slavonic, I found that: 1.) the community has surpassed the third-generation language shift paradigm that most refugees and immigrants to the United States succumb to; 2.) overt expressions of religiosity quantifiably distinguish Old Believers from their non-Old Believer counterparts in the Village, which indicates that
high-fidelity transmission still occurs; and 3.) traditional transmission is still positively
influencing community retention. Additionally, I found that significant events for the
Village have induced varying cultural transmission strategies at the individual level that
have had interesting effects on acculturative strategies and behavior at the group level.
The initial transmission strategy was prestige biased traditional transmission, and it
resulted in a clear acculturative strategy for the SCAK Old Believers: separation from the
surrounding post-industrial society. Three pivotal sociohistorical events (i.e., the
establishment of a state school and subsequent opening of the Village to outsiders, the
largest of several religious schisms, and the matriculation of the first SCAK Old Believers
to colleges) are reflected in shifts to cultural transmission patterns or resulting
acculturative strategies and cultural behavior that can be modeled as dynamically
integrated strategies instead of more linearly related progressions from separation through
integration to assimilation.

Not only is this research a significant contribution to further clarifying human
behavior and cultural evolution. This research and these findings are timely and relevant
as social justice for refugees and immigrants are at the forefront of many current national
and global sociopolitical conversations. The SCAK Old Believers demonstrate that it is
possible to maintain linguistic and cultural heritage within a dominant post-industrialized
society, and their case also illustrates the importance of choice for refugees and the value
of life without fear.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Here I report ethnographic research and results of hypothesis testing focused on cultural and linguistic maintenance in a small, isolated, Russian religious community in South-Central Alaska called Old Believers (OBs). This community is characterized by notable apparel, continued use of Russian and the liturgical language, Old Church Slavonic (OCS), and a distinct Christian religious system. Cultural contact among cultures that differ greatly in population size, economic power, and political complexity leads to cultural and linguistic exchange and most often results in intergenerational attrition of cultural and linguistic features from the smaller cultures involved. For immigrant families, native language attrition typically increases to the point of complete shift to the majority language by the third generation. A similar phenomenon often occurs in communities (Hopp & Schmid, 2011), but the retention of conspicuous non-linguistic traits seem to be more variable. In this case, the community has remained intact and distinct since the 1700s when its ancestors fled persecution in Russia. Since that time, it has relocated to China, Brazil, and, most recently, to the United States. It consequently reflects an anthropologically unusual case of cultural transmission and cultural maintenance.

The research presented here was centered on clarifying how this small, traditional South-Central Alaskan community manages linguistic and cultural continuity while being, however peripherally, included in American society, which is increasingly economically globalized and socially integrated. To that point, I addressed the following research questions:
RQ1: Is language maintenance correlated with community retention (i.e., sustained population) in the South-Central Alaska (SCAK) OB village?

RQ2: Are conspicuous displays of membership correlated with community retention in the SCAK OB village?

I hypothesized that the emphasis Russian OBs in the SCAK community place on their unique language and culture may explain, to some degree, the success they have had in maintaining language and culture where other minority groups have not. As an amalgamated whole, I intended my mixed-methods research to clarify mechanisms and perspectives of OB conservation and change, which may then help explain how and why minority cultures, more broadly, exhibit varying degrees of high-fidelity vertical transmission.

My hypotheses were predominantly supported, and an emphasis on religious transmission seems to be the key to levels of language and conspicuous displays of membership that were maintained. Through the perspective of delineated varieties (Berry, 1992) of the more generalized view of acculturation as a singular process, and the application of mutational meltdown of culture (Hochberg, 2004), it is possible to clarify mechanisms and causation of attrition and shift this OB community is concomitantly experiencing. Here, then, I present essential and meaningful conclusions specifically related to the facets of linguistic and non-linguistic behavior present in the community as well as potential mechanisms of behavioral changes in this OB community.
Significance

As with other traditional cultures (e.g. Amish and Mennonites) that have resisted acculturation into contemporary North American society (Craig Palmer, 2010), understanding how and in what ways OBs have succeeded in preserving social solidarity is a significant issue. The unexpected frequency of attrition of both linguistic and non-linguistic behavior in this particular community may be a reflection of variable social foci at the community level, in that the balance of horizontal transmission and high-fidelity vertical transmission is driven by how community members as a unit perceive themselves with relationship to American society at large.

Numerous sociocultural and theological studies have focused on ideological unification and division of OB groups in North America (e.g. (Dolitsky, Muth, & Kuzmina, 1991; Morris, 2001; Pokrovskiĭ & Morris, 1992; Scheffel, 1991a, 1991b; Sidau, 2010; Smithson, 1976; Thompson, 2001). Combining this corpus of research with a holistic theoretical basis will help build a framework for identifying mechanisms of OB cultural continuity and explaining the contribution of language maintenance to that continuity.

Significance of Study Population. OBs are adherents of pre-schismatic (i.e., before the Great Schism of 1666) Russian Orthodoxy who emigrated from Russia to escape religious persecution (Beliajeff & Morris, 1987; Conybeare, 1962; Lupinin, 1984). The OBs I investigated represent one sect of many similar groups in North America (Morris, 2001) subsumed under the more generalized, and archaic, term Raskol’niki (Schismatics). While in-depth 20th-century accounts of assimilation in Canadian Doukhobor communities (Woodcock & Avakumovic, 1977), as well as OB communities
in Hines Creek, Alberta (Anonymous, 2005; Orshanskaya, 2008) and Pennsylvania (Holdeman, 2002) focus on sects of *Raskol'niki* that did not actively isolate themselves from surrounding contemporary society, my research is focused on *OBs* whose primary goal has been sequestration, in varying forms, from what they perceive as the corruption of American society (Beliajeff, 1977; Dolitsky & Kuz'mina, 1986; Morris, 2001).

North American *OBs* migrated through many countries before immigrating to the Willamette valley in Oregon as religious refugees through the sponsorship of the Tolstoy Foundation (Committee on the Judiciary, 1964a; Tolstoy Foundation, 1972). The *OB* enclave included in my research developed subsequent to that single migration *en masse*, and has made more stringent attempts to continue to maintain their 17th-century-style lifeways in Alaska despite being immersed in 21st-century North American culture.

Academic examination of the extent of *OB* traditional lifeways maintenance, particularly in Oregon, was carried out through waves of research in the 1970s (Beliajeff, 1977; Piepkorn, 1977; Smithson, 1976; Untiedt, 1977) and the 1990s (Dolitsky et al., 1991; Hardwick, 1993; Morris, 1991; Scheffel, 1991a). However, although there has been documentation that contemporary *OBs* still practice traditional dress and religious behaviors (L. Harris, 2010; Silva, 2009), there is a dearth of specific research about the sources of *OB* linguistic and non-linguistic behavioral stability.

Much of the previous research focuses on the community of Woodburn, OR, which is easily accessible and has been historically welcoming to non-*OBs*. The *SCAK* community has also been the focus of anthropological research, but it has historically been intentionally isolated. The *SCAK OBs* are significant and appropriate for my specific research questions because of the reasons the community was founded and is
currently maintained. Nearly a decade after the immigration of OBs to Woodburn (Dolitsky & Kuz’mina, 1986), two families left the region in search of a more geographically and socially isolated area where their children would not be corrupted by the impurity of American society (Hardwick, 1991, 1993; Loughlin & Jonassen, 2013; Scheffel, 1989). In the early years of the village, community members went as far as gating off the single road leading to the remote village as a means of preventing all contact with outsiders (Participants, 2012b). These events demonstrate the intentional isolation this community sought, established, and maintained for a significant period of time, which allowed me a valuable exploration of a cohesive traditional population.

Significance of Transmission. Both large, hierarchically organized societies and smaller traditional societies incorporate a mixture of vertical and horizontal transmission, whereby culture is either static or innovative. However, traditional cultures, in which vertical transmission is more highly valued than horizontal, tend toward maintenance, with the amount of fidelity of transmission dictating the degree of maintenance (Steadman & Palmer, 2008). In the United States, the fidelity with which cultural and linguistic behaviors are transmitted in immigrant communities is highly variable. Remnants of the English-only movement (Dick, 2011) continue to fuel popular arguments for cultural and linguistic assimilation, but pockets of embedded communities (e.g., “Little Russia” in Brighton Beach, NY, Haitian enclaves in Miami, FL, and numerous Latino communities across the country) have had some success in maintaining at least conspicuous non-linguistic behavior.

Overall, although conspicuous displays of membership (e.g., adornment, advertisements in a minority language native to immigrant families) in these types of
enclaves remain, without cultural or linguistic behavior (e.g., rejection of American cultural characteristics, native bilingualism) considered more substantial by community members, those negligible conspicuous displays may appear to indicate assimilation. For instance, following a recent university presentation I gave on the SCAK OBs, one second generation non-OB Russian-American student articulated that if they are no longer able to maintain 17th-century lifeways to the fullest extent, community members ought to no longer self-identify as OBs. For that student, then, if individuals cannot maintain high-fidelity transmission of linguistic and non-linguistic behavior, then they cannot claim to be active participants of, in this case, Old Belief.

However, reduced-fidelity transmission, particularly with regard to the significance given to horizontal as opposed to vertical transmission, may actually be an indication of the mechanism by which this community has managed to preserve their heritage while mitigating economic hardship. In other words, instead of low-fidelity, partial transmission of linguistic and non-linguistic behavior indicating attrition, it may instead be a survival mechanism.

Over the course of fieldwork in the SCAK OB community, I collected both quantitative data in the form of surveys and interviews, and qualitative data in the form of continuous monitoring and time allocation studies. Both quantitative and qualitative data analysis indicated a clear pattern of substantial Russian language maintenance concomitant with the adoption of English. However, some aspects of Russian language competency and conspicuous markers of membership, such as apparel and hairstyling, seem to be less significant than was reported in the past.
The *SCAK OB* community proper has decreased since the height of Village growth in the mid-1980s; currently, the population is approximately 130 people, including children. Although the small size of this *OB* population may preclude generalizability, I anticipate that this research could serve to augment the corpus of previous broader research on immigrant community maintenance and acculturation with meaningful information on specific mechanisms of preservation and change through the *SCAK OBs* ’ perspectives of traditional culture and language.

**Dissertation Overview**

In subsequent chapters, I will: (a.) provide background on the *OBs* to illustrate what form maintenance and change in the *SCAK* community is taking; (b.) specify theoretical foundations that drive my research; (c.) explain my research methodology; and (d.) present and discuss my findings. Specifically, the focus of each chapter is as follows:

Chapter 2 reviews the history of the *OBs*, from the initiation of their Russian Orthodox sect in the 17th-century to their migration to geographically isolated or marginal regions of the country. In this chapter, I also include motivations for *OB* withdrawal from official Russian culture and religion, as well as the causes and consequences of punitive reactions from Russian political leaders.

As a means of clarifying how North American *OB* communities exist, as opposed to communities still extant in Romania and Russia, Chapter 3 introduces the specific *OB* population central to my ethnographic research and describes the lengthy process of their migration from Siberia in South-Eastern Russia to North America. In addition, I explain how and why the large community of *OBs* who initially immigrated to Oregon fractured.
into separate communities, including the community I investigated in South-Central Alaska.

Additionally, I offer a literature review of prescriptive and traditional social organization of OB communities. While understanding that historic normative regulations are important to clarifying the impetus for contemporary OB behavior, I also emphasize a more contemporary comparison of OB organizational traits and North American post-industrial social organization. Specifically, I discuss what aspects of OB subsistence strategies, kinship, household and community leadership paradigms, and marriage patterns parallel pre-industrialized societies, and which are more comparable to social organization after industrialism. I also elucidate conspicuous displays of membership among OBs that have been faithfully transmitted.

Chapter 4 describes theoretical foundations of small insular communities as significant from an evolutionary perspective, as well as perspectives regarding maintenance and change in immigrant communities at both the individual and group level. I also discuss the intersection of linguistic and non-linguistic behavior with regard to high-fidelity transmission of traits and population maintenance. Chapter 4 allows me to establish the reasoning behind the hypotheses, which I present in this chapter, that I developed to answer my research questions.

In Chapter 5, I discuss the methodology of this research – the rationale for my mixed-methods project, each of the methods used, how participants were recruited, and the sample size of my project. For each of these facets of my research, I delve into particulars regarding experimental design and actual operationalization of my research.
In this chapter, I also enumerate and discuss specific variables I used in hypothesis testing. I present quantitative and qualitative data analysis results in Chapter 6.

In Chapter 7, I provide an in-depth discussion of the implications of data analysis results, with particular focus on how my results are related to the theoretical foundations of this research as well as what these results could indicate for the future of the SCAK Village.

Finally, in Chapter 8, I consider how my findings from the SCAK OB population compare to historical information and more recent literature about OBs and propose how this project could be expanded or could influence future research. I also illustrate how this study could impact literature on maintenance and change of linguistic and non-linguistic behavior in small, isolated, refugee and immigrant communities.
CHAPTER 2: HISTORY OF THE OLD BELIEVERS

My research is focused on exploring the mechanisms Old Believers (OBs) have used to facilitate cultural maintenance over the forty years since their establishment in South-Central Alaska, especially as they relate to retention of Russian, Old Church Slavonic (OCS), and traditional apparel. These outward signs of cultural maintenance seem to be key to continuity since the events of the Raskol (Great Schism), its consequences, and the more overarching relationship between the peasantry and the elite resulted in OBs seeking more religiously tolerant countries through emigration. It is this undesirable but necessary emigration, born out of the Raskol, that is the fundamental impetus for the ultimate settlement of this Alaskan OB community. Although 17th-century arguments centered on alterations to religious traditions may seem insignificant to contemporary readers, OBs, like many religious fundamentalists, held themselves to the traditions and customs of what they considered the “true essence of religion” (Steadman, 2009, p. 50, italics in original). Although the intricacies of the Raskol do not fit within the scope of this research, ample understanding of OB religious and cultural history is essential for clarifying current linguistic and cultural maintenance and shift in this Alaskan community.

Religious Background and the Raskol

Although the first imaginings of OB separation from the Orthodox Church began with the Church Council’s consideration of reform in 1655, what is actually considered the Raskol (Great Schism) occurred in 1666-1667 (Cherniavsky, 1966; Morris, 2001; Scheffel, 1991b; Zenkovsky, 1957) with the official initiation of extensive reforms to the
long-held traditions of Russian Orthodoxy. Religious leader, Patriarch Nikon, along with his “spiritual son” (Myendorff, 1991, p. 38), Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich (reigned 1645-1676), and various other Orthodox advisors, implemented a number of reforms to text, iconography, and dogma that were focused on what he envisioned as “cleansing the faith of accretions” and restoring Russian Orthodoxy “to pristine purity” (Franklin, p. 100; Crummey, 1970; Morris, 2001) – a standardized Orthodoxy without the variations or discrepancies that had been slowly introduced over time (Zenkovsky, 1957). These changes were then vigorously enforced and expanded by Tsar Peter I (reigned 1682-1725). Argument can be made that Nikon was attempting to standardize the religious language, Old Church Slavonic (OCS), and rituals and bring more regionally variable forms into alignment with what he viewed as the most strictly preserved originals (Franklin, 2004). However, OBs denied the authority of both Church and State following Nikonian reforms, which they deemed as impure and a renunciation of the righteousness of Russian Christianity.

OB resistance was founded on their view of Russian church history. From the initial 10th-century introduction of Christianity to pre-unified Russia, the Church, which permeated every aspect of life, from personal relationships to material culture, to the very kitchen of each household, the Church and Russian culture was intended as changeless; prescriptives of Orthodoxy were not only a “theological imperative” (Franklin 2004, p. 99), but also a source of pride in the uniqueness and longitude of specifically Russian ideology and national identity (Franklin, 2004; Zenkovsky, 1957; V. V. Zenkovsky, 1963). In fact, for the OBs, “dogma and ritual [were] so connected that it [was] impossible to treat them separately” (Sidau, 2010, p. 25); the performance of ritual, and
even the sequence of rituals, were viewed as a means of accessing truth – the divine – and attaining salvation (Robson, 1993; Zenkovsky, 1957). Therefore, the reforms were tantamount to changing the very foundation of Russian Orthodoxy and the identity of Christ himself (Cherniavsky, 1966).

Following the ideology of preserving the essential truth of Russian Orthodoxy, neither Nikon nor his opponents “advocated innovation” (Franklin 2004, p. 100), as novelty – intentional or not – in any form (e.g., textual, visual, performance) was considered idolatry that paralleled heresy. While Nikon considered Slavic texts to include innovations in the form of regional variation, when compared with Greek originals, and strove to eliminate them (Meyendorff, 1991), the Raskol’niki (Schismatics) or Staroveri (Old Believers) saw his reforms as innovations in themselves to their generations-old faith. Archpriest Avvakum implored his followers to “spit on their doings and their ritual, and on their new-fangled books, and all will be well” (Avvakum, p. 95). He emphasized that “all the traditions of the Church, handed down to us by the holy Fathers, are holy and incorrupt” (Avvakum, p. 132). Ultimately, both factions considered themselves to be more traditional, which essentially resulted in “each claiming to out-archaize the other” (Franklin, p. 100).

For many Russians, including the OBs, Nikon’s initial alliance with the tsar (Lobachev, 2001; Spinka, 1941; Zenkovsky, 1957) brought his motives further into question. The Church was intended to be – and had been supported as – superior to and much more valuable than governmental agents; however, Nikon’s personal relationship with Tsar Alexei in matters of the Church was an indication to the OBs that the Church was shifting its focus from Christ to the tsar. Furthermore, suspicion held that Nikon and
Alexei intended to re-align Russian Orthodoxy with Greek Orthodoxy (Franklin, 2004; Meyendorff, 1991; Robson, 2008) as a means of reestablishing politico-religious relationships with Eastern Orthodox countries and denying Russian Christians of their sacred Slavic heritage. Based on his relationship with the tsar and Grekophile Orthodox advisors, the OBs saw Nikonian attempts at reform as allowing Greek Orthodox influence to impede the generation-to-generation continuation of true Orthodoxy.

Emically, then, 17th-century reforms, were not simple or superficial, but instead constituted an upheaval of everything the OBs deemed sacred and holy – an absolute apostasy (S. A. Zenkovsky, 1963). In fact, Archpriest Avvakum, who was exiled and imprisoned in Siberia following his rejection of Nikon’s and Tsar Alexei’s changes to Russian Orthodoxy (Cherniavsky, 1966; Roberta L. Hall, 1969; Zenkovsky, 1957), wrote in his autobiography that these reforms worked to change even the identity of Christ himself. He exclaimed, “Give us back our Christ!” (Avvakum, 1963) in the face of Westernization, and his plea is a faithful representation of OBs’ concept of the magnitude of Church reforms. Among the myriad Nikonian reforms, four of the most provocative were: the spelling of Jesus in liturgical texts, rejection of long-sanctified icons, the manner of making the sign of the cross, and the custom of keeping an untrimmed beard.

**Texts.** For the OBs, scripture and liturgies – even the appearance of the words and pages – were extensions of God, the relationship Christians had with him, and manifestations of the manner in which they should emulate Christ. Liturgical texts were viewed as untainted, pure, and a very literal path to salvation. Any change, therefore, was also change to *truth* itself. Nikon’s reform of the spelling of Christ’s name was one critical issue, as the Christ figure was – in its very essence – the sole means to salvation
and through that salvation, eternal life. Russian church fathers endorsed, over the centuries, the spelling as Icuc. In contrast, Nikon proposed the revision of liturgical texts to replace Icuc with Iicuc (Robson, 1993), and the implementation of this orthographic alteration was considered fundamentally heretical.

Interestingly, for the 16th-17th-century parishioner, language normalization was not widespread, and the separation between OCS and colloquial Russian may not have been nearly distinct as the separate names suggest (Auty, 1978; Clarke, 1981; Jakobson, 1955; Kantor, 1993), which allowed for disparate spellings in texts or an initial orthographic variant that ultimately became widespread in Russian Orthodoxy. Beyond linguistic variation, continuous copying of liturgical texts introduced further inconsistencies (Wolkonsky, 1897). Nevertheless, OBs considered the name of Christ unchangeable, and especially significant because 17th-century Russian Orthodox Christians considered themselves the last remaining and final bastion of true Christianity following social corruption of Byzantine Orthodoxy in the 16th-century (Conybeare, 1962; Georg B. Michels, 2009; G. B. Michels & Nickols, 2009; Timofeev, 2006; S. A. Zenkovsky, 1963). As Avvakum insisted, Nikon and his supporters had “planned with the devil to misprint books and falsify everything” (Avvakum, p. 132); the texts passed down to parishioners for 700 years were truth, the key to salvation, and a physical representation of their faith.

**Icons.** The significance of the seemingly small change in the spelling of Jesus went beyond the text. Both orthographic and visual form were of central importance to Russian Orthodox Christians of the 17th-century, as “worship [was] directed equally both to the image and the name” (Uspensky, 1976, p. 11). Similar to holy texts, therefore,
icons were viewed as a literal and active part of religious practice and identity, and since religion inundated every aspect of life, placement and veneration of icons was not restricted to churches. Instead, icons were “everywhere, in the place of honor in the right hand corner of every living room, on street corners, over gateways, in hotels and railway stations and steamships, in public buildings and offices” (Miller, 1907, p. 619); they were carried in public processions, prolific in every aspect of daily activities, and specific icons were the destination of Holy Pilgrimages (Franklin, 2004; Miller, 1907).

Although contemporary viewers see icons as an art form, the pre-Petrine conception was that they were “not really ‘art’ at all in a modern sense”; instead, all religious material culture, particularly icons “were devices to make the divine manifest in the material” (Franklin, 2004, p. 99) that allowed a relationship between the faithful and the divine. For much of Russia’s Christian history, and for the OBs after the Raskol icons were venerated as corporeal revelations of saints and holy figures. Icons were not simply aesthetically pleasing visual art, but “a reflection of Truth as defined by God” (Scheffel, 1991, p. 44), a dynamic intimation of the spiritual world, a phenomenon, an ever constant image of the divine to learn from and emulate (Andreyev, 1962, 1970b; Olsufiev, 1930). Additionally, in keeping with this tradition of icons as the divine made visible, pre-Petrine icon painters were not considered artists; all icons were viewed as holy and equal in importance (Espinola, 1992; Miller, 1907), instead of being judged on their style or beauty. Icon painters were simply “the master (dolichnik)” who uncovered or recreated an ever-existing sacred image (Uspensky, 1976, p. 16, italics in original; Franklin 2004), and for this reason, early icons were not signed; in fact, any personalization or innovation
of icon reproduction was heretical, and veneration of these images without truth was a sin of idolatry (Espinola, 1992).

Consequently, OBs considered icons that included the altered name of Christ as heretical. Maintenance of the form of holy texts, as well as icons, represented for them not only their adherence to the true faith, but also constituted their personal identity, “a kind of self-affirmation of the cultural community in which [the form] is venerated” (Franklin, 2004, p. 100) not unlike kin recognition and preference (Michod, 1982) or the use of material culture as a proxy for an intimate connection with the spiritual world (Robert L. Hall, 1976).

Further, the manner in which Christ was portrayed was changed, as Peter I decreed that Russian iconography be updated to meet Western standards (Cracraft, 1971). For some time, Western and traditional Muscovite styles co-existed (Franklin, 2004). However, Archpriest Avvakum, outraged at the defilement of holy images, gave voice to the general reaction of OBs when he protested that new iconography (Fig 2.1) portrays:

> The image of the Savior, Immanuel, as puffy-faced, with rosy red lips, curly hair, fat arms and muscles, bloated fingers and fat thighs…and all this is painted in a carnal way because the heretics are enamored of carnal grossness and have cast the heavens down to the depths. (quoted in Uspensky, 1976)

Avvakum’s remonstration was also provoked by shifts in iconography like those illustrated in Figures 2.2 and 2.3:
Figure 2.1: Icon of Jesus in reformed style

Figure 2.1. Depiction of Jesus as a more realistic figure (Cracraft, 1997).

Figure 2.2. Traditional Theotokos

Figure 2.2. Highly stylized icon of Mary and Jesus (Unknown, Late 16th Century).

Figure 2.3. Reformed Theotokos

Figure 2.3. Icon of Mary and Jesus post-Nikonian reform (Unknown, Late 17th century).
that increased in realism and artistic innovation of the Mary and Jesus figures between the pre- and post-Raskol time period. Given the importance OBs placed on the truthful revelation of Holy figures, and the sanctity and inviolability of icons by anonymous iconographers as a means of accessing and emulating the Divine, it seems reasonable that the OBs would react passionately to Peter I’s intentional icon alterations.

Sign of the cross. Beyond icons, one of the most conspicuous symbols of piety for many Western Christians is making the sign of the cross in reverence to the Holy Trinity. For the OBs, reforms to the manner in which Russian Orthodox Christians crossed themselves was one of the most contentious reforms. Because Russia was viewed as the last scion of true Christianity, the Third Rome, following the heresies of Byzantine Orthodoxy (Strémooukhoff, 1953; S. A. Zenkovsky, 1963; V. V. Zenkovsky, 1963), the way in which an individual demonstrated her or his allegiance was of utmost import.

The distinguishing feature of signing the cross between Old Orthodoxy and reformed Orthodoxy was the traditional dvoeperstie (two-fingered sign) compared to the reformed troeperstie (three-fingered sign) (Meyendorff, 1991). As Figure 2.4 illustrates, the two-fingered sign of the cross was made with the index and middle fingers slightly bent and separated, and the ring finger, little finger, and thumb grouped together. This symbol communicated the theological perspective that Christ has two forms: (a.) Pantocrator, or creator; and (b.) Redeemer (Olsufiev, 1930). In addition, the symbol communicated the significance of the Trinity as simultaneously three divine elements and one through the grouped fingers.
In contrast, as Figure 2.5 illustrates, reformed Orthodoxy prescribed the three-fingered sign of the cross. This symbol consists of the fingers representing the spelling of the name Jesus, whereby the index finger resembles \( I \) and the middle finger resembles \( C \) for \textit{Icuc}, and the crossed ring finger and thumb resembles \( X \) and the little finger resembles another \( C \), for \textit{Xrictoc} (Meyendorff, 1991). For reformers, making the sign of the cross in this manner exhibited the focus of religious devotion on Christ himself. However, for the \textit{OBs}, it would have been heretical on several levels. \textit{OBs} perceived \textit{troeperstie} as defiling the holy trinity that was symbolized with the thumb, ring finger, and little finger held together in \textit{dvoeperstie} (Cherniavsky, 1966; Meyendorff, 1991; Scheffel, 1991b; Sidau, 2010). Furthermore, \textit{troeperstie} not only paralleled Eastern Orthodox practice, but it also recalled the Nikonian liturgical reform to the spelling of Christ’s name in religious texts.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{dvoeperstie.png}
\caption{Depiction of \textit{dvoeperstie}}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{Avvakum.png}
\caption{Ikon of Archpriest Avvakum employing \textit{dvoeperstie}, where the index and middle fingers represent Christ as creator and Christ as redeemer, while the remaining fingers are grouped together in representation of the Holy Trinity (Unknown, 19th Century).}
\end{figure}
Figure 2.5 Depiction of Patriarch Nikon demonstrating *troeperstie*, where each finger represents a letter that together represents the name of Christ according to Greek orthography (*ICUC*). The OBs accused practitioners of *troeperstie* of heresy based on the notion of splitting the trinity by not grouping the last three fingers (Bezmin, 1690-1700).

Reform Patriarchs, in attempts to convince Avvakum of the purity of *troeperstie*, made reference to Orthodox Christians in Palestine, Serbia, Albania, Rome, and Poland; these reform Patriarchs considered Avvakum stubborn and obstinate in his insistence to make the sign of the cross in the unseemly fashion of *dvoeperstie*. Avvakum’s reply is strikingly emblematic of *OB* ideology:

Nikon, the wolf, together with the devil, ordained that men should cross themselves with three fingers, but our first shepherds made the sign of the cross and blessed men as of old with two fingers according to the tradition of our holy fathers. (P. Avvakum, Protopope, p. 121)

As with textual reforms, Nikon with his supporters, and Avvakum with the *OBs* were all driven to prescribe what they viewed as the most traditional and therefore purest version of Russian Orthodoxy.
As these arguments spilled over from text to icons, the same positions were maintained. For instance, the parallels between Figure 2.4 of Avvakum and Figure 2.6 of Christ were arguably consciously made. Both figures are presented with the large circular stylized halo behind the head. Both figures are positioned in a similar fashion, and include the Holy Scripture. Both figures are making the true sign of the cross, and both figures are wearing old-style vestments. Significantly, Figure 2.6 was later attributed to the most renowned 14th-century icon-painter, Andrei Rublev; therefore, a visual parallel between Avvakum, a prominent leader of the OBs, and Rublev’s Christ also parallels Old Belief with the fundamental and faithful form of Russian Orthodoxy. Figure 2.5, of the reformer Nikon, in contrast, is a visual symbol of new Orthodoxy. Nikon is depicted in Greek-style vestments, which he demanded of Russian clergy as part of the reforms, and he is making the heretical sign of the cross.

**Beards.** Personal appearance was also an indication of adherence to regulations of purity or sacredness – in contrast to the profane – a dichotomy that was elemental to Old Belief. Beards were of such significance to OBs, because they were an act of imitation of saints and martyrs as depicted in holy icons, as illustrated in Figures 2.7 and 2.8, whereas clean-shaven faces were paralleled to depictions of the devil (Hughes, 2004). As I discuss in more detail below, borodachi (men with beards) (Hughes, 2004, p. 30) were increasingly persecuted post-Raskol. Throughout his Zhitie, Avvakum repeatedly makes mention of the forceful “shearing” of OBs (Avvakum, 1963), which defied the faithful devotion to this element of finding salvation through the truth of Christ. For many OBs, devotion to the maintenance of this conspicuous trait
Figure 2.6. Icon of Christ, showing *dvoeperstie*

Figure 2.6. Icon of Christ enthroned displaying *dvoeperstie* (Unknown, 16th Century).

Figure 2.7. Holy fathers with beards and short hair

Figure 2.7. Icon of ascension of Mary depiction holy fathers with short hair and beards (Unknown, 15th century)

Figure 2.8. Holy fathers with short hair and beards

Figure 2.8. Holy Doors (for the purposes of this project, similar to icons) depicting holy fathers with short hair and beards (Unknown, Late 16th - Early 17th century).
ultimately meant that isolation from modernization was essential (Beliajeff & Morris, 1987; Conybeare, 1962; Cracraft, 1971; Hughes, 2008; Lupinin, 1984). However, further factions among the broadly defined Raskol’niki meant that relationships with outsiders and the geographic areas allowing them to practice more individualized religious freedom differed.

**Persecution and Punishment**

Following the Raskol – and even through to the mid-19th-century – OBs had a particularly volatile relationship with the government. Followers of old Orthodoxy were overtly anathematized, ostracized and brutalized; prelates, including Archpriest Avvakum, had their tongues cut out, were exiled to Siberia and, according to OB folk knowledge, were later burned at the stake (Cherniavsky, 1966; Pascal, 1976). Monasteries were burned, and the monks were massacred; parishioners were mutilated for practicing dvoeperstie instead of troeperstie, and OB speakers, icon painters, and authors were whipped, beaten, branded, beheaded, or even “smoked to death like bacon” (Cherniavsky, 1966, p. 25). However, the intensity and frequency of such events was not as extreme under Tsar Alexei as they would become under Peter I.

**Nikon and Alexei.** During the early period of the Raskol, Nikon enforced his reforms by confiscating and vandalizing icons that did not align with the particular requirements he valued as representing truth (Wolkonsky, 1897). As the movement of dissent strengthened, Nikon became steadily more reactive. He destroyed OB liveries, enforced anathema for all who would not use reformed texts and dogma, and chained or deposed priests for not agreeing with him (Andreyev, 1961; Meyendorff, 1991; Spinka, 1941; Wolkonsky, 1897).
Alexei largely supported Nikon’s actions and continued with persecution and punishment of OBs after Nikon himself was deposed. Russians who refused to acquiesce to the doctrines and rituals of reformed Orthodoxy not only experienced the wrath of the Church, but were also handed over to secular authorities for punishment, which consisted of forced conversion, additional excommunication, and more violent repercussions (Cracraft, 1971; Lobachev, 2001; Lupinin, 1984; Meyendorff, 1991; Scheffel, 1991a).

**Peter I.** From the outset of his accession to the throne in 1682 (Cracraft, 1971), Peter the Great initiated drastic measures to Westernize his country as a means of moving beyond the arcane traditions of the Slavic or Muscovite old Russia (Zenkovsky, 1957). As a result of his sociopolitical reforms, Peter I exacted the end of religious leadership of Russia and placed himself, as a secular leader, in the position of head of both Church and State (Cracraft, 1971; Franklin, 2004; Voltaire, 1983). In opposition to the tsar as a “spiritual son” of the Church leader, as Alexei was to Nikon (Meyendorff, 1991, p. 38), Peter I proclaimed that having “two powers” over Russia “was preposterous” (Voltaire 1983, p. 230). While high culture previous to Peter I’s reign was centered on the Church, post-Petrine cultural prestige was based on West European models. In fact, artists and architects were not only encouraged, but ordered “to apply their talents to worldly projects” (Franklin, 2004, p. 102).

For the OBs, Peter I’s displacement of the Church as the center of Russian life was heretical, and even more contentious than previous reforms, because they were intentionally motivated by worldly or profane alignment with non-Orthodox lifeways. Several critical OB domains of material culture were radically affected, including icon

The previously mentioned sweeping changes to iconography was one of Peter I’s more indirect attempts to Westernize his Muscovite country. However, Peter I was not remiss in enacting more overt revisions to Russian culture as well. He imposed upon all of his subjects, including the OBs, Westernized Hungarian or German-style clothing (Cherniavsky, 1966; White-Johnson, 1982; Wolkonsky, 1897). Moreover, in 1714, he officially banned the sale of Russian-style clothes and boots “on pain of the whip and hard labor in Siberia” (Cherniavsky, 1966, p. 35).

Most significant for this research, Peter I decreed explicit legislation leveled at the OBs. To discourage non-conformity, Peter I developed a series of edicts to increase heavy taxes upon anyone who continued to espouse Old Belief instead of the reformed religion (Cracraft, 1971). In particular, he introduced a beard tax for OBs who wanted to retain their religious custom of long beards (Hughes, 2008; Voltaire, 1983) as well as a census to identify OBs. Upon identification by the State, OBs were then obligated to pay double taxes. As OBs persistently preferred to pay the hefty taxes instead of shaving, Peter I is said to have forcibly sheared them (Figure 2.9) in court and even in the streets as he came upon them. For Peter I, it was not the beard itself, but the ideology it was based on that was so abhorrent (Hughes, 2004). Although the untouched beards of the OB men were what they thought made them recognizable as Christians (Hughes, 2008), in Peter I’s estimation, borodachi were obstinately maintaining their facial hair as a form of sustained dissent.
Peter I’s decrees and his vicious enforcement of them culminated in branding *OBs* and having them burned at the stake (Cherniavsky, 1966), and eventually became a damaging aspect of his reputation (Cracraft, 1971; Crumme, 1970; Uspensky, 1976). *OBs* were urged to “suffer and be strong” (Scheffel, 1991, p. 30) through the persecution they faced under Alexei and Peter I, which they did. However, they also altered their approaches to the tsar and their interaction with the Russian government.

**OB Reaction**

The *OBs* enacted numerous striking reactions to post-*Raskol* policies. Particularly significant for this study was their refusal to participate in Peter I’s state census, registration, and taxation for fear of torture (Crummey, 1970), or more crucially, acquiescing to the culture of the Antichrist (Cherniavsky, 1966). Amalgamated with religious superstition, the year 1666 became the year of the initiation
of the apocalypse, because of the triple-six digit, and OBs began to view the position of tsar as the Antichrist for introducing heretical alterations into the Church (Crummey, 1970; Gur'ianova, 2009; Scheffel, 1991a). Even to this day, American OBs, who have never been to Russia but are strongly influenced by vertical transmission of the consequences of participation in censuses, still espouse the hesitancy of their ancestors to put anything in writing (Hardwick, 1991). (As a point of interest, the community studied in this research was not included in either the 1970 or 1980 census despite its establishment in 1968.)

**Peasantry**

Religion was the primary function of division between the unified Russian Orthodox Church and the OBs and a defining aspect of the sustained continuity of the OBs into the 21st-century; however, several other political factors and hierarchical social friction (e.g. initiation of serfdom and establishment of ties with Western countries), which were intertwined with theology, were significant in affecting the OB social organization and behavior that is so conspicuous in contemporary North American society. During and shortly following the Raskol, OBs as a broad assembly “held possession of the majority of the country,” while Nikonian reformers held “a slight minority composed of the upper class of Moscow” (Wolkonsky, 1897, p. 102) that was supported by tsar and court. Although initially the OB movement incorporated both urban elite and rural peasantry, the majority of support came from marginalized and disenfranchised groups (Crummey, 1970). Driven by both external and internal pressures though not all peasants were OBs, and *vice versa*, over time the most unified and
dynamic alliance of the OB population at large comingled with or became the isolated peasantry.

Interestingly, peasantry, OBs included, occupied a dualistic persona within Russian society. The OBs had little social, political or economic capital (Cherniavsky, 1966), yet these common people have been considered the essence of what was considered the true faith. Anthropologically, peasants are distinguished from the urban elite largely based on small-scale agrarian subsistence (Dalton et al., 1972), and it was through “pursuing age after age their sacred tending of soil and crops in a communal setting” (Wenzer, 1997, p. 644) that OBs merged the historic notion of peasant with the idealized concept of religious purity. Ultimately, it was through the peasantry that the fundamental elements of Russian Orthodoxy (e.g., autocephaly of the Church, separation from Eastern Orthodoxy at large, communal life) were continued (Sidau, 2010).

The liturgical reforms of the Raskol were viewed by rural OB peasants as the most overt in a series of prejudicial actions against them by the high-status urban elite (Florovsky, 1962; Georg B. Michels, 2009). Beyond the disdain the OBs earned through their disobedience to the reformed Orthodox Church, OBs were largely considered “ignorant, illiterate, superstitious, [and] fanatical” (Cherniavsky 1966, p. 1). Although there are conflicting reports of literacy rates among OBs (Sidau, 2010), with a higher rate among OBs who were not also in rural peasant areas, Voltaire (1983) considered them insufferably ignorant, and even Avvakum (1916) assessed some venerable Holy Fathers as unlearned and illiterate.

The reality of literacy and education rates among the post-Raskol OB peasantry, or the degree to which those factors affected affluence is difficult to ascertain. However,
appearance during the reign of Peter I was certainly a marker for clearly distinguishing between peasant and elite. The significance of untrimmed beards to the OBs was a mark of religious rebellion, as discussed above, but beards were also an overt trait of low socioeconomic status (Hughes, 2004); therefore, as he was segregating the OBs as dissenters with his beard-free policies, Peter I was also emphasizing the demarcation between social classes. Further ostracizing them, Peter I later forced the OBs alone to maintain their traditional peasant clothing (Hughes, 2008) in order to make their position in society clear to all who met them.

**Apparel.** Apart from the external pressures of marginalization set about through the dictates of reform leaders, OBs independently strove to conspicuously distinguish themselves from their non-OB counterparts by replicating the devout and Holy figures of religious icons (Scheffel, 1988). As discussed above, Peter I’s reforms to attire and accoutrements, were, for the OBs, as detrimental to their salvation as liturgical and iconographic reforms. For them, just as the appearance of words on a page held vital elements of religiosity, so their personal physical appearance acted as a marker of their devotion to Christ; therefore, conceding to Peter I’s demands for Westernization of dress was tantamount to an outward defilement that also indicated an inward denial of Christ (Johnson, 1982).

As a symbol of their dualistic theological and traditional identity as Staroveri and peasants, OBs conserved the custom of wearing particular elements of peasant garb from previous generations. Men wore brightly colored Russian peasant-style shirts (*rubakha*) and pants (*shtany*) along with hand-woven belts that symbolized their membership; they also kept short hair and long beards. Women wore distinct peasant-style empire-waisted
apron dresses (sarafani) over blouses, and they covered their long, braided hair with kerchiefs (shashmuri) (Scheffel, 1991a). As with so many other aspects of OB behavior, conservation of seemingly inconsequential cultural features like clothing were vital to their sustained cohesion because these elements functioned as conspicuous markers of membership (Purzycki & Sosis, 2009; Sosis, 2004; Sosis & Alcorta, 2003b).

**Piety.** While lineage or clan endogamy strengthens “wider relationships between kin” (Goody, 2000, p. 32), the institutionalized Christian Church initiated the concept of “spiritual” kinship (Goody, 2000, p. 30), where followers maintained fictive kinship of their fellow Christians as brothers and sisters in Christ. OB theology, which was historically founded upon Greek Orthodoxy (Dolitsky & Kuz'mina, 1986; Pankratov, 2000; Piepkorn, 1977), illustrates this aspect of Church influence, where Christianity functioned as a means of increasing social cohesion in the Russian peasantry; successively, the simple life of Russians outside urban elite centers was often paralleled with the most genuine of Russian piety (V. V. Zenkovsky, 1963).

*Sobornost’* is the theological and philosophical conception of the church as a congregation of believers (Robson, 1993), where the institutionalized administrative body of Russian Orthodoxy is decentralized, having no authority over the “free union of believers who love one another” (Edie, et. al, 1976, p. 162). This concept fundamentally affected interpersonal relationships and social organization of the rural Russian peasantry even through the Revolution (1916-1918), and sobornost’ is still visible through the organization of OBs, both socially and geographically.

From the abstract philosophy of sobornost’ came the sobor’: the primary organizational system of the OB community (Johnson, 1982). Not only does the sobor’,
as a religious entity, uphold the essential ideology of sobornost’, but also, the ideological concept of sobor’ incorporates a social structure, whereby elder male residents of the peasant commune held all decision-making authority (Hoffmann, 1994). Historically, the collaborative approach of sobornost’ and the patriarchal organization of sobor’ permeated all other aspects of OB lifeways.

**Subsistence.** While religious reform and subversion instituted by the Russian monarchy resulted in significant tension between classes in the social hierarchy, sobornost’ and podvizhnichestvo (spiritual achievement through brotherhood) resulted in local collectivization of work, which served to replace class wars and self-interest in survival (Roshchin, 1995, p. 264). Keeping to the ideology of communal interests based on faith, OBs upheld the ideal of “communal land tenure” (Hoffmann, 1994, p. 641) with only use rights acknowledged (Wenzer, 1997). Because the OBs reasoned that communal life “founded on the soil will promote morality, perfection, and salvation” and “allowed liberty from all depravity and oppression” (Wenzer, 1997, p. 642), Peter I’s introduction of the concept of individually-owned property was yet another act of heresy (Cherniavsky, 1966).

Russia was a largely agrarian society throughout its Middle Ages (Billington, 1962; Ershova, 1999; Sidau, 2010). As OBs withdrew from or were pushed out of urban areas, the vast expanse of the country beyond major metropolitan centers appealed to the OBs’ as land to meet their needs for community and self-sufficiency. In addition, solitary settlement in the rural margins of Russia allowed the OBs to continue traditional household organization and marriage patterns.
**Household.** Traditional Russian peasant households included extended families of, typically, three generations (Hoffmann, 1994) with a mean pre-19th-century household size of 14 (Goody, 1996). Household composition for *OBs* paralleled this general Russian trend, most likely as a result of the admonishment of birth-control, with stem family or joint family residence for at least part of the domestic cycle (Johnson, 1982). Furthermore, social pressure for children in order to avoid misery in old age (Scheffel, 1991b) was encouraged by a religious creed of long-term financial support and physical care, not only for children, but also for communal support for widows and orphans (Bowman, 2003), as well as the elderly, who were the responsibility of the youngest son (Johnson, 1982).

With regard to division of labor by gender, *OBs* observed a traditional private-public dichotomy (Johnson, 1982; Shenk, 2012). For instance, while men were responsible for food provisioning, either in agricultural endeavors or by wage labor when necessary, women were responsible for food processing and helping the family meet the requirements of holy days and fasts (Johnson, 1982). Women’s responsibilities were very time-consuming, as food processing and preparation included household and community-wide feasts and food-specific fasting requirements for the 150 or so recognized holy days each year (Hardwick, 1993; L. Harris, 2010; Silva, 2009).

Children in *OB* households were viewed as productive members of society and economic assets (Johnson, 1982). Instead of an emphasis on education, if it was available, *OBs* expected children to participate in agricultural or wage labor. In fact, education was viewed as detrimental to the maintenance of *OB* faith and heritage (Roberta L Hall, 1973; Johnson, 1982; Morris, 1991; Scheffel, 1988). *OB* faith also
affected the practice of inheritance to children. Because of tendencies toward communal ownership, there was not much emphasis on large financial or material contributions to younger generations, and inheritance that did occur was spread relatively equally among all sons and daughters (Bowman, 2003). *OB* inheritance patterns also aligned with diverging devolution, based on vertical and bilateral inheritance of different resources at different times in life (Goody, 1976); this notion is clear through one of the primary celebrations in the *OB* domestic cycle: marriage.

**Marriage.** *OB* marriage was regulated by negative marriage rules (Shenk, 2012) centered on kin closer than third cousins (Scheffel, 1991b), or, in terms of the “exogamic bounds set by Greek Orthodox canon: four ‘links’ for consanguineal kin, and two ‘links’ for affinal” (Shimkin and Sanjuan, 1953, p. 332), where links or steps are the generational distance by which two individuals are separated from a common ancestor (Scheffel, 1991a). Beyond the liturgical strictures of negative marriage rules, it is not surprising that, in many ways, *OB* marriage parallels Russian peasant customs and law. Throughout centuries of post-*Raskol* attempts to convert *OBs* to official Russian Orthodoxy, *OBs* were penalized for “civil” (svobodniy) as opposed to “church” (tserkovniy) marriage (Paert, 2004, p. 562). Common law marriages that were outside the auspices of the official Church were deemed illegal and resulted in brides being forced to return to parents and wear maiden attire; in addition, children were prohibited from inheriting parents’ property unless the marriage was legalized (Freeze, 1990; Paert, 2004).

In svobodniy and tserkovniy marriages alike, there was a reflection of the importance of apparel in the pre-ceremony activity of tasking the bride with embroidering
wedding clothes and other traditional shirts for the groom. As the wedding approached, both bride and groom enjoyed a week of celebration, during which the bride and her friends collected and crafted items for the newlyweds’ trousseau, including clothes and other household cloth materials for use in married life, and traditional kroseta (headdresses) for the ceremony (Johnson, 1982, p. 71).

Post-marital residence patterns were patrilocal. Newlyweds moved into the groom’s parents’ household, either living directly with them or in an adjoining structure, for at least one year, and sometimes longer (e.g., until the first child is born) to learn acceptable housekeeping and marital behavior (Johnson, 1982; Scheffel, 1991a). After this period of learning, married couples were expected to raise a large family, and divorce was considered sacrilegious excepting specific circumstances. Most commonly, separation or divorce was allowed on the grounds of religious difference (Paert, 2004), which the OBs conceived of as the failure of one of the spouses to adhere to OB religious ideals.

Marriage patterns and practices were strictly observed in order to ensure the purity of the faith in each OB community. Endogamy was emphasized among OBs as a way to avoid the pollution of non-Orthodox traditions, and divorce was allowed in few circumstances beyond religious adherence. However, after the Raskol, what was initially an overarching movement of Raskol’niki continually divided into smaller groups of like-minded OBs that complicated the definitions of endogamy and religious adherence.

Sects

The importation of Christianity successfully unified Russians (Andreyev, 1970a; S. A. Zenkovsky, 1963). OBs experienced further social unification as a broadly defined group of dissident non-conformists. However, post-Raskol existence for the OBs was
further complicated by inner factions (Figure 2.12) related to disagreements about the charisma of church leadership and varying theological perspectives on singular issues of liturgy or canon (Crummey, 1993). One division among these was between the Popovtsy (priestly) and Bezpopovtsy (priestless) OBs.

Encapsulated in Russian Orthodoxy, and preserved after the Raskol in Old Belief, was the ideology that “without clergy there can be no Sacraments, and without Sacraments there is no salvation” (Sidau, 2010, p. 27). However, without extant bishops among OB ranks, priests could not be ordained, and therefore, the clergy would atrophy to non-existence. Popovtsy OBs, aware of the fate of their congregation, agreed to accept clergy who abandoned the reformed Orthodox Church. Those clergymen could then establish their own monasteries and churches, ordain priests to carry on the rituals of Sacraments, and lead OBs in churches.

Bezpopovtsy OBs also anticipated a considerable change in the structure of their church and decided to either forego clergy altogether, or ultimately lost their priests through more passive attrition. For the Bezpopovtsy OBs, then, there ceased to be any intermediary between parishioners and God; replacing the church building and church hierarchy was a prayer house with an elected, but not priestly, leader (Morris, 1991; Pokrovskiï & Morris, 1992; Scheffel, 1989; Sidau, 2010). Bezpopovtsy OBs can also be categorized as chasovennye (chapel-going) OBs (Morris 2001), because often, leaders of the Bezpopovtsy were nastavniyi (laypeople) (Dolitsky & Kuz'mina, 1986) who were elected by the men of the community, and these nastavniyi presided over parishioners in a local prayer house; an official church was impossible for the Bezpopovtsy, since the
relics and alter of the community could not be officially blessed (Beliajeff & Morris, 1987; Morris, 2001).

Figure 2.10. Diagram of Raskol’niki sects

Figure 2.10. The \textit{OBs}, displayed in the center of this diagram, are further divided into \textit{Bezpopovtsy} and \textit{Popovtsy} (adapted from Hardwick, 1991).

Significantly, the tendency to live in isolation, both voluntarily and through social pressure, resulted in \textit{Bezpopovtsy} \textit{OBs} practicing the conservation of dogma and ritual independently; independent interpretation subsequently led to disagreements between
communities regarding the sacred and profane elements of life and environment. Ultimately, there has been and continues to be situations in which OBs, even of the same general sect, must undertake cleansing rituals or abstain from interaction (e.g., not sharing utensils) similar to poganie (pagans, also non-OBs) in order to safeguard their perspective of the truth of Old Belief (Morris, 2001).

**Conclusion**

The Raskol “split the nation into two parts: the civilized elite and the masses” (Florovsky, 1962, p. 4), and while it was assumed that the masses would soon give way to the reforms of Church and State leaders, OBs managed to maintain their religious and social identity through geographic isolation and strict adherence to religious mandates regarding all aspects of their lifeways. Although sustained tension among OBs resulted in continuing smaller schisms of congregations, many extant populations of OBs have accomplished the social solidarity they sought over numerous generations.

Social history is essential for understanding present behavior, especially instances of insular, uncompromisingly conservative communities like the OBs. Because of their overt attempt to continue 17th-century lifeways, not only is there a nearly perfect communication of customs, church music, and painting from that era of Russian history (Mirsky, 1963), but there is also the possibility of further understanding the social mechanisms that have allowed such a longitudinal continuation of OB cultural traits. Centuries of history since the Raskol have shaped who OBs perceive themselves to be, and how they present themselves to their 21st-century non-OB and non-Russian counterparts; furthermore, identifying the events and motivations for OB behavior
throughout the 17th- and 18th-centuries provides clarification of current behavior as well as insight into what behaviors may have allowed for the survival of their culture.
Chapter 3: History of the Old Believers in South-Central Alaska

*OBs* were not the first Russian Orthodox inhabitants of Alaska (Boraas & Leggett, 2013; Townsend, 1974). However, while early Russian Orthodox priests maintained close contact with indigenous peoples in the area in attempts to Christianize them, the *SCAK OBs* are most appropriate for this research because of their adherence to the tenets of 17th-century Russian Orthodoxy, along with their Russian peasant heritage, and their prolonged intentional insularity. These traits have culminated in an enclave of *OBs* who display pre-industrial lifeways and social organization, and could clarify some mechanisms of high-fidelity transmission of behavior.

The sequence of emigration that eventually led to the establishment of the *SCAK* community studied here began with harassment and persecution beginning during the 17th-century *Raskol*, which resulted in social and geographic marginalization of *OBs*. However, exterior pressures were not the only factor in the *OBs*’ isolation. In order to live the pure and sacred life the *OBs* saw as necessary for salvation, as well as maintain the agricultural self-sufficiency they viewed as part of their heritage, they preferred to “inhabit the Russian Empire’s most inaccessible areas” (Sidau, 2010, p. 35). While some groups drifted west, and eventually settled in Turkey (Argudaeva, 2006; Roberta L Hall, 1973; Uthmann, 2005), the focus population of this study wandered east, where they remained until the late 19th-century and early 20th-century, when Early Soviet policies threatened repatriation on technicalities of citizenship (Committee on the Judiciary, 1964a; Georg B. Michels, 2009; Morris, 2001; White-Johnson, 1982). *OBs* in east Siberia took the opportunity to emigrate across the border into China to escape the
collectivization and continued persecution of the Early Soviet period, take advantage of free land in China, and search for more peaceful, isolated areas (Barbich, 1993; Gur'ianova, 2009; Uthmann, 2005).

Until the Chinese revolution again threatened their religious practice, OBs in China farmed, sold honey, found employment with railroad companies, and even worked with Chinese noblemen as tiger hunters (Participants, 2012a; White-Johnson, 1982). With political unrest in the 1950s, OBs in China reached out to the World Council of Churches, who took notice of the difficulties the OBs were having with regard to continued persecution in China, and helped them relocate. After failed attempts at immigration to the United States, the Intergovernment Committee for European Migration and World Council of Churches negotiated OB immigration to, among other places, government-donated land in a remote 6000-acre region of Brazil (Morris, 2001; Sidau, 2010; Uthmann, 2005). Brazil offered the most isolated region the OBs had inhabited, and without pressure for education or assimilation, transmission of cultural behavior with high fidelity was finally realized; OBs’ continual maintenance of traditions and lifeways of 17th-century Russian Orthodoxy was secured.

However, many of the Brazilian OBs stayed in the area for fewer than 20 years. Possible reasons put forth include the intimate relationship OBs historically had with the land, which was difficult to maintain given the “arid climate, poor soil and low prices for crops” (Hall, 1969, p. 52), and required mechanization for farming. Added to practical farming hindrances were federal tax corruption and a poor economic climate (Uthmann, 2005; White-Johnson, 1982). The combination of these agricultural and economic struggles may have spurred the move to North America, which offered a more authentic
mimic of the Russian climate OBs had learned to farm in, as well as a relatively more fruitful economy. Another reason proposed for the move is limited OB social networks in Brazil (Hardwick, 1991), which made finding marriage partners difficult given the negative marriage rules prescribed by OB Orthodoxy. Ultimately, their immigration was eased through sponsorship and resettlement assistance from the Tolstoy Foundation (Committee on the Judiciary, 1964a; Hardwick, 1993; Piotrovsky, 1983; Tolstoy Foundation, 1972) and financial assistance for relocation through “Pan American’s ‘Fly Now, Pay Later’ plan” (White-Johnson, 1982, p. 39).

Immigration to Oregon

After centuries of migration from the Eastern periphery of Russia to China and then to Brazil (Fig 3.1), a group of OBs were admitted to the United States as religious refugees in 1964 (Committee on the Judiciary, 1964b; Tolstoy Foundation, 1972) and moved to Woodburn, Oregon.

Immigration to Woodburn continued, and over the next five years, 200 families settled there, while only 75 families remained in Brazil (Roberta L Hall, 1969). Similar search for fertile ground and religious freedom led to the co-settlement of three distinct OB groups harking from Harbing and Xinkang, China, and Turkey. Eventually intermarriage and social unification in the area led to a blended community (Uthmann, 2005), and from that blended community, most of the populations in Alaska and Alberta were subsequently established.

In general, OBs in North America attract a lot of attention, both academic (Argudyaeva, 2006; Beliajeff, 1977; Dolitsky et al., 1991; Roberta L Hall, 1969; Morris,
and social (Dotson, 2008; Gay, 1988; Rearden, 1972), because they are conspicuously conservative

Figure 3.1. Migration of SCAK O Bs

Figure 3.1. The OB population in this study moved to peripheral regions of Russia before crossing the border into China at two separate geographic locations. From there, the groups were reunited in their migration to Brazil. Following the initial immigration to Woodburn, the combined (Turkish and Chinese) OB community fractured, and the SCAK community was established.

in their view of pre-schismatic Russian Orthodoxy as the last stronghold of true Christianity (Georg B. Michels, 2009; S. A. Zenkovsky, 1963). Pre-schismatic liturgy, sacred writings, and instructions continue to have a unifying influence on OB traditional behavior, including religious services, approaches to nepravoslaviye (the unclean) and poganie (pagans), concepts of kinship and family structure (Scheffel, 1991b), and most visually striking, material culture (Hardwick, 1993; Scheffel, 1991a; White-Johnson, 1982).
Despite generations of global OB diaspora, researchers found that the OBs in Woodburn had managed relatively high-fidelity transmission of 17th-century traditions, with few and minor cultural or linguistic transference from cultural contact in China and Brazil (Khisamutdinov, 2006). Their stalwart commitment to cultural continuity was a reflection of OBs’ adherence to prescriptions of their sacred liturgical texts. The most significant prescriptions included: observing four major fasts and other daily dietary restrictions; wearing traditional clothing and hair styles; refraining from consumption of alcohol, except braga (homemade fruit wine); actively participating in Sabbath and Holy days of the religious calendar; and maintaining ritual purity and union with the OB sobor’ (Roberta L Hall, 1969; White-Johnson, 1982). Observance of these tenets of Old Belief, along with a resilient conviction that surrounding societies threatened their very salvation, were powerful forces of social solidarity that allowed the OBs to resist assimilation (Sidau, 2010), even in the face of vast geographic separation. Early ethnographic reports confirmed the OBs’ success in inter-generational transmission of traditional behavior, and documented instances and potential explanations for innovation in Woodburn OB culture.

**Clothing.** Although material culture “changed but slightly from that of the seventeenth Russian peasantry” (White-Johnson, 1982, p. 41) by the time the OBs immigrated to Woodburn, first generation immigrants noted that the clothes that “mean everything to us” were “slipping away from us” (White-Johnson, 1982, Preface). The process of apparel attrition was not immediate or complete. First generation immigrants, particularly older individuals, preserved traditional adornment in daily life (Fig 3.2). Women wore brightly colored peasant-style dresses with aprons, and kept their hair long
and braided. Married women wore the traditional *shashmura* (*marriage cap*) with scarves covering a single braid, and unmarried or young women wore scarves with double-braids. Men wore shirts reminiscent of Russian peasants, short hair with a fringe in front, and the ever-present beard (Roberta L. Hall, 1969; Morris, 1991; Razumovskaya, 2008; Scheffel, 1991a; White-Johnson, 1982), and as soon as children were fully mobile, their attire was a perfect parallel to adults’ (Razumovskaya, 2008; White-Johnson, 1982).

Although most men had lost the skill of hand-making leather shoes sometime following their emigration, women continued to learn and teach sewing and embroidery (Fig 3.3) after their arrival in Woodburn. Newcomers were particularly austere with regard to traditional dress in every occasion, most likely to overtly communicate their dedicated membership to the *OB* community they were joining (White-Johnson, 1982). However, although knowledge of embroidery retained cultural significance, *OBs* unilaterally accepted some conveniences of American material culture, such as manufactured socks and jeans. Men began to wear jeans habitually, instead of hand-sewn cloth pants, and the styles of women’s dresses incorporated Americanized silhouettes (Razumovskaya, 2008; White-Johnson, 1982).

Adolescent *OBs* were much more tolerant of modifications to dress, most likely because of the influence of intensive interaction with Americans through school and social events. Girls sometimes wore make-up and calf-length dresses, especially when visiting Portland. Boys’ clothes corresponded more to American clothing, and coupled with their “wild” nature, incorporation of American styles was more pervasive.
Figure 3.2. *OB* family in the 1950s

Figure 3.2. The Martushev family waiting in Hong Kong for resettlement to Brazil. All members conforming to traditional adornment traits. Photo from the ICEM (http://www.iom.int/Template/resettlement/russian_old_believers/slideshow.htm)

Figure 3.3. *OB* girls occupying their time

Figure 3.3. *OB* girls waiting for resettlement to Brazil spent many hours a day practicing weaving and embroidery together. Photo from the ICEM (http://www.iom.int/Template/resettlement/russian_old_believers/slideshow.htm).
Nevertheless, intimate connections of apparel with Old Belief resulted in newly sewn, strictly traditional clothes for all family members during Holy days and rituals, like weddings (Fig 3.4) or baptisms (Razumovskaya, 2008). Because of strong acculturative pressure, immigrants in general in the United States rarely maintain traditional dress beyond the first generation (White-Johnson, 1982). However, regardless of marginal adolescent noncompliance that spurred elders into distress, and the adoption of some garments for practical purposes, the early OB community in Woodburn generally preserved their striking separation from their nepravoslavnie neighbors, which was one indication of continued solidarity.

**Piety.** Behaviors more specifically linked to religiosity also signified cultural continuity. Following their arrival in Woodburn, the OBs had significant debt to satisfy for their transportation (Khisamutdinov, 2006), but steady work and economic efficiency
helped them settle their arrears. As the OBs were secured in wage labor, they were also inundated with modern American technology that they were able to afford. Although adoption of technology could have led to a speedy decline of high-fidelity transmission of traditional behavior, the OBs accepted some modern technology in their daily secular lives while concurrently preserving religious prescriptions (White-Johnson, 1982).

For instance, some OBs opened shops within the Woodburn city limits, which would necessitate modern, Westernized sales equipment, but the universal consensus was that technology beyond necessity, such as tape-recorders and television, was the “work of Satan” that “stultify[ied] the mind” (Razumovskaya, 2008, p. 102). Furthermore, OBs persisted in traditional practices and concepts of purity that were not derived from American culture, but were required for upholding union with the sobor’. Ritual purification through bathing in a wooden banya (sauna) built separate from the house was required before all religious holidays and after behaviors perceived as poganie (e.g., eating at a restaurant). Ritual cleansing was not sufficient, however, for OBs in a state of ritual impurity (e.g., menstruating or post-partum women), and these parishioners were only allowed to join the sobor’ for services in the antechamber of the prayer hall (White-Johnson, 1982). Significantly, the OBs in Woodburn were initially resolute in their choice of American cultural traits that would not cause discontinuity of their faith.

**Subsistence.** Beyond expressions of piety, OBs in Woodburn maintained other behaviors signaling their continuity with 17th-century lifeways. Conforming to their peasant heritage, OBs exhibited subsistence strategies that paralleled pre-industrialized societies; they emphasized small-scale agriculture with a goal of supporting the household, as opposed to industrial and post-industrial agriculture, which focuses more
on highly mechanized production of cash crops for economic profit (Crone, 2014; M. Harris & Ross, 1987).

Not all OBs in Oregon were farmers, though. Wage labor was also common, especially in logging, construction, and fishing (Dolitsky et al., 1991; Hardwick, 1991; White-Johnson, 1982), and while a distinct public-private dichotomy was present in many aspects of life, women were also expected to provide some income, through gardening or working at plant nurseries or sewing factories (Roberta L Hall, 1969; Razumovskaya, 2008; White-Johnson, 1982). This blended subsistence pattern, similar to biculturalism in other domains (i.e., material culture), was different from previous behavior, although the fundamental aspects of OB lifeways remained intact.

OBs were also reminiscent of pre-industrial societies in their reliance on extended cognatic kin groups (Scheffel, 1991a). Persistent emphasis on extended kin networks among OBs was also reinforced by the perpetuation of large families, even though the primary purpose – agricultural work (Hardwick, 1993; Scheffel, 1991a) – was no longer the sole means of subsistence. Emotional ties between families and cooperation between kin was stout enough to encourage discussion about communal living (Roberta L Hall, 1969), and was certainly a central theme of the household.

**Marriage and household.** Paralleling traditional marriage practices, sect-endogamous marriage was essential (Barbich, 1993; Roberta L Hall, 1973; Razumovskaya, 2008). While exogamous marriage resulted in disunion with the sobor’ and denial of the right to wear traditional OB dress or have their children baptized (White-Johnson, 1982), the influx of OBs to Woodburn from different regions of their global diaspora initially alleviated difficulties of finding an acceptable spouse. Boys and
girls were encouraged to marry in their mid-teens (Barbich, 1993; White-Johnson, 1982) in order to prevent them from succumbing to American temptations (e.g., premarital sex, television, alcohol, drugs) as well as to preserve social hierarchy within the sobor’ and the elders’ authority over it (Morris, 1991). Early marriage and family-building also meant an all-but-absent period of teenage youth, at least relative to their American counterparts, with OB teens transitioning directly from the dependency of childhood to post-marriage full time work and substantial financial contribution to the household (Roberta L Hall, 1969).

Marriage included the longstanding practice of dowry, which most often involved a sewing machine, other sewing necessities, and a trousseau of fabric (Razumovskaya, 2008; White-Johnson, 1982). For the bride, there was also the donning of the shashmura, which veiled her hair from all but her husband and female friends until burial after death (White-Johnson 1982). Newly married couples followed the patrilocal post-marital residence patterns of previous generations for 1-2 years until the couple could afford a house of their own. During that time, the new couple most often had their first of the 8-10 children that was still the most prevalent family size (Roberta L Hall, 1969; White-Johnson, 1982).

While the public-private dichotomy was observed to some degree, both women and men were expected to provide income for the household in some capacity – either financial or subsistence (Fig. 3.5) – as well as participate in child-rearing (Roberta L Hall, 1969). Responsibility of care for elderly parents fell to the youngest son, and
women were primarily responsible for maintaining feast and Holy day rituals, dietary guidelines, and overall purity of the family (White-Johnson, 1982). However, while mothers were charged with educating daughters in the household and textile duties, teaching children to read religious texts in OCS fell under the purview of fathers or male elders of the community (Scheffel, 1988).

**Education.** In-depth study of religious doctrine and texts was viewed as essential, while education in the American public school system was still considered irrelevant, particularly when teens could be working for wages. So while OBs in the United States were required to attend school in their youth, most only completed 5th or 6th grade, which was significantly more than the previous generation (Dolitsky & Kuz'mina, 1986; Roberta L Hall, 1969; White-Johnson, 1982). OB parents overtly opposed offensive subjects like science, sex, and contemporary art, music, and literature, and generally saw education only as means of teaching kids to read, write, and think enough to avoid being “cheated by shop owners” (Dolitsky and Kuz’mina, 1986, p. 230).
OBs viewed more abstract subjects as part of the godly realm, which was not appropriate for human involvement, and chose instead to focus on maintaining vertical transmission to younger generations of OB heritage, through language, religiosity, and ritual (Dolitsky & Kuz’mina, 1986; White-Johnson, 1982). Children who grew up in Woodburn were all able to read and write in English. At home, however, parents typically required them to speak Russian; if parents did not teach children to write in Russian, many would teach themselves in order to uphold OB religious and cultural heritage, which meant longitudinal Russian language maintenance (Roberta L Hall, 1969; Khisamutdinov, 2006; Razumovskaya, 2008).

Resettlement to Alaska

The Bezpopovtsy OBs were used to being a minority group, but in rural setting, where the “culture of one’s birth was the culture one kept” (Hall, 1969, p. 53). OB unity and ingrouping was overtly conveyed through their self-identification as Nashi (We) (Sidau, 2010, p. 89), and the OBs were successful at maintaining continuity over generations and during multiple resettlements through rural isolation and social insularity. Over time, different interpretations of these texts and various other theological disagreements (Roberta L Hall, 1969; Morris, 1991) resulted in fissioning within the North American OB populace as a whole. The impetuses for cultural unification or division between groups seem to parallel the arguments made during the Raskol: only the consistent pursuit and preservation of the truth of God given through the most ancient and therefore holy Russian Orthodox liturgies and practices will lead to salvation. What these OBs experienced in Woodburn, though, was internal debate coupled with competition with the culture of an American semi-urban area that allowed for innovation.
in younger generations through the adoption of behavior they observed in American youth (Roberta L Hall, 1969). As with the Raskol, there continue to be alternate perspectives about what that truth is, and the added pressures of Americanization has led to remarkable strategies for maintaining religious and community continuity.

Specific to Woodburn were two primary forces of acculturation for Bezpopovtsy OBs: American society, and influence from other subgroups (Argudyaeva, 2006; White-Johnson, 1982). While the different OB subgroups that converged in Woodburn upheld conflicting religious rituals and doctrines, incorporations of American cultural traits were particularly troublesome. Despite parents’ attempts to maintain linguistic and cultural continuity in the home, children ultimately lived American lives during the day and Russian lives only at night (White-Johnson, 1982), because they were encompassed by English monolingualism and American society in school.

When some of the OBs groups in Woodburn began to search in earnest for a Romanian monastery rumored to have allowed a Russian Orthodox priest to be rebaptized as an OB in the 19th century, dissention erupted. As legend held, this Romanian priest managed to establish a hierarchy that could ordain other priests, therefore allowing OB parishioners to reintroduce a sanctified church dogma with sacraments and allowing them to shift from Bezpopovtsy to Popovtsy (Clay, 2009; Hardwick, 1991; White-Johnson, 1982). Compounded with threats to cultural and religious fidelity first-generation OBs saw in their children, one group of Bezpopovtsy OBs considered alternative options. A few members of the Woodburn community scouted out more suitable territory in Alaska that would provide farming land, and a less densely populated region that would spare them “the influences of television, movies,
tobacco, alcohol and drugs” (White-Johnson, 1982, p. 40) and allow them to escape interference with their traditional lifeways (Beliajeff, 1977; Scheffel, 1989). Ultimately, five families moved to 640 acres in South-Central Alaska with the help of the Tolstoy Foundation in 1968 (Fefelov, 2011; Hardwick, 1991).

**South-Central Alaska (SCAK) Community**

Early reports indicated that the SCK community continued with the cultural behavior of their ancestors. By 1986, the SCK community had a population of 400 OBs who were agriculturally self-sufficient – they only bought sugar and salt from markets and secured food for the entire year through gardening, cattle-raising, fishing, hunting, and trading with other OBs in the community (e.g., clothing, construction projects) (Dolitsky et al., 1991; Razumovskaya, 2008). These OBs also strictly maintained traditional dress (Figs. 3.6, 3.7), so that all around the village, “one [was] treated to the frequent sight of Russians resembling peasants of yesteryear” (Dolitsky and Kuz’mina, 1986, p. 229), which was both a reflection and a result of their desire for a more isolated existence than they experienced in Woodburn.

Fishing in SCK was a particularly successful subsistence strategy for men. SCK OBs were able to build and maintain their own boats because of the wood-working and construction skills OBs had acquired during their periodic migrations (Hardwick, 1991; Participants, 2012a). In addition, fishermen were self-employed, which bolstered self-sufficiency and allowed for observation of the nearly 200 holy days each year (Dolitsky & Kuz'mina, 1986) without conflicts with employers.
Figure 3.6. Traditional dress in this picture, taken just after the SCAK community's establishment incorporates not only shirts and belts typically seen in Woodburn, but also hand-sewn cloth pants that the Woodburn community soon chose to forego in lieu of American-style trousers or jeans. Picture from the Alaska State Library, Dolgopolov Files (Dolgopolov, 1981).

Figure 3.7. Traditional dress maintained by men, women, and children in the SCAK community shortly after their arrival closely paralleled that of their 17th-century Russian OB ancestors. Picture from Dolitsky and Kuz’mina, 1986, p. 228.
Early SCAK OBs not only isolated themselves geographically, but they also strongly protested interference in their daily life from outsiders. With only a single road entering the village, it was relatively easy to avoid outsiders, and any passersby were warned about the private ownership of the village (Fig. 3.8) (Participants, 2012a). The

Figure 3.8. “Keep Out”

...large size of the early SCAK community, and the absence of a state-sponsored school until 1983 (Argudyaeva, 2011) allowed villagers to retain Russian as the majority language. Men worked with other OBs, and women worked primarily at home with little interaction outside the village (Fig. 3.9), so there was little need to learn or use English; maintenance of OCS was also easily achieved through long-established customs of community elders working with children (Fig. 3.10).
For nearly two decades after its establishment, the SCAK community remained more isolated than the Woodburn population, and therefore more traditional. However, as one Russian visitor commented, eventual assimilation seemed unavoidable (Barbich, 1993). As the community quickly grew in geographic size, population, and median

Fig. 3.9. SCAK woman in the garden

Figure 3.9. Small-scale agriculture and cultivation, primarily attended to by women, supplemented fishing and hunting returns by SCAK men. Picture from the Alaska State Library, Dolgopolov Files (Dolgopolov, 1981).
income, interaction with outsiders increased, and further theological disagreements regarding priesthood again gained ground (Hall 1969; Morris 1991). In the mid-1980s, these led to one influential elder’s global search for a lingering priest (Dolitsky & Kuz’mina, 1986; Participants, 2012a). When he found the monastery in Romania and returned ordained, the Bezpopovtsy SCAK community splintered, with many converting to Popovtsy Old Belief and some families, persevering in their view that no real OB priest could have survived communism in Romania (Participants, 2012a), leaving the original community for a new but even more remote location just 45-50 miles away (Argudyaeva, 2011).

Following the mid-1980s fission, and combined with the addition of a state-sponsored school, many of the SCAK OBs’ traditional cultural traits were undermined. Conspicuous displays of membership like traditional dress were preserved by some
members, while others began introducing American elements (Figs. 3.11, 3.12); Russian monolingual education in the local school was amended, with Russian language instruction reduced to 30 minutes (Argudaeva, 2011); and while there remained a distinction for the OBs between themselves and Americans, land was sold to Americans with the intent of doing anything to “help” the village (Participants, 2012a). Additionally, fishing as a self-sustaining subsistence strategy became a more profitable enterprise that changed the physical appearance of the village.

The first SCAK founders settled into two log cabins, and the five families who relocated together from Woodburn built another four cabins. One participant lives in an original structure that has been heavily renovated with American-style manufactured materials, and the others have been abandoned (Participants, 2012a). Instead of log
cabins, the village is now dappled with large, modern houses with fewer family members in each household and smaller families overall. Non-OB Americans live among the SCAK OBs, and in general the village mirrors the Woodburn community in its accommodation of biculturalism.

Figure 3.12. SCAK men illustrating bicultural dress

Figure 3.12. SCAK men highlighting a changing environment of material culture. Picture from Dolistky and Kuz’mina, 1986, p. 228.

Shifts in material culture and ambitions are closely linked with, and potentially further propelled by changes in education. In 1990, the first two SCAK OB highschoolers matriculated into the University of Oregon (Hardwick, 1991), which represented a fundamental change to traditional views of school as necessary only for the most basic survival skills. Although SCAK OB children attend a public school, they still make up
the majority of the student population, so they remain relatively isolated from secular society. However, after the possibility of a university degree was introduced, the number of highschoolers who continued to college increased, and currently, about 90% of high school graduates enter college; many who do only return to the SCAK community for major holy day celebrations (Participants, 2012a).

The diffusion of American norms in the SCAK community has also affected marriage practices to some degree. *OB sobori* are autonomous, both religiously and functionally, but there are so few communities in North America that they must rely on each other for support, and for spouses. Despite being geographically distanced, *OBs* maintain inter-community contact through which young men and women are able to meet, court and marry. While sect-endogamy persists for some families in the SCAK community – even to the point of choosing spouses from communities in Brazil or Australia (Participants, 2012a) – inter-sect marriages and marriage to non-OB Americans has increased. Interestingly, there are instances of divorced couples, inter-sect couples, and *OB/non-OB* couples living in the SCAK community with relatively little ostracization (i.e., inclusion in the *sobor*’ contingent on active participation).

Complications lie in enduring community fragmentations based on continuous theological conflicts. The mid-1980s fission was familiar to *OB* scholars, and the cohabitation of three “geographically contiguous” but theologically independent *OB* communities was reported as little as 10 years ago (Fall et al, 2000, p. 4); however, prior to fieldwork I was unaware of the number of unconverted (*Bezpopovtsy*) *OBs* who co-reside with the now *Popovtsy* *OBs* in the SCAK village. Furthermore, the most recent schism in the area has not been widely documented. According to *SCAK* participants,
any time there is a disagreement, “they [schismatics] just leave and start their own community” (Participants, 2012a) – a phenomenon that created what is now known as “3rd Village” at the northeast periphery of the SCAK village.

Bezpopovtsy OBs in 3rd Village are currently embroiled in an ongoing dispute with the Popovtsy villagers in the community over the same issues that spurred the Raskol’niki to abandon the Orthodox Church in Russia: signs of the cross and icons. SCAK OBs call these 3rd Villagers “double-crossers” because although they make the manner of the cross with the thumb, ring, and little finger in union, they form a visual cross by holding their middle finger perpendicular to their index finger at the second joint. By holding their fingers in the shape of a cross and then also crossing themselves in the manner of Old Belief, they are, in essence, crossing themselves twice.

Although 3rd Village is considered separate from the SCAK community, some 3rd Villagers live within the SCAK perimeter, and OBs from both groups must have continual contact because their children attend the same school. Therefore, what is technically an intra-sect quarrel affects the SCAK OBs who were the focus of this study. Coupled with ongoing resentment over the introduction of Popovtsy dogma in the 1980s, tension in the SCAK community is palpable. SCAK OBs describe 3rd Villagers as heretical and hypocritical. For instance, 3rd Villagers have constructed a prayer house, but to the SCAK OBs, “it looks like a house, and it doesn’t even have a cross on it” (Participants, 2012). Furthermore, since OBs can only pray together and must forego reading the liturgy in absence of an ordained priest, the 3rd Village OBs “just skip over that part” of each service, which is a “big problem for following the faith” (Participants, 2012). Beyond services, 3rd Villagers are much more stringent about observing traditional tenets of Old
Belief, including coffee and television restrictions, but from SCAK OB observations, 3rd Village OBs simply hide their sinful behavior from their neighbors. As one SCAK OB remarked, “the hypocrisy is ridiculous,” your neighbors may not notice, “but God always sees” (Participants, 2012) Most alarming for some Participants (2012) is that the 3rd Village sobor’ has taken up burning priceless icons because the figures portrayed improper hand formation. These specific points of contention are echoed in a more generalized perspective that the SCAK OBs “don’t turn people away;” they “love everyone,” and accepted me as a temporary participant in their sobor’, while they cautioned me that the OBs in 3rd Village are different – they are not sympathetic to nepravoslavnie (pagans) (Participants, 2012).

Daily life for the SCAK OBs is marginally affected by the turmoil within the 3rd Village sobor’, but a much more detrimental effect is a consequence of residual Bezpopovtsy ideology concerning purity. 3rd Villagers observe the strict dietary constraints of traditional Bezpopovtsy OBs, including not polluting themselves by sharing food or common dishes with nepravoslavnie (Dolitsky & Kuz'mina, 1986; Hardwick, 1991; Scheffel, 1991a). For inter-sect and converted OB-American couples, then, their children and all affinally related individuals remain nepravoslavnie to 3rd Villagers and are treated as such (Sidau, 2010). This uneasiness about pollution extends to familial rituals and rites of passage as well; regardless of kinship, SCAK OBs have been asked to leave weddings because of their nepravoslavnie classification (Participants, 2012).

As it exists now, the SCAK population is much more acculturated, with regard to material culture, than it was just a generation ago. Women from 20-40 wear combinations of traditional adornment and hoodies or sweats, university students wear
traditional dress only when they return for holy days, and many men are difficult to distinguish from their non-OB American neighbors. However, elements of 17th-century lifeways and religion remain. Self-sufficiency is still emphasized through some pre-industrial subsistence patterns, and cultural continuity is still overtly communicated to outsiders. OBs in the SCAK community still manage to maintain transmission of cultural traits they view as most significant, and concepts of self-identification as an OB as well as various conspicuous displays of membership are still prominent and mediated by religiosity. Theological disputes continue, but it seems that they are largely mitigated by an enduring awareness of emically defined demarcation between OBs and the American society within which they are embedded.

Conclusion

Following their mid-20th-century admittance into Oregon and settlement in Woodburn, Bezpopovtsy and Popovtsy OBs continued to argue amongst themselves, with Bezpopovtsy OBs tending to be less organized smaller communities that fractured more frequently (Crummey, 1993; G. B. Michels & Nickols, 2009; White-Johnson, 1982). Most significantly for immigrants to North America were concerns regarding the perceived negative influence of American culture on OB youth (Dolitsky & Kuz'mina, 1986; Roberta L Hall, 1969; White-Johnson, 1982). Within the first decade following immigration to the United States, one group of Woodburn Bezpopovtsy OBs began looking for more isolated regions and soon splintered off to settle in Alberta, Canada, and SCAK.

A generation after establishing their community, disagreements over the existence of a genuine OB priesthood in Romania resulted in contestation between SCAK OBs who
remained skeptical of the survival of an OB priest and those who adopted the initiative of popovtsy revitalization caused an insurmountable rift in the community. Exclamations of heresy sounded from both sides; some SCAK OB families left the village, while others either co-resided with the newly converted popovtsy OBs in the borders of SCAK or resituated themselves in 3rd Village. Decades later, the SCAK schism churns among OBs in the region, and recent in-fighting among 3rd Villagers has exacerbated the prolonged overarching theological dissension.

Despite recurring factions, there remains a core SCAK OB sobor’ that has navigated American society and managed to defend the mainstays of their culture. These SCAK OBs have tolerated bicultural behaviors in some domains while also retaining what they view as the fundamental aspects of OB lifeways. These OBs are no longer as isolated as they originally intended; however, they have largely preserved their cultural continuity from the threats they distinguished in surrounding society, and their behavior demonstrates a lingering search for the truth and salvation that their ancestors defined. Through residual traditional cultural traits, the SCAK OBs uphold fidelity in cultural transmission and preserve their identity as Nashi.
Chapter 4: Theoretical Foundations

In this analysis, I seek to understand a variety of factors at various scales. Most central are the processes of cultural transmission and the strategies used by refugees and immigrants to interact with and/or accommodate the larger, dominant culture. Interestingly, these two issues (i.e., cultural evolution vs. immigrant accommodation) have been largely non-overlapping theoretical domains, with cultural evolution focused largely on technological, mating, or subsistence related research (e.g., Cavalli-Sforza, 1986; Efferson 2008; Henrich 2004; Richerson 2001) and studies of acculturation using a framework based more closely on social theorists such as Berry (1997), Vasta (2010), or Alba (2005). Here, I aim to meaningfully bridge the two perspectives to better understand how cultural evolution will relate to – and in some ways control – immigrant cultural accommodation. I begin my discussion with an overview of cultural evolution theory, and then discuss how it relates to acculturative strategies outlined by Berry (1997), based on social theory.

Cultural Evolution

The OBs constitute a conspicuous minority immigrant community embedded in industrialized 21st-century American society. Current discussions of the ultimate results of globalization have led to concerns about the potential loss of social cohesion in small traditional cultural groups. Conflicting emphases, both synchronically and diachronically, on either diversity initiatives supporting immigration or nationalism supporting assimilation pressures, ultimately result in divisiveness in society and potential attrition of traditional groups (Vasta, 2010). Living in an increasingly homogeneous socioglobal environment that emphasizes innovative behavior introduces
disruptive horizontal transmission that could undermine the continued high-fidelity reproduction of OB cultural traits, despite the OBs’ past success in maintaining cultural continuity.

The amalgamation of language and other conspicuous cultural traits that are markers of loyalty (Fishman, 1966b) have shaped OB identity. These traditions require intense interaction and identification with family members and others in the community and facilitate clear social margins. In contrast to other OB sects that have acculturated into North American society (Holdeman, 2002), the intense interaction among the SCAK OBs may both reflect and allow high-fidelity replication of behavior over generations and multiple migrations.

For cultural groups in general, if there is rapid local adaptation, inter-group variation will persist, meaning that local cultural groups will remain distinct while also retaining competitive strength – even in a sociocultural arena. However, “if mixing is stronger, all groups will converge to a single genetic or cultural variant” (Boyd & Richerson 2009, p. 3284) – a result that would eliminate the OBs as a traditional cultural group. Combining perspectives of cultural evolution as they relate to cultural continuity and costly signaling, along with discussion of intercept phenomena of immigration allows a holistic clarification of what elements drive cultural proliferation. Identifying mechanisms of cultural proliferation is significant to understanding how cultural transmission relates to the sequence of cultural development, how and why certain behaviors are transmitted, and may offer a resolution of conflicting behavioral approaches to cultural change (C. VanPool, 2008; T. VanPool, Palmer, & VanPool, 2008).
Cultural evolution theory is founded on the observation that the characteristics of and changes in culture can be seen as analogous to the concepts of biological evolution in that aspects of culture are subject to natural selection and other evolutionary processes. There are two prevalent approaches to cultural evolution. One approach argues that behaviors are passed or transmitted to offspring without much modification (M. Harris, 2001; Tomasello, 2009), with an emphasis on cost-benefit analysis and individual decision-makers – instead of transmitters – as driving behavioral change. Cultural evolution from this perspective occurs through unbiased transmission combined with opportunistic behavior. Individuals imitate the “idea, belief, or behavior itself” (Henrich and McElreath 2003, p. 129), because it is most attractive to the individual (Boyd 1998). For example, OB females in Woodburn began making slight modifications to their dress, which still maintained the requirements of traditional dress, simply for the sake of comfort (White-Johnson, 1982); individuals who imitated this behavior were not necessarily preferentially adopting the behavior based on the model they observed, but instead, because the cultural trait of comfort was more attractive. In effect, people solve problems they identify as important using any of the range of possible behaviors and social/technological tools available to them. Cultural transmission within this framework is really shared problem-solving strategies in which people innovate changes and/or pragmatically borrow cultural traits from each other based on their perceived utility.

The other approach focuses on social learning as the primary source of behavior acquisition and transmission (Cavalli-Sforza, 1981; Richerson & Boyd, 1992) and emphasizes biased transmission in the form of direct, prestige, or conformity bias. The underlying premise is that people do not just solve problems, but instead learn how to
complete tasks from others in systematic ways. Children faithfully learn behaviors, often before they even realize the importance of the behavior. Further, what problem solutions may seem useful are often contingent on the individual from whom the trait might be gained. The behavior of trusted individuals (e.g., parents) or high prestige individuals might be copied over superior potential solutions demonstrated by others. Several models have been created to describe the processes of cultural transmission.

Biased cultural transmission is a preferential selection of cultural traits or variants based on individual observation and assessment of the varieties they are exposed to in attempt to gain adaptive benefits (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001; Soltis, Boyd, & Richerson, 1995). While individuals imitate and adopt behaviors that meet their own goals, if these goals align with those of the cultural group at large, then individual behaviors will spread. While many anthropological examples describe cultural continuity within a physical environment (Broughton, Cannon, & Bartelink, 2010; Henrich & Henrich, 2010; Müller-Schwarze, 2006), the same strategies are significant for the proliferation of a culture in a social environment. For example, SCAK OBs who observe fasting rituals according to the holy calendar because they observe the priest doing so will maintain the pay-offs they receive from the community, and the cultural group will be sustained through population maintenance. In fact, this type of decision-making – where cultural traits are adopted based on the behaviors of a leading member is one of the most significant types of biased transmission: prestige bias.

Prestige biased transmission occurs when individuals imitate the most successful or competent model (Boyd, 1988; Boyd & Richerson, 1985; Henrich & McElreath, 2003; Soltis et al., 1995). Cultural learners, children and parents alike, assess various models
around them, observing both physical (e.g., sex, age) and cultural cues (e.g., ethnicity, skill) and decide which of these displays traits or behaviors (e.g., dress, language, food) are most likely adaptive and therefore amenable to the learner’s situation (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001; Henrich & Henrich, 2007). Success or competency in the mind of the cultural learner could relate to subsistence, fitness, or, as is the case in the example of the SCAKs above, social acceptance.

Conformity biased transmission is another model-driven strategy, where individuals imitate the most common cultural trait (Boyd, 1998; Boyd & Richerson, 1985; Soltis, Boyd & Richerson, 1995), or the trait of the majority (Henrich & McElreath, 2003). If the majority of SCAKs drink braga (homemade wine) instead of store-bought wine, then an individual who imitates the majority of models in the community will be following the conformity biased transmission strategy.

While there are some contradictions between unbiased and biased transmission, researchers tend to use combinations of both (Henrich, 2001) in order to most accurately define and analyze the processes and results of cultural evolution. In both cases, though, information acquisition is still key, and cultural changes occur with the adoption of trait mutations. These cultural traits are phenotypic expressions of genotypic variation, and those phenotypic traits that lead to increased individual survival and reproduction will be selected for and maintained through transmission from generation to generation. Put more concisely, cultural evolution theory outlines that: (a.) human culture is a phenotypic expression that affects the survival and reproduction of individuals, and therefore their genes; (b.) because human society is composed of multiple interconnected and interdependent individuals who are horizontally transmitting information along with
vertically (traditionally) transmitting information to their offspring, human adaptation is cumulative; and (c.) because human societies exist in varying environmental and social conditions, adaptation in the form of behavior also varies (Boyd & Richerson, 2005; Cavalli-Sforza, 1986).

Cultural evolution includes both individual- and group-level phenomena, because humans are social creatures that exist within a group that typically shares beliefs, norms, and expectations. While none of these mental constructs can be directly observable, individual behavior is observable and is reflective of the beliefs, norms, and expectations a cultural group holds (Efferson, Lalive, & Fehr, 2008). Within this framework, issues of altruism are particularly problematic, because individuals are often asked to contribute to the “public good” at expense of their own self-interest (Roscoe, 2009, p. 70). Sacrificing self-interest for the benefit of a group is counter-intuitive to the idea that individuals “should adopt beneficial behaviors” and reject harmful ones (Soltis, Body, & Richerson, 1995, p. 474) to increase individual fitness.

Biologically, an individual’s fitness is determined by differential reproductive success, whereby the number of surviving direct descendants and descendants from closely related collateral kin determine evolutionary success (Hamilton, 1964). Among humans, parents, the recipients of a behavioral system beneficial enough to lead to their own survival and reproduction, must continue that system through communication to their children in an attempt to ensure continued survival and reproduction (Craig Palmer & Steadman, 1997). This recurrent transmission of beneficial behavior from parent to child constitutes the development of human culture, defined here as transmitted behavior, and though it has been modified, the pattern has persisted from the time of our most
distant hominid ancestors and is a cross-cultural phenomenon (T. VanPool et al., 2008). Considering fitness alone, humans should always be more likely to associate and cooperate with kin than non-kin, therefore undermining the possibility of substantial investment of time, energy, or resources to a cultural group that includes both kin and non-kin. However, large cultural groups exist. One benefit of belonging to a cultural group is that individuals can attain goals (e.g., defense, technological advances) that they could not achieve on their own – or at least not as efficiently (Roscoe, 2009).

Within a cultural group, traditional or vertical transmission (i.e., from parent to offspring) of information is amalgamated with horizontal transmission (i.e., from peer to peer) and oblique transmission (i.e., from parent generation to non-kin offspring) (Cavalli-Sforza, 1981); advantageous information presented in the form of behaviors that are acquired from horizontal transmission are then proliferated through traditional transmission (T. VanPool et al., 2008). Individual learners within cultural groups, then, are inundated with information from numerous sources, and must be able to “pay attention to and store” vertically (i.e., from parent to child), horizontally (i.e., within peer groups), and obliquely (i.e., from unrelated member of the parent generation to a member of the child’s generation) transmitted behaviors that are potentially adaptive by giving preference to behaviors that are relevant to their fitness, possible to implement, and compatible with their individual goals (Henrich, 2009, p. 245). This continual process of social learning and hierarchically sorting and storing information for future transmission leads to the “possibility of cumulative, non-genetic evolution” (Boyd & Richerson, 2009, p. 3281) and refined adaptation to particular physical environments that occurs at a much faster rate than genetic evolution. The speed and efficiency of accumulative human
adaptation also means that different cultural groups are able to independently adapt to their particular environments (Boyd & Richerson, 2009).

The differential survival and proliferation of cultural groups with varying accumulative traits is termed cultural group selection (Henrich, 2009; Soltis et al., 1995). Much like individual genetic evolution, in order for beneficial attributes to spread, cultural group selection requires variation between groups that directly affects the proliferation of a given group and transmission of group variations to subsequent generations. While genetic variation is not likely prone to group selection, cultural variation is more likely to be affected by group selection, which may explain the development of common and expansive human cooperation in comparison to other species (Soltis et al., 1995).

The mechanism for cultural group selection is, in essence, behavioral variation at the individual-level, which gives rise to differentiation between groups, and those persistent inter-group differences ultimately result in rapid cultural evolution (Soltis, Boyd and Richerson 1995; Boyd and Richerson 2009). As cultural groups develop suites of traits (e.g., practices, ideologies, beliefs) that promote cooperation, some groups will become more adaptively competitive than others. Cooperation requires costly behavior that benefits both the performer and the recipient. Individuals typically exhibit costly cooperation behaviors with expectations of future returns, and groups with more cooperative individuals – and therefore a greater degree of cooperation at the group-level – are selected for over less cooperative groups (Boyd & Richerson, 2009). When groups with higher or lower degrees of cooperative strategies come into contact, cultural group selection can occur through one or more of several processes (Fig. 4.1):
1. Direct competition: cultural groups with advanced cooperation strategies, based on language, “integrated sets of beliefs, practices and values that organize social interactions” (Henrich, 2009, p. 253) out-compete and subsequently eliminate or absorb other less cooperatively competitive groups (Abrams & Strogatz, 2003).

2. Demographic influence: more cooperatively competitive groups attract migrants from competitively inferior groups through exposure to a higher frequency of “cultural bearers” (Henrich, 2009, p. 253).

3. Preferential imitation: cultural groups “stuck at less group-beneficial equilibrium” imitate the behaviors they observe in groups with higher competitive capabilities that display more significant benefits for group members (Henrich, 2009, p. 253).

Selective phenomena operating on cultural groups are recursive in that inter-group competition results in the “spread of behaviours that enhance [the] competitive ability” (Boyd and Richerson 2009, p. 3281) of more adaptively agile groups that is then driven by differential group success. Furthermore, cultural groups that promote “in-group cooperation and out-group competitiveness” through costly acts and “credibility enhancing displays” (Henrich 2009, p. 249) of beliefs are also significantly more successful in spreading “belief-ritual packages” (Henrich 2009, p. 255). In all, cultural group selection is driven by inter-group variation, but it can also maintain differences between groups with strong influences of individual-level biased cultural transmission (Soltis et al., 1995).
Figure 4.1. Three processes of cultural group selection

In the "Demographic Influence" process, migrants from less competitively cooperative groups are drawn toward more competitively cooperative groups; in the "Direct Competition" process, more competitively cooperative groups overtake less competitively cooperative groups and either eliminate or absorb them; in the "Preferential Imitation" process, cultural groups adopt the behavior of more competitively cooperative groups.

The process of cultural evolution itself is also recursive in that individual decisions and behavior affect group-level dynamics, which in turn affects individual behavior (Fig 4.2). Rapid cultural evolution results in vast genetic variability, and natural selection in those groups favor genes that increase “pro-social motives” (Boyd & Richerson 2009, p. 3281); for instance, shame and guilt increase the probability of normative compliance. Biased cultural transmission, where cultural learners weigh the various behaviors presented to them and make effectively charged choices to adopt those behaviors that are most likely adaptively beneficial, is a significant factor for pro-social behavior (Dolitsky & Kuz'mina, 1986; Henrich, 2009). Additionally, reproductive success increases for individuals who function well within social group bounds of moral systems, sanctions, and rewards; therefore, fitness is both a reflection and result of sanctions and rewards.
Through the process of cultural evolution discussed above, “culture leverages individual creativity” (Boyd & Richerson 2009, p. 3282), because small innovations accumulate over generations and are maintained through high-fidelity transmission. However, for this research, it is the lack of innovation that allowed for OB survival in socially intrusive environments. Significantly, cultural transmission is not an event, but a process that requires time and practice to master complex factors involved in suites of behavior (C. VanPool, 2008). Similarly, the absence of change is also an active process, not a passive state, because it, too, takes time and practice (Craig Palmer, 2008). The intense investment required for high-fidelity transmission is most conducive to traditional transmission; the creation and maintenance of human social environments requires individuals to convince descendants to imitate them and cooperate with other kin (Craig Palmer, 2008), and the intimate long-standing relationship between parents and children is the most accommodating for successful sustained transmission of cultural behavior.
In pre-industrial societies, traditional transmission was predominant. Horizontal transmission was significant for cultural groups, but it only persisted through traditional transmission. However, in industrial societies, horizontal transmission has gained more social capital; currently observable individual behavior may be a reflection of traditional transmission, creativity, or borrowing, without mutually exclusivity. However, traditional transmission remains the central link between genes, language, and other cultural traits (T. VanPool et al., 2008). Traditional societies (i.e., focused on traditional transmission) that remain intact in the post-industrial revolution era, like the OBs, are a more accurate representation of human prehistory than innovative societies (Craig Palmer, 2008) and can therefore offer clearer insight into the particular mechanisms of cultural change and continuity.

Social scientists have long studied the process of cultural change, which can dramatically impact human populations. Cultural adaptation can be a quick process for humans because it is cumulative, and because it is transmitted in a number of different ways, numerous models for cultural change have been developed (Eerkens & Lipo, 2007). However, in the case of the OBs, it is their resistance to social change that is most interesting; non-innovation (i.e., reduced introduction of cultural variation) has the evolutionary benefit of selection favoring individuals who could create large kin-based social networks through traditional transmission of culture (Palmer 2008). OBs fit this model of combining non-innovation with traditional transmission. Old Belief stresses the importance of conspicuous displays of membership; OBs work to separate themselves geographically and socially from surrounding society; and OBs typically have large families (Dolitsky & Kuz'mina, 1986). Large, interconnected and easily recognizable
families, as well as a high-fidelity transmission of language and other culture phenotypes, may have helped keep OBs bounded despite the difficulties they faced in maintaining traditional cultural continuity in the midst of intense persecution and an innovation-based society.

When compared to cultural change, cultural continuity, in which cultural information is transmitted with great fidelity between generations, has been far less studied. Cultural continuity is often considered less interesting than change, typically because researchers assume that cultural continuity is expected unless something causes behavioral change (e.g., environmental change, technological discovery). Anthropological research has demonstrated this is not the case, though. Social pressures do influence behavior horizontally, particularly in the globalized context of the 21st-century, and cultural traits are often modified because of incomplete learning, intentional innovation, and mistakes, along with a host of other reasons. However, it is traditional transmission that has the most significant effect on the continuation of behavior within a cultural context (C. VanPool, 2008). Cultural continuity only occurs when explicit care ensures faithful intergenerational cultural transmission; following this perspective, small traditional societies are more likely to exhibit continuity through an emphasis on high-fidelity traditional transmission of behaviors.

A central key to cultural continuity is that sustained close contact influenced by cooperation allows the transmission of difficult tasks that require extensive time and commitment to master allows for cultural proliferation. Differences in the transmitted behavior lead to the maintenance of distinct ethnicity (i.e., traditions) such as what we see in modern American society. Beyond decision-making behaviors by cultural learners,
cultural continuity is also driven by hierarchy and retribution – as dominance behaviors – reputation, and third-party sanctions (Boyd, Gintis, Bowles, & Richerson, 2003; Boyd & Richerson, 2009; Fehr & Gächter, 2002; Hochberg, 2004) maintain the “shared moral systems that specify the rights and duties of individuals” (Boyd & Richerson, 2009, p. 3281). Altruistic policing or punishing, where individuals who deviate from normative behaviors of the cultural group or adopt deviations are denied resources, cooperation or even group membership, is a necessary component of cultural continuity (Boyd et al., 2003; Fehr & Gächter, 2002) and matches the historical record for OBs, who ostracized individuals who deviated from normative behaviors. Without the possibility of sanctions against non-cooperative members, cultural groups would continually tolerate defectors, and deviant cultural traits could lead to a break in cultural continuity (Fehr & Gächter, 2002).

The established hierarchy of a cultural group determines policing strategies. Often in small independent groups, self-policing is based on a nested system of similarly organized sub-groups (Gellner, 2000; Roscoe, 2009) (Fig 4.3), where each sub-group maintains similar strategies of self-policing. Similar to the group as a whole, sub-groups, particularly in small societies like the SCAK OBs, can be individual family units that bond together into larger coalitions (Gellner, 2000) for protection against outsiders and assurance of cultural continuity. Coalitions of sub-groups resemble the sub-groups themselves, and each sub-group resembles each other, which allows for a fluid hierarchical and lateral maintenance of cultural continuity.
Altruistic punishment of defectors and self-policing at multiple levels leads to structured similarities in behavior. However, in order for a culture to maintain continuity, there must also be a system in place for community regeneration through readmittance and recruitment (Goode, 2004; Hochberg, 2004). Readmittance and conversion can require a wide range of rites depending on the culture, from public display or sacrifice to much more intense puberty rituals, that clearly signal to group members an individual’s loyalty (Alexander, Giesen, & Mast, 2006; Gellner, 2000; Lutkehaus & Roscoe, 2013; Nas, 2002). Such rites and rituals also serve to enhance cultural continuity in the future through recurrent biased transmission and restraint strategies from sub-groups or coalitions of sub-groups.
Despite social dynamics and individual decision-making that lead to cultural continuity, varying degrees of continuity breakdown do occur simply through changing resources, copying errors, or environmental necessity (e.g., the environmentally required use of mechanized farming implements by OBs in Brazil). Cultural change and continuity are both relevant to the current state of the SCAK OB community, and both are affected by what information is transmitted from person to person and the relative importance individuals place on different types of transmission. While materialist Durkheimian and Marxist approaches considered the social pressures exerted from peers either for cohesion or separation as the primary driving force of social behavior (Bird & Smith, 2005; Gellner, 2000), more contemporary discussions include approaches focused on both horizontal transmission, in the form of social pressures (Gellner, 2000; Nettle, 1999), as well as vertical or oblique transmission that facilitates the continuation of cultural traits over many generations (T. VanPool et al., 2008). Disruption of cultural continuity can result from both in-group and out-group complications, with variable intensity from either source. For instance, in-group-based continuity breakdown can occur simply from population decline (Soltis et al., 1995), or from more vigorous processes, such as dissent or “death or incarceration of the leader” (Sosis & Bressler, 2003, p. 221). Significantly for the OBs, common events that cause continuity disruption, such as persecution, economic failure and the death of a leader (Sosis & Bressler, 2003) have historically served to bolster their cultural continuity.

A more substantial issue for OBs may be “cultural meltdown” (Hochberg 2004, p. S313), whereby there is a reduced selection against deviant markers that leads to reduced cooperation, a decreasing capacity for resolving problems that interrupts collective
actions of the cultural group, and membership loss (Hochberg 2004; Sosis and Bressler 2003). OBs as a whole have distinct cultural markers that have served to support cultural continuity over hundreds of years (discussed in Costly Signaling below); however, if these markers are subject to weak selection, they become “subject to loss or substitution” that, without “stabilizing reactions,” could lead to “many or most of a culture’s identifiers” being lost forever, and the culture itself being caught in the vortex of cultural meltdown (Hochberg, 2004, p. S313).

In order for cultural meltdown to gain traction in a culture, several conditions must be met. First, individuals must be frequently exposed to deviations of traditional cultural traits. Second, deviant cultural traits must accumulate within an individual’s repertoire, and third, these deviations must spread throughout the cultural group through any of the transmission processes discussed above. Exposure to cultural traits that deviate from traditional ones and any resultant cultural meltdown can be due to preferential social learning or the actions of aggressive neighbors (Soltis et al., 1995). With technological and communication advances that increase and globalize, deviations can be introduced at a higher frequency, which then increases the threat of cultural meltdown (Hochberg, 2004). Using this insight, it is possible to apply cultural evolution theory to the general case of refugees and immigrants interacting within their larger cultural context.

Cultural Evolution and Immigrant Responses

The term globalization is often associated with economic and financial market interdependence, and global media. The effects of globalization on everyday lives is less clear than on corporations or labor markets (Vasta, 2010), but a significant concern is that
globalization may be increasing the speed and frequency of cultural meltdown and shifts toward homogeneity (Hochberg, 2004; Vasta, 2010). Within the context of globalization, cultural change is “driven principally by prestige-based imitation” (Hochberg, 2004, p. S314); when members of a culture are exposed to members or institutions (e.g., virtual media, internet) of another larger/more prestigious culture, the result can be the adoption and spread of homologous cultural traits representative of the dominant culture.

Following the “techno-science revolution” that began 30-50 years ago (Vasta, 2010, p. 511), the time-and energy-intensive process of cultural continuity has been challenged by mass media and personalized technological devices that bring “many hitherto separate groups into contact” (Vasta, 2010, p. 512) and present cultural learners with more easily accessible cultural trait variations that they must weigh along with all other transmitted behaviors.

A significant aspect of cultural continuity, which was particularly advantageous in human prehistory, is that “cultural transmission is both reflected in and a result of daily behavior” (C. VanPool, 2008, p. 200). When traditional cultural groups are embedded in 21st-century globalized social environments, members are faced with many choices about what their daily behavior will consist of, and individual decisions may more directly, or at least more quickly, influence the balance of cultural continuity and change. In “culturally plural societies” (Berry, 1992, p. 72) like the United States, cultural groups, and their members are confronted with two essential questions (Fig. 4.4) concerning adaptation:
1. Is traditional culture valuable, and should therefore be maintained?

2. Are relationships with the surrounding society important, and should therefore be pursued?

Decisions regarding these questions not only affect whether or not — or how — individuals participate in adaptation, but also influence individuals’ views of personal and ethnic identity.

Figure 4.4. Determining value of cultural and surrounding societies

Figure 4.4. Members of traditional cultural groups embedded in non-traditional societies are faced with making two significant decisions that can directly and quickly affect cultural continuity: whether their own culture or the surrounding culture is of more value. (Figure adapted from Berry, 1997.)
Outcome behavior based on these adaptive strategies can affect the cultural continuity of a cultural group overall, but regardless of whether or not cultural continuity is maintained, and high-fidelity transmission of traditional cultural traits continues, there typically still remains a threshold of individual variation within the cultural group (Berry, 1997), instead of behavior approaching uniformity. Culturally plural societies, then, position traditional cultural groups within a radically different arena than the sparsely populated regions inhabited by traditional groups of human prehistory.

In this 21\textsuperscript{st}-century arena, traditionalist individuals (i.e., individuals within traditional groups) and groups have three adaptive strategies to consider when interacting with surrounding society: adjustment, reaction, and withdrawal (Berry, 1997). Using adjustment, traditionalist individuals behave in a way that brings them into congruence with their social environment, while reaction is a retaliation against the social environment, and withdrawal “reduces pressures from the environment” through “removal of the group or individual from the adaptive arena” (Berry, 1997, p. 71). A corresponding phenomenon to adaptive strategies are acculturative strategies that are available to individuals and groups following sustained cultural contact with a surrounding dominant society. Acculturative strategies include assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization, each of which carries distinct balances of toleration and rejection of external cultural traits (Fig. 4.5).

1. Assimilation: The traditional cultural group is absorbed into the dominant society. Under this strategy, there is a high level of cultural learning along with a high level of “culture shedding” (Berry 1997, p. 73). Putting this in terms of cultural evolution, cultural traits from the dominant society are
preferred over most or all traditional traits as a result of prestige bias (i.e., wanting to mimic high-prestige individuals) or conformity bias (i.e., wanting to blend in with the population).

2. Integration: The traditional group balances some toleration of the dominant society (i.e., some amount of adjustment), as a means of becoming an integral part of that society, with varying levels of cultural continuity (i.e., some amount of resistance). Using this strategy, there is still significant cultural learning for members of the cultural group; however, there is reduced cultural shedding. Again, placing this strategy within a framework of cultural evolution, there is more limited prestige and conformity bias, which is probably especially pronounced in highly visible, public displays that are important for signaling membership in the larger culture; there is likely also significant reliance on vertical transmission and oblique transmission from elders within the traditional community for many traits.

3. Separation: The traditional group maintains traditional cultural traits while resisting or rejecting full participation in the structure or framework of the dominant society. Using this strategy, both cultural learning and shedding are insignificant. Within the cultural evolutionary framework, transmission from outside the group is rejected in favor of transmission within the group, especially vertical and oblique transmission.

4. Marginalization: Traditional groups, either by choice or force, are separated from both their traditional culture and the dominant society, and under these circumstances, both cultural learning and shedding are at the lowest levels.
When this strategy is implemented, horizontal transmission from the dominant culture is rendered largely or completely impossible, and transmission is limited within the group, especially for traits that require extended period of time and labor to master.

Figure 4.5. Acculturative strategies

Figure 4.5. Members of traditional groups, or groups themselves have a number of acculturative strategies available to them when facing long-term contact with a dominant society. Each of the four strategies displayed here is a result of a member’s or groups’ evaluation of the value they place on maintaining traditional cultural traits and establishing a productive relationship with the surrounding dominant society. These strategies can be adopted in full or in combination with other strategies. Furthermore, each strategy can be adopted to varying degrees depending on the amount of value placed on traditional culture and dominant society.
Assimilation and integration strategies are typically accompanied by low levels of conflict, since cultural group members accept features of the dominant society and are accepted, to differing degrees, by that society. However, the likelihood of conflict rises considerably with separation and marginalization strategies, because these strategies are much more focused on resisting or completely rejecting cultural features of the dominant society, which is then reciprocated by the dominant society.

Outcome behaviors depend on the strategy, or combination of strategies, used by traditionalist individuals/cultural groups. While the assimilation strategy is accompanied by “substantial behavioural change,” the separation strategy results in a “reaffirmation” of traditional group heritage and cultural traits (Berry, 1997, p. 74). Particularly interesting for the SCAK OBs, the integration strategy is accompanied by selective cultural learning from both the traditional culture and the dominant society. The combination of cultural traits under integration may be manifested in the use of one suite of behaviors in the public domain and another in the private domain, and the selection of cultural features may be directly linked to differential adoption of adaptively beneficial traits. The relationship between these acculturative strategies and their resultant outcome behaviors are not deterministic, but rather probabilistic – they are “likely to occur but are not fixed” (Berry 1997, p. 74) synchronically or diachronically.

An important consideration within this context is costly signaling, an outgrowth of evolutionary analysis that focuses on the signaling of traits that entail some form of evolutionary cost. In the context of refugee/immigrant interaction with the dominant culture, costly signals may be very important in the context of integration and separation when members of traditional groups want to emphasize the importance of – and their
dedication to – continuing traditional lifeways, as was the case for the SCAK OBs at the point of their immigration to the U.S.

**Costly Signaling**

Costly signaling theory is based on consolidating approaches to social behavior that focus on symbolism and social capital. The principle is that individuals signal their ability to survive and reproduce through specific overt behaviors that otherwise bear evolutionary costs. Despite the apparent cost, costly signals benefit both signaler and recipient by providing a low-effort assessment of the signaler’s qualities and intentions (Bird & Smith, 2005; Gintis, Smith, & Bowles, 2001; Eric Alden Smith, 2000). This concept can be illustrated using Zahavi’s handicap principle (1975), which explains that an individual’s phenotypic display draws attention to individuals with high genotypic quality, and interprets cultural phenomena within the framework of what individuals will gain from behaving in certain ways.

Typically, Zahavi’s argument is exemplified through a male peacock being robust enough to carry heavy and colorful plumage as a signal to females that he is healthy, and his offspring will therefore also likely be healthy. What is particularly attractive about the peacock example is its obvious support of two aspects of costly signaling: (a.) signals convey honest and reliable information about the signaler, (b.) the cost of signals is correlated with the quality of information being displayed (Gintis et al., 2001; Eric Alden Smith & Bird, 2000). The physical ability to bear the weight of heavy plumage cannot be dishonestly faked, and fuller more colorful plumage is a direct communication of health and virility. Although envisioning costly signaling is often more straightforward in non-
human species or physical traits, the same concept is readily applicable to abstract features of human culture.

Costly signals among humans typically require much time and effort to perfect in addition to sacrifice of physical resources (Barclay, 2013; Kantner & Vaughn, 2012; Sosis & Alcorta, 2003a). In the case of the OBs, conspicuous displays of membership, both material and non-material, indicate to community members and prospective cooperators the signaler’s reputation conformity and cooperation potential. However, the utility and recipient of the costly signal may differ based on which acculturative strategy (Berry, 1997) is implemented. For instance, under the separation strategy, costly signaling may indicate to individuals within the immigrant community the commitment and loyalty of the signaler to the immigrant group and the traditional cultural framework. In contrast, costly signaling in an integrative or assimilation strategy may signal the commitment and loyalty of the signaler to the newly adopted cultural group and framework – although some possibly less widely visible costly signals might remain focused on signaling in-group commitment in an integrative context.

Costly signaling certainly is not the only or even a primary motivation for individual behavior, but in coordination with theoretical approaches to cultural evolution and cultural continuity, costly signaling is an appropriate and significant approach in immigrant communities like the SCAK OB community where members of immigrant groups are likely evaluating each other constantly for evidence of cultural change and potential group defection; this is not to say that any apparent accommodation of the dominant cultural system will necessarily be punished or even criticized within an immigrant community. Instead, individuals will be expected to continue costly displays
so long as they are advantageous. When cultural changes occur that render them moot (i.e., full cultural assimilation or marginalization) then the behavior will likely be dropped quickly for the reason that it is costly.

As mentioned above, continual, faithful replication of cultural traits including conspicuous displays of membership in *OB* communities can be viewed as an active process instead of a simple lack of meaningful behavioral change (Craig Palmer, 2008). For instance, *OBs* who are easily recognizable as committed group members, as an extension of kin, may be more likely to cooperate with other easily recognizable *OBs*. This costly signal would thus have the benefit of helping to identify the strength of individuals and their cooperative bonds with the group. Historically, especially in times of economic uncertainty or social environments that are intolerant of diversity, *OBs* have survived through intensive and expansive cooperation. Conceivably, conspicuous displays of membership not only reflect commitment, then, but also indicate a willingness to cooperate with extensive social networks.

Costly signaling is also strengthened with the addition of credibility enhancing displays (Henrich, 2009) that positively affect an individual’s reputation within a group and therefore lead to greater influence within that cultural group. The human capacity for cultural learning and willingness to adopt and commit to transmitted signals may have actually been considerably influenced by credibility enhancing displays in that individuals weigh signals combined with credibility enhanced displays more heavily than signals alone (Henrich, 2009). The weight or amount of selection for cultural traits affects continuity and change in cultural groups, and the relationship between cultural traits in general – and costly signals specifically – reveals that the adoption of costly
signals “can arbitrate whether a culture persists in its ideal state, tolerates deviations among its members” (Hochberg, 2004, p. S313) or declines into meltdown.

Under high selection, cultural learners give great weight to costly signals, and individuals who adopt novel markers have relatively little influence on the cultural group as a whole. Under low selection, the opposite phenomenon occurs, with little weight given to costly signals, and waves of novel markers slowly infiltrating the entire cultural group. However, under intermediate selection, both costly signals and novel markers are equally weighted; this process of selection triggers the entire population to continually tolerate the load of novel markers; concomitant with the toleration and inevitable adoption of these novel external markers is the loss of weighted costly displays of membership (Hochberg, 2004). The potential variability in selection of costly signals parallels the fact that costly signaling is not consistent over time; it can change dramatically and quickly because of innovation (Bird & Smith, 2005). For instance, after just one generation in the United States, the esteem OBs gave fine-quality hand-made goods was replaced with the innovation of machine-made goods. Change in costly signals can be a result of any transmission strategy. Preference for machine-made goods was most likely the effect of a more neutral direct transmission; however, the impetus for changes in costly signals, as well as the absence of change, can also be based on “differential replication of information” (Bird and Smith, 2005, p. 233) that would be closely linked with cultural evolution and continuity.

Instead of difficult identification of asocial members, costly signaling, which is dependent on in-group favoritism and communicates deep commitment to group-level ideologies, allows individuals to easily identify others with whom they can form alliances
through cooperation (Gintis et al., 2001; Henrich, 2004a) that are. While costly signaling is often coupled with traditional groups in isolated regions of developing countries, “attenuated forms” (Roscoe, 2009, p. 107) of costly signaling also exist in modern industrial states and allow cultural groups to maintain continuity in the midst of other groups without archetypal costly signals (Roscoe, 2009). A common and meaningful ideology among cultural groups is religion and its associated rituals, the most effective of which make use of imitation and various transmission strategies (Henrich, 2004b). Along with costly signaling, altruistic punishment, nested coalitions, and most importantly, traditional transmission, shared religious beliefs promote prosocial behavior and social solidarity (Henrich, 2004a; Roscoe, 2009; Sosis & Alcorta, 2003b) that result in continuity. OB costly signaling is manifested through two communal attributes: religion and language. Both of these aspects of culture augment cultural evolution and support costly signaling.

Religion

Religion is universal, perhaps because it is a fundamental element of sociality for humans (Sosis & Bressler, 2003). Religion may promote the collective attainment of goals through the coordination of individuals, which in turn retains practitioners in the community, and the maintenance of group solidarity and continuity (Durkheim, 1912; M. Harris, 1970). Although discussions of potential benefits and functions of religion are interesting and necessary, the “fuzzy boundaries” (Irons, 2006, p. 296) of religious belief are impossible to quantify; instead, the most effective means of studying religion from within a scientific methodology is through systematically evaluating shared symbols that
are replicated over space and time (Steadman & Palmer, 1995; C. S. VanPool, VanPool, & Phillips Jr, 2007).

Ritual, a succession of discrete elements in a particular sequence is but one component of religion. However, it may in fact be what offers most support to the reason for a functional explanation of the existence of religion in cultural groups (Wallace, 1966). Ritual is also a functional form of communication (Sosis & Bressler, 2003). The verbal and social communicative effects of ritual has a place in both individual-centered and group-centered perspectives of cultural evolution, particularly when considering traditional transmission. Religious behavior, in the form of talk about the supernatural, is an adaptively advantageous signal, because individuals who are successful in convincing children to accept religious claims are more likely to increase their direct and inclusive fitness (Steadman & Palmer, 1995). Furthermore, children’s adherence to their parents’ religious claims leads to successive generations of individuals who are adapted to their environment in a way that continues the process of survival and reproduction. With this type of descendant-leaving strategy, those behaviors that result in inclusive fitness along with the survival and reproduction of direct descendants will be selected for (Craig Palmer, 2008).

Various forms of transmission also encourage group-level adaptation through adherence to religious behavior. The unification of the group through religious behaviors and rituals averts asocial motivation (Purzycki & Sosis, 2009) and increases cooperation and solidarity (Sosis & Bressler, 2003; Wilson, 2002). In fact, selective pressures favoring the evolution of human capacities for belief may have selected for religion as a universal prosocial strategy (Irons, 2001), which may very well be “the primary adaptive
benefit of religion” (Sosis & Bressler 2003, p. 211), as it solidifies a cultural group that is subject to natural selection in its social and natural environments thereby increasing the selective advantage of competition (Wilson, 2002) compared to other groups.

Costly signaling through conspicuous displays of religiosity are similar to other signaling behaviors of culture (e.g., ritual scarification, adornment) as they demonstrate the signaler’s loyalty and commitment to the cultural group. Common to many religions, and particularly salient for the OBs, are costly signals involving religious taboos, or constraints, and ritual obligations (Irons, 2001; Sosis & Bressler, 2003). Not only do these obligations and constraints “assuage collective action problems by promoting commitment and loyalty to others who share these beliefs” (Sosis & Bressler 2003, p. 213), but they also allow other members to monitor and evaluate the sincerity of the signaler (Irons, 1996).

While costly signaling commitment to a cultural group in general requires time and effort that may not be related to basic survival needs or reproduction, or decreases efficiency and out-group interaction, costly signals specific to religion tend to be more honed toward restraint of “somatic or reproductive goals” (Sosis & Bressler 2003, p. 219). Religious costly signals may include “attending long boring rituals” (Henrich, 2004, p. 249), or can be more formally operationalized as in Table 4.1 (adapted from Sosis & Bressler, 2003, p. 220). These costly behaviors require sacrifice on the part of group members in the form of stigmatization, heavily regulated social interaction with outsiders (Sosis & Bressler, 2003), or pointed reduction in fitness. The obligations and requirements of religious cultural groups vary with regard to number and intensity. Significantly, though, constraints initiated by religious groups are closely interrelated
Table 4.1. Operationalization of religious constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrition</th>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Hairstyle</td>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td></td>
<td>Out-group interaction</td>
<td>Use or ownership of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processed food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Religious costly signals can be operationalized by constraints in particular categories (Adapted from Sosis and Bressler, 2003). For the OBs, operationalization for constraints on nutrition, appearance, relationships, and information would include the variables in this table.

with longevity of the group, as are the number of costly requirements, most likely because the intensity and quantity of these costly signals increases member commitment (Henrich, 2004a; Sosis & Alcorta, 2003b).

Because religious behavior, on the part of individuals, groups, or both, is a discernable trait, it can signal the introduction and subsequent communal acceptance and proliferation of specific – but abstract – ideologies that influence cooperation and adaptation (Purzycki & Sosis, 2009). Although any of a number of theoretical approaches can be used to explain religious behavior, caution must be used in relying too heavily on a single approach; fully understanding the purpose and function of religion is difficult if the onus for explanation is placed on one perspective (Sosis & Alcorta, 2003a). For instance, there exist overt and costly religious behaviors (e.g., fasts, material culture) in the SCAK OB community that signal across peer groups and generations acceptance of a system that unifies the community as well as historically meeting their need to define their “universe of relationships” and maintain control over their traditional lives (Dolitsky & Kuz'mina, 1986). However, another costly signal for SCAK OBs is the
maintenance of two languages (i.e., Russian and Old Church Slavonic), which are closely tied to OB religion, but also to their socio-political environment as immigrants in the United States.

**Language**

Linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistic perspectives of language focus on the interaction between language and a particular cultural context (Gumperz, 1977; Hymes, 1974; Labov, 1972). The predominant focus of such studies is language change, including how language occurs, how language attrition can be reversed, and which languages are endangered (Blount & Sanches, 1977; Labov, 2001; Lippi-Green, 1989; Mufwene, 2004). However, just as with cultural continuity, in the case of the OBs, it is their language maintenance despite intense pressure for acculturation that is most significant. Because continuing active use of a minority language requires a large investment of time and effort, it may be likely that concentrated focus on language maintenance is central to preserving other cultural traits. Furthermore, because the OBs emphasize the importance of continuing traditional behavior, and because they continue to use Old Church Slavonic (OCS) as their primary liturgical language (Barabtarlo, 2011; Robson, 1993; Thompson, 2001), the rate of language change within their communities could be slower than usually expected.

The fundamental components of language are universal and innate (Chomsky, 1965); it is culture-specific structures that are variable and influenced by cultural behavior (Gumperz, 1977; Hymes, 1974; Pinker, 1994). Just as with other aspects of culture, both internal and external forces affect language maintenance or change (Charles D. Yang, 2001), which can be defined as variation between generations of speakers,
where children acquire a different grammar than their parents and provide a different paradigm for subsequent generations. There are myriad ways to explain language change – or lack thereof – although the identification of causes for grammar variation, and the interaction between those causes is necessary (Charles D Yang, 2000). For example, in the *triggering model*, language learners give more or less value to one language paradigm based on its ability to analyze incoming linguistic cues (Charles D Yang, 2000, p. 232).

Another approach, the *later loss hypothesis*, concentrates on language change due to critical decline of speech partners over time (Sasse, 1992a). Considering that universal grammar is fixed, the differential weight of grammars given particular language environments (e.g., time, place) being the most essential influencer of change or stasis is rational. In addition, this focus on external pressures for language adaptation fits with perspectives of cultural evolution, where language acquisition is the result of competition between populations of languages, or grammars (Charles D Yang, 2000) and language learners who adopt more adaptively beneficial linguistic parameters are more likely to succeed. Overall, as with natural selection, heterogeneity is a prerequisite for language change; “once the homogeneity is punctured” (Charles D Yang, 2001, p. 241) the language dynamics of a cultural group can be modified. The opposite is also true: if homogeneity of language is preserved, or the language at risk of changing is accorded prestige and ultimately traditionally transmitted, language change is avoided.

Significantly for the *OBs*, the “distribution of grammars changes as an adaptive response to the linguistic evidence in the environment” (Charles D Yang, 2001, p. 234), so the *SCAK OBs’* tolerance level of external influences directly affects the propensity for language maintenance.
Language is a conspicuous signal of group membership that has “virtually unlimited complexity” (Boyd & Richerson, 2009, p. 3281). It can be costly, as is the case with the OBs, or generally low-cost when compared with other cultural traits at large (Boyd & Richerson, 2009; Henrich, 2004a). One potential with language as a signal, however, is that it can be easily faked compared to religious signals, which means that a speaker can say one thing and behave in a manner contradictory to their verbal communication; this circumstance would exploit other cultural group members who are open to behavior modification as well as potentially increasing the fitness of the manipulative speaker (Henrich, 2004a). Prior to the evolution of sophisticated symbolic communication through language, learners had to observe the actions of their models in order to acquire behavior. Under these circumstances, exploitation was minimal. Post-language evolution, “mental representations (e.g., beliefs)” exposed opportunities for “Machiavellian manipulators” to dramatically increase his or her own fitness through “well-designed culturally transmitted mind viruses” (Henrich 2004, p. 247, italics not in original). Therefore, the manipulative speaker disguises asocial motivation, and gains from the cultural group without contributing. Such free-riding behavior can be limited, though, through cultural systems “linking contributions to collective action and benefits at the individual level” (Roscoe, 2009, p. 102).

In embedded cultural groups with more conspicuous social signals, individuals and subgroups that utilize honest linguistic symbols receive more pay-offs and reduce social sanctions against themselves. Language paired with another cultural behavior, with both cultural traits being socially motivated, makes individuals more prestigious and valuable as allies (Roscoe, 2009; Eric A Smith & Bliege Bird, 2005). In the Yangoru
Boiken of New Guinea, individuals tempted to free-ride reduced their likelihood of reproductive, subsistence and security rewards from the group and “eroded their reputation for strength,” instead gaining reputation of being weak (Roscoe, 2009, p. 103). For the OBs, free-riding through language is much more difficult because the language-behavior pairing is not focused on semantics, but separate grammars (i.e., Russian, OCS, and English). Language as a signal for OBs is therefore costly, and works in their circumstance as a parallel to the cost and weight of religious signals.

OBs learn OCS along with Russian that is spoken in the home. The combination of learning both languages and mastering the social norms prescribed by Old Belief requires significant time and effort, which OBs demonstrate through placing as much emphasis on language as on culture (Robson, 1993). Though OBs have generally managed language maintenance for the past 300 years, the rate of language change or variation can vary drastically due to social pressures of language contact, because languages are usurped based on “prestige-based imitation” (Hochberg, 2004, p. S315). Migration and differences in sociocultural environments can result in language innovation in younger generations, or when two available grammars are given differential weights by different generations (Charles D Yang, 2000). Because of the combination of these complex and interacting phenomena, for refugees and immigrants to industrialized Westernized countries, prestige-based language change is difficult to avoid.

Immigration

Although discussion about individual- and group-level beneficial adaptation behaviors often focuses primarily on interactions with physical environments, variable social environments are particularly salient for this research on the OBs. In general,
people tend to imitate successful neighbors (Boyd & Richerson, 2005; Henrich & Gil-White, 2001; McElreath et al., 2005) at both individual- and group-levels. For refugees and immigrants, cultural evolution is a constant as it is for every cultural group, but social pressures from the dominant society further encourage imitation and acquisition of behaviors thereby skewing or expediting evolutionary processes. Discourse about diversity seems to be increasing; however, conflicting ideologies of solidarity and diversity remain, with immigrants and ethnic minorities more generally still being regarded as out-groups who are expected to integrate (Vasta, 2010).

Immigrant families arriving before WWII had – in general – relatively little education, were lower class, and had little awareness of their national heritage (Fishman, 1966b). Following social justice movements of the 1960s and 1970s in Western Europe and the United States that celebrated diversity, there was a return to the concept that immigrant and minoritized populations could threaten national identity and solidarity (Vasta, 2010). As a result of “assimilationist discourse dominated by a desire for ethnic and religious homogeneity” (Vasta, 2010, p. 515), assimilation policies have been developed in many countries, and pressure – if not policies themselves – exists in the United States. Placing the duty of integration on refugees and immigrants has maintained the ongoing pattern of complete assimilation among immigrant groups within just a few generations (Alba, 2005b; Gellner, 2000; Vasta, 2010; Waters & Jiménez, 2005). The same fear of diversity leading to loss of social cohesion and individual identity with their heritage was prevalent enough in Woodburn to prompt the establishment of the SCAK community.
Even with the development of centralized industrialized states, “elements of small-scale social organization persist” (Roscoe, 2009, p. 107); although many cultural groups are dramatically modified in structure and member roles, the OBs exemplify this persistence in a more literal fashion, because they have maintained social organization more closely paralleling that of pre-industrial small-scale cultures. Traditional forms of social signaling also often decline in industrialized societies (Roscoe, 2009), but cohesive cultural groups remain aware of in-group requirements. For instance, members of small independent cultural groups in the Middle East who move to urban areas continue to claim group membership but are considered fraudulent by the group as a whole for their lack of appropriate signaling (Gellner, 2000). Often, subtle markers (e.g., non-public rituals, mannerisms) are the only differentiation between neighboring – or embedded – cultures, and these markers “may influence social behaviors,” “augment group cohesion,” and “channel reproductive preferences” (Hochberg, 2004, p. S313). Language may or may not be considered a subtle marker, depending on the perspective of both hearers and speakers; however, it is a clear distinction between OBs and their American neighbors, as well as a cultural trait that is overtly affected by pressures for assimilation.

The rate of contact-induced language change is highly variable; in fact, significant language change can be seen in as little as a single generation (Myers-Scotton, 2002). Through language contact, refugee and immigrant communities tend toward third generation language shift because of pressure for acculturation and economic contribution from the majority community (Alba, Logan, Lutz, & Stults, 2002; Appel & Muysken, 2005; Ishizawa, 2004). Additionally, immigrants and many refugees want their children to be financially and socially successful, so many stress the importance of
learning the majority language, which confounds external pressures with internal ones and demonstrates the depth of interconnectedness between language and culture.

When monolingual speakers immigrate, their children most often become bilingual. When the same circumstances repeat in the subsequent generation, the third generation often loses bilingualism altogether, instead displaying monolingual majority language behaviors. This consistent pattern of third generation loss can be viewed as an aggressive strategy in the United States to avoid becoming what Theodore Roosevelt deemed a “polyglot boardinghouse” (Portes, 2002). English-only legislation was initiated in 1906 and again in the 1920s, culminating in highly negative perceptions of immigrant language that again gained potency in the 1980s and continues, perhaps to a lesser degree, to result in employment and mentality bias toward minority languages (Andrews, 1999; Fishman, 1999; Urciuoli, 1995; Warriner, 2007).

Although the broad perspective of third generation language loss due to Anglicization (Fishman, 1966a; Veltman, 1983a) may be less of an issue for immigrants after 1960 due to potential bilingual benefits for transnational communication and related job markets, Chinese immigrant populations still exhibit a clear third generation linguistic assimilation process, while Mexican and Cuban populations exhibit a slower and less intense assimilation (Alba et al., 2002). So, while negative perceptions of stable bilingualism may have relaxed for some immigrant groups, acceptance and perceptions are not universal. Additionally, the process of language assimilation itself is not uniform; instead there are several types of speakers who adopt parts of two languages:
1. A rusty speaker is one who has a relatively proficient and high level of passive knowledge (i.e., can understand the language but not speak it); this type of bilingualism occurs in areas of very rapid or very gradual change.

2. A prototypical semi-speaker has imperfect knowledge and constitutes a continuum from nearly full competence to rememberers.

3. A speaker at the end stage of bilingualism loss reproduces only memorized and anecdotal phrases (e.g., toasts) as a means of identifying themselves with their heritage or cultural group (Sasse, 1992a).

For Russian speakers, imperfect speakers, particularly of younger generations, are termed heritage speakers. Heritage Russian, also casually called kitchen Russian, is typically spoken by second generation immigrants who grew up hearing, and potentially speaking Russian in the household, but in their adulthood have mostly passive knowledge (Dubinina & Polinsky, 2012).

Although language change or maintenance can be viewed from a strictly linguistic perspective, language is a social institution: it is driven by culture (Blount & Sanches, 1977; Urciuoli, 1995; U. Weinreich, Labov, & Herzog, 1968). Speakers are subjected to selective pressures that directly impact the unique role each speech community has and the measures it takes to adapt or resist adaptation to sociocultural environments (Hymes, 2001). As a speaker-driven cultural institution, language carries “cultural and symbolic capital” (Urciuoli 1995, p. 526) driven by learners’ orientation to observed speakers based on status or even novelty (Andrews, 1999; Haugen, 1969; Labov, 2001; Urciuoli, 1995). Differential prestige given to one language over another leads to asymmetrical use of the destination language over the native one (Heine & Kuteva, 2005; Myers-
Scotton, 2002). The reason that dominant languages can spread widely and lead to the extinction of others (Labov, 2001) is that asymmetrical use is often tied to idealized views of majority language superiority along with stigmatization of minority languages that profoundly influence speakers to emulate the prestigious cultural group to which they want to belong (Andrews, 1999; Haugen, 1969; Sasse, 1992b; Uriel Weinreich, 1953).

Further, if such interference phenomena is not supported as an economic adaptation (i.e., encouraging children to learn the majority language for increased job potential), parents may assess language loss as the result of children’s lackadaisical tolerance for code-switching (Urciuoli, 1995). As with this example of oppositional behavior or perception from parents, individual attrition of language or even group-level shift can be symbolic of shifts in immigrants’ self-perception (Andrews, 1999). Even though it does not necessarily lead to the loss of heritage, long-time immigrants who are aware of language mixing or loss are sometimes ashamed of the loss of language in their cultural group but are unable to reverse the shift (Haugen, 1969; Uriel Weinreich, 1953).

Contact-induced culture and language change as a result of immigration can be beneficial or devastating for the affected minoritized or marginalized cultural group. Based on the tenets of cultural evolution, cultural groups that assimilate into the majority society are more likely to survive and reproduce. However, also based on the tenets of cultural evolution, immigrant groups that actively practice prosocial behavior, social signaling, and traditional transmission are also evolutionarily successful through cultural continuity. For immigrant groups in particular, language plays an essential role as a conspicuous display of membership, and for the OBs, both Russian and OCS are devices
for individual-level identification of group members and group-level longitudinal success.

**Conclusion**

Here I have reviewed approaches to cultural evolution, cultural continuity, the significance of religion, language maintenance, and the effects of immigration on refugee and immigrant groups. What is most important is that the combination of all of these perspectives and theories are central to understanding and explaining the multifarious cultural phenomena displayed by the SCAK community. A unique trait of human social groups is regular cooperation with both kin and non-kin. For humans, social life is “regulated by shared moral systems that specify the rights and duties of individuals” (Boyd and Richerson, 2009, p. 3281) and reinforced by social rewards and sanctions. For the sake of evolutionary success, humans should be self-interested and thus only adopt beneficial behaviors; however, “group selection can counteract this process” if groups, like the OBs, are small, with limited inter-group migration (Soltis, Boyd and Richerson 1995, p. 474).

Group selection requires in-group cooperation and out-group competition. For cultural groups centered on religion, as the OBs are, inter-group competition is increased by rituals “that maximize participants’ commitment” (Henrich, 2009, p. 245) to shared religious beliefs in addition to costly signals that identify individuals as potential allies, thereby intensifying cooperation and solidarity. Daily OB life is driven by conspicuous displays of membership in the form of archaic clothing, personal religious icons, extensive liturgical activities, and the maintenance of Russian and OCS. These types of social signals are costly in that they may draw scrutiny (Sosis, 2004; Sosis & Alcorta,
2003a) from non-Russian neighbors who do not espouse the same ideology; yet accumulated, they function as a means of increasing cultural evolutionary success.

Despite immigration to the United States, which has historically been and, in some domains continues to be, aggressively assimilationist, the OBs have maintained cultural continuity through a balanced strategy of tolerance and separation. From Woodburn, the SCAKs evaded acculturation through geographically isolating themselves from American society at large. Now in their fourth generation post-immigration, SCAKs continue to mediate interaction with and tolerance of American cultural traits using various transmission and signaling strategies.
Chapter 5: Methodology

The full series of hypotheses I analyze is presented in Chapter 6; broadly, the purpose of this research was to identify the extent and source of linguistic and cultural continuity in this small, isolated, Russian religious community of Old Believers (OBs) in South-Central Alaska (SCAK). In order to evaluate my research questions (outlined below), I conducted field research from mid-October to mid-November, 2012, in the SCAK community, and I initially intended to use the following methodological approaches: (a.) A self-administered questionnaire focused on spoken and written language forms, transmission of OB linguistic customs and behavior, Old Church Slavonic (OCS) language, and demographic information including age, immigration, and participant-reported relative importance of OB culture and language; (b.) Semi-structured and open-ended interviews of participants following statistical analysis of surveys to qualitatively evaluate trends related to cultural transmission and community retention; and (c.) Observation of participants' patterned linguistic and cultural behavior primarily focused on transmission of cultural and linguistic information between OB participants. Although I planned fieldwork to avoid major Holy days and to coincide with what I thought was the end of the fishing season (September 31st), I learned upon arrival that SCAK Villagers take full advantage of overlapping salmon, cod, halibut, and rockfish seasons among others that can extend until December 31st, depending on the particular water source (e.g., open water or river used) (Fall, Stanek, Davis, Williams, & Walker, 2004; Fall et al., 2000).
Research Questions and Metrics

As a means of giving more structured direction to this project, I focused on two primary research questions:

1) Is language maintenance correlated with community retention (i.e., population maintenance)?

2) Are conspicuous displays of membership correlated with community retention?

Language maintenance clearly and directly relates to the motivation for working with this community specifically; however, conspicuous displays without an inclusion of religion more broadly may seem peripheral. I intentionally did not ask invasive questions regarding the specifics of OB religion in the interest of respecting the requests of local contacts who were clear about not wanting to discuss these issues with outsiders. Furthermore, I had been advised by another researcher that although the OBs that he works with were open to talking about religion with outsiders for quite some time, they felt that previous non-OB researchers had acted unethically in the recent past. OBs felt they had been misrepresented as backward, aberrant, even nefarious, and are now much less willing to discuss topics they view as personal or sensitive with outsiders (M. Sidau, personal communication, October, 2011). My initial contact in the SCAK community was reticent about discussing even historical religious issues with me and only became more supportive after assurances that my research would solely be centered on language and culture outside the church. Even the backpack I wore the first day of fieldwork was met with shocked resistance from my initial contact, who insisted that I exchange it for something else in order to avoid appearing as a researcher to villagers (Participants, 2012a). As a result, I did not ask about or collect any information related to specific
theological or religious practices beyond those readily visible and directly related to signaling status as an *OB* (e.g., diagnostic clothing, open display of *OB* religious paraphernalia such as crosses).

Beyond what I expected as the limited scope of participant willingness for discussing *religion* as a potential cultural component of continuity, the concept itself is a difficult variable to operationalize without first segmenting into more discrete metrics. For instance, the conspicuous displays of membership included at the end of Table 5.1 are easily identifiable, and their presence or absence is easily measureable. Furthermore,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home language</td>
<td>Russian, English, mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian proficiency</td>
<td>Continuum (non-speaker - native fluency) adapted from Holdeman (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Russian use in public</td>
<td>5-point Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Old Church Slavonic</td>
<td>Number of times per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of interaction with OCS</td>
<td>Taught in peer group by community elder; taught by parents/grandparents; no formal training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education completed</td>
<td>K-8, high school, college, other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public displays of membership</td>
<td>Presence or absence of distinguishing attire and religious symbols; description of distinguishing traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private displays of membership</td>
<td>Presence or absence of household ikons, krasnie u golki or other symbols; descriptions of those items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Operationalization of primary variables

Table 5.1 These primary variables illustrate metrics for approaching evaluation of linguistic behavior, vertical transmission through learning strategies, and cultural behavior through conspicuous displays. All but the last two of these primary variables were included in items on the questionnaire that was given to participants. Conspicuous displays in public and private domains were measured through observation.

these displays are clear reflections of religion as they allow individuals in either public or private domains to judge not only dedication to the religious community, but also, at least superficially, the owner’s degree of religiosity.
**Procedures**

This project included three types of data collection: a questionnaire, interviews, and observation. The questionnaire was designed as a tri-partite, self-administered survey, intended to be taken in a single sitting at a place and time of the participant’s choosing. The three sections of the survey were centered on: (a.) the participant's Russian and English language usage in various forms; (b.) Old Church Slavonic language usage in various forms; and (c.) single demographic indicators (e.g., age, country of birth, number of years of residence in North America) that would allow for categorization of participants by variable (Bernard, 2006). Semi-structured and open-ended interview questions were intended to allow for qualitative analysis of patterned data reported in the survey as well as a more in-depth examination of sources of language maintenance and cultural continuity (e.g., conspicuous displays). Direct and participant observation provided further insight into linguistic and cultural behavior in the SCAK community and clarified any unconscious differences between participant-reported behavior and participant-performed behavior.

I prepared oral consent and assent scripts, expecting that the SCAK OBs would be reluctant to sign research documents from an academic outsider. Additionally, I willingly assured as much anonymity as is possible for this written version of my project through aggregated data, unspecified references to participant(s), not using the community’s name in this document, and so forth. Regardless, many individuals were not interested in filling out the questionnaire. Initially, I mistook phrases like “I’m too tired,” “It will take too long,” “I don’t have time right now,” or “I’m just not feeling well,” (Participants, 2012a) to mean “I’ll do it later.” I became concerned for some individuals’ health when I
returned several days in a row and they were still “too tired” or “not feeling well,” and I started checking in on them without the survey. It was not until a participant changed her or his mind during a conversation that I realized those “I’ll do it later phrases” really meant “No.” Interestingly, most people who were willing to talk with me at all were also willing to answer almost any question I had to ask, either from the questionnaire, from prepared interview questions, or questions that developed out of curiosity during the course of our interview conversation. When requested to put pen to paper and fill out the survey, however, many SCAK OBs were reluctant. Eventually I asked one participant about the pattern I had noticed, and the participant was frank: for adults in the community, the OBs’ history and persecution was still “fresh in their minds” and made them “wary of filling out paperwork” (Participants, 2012a).

I intended the questionnaire and interview to be discrete components of this project, with time enough between collection of survey data to at least identify any overarching patterns in the data and address them in interviews; however, the two very often ran consecutively. Participants were often times very welcoming. I was invited to stay for dinner or come in and talk while surveys were completed and ask anything I wanted of the participants. Even bezpopovtsy participants, whose faith would not allow sharing food or utensils with a nepravoslavnaya (literally unorthodox) offered me a can of soda – a wonderfully polite and unexpected compromise. At other times, there were instances where I was offered very little time to attempt to collect both survey and interview data.

One well-known participant excitedly introduced me, at a community event, to a new participant who was very knowledgeable about community history, linguistics, and
religious history, and said that I should ask my questions at that moment. When I began with the consent script, they both stared and said this new participant had very little time before family dinner; this new participants’ family was waiting in the car. This example illustrates the complications to my initial expectations of being able to administer the written survey on one day, and then revisit the participant after I had a chance to examine her or his responses to explore particular patterns that might be evident on the written survey. Unfortunately, time constraints on both my participants and me often required me to gather survey and interview data simultaneously. However, in these cases, where I was expected to ask everything I wanted to know in one sitting, the stories, perspectives, and opinions about linguistic and cultural continuity that participants freely offered in open-ended interviews provided much more insight than answers to the questionnaire alone would have elicited.

The questionnaire included a section assessing acceptability of Russian word order variability, a section on Russian and English language, a section on Old Church Slavonic, a section on family and traditions, and a short demographic section. I constructed 5-point Likert scale, two- and three-point multiple choice, rank order, and one or two word text entry items to make the questionnaire as efficient for participants as possible. This research is based on analysis of four 5-point Likert scale items like the one in Figure 5.1 analyzed with mediating variables. The questionnaire is included in Appendix A, and the list of open-ended and semi-open-ended interview questions is included in Appendix B.
Direct observation in the form of time allocation studies (Bernard, 2006) at the only truly public locale was the most amenable for comparing participant-reported behavior, from surveys and interviews, with participant-performed behavior. In addition,

Figure 5.1. Example of 5-point Likert scale questionnaire item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Experience</th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Writing/Typing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Speaking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Listening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Writing/Typing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Speaking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Listening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1. Participants were asked to assess their use of language based on a 5-point Likert scale. Quantitative analysis of this research is based on four of these items. Data collected from other items from the questionnaire will be presented in subsequent research.

I was able to unobtrusively observe Villagers in general interacting at random with one another. The public location was centrally located and visited by someone in most of the households at least once a day. Operational hours for this facility were intermittent at times and not extensive: usually about 6 hours per day during the week and about 4 hours
on Saturday. It was a favorite spot for local kids to grab a sweet snack after school and was patronized by OBs and non-OBs alike.

Other than the multi-function public location, there was no other site beyond the streets themselves where I could ethically collect information about conspicuous displays or vertical transmission of cultural traits. Although I did not formally collect data there, I was incredibly honored to be invited to attend and even participate in parts of OB church services. Many of my questions about the importance and significance of several variables and their transmission were substantiated through this experience.

**Field Site**

After arriving in the SCAK Village, I mapped the area (Fig. 5.2) and attempted to enumerate the number of occupied residences. Many buildings were dilapidated, in disrepair, or in varying stages of restoration or construction. With the help of participants, I was able to distinguish which buildings were residences, as opposed to family banyas\(^1\) or outbuildings, and which residences were, in fact, permanently occupied.

When the village was first founded over four decades ago, Main Village Rd. 1 (Fig. 5.2) was the only access point by vehicle (see Chapter 3 for more discussion). As Figure 5.3 illustrates, there are now multiple access points, and none of them are intentionally closed as Main Village Rd. 1 once was, which made geographically defining the Village more difficult, because OBs and non-OBs alike have built residences along Main Village Roads 1 and 3 beyond the original Village limits. In addition to geography, the schism I discussed in Chapter 3 between self-identified Villagers and 3\(^{rd}\) Villagers

\(^1\) A banya is a bathhouse, similar to a sauna, for ritual cleansing before religious services or rites of passage.
also complicated clearly assessing how to aggregate and disaggregate SCAK inhabitants for sampling purposes. Although at the outset, my research into the literature was more concentrated on delimiting bezpopovtsy from popovtsy OBs, the conversion of the SCAK Village and the geographic adjacency of 3rd Villagers and Villagers meant that I would

![Figure 5.2. Occupancy map of the SCAK village](image)

Figure 5.2. This map includes only habitable structures or structures viable for intended occupancy and excludes banyas and other outbuildings. Permanent dwelling units were of widely varying age, construction materials, and overall viability.

either have to have chosen to categorically eliminate many possible participants because they were bezpopovtsy 3rd Villagers or redefine my study area to exclude the Village and focus instead on 3rd Village, which would have eliminated founding families of the community, and significantly reduced possible sample size. Ultimately, I decided to define the village as Villagers defined it. I aimed for whole population sampling, based
on the amount of time I had and the size of the village, in order to try to address my research questions as fully as possible. Through data collection, I became aware of the fact that this ongoing schism has been unique in that not all dissenting OBs left; although 3rd Village was geographically adjacent to the Village proper, members of both sects lived side-by-side within the limits of the Village. I decided to continue with my attempt at whole population sampling of the SCAK Village and include any self-identified bezpovtsy OBs who were willing to participate.

**Sampling**

Given site parameters, I enumerated 55 households to contact. Of those 55, 22 participated in the survey, interview, or both, and six refused (Fig. 5.3, Table 5.2). Through either the deteriorated state of particular residential structures or through participant substantiation I was able to determine that 10 households were unoccupied. I spoke with residents of another 10 households who were not OBs and therefore were not included in the study. I attempted contact at the remaining seven households multiple times without success. Although clearly identifying which households to sample was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enumerated Households: 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households surveyed/interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households - no contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-OB Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-contact rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Unoccupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-OBs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2. This table demonstrates participation categorization and frequency at the household level. From this perspective, the refusal rate is very low, and the rate of unoccupied and non-OB households is nearly equal that of participating households.
more challenging in the field than I initially expected, at the individual level inclusion
and exclusion criteria were maintained as outlined before fieldwork:

**Inclusion criteria**: individuals who (a.) consider themselves as members of the
SCAK OB community; and also (b.) have had sustained interaction (more than
would be expected from random interactions in a multi-lingual society) with
natively spoken Russian.

**Exclusion criteria**: (a.) individuals <12 years old, in order to exclude members
whose language is still largely malleable (Chomsky, 1965); (b.) individuals who
do not identify themselves as Russian, in order to contain linguistic and cultural
variation to Russian traditions.

Even with such a relatively small village, I realized that this community’s cultural
history would make achieving my goal of total population sampling difficult. Although
my survey sample seems very small (n=36), it accounts for 51% of the contacts in each
household I made (Table 5.3), which is generally better participation than the 30% return
I would expect from a survey (Anseel, Lievens, Schollaert, & Choragwicka, 2010;
Baruch & Holtom, 2008). In accounting for the 49% of individuals in contacted
households who did not take the survey, I can identify several potential limitations. First,
as discussed above, many OBs did not feel comfortable filling out paperwork. For
instance, as I was talking with one participant who lived in a two-generation household, I
asked if I could come back when the older generation household members were home to
ask them to participate as well; my participant made it very clear that the older generation
would not consent to participate, and it would even make them upset if I came back.
Second, as Table 5.3 indicates, there was a percentage of ineligible individuals in some
households due to age (15%) and OB-non-OB intermarriage (7%). Finally, many residents were still making short fishing runs, and some whose open-water season had ended were vacationing.

Figure 5.3. Participation map of the SCAK village

Overall, limiting factors may have affected participation to some degree. However, considering that the mean household size of my sample was four individuals (Table 5.3), my estimated village population, including participating, no contact, and
refused households from Figure 5.2 is 140; this estimate was validated by a participant who said the Village population was 130. Substantially, with a population of 130, or

Table 5.3. Demographic details of participating households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Size*</th>
<th># Participants</th>
<th>% Participate</th>
<th># OBs</th>
<th>% OB</th>
<th># &gt;12yo</th>
<th>% &gt;12yo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. For participating households, this table shows the number of individuals living in each house, the number who participated (and the rate of participation), the number and relative percentage of eligible individuals by self-ID as OB in the household, and the number and relative percentage of eligible individuals by age in the household. *Because children under the age of 12 were not the focus of this study, and were often otherwise engaged, e.g., with friends or outside, it was sometimes difficult to make absolutely sure which of the larger households some children belonged to. Household size is accurate to the best of my knowledge.
even 190 counting the 60 3rd Villagers who may not have been included in my Participant’s population total but a few of whom did participate in my survey, 36 participants allowed for robust quantitative statistical analysis with a 14-15% margin of error at a 95% confidence interval.

Analysis

In order to explore my research questions as holistically as possible, this is a mixed methods project, with both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis. I used logistic regression analysis in SPSS and analysis of frequency distributions in Excel for quantitative data. In analyzing qualitative data, I used a modified narrative technique (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013) for interview data and interspersed thematically organized data with relevant quantitative data for discussion purposes. In addition to grouping and coding observational data, I also mapped data to visually represent conspicuous religious displays at the household level.

Clarifying issues underlying my research questions through evaluating the hypotheses presented in Chapter 6 with a mixed-methods approach was essential. Although all not of my initial methods and procedures were possible or applicable, the knowledge I gained through fieldwork was not only significant for the results of the project, but also for duplication of any potential similar projects in the future.
Chapter 6: Analysis

Here I report results of hypothesis testing focused on cultural and linguistic maintenance in the SCAK OB community. With a goal of clarifying how this small, traditional SCAK community has managed linguistic and cultural continuity while concomitantly existing in an increasingly globalized and integrated American society, I address the following research questions:

1) Is language maintenance correlated with community retention in the SCAK OB community?

2) Are conspicuous displays of membership correlated with community retention in the SCAK OB community?

While many refugee and immigrant groups have not succeeded in maintaining traditional language and culture, I hypothesized that the SCAK OBs’ success rests on emphasizing the importance of their unique language and culture to younger generations. Because both questions include the element of community retention (i.e., population maintenance), I evaluate the unique factors of each question individually first, and then address community retention, along with conclusions, at the end of the chapter.

Generation

In order to begin addressing my first research question, it was necessary to evaluate the continuity of minority language within the SCAK community, and I proceeded with three potentially intervening variables: generation, age, and education. Additionally, I considered both Russian, and Old Church Slavonic (OCS) for reasons discussed in previous chapters. While many migrations through countries whose
majority languages were not English certainly affected the Russian these OBs use from a dialectical standpoint, the primary purpose of the language-centered hypotheses presented below is to determine whether or not this community’s initial persistence strategy of geographic and social isolation allowed for Russian in daily use to continue beyond the third generation language shift paradigm previously discussed in Chapter 4. My first hypothesis evaluated exactly this generational decay issue:

**H6.1: SCAK OBs surpassed the third generation language shift paradigm.**

Cultural contact results in the exchange of both cultural and linguistic information, but rarely allows for sustained, equal contribution by both cultures or subcultures involved. Third-generation language shift (i.e., native language shift to the majority language by the third generation for refugee or immigrant families) can occur at a family level or community level (Hopp & Schmid, 2011). However, conspicuous non-linguistic traits seem to be more variable; for example, traditional clothing may continue even after language loss. As a means of evaluating whether or not SCAK OBs have surpassed this paradigm, it is not enough to ask respondents if they use Russian; in order to assess both linguistic competence (Chomsky, 1966, 1993) and communicative competence (Hymes, 1967, 2001), I also asked respondents how comfortable they felt using each language in a variety of contexts. As for linguistic performance, discussion of observational data is included under the next hypothesis (H6.2). Additionally, because the SCAK OBs are, however marginally they have attempted to be, embedded in American society, they also interact with English to varying degrees. As I found while doing fieldwork, English has become ever more pervasive in their community as would be expected following the third generation shift paradigm. My inquiry was to find out if
the paradigm held true for the SCAK OBs, or if Russian was vertically transmitted in some meaningful way to the third generation and beyond. Therefore, asking respondents to comment on English alongside Russian was essential in order to give the most complete evaluation possible.

Tables 6.1 – 6.4 present the results of the analysis of survey information reflecting self-reported scores of how comfortable participants were using Russian and English. Responses are divided into two categories – comfortable and not comfortable – based on original ordinal measurement. Scores of 0-2 were classified as not comfortable, and scores of 3-4 were classified as comfortable. Tables 6.1 and 6.3 offer summary information for binary logistic regressions for each generation (i.e., first-generation respondents through third-generation respondents) included in the sample tested independently against the four linguistic input components that respondents were asked about as discussed in Chapter 5. Each regression evaluates a null hypothesis that there is not a statistically significant association among the generation category (e.g., Gen1) of the respondents and the given linguistic interaction variable (e.g., Reading). Comfort levels with Russian (Table 6.1) and English (Table 6.3) are displayed by generation (i.e., Gen1, Gen2, Gen3) only as a means of making these regressions easier to visualize; these are not single comparative regression models. Tables 6.2 and 6.4 offer data underlying the analyses, which helps clarity the relationships reflected in Table 6.1 and 6.3.

As Table 6.1 demonstrates, I reject the null hypothesis for comfort level of Speaking in Russian regressed on Gen3 – the single significant model among all logistic regressions of comfort level of Russian on generation. Gen3 indications of comfort are
negatively correlated ($p = .012$, Nagelkerke $R^2$ maximum likelihood estimation $= .247$) with Speaking in Russian, which means that Gen3 respondents are less likely to feel

Table 6.1. Comfort level with Russian usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen1</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.761)</td>
<td>(.761)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen2</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>-.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.688)</td>
<td>(.699)</td>
<td>(.756)</td>
<td>(1.062)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen3</td>
<td>-.537</td>
<td>-1.232</td>
<td>-2.110*</td>
<td>-1.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.796)</td>
<td>(.883)</td>
<td>(.844)</td>
<td>(1.080)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1. Standard errors are provided in parentheses under coefficients for each dependent variable. Individual coefficients are significant at the †10% level, *5% level, or **1% level. Note: N/A reflects total separation (see Table 6.2), which precludes statistical analysis.

Table 6.2. Number of responses by generation, linguistic component, and level of comfort with Russian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfort with Russian Usage</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>Comf</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>Comf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2. This table displays the number and distribution of responses used in the binary logistic regressions in Table 6.2 as a means of clarifying what pattern of data was present, and what may be driving analysis results.

2 For regressions run in SPSS I chose Nagelkerke’s $R^2$ maximum likelihood estimation (Nagelkerke, 1991) as a proxy for the traditional $R^2$ fitness estimation that is impossible with binary logistic regression given the data’s distribution. McFadden’s may be a more suitable choice, but it is unavailable in SPSS, and Cox and Snell’s would be less familiar looking to readers because it ranges from 0-.75 (Allison, 2012).
comfortable *Speaking* in Russian relative to other generations. Table 6.2 illustrates this point, in that 100% of Gen1 speakers, and 75% of Gen2 speakers, but only 40% of Gen3 speakers are comfortable speaking Russian. I failed to reject the null hypotheses for all other regressions, which means that from a statistical perspective, all three generations are roughly equally comfortable with other linguistic components of Russian, although in all cases Gen3 shows less comfort than the preceding generations. When considering the relative pattern of responses over generations (Fig. 6.1), it may be that instead of Russian shift by Gen3, what is a stronger driving force of language change for Gen3 is the additive effects of English.

Figure 6.1. Relative pattern of responses by generation

![Graph showing participant comfort with Russian and English components.](image)

Figure 6.1. While Gen3 may be less comfortable overall in English than in Russian, the pattern of comfort in Russian is not remarkably different than Gen2 or Gen1 – nor is the percent of comfortable participants.
While the focus of language shift is typically on Gen3 speakers, attention here needs also to be given to continuity of behavior in each linguistic component. Because many first generation *SCAK OBs* did not have access to education in China or Brazil and were, therefore, illiterate, they were comfortable with *Speaking* and *Listening* linguistic components of Russian while *Reading* and *Writing* were beyond the scope of their *institutionalized* communicative competence. For Gen2 and Gen3 respondents, many of whom had access to *SCAK* education, linguistic continuity was manifested through generations in the components their elders themselves had access to and used on a daily basis (i.e., *Speaking* and *Listening*) and was further augmented through additional instruction in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen1</td>
<td>-2.884**</td>
<td>-1.435†</td>
<td>-3.624**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.924)</td>
<td>(.805)</td>
<td>(1.207)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen2</td>
<td>1.540†</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>1.861</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.883)</td>
<td>(.756)</td>
<td>(1.142)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>6.429</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen3</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.132)</td>
<td>(1.132)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.765</td>
<td>4.765</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3. Comfort level with English usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen1</td>
<td>-2.884**</td>
<td>-1.435†</td>
<td>-3.624**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.924)</td>
<td>(.805)</td>
<td>(1.207)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen2</td>
<td>1.540†</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>1.861</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.883)</td>
<td>(.756)</td>
<td>(1.142)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>6.429</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen3</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.132)</td>
<td>(1.132)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.765</td>
<td>4.765</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3. Standard errors are provided in parentheses under coefficients for each dependent variable. Individual coefficients are significant at the †10% level, *5% level, or **1% level. Note: N/A reflects total separation (see Table 6.4), which precludes statistical analysis.

Shifting attention to the other side of third generation language loss, Tables 6.3 and 6.4 reflect increased comfort with English. As reflected in Table 6.3, I rejected the null hypothesis for *Reading*, *Writing*, and *Speaking* in English regressed on Gen1. Gen1 indications of comfort are negatively correlated with *Reading* ($p = .002$, Nagelkerke $R^2 =$
.401), Writing ($p = .075$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .123$), and Speaking ($p = .003$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .500$) in English, which means that Gen1 respondents are less likely to feel comfortable using these components in English. Similar to Table 6.1, there is a clear pattern of differentiation, in Table 6.3, between generations. Table 6.4 illustrates this pattern further, with only 40% of Gen1 respondents indicating frequent Speaking in English compared to 100% of Gen3 respondents. Similar trends are reflected in the other three linguistic components.

Table 6.4. Number of responses by generation, linguistic component, and level of comfort with English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfort with English Usage</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT Conf</td>
<td>Conf</td>
<td>NOT Conf</td>
<td>Conf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4. This table displays the number and distribution of responses used in the binary logistic regressions in Table 6.3 as a means of clarifying what pattern of data was present, and what may be driving analysis results.

For comfort level of Reading in English regressed on Gen2, I rejected the null hypothesis. A positive correlation ($p = .081$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .136$) indicates that Gen2 participants are likely to be comfortable with Reading in English, indicating increased English competency. Regardless of statistical significance, it is clear that a positive correlation is prevalent for Gen2 and Gen3 respondents and all linguistic components of English. While Gen1 respondent interactions with English are mixed, Gen2 and Gen3 interactions with English are very clearly robust.
Tables 6.5 and 6.6 present the results and supporting data of binary logistic regressions evaluating the effects of generation using the same four Russian and English linguistic components (i.e., *Reading*, *Writing*, *Speaking*, and *Listening*). Each regression again evaluates a null hypothesis that there not is a statistically significant association among the generation category (e.g., Gen1) of the respondents and the given linguistic interaction variable (e.g., *Reading*).

As Table 6.5 demonstrates, I rejected the null hypothesis for *Reading* regressed on Gen1, *Writing* regressed on Gen1, *Reading* regressed on Gen3, and *Speaking* regressed on Gen3. Gen1 frequency of Russian usage is positively correlated with *Reading* ($p = .043, R^2 = .156$) and *Writing* ($p = .041, R^2 = .167$). Gen3 frequency of Russian usage is negatively correlated with *Reading* ($p = .094, R^2 = .143$) and *Speaking* ($p = .007, R^2 = .282$). As reflected in Table 6.6, Gen1 respondents are far more likely to *Read* and *Write* in Russian, with the frequency decreasing in each of the next two generations; Gen3 is far less likely to *Speak* frequently in Russian compared to the previous generations.

Comparing Table 6.5 with 6.2 further indicates a relationship between competency and usage, in that the number of people who feel comfortable closely mirrors the number who use these skills frequently.

Considering these data and analyses together, while there is a statistically significant relationship between linguistic components and Gen3 responses, all three generations apparently continue to use Russian frequently. For example, the 30% of Gen3 community members who claimed to not regularly *Listen* to Russian may have been higher if I had measured *hearing* Russian. I saw several instances of adolescent Gen3 community members who claimed to not hear Gen1 or Gen2 community members
Table 6.5. Frequency of Russian usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>1.609*</td>
<td>1.705*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds-ratio Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds-ratio Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>-1.887†</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-2.282**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds-ratio Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5. Standard errors are provided in parentheses under coefficients for each dependent variable. Individual coefficients are significant at the †10% level, *5% level, or **1% level. Note: N/A reflects total separation (see Table 6.6), which precludes statistical analysis.

Table 6.6. Number of responses by generation, linguistic component, and frequency of Russian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Russian Usage</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT frequent</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>NOT frequent</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>NOT frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6. This table displays the number and distribution of responses used in the binary logistic regressions in Table 6.5 as a means of clarifying what pattern of data was present, and what may be driving analysis results.

Speaking to them in Russian. When given a second, much louder or slower or more no-nonsense approach, these same Gen3 respondents seemed to hear, listen, and respond adequately. Their initial reluctance to engage in Russian seems to reflect selective hearing, perhaps to attempt to force their interlocutor to use English or perhaps because of some other social or personal reason (e.g., giving someone the silent treatment). It is worth noting that none of the linguistic components regressed on Gen2 resulted in significant values. Furthermore, regression coefficients (*Reading* = -.169; *Writing* = .844; *Speaking* = .844; *Listening* = .529).

129
Writing = .000; Speaking = .169; Listening = -.636) varied from slight positive values to negative values. What could be driving these disparate results are the heterogeneous backgrounds of second generation community members. Some first generation SCAK OBs were very young when they moved with their families to the United States and other first generation SCAK OBs were already adults; furthermore, the experience first generation SCAK OBs had with education – regardless of the country they were educated in – was widely variable, ranging from none at all to a master’s degree. Second generation children, all of whom received at least fifth grade educations, would have been influenced by the disparate education experiences of their parents, and therefore may have drastically different interactions with and understandings of American culture based on whether or not their parents went through the American school system, whether or not they enjoyed it, and how much education they received in total.

Table 6.7 reports the results of the analysis of the frequency of English usage by generation. I rejected the null hypothesis for all linguistic components regressed on Gen1. Gen1 frequency of English usage is negatively correlated with Reading ($p = .001$, $R^2 = .482$), Writing ($p = .000$, $R^2 = .772$), Speaking ($p = .000$, $R^2 = .677$), and Listening ($p = .001$, $R^2 = .482$), which means that Gen1 respondents are less likely to frequently use English in any of these contexts. Table 6.8 reflects the stark differences between Gen1 and Gens 2 and 3. Gen1 respondents claim to use English only rarely, whereas Gens 2 and 3 use it frequently. Such divergent frequencies of use are also reflected in the statistically significant results for Reading ($p = .041$, $R^2 = .230$), Writing ($p = .026$, $R^2 = .272$), and Speaking ($p = .041$, $R^2 = .230$) regressed on Gen2. Regression coefficients for all linguistic components, including Listening, although it was not significant, were
Table 6.7. Frequency of English usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen1</td>
<td>Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>-3.332**</td>
<td>-5.416**</td>
<td>-4.605**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>(1.009)</td>
<td>(1.467)</td>
<td>(1.290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds-ratio</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen2</td>
<td>Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>2.303*</td>
<td>2.507*</td>
<td>2.303*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>(1.129)</td>
<td>(1.126)</td>
<td>(1.129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds-ratio</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>12.237</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen3</td>
<td>Regression Coefficient</td>
<td>1.386</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>(1.137)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds-ratio</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7. Standard errors are provided in parentheses under coefficients for each dependent variable. Individual coefficients are significant at the †10% level, *5% level, or **1% level. Note: N/A reflects total separation (see Table 6.8), which precludes statistical analysis.

Table 6.8. Number of responses by generation, linguistic component and frequency of English usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of English Usage</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT frequent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT frequent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT frequent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT frequent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8. This table displays the number and distribution of responses used in the binary logistic regressions in Table 6.7 as a means of clarifying what pattern of data was present, and what may be driving analysis results.

positively correlated with Gen2 responses, indicating that Gen2 respondents were more likely to use English more frequently (Table 6.8). This trend continues into Gen3, in which nearly 100% of respondents use English in all four linguistic components.

Considering these values together, while there is a statistically significant relationship between linguistic components and Gen1 responses, here again, as with Gen3 results in Table 6.5, low probability values indicate that at a community level, an absence of frequent English usage is unlikely.
Noteworthy for these analyses, *Reading* and *Writing* are not necessary for daily interaction, whereas *Speaking* and *Listening* are. *Reading* and *Writing* are much more specialist endeavors, whereas *Speaking* and *Listening* are required for survival and daily life, and can therefore be more closely linked with longitudinal cultural continuity in the most traditional sense. While the latter have existed since the advent of language itself, *Reading* and *Writing* are cultural behaviors that reflect a community’s investment in activities beyond bare essentials. My observations while conducting fieldwork indicate that differential emphasis was placed on interlocution components compared with literacy components for fourth generation community members. Although these children were not included in my formal study because they were under the age of twelve, what I typically observed was the behavior of a *heritage speaker* or *kitchen Russian* speaker, who has passive knowledge of the language and can reply if they want to, but does not have a strong command of the language. As far as Gen3 parents were concerned, they were divided on the issue of their children learning Russian.

One family held language and religious knowledge, which they termed an “internal faith,” as more important than conspicuous displays of membership. For that family, traditional apparel was merely clothing, and the continuity of linguistic and non-visual cultural traits was the true signifier of being an *SCAK OB* (Participants, 2012a). Another family, however, when faced with young children who refused to speak or listen to Russian, were not concerned, given that they had strong views about living in the United States and speaking English. The parents in this family did not agree with bilingual signage for any language and were proponents of an English-speaking majority in the country despite belonging to a bilingual generation (Participants, 2012a). A third
family with pre-school-aged fourth generation children had not yet considered whether or not to include Russian language as part of their children’s lives, although they were bilingual (Participants, 2012a). And a fourth family spoke only Russian at home with their young children, two of whom were in early levels of school (Participants, 2012a).

Statistically speaking, continuity is not completely maintained through the three generations included in my study. Comfort levels with both Russian and English indicates continuity, but frequency of usage, particularly with English, shows some strong patterns of differentiation between generations. Simply put, comfort level and usage of English has increased from Gen1 through Gen3, but comfort level and usage of Russian has decreased – although it does remain commonly used among Gen3 participants. Additionally, it is clear through observational data that the community is not united in a decision about the importance language should play in the lives of fourth generation community members, which could be an indication of a lack of culturally-embedded emphasis on linguistic continuity.

Most important, however, in evaluating H6.1, is the fact that generation of immigration for this community does not parallel genealogical generation. SCAK OB families were traditionally so large when they migrated from Brazil to the United States in 1964 (Committee on the Judiciary, 1964a; Tolstoy Foundation, 1972), that it was reasonable to arrive with pre-adolescent children of varying ages, and birth more children after immigration. It is perhaps this relationship, which corresponds to very different educational backgrounds for Gen2 participants (Fig. 6.2), that has resulted in highly varied statistical results among Gen2 respondents, and heritage speaking behaviors in
fourth generation speakers where I would expect to see them at least one generation earlier if the third generation language shift paradigm held true for this community.

Figure 6.2. Generation of immigration versus genealogical generation

Considering both statistical and observational data, H6.1 is supported. Russian language usage and competence has decreased but remains prevalent; yet it remains to be seen how long the pattern of continuity will last – at least when viewed through a perspective of generational maintenance. With so many disparate views on the significance of Russian language from the perspective of the community and its members, and with so many fourth generation children being raised without consistent Russian input, it may well be that the third generation shift paradigm has been delayed but one generation.
Age

Although related, in that Gen1 members tend to be older than Gen2 members who in turn tend to be older that Gen3 members, generation and age are not the same and reflect slightly different aspects of institutional and life histories. As a result I evaluate age as an intervening variable independent of generation. My hypothesis here is as follows:

H6.2: There will be a positive correlation between age and Russian language competency.

Tables 6.9 to 6.12 offer summary information for binary logistic regressions of the same four linguistic components as Tables 6.1-6.8 above run independently on age. In all cases, these regressions are evaluating a null hypothesis that there are not statistically significant associations related to the age of the respondents for the given linguistic variable.

As Table 6.9 demonstrates, I rejected the null hypothesis for comfort with Russian Writing ($p = .08$, $R^2 = .163$) regressed on age. The regression coefficient value was positive, which indicates that the level of comfort of Russian usage increased with the age of the respondent; what is driving this relationship are the skills older residents gained in their youth. Regression coefficients for all other linguistic components were similarly positively correlated with participant responses. Based on observational data, with so many older community members speaking primarily Russian, these results are exactly what I expected to see. This again indicates that comfort with Russian continues in general, although it is decreasing somewhat as reflected by the significant value for Writing and the positive regression coefficient for the other variables.
Table 6.9. Comfort level with Russian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.047†</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.022)</td>
<td>(.027)</td>
<td>(.019)</td>
<td>(.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odds-ratio</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>1.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.9. Standard errors are provided in parentheses under coefficients for each dependent variable. Individual coefficients are significant at the †10%, *5% level, or **1% level.

Regressions of comfort level of English on age (Table 6.10) are robust foils to the regressions of comfort level of Russian on age (Table 6.9). I rejected the null hypotheses for all four linguistic components: Reading \( (p = .004; R^2 = .451) \), Writing \( (p = .054; R^2 = .157) \), Speaking \( (p = .011; R^2 = .367) \), and Listening \( (p = .010; R^2 = .510) \). Regression coefficient values for all linguistic components are negative, which indicate that older respondents are less likely to feel comfortable interacting in English using any of these components. Paired with the results from Table 6.9, there is a pattern of age differentiation when it comes to levels of comfort with language use, whereby older SCAK community members are more comfortable with Russian, while younger members may be more comfortable with some components of English.
Frequency of language use regressed on age (Tables 6.11 and 6.12) show similar results. As Table 6.11 demonstrates, I rejected the null hypotheses for frequency of Russian usage with all linguistic components regressed on age. Given the positive regression coefficient values for all variables, the odds of frequently Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening in Russian increase by age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Odds-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.048*</td>
<td>.062*</td>
<td>.196**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.022)</td>
<td>(.025)</td>
<td>(.069)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11. Frequency Russian usage

Table 6.11. Standard errors are provided in parentheses under coefficients for each dependent variable. Individual coefficients are significant at the †10% level, *5% level, or **1% level.

The coefficient for Speaking in Russian is comparatively high, suggesting that age impacts this particular trait heavily; the reason could be two-fold. First, speaking in Russian is a trait that all of the older respondents possess – even those who are illiterate. Second, while younger people are often comfortable listening to Russian, the number who are comfortable speaking is fewer. While many older community members came to the U.S. illiterate, incorporating Russian and OCS literacy for school-aged children in the community was a high priority until a dearth of full-time language teachers and time to devote to these skills diminished community children’s hours spent in pursuit of formal study (Participants, 2012a). For example, one upper-middle-aged community member who did not fill out the questionnaire but talked with me was an adolescent-aged first generation refugee who came to the United States with no formal education and later self-educated through a U.S. G.E.D. This community member’s older children were capable
of interacting with Russian much more fluently than their youngest, who were not yet in high school and did not have the hours of directed Russian study in the classroom that the older children did (Participants, 2012a). Present in this one family is a scenario that could clarify why the regression coefficients for Reading, Writing, and Listening are lower for frequency of Russian usage regressed on age than I anticipated.

The upper-middle-aged parent did not read or write Russian well, but they spoke and understood spoken Russian with native proficiency. The eldest children heard Russian around the house and learned to read and write Russian in school; however, the youngest matriculated into the school when Russian language instruction had all but disappeared. Concurrently, the Village tolerated increasingly more American culture. By the time of my fieldwork in 2012, satellite dishes streaming American TV in English were the norm, as were various mp3 players pumping American music through earbuds. Ask the older or younger family members if they frequently read or write in Russian, and they would most likely say no, while family members in the middle may be more inclined to say yes, particularly if they are interested in language learning or if they are connected in some way with religious activities. With regard to less frequent listening to Russian, if younger siblings have less exposure to Russian than older ones, are more exposed to the dominant American culture, and then introduce more American culture to the household, there could be an intergenerational linguistic shift at the household level.

Table 6.12 parallels the findings of Table 6.11. I rejected the null hypotheses for frequency of English usage with all linguistic components regressed on age. Reading ($p = .006$ at $\alpha = .01$, $R^2 = .405$), Writing ($p = .006$ at $\alpha = .01$, $R^2 = .752$), Speaking ($p = .004$ at $\alpha = .01$, $R^2 = .561$), and Listening ($p = .013$ at $\alpha = .05$, $R^2 = .301$) were all negatively
Table 6.12. Frequency English usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Odds-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.081**</td>
<td>-0.195**</td>
<td>-0.116**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.030)</td>
<td>(.071)</td>
<td>(.040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.12. Standard errors are provided in parentheses under coefficients for each dependent variable. Individual coefficients are significant at the †10% level, *5% level, or **1% level.

correlated to participant age, but the relationship seems to be weaker for Listening and Reading when compared to Speaking and Writing, likely as a reflection of the difference between passive and active interaction with language.

To summarize, then, I accept H6.2. All respondents were able to, or at least claimed to be able to use verbal Russian; in fact, for several who were between 18-25 years old, being able to speak Russian seemed important even though they were not speaking in Russian to me, as they answered hastily with replies of “yes, of course,” or “we all learned Russian” (Participants, 2012a). However, in my observations, younger community members spent the majority of their time in public speaking in English, and code-switched to Russian generally when spoken to in Russian by an older community member. Unfortunately, with me, nearly everyone who was even marginally bilingual spoke English, except at church when they could not readily tell I was an outsider.

In public spaces, then, and for some younger fourth generation community members, whose parents are less concerned about Russian language maintenance, there may be fewer chances to listen to Russian now than a decade ago. In church services, however, Russian was second only to OCS. Children as young as six or seven years old would even help their toddler siblings identify religious items by their Russian names.
Additionally, liturgical books were available for the congregation in OCS and Russian, as the services were delivered in a mixture of both; young parishioners were guided through, and anyone who wanted to follow along, including me, was eagerly shown the corresponding page. Between Vespers (Vsyenoshnya), Matins (Utrenya), and the Divine Liturgy (Bozhestvennaya Liturgiya), the amount of time allowed for language learning during standard weekly services was substantial – 8 to 10 hours for a person who attended all services; Feast weeks or Holy weeks included many more hours of church services.

Compared with observational data, the degree to which older community members felt comfortable with and frequently used oral Russian relative to their younger counterparts was not adequately expressed in the statistics above. However, because the older people in the Village preferred to speak with me but not fill out the questionnaire, only 8% of the respondents included in statistical testing were over 65 years old. Although, statistically speaking, age is noticeably a clearer indicator of relationship with linguistic components than generation, there is still much to be clarified to better understand the SCAK community’s potential relative success with language maintenance. By their own account, community members have noticed change over the decades since outsiders have been allowed inside. One of the major factors they claim causes change in the Village is that younger members are not spending enough time in religious pursuits; another claim is that education drives young people away (Participants, 2012a).

**Education**

As I discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, OBs in general, the SCAK community being no different, have historically had limited confidence in and access to state-sponsored
education. Two years after the SCAK community was established, a temporary public school was established, and by 1976 when the permanent school was built, all community children were mandated to attend through the 8th grade (McArthur, 1979). Given the U.S. education system’s tendency for English assimilation, my hypothesis here is as follows:

**H6.3: Years of U.S. education will predict greater Russian language decay.**

Tables 6.13 to 6.16 offer summary information for binary logistic regressions of the same four linguistic components as above run independently on education. In all cases, these regressions are evaluating a null hypothesis that there is not a statistically significant association related to the years of education of the respondents for the given linguistic variable.

As Table 6.13 demonstrates, I failed to reject the null hypothesis for comfort of Russian with all linguistic components regressed on years of education. Given the positive regression coefficient values, the odds of being comfortable Reading and Writing in Russian seems to increase with years of respondent education. Contrariwise, the negative regression coefficient values for Speaking and Listening mean that the odds of being comfortable Speaking and Listening in Russian decrease with increased education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.13. Comfort level with Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regression Coefficient</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Error</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Odds-ratio</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.13. Standard errors are provided in parentheses under coefficients for each dependent variable. Individual coefficients are significant at the †10%, *5% level, or **1% level.
Although none of these regressions are statistically significant, they are anomalous and therefore require further consideration. Village elders have historically been concerned about the eroding effects of American education on OB youth; their apprehension has not been unfounded, based on the wavering and largely prescriptively conformist education policies toward bilingualism in the United States (Crawford, 1992; Field, 2011; Ovando, 2003). Bearing in mind that the American education system often has an effect of Anglicization of bilingual students, I expected negative regression coefficient values for all linguistic components in Table 6.13. If education were a conclusive intervening factor of Russian language decay, the odds of comfort level across all interaction types – interlocution and literacy – would decrease with the increase of education. What is driving the positive values for Reading and Writing may be the effects of intermittent Russian language instruction of variable forms at the SCAK school combined with deviations in the degree of personal study outside of school. For example, 65% of my sample is under 45 years of age, which means that all of those individuals received at least some education in the SCAK school. If some individuals attended while there was a proper bilingual program and/or continued their literacy study in Russian, they may offset some of the negative effects of Russian language decay caused by education.

Unlike the results of regressions of comfort levels and Russian in Table 6.13, the results in Table 6.14 are exactly what I expected – I rejected the null hypotheses for comfort of English usage with all linguistic components regressed on education. Reading \((p = .005 \text{ at } \alpha = .01, R^2 = .518)\), Writing \((p = .009 \text{ at } \alpha = .01, R^2 = .354)\), Speaking \((p =
.006 at \( \alpha = .01, R^2 = .582 \), and \( \text{Listening} (p = .008 \text{ at } \alpha = .01, R^2 = .615) \) were all positively correlated to participant education level.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>.511</strong></td>
<td><strong>.347</strong></td>
<td><strong>.593</strong></td>
<td><strong>.644</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>(.181)</td>
<td>(.132)</td>
<td>(.217)</td>
<td>(.244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odds-ratio</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>1.809</td>
<td>1.904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.14. Standard errors are provided in parentheses under coefficients for each dependent variable. Individual coefficients are significant at the †10%, *5% level, or **1% level.

Beyond primary education of the youngest generation, there was also a shift in the concept of education and its acceptability over time. Not only did pursuing education beyond the minimum requirements become more common, but in 1990, the first two \( SCAK \ OBs \) who graduated from the local high school went to college (Hardwick, 1991). By the time of my visit, the normative post-secondary school track was pursuit of a higher education in some form. There are a few small colleges in the area, and the most popular state college for high schoolers seems to be in Anchorage (Participants, 2012a). During the course of education in a now fully American system in the \( SCAK \) village, these students prepare for college from the beginning of high school as do their American peers – instead of chancing into college with English as the means to higher education as did their \( SCAK \) predecessors. These changes in attitude toward and practice in education are driving the results of the regressions in Table 6.14.

Similar to comfort with Russian, Table 6.15 demonstrates that I fail to reject the null hypothesis for frequency of Russian usage with all linguistic components regressed on years of education. Here, however, all regression coefficient values were negative,
meaning that the odds of frequent Russian usage for all linguistic components decreased for every year increase in respondent education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.15. Frequency of Russian usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odds-ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.15. Standard errors are provided in parentheses under coefficients for each dependent variable. Individual coefficients are significant at the *5% level, or **1% level.

Frequency of English usage parallels comfort of English in correlation, as Table 6.16 displays. I rejected the null hypotheses for all linguistic components regressed on years of education. *Reading* \((p = .04, R^2 = .191)\) was positively correlated with education, as was *Writing* \((p = .008, R^2 = .375)\), *Speaking* \((p = .007, R^2 = .408)\), and *Listening* \((p = .028, R^2 = .224)\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.16. Frequency of English usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odds-ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.16. Standard errors are provided in parentheses under coefficients for each dependent variable. Individual coefficients are significant at the †10%, *5% level, or **1% level.

For some older community members, literacy was beyond their reach as they were growing up in Brazil. In the most traditional of OB communities like those in Brazil, education is categorized as useful or useless, with the only useful education being that which improves daily sustenance or edifies the eternal soul. Children are inundated
with religious teachings and traditions from birth and taught to work closely with the land, but secular westernized education is perceived as futile and even degrading to the purity of the soul (Morris, 1991; Pokrovskii & Morris, 1992; Sidau, 2010).

One first generation respondent received very little formal education before immigrating to the U.S. at the age of 16, and was so far behind in school that they soon left it behind (Participants, 2012a). Speaking and Listening are of course two easily accessible linguistic components for that respondent and others with similar educational backgrounds, but although they have developed some literacy over the years for the sake of employment, the comfort with and frequent utilization of Reading and Writing as linguistic components is significantly less than for younger respondents. Interestingly, another respondent of nearly the same age received a sort of private tutelage in youth in a neighboring village in Brazil and learned to read and write through studying scripture. This second older respondent is widely read in multiple self-taught languages, and had quite different responses to the questionnaire (e.g., showed little concern for changes in the Village regardless of their magnitude; professed value for being American over value for being OB) although both this second older respondent and the former one had the same level of formal education (Participants, 2012a).

For younger community members, the variable Russian language environment in the school over the years has resulted in varying levels of formal interaction with Russian. Younger children of one family were unable to answer questions in Russian, and although their parents admonished their lack of knowledge while they were talking with me, the children were unconcerned (Participants, 2012a). Additionally, children speaking with each other were unlikely to spontaneously use Russian unless in the
context of religious services, which may bolster older community members’ concerns about language decay in younger community members as a result of a combination of non-religious activities and American education.

Regarding statistical evaluation of H6.3, considering the statistical significance of values for regressions for comfort of English and frequency of English usage, H6.3 could be supported by counterpoint: respondents with more years of formal education are more comfortable with English and report using English more often, which may indicate that they are less comfortable with Russian and use Russian less often. However, it is difficult to determine that years of formal education has resulted in decay of Russian language without significant statistical values for either comfort with or use of Russian. Observational data further confounds whether or not years of formal education significantly precludes Russian proficiency. Ultimately, this hypothesis is not clearly supported.

**Old Church Slavonic (OCS)**

Both Russian and English are used in varying degrees on a daily basis, and although OCS is confined, as it were, to religious spheres, this is a religious community, and therefore, I thought there might be some indication of continuity or change in generational frequency of OCS usage. My hypothesis here is as follows:

**H6.4: Interaction with OCS will be sustained by younger SCAK OBs.**

Because OCS is not used in the same way as Russian or English, input categories were modified appropriately. OBs are not taught to write OCS, but simply read it, pronounce it, and recognize it when it is read to them by clergy. OCS is not intended to be used as a creative language, the constituents of which can be combined into new
phrases, but instead is memorized and recited as holy text. To reflect this relationship in the questionnaire, I used the variable labels *Hear*, *Pronounce*, and *Read*. Table 6.17 offers summary information for binary logistic regressions of three linguistic components run independently on *OCS*. In all cases, these regressions are evaluating a null hypothesis that there is not a statistically significant association among the generation category (e.g., Gen1) of the respondents and the given linguistic interaction variable (e.g., *Pronounce*).

As Table 6.17 demonstrates, I rejected the null hypothesis for *Reading* regressed on Gen1 and Gen3. Gen1 indications of frequency are positively correlated (*p* = .073, R\(^2\) = .122) with *Reading*, which means that Gen1 respondents are more likely to frequently *Read OCS*; Gen3 indications of frequency are negatively correlated (*p* = .069, R\(^2\) = .168) with *Reading*, which means that Gen3 respondents are less likely to frequently *Read*.
Table 6.18. Number of responses by generation, linguistic component, and frequency of OCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency with OCS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hear</td>
<td>Pronounce</td>
<td>Read</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT frequent</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>NOT frequent</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.18. This table displays the number and distribution of responses used in the binary logistic regressions in Table 6.17 as a means of clarifying what pattern of data was present, and what may be driving analysis results.

OCS. Table 6.18 supports these analyses, as 40% of Gen1 respondents but only 11% of Gen3 respondents frequently Read OCS. Though they are not statistically significant, values for Pronounce regressed on generation show a similar pattern to the Read regressions, where Gen1 is positively correlated with the linguistic component and Gen3 is negatively correlated; as reflected in Table 6.18, Gen1 respondents Pronounce OCS more frequently than Gen3 respondents. Also, from Table 6.18, it is clear that the N/A regression results were triggered by complete separation in both Gen2 and Gen3 participants.

What these results mean in terms of evaluating H6.4 is that although I did find statistically significant relationships between generation and Reading OCS, the implication of regressions and supporting data was that while Gen1 maintained interaction with OCS, maintenance of frequent usage with this language began to decay in Reading by Gen2, and the process intensified by Gen3. The difference between the frequency of Hearing and Pronouncing OCS is odd, given that the most common use of OCS is in either church services, which typically requires all three activities, or private prayers said at various times of the day, which requires pronouncing OCS. The reason
for the differences in Hearing, Reading, and Pronouncing OCS may reflect training – in that people who have received limited training can still hear the language but may not be able to pronounce or read it. Based on the religious nature of the SCAK community, I would have expected more prominent language shift with Russian and less with OCS. However, OCS is not an interactive language, and the only active teacher at this point teaches twice per week during the winter to avoid fishing season, so there is limited learning availability (Participants, 2012a). Interestingly, one younger participant with particular affinity and acuity for OCS has decided to start a family and stay in the Village, which may reinvigorate traditional transmission of OCS in the future.

To this point, I have addressed the language maintenance component of my first research question with the following conclusions:

1. Although it is not a universal phenomenon, there are strong indications that OBs in the SCAK community have surpassed the third generation language shift paradigm with Russian – if only to delay it by one generation.

2. Both age and generation provide a clear view of the relationship between respondents and language, with older respondents reflecting greater comfort with Russian.

3. Years of education influence the use of English, as older community members anticipated, and may even detrimentally affect young community members’ Russian language usage. However, Russian language use does continue, even among those who have more years of formal education; for the SCAK community, education may be resulting in additive effects of English, degrading effects of Russian, or both.
4. Significant OCS language decay has occurred among third generation Villagers.

What I expected to find in the SCAK community was much more overt Russian language maintenance. However, the OCS teacher, who at some times of the year lives outside of the Village told me, “I wouldn’t get out of bed in the freezing cold and snow and ice to drive 40 miles to teach and read and speak OCS, but I would get out of bed for God’s work” (Participants, 2012a). For the OCS teacher, Russian was of little significance, and though OCS is in some ways inseparable from Russian Orthodoxy, the language itself is not as essential to OB lifeways as other attributes. What remains to be seen, then, is if community retention is associated with linguistic aspects of traditional transmission, or if, as the OCS teacher implied, this religious community persists because of other aspects of its religiosity.

**RQ2: Are conspicuous displays of membership correlated with traditional transmission in the SCAK OB community?**

Nearly four decades after initial settlement of the SCAK community, an average outsider walking through the Village with no knowledge of the history of these OBs would still be able to recognize a large part of the community as traditional OBs by their conspicuous displays – or markers – of membership (e.g., personal icons, traditional apparel, religiously prescribed hairstyles). However, conspicuous displays are not as ubiquitous among Villagers as they were in the 1970s and 1980s. Part of the difference, of course, is the relatively recent inclusion of non-OB community members, but there has also been a change in the number of OB community members who participate in readily
identifying themselves as OBs through traditional conspicuous markers. My second research question is focused on whether or not conspicuous displays of membership affect community retention; if these conspicuous markers do affect community retention, and if participation wanes, the village population should also be waning. If, on the other hand, there is some other mechanism of continuity, or a multifaceted suite of mechanisms, the population should not show significant decrease.

As the Village became more open to outsiders in the 1980s and non-OBs began to move in, one means by which OBs were able to readily identify themselves was by overt markers on and in their houses. Here, my hypothesis is as follows:

**H6.5: OBs’ houses in the Village are clearly delineated from their non-OB counterparts.**

Evaluating this hypothesis was straightforward. According to one Participant (2012a), Villagers hung Russian Orthodox crosses on their doors, while 3rd Villagers and non-OBs did not. As I enumerated the houses in the Village, I found that a slight majority (57.1%) of confirmed OB houses clearly displayed a Russian Orthodox cross on the front door (Table 6.19). Further, some of the houses I was unable to establish contact with also had crosses, suggesting that the percentage I calculated may be low.

In the simplest of terms, H6.5 is supported in that the majority of OB Village houses are conspicuously – although not uniformly – delineated from both their non-OB and their 3rd Village counterparts. Additionally, H6.5 is supported for both Village and 3rd Village OB households through the clear display of the Orthodox crosses and krasnie ugolki (beautiful corners), which are collections of icons for prayer as in Figure 6.3.
Table 6.19. SCAK households with exterior cross display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enumerated Households: 55</th>
<th>Confirmed OB: 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Displaying Russian Orthodox Cross: 20</td>
<td>Confirmed non-OB: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Displaying Cross: 25</td>
<td>Unoccupied: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied: 10</td>
<td>Unknown: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 55</td>
<td>Total: 55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.19. I observed 20 of 28 confirmed OB households displaying a Russian Orthodox cross on the front door; however, because I was unable to make contact with 7 households not displaying a cross, I included them in the “Confirmed OB” count, reducing the percentage of “Displaying” households from 71.4% to 57.1%.

Figures 6.4 – 6.7 are examples of OB floor plans. Figures 6.4 – 6.6 are my renderings of Villager floorplans, while Figure 6.7 is a rendering of a 3rd Village floorplan. In each case, I used an Orthodox cross symbol to indicate my observations of clearly displayed crosses on the front door and krasnie ugolki inside. I did not seek to create a full account of all personal holy objects in private areas of any house to which I was not given voluntary access. Without regard to square footage or the age of the house, it seemed that some families preferred to have a single krasnij ugol in the main living space, while other families preferred to have more than one. Multiple generation households tended to have krasnie ugolki for each family unit in their own private living quarters, which meant that households with fewer people tended to have fewer krasnie ugolki. There were exceptions, though. One household had a remarkable number of krasnie ugolki of varying ages and materials. Interestingly, while Villagers’ houses incorporated the krassnij ugol in the right corner, where I expected it, 3rd Villagers – for the most part – placed their krasnie ugolki in the left corners.
Figure 6.3. Example of krasnij ugol. This picture is posted in an article about “How to set up an icon corner at home” (Alexeev, 2013).

Figure 6.4. Russian cross symbols indicate crosses on the front door (outside) and krasnie ugolki (inside). I only recorded portions of houses where I was invited, and these figures include only krasnie ugolki and minimal furniture for spatial reference.
Figure 6.5. Floorplan #2 of a Villager resident

Figure 6.5. Russian cross symbols indicate crosses on the front door (outside) and *krasnie ugolki* (inside). I only recorded portions of houses where I was invited, and these figures include only *krasnie ugolki* and minimal furniture for spatial reference.

Figure 6.6. Floorplan #3 of a Villager resident

Figure 6.6. Russian cross symbols indicate crosses on the front door (outside) and *krasnie ugolki* (inside). I only recorded portions of houses where I was invited, and these figures include only *krasnie ugolki* and minimal furniture for spatial reference.
Differential generational variances in adherence to conspicuous displays, where younger community members were at times less inclined to abide by the strictures of traditional dress, did occur in the village. However, to this point in the project I had not been able to identify potentially significant sex-oriented differentiation. Conspicuous displays of membership offered the opportunity to evaluate comparative behaviors of females and males, and I hypothesized that there would also be differential continuity by sex, with females wearing traditional apparel more often than males similar to the behavioral patterns discussed in Chapter 3.

**H6.6: Conspicuous displays of membership are maintained more often by females than males.**

Tables 6.20 and 6.21 show summary information from time allocation studies for adult females and adult males at a retail establishment, which was the only public locale patronized by local villagers. For these observations I used sampling without
replacement; although two of the variables (i.e., traditional apparel and Active Russian) are potentially inconsistent from day-to-day or even between interactions, the community is small enough, and the other variables are uniform enough within an individual to make sampling with replacement problematic (e.g., counting the hairstyle or beard of the same individual multiple times would create difficulties). In Tables 6.20 and 6.21 I report either the only observation I had of individuals or the most consistent status of an OB viewed multiple times. Categorization of OBs was based on self-identification, identification by an OB in the store, previous conversations, seeing them attend church, or knowing family members; non-OBs were identified through self-identification or OB informants. When I was uncertain about whether or not an individual was an OB, I simply recorded that individual as unknown.

Straightaway, the most striking difference between the two tables is in traditional apparel: the rubakha for adult males, and the sarafan for adult females. Excluding observations of community members who were not clearly OBs, only 2 of 17 (12%) adult males who were OBs incorporated the rubakha, while 17 of 21 (81%) adult OB females incorporated the sarafan.

Importantly, I did not include observations of traditional shtany (pants) for males, because no one wore them, and although I used the label sarafan, construction of traditional-looking apparel for younger adult women were often separate skirts and blouses instead of the unmodified sarafan. For males, then, apparel markers were nearly absent; however, even with significant modification, females did maintain conspicuous displays of membership much more often during time-allocation observations. What I observed outside the data-collection times indicated even more flexibility for younger
Table 6.20. Adult male conspicuous displays of membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>OB</th>
<th>Hairstyle or Beard</th>
<th>Rubakha</th>
<th>Active Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

∑ = 30  ∑+ = 17  ∑+ = 15  ∑+ = 2  ∑+ = 10

Table 6.20. Conspicuous public markers for adult male villagers. + marks positive result for marker indicated in column heading. – marks negative result for marker indicated in column heading. ≠ marks unclear or unknown result for marker indicated in column heading.
Table 6.21. Adult female conspicuous displays of membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>OB</th>
<th>Hairstyle or Shashmura</th>
<th>Sarafan</th>
<th>Active Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.21. Conspicuous public markers for adult female villagers. + marks positive result for marker indicated in column heading. − marks negative result for marker indicated in column heading. ≠ marks unclear or unknown result for marker indicated in column heading.

adult females. One example illustrating a pattern of apparel alterations is that while visiting a multi-generational household, a younger couple returned from running errands and continued with their chores, incorporating discussions with me into their afternoon. Both partners were dressed for end-of-season fishing duties; the female wore a hoodie, a
pair of sweat pants, and tall rubber boots. As with the two instances of adult females who were not wearing *sarafani* in the general store, but self-identified as *OBs*, what was not omitted from this young adult female’s attire was her *shashmura* (cap covering a married woman’s hair).

Sex-oriented differences in prescribed hair markers were comparable, with 15 of 17 (88%) of adult males displaying the appropriate hairstyle and/or a beard for an *OB* (discussed in Chapter 2). For adult females, the rate was very similar, with 18 of 21 (86%) displaying the appropriate hairstyle or wearing a *shashmura*, depending on marital status. The only *OB* who did not display this marker while displaying every other was a younger unmarried adult who wore her hair in an *American* style – cut, and banded in a ponytail – instead of long and braided as would have been prescribed for her social role in the community.

For males, unlike the *borodachi* in 17th century Russia, wearing beards in 21st century Alaska is not unusual. However, even with the recent popularization of beard culture in the U.S., untrimmed beards are rare, especially paired with a front-fringed haircut, so identification of older adult *OB* males was relatively easy even at a distance. Young adult *OB* males who did not have a beard for whatever reason were much more difficult to identify. Just as young adult women have altered apparel, it seems that young adult men have altered hairstyles. The easily recognizable traditional cut, with long locks worn straight across the brow in front and close-cropped sides and back, is much more accommodating to personal style; for instance, the same cut with a simple brush of the hair to one side could be mistaken for any number of young adult musicians.
*Active Russian*, the last conspicuous display of membership here, indicates not merely being included in a Russian conversation, but speaking Russian. Of the adult *OB* males I observed, 10 of 17 (59%) spoke Russian, while 11 of 21 (52%) adult females spoke Russian. Some adults came into the store and either didn’t speak, or talked quietly enough with the owner that I could not determine whether they were speaking in Russian or English. Overall then, for adult *OBs*, it seems that males and females are relatively evenly divided with respect to conspicuous displays of membership. The single significant sex-oriented variation was apparel displays of membership, with females displaying more frequently (i.e., 81% compared to 12%).

Observations of minors’ conspicuous displays (Tables 6.21 and 6.22) offered a bit more straightforward perspective. Since I did not observe any minors speaking Russian, apparel and prescribed hairstyles for their age were the only markers I could use to evaluate frequency of sex-oriented conspicuous displays of membership. With regard to hairstyle of minor *OBs* I observed, 10 of 10 (100%) males, and 10 of 14 (71%) females wore a hairstyle that I could classify as *OB*. Initially, these percentages seem to indicate that minor males may be displaying conspicuous displays more frequently than minor females. However, because so many of the minors without additional markers looked so similar, I was unable to confidently eliminate any of them from the potential *OB* population. Therefore, since I happened to see more minor females than minor males, the percentage of female marker display is lower. I was more confident in classifying minor females as *OB* or non-*OB* as a result of the behavior of both sexes: minor male *OBs* engaged in hairstyle modification to a larger degree than their elder community counterparts; and female apparel markers are undeniably *OB*, even with modifications.
Sex-oriented differences in apparel for minors reflect what I observed on a daily basis, with only 1 of 10 (10%) OB males incorporating the rubakha. Significantly more minor OB females 14 of 14 (100%) incorporated the sarafan, clearly marking themselves as OBs; additionally, some portion of adolescent females marked as “unclear or unknown OB result” in Table 6.22 may also have been OBs. What I typically saw with minors in the Village was groups of children pouring out of the school in the afternoon. Boys and girls together would visit the shop for sweets; some would go to their houses too, and then come back outside to play. Some girls would continue to play in their silky ankle-length skirts with coats or sweatshirts on top, while others would change into pants – the ratio was relatively equal. One girl changed into a long khaki skirt that was more amenable to riding a bicycle, but it met the strictures of modesty for OB attire. Boys, on the other hand, rarely changed clothes; they wore the same clothes all the time and were largely indistinguishable from American youths I would have expected to see in a non-OB community. The only wide-spread departure from this non-traditional apparel pattern for minor males was for school picture day, and nearly all of the boys quickly went home to change into their typical jeans, t-shirts, and sweatshirts.

An unexpected intersection of apparel flexibility and sex was sports; most afternoons, the co-ed track team traversed and exited the Village in practice for meets. Nearly all team members wore American-style running gear (e.g., running shorts and long-sleeved shirts, running pants and t-shirts, running pants and sweat shirts), and the female coach, who appeared to be a non-OB, wore a track suit. A graduate of the high school said that years ago, when students became more interested in interscholastic sports, parents were largely unconcerned about boys’ American-style uniforms, but
unsupportive of girls’ uniforms – particularly for volleyball at that time, and for many years the girls’ team wore long khaki skirts to play. However, over time, parents became more supportive of uniforms for both volleyball and basketball that allowed easier movement, and as of 2012, American-style uniforms for both girls’ and boys’ teams were normalized (Participants, 2012a).

Table 6.22. Minor male conspicuous displays of membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>OB</th>
<th>Hairstyle</th>
<th>Rubakha</th>
<th>Active Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.22. Conspicuous public markers for minor male villagers. + marks positive result for marker indicated in column heading, – marks negative result for marker indicated in column heading, ≠ marks unclear or unknown result for marker indicated in column heading.

In the homes I was invited to visit, there seemed to be a similar pattern for display of conspicuous markers in the private domain as the public: some families are more conscientious about maintaining traditional OB apparel than others, but there is no obvious majority. In very few homes was there an equally frequent instance of males wearing traditional OB attire as in public. For the most part, the extent of male display of
Table 6.23. Minor female conspicuous displays of membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>OB</th>
<th>Hairstyle</th>
<th>Sarafan</th>
<th>Active Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>≠</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.23. Conspicuous public markers for minor female villagers. + marks positive result for marker indicated in column heading. − marks negative result for marker indicated in column heading. ≠ marks unclear or unknown result for marker indicated in column heading.

Traditional apparel was a few older adult males who wore *rubakhi* habitually. Females of varying ages in several families, despite the day or time of my visits, were wearing traditional *OB* apparel; in other families, all females were wearing American clothing.
(e.g., yoga pants and sweat shirts), with married women wearing shashmuri; in still other families, older adult females would wear sarafani and shashmuri in public and private, but younger adult females and minor females would wear American clothing and American hairstyles. It seems that what remained universal, when appropriate, was the shashmura.

Bearing in mind data from time allocation observations as well as personal observations from the private domain, it seems that H6.6 is supported, but with a caveat that I will introduce here and delve into in more depth in Chapter 7. In the Oregon community, as I discussed in Chapter 3, flexibility in attire for males was more quickly and easily legitimized for purposes of cost efficiency and convenience; jeans were readily available and cheap, and therefore replaced shtany in relatively short order. Conversely, since there was no suitable American-style parallel for the sarafan, and sarafani were relatively easy and cheap to make, the traditional dresses remained a staple for females. For males, costly and conspicuous clothing symbols began to decline early, and the trend has continued. For females, however, apparel remain conspicuous, and though the garments themselves may not be financially costly to fabricate, they carry hefty social cost for younger generations.

In Oregon, the social cost of conspicuous displays of membership caused adolescent OBs to modify their apparel. If both sexes in the SCAK community continued to make modifications to traditional apparel based on what their parents and grandparents came with, then I might observe behavior whereby the adolescent male OB’s traditional garb is a peasant shirt and jeans without the traditional shirt, which, without the ability to grow facial hair yet, would leave them looking like any other American. Meanwhile,
adolescent females may wear only half of the traditional clothing (e.g., skirts) they were taught to wear, but females would still be more recognizable, because mainstream American adolescent females wear noticeably different types of skirts. It is difficult to discern whether females – at least young females – are actually maintaining conspicuous displays to a greater degree than males, or are simply more visible than males in their equal rate of modification.

Traditional apparel is perhaps the most obvious of OB membership, but it is merely one of a suite of conspicuous markers. When it comes to preserving the OBs’ century-old lifeways, Villagers vacillate about the single most essential element required to preserve the identity of the SCAK OBs. One participant parent remarked: “I don’t care if kids wear OB clothes, but I really want them to embrace language and be fluent in Russian. I want them to carry on the Russian tradition in that way” (Participants, 2012a); this parent’s view may be unique among others, and it is certainly divergent from the OCS teacher’s view of relative unimportance of language compared to religion. The final element necessary to answer my research questions is determining, how, if at all, language (RQ1) or conspicuous displays of membership (RQ2) affect community retention. As a means of approaching the success of diachronic cultural continuity, my hypothesis is:

**H6.7: traditional transmission will motivate subsequent generations to remain in the Village**

In order to evaluate H6.7 as of my field work in 2012, I need to first establish reliable population data for the Village, which is difficult for several reasons: (a.) there are problems with typical measurements used in ascertaining population (e.g., census
data), (b.) significant historical events within the Village have affected population growth and decline in undetermined ways, and (c.) seasonal fluctuation of housing occupancy can affect academic and government reports of population.

**Population Measurements**

The *SCAK* community is itself labeled a Census Designated Place (CDP) within the Kenai Borough District (Alaska Consultants, 1980; Census, 2012), which means that it has no incorporated boundaries; instead, it is defined by geographic features, “a sense of community and 25 or more persons residing in it” (J. G. Williams, 2000, p. 105). The result is that boundaries for the *SCAK* community CDP includes rural areas beyond what the *OBs* self-identify as their Village, thus making census data a difficult metric for establishing an accurate population reckoning at any given time – as does missing data from the 1980 census. Table 6.24 reports population estimates with corresponding references, and my discussion follows.

**Table 6.24. *SCAK* population estimates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Population Estimate</th>
<th>Inclusion Area</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Hardwick 1991; Fefelov 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Alaska Division of Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-1980s</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Dolitsky, Muth et al. 1991; Razumovskaya 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>CDP</td>
<td>Williams 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>Village and surrounding subdivisions</td>
<td>Fall et al. 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>CDP</td>
<td>US Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>130+60</td>
<td>Village + 3rd Village</td>
<td>Participant and personal observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.24. Diachronic population estimates for the *SCAK* community including source of the estimate and the geographic area of inclusion from which the population estimate was reckoned.
The most accurate population data comes from settlement and early development of the SCAK community. From the initial five families totaling 22 individuals who settled the SCAK community in 1968 (Fefelov, 2011; Hardwick, 1991), the population grew quickly. The Village was closed to outsiders (see discussion in Chapter 3) in the first decades of settlement, and official Alaska reports suggest an increase to 40 families totaling 275 residents by 1976 (Alaska Division of Parks); academic sources trusted by the community give relatively reliable and consistent population data from the mid-1980s of approximately 400 (Dolitsky et al., 1991; Razumovskaya, 2008). Therefore, over the first twenty years of Village existence, there is a clear pattern of community growth.

After the mid-1980s, estimating Village population becomes more complicated. Demographers and state officials estimated the population of the Village in its entirety, but not always with a consideration of which community members were OBs. In a report on traditional subsistence for Alaska’s Department of Fish and Game in 2000, James Fall et al. (2000) estimated the SCAK population at 345; however, their study included the Village and surrounding subdivisions. Alaska State Demographer, Dr. J. Gregory Williams (2000), reported the SCAK population at 371 in 1990. When Williams published his report, he estimated the SCAK CDP population to have been 500 in 1994, and approximately 480 in 1999 based on “indicator data” (p. 152). Williams’ estimates reflect the relatively stable population tendency through the turn of the century that are substantiated in Fall et al.’s report. Although there were likely population fluctuations around 1999-2000, a dramatic reduction of 135 people in one year seems unlikely without a historical record of why; therefore, I have chosen only collected data – and not estimated data – from Williams and Fall et al. to include in Table 6.24.
After 2000, Village population estimates show a trend of minor decline. The 2010 census reports a CDP population for the SCAK community of 318 (alaska.gov); even considering that the CDP measurement is more inclusive, the Village population would have to be somewhat lower than in previous decades. In 2012, participants reported a Village population of 130 (Participants, 2012); in addition to the estimated Village population, my observation of 3rd Village population would include approximately 60 residents, which is consistent with EPA estimates from 1992 (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2001). The SCAK geographically contiguous OB populations, then, would total approximately 190. Overall, compared to the height of OB population in the SCAK community in the mid-1980s of approximately 400, there were only 190 or so OBs in 2012. However, in evaluating whether or not this decline is a result of a failure of traditional transmission, there are other compounding variables that must be taken into consideration.

Additional lines of evidence reflect a stable or slight decrease in Village population. First, housing occupation rates have remained stable (Figure 6.8). Clearly, there were no vacant houses at the point of settlement, but the Kenai Peninsula Borough Planning Department reported a 30% housing vacancy rate in 1990, and a 21% rate in 2000 (Bryson, 2005). As I noted in Chapter 5, I observed an 18% housing vacancy rate in 2012. Although the percentage of residence occupancy shows steady growth over two decades, there is no indication from the Kenai Peninsula Borough Planning Department how many of those households were OBs. Perhaps the best index of OB residences in the community is Fall et al.’s (2000) traditional subsistence report. Fall et al. document 51 OB residences and 47 non-OB residences – a 52% rate of OBs. Comparatively, I
confirmed 28 *OB* households, 10 non-*OB* households, and 7 households I was unable to contact, which allows for an *OB* population rate of between 62% and 78%. Trends in housing occupancy mirror population rates, in that, following a decline before 1990 – perhaps as a result of first *SCAK* schism – Village occupancy rates increased again. Furthermore, between Fall et al.’s 2000 study and my 2012 data collection, I expect that there was approximately 10-12% increase in the number of *OB* households in the

Figure 6.8. *OB* housing occupancy by percentage

Village. The overall CDP population may have declined over the past 4-5 decades, but it seems that the *OB* population and population density, at least at the household level, has remained relatively consistent.
In addition to housing, patterns of school enrollment show a consistent trend with population reckoning. In 1970, before the official school building was built, the Kenai school district dispatched a mobile unit and two teachers to teach 22 students in the Village (Pomeroy, 1984). Although there is a dearth of data for the 1980s, school enrollment for 1990 was 142 (Bryson, 2005). By 2000, there were 111 students, and in 2012, there were 72 (education.alaska.gov). These data are less malleable than basic population indicators, as there is only one school in the Village, and as Figure 6.9 shows, school enrollment patterns show a more robust pattern of decline than overall population estimates (Figure 6.10) – particularly when considering the additive effects of CDP calculations. The changes in the numbers of students likely reflects decreases in traditionally large families of 10-12 to significantly fewer children.

Figure 6.9. Student enrollment in the SCAK school
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Figure 6.9. Figures for school enrollment are more reliable than population statistics, because there is only one school, but they follow the same basic trajectory as overall population figures from Figure 6.7.
Figure 6.10. Culmination of SCAK Village OB population data estimates

Figure 6.10. These figures, from the time of settlement to fieldwork, are based on available census data, government reports, relevant literature, and participant information. The SCAK community is a rural community, and as a Census Designated Place (CDP), its population may be over-reported, as it is calculated, for census purposes, along with any surrounding residences within wide-ranging geographical borders. Furthermore, non-OBs who moved into the Village after the mid-1980s schism may have maintained community population figures, but without accurately representing the number of OBs in the Village. While the 2012 population estimate appears much smaller, it is also less inclusive than other population estimates of the area that focus on OBs and non-OBs together may have calculated.

Both the SCAK community population en masse and SCAK school enrollment show similar patterns of fluctuation, and over time, there is consistently approximately one-third of the population enrolled in the SCAK school. Taking into consideration population estimation issues, compounding historical factors (i.e., opening the village to outsiders, schisms, pursuit of higher education), and additional supporting evidence (i.e., housing occupancy and K-12 school enrollment trends), I reject the null hypothesis.

Although some individuals may be passively or actively rejecting OB traditions and leaving the community for better economic possibilities, there is either an equal or
increased rate of traditional transmission, which indicates that traditional transmission and retention of population – to some degree – was successful as of 2012.

Three dramatic types of change to the community may have affected its population: opening the community to outsiders, recurrent schisms, and changing perspectives of education. Although the community was still closed in the mid-1980s, by the end of the decade, the single road entering the Village was opened to outsiders (Dolitsky & Kuz'mina, 1986). Since that point, non-OB residents have inhabited vacant houses and built new ones. Among some Village members, however, there remains a separation of identity. As one Participant (2012) mentioned, “an American is building that house.” When I asked the participant to clarify what they meant, since they had been born in the United States as well, the Participant clearly categorized non-OBs as Americans.

Recurrent schisms have also given rise to OB population fluctuations. The most notorious schism in Village history centered on the ordination of an OB elder in Romania in the mid-1980s (see discussion in Chapter 3). Following that official schism in 1986, part of the Village left to a more remote part of the Kenai Peninsula to form a separate community and continue the traditions of bezpopovtsy OB lifeways (Dolitsky et al., 1991; Hardwick, 1991; Silva, 2009). There are no data regarding exactly how many people left, but their departure decreased the number of OBs in the Village. More recent schisms have probably not affected the Village population as drastically, but as one community member reported, “any time someone disagrees, they just move away and start a new village” (Participants, 2012). Interestingly, the most recent schism has not affected community population overall, since 3rd Village is geographically contiguous but
culturally distinct from the Village (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2001; SCAK Community Council, 2007), which is now also referred to as “First Village” (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2001).

*OBS’s* matriculation to college has also affected Village population. Following the first two students’ pursuit of post-secondary education in the 1990s (Hardwick, 1991), the general perception of higher education – and acceptance of it by Gen1 and Gen2 community members – changed. As of 2012, 100% of high school students graduated (Atwater, 2013), and it has become much more the norm instead of a rarity in cohorts to attend either a regional community college or a state university. While a few young Villagers either stay or return to the community to raise families, many more leave behind the separation strategy of their parents and grandparents for better economic opportunities that come with a college education.

For Villagers, religious shortcomings, education, and subsistence were the primary factors driving what they perceived as Village population decline. One middle-aged Participant (2012) was certain that their generation would be the last to carry the traditions of Old Belief, citing an inability of younger generations to follow the “narrow path” of the religion, along with the physical roads built into the Village that encouraged Villagers to seek economic gain outside the community.

**Conclusion**

In evaluating RQ1, I found that community members have succeeded in maintaining Russian language beyond the assumed standard of third generation language shift in refugee and immigrant communities (H6.1); however, *OCS* is not being maintained as vigorously (H6.4). I found that age (H6.2) is a robust indicator for frequency and comfort of language use, but that education (H6.3) is not necessarily a
reliable indicator for reduction in Russian use. In evaluating RQ2, I found that OBs who self-identify as Villagers are distinguishable from their 3rd Villager and non-OB counterparts by a narrow simple majority through conspicuous markers of membership in the form of Russian Orthodox crosses displayed on their houses, and OBs display markers of membership in the form of *krassnie ygli* in their houses (H6.5). With regard to conspicuous displays of membership at the individual level in the public domain, it seems that males and females may both display markers of membership weighed differentially by social role and age; however, the data do not substantiate females predominantly maintaining conspicuous displays more than males (H6.6). Finally, despite not overwhelming but also not unnoticeable population decline, population density, percentage of OB housing occupancy, and percentage of school enrollment relative to Village population, the SCAK OB Village population has remained relatively stable. Population stability indicates more success than failure when considering traditional transmission resulting in motivating younger generations to remain in the Village (H6.7); as case in point, six women were pregnant during my fieldwork, and all of the parents were expecting to remain in the Village.
Chapter 7: Discussion

Analysis in Chapter 6 provided the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions and hypotheses</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Not clearly supported</th>
<th>Not Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ1 - Is language maintenance correlated with community retention in the SCAK OB community?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.1: SCAK OBs surpassed the third generation language shift paradigm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.2: There will be a positive correlation between age and Russian language competency.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.3: Years of U.S. education will affect Russian language decay.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.4: Interaction with OCS will be sustained by younger SCAK OBs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ2 - Are conspicuous displays of membership correlated with community retention in the SCAK OB community?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.5: OBs houses in the Village are clearly delineated from their non-OB counterparts.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.6: Conspicuous displays of membership are maintained more often by females than males.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6.7: Traditional transmission will motivate subsequent generations to remain in the Village.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In assessing statistical analysis combined with considerations of theoretical frameworks discussed in Chapter 4 and additional observational data from the field, I see the following overall patterns. As I discussed in Chapter 4, traditionalist refugee and immigrant individuals and groups encompassed within an assimilationist dominant culture tend to have four behavioral strategies (Berry, 1997) – assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization – whereby settlers evaluate the cost-benefit ratio of cultural continuity and relationship-building with the dominant culture. With regard to
the SCAK OBs, the behavior of community members is highly characteristic of an initial period of maintenance of cultural traits and resistance of full participation in the dominant society for some time, followed by a slow shift for some members in acculturative strategy. Because of the SCAK OBs' sociohistorical circumstances and belief system, the cultural and linguistic situation in the Village is uniquely complicated. Patterned shifts in acculturative strategies for the SCAK OBs are not simply a steady progression from separation, through integration, and on toward assimilation. Neither has there been a single community-level consensus on the most beneficial acculturative strategy beyond separation; however, these shifts coincide with several formative events in Village history, and patterns of overlapping strategies now exist concurrently within the Village.

Additionally, as my analysis from Chapter 6 shows (Table 7.1), patterns of individual behavior suggest strong traditional transmission of cultural traits across generations despite distinctive approaches to apparel and variable approaches to language. Concomitantly, there also exists innovative cultural traits, some of which are also intergenerational. Some of these traits overlap and coexist without seeming contradictory to Villagers, and some of these traits are mutually exclusive. Essentially, the SCAK OBs exhibit two broad types of cultural transmission patterns (i.e., traditionally transmitted and innovated), but both transmission patterns are sometimes intergenerationally variable (e.g., some Gen1s are tolerant of exogamous marriages, and some Gen2s are not – though at a community-level, exogamous marriages are still not tolerated).
For the *SCAK OBs*, shifts in acculturative strategies are driven by changes in cultural transmission. These modifications to cultural transmission also influence other behaviors, like costly signaling or tolerance of innovation. Significantly, the process of transmission modification in the Village has not always been a conscious one, it is not unidirectional, and it has varying effects at the individual- and group-level. In order to discuss how data analysis and theoretical framework fit with: (a.) how changes in cultural transmission were initiated, (b.) what, if any, acculturative strategy shifts or other behavioral patterns resulted, (c.) where individuals could be situated in the community cultural perspective based on their behavior, and (d.) how individual-level and community-level behavior patterns and acculturative strategies overlap, I have developed visual models of the Village (Fig. 7.1-7.4) in various stages of its cultural evolution.

Following my discussion of what my analysis and theoretical framework indicate about individual-level patterns and group-level patterns of behavior, I suggest possible future trends of behavior for the *SCAK OBs*.

**Individual-level and Group-level Behavior**

The separation strategy the *OBs* first adopted in Oregon was partially spurred on by a Gen1 identity as refugees immigrating to a new nation. Resultant costly conspicuous signals of community affiliation in the form of linguistic (i.e., Russian and *OCS*) maintenance and apparel markers were, indeed, costly at both individual and group levels, as they were adhered to in the midst of a post-industrialized American town. At the point of *SCAK* Village settlement, a separation acculturative strategy continued and intensified based on a group-level focus of retaining *OB* religious identity as distinct from secular American identity; the primary goal was to protect the religious purity of children
in the community. Prestige biased transmission, with Village founders considered social and theological leaders, was the driving mechanism of community members’ separation acculturation strategy. While costly signaling of some cultural traits (e.g., religious rites

Figure. 7.1. Initial cultural transmission pattern and resulting behavior patterns of the SCAK OBs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>INITIAL TRANSMISSION MODIFICATION &amp; RESULTING ACULTURATIVE STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCAK Village founded (1968)</td>
<td>prestige bias separation strategy &amp; reduced costly displays to outsiders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.1. This figure illustrates the Village at its founding. Prestige biased cultural transmission was the driving mechanism for a separation acculturation strategy. Because the Village was geographically and socially isolated, the population was homogenous, resulting in a reduction of some traditionally transmitted cultural markers (e.g., conspicuous displays of membership).

and rituals, self-sustainable agricultural abilities, and skills in making clothing and accompanying OB materials) remained high, the cost of other cultural signals (e.g., language and conspicuous displays of membership) waned with Village homogeneity. At the individual level, traditional transmission was perpetuated through horizontal
transmission in the form of community elders (i.e., religious leaders), and at the community level, Villagers sought to maintain an identity of themselves as separate from Americans. Therefore, the group-level goal of separation from what was viewed as an impure American society paralleled the individual-level behavior of a separation acculturative strategy, and the strictures reported in early literature were maintained through a recursive relationship of individual-level and group-level behavior.

The first instances of innovative behavior in the closed SCAK OB community, and tolerance of them, are still debated among community members, because several cultural shifts occurred in quick succession. The introduction of a permanent public school building in 1983 was a monumental event for the Village. With Alaskan state-sponsored school administrators and the curriculum oversight that followed, novel markers derived from dominant U.S. culture were introduced to young SCAK OBs. When the Village was opened to outsiders, largely due to an ongoing process of changing economy, novel markers were introduced to older SCAK OBs as well. Farming and small-scale fishing were the initial subsistence strategies of SCAK OBs, as community members strove to be as self-sustaining and as removed from the larger American economy as possible. However, the possibility of complete self-sustainability waned as house repairs, non-agricultural supply needs, and economic demands necessitated outmigration of labor, selling produce to outsiders, and importation of materials from nearby American towns. Remnants of the height of transition from a small-scale self-sustaining economy to a cash-based economy are still evident in the Village; the fishing-boat-building business facility, which is located in the middle of the community, is dilapidated. Americans bought the property in the last few years, but they have yet to reinvigorate any actual
business. Ultimately, the opening of the school coupled with opening the Village meant that the geographic isolation the SCAK OBs initially sought was lost and novel markers from the dominant American culture became a permanent attribute of SCAK OB life. As a result, in the early- to mid-1980s, my assessment is that some individuals in the Village unintentionally shifted to conformity biased transmission of behavior, which was a driving mechanism for a slow shift to a more integrative acculturative strategy and reduced costliness of conspicuous signals of group membership towards outsiders.

I am not arguing that the SCAK OBs no longer signaled their group membership because it was too costly, but rather that the signals themselves had reduced social cost. The cost of cultural signals ebbs and flows, particularly with the OBs, as they migrated from more to less populated areas where signals held more or less cultural capital. When the SCAK OBs were geographically isolated, traditional apparel, overt displays of religiosity, and even language were not as costly, because of the high level of homogeneity. Until the Village was opened to outsiders, only a rare visitor was ever allowed in to conduct official business with Village leaders; outsiders in that case were the minority, and the bulk of cultural capital rested with Villagers. However, when the Village was opened, and Villagers continued their traditional lifeways in the presence of non-OB residents in the Village, speaking Russian, wearing traditional OB apparel, and the like required more sacrifice on the part of Villagers, and therefore those displays carried higher social capital and higher social cost. One aspect of OB lifeways that is consistently costly regardless of surrounding cultural patterns is performance of religiosity, because the number of holy days per year and the number of hours per
religious service require extensive time away from maintaining a livelihood (discussed in more detail below).

Statistically speaking, innovative behavior at the individual level, which reflects the shift to an integrative acculturative strategy occurred most noticeably in interaction with OCS (H6.4) and traditional apparel (H6.6). This shift in acculturative strategy was not immediate, though – the slow rate of change was intergenerationally cumbersome. For instance, after the Village opened, novel markers for girls’ high school athletic attire were not immediately tolerated by parents; it took nearly a decade for culottes to be permitted as girls’ official basketball and volleyball uniforms (Participants, 2012).

Figure 7.2 highlights part of the bicultural worldview SCAK OBs experience. The same individuals who displayed traits of conformity bias transmission in some aspects of their daily life (situated in the smaller circle in Figure 7.2) concomitantly displayed traits of prestige bias transmission in other aspects of their life (just as the smaller circle is also situated inside the larger circle of Figure 7.2). As Berry (1997) points out, integration is typically tolerated in the private domain first. In fact, tolerance of non-normative behavior is often initiated in the separation between private and public domains. Consider the role of technology in the SCAK OB community for example. All forms of personal technology, apart from perhaps the telephone, were considered heretical – particularly television (Morris, 1991; Razumovskaya, 2008; Scheffel, 1989). However, as the Village opened to outsiders, innovative behaviors like watching television became less novel. Then, when increasingly more individuals openly incorporated televisions in their households without negative reaction to their non-normative behavior, conformity
biased transmission was the driving mechanism for a more integrative acculturative strategy that eventually led to a public acceptance of satellite dishes displayed outside OB houses. When Vitali Vitaliev, a journalist with *London’s Daily Telegraph* visited an Alaska OB community in 2000, he asked the priest at the time about why satellite dishes were allowed, to which the *batiushka* answered, “We had to slacken up eventually. You ban television and the kids run to our American neighbours, or go to the cinema, which is even more dissipating” (Vitaliev, 2000, p. n.p.).
The sentiment conveyed by the batiushka in 2000 was not a result of a single event, but the culmination of many. Just three years after the public school building was constructed and the Village was officially opened to outsiders, the largest of several schisms occurred, which led to a splintering of the largest population of SCAK OBs in Village history. At that point, for those who remained with the now ordained priest and his popovtsy congregation, conformity bias was already driving a more integrative acculturative strategy, and this process gained momentum. Education for girls, which was historically deemphasized, was modified so that more girls remained in school instead of being expected to care for younger siblings at home. As one Gen2 Participant (2012) noted, while she had to hide her attempts at continuing education past the 7th grade from her mother while maintaining household duties, her children have all graduated high school and followed whatever higher education pursuits they wish.

Tolerance of innovative behavior at the household level with regard to education extended beyond girls after the events of 1983 and 1986; in fact, the average acceptable years of education for all OB children extended from five formal years to state-mandated eight years to the vast majority of SCAK OB children graduating from high school.

Household level tolerance of innovative behavior after the popovtsy-bezpopovtsy schism continued to increase in other domains as well. As increasingly more male OBs adopted American clothing instead of traditional OB clothing, the overt expression of clothing as a signal of OB membership was lost outside of religious services. I expected to find during fieldwork that there would be clear differentiation between male and female OBs, with more females still maintaining traditional clothing. However, statistically speaking, my hypothesis (H6.6) was not clearly supported (see Table 7.1).
While innovative behavior in the form of clothing has been tolerated, my assessment is that there remains less tolerance of beard shaving for men, or the absence of the *shashmura* for women. Regardless of the private-public domain dichotomy or the degree to which traditional dress is modified, I saw the *shashmura* absent for a married woman on only a single occasion; the *shashmura* was even present at times when the wedding ring itself was not (e.g., in cases of widowhood, swollen fingers of pregnancy, etc.). I focused on traditional apparel components as a suite of interdependent conspicuous markers. However, *SCAK OBs* may view each marker as independent – meaning that while I considered traditional apparel to be a single multifaceted unit (e.g., the *shashmura* and *sarafan* for females), the *SCAK OBs* may view each as an independent marker of membership.

Although the blending of American and traditional OB apparel may seem counterintuitive to outsiders, for the younger generations particularly, it is more representative of a bicultural identity. Where Village settlers self-identified as separate from American society, younger generations self-identify as both American and OB. As Figure 7.3 illustrates, individuals whose worldview exists at the intersections of the Village and school opening and the schism would exhibit behavior influenced by conformity bias as an increasingly powerful mechanism driving an integrative acculturative strategy, continued selected increase of costly signaling, and increased tolerance of innovation. The significant caveat here is that these individuals are concurrently existing in a community bound by prestige bias as a mechanism leveraging non-innovation through a separation acculturative strategy and highly emphasized costly
signaling of overt practice of religiosity. The question is, then, does individual manipulation of traditional behavior represent a group-level loss of traditional culture.

Figure 7.3. Sustained transmission pattern with modified resulting behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>PARTIAL INTEGRATION OF TRANSMISSION PATTERNS &amp; RESULTING BEHAVIORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCAK Village founded (1968)</td>
<td>prestige bias separation strategy &amp; reduced costly displays to outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school building opened (1983), Village opened to public (1986)</td>
<td>conformity bias integrative strategy &amp; increased costly signaling to outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest schism (1986)</td>
<td>conformity bias integrative strategy and increased tolerance of innovative behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.3. The bezpopovtsy-popovtsy schism was similar to the public school/Village opening in that the result was the introduction of novel markers and an increased momentum of conformity bias transmission driving a more integrative acculturative strategy. Individuals who remained in the Village and were influenced by this event were and are also concurrently influenced by multiple transmission patterns and acculturative strategies.

In Chapter 4, I discussed that cultural continuity can only exist when explicit care is taken to ensure that high fidelity transmission of behaviors occurs across multiple generations. I also discussed that individual level and group level behavior have a recursive relationship, such that when innovation occurs at high frequencies at the
individual level and aligns with group goals, group level innovation will also occur, which will then recursively affect those previously non-innovating individuals (Boyd & Richerson, 2009). With regard to the SCAK OBs, it is apparent through analysis of clearly supported hypotheses (Table 7.1) and my observation of community members during fieldwork, that many Villagers were still actively maintaining cultural continuity as of 2012. However, different aspects of traditional OB lifeways were given higher priority by different individuals, which may be affecting how Gen3 and Gen4 individuals perceive the OB worldview. For example, while some individuals said they view wearing traditional clothing daily – even in modified form – as an outward expression of cultural continuity and one worth preserving, others said they view maintaining Russian language as a more important aspect of OB lifeways. At this point, although individual modifications may be affecting the level of fidelity of transmission of traditional cultural traits to some degree, the majority of group level behavioral patterns have not been deleteriously affected. As Gen4 grows into adolescence and adulthood and Gen3 takes over leadership roles, these results may change; if the goals and needs of the community align with modified cultural traits being introduced now by individuals, these individual behaviors will spread and group-level behavior will mirror modifications that are now the minority and tolerated as deviant.

Perhaps the most pivotal cultural event for the SCAK OBs was the matriculation of two community members to college in 1990. While previous events issued in relatively subtle changes to individual behavior that would not necessarily lead to what Hochberg (2004) terms cultural meltdown, some community elders feared that leaving the Village for university would also mean young people’s permanent abandonment of
Old Belief, continual hemorrhage of community members, and a quick death of the Village itself. The community has been sustained for now. However, although there are some similarities in the results of this event and the previous two post-settlement events I have discussed, both the event itself and the timeframe made SCAK OBs matriculating to university a much more significant shift for many individuals, in my estimation, than the previous two events. Following the departure of OB students to college, my assessment is that younger OBs (younger Gen2s and Gen3s) saw opportunity – and had access to developing internet technology – that allowed them to view the globalizing world from a different perspective. Figure 7.4 illustrates how I estimate these individuals would be situated in the community.

There are three potentialities I saw, based on observational data, for individuals influenced by the first SCAK OBs leaving the Village in pursuit of higher education – coupled with concomitant technological advances and burgeoning globalization – first, for individuals who remained in the Village, unbiased transmission was and is the driving mechanism of behavior toward a more assimilation acculturation strategy than preceding generations. However, these individuals, depending on other intervening variables (e.g., age, sex, occupation, degree of religiosity), may also experience varying degrees of concurrent transmission patterns and acculturation strategies within their Village life. In Figure 7.4, these individuals would be situated somewhere within the “direct bias or unbiased transmission” circle but not outside the bounds of the “prestige bias” circle. Second, for individuals who left the Village and did assimilate into American life, the process is much less complex. Unbiased transmission was and is the driving mechanism of behavior toward complete assimilation represented by the part of the “direct bias or
unbiased transmission” circle of Figure 7.4 outside the bounds of the “prestige bias” circle. Third, for individuals who left the Village and either joined another OB

Figure 7.4. Accumulation of processes – transmission patterns, acculturative strategies, and behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE INTEGRATION: TRANSMISSION MODIFICATIONS &amp; RESULTING BEHAVIORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCAK Village founded (1968)</td>
<td>prestige bias separation strategy &amp; reduced costly displays to outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school building opened</td>
<td>direct bias or unbiased transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1983), Village opened to public (1986)</td>
<td>conformity bias integration strategy &amp; increased costly signaling to outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest schism (1986)</td>
<td>integration strategy and increased tolerance of innovative behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First OBs attended college (1990)</td>
<td>conformity bias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.4. This figure illustrates the dynamic integration of modifications to cultural transmission patterns in the SCAK OB community and the resultant changes in acculturative strategies, costly signaling, and tolerance of novel markers. The overlapping areas of each smaller circle are representative of the part of the community that is shaped by multiple transmission patterns and acculturative strategies, and the extension of “direct bias/unbiased transmission” circle beyond the “prestige bias” circle illustrates the effect of assimilation on the part of the community that is no longer concurrently influenced by multiple transmission patterns and acculturative strategies.

community through marriage or because of occupational circumstances or maintain Old Belief on their own, their circumstances are not represented in Figure 7.4. The particular
cumulative integration of transmission patterns and acculturative strategies in other North American OB communities, particularly as more cross-sect (bezpopovtsy-popovtsy) and exogamous marriages are permitted would be an excellent future path for research.

Even though as analysis of H6.7 indicates the youth of the Village are not fleeing, among older Gen1 community members, education continues to be perceived as one of the leading culprits for young people leaving the Village. At the same time now, though, certification or degrees beyond high school are respected and highly encouraged among many Villagers (Participants, 2012). In fact, in 2014, the first SCAK OB female high school athlete received a full scholarship to play in college (Jackinsky, 2014) and sent her letter of intent with her family’s blessing; this event is a broad departure from my Participant’s inconspicuous fulfillment of personal post-seventh grade educational goals. Although the literature I reviewed in Chapter 3 may have incorporated SCAK OBs’ views during a different period of transmission behavior and acculturative strategy, my assessment is that group-level goals about education are in transition, which most likely affected the unclear results of H6.3, with frequent exposure to innovative markers of higher education since 1990 having had the effect of spreading throughout the group through multiple transmission processes and now entering stages of recursive group-to-individual-level behavior patterns.

Education is not the only concern elders have as a potential impetus for young people leaving the Village or the faith, however. One SCAK Participant (2012) is concerned that the past decades’ economic problems are due to younger generations leaving the community and the “narrow path.” For this Participant, transportation allows easy access to cities. When the single road turned into multiple, and the first vehicle
travelled on them, people were able to choose both their physical and spiritual paths: “Our way is the narrow path, and kids want the wide path,” which means that in this Participant’s estimation, “my generation is the last to truly hold pure language and traditions.” In fact, this Participant talked with some Molokans just before moving to the United States. They warned that the Participant’s culture would be gone 30-40 years after moving here, and “they were right” (Participants, 2012). Although SCAK Old Belief may tolerate deviant markers that were initially unfamiliar to this Participant in 1964, the culture at a community level has survived past the apocalyptic prediction it was given.

Some elders may place the onus for upholding cultural continuity in the future on younger generations. However, beyond varying significance given to different cultural variables by different community members, I also found that some adult Villagers were not as interested in investing the time necessary to transmit high-fidelity traditional behavior to younger generations, or they seemed to find themselves in a position of not having the requisite time to invest with each child. After the SCAK OB community’s shift to a primarily post-industrialized cash-based economy, many households required two incomes; additionally, due to either spousal death or divorce, I found some households depending on a single parent to raise multiple children. The social landscape for these individuals, particularly when the Village school is public, offers Russian language intermittently, and the Village is open to outsiders moving in to buy vacant houses, is inevitably going to look different. For instance, single parents supporting multiple children may be more likely to allow innovation, particularly if that innovative behavior was encouraged by an increase of tolerance by other community members. One
single parent Participant worked long hours outside the Village, and though it was apparent that *OB* traditions were important to this Participant, they could not find the time necessary when they returned home to make traditional dinners, teach Russian, help with homework, teach traditional prayers and reinforce reading *OCS* before bedtime. The eldest Gen3 child in this Participant’s household did not participate in my study, and the others were not old enough, but none of them displayed high levels of Russian fluency, and English was used in the home while I was there.

With regard to young Gen3s’ use of Russian, a common theme among Participant households was that older children – who had already moved out of the house – had much higher levels of Russian and *OCS* fluency than younger children – the children I interacted with – because of shifts in the frequency of Russian speakers and teachers in the school as well as the amount of time parents had to instruct their children in multiple languages (Participants, 2012). Perhaps some households I visited displayed an increased use of English as a result of an Observer’s Paradox (Labov, 1972), whereby heritage speakers would be much more likely to speak Russian with family members and other native Russian speakers than with outsiders. Similar results have shown that heritage speakers are less likely to speak Russian with similarly-aged peers than with Russian-speaking adults; they readily switch to English if they are interacting with English-speaking interlocutors, which is considered to show a significant “functional reduction” (Dubinina & Politsky, 2012, p. 15) of Russian fluency. Although this differential code-switching behavior of heritage speakers is also considered as a mark of general language shift for individual speakers (Dubinina & Polinsky, 2012), my analysis suggests that this code-switching may be more a mark of bicultural orientation and the influence of
multiple transmission patterns and acculturation strategies than direct language shift. Furthermore, statistical analysis suggests that generalized shift has yet to occur at the group level for the *SCAK OBs*, meaning that enough young speakers are maintaining Russian, and group goals are still aligned with the maintenance of Russian as, at least a secondary language, to support that maintenance.

An unexpected source of innovative linguistic behavior tolerance came in the form of American nationalism by a few adult Participants. These individuals were not all from the same household, and they conveyed strong views that paralleled deeply rooted American political English-only perspectives. Vasta (2010) writes that nationalism is typically an external pressure for assimilation that works opposite to diversity initiatives of inclusiveness (discussed in more detail in Chapter 4), but for these middle-aged and older Gen1 Participants it may be the combination of media and internal pressure. While several Gen3 Participants, out of a sense of urgency to learn the language, were searching out ways to buy Rosetta Stone for the school as alternative to live Russian language instruction, which was not offered in 2012, a few middle-aged Gen1 Participants expressed their consternation at the possibility of tax dollars being spent to pay for bilingual Spanish-English signs. When I asked them about Russian-English signs, their answers were the same – it is the responsibility of any community to uphold whatever linguistic and cultural values they want, but it is not the responsibility of American taxpayers to include or encourage any language but English at a state or federal level (Participants, 2012). When I talked with one older Gen1 Participant about their individual linguistic and cultural history, they asked with exasperation, “Why can’t we just be Americans?” (Participants, 2012). Sidau’s (2010) ethnographic study of the
Woodburn community mentions that older community members at times seem to participate in OB traditions out of obligation instead of motivation to sustain the culture. Sidau suggests that people in the older generations are discouraged; they “are tired of struggling, and feeling like it is a battle that they are losing” (p. 68). Whether or not these adult Participants’ sentiments of nationalism are spurred on by sentiments of discouragement or alterations of ideology from what they initially held at the point of Village settlement is difficult to ascertain given the data I have for this project. Not only would it be helpful for future studies to ask more specific questions about these topics in order to understand these Participants’ worldviews, but also to clarify the potential for Village longevity. What the behavior of adult SCAK OBs illustrates is that not only is innovation being initiated by young and old alike, but tolerance of innovative behavior in the Village is even more complex than I initially expected.

Tolerance of deviant or innovative behavior can occur at all levels (i.e., individual level, household level, and group level) of a community. In assessing the patterns of behavior I observed and analyzed in the SCAK OB Village, where and when tolerance of deviant or innovative behavior began to occur, what allows tolerance to continue, and what tolerance will mean for the future of the Village with regard to cultural continuity is part of what makes SCAK OB behavior so complex. The literature and Participants suggest that older Gen1 OBs tolerated little deviation from traditional OB lifeways at the settlement of the community. However, my observation of behavior indicates that younger Gen1, Gen2, and Gen3 community members are more tolerant of innovative behaviors, but not all behaviors, and not all the time, and not everyone agrees about what innovative behaviors should be tolerated.
Behaviors that do seem to be nearly universally tolerated are modifications to clothing, which I have already discussed, and personal technology. The OBs managed cultural continuity over 300 years and many migrations partially assisted by the lack of globalizing assimilative technology. At this stage, the SCAK OB community is experiencing an increase in personal technology in younger generations that seems to parallel any other community. MP3 players and ear buds, smart phones, handhelds, social media access, and instant connectedness with outsiders seems to be typical behavior for Gen3 and Gen4 individuals. Although being electronically connected with the world may have benefits for finding a spouse in fitting with OB marriage constraints (some OB organizations have their own social media sites), or being more marketable in the job market, there may also be negative consequences for the maintenance of cultural continuity.

What is unquestionably holding this community together is the one essential variable I agreed to not focus on for this project: religion. Despite all the shifts in transmission behaviors and acculturation strategies over the decades’ events in the SCAK OB community, there remains an ever-present underpinning of prestige biased transmission and separation strategy. Religion permeates all aspects of life and in many ways continues to supersede widely accepted innovative behavior. In fact, one possibility for the development of tolerance – at least for some individuals – may be as a means of encouraging younger community members to adhere to the most vital of traditional behaviors during extensive religious days and remain in the Village themselves when they are old enough to make their own decisions.
A faded sign in the community store reminds customers that “Stealing is a Crime and a Sin” – an homage to the bicultural identity of both individuals and the Village in general. Many females who choose to wear American clothing when vacationing or visiting other cities don traditional clothing when they return; one Participant said she wears what feels most comfortable where she is – when she returns to the Village, she wears traditional clothing because she is OB (Participants, 2012). An argument could be made for conformity bias in this case, but as Figure 7.4 illustrates, in the case of the SCAK OBs, conformity bias and prestige bias are heavily entwined for individuals depending on what events have most influenced them as well as how they view themselves within the scope of the Village worldview.

Interestingly, family members who return to the Village for the most important holy days are said to be numerous, and they “easily slip back into the Old Ways” (Participants, 2012), which is to say they wear traditional OB clothing, use traditional language as appropriate, and participate in requisite fasting rituals during their visits. Clothing in this case cannot be a costly signal, as many of the returning family members do not wear traditional clothing outside the Village. However, the mechanism for acquiescing to traditional behavior includes aspects of conformity bias and prestige bias. As children, these returning family members were taught the significance of OB lifeways, and they maintain them when they are in the company of their teachers; another view is that they are simply more comfortable in the clothing of their youth when they are in the community of their youth. The religious ceremonies community members continue to attend are more clearly prestige biased driven, costly signals of religiosity. High holy days include overnight ceremonies and days’ long ceremonies; they require dedication of
time, spiritual cleanliness, and intimate knowledge of the belief system in order to participate in them. One Participant (2012) said, “Everything we are is our religion,” and that ideology was consistent, though it is expressed in varying ways. Discussions throughout my fieldwork returned to “measures of True Faith” (Participants, 2012) as most important for SCAK OB life in the Village. Considering that some resident Villagers and some non-resident ex-Villagers adopt the same conspicuous displays of membership when in the Village, a significant question is whether there is a difference in the acculturative strategy these individuals are following (Fig. 7.4). This question is an excellent one for future research (see Chapter 8).

Ultimately, my analysis in Chapter 6 showed little substantial population decline of OBs in the Village (H6.7), but there remains uncertainty for some elders about the future of Village viability. One question to consider here is what compels younger generations to stay in the Village? According to one Gen2 Participant (2012), remaining in the same Village that they grew up in, and knowing everything about the community and the school provides comfort and security; it is easier to reinforce beliefs and teach their kids to “hold fast” in the Village. This Participant’s tolerance of innovative behavior in the form of handhelds and other technological advances, additive effects of English, modifications to apparel and the like parallels that of many other SCAK OB parents. Rarely, Villagers who leave and assimilate into American life return permanently. Two of my Participants had returned to the Village; both of them had American spouses who were supportive of their choice to return. One of the Participants was fully active in the SCAK OB lifestyle and had even returned to wearing traditional apparel, while the other was significantly less active and retained more of their American
lifestyle while in the Village. When I asked the active _OB_ Participant why they had made the choice to return and fully participate, they responded that their American identity, and all that it entailed, was not fulfilling. In reevaluating life, faith and the truth of that faith was more fulfilling (Participants, 2012). This Participant felt that they had to choose between cultures instead of existing between them.

**Speculation of Future Trends**

To this point, I have discussed various possibilities of individuals adopting novel behaviors introduced through pivotal historical events that have led to modifications of transmission patterns and acculturative strategies. Bicultural identity and bilingualism have become fluid emic variables for the _SCAK OBs_ that in some instances have produced group level effects and in other instances have been encapsulated at an individual level phenomenon. What my analysis has indicated is that as of 2012, despite any reduction in the level of fidelity of cultural transmission, traditional transmission is continuing to occur at the group level. Furthermore, data analysis shows that at the individual level traditional transmission of most markers down to Gen3 is still occurring, and the _SCAK OB_ community has maintained its population. These two findings indicate that the Village remains intact because group goals and individual goals remain aligned enough on the focus of preserving _OB_ lifeways. With my present data, I cannot confidently model precise future behavior; however, based on the quantitative and qualitative data I do have, these are the suppositions I can make about what the Village may look like in the years to come.

Religiosity is the most significant facet of Village life and is the compelling force of conspicuous _OB_ markers. Apparel and language, both Russian and _OCS_, are of
variable significance. Overall, costly signals are already no longer as costly. Group-level tolerance of novel markers (e.g., overt loss of traditional apparel, especially among males) due to the combination of an integrative acculturative strategy and conformity bias from individual-level and geographic isolation has largely resulted in the loss of cultural capital of conspicuous markers of membership. Therefore, traditional apparel will most likely fade away in daily use and will mostly likely be donned for religious services alone – even then there may be significant modification. Language is more difficult to make predictions about based on my analytical results. As long as Russian and OCS are pervasive in religious services, they will most likely be transmitted to some degree in the community. If complete Russian language shift does occur, the triggering model may be a result of the later loss hypothesis. Currently, many Gen3 speakers are differentially valuing English – many are choosing to speak only English to their children. If this pattern continues, the result may be that Gen4 speakers will have Russian interlocutors in their young life (i.e., grandparents until they have passed), and then they will have no Russian speakers to practice with, at which point the community will become English-only. If cultural meltdown (Hochberg, 2004) does occur, recursivity of individual-level and group-level behavior would be its source, and most likely the last holdout, the last remaining center of OB lifeways would be religious ceremonies and rituals. Once the goal of the group is no longer centered on at least attempting to maintain traditional behavior there, then of course it follows that cultural continuity would fail.
Conclusion

As I have mentioned, I did not account for the intervening variable of technology in my study, and I agreed to leave out religion. The interplay of these two variables along with changes, intertwined as they may be, in transmission (as a mechanism for acculturation strategy) from vertical to oblique and horizontal has resulted in varying degrees of modifications at the individual level in acculturation strategies. During my fieldwork, though the community may soon reach irreversible momentum, OBs were managing continuity. The culmination of transmission patterns and acculturative strategies for Villagers has become much more complex over time, as would be expected for a traditionalist community embedded within a post-industrialized society, with the onus of sustaining cultural continuity in any domain or for any cultural variable beyond 2012 building heavily on those community members who have the desire to do so.

During one of his sermons while I was visiting, the batiushka spoke poignantly about Village life and OB lifeways. He said that “people in this Village have to take responsibility for teaching kids about OB traditions and language so we won’t lose them; without direct teaching, we will lose everything” (Batiushka, 2012). To what degree his parishioners enact his message is yet to be seen. Further studies will better parse out the complexities of which cultural and linguistic variables are being maintained at what rates and by whom; however, the suite of behaviors and multiple processes incorporated in contemporary SCAK OB Village life necessitates holistic consideration of both language and culture.
Chapter 8: Conclusion

In considering how facets of cultural evolution and refugee strategies relate to the SCAK OB community, I ultimately found that traditional transmission continues in the Village, although separation acculturation strategies have been complicated by integrative strategies, and in some cases, assimilative strategies. These results provide greater insight into refugee and immigrant contexts in general, where small groups of people find themselves living within larger sociocultural systems that have significantly different ideological perspectives and behavioral transmission patterns. Furthermore, this study has generated additional questions that can lead to supplementary research and clarification of how well North American OBs who are connected with the SCAK Village are maintaining cultural continuity and what the longevity of that continuity will be.

As I began this research, I developed hypotheses as a means of clarifying whether or not the SCAK OB community has maintained cultural continuity, but because this research is focused on a group descending from traditionalist religious refugees embedded in a post-industrialized society, it may also have broader anthropological implications for other religious refugee groups in similar contexts.

Broader Anthropological Implications

Because the research presented here is so multifaceted, it adds to the broader scope of anthropology and social sciences studies that focus on refugees and immigration, language maintenance, and cultural continuity. I attempted to find other ethnographic studies focused on how refugee or immigrant groups in various countries manage cultural continuity. Instead of what I expected to find, however, it seems there is
a corpus of literature, particularly outside the United States, based on pressing refugee and immigrant groups to assimilate to their host culture. I have chosen to include here the best articles that I could find, in that they have at least a few elements of cursory relevance to the research I have presented; a few of them raise unsettling questions of how to navigate integration with migrant or immigrant participants.

Thayer Scudder’s (1993) research on the forced resettlement of large numbers of Gwembe Tonga from the Gwembe Valley of Zambia to designated resettlement areas of Zambia and Zimbabwe highlighted what he termed “development refugees” (p.124) – entire communities relocated merely for the sake of development projects. In the case of the Gwembe Tonga, a dam was built on the Zambezi River that put their village over 100 yards under water. Focusing on census and education data, along with tensions between the relocated and host cultures over job and housing availability, Scudder outlined a five-stage process for successful “land settlement process” (p. 130) that ends with complete assimilation into the host culture. For him, suitable refugee rehabilitation planning for faster contributions to the host “development and culture” (p. 134) and innovation, especially in the form of acquiring Westernized prestige goods, are viewed imperialistically as positive attributes. Therefore, non-innovation and cultural continuity would not be his primary research goal. Over the course of his research, Scudder noted that generations at the point of article publication were growing up, getting married, and having children of their own without ever having seen the Valley the elders talked about. He observed the decline of traditional cultural traits following resettlement (e.g., funerary and puberty rituals, agricultural rituals, community-level leadership patterns) until some of them were accepted by the host community (e.g., funeral drumming), the modification
of traditional subsistence strategies – based on what the host community allowed – that led to more stable economy for the relocated Gwembe Tonga community, and younger generations leaving the rural village for education in bigger cities but maintaining contact with family members in the village. The fifth stage of complete assimilation for the Gwembe Tonga community was interrupted, because circumstances for everyone declined at both national and regional levels following Zambian economic downturns and policies affecting rural inhabitants.

Scudder’s findings show some similar patterns to mine with regard to change in subsistence strategies and some individuals leaving the resettlement village for educational opportunities in bigger cities. However, he never considers what facets of Gwembe Tongan culture community members might want to maintain, what transmission patterns look like or how they change with relocation, or how long it might be possible for the Gwembe Tongans to live biculturally. In fact, it is difficult to ascertain whether Scudder’s five-stage plan and emphasis on economic development of the Gwembe Tongans is intended as a means of assisting his participants in coping with an inevitable outcome or a discussion of how to assist developers in more efficiently Westernizing indigenous peoples.

More current research outside the United States similarly focuses on ways in which refugee and immigrant individuals and groups can become productive, acculturated members of the host culture, with an emphasis on how to make the process of progress faster and more efficient. Val Colic-Peisker’s (2009) research on refugees in Australia is not concerned with the preservation of refugee culture either, or what refugee cultures may want to preserve, but how quickly and how well refugees can adapt to new
environments. Colic-Peisker evaluates refugees at an individual level and categorizes participants into active and passive resettlement styles. There is a clear, value-laden distinction between those refugees who choose each style, with the active style being indicative of more valuable individuals for the Australian culture and labor market, and the passive style being indicative of individuals who will be a burden on the Australian economy. Individuals in the active resettlement style are further labeled as either achievers or consumers in society based on their cognitive orientation and behavior, and those who choose a passive resettlement style are labeled either endurers or victims based on their cognitive orientation and behavior. According to Colic-Peisker, interactions with interviewers and service workers influence resettlement styles, achievers are the most likely to quickly become productive members of their new society, and a passive resettlement style is less conducive to “normal life” (p. 79).

Colic-Peisker’s research does have a point of similarity with the research presented here: she includes multidimensionality of characteristics (i.e., linguistic, physical, and textile) when discussing the social visibility of refugees. However, she discusses the visibility of refugees as a detriment to their efficient and effective assimilation. Furthermore, Colic-Peisker seems to consider Australia’s financial stability as a primary mechanism for appropriately choosing immigrants – even if those immigrants have endured the atrocities of war.

In the U.K., Lucy Williams’ (2006) qualitative research began as an assessment of how refugees in Thanet and London are over-dependent on federal healthcare but led her to attempt to individualize a typically “homogenous and faceless group” (p. 870) and undermine stereotypes of refugees as aimless, “passive recipients of care” (p. 866).
Williams evaluates different types of social networks: cross-national (e.g., refugees maintaining virtual relationships with family and friends in countries of origin for support), national (e.g., governmental organizations or other refugees offering practical support for daily life), trans-national (e.g., refugees attempt to recreate culture of country of origin by maintaining contact across multiple countries, or helping extended family members immigrate), and networks of weak ties (e.g., temporary ties between refugees or individual refugees who have few social networks) with the goal of clarifying the importance of these networks to adequate refugee acculturation. Currently U.K. policy dictates that incoming refugees are only allowed to live near friends or family if those individuals can financially support the new arrivals; Williams suggests her research should be taken into consideration when housing new arrivals in order to appropriately financially and socially bolster both newly arriving and currently residing refugees.

Although Williams’ research highlights the significance of familial support, her research parallels Colic-Peiskers’ in favoring acculturation or assimilation over any construct of cultural continuity. Williams’ observation of the importance of overlapping and multifunctional networks is the similarity I see between her work and what I present here.

Current research in the United States seems to include more positive connotations of diversity as a potentially valuable cultural commodity. If researchers appreciate diversity, or at least tolerate diversity as a component of integrative strategies, there is room for the investigation of non-innovation or cultural continuity as a form of social adaptation. Support for diversity can in turn generate continued public policy that facilitates elements of culture that immigrant and refugee groups may be interested in preserving. Susan Hume and Susan Hardwick (2005) outline the draw of Portland for
refugee groups from Africa, Ukraine, and Russia and explain the benefits for each of these groups. Portland provides a positive host environment because of active, ongoing attempts to build a polyracial, polycultural society. Additionally, there are myriad federally funded and NGO associations providing refugees assistance with occupation retraining and stability, and multiple networks to support with moving and adjusting to new life in – importantly – whatever capacity refugees prefer. However, as Hume and Hardwick point out, insider networks are more important than social services provided to new arrivals. Refugee-initiated organizations exist for every African country represented in Portland in order to celebrate important holidays (e.g., independence days) and give social support to community members. Refugees from Ukraine and Russia immigrated in large groups after 1980; they were motivated by evangelical religious freedom and living together helps support the maintenance of “values, language, and beliefs brought from home” (p. 199). Hume and Hardwick note that many refugees experience great frustration in navigating social complexities of breaking through economic barriers of host culture without losing cultural components of their culture of birth. While there is not an evaluation of particular cultural traits, or a discussion of exact cultural continuity or community longevity in Hume and Hardwick’s article, their perspective of communities of refugees existing within adjacent geographic boundaries and carrying out intergenerational transmission of culture is similar in general concept to the research presented here.

Jamie Winders’ (2006) research focuses on Nashville as one of several cities that have not previously had large numbers of immigrants but were asked to take on or accept immigrants and refugees after 2001 as part of the “New American Community Initiative”
Winders notes that the refugee community in Nashville is politically, ethnically, and linguistically visible, and on par with that in Portland. Several governmental organizations and NGOs have been created to assist immigrant and refugee leaders in gaining the social capital necessary to become impactful agents of positive change for their respective communities in Nashville. She observes that the ethnic diversity of international refugees and Hispanic immigrants intersects with tensions stemming from Nashville’s historically racial dichotomy, and she suggests an increase of research focused on the changing climate of immigrant/refugee politics in Southern cities. Winders, like Hume and Hardwick, is significantly more centered on immigrant and refugee groups as independent units that can exist beyond the bounds of acculturation or assimilation to the host culture; however, there is still minimal inclusion of specific cultural variables and no analysis of intergenerational patterning.

Research that does consider specific cultural traits and intergenerational patterning tends to also incorporate a specific generation, instead of exploring multiple generations, which makes assessment of community longevity impossible. Jo Ann Farver, Sonia Narang, and Bakhtawar Bhadha (2002) evaluate the differences in acculturative strategies between Southern California Asian Indian immigrant parents and children using Berry’s (1992) model. Although participants were reluctant to answer questions about topics considered private, Farver, Narang, and Bhadha measured demographics, ethnic identification, religious affiliation, self-esteem, anxiety, family conflict, and acculturation through frequency of use of 17 Asian Indian cultural items and 13 Anglo cultural items (although the items were not listed). According to Farver, Narang, and Bhadha, Asian Indian immigrants tend to hyper-preserve Indian cultural
traits (e.g., emphasis on the extended family, traditional gender roles, deference to elders) – even beyond what is typically expressed in households on the Indian sub-continent. They found increased family conflict in families where parents had different acculturative strategies than children, for instance, where parents chose a separation or marginalization acculturative strategy and children chose an integration or assimilation acculturative strategy. Additionally, they found that parents tend to maintain biculturalism, while adolescents choose to assimilate much more quickly, because adolescents who maintain a bicultural identity may experience alienation from American peer groups. Farver, Narang, and Bhadha’s research intimated areas of cultural continuity and change, but the researchers did not delve into specifics of which traits were maintained or lost between generations or by whom or why.

A similar study by Arpana Inman, Erin Howard, Robin Beaumont, and Jessica Walker (2007) provides a qualitative evaluation of Asian Indian immigrant parents’ perspectives of cultural shift. Among other things, Inman et al. found that cultural continuity was not universally emphasized among parents, and that “mothers regretted overworking and not being available to their children, whereas fathers regretted not speaking the ethnic language” (p. 99). Inman et al.’s study highlights interesting intragenerational variation of a few cultural traits; however, because the participants do not seem to be geographically integrated, it is difficult to parse out what internal and external acculturative pressures are a result of not having local Indian immigrant networks to rely on for support.

Another intragenerational study is Dina Birman, Edison Trickett, and Andrey Vinokurov’s (2002) research, which focuses on how well Gen1 Soviet Jewish adolescents
are adjusting to life in Maryland. Birman, Trickett and Vinokurov also use Berry’s (1992) acculturation matrix among others to evaluate the adaptive benefits of varying styles of acculturation across domains in different contexts. In particular, they question the benefits (e.g., health benefits) of bicultural acculturative style for adolescents and propose that when cultural traits or values between two cultures of belonging conflict, biculturalism is unlikely. As a means of approaching evaluation of their research questions, Birman, Trickett and Vinokurov offer a multidimensional model including language, identity, and behavior and incorporate the following measures: peer and family relationships, feelings of loneliness, and achievement in school. Following analysis, Birman, Trickett and Vinokurov found that acculturation to each culture (i.e., American or Soviet Jewish) was advantageous for their adolescent participants in specific contexts. They were surprised to find high levels of sustained Russian language competence despite an average of five or more years in the United States, and they related this language anomaly to a perceived achievement in multiple areas of education. There were additional unexpected findings with language as well; American language competency related to many variables, while Russian language competency related only to peer support and increased GPA. Birman, Trickett and Vinokurov used these curious results as an example to caution against drawing conclusions from a single domain or assessment, arguing that it is not possible to understand the complete complex process of adaptive patterns of acculturation that fluctuate with cultural circumstances individuals encounter from a single cultural trait like language.

As Birman, Trickett and Vinokurov (2002) mention, and as is evident from the plethora of studies on the topic, maintenance and shift (i.e., continuity and innovation)
are much more widely studied from a linguistic perspective. Third generation language shift, typically attributed in the United States to Joshua Fishman (1966) and Calvin Veltman (1983b) has been extensively investigated. Language shift surpassing the third generation but occurring in the fourth generation in a Greek community in Pittsburgh was facilitated through an active Church community and language classes, as well as the continual introduction of monolingual Greek-speaking marriage partners emigrating from Greece (Baker, 2011). Interestingly, changes in dominance can occur, such that dominance of one language over other in one generation can alternate in another. This alternating dominance, in the case of Quechua in Peru resulted in balanced bilingualism in the third generation, alternating dominance between Quechua and Spanish in generations two and four, and language shift in the fifth generation. According to Colin Baker (2011) communities like the Pennsylvania Amish surpass third generation shift “by retaining boundaries between them and the outside world” (p. 76), while communities that tend toward third generation shift like a prominently Italian-speaking community in Pittsburgh have no language instruction and share a Catholic church with other ethnic Catholics. Baker’s examples are not ethnographic in nature, but they do offer similarities to the research presented here in that third generation language shift is not universal.

With a more ethnographic perspective, Richard Alba (2005a) set out to investigate the possibility of sustained bilingualism as a viable alternative to the third generation shift paradigm. Alba evaluated numerous ethnic groups through census data and compared reported spoken language at home; he found that the third generation language shift paradigm is largely supported with the exception of Spanish speakers where endogamous marriage and community support are present. One question using census
data alone metes out is how it would be possible to evaluate whether or not children categorized as *bilingual* are functionally proficient in both languages. However, whether or not participants in the research presented here could also have over-emphasized their knowledge of Russian or English cannot be established beyond doubt; the most essential element of research here, it seems, is to adopt or develop as multidimensional a method and model of inquiry as possible.

One ethnographic study that had a more similar structure to mine, in looking at the influence of family units and surrounding culture on potential language shift, is Carla Finocchiaro’s (2004) comparative research on language maintenance in Italian immigrant families in three countries (i.e., U.S., Australia, and France). All of the families included in Finocchiaro’s study were at least three generations from the point of immigration, and all had descended from a common ancestor, so there was a reduction of intervening variables. Finocchiaro found a reduction of third generation functional use of Italian in the U.S., but much stronger skills in third generation speakers in Australia and France – perhaps owing to an emphasis on bi/multilingual educational policies and a social perspective of bi/multilingualism as a significant skill in those countries. In juxtaposition, monolingualism was favored in all domains in the U.S. Finocchiaro’s research was not multidimensional; it did not consider specific cultural traits or transmission patterns. Her model of international comparison would be helpful, though, for future studies of relative success the OBs have had in varying global situations, as there are communities in Romania, Brazil, and Australia.

Perhaps one of the most influential perspectives for potential future research is Tasaku Tsunoda’s (2006). Tsunoda argues that language shift as a single theory is too
simplistic, as each instance requires its own definition and contextual considerations. For Tsunoda, evaluating functional domains of language (Table 8.1) through a combination of classic approaches, like Hymes’ (1971) ethnography of *SPEAKING* and Fishman’s (1972) approach to speech domains, and observation of language dominance, it is possible to more fully clarify the role of a given language to a given speaker or community of speakers.

Table 8.1. Adaptation of Tsunoda’s functional domains of speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Domains of Speech</th>
<th>Minority Language</th>
<th>Majority Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>post-industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private</td>
<td></td>
<td>public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious</td>
<td></td>
<td>secular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside the family</td>
<td></td>
<td>inside the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with community members</td>
<td></td>
<td>with outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td>for power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2. Adapted from Tsunoda 2006, p. 65 – who combined Fishman’s approaches to speech domains (1972) and Dell Hymes’ ethnography of *SPEAKING* (1971)

Tsunoda also discusses enclave languages of immigrants, such as Hungarian in Austria or Scottish Gaelic in Nova Scotia. In the case of the former, the language is associated with peasant agriculture, the ways of the past, and is generally denigrated by younger speakers and outsiders. In the case of the latter, adults are the primary sources of pressure for maintaining the language as a means of maintaining community solidarity through language loyalty. By the middle of the 20th century, however, pressures for linguistic maintenance gave way, and Scottish Gaelic has been relegated to the domain of private adult use (Tsunoda 2006). Through employing an assessment like Tsunoda’s, it would be much easier to establish whether or not Russian in the *SCAK OB* community, as
an enclave language, is stable or fluctuating in terms of bilingualism. Furthermore, there would be a much more efficient means of re-evaluating the use of Russian and English in terms of functional usage and functional domains to determine dominance.

According to Richard Alba, John Logan, Amy Lutz, and Brian Stults (2002), “Language is a critical domain for assessing acculturation because it is a socially salient indicator of cultural difference and a marker of ethnic boundaries” (p. 468); combined with other cultural variables to contextualize language usage, I agree. Without a broader cultural context, as Birman, Trickett and Vinokurov (2002) caution, it is all too easy to depend on curious findings as a complete explanation when in fact, the findings are merely an indication of a more deeply rooted cultural process. The same can be said of cultural research without a consideration of language, particularly in the case of immigration and refugee studies.

**Avenues of Future Research**

In Chapter 7, I mentioned two potential future areas of research that could better estimate the longevity of the SCAK OB Village. First, there is the issue of how SCAK OBs who left the Village and joined other OB communities would fit within the worldview I proposed in Chapter 7. What transmission patterns do those individuals maintain? What acculturative strategies do they use? Do their choices have any lasting effect on remaining family members in the Village, and if so, what are they? The geographically integrated popovtsy-bezpopovtsy SCAK Village also brings up the question of what type of OB community Villagers would choose to settle in, and what effect that choice would have on family members’ remaining in the SCAK Village. For instance, although the largest current North American settlement of traditionalist OBs is
near Woodburn, OR and is reported to also be geographically integrated (Morris, 1991; Sidau, 2010), others are smaller, more conservative bezopopovtsy communities (Holdeman, 2002; Participants, 2012a). Where these Villagers choose to settle, and what the prevailing transmission patterns and acculturative strategies are at both individual and group levels may have significant effects on the longevity of the SCAK OB Village depending on those patterns/strategies and the amount of social media and other communication between family members.

Second, assessing whether and what kind of difference in acculturation strategy there is between individuals who display conspicuous markers of membership while in the Village and live in the Village and those who display conspicuous markers of membership and do not live in the Village would be an essential aspect of determining longevity of the Village – particularly because for this community these conspicuous markers are tied to “measures of True Faith” (Participants, 2012). Approaching this question would necessitate an emic evaluation of SCAK OBs living outside the Village with regard to self-identification (e.g., OB, American, bicultural), frequency of time spent as an OB and an American, and, for comparative purposes, more general conceptions about what it is to be OB. My perspective here is that there cannot be a binary assessment of adherence to variables leading to an appropriate understanding of SCAK OB cultural processes; instead, there is a much more fluid and transitory movement between acculturative strategies with the possibility to return to previously experienced strategies, and continuous influence by the initial Village strategy of separation. As I have found, the “measure of True Faith” within the Village varies, so additive perspectives from current or once members outside the Village may clarify current
overall cultural patterns of acceptable OB lifeways, potential longevity of the Village, and impetus for individuals who have left the Village to settle elsewhere. In addition to clarifying cultural processes and potential longevity of the SCAK OB Village, the second approach to comparatively evaluating the acculturative behaviors of Village inhabitants and Village relocaters could also shed light on how refugee and immigrant cultures exist within globalizing societies so that community members would know what to expect and could work to extend cultural continuity and language maintenance beyond expectations or estimations if they chose to do so.

Avenues of future research, which would require additional data collection, is an important consideration. However, the research presented here is only the beginning of analysis of data that I already have. As I mentioned in Chapter 5, this dissertation is based on analysis of four questions in a thirteen-question survey, and many of these questions are multi-faceted. I also have additional qualitative and quantitative data not included here. The first project I want to work on following completion of this dissertation is evaluation of potential Russian word order variability. Variable word order languages have been discussed for some time, with Russian and Japanese word order variability being considered comparable in some ways (Bailyn, 2001, 2003; Iwasaki, 2003). However, structural linguists tend to focus on qualitative methods in support of their arguments. In order to evaluate whether or not and to what extent Russian is a variable word order language, I asked each participant to rate a series of written Russian sentences as acceptable or unacceptable. With this data, I want to analyze the results using mixed methods and clarify the question of word order variability, at least from a case-study perspective.
Closely related is the question of whether or not the SCAK OBs speak an *archaic* form of Russian (Argudyaeva, 2011; Gay, 1988; Roberta L Hall, 1973). Only one of the SCAK OBs allowed me to audio-record their speech, and what I noticed when speaking with them in Russian seemed to be linguistic differences akin to dialectical differences and multiple migrations than a single, unified archaic form of Russian. I have written records from a Participant (2012) that I want to compare to written Russian from various time periods in order to evaluate the question of whether or not the language the SCAK OBs speak is more reminiscent of pre-20th century Russian or a mixture of dialects and calques from Chinese and Portuguese.

In the survey, I also asked Participants (2012) to rate the relative importance of five variables: cultural history, family history, language, cultural traditions, and religious traditions. As a continuation of the research presented here, it would be interesting to investigate correlations between what variables Participants rated highest and their comfort and usage of Russian, English, and OCS language.

The potential for future research in this area is great. However, it is important to realize that what one of my Participants (2012) said is a valid representation of how many in the Village feel: “What could you want to ask? Everyone has already studied everything there is to know about us.” Although academics may not agree with my Participant, the sentiment they expressed must be respected. From an emic perspective, Participants cannot imagine any further research that would benefit them; for some of them, although I was graciously tolerated, my questions were beyond what they considered helpful to the community.
Conclusion

The research I have presented here is intended as an evaluation of the mechanisms that cause variation in fidelity and mode of transmission of behavior in a single community because of this community’s unique history. Through further understanding non-innovation and prolonged cultural continuity in the midst of increasing globalization, not only can we gain knowledge about human prehistory, but we can also gain knowledge about the potential future of refugee and immigrant groups who continually find themselves, either voluntarily or forced, in similar situations of living in a dominant society with very different lifeways, religious systems, and normative cultural behavior. Overall, I have been able to quantifiably support that longitudinal cultural continuity is possible; however, it is not apparent in every domain, and I have not been able to define or find a measure for how long cultural continuity can last in post-industrial contexts given any certain parameters. In essence, I found that third generation language loss is not universal, even with an integrative strategy; religion is a unifying cultural element within this – and potentially other – cultures for high-fidelity traditional transmission (the more central the religious behavior, the more faithful the transmission); and social media and television are primary sources of conformity bias, at least for the SCAK OBs, that have negated geographic isolation as a legitimate boundary from the American culture at large.

Additionally, I found that while high-fidelity transmission is the most straightforward means of ensuring cultural continuity, for the SCAK OBs, reduced-level fidelity transmission, varying transmission patterns, and varying acculturation strategies are all intentional strategies, with modifications to transmission patterns acting as the
mechanism for cultural change and maintenance in a complex and fluid system. To this point, cultural meltdown has not occurred, and as long as innovative behavior is tolerated by individuals in the community under a critical threshold while they are choosing which traditional behaviors to maintain, the community should be able to continue as it was in 2012. However, it is important to state plainly that this community and every other should have the choice to exist as they will. I have included in this chapter a couple of articles that seem to focus more on economic integration of refugee or immigrant groups, but with a concomitant emphasis on cultural assimilation. My study shows that such extreme shift from cultural continuity is unnecessary; it is possible for immigrant and refugee groups to maintain their cultural heritage while still living in American society, and they should have the choice to do so if they wish. I have also included potential areas of future research for the SCAK OBs. Keeping in mind the ethical considerations of anthropology as a discipline and the importance of choice I just noted, I must make it clear that if I were to ask my participants what they would want next out of this dissertation and future research, I believe they would simply want to be left alone.
Appendix A: Questionnaire

Part 1: Russian Language
Directions: Read each sentence. Write ✓ next to each sentence that would sound normal if you heard someone say it. Write ✗ next to each sentence that would sound funny or weird if you heard someone say it. Label each sentence provided below. Mark the sentences as quickly as possible – I want to know your first impression.

Ваня дал мне газету.
Лена смеялась громко в комнате.
Читала книгу тихо Ника дома.
Дома Ника книгу читала тихо.
Газету дал Ваня мне.
Увидел Иван собаку в парке вчера.
Алеша сидел удобно на диване.
Удобно на диване Алеша сидел.
Читала дома тихо книгу Ника.
Ваня мне дал газету.
Мне газету Ваня дал.
Смеялась в комнате Лена громко.
Иван увидел вчера собаку в парке.
Громко смеялась Лена в комнате.
Вчера Иван собаку в парке увидел.

В парке собаку Иван увидел вчера.
Тихо книгу читала дома Ника.
Дал Ваня газету мне.
Сидел Алеша удобно на диване.
На диване сидел Алеша удобно.
Дал мне газету Ваня.
Смеялась громко в комнате Лена.
Собаку в парке увидел вчера Иван.
Алеша удобно на диване сидел.
Алеша удобно на диване сидел.
Увидел собаку вчера в парке Иван.
Лена в комнате смеялась громко.
Книгу Ника читала дома тихо.
В комнате Лена смеялась громко.
Ника читала книгу дома тихо.
На диване сидел Алеша удобно.

Part 2: Russian and English Language
Directions: This section asks questions about many different aspects of language use and interaction. 1.) For multiple-choice questions, circle the answer or answers that describe you best. You may circle as many answers as you think appropriately describe you. Please mark your answers clearly. If any question is unclear, ask me. 2.) For tables, follow the specific instructions provided above each table. Please feel free to add any extra comments if you have them.
Part 2.1: Language Use

1. This table has to do with your daily interaction with language. Think about the amount of time every day that you spend hearing, speaking, reading, and writing/typing in both Russian and English. Please circle only one number in each row that most accurately represents your daily experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Experience</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russian</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing/Typing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing/Typing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you read books for fun in **Russian** now?
   a. Yes
   b. No

3. Do you read books for fun in **English** now?
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. This table has to do with how comfortable you feel using each language. Think about how comfortable you feel, in general, when you read, write/type, speak, and listen to both Russian and English. Please circle only one number in each row that most accurately represents your experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Experience</th>
<th>Level of Comfort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Uncomfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russian</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing/Typing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing/Typing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. When you hear someone speaking, is it easier for you to understand them if they are speaking in Russian or in English?
   a. Russian
   b. English
   c. I understand both equally.
6. If you are speaking with people who speak both English and Russian, which language do you use most often?
   a. English
   b. Russian
   c. I use them both equally.

7. If you are speaking with people who speak both English and Russian, do you find yourself saying some phrases in English and some phrases in Russian?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I can’t tell.

Part 2.2: Language Influences

8. This table has to do with what language was the first that you and your family members learned. Please mark an X in the box that indicates your answer for each of the family members listed. You may mark as many boxes as you think are appropriate. If any of the family member categories does not apply to you, (for example if you do not have children) please draw a line through the row. If there are or were circumstances that do not fit the categories provided, please write any additional comments below the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Member:</th>
<th>First Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Maternal Grandmother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Maternal Grandfather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Paternal Grandmother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Paternal Grandfather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Oldest Sibling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Youngest Sibling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Eldest Child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Youngest Child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. If you DO have children, and have filled in the whole table above, please draw a large X through Question 9 and move ahead to Question 10. If you do NOT have children, do you plan to teach your children Russian?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don’t know yet.
   d. Other: _______________________________________________________________

10. For you, what has been the most influential source(s) for learning Russian?
    a. Parents or family at home
    b. School
    c. Church
    d. Other: _______________________________________________________________
11. For you, what has been the most influential source(s) for learning English?
   e. Parents or family at home
   f. School
   g. Church
   h. Other: _____________________________________________________________

12. Do you consider yourself a native speaker of:
   a. Russian
   b. English
   c. Both
   d. Other: ____________________________________________________________

13. In your home, do you prefer that your family speaks English or Russian?
   a. English
   b. Russian
   c. It doesn’t matter.

14. In your home, do you prefer that your friends speak English or Russian?
   a. English
   b. Russian
   c. It doesn’t matter.

15. In your home, if you have visitors who do not speak Russian, do you speak Russian around them?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Part 2.3: Stories

16. This table has to do with who told or read you stories in what language(s) when you were young. Please mark an X in the box that indicates your answer. You may mark as many boxes as you think appropriately describe you. If any of the family member categories does not apply to you, please draw a line through the row. If there are or were circumstances that do not fit the categories provided, please write any additional comments below the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Member</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>I don’t remember</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Grandmother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Grandfather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Grandmother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Grandfather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. This table has to do with what language you used to read or tell stories to younger generations. If any of the family member categories does not apply to you, or if any are unnecessary (for example, if you answer “All Children”, then “Eldest” and “Youngest” would be unnecessary) please draw a line through the row. If there are or were circumstances that do not fit the categories provided, please write any additional comments below the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Member</th>
<th>Your Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldest Children Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest Children Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Grandchildren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldest Grandchildren Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest Grandchildren Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. When you were young, which did you **enjoy** more: stories in Russian or stories in English?
   a. English
   b. Russian
   c. It didn’t matter.
   d. I only heard stories in Russian.
   e. I only heard stories in English.

19. This table has to do with what your children and/or grandchildren seemed to **enjoy** more: stories in Russian or stories in English. If any of the family member categories does not apply to you, please draw a line through the row. If there are or were circumstances that do not fit the categories provided, please write any additional comments below the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Member</th>
<th>Your Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Do you tend to **remember** Russian stories or English stories better?
   a. English
   b. Russian
   c. There is no difference.
   d. I only heard stories in Russian.
   e. I only heard stories in English.
Part 2.4: Poetry

21. This table has to do with what kind of contact you have had or do have with poetry. Please mark an X in the box that indicates your answer for both Russian and English. If any of the language categories does not apply to you, please draw a line through the row. If there are or were circumstances that do not fit the categories provided, please write any additional comments below the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Used to Read</th>
<th>Used to Memorize</th>
<th>Read now</th>
<th>Memorize now</th>
<th>No contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. If you did NOT memorize Russian poetry when you were young, please draw a large X through Questions 22-25 and move ahead to Part 2.5. If you DID memorize Russian poetry when you were young, who encouraged you?
   a. Parents
   b. Grandparents
   c. School
   d. I chose to memorize poetry on my own.
   e. Other: ______________________________________

23. If you DID memorize poetry in English when you were young, who encouraged you?
   a. Parents
   b. Grandparents
   c. School
   d. I chose to memorize poetry on my own.
   e. Other: ______________________________________

24. If you DID memorize Russian poetry when you were young, do you still remember any of it?
   a. Yes
   b. No

25. If you DID memorize English poetry when you were young, do you still remember any of it?
   a. Yes
   b. No
Part 2.5: Language in School

26. This table has to do with which languages were offered during your school years and whether or not you chose to take them. Please mark an X in the box that indicates your answer for each category of school for both Russian and English. If any of the language or school categories does not apply to you, please draw a line through the row. If there are or were circumstances that do not fit the categories provided, please write any additional comments below the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages in School</th>
<th>Offered</th>
<th>Not Offered</th>
<th>I took them</th>
<th>I did NOT take them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. This table has to do with which language(s) were used most often during your school years. Please mark an X in the box that indicates your answer for each category of school. If any of the school categories does not apply to you, please draw a line through the row. If there are or were circumstances that do not fit the categories provided, please write any additional comments below the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Category</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. This table has to do with whether or not grammar classes were offered during your school days, and whether or not you chose to take them. Please mark an X in the box that indicates your answer for each category of school for both Russian and English. If any of the language or school categories does not apply to you, please draw a line through the row. If there are or were circumstances that do not fit the categories provided, please write any additional comments below the table. **NOTE:** What I mean by the word “grammar” are things like learning parts of speech, how each part of speech functions in a sentence, or diagramming sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar in School</th>
<th>Offered</th>
<th>Not Offered</th>
<th>I took them</th>
<th>I did NOT take them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3: Old Church Slavonic Language

Directions: This section asks questions about many different aspects of language use and interaction. 1.) For multiple-choice questions, circle the answer or answers that describe you best. You may circle as many answers as you think appropriately describe you. Please mark your answers clearly. If any question is unclear, ask me. 2.) For tables, follow the specific instructions provided above each table. Please feel free to add any extra comments if you have them.

1. Have you ever heard of the language called Old Church Slavonic or Old Church Russian?
   
   a. Yes
   b. No

   **If you answered NO to Question 1, please skip this section and move ahead to Part 4 of the survey.**

2. Have you ever been taught how to read or pronounce any Old Church Slavonic?
   
   a. Yes
   b. No

   **If you answered NO to Question 2, please skip this section and move ahead to Part 4 of the survey.**

3. This table has to do with the type of experiences you have had with Old Church Slavonic words or letters and how old you were when you started learning Old Church Slavonic. Please mark an X in the box that indicates your answer for each category of experience. Then write down how old you were when you started learning to pronounce and/or read Old Church Slavonic words or letters. If there are or were circumstances that do not fit the categories provided, please write any additional comments below the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Language Pronounce</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>Pronounce</th>
<th>Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Church Slavonic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. This table has to do with the amount of time each week you interact with Old Church Slavonic. Please circle only one number in each row that most accurately represents your experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Times per Week</th>
<th>Type of Experience</th>
<th>Very Rarely Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Church Slavonic</td>
<td>Hear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronounce</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. For you, what have been the most influential sources for learning Old Church Slavonic?
   
   a. Parents or family at home
   b. School
   c. Church
   d. Other ____________________________________________________________

6. Have you ever memorized texts or parts of texts in Old Church Slavonic?
   
   a. Yes
   b. No
7. If you answered **NO** to Question 6, please draw a large X through this question and move ahead to Question 8. If you answered **YES** to Question 6, who encouraged you to memorize texts or parts of texts in Old Church Slavonic?
   a. Parents or family at home
   b. School
   c. Church
   d. Other ________________________________

8. Do you think that Old Church Slavonic and Russian are similar?
   a. Yes
   b. No

9. If you answered **NO** to Question 8, please draw a large X through this question and move ahead to Question 10. If you answered **YES** to Question 8, please circle what parts of Old Church Slavonic you think are similar to Russian. You may circle as many answers as you think appropriately describe you.
   - The way the letters look.
   - The way whole words look.
   - The way Old Church Slavonic sounds.

10. Do you think it is important for people of Russian heritage to have some knowledge of Old Church Slavonic?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. I don’t know.

11. This table has to do with whether or not you taught your children and/or grandchildren Old Church Slavonic. If any of the family member categories does not apply to you, please draw a line through the row. If there are or were circumstances that do not fit the categories provided, please write any additional comments below the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Members</th>
<th>Teaching Old Church Slavonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Children</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Grandchildren</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. If you **DO** have children, and have filled in the whole table above, please draw a large X through Question 12 and move ahead to Part 4. If you **DO NOT** have children, do you plan to teach your children **Old Church Slavonic**?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. I don’t know yet.
Part 4: Family and Traditions

Directions: This section asks questions about many different aspects of family and traditions. 1.) For multiple-choice questions, circle the answer or answers that describe you best. You may circle as many answers as you think appropriately describe you. Please mark your answers clearly. If any question is unclear, ask me. 2.) For tables, follow the specific instructions provided above each table. Please feel free to add any extra comments if you have them.

1. How many generations live in your house?
   a. 1
   b. 2
   c. 3
   d. More than 3

2. This table has to do with how close you live to your relatives and how often you see them. Please mark an X in the box that indicates your answer for each category of family member. Then write down how often you see them. If any of the family member categories does not apply to you, please draw a line through the row. If there are or were circumstances that do not fit the categories provided, please write any additional comments below the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Write out your best estimate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same House</td>
<td>Same Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Grandparents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Grandparents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-laws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. This table has to do with how much you know about history and traditions. If any of the categories does not apply to you, please draw a line through the row. Please circle only one number in each row that most accurately represents your experience.

NOTE: When I use the phrase “Russian traditions,” I mean things like embroidery, cooking Russian food (borscht, pel’meni, etc.), celebrating holidays and Holy Days. When I use the phrase “Old Believer Traditions,” I mean things like special clothing (rubakh, shtanyiy, sarafanij, platki, etc.) and special services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Knowledge</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Family History</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian History</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Saints</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Believer History</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Traditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Believer Traditions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Do you think knowing about Russian traditions is important?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Maybe a little bit.
   d. I don’t know.

5. Do you think knowing about Old Believer traditions is important?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Maybe a little bit.
   d. I don’t know.

6. Who taught you or is teaching you the most about Russian traditions?
   a. Mother
   b. Father
   c. A Grandmother
   d. A Grandfather
   e. Other ____________________________________________

7. Who taught you or is teaching you the most about Old Believer traditions?
   a. Mother
   b. Father
   c. A Grandmother
   d. A Grandfather
   e. Other ____________________________________________

8. This table has to do with how influential you think American society is on yours, your children’s and your grandchildren’s knowledge of language, history, and traditions. If any of the categories do not apply to you, please draw a line through the row. Please circle only one number in each row that most accurately represents your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Level of Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Language</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian History</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Traditions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Believer Traditions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Language</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian History</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Traditions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Believer Traditions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Your Grandchildren</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Language</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian History</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Traditions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Believer Traditions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. This table has to do with what you think about American influences on your and your family’s knowledge of language, history, and traditions. If any of the categories does not apply to you, please draw a line through the row. Please circle only one number in each row that most accurately indicates your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Your Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Language</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian History</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Traditions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Believer Traditions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. This table has to do with whether or not you taught or plan to teach your children and/or grandchildren Russian and/or Old Believer traditions. If any of the family member categories does not apply to you, please draw a line through the row. If there are or were circumstances that do not fit the categories provided, please write any additional comments below the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Traditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How important do you think each of the following topics is for holding onto heritage and identity? Please fill the blanks below with the topic options I have listed. Blank #1 is what you consider the most important, and Blank #5 is the least important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural History</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family History</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Traditions</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Traditions</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 5: Your Background

Directions: Read the following questions and write out your answer. If any question does not apply to you, then draw a line through that question. Please mark your answers clearly. If any question is unclear, ask me. Please feel free to include extra comments if you have them.

1. In what year were you born?

2. In what city and country were you born?

3. In what countries have you lived?

4. If you were not born in the United States, in what year did you move here?

5. Where in North America have you lived?
Appendix B: Interview Questions

1. Some people think that babies always learn certain kinds of words first, but other people say that a baby’s first word depends on their cultural environment.
   a. Did your parents tell you what your first word was?
   b. Do you remember what the first word was of each of your children?
   c. Do you remember any of your grandchildren’s first words?

2. What language [do/did] you typically speak to your children?
3. If applicable:
   a. What language do your children use when talking with their children?

4. [Did you/Do you] have a favorite childhood story in Russian? Will you tell it to me in Russian?

5. Do you and your [husband/wife] use a different language when you talk to each other than you do when you talk to your children?
   a. Did your parents use a different language when they talked to each other than when they talked to you?

6. When your children were young, did they speak only Russian, only English, or both?
   a. Why do you think that was?
7. If applicable:
   a. Was there a specific time period that you noticed a change in which language they used more frequently?

8. Will you tell me, in Russian, about your children? For instance, [were/are] they sweet or mischievous? What is unique about them compared to their siblings? Or what are some of your favorite memories?

9. [When you were young,] what language [did/do] you typically use when you are talking with friends?
10. If applicable:
    a. What about now?
11. If applicable:
    a. Why do you think there is a difference?

12. Do you think that living in North America affects how well you or your children know the Russian language?
13. If applicable:
    a. In what way?
    b. What is your opinion about that change?

14. Besides language, is there anything about you that you think makes you uniquely Russian or Russian-American?
15. If applicable:
    a. Like what?
    b. What do you think about those characteristics?

16. Will you tell me, in Russian, about your day today? For example, did you have a good day or a bad day? What made it good or bad?

17. Do you think that living in North America affects how much you or your children know about Russian traditions?
18. *If applicable:*
   a. In what way?
   b. What is your opinion about those changes?

19. Do you think it is important for [Old Believers/Russian immigrants/Russian-Americans] to remember their heritage?

20. *If applicable:*
    a. Why?

21. Do you think it is important for children with a Russian heritage to speak Russian?

22. *If applicable:*
    a. Why?

23. Do you think it is important for [Old Believers/Russian immigrants/Russian-Americans] to practice their heritage or show their heritage to non-[Old Believers/Russians]?

24. *If yes:*
    a. In what ways?
    b. Why?

25. *If no:*
    a. Why not?

26. [Have you/will you] try to pass on Russian traditions to your children?

27. *If yes:*
    a. What kinds of traditions?
    b. What is important about them?

28. *If no:*
    a. Why not?

29. [Did you/Do you] have a favorite childhood story in English? Will you tell it to me in English?
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