

IRSTI 16.01.17

## Language Resources and Multiethnic Central Asian Economies

Maria Elo<sup>1</sup>, Maria Ivanova-Gongne<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*University of Southern Denmark, Denmark*

<sup>2</sup>*Åbo Akademi University, School of Business and Economics, Turku, Finland*

### Abstract

The objective of this research is to shed light on the multiethnicity of the Central Asian countries and their language plurality and examine the development of their broadly dispersed and boundary-spanning language capabilities from the economic perspective

This paper reviews and analyses secondary sources and primary data qualitatively. The findings illustrate that the Central Asian countries possess a notable language-resource base that can serve as a crucial asset in connecting economies via trade and collaboration, i.e. contribute to the national competitiveness

Studies addressing the economic impact of Central Asian language heritage are very limited, this is among the few examinations that link these language assets with economic relations and development

The study points out that regional and minority languages are potentially relevant assets to be considered - beyond cultural heritage - especially regarding international economic and trade relations, not only dominant global business languages. It also suggests that minorities and diasporas are important boundary spanners and connectors across economies with their language and communication resources.

**Keywords:** Central Asia, language, multiethnic, heritage, minority, diaspora, economy, international trade

## Introduction

Central Asian area as an economic context is less well known. However, the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) has raised interest in the area and its development. BRI is seen as a massive infrastructure project that links Central Asia better to the global economy and increases the mobility and economic activity in the area. In particular, Central Asia is seen as a valued neighbor and partner in building a trade corridor between China and Europe (Dave & Kobayashi, 2018). Furthermore, being part of the former Soviet Union, Central Asia has historically close economic relations with Russia, thus being an essential part of what has been labeled as “greater Eurasia”, which spans former Soviet territories, China, Afghanistan, Iran, and India (ibid.) In this setting, the dynamics related to the multiethnic populations of Central Asia play an important but neglected role. In particular, language has usually not been considered as important for economics (Grin & Vaillancourt, 1997), while research shows that, for example, 9% of Switzerland’s GDP is generated by its multilingualism (Bel Habib, 2011). This paper reviews the ethnic populations and diasporas and current views on the role of their multilingual resources in the regional economy. Regionalization and globalization set additional importance for addressing ethnic, mobile, and boundary-spanning populations and diasporas, and as the recent Special Issue of *Regional Studies* illustrates, this is also highly relevant for innovation and economy (see e.g. D’Ambrosio, Montresor, Parrilli & Quatraro, 2019). Language is essential in connecting business actors internationally as it offers layers of cultural, social, and even political understanding for shaping economic relations within and outside organizational settings (e.g. Marschan-Piekkari, Welch & Welch, 1999). Following the work of prominent scholars on language in the organizational and international business context (Harzing & Maznevski, 2002; Marschan-Piekkari, Welch & Welch, 1999) the multilingual people of Central Asia are addressed here as an economic resource and value, an untapped resource for international activities (Newland & Tanaka, 2010).

The Central Asian countries Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan were parts of the Soviet Union and became independent states in 1991. These countries have followed different economic development policies after their

independence. They have faced diverse political and societal challenges, even ethnic cleansing and civil war, but also notable outflows of migration and ethnic complexity. Although the region is often perceived in a simplistic manner, e.g. dominantly Muslim countries, the region represents a rich mosaic of different ethnicities and populations that have distinct cultures, traditions, and languages. This multiethnic nature of these countries represents a valuable asset and social capital for economic and trade relations, especially in terms of rich language resources. Multiethnic- multilingual populations act as boundary spanners and connectors that can communicate and bridge interests across locations (cf. Cross & Prusak, 2002). Both, the role of Central Asian diasporas in linking the landlocked countries to international trade and the role of Asian diasporas in co-developing the Belt and Road project locally are of interest. Furthermore, the research on the central Asian languages often employs political or cultural approaches and focuses on negative aspects, such as oppression through language, while the positive side, the business enabling dimensions of the languages remain underexplored. This study takes a look at the Central Asian language landscape and resource base asking what kind of languages are spoken in the area and how these resources evolve. This understanding is important for educational policies, but also for the economy and society as a whole on the national and regional levels. We contribute to a better understanding of the language richness in the area, specifically to the different ways to approach minority and diaspora language assets as well as languages that may carry historical-political loadedness. For example, prior research has not considered the role of diaspora connectedness and language resources, e.g. for entrepreneurial activities in an adequate manner (Elo & Dana, 2019). We illuminate the potential and richness of the international and intercultural communication that is enabled by the Central Asian language landscape and usage.

## Literature Review

Social and language capital are essential assets when communicating, networking, and connecting with trading partners and other markets or venturing internationally (e.g. Coviello, 2006; Dana, 2007). Language is seen as a central

aspect of the research agenda for international business (Tenzer, Terjesen & Harzing, 2017). Typically, dominant languages, such as English, are considered a must-have for any international business, but also regional languages can be assets (CILT, 2006). Especially, the cross-border and international business in the Central Asian economies illustrates a special case, partly due to the Soviet Union footprint in the regional business and partly due to highly diverse language heritage in the area. Diasporas often act as intermediaries and change agents employing their diverse capitals in border-crossing and their multiple embeddedness in cultural, economic, and political settings (Cohen, 2008; De Lange, 2013; Brinkerhoff, 2009, 2016; Elo & Dana, 2019). There is evidence of diasporic ties and entrepreneurial features that allow and foster bridging of institutional divides and diverse voids and create positive economic impact via entrepreneurship and capacity building (Riddle & Brinkerhoff, 2011; Riddle, Hrivnak & Nielsen, 2010; Minto-Coy, Elo, & Chrysostome, 2019). The role of language capabilities and resources that diasporas possess, both in overall communication and in terms of linguistic superdiversity-related assets, are of economic interest (Sahradyan & Elo, 2018). The language resources of individuals can be seen to aggregate into national-level assets and competitiveness, furthermore, it is important to notice that they are dynamic and mobile resources (Tung, 2008).

Languages can be addressed as overarching resources and they need to be captured more instrumentally in the economic context, as languages can be employed in a hybrid manner and can cross all boundaries (Gaibrois, 2018). There are linguistic plurality and hybridism in Central Asia due to the multiethnic regional context and its history, making it interest and evolving context of rich language resources. Languages are often considered as human capital in the form of bilingual and multilingual competences and abilities that then contribute to the social and economic contexts in which these individuals are embedded and active (see e.g. Brannen, Piekkari & Tietze, 2017; Cohen & Kassis-Henderson, 2017). The types of language "mixes" differ. For example, there are yet limited research findings on the rich Central Asian multilingualism and the respective resource mixes, especially from the business and economic perspective (Ahn & Smagulova, 2016).

Beyond the individual, human capital level, there is also the aggregated level of the languages and their users in the ethnic and regional context. This is particularly relevant as a view to rich multilingual-multiethnic nations. Bahry et al. (2017) present the complex multiethnic language ecology of Central Asia that includes many languages besides each republic's titular languages: Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tajik, Turkmen, and Uzbek. In their work, they examine multilingualism, languages, and education in the region from pre-Soviet to Soviet and post-Soviet periods while focusing on informal and formal approaches to bi-/multilingualism. Their study points out the post-independence Russian vs. titular language dilemma in language education and overall approach to language policies that are highly relevant for maintaining their communication competences and language diversity (Bahry et al., 2017). The balance between the languages and their role in education, culture, and economy has been debated. The unbalanced situation has led to the elite learning Russian language in e.g. boarding schools and as a consequence losing their bilingualism abilities and at the same time “acquiring an attitude of condescending superiority over rural residents due to their lower proficiency in Russian (Bahry, 2016, p. 7). Historically, the region as part of the historical silk road has benefitted from trading in diverse languages and communicating across cultural boundaries. In particular, the growing trade between China and Central Asia are largely conducted by the multiethnic diasporas of the region, e.g. Uighurs, Uzbek, Dungan, etc. (Bahry, 2016)

In recent decades the language landscape and policies have been under transformations. The Soviet Era added a new dimension of dominant Russian language that became the administrative and commercial language linking all Soviet Union member states (Lähteenmäki & Vanhala-Aniszewski, 2010). After the fall of the Soviet Union, the member states aimed at derussification, thus leaning towards the preservation of local languages and English as a new lingua franca (Pavlenko, 2009). However, Russian, despite losing its official status, is to these days used by various groups of population in the former member states, from government officials and industry to educational facilities (Suleymenova, 2010). This Russophone world outside and inside the previous Soviet Union context

maintains economic ties, often digitally (Morgunova, 2012). The communication is no longer limited to a particular physical space or region, which enables diasporic communication and participation and more intense links to the country of origin. Hence, digital diasporas can efficiently relate and act in shaping the economic ties and activities across cultures (Brinkerhoff, 2009; Hepp, Bozdog & Suna, 2011). However, the plurality and superdiversity as well as the length/generations of diaspora may also inhibit efficient communication forcing partial communication to take place or selecting an adopted common language (Sahradyan & Elo, 2018)

Languages, traditions, and culturally-specific communication schemes have not disappeared despite the internet and digital communication (e.g. Hepp et al., 2011; Brinkerhoff, 2009). However, these layers of communication set new pressures for language asset management and governing cultural-linguistic capital.

The newly established independent states developed language-related policies with multiple aims; for example, there was a need to raise the status of the titular language relative to Russian in the education system, they also kept providing education for proficiency in Russian as a second/foreign language and they increased other foreign language education, like English. These policies illustrate the aim to cherish their bi-and multicultural heritage via education regarding the language as this was perceived as a potential for both nation-building as well as for economic and cultural relations (e.g. Bahry et al., 2017). Since the early policies and modifications in education programs, times have changed and especially many young people perceive higher the potential of English or other western languages than the Russian language. These trends influence the ability of entrepreneurial people to conduct business in the region (e.g. Elo, 2016). This shift in perceptions, if not revisited, leads to a deteriorating level of regional language capabilities and communication.

## Methods

This is a qualitative study that reviews and addresses language capabilities and assets in Central Asia by using secondary and primary research data. Here, the

Central Asian region and its diasporas construct the case context (Marschan-Piekkari & Welch, 2004). The data collection is based on previous research literature, academic publications, statistics, and articles, but also on other qualitative materials, such as interviews, observations, recordings, documents, online-sources, and field notes. The first round of analysis reviews the academic and other research literature on Central Asian languages and their employment in and out of the area. After that, the second round of analysis reviews the empirical data collected from Central Asia and Central Asian diasporas and analyses the content related to language. This progressive focusing-approach that systematically addresses the theme by narrowing it down and refining the research focus also of the fieldwork accommodates issues related to socio-cultural behavior, like language (Sinkovics & Alfoldi, 2012). We apply content analysis. The analysis follows the contents in terms of the type of language or mix/hybrid languages, the use of languages, and the entrepreneurial-business context of language use.

### **Findings and Discussions**

The data presents language- and cultural plurality and superdiversity in the language ecology of Central Asia. This is linked to the multi-ethnic populations in the area as well as in the diaspora.

Language usage for governance and economy is an indicator of diverse meanings and purposes. For example, in Uzbekistan, a lack of respect for the state language among Uzbek officials has been pointed out. Although the Uzbek language is the only formal state language since 1995, the government has not been able to increase its status over the Russian language in total. As Russian is more powerful as a language asset, it is no wonder that Tashkent elites get an education in Russian-schools in Uzbekistan (Hashimova, 2019). Similar kinds of language employment issues across ethnic populations, generations, and usages are debated in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan (e.g. Huskey, 1995; Nourzhanov & Bleuer, 2013). However, these debates have a more political or linguistic nature and they do not engage in the economic meaning of the languages, choices, and usage of languages for entrepreneurship, business, or international or cross-border trade,

not to mention the lack of addresses cross-border investment that are carried out- usually- using foreign languages.

This study examined the formal and other languages used locally in Central Asian countries. The types of languages identified are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Main languages in Central Asian countries

Countries	Formal languages	Minority languages	Languages used in the diaspora	Foreign languages in the country
Kazakhstan	Kazakh language as official, Russian designated as the "language of interethnic communication"	German, Ukrainian, Uzbek, Uighur, Russian (as special case spoken by 95 percent of the population in 2006)	Kazakh, Russian, German, Ukrainian, Uighur	English, German, also Chinese, and Turkish
Kyrgyzstan	Kyrgyz as an official language, Russian as the "language of interethnic communication"	Russian dominant minority language, Uzbek, Slavic languages, German, Turkish, Tajik	Kyrgyz, Russian, Tajik, other	English, Turkish, Chinese
Tajikistan	Tajik, similarly as the others, Russian as the "language of interethnic communication"	Russian, Uzbek, Buchori	Tajik, other Persian language variants, Russian	English
Turkmenistan	Turkmen is the formal and the dominant language, Russian as the "language of interethnic communication"	Russian, Uzbek, and other languages	Turkmen, Uzbek, and other languages, e.g. Turkic languages	English, Turkish



Uzbekistan	Uzbek language, Russian language (practically formal) There is an additional region-specific official language of Karakalpakstan in the Republic of Karakalpakstan which is part of Uzbekistan	Russian, Tajik, Kazakh, Karakalpak, Buchori (Bukharian, a Judeo-Tajik language), Iranian, Korean, German	Uzbek, Russian, Tajik, Buchori, Iranian, Korean, German	English, German
------------	---	--	---	-----------------

Thereafter, the study identified the key ethnic populations in the Central Asian countries that are the users and carriers of these languages. The country contexts are analyzed in terms of the populations and language heritages as well as language usage context, which indicates the language diversity in use, see Table 2.

Table 2. Ethnic groups and language diversity employment

Countries	Major ethnic groups	Minorities	Language heritage	Communication contexts beyond native language usage
Kazakhstan	Kazakhs as the dominant group, Russian as the second major group	More than 106 documented “nationalities” within the state. In 2009, 23.7 percent Russian, 2.1 percent Ukrainian, 2.9 percent Uzbek, 1.1 percent German, 1.4 percent Uyghur, 1.3 Tatars, 0.6 percent	Kazakhstan is an ethnically diverse, multiethnic country. In ethnocultural and linguistic terms it presents a mosaic of 126 local languages. Active language policy: The harmonious language policy is stated in the project “The functioning and	Internal and international communication in total, especially for successful integration in the world economy and science. A language and cultural program “The Trinity of Languages: Kazakh, Russian and English”. In recent years, also

		<p>Koreans, and 0.4 percent Belarusians. Between 1989 and 1999, 1.5 million Russians and 500,000 Germans (more than half the German population) left Kazakhstan, causing concern over the loss of technical expertise provided by those groups. The diaspora formation continues until today.</p>	<p>development of languages of Kazakhstan for 2011-2020.” (art. 555) which provides the full-scale functioning of the state language as the most important factor for strengthening national unity and preserving the languages of all ethnic groups living in Kazakhstan. In the near future, the Kazakh language is expected to be the language of international communication. (Aksholakova &amp; Ismailova, 2013, 1581)</p>	<p>Chinese and Turkish languages are growing in importance. Furthermore, French is widely taught in Kazakhstani schools as part of multilingual education and Korean is the language of one of the biggest Kazakh diasporas.</p>
Kyrgyzstan	<p>Kyrgyz Ethnic Kyrgyz were in mid-century only 40 percent of the population. A multi-ethnic state.</p>	<p>The significant minorities in 2019<sup>1</sup> have been Russians (5,5%), Uzbeks (14,7%), Dungan (1,1%), Uighurs (0,9%), Tajiks (0,7%), Germans (0,1%)</p>	<p>The shaping of educational, economic, and political opportunities in the country through language. "diglossia. ..the</p>	<p>International communication focuses on foreign relations and trade, language as an instrument of nation-building. Foreign aid and development</p>

<sup>1</sup> Source <http://www.stat.kg/ru/> retrieved 9.8.2020

		and other European and Asian peoples. Slavic linguistic groups.	asymmetric bilingual condition where matters of importance are the reserve of a 'high language'" (Huskey,1995, p.4) Multilingual education systems	programs require language competences too. Family and social relations, economic and business relations.
Tajikistan	Tajik	As of 2010: Tajik (84%), Uzbek (14%), Kyrgyz (0,8%), and Russian (0,5%) minorities, diverse Persian-speaking groups of people.	The Tajik language often refers to Persian language speakers of diverse origins. The language of the Tajiks is also called Persian, Farsi, and Dari in its variants. Dari itself has a Pashtun lineage (Nourzhanov & Bleuer, 2013). It also links to the Bukhori language.	Family and social life, business and international trade, entrepreneurship across-borders, foreign aid, investment, and capacity building
Turkmenistan	Turkmen	Russian, Uzbek, and other minority groups.	Turkic languages form a large group of diverse speakers, with proposed linkages to the Altai and Uralic language families. Turkmen populations in neighboring areas without formal acknowledgment,	Family and social relations, business relations and international trade, but also international relations, entrepreneurship, and investments

			relations to Azerbaijani, and other languages of similar origin.	
Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan is a multiethnic country. The majority of the population are Uzbeks (82%). Anthropologically these are mixed-origin people. Uzbeks are the representatives of the southern European ethnicity of Central Asian Mesopotamia. Uzbek ethnic formation was heavily influenced by Mongoloid race (MIFT 2020).	Representatives of other Turkic-speaking people also live in Uzbekistan: Kazakhs, Kirghiz (1,4%), Turkmens, Uighurs, and Tatars (0,7%). Besides there is a large community of Tajiks (4,8%) in the republic, who speak the Iranian language <sup>2</sup> . Russian and Russian-speaking people, the total number of which is about 2,6% of the total population of the republic, constitute a significant part of the population. Koreans, Arabs,	Literary Uzbek language belongs to the Karluk group of the Western branch of the Turkic languages. Spoken language has many different dialects. The Uzbek language has its profound historical link to the Tajik language, which can be observed in phonetics, syntax, and especially in vocabulary.	Family and social life, business, manufacturing and trade, entrepreneurship, investment, and knowledge sharing. Also, tourism is a growing area of language usage.

<sup>2</sup> This figure is debated between 4,7 percent and 30 percent, see more in Cordell, Karl (1998) *Ethnicity and Democratization in the New Europe*, Routledge, ISBN 0415173124, p. 201

		Central Asian Gypsies and Jews, Germans, and many others represent further local minorities.		
--	--	--	--	--

The data illustrate a rich set of diverse languages and a usage of languages that cross borders and ethnic boundaries, employs hybrid ways of communication, and has been open for multiculturalism and language pluralism. As a limitation of the research, it can be noted that there are diverse statistics and estimations across time and source, making it hard to produce accurate information. It is also likely that different sources have specific perspectives and data sets that influence the results. We have tried to alleviate these issues by employing multiple data sources.

### Conclusion

The newly independent states employed language as an instrument of nation-building and language policies as tools to guide and harmonize situations in such multiethnic states, especially, as they were under the Russian influence regarding the ethnic Russian population within the countries. Language heritages in these Central Asian countries were not homogenously given, instead, they have been evolving under their particular historical and political circumstances. For example, in the beginning, Tajikistan introduced a standardized Tajik language as part of its national policy and expanded the reach of the media and formed 'national, political, cultural, and educational institutions' where this language was present. At the same time, Tajik intellectuals gave shape and substance to the Tajik heritage building. Educational institutions throughout Central Asia worked with policies supporting bi- and multilingual language education and society. Similar bi- and multilingual systems were built throughout the Central Asian states, although following diverse sets of aims towards cultural identity, unity, ethnic awareness, knowledge sharing as well as communicating for science and economy (e.g. Nourzhanov & Bleuer,

2013). Interestingly, the ethnic dimension of the multi-lingual society was acknowledged in the form of a national formal language. This was done regardless of the size of the speaker population and not by producing multiple formal national languages, instead, the Russian language typically held the position of the next most important language with a special status. This deviates from the Baltic response to the independence that created more exclusive policies for Russian-speakers (Järve, 2002). Despite the special status and role of the Russian language, many Central Asian countries have had outflows of skilled migrants, who are often Russian speaking. This has led to brain drain and economic vulnerabilities. Hence, language policies and capabilities gained importance.

The Central Asian idea of the language-related policymaking did not fully capture the ethnic sensitivities, cultural-linguistic capitals, or the full potential embedded in these multiple cultural and linguistic groups. These groups, e.g. Turkmen speakers, can per se connect in their own linguistic regions across borders. Such ability represents a form of capacity and an economically useful resource-base. Turkic languages' speakers stretch from Eastern Europe via Eurasia to North and East Asia. Hence, diverse people, like Tatars, Turkmens, or Azerbaijani may link through this language heritage. Many Bukharians from Uzbekistan can connect with Tajik, Persian speakers, Russian and Uzbek speakers as well as Hebrew speakers (Elo, 2016). These groups of people possess atypical but regionally highly relevant linguistic assets that can serve the economy and cross-border and international trade. The role of the minority languages could have been more instrumental for business and entrepreneurship if different policies had been developed early on. Even titular languages were not developed to their full potential in society and economy (Huskey, 1995).

The English language is considered as the prospective language of international trade with Central Asian countries, especially in light of the gradual transfer to Latin script in countries, such as Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan (Molodov, 2017). Especially among the youth, the English language has gained dominance over the Russian language, partly due to the global internalization and youth culture (Molodov,

2017). However, in terms of regional and international trade, the role of the Russian language has been and remains crucial as the instrument of interethnic communication and cross-border activities. It also serves as a language of Eurasian knowledge development and dissemination that is highly relevant for the economies. Furthermore, the example of Central Asian countries illustrates that it is not only English that is crucial for international business as regional economic powers such as Russia or China can also be considerable options in terms of their languages. It is interesting to notice that Russian is a very central common language connecting the post-Soviet diasporas around the world and hence an important asset for international business and trade relations. The German language resources could also be seen as a potential niche language for the future and the more connected trade and economy. Finally, it is highly interesting that despite the relatively young age of the independent states, the inherent economic and political turmoil following the collapse of the Soviet system, even civil wars, there has been a rather accommodating policy approach for language; bi- and multilingualism and citizenship building on multiethnicity in the Central Asian region. Such an accommodating and inclusive approach could be further cultivated to empower and develop diversity into an economic asset and forms of capacity building.

The next challenge relates to the development of the Belt and Road initiative and the accommodation of the new linguistic and cultural issues that follow such a massive project and the resulting business operations. The “interethnic” communication needs to be considered in a sustainable and locally legitimate manner that embraces the cultural diversity of the region, hence, research partnerships (see United Nations’ sustainable development goals) can be useful in developing new and inclusive policies for language education and employment. Additionally, future research should examine how the potential of the Central Asian diasporas across the world could be engaged to advance, co-develop, and internationalize Central Asian entrepreneurship and business.

## References

1. Ahn, E. S., & Smagulova, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Language Change in Central Asia* (Vol. 106). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
2. Aksholakova, A., & Ismailova, N. (2013). The language policy of Kazakhstan and the state language in government service. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 1580-1586.
3. Bahry, S. A. (2016). Language Ecology: Understanding Central Asian Multilingualism. In Ahn, E. S., & Smagulova, J. (Eds.). *Language Change in Central Asia*. Vol. 106. pp. 11-32. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
4. Bahry, S., Niyozov, S., Shamatov, D. A., Ahn, E., & Smagulova, J. (2017). Bilingual education in Central Asia. *Bilingual and Multilingual Education*, 259-280.
5. Bel Habib, I. (2011). Multilingual skills provide export benefits and better access to new emerging markets. *Sens public*.
6. Brannen, M. Y., Piekkari, R., & Tietze, S. (2017). The multifaceted role of language in international business: Unpacking the forms, functions, and features of a critical challenge to MNC theory and performance. In *Language in international business* pp. 139-162. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
7. Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2009). *Digital diasporas: Identity and transnational engagement*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2016). *Institutional reform and diaspora entrepreneurs: The in-between advantage*. Oxford University Press.
9. Gaibrois, C. (2018). 'It crosses all the boundaries': hybrid language use as an empowering resource. *European Journal of International Management*, 12(1-2), 82-110.
10. CILT, (2006). *ELAN: Effects on the European Union Economy of Shortages of Foreign Language Skills in Enterprises*. European Commission, Brussels.
11. Cohen, R. (2008). *Global diasporas: An introduction*. Routledge.
12. Cohen, L., & Kassis-Henderson, J. (2017). Revisiting culture and language in global management teams: Toward a multilingual turn. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 17(1), 7-22.
13. Coviello, N.E. (2006). The network dynamics of international new ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, 713-731.
14. Cross, R., & Prusak, L. (2002). The people who make organizations go-or stop. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(6), 104-12.



15. Dana, L. P. (Ed.). (2007). *Handbook of research on ethnic minority entrepreneurship: A co-evolutionary view on resource management*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
16. Dave, B., & Kobayashi, Y. (2018). China's silk road economic belt initiative in Central Asia: economic and security implications. *Asia Europe Journal*, 16(3), 267-281.
17. D'Ambrosio, A., Montesor, S., Parrilli, M.D. & Quatraro, F. (2019) Migration, communities on the move and international innovation networks: an empirical analysis of Spanish regions, *Regional Studies*, 53:1, 6-16, DOI: 10.1080/00343404.2018.1426850
18. De Lange, D. E. (2013). Embedded diasporas: Shaping the geopolitical landscape. *Journal of International Management*, 19(1), 14-25.
19. Elo, M. (2016). Typology of diaspora entrepreneurship: case studies in Uzbekistan. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 14(1), 121-155.
20. Elo, M. (2019). Immigrant effect and entrepreneurial strategy The creation and development of a Turkish business group. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, 44(4), 170.
21. Elo, M., & Dana, L. P. (2019). Embeddedness and entrepreneurial traditions. *Journal of Family Business Management*.
22. Gaibrois, C. (2018) 'It crosses all the boundaries': hybrid language use as empowering resource', *European Journal of International Management*, Vol. 12 No.1-2, 82-110
23. Grin, F., & Vaillancourt, F. (1997). The economics of multilingualism: Overview of the literature and analytical framework. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 43-65.
24. Harzing, A. W., & Maznevski, M. (2002). The interaction between language and culture: A test of the cultural accommodation hypothesis in seven countries. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 2(2), 120-139.
25. Hashimova, U. (2019) Can Uzbekistan Put the Uzbek Language First? Moscow made an unprecedented comment in defense of the Russian language in Uzbekistan, <https://thediomat.com/2020/05/can-uzbekistan-put-the-uzbek-language-first/> retrieved 2.8.2020
26. Hepp, A., Bozdog, C., & Suna, L. (2011). Mediale migranten. In *Mediale migranten* (pp. 239-252). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
27. Huskey, E. (1995) The politics of language in Kyrgyzstan, The National Council for Soviet and East European Research, US Department of State, Washington DC
28. Järve, P. (2002). Two waves of language laws in the Baltic states: Changes of rationale?. *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 33(1), 78-110.

29. Lähteenmäki, M., & Vanhala-Aniszewski, M. (2010). *Language Ideologies in Transition: Multilingualism in Russia and Finland*. Peter Lang.
30. Library of Congress – Federal Research Division Country Profile: Kazakhstan, December 2006, <https://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/cs/profiles/Kazakhstan.pdf> retrieved 2.8.2020
31. Marschan-Piekkari, R., & Welch, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of qualitative research methods for international business* (pp. 5-24). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
32. Marschan-Piekkari, R., Welch, D., & Welch, L. (1999). In the shadow: The impact of language on structure, power, and communication in the multinational. *International business review*, 8(4), 421-440.
33. Minto-Coy, I., Elo, M., & Chrysostome, E. (2019). Transnational Diaspora Remittances and Capacity Building in Developing and Transition Countries: A Contextual Analysis in the Caribbean Islands and Central Asia. In *Capacity Building in Developing and Emerging Countries* (pp. 205-242). Springer, Cham.
34. Molodov, O. B. (2017). Русский язык как инструмент использования «мягкой силы» в странах Центральной Азии [Russkiy yazyk kak instrument ispol'zovaniya «myagkoy sily» v stranakh Tsentral'noy Azii]. *Discourse-Pi*, 14(1).
35. Morgunova, O. (2012). National Living On-Line? Some aspects of the Russophone e-diaspora map. *Exploration and Cartography of Diasporas on Digital Networks, Paris: Édition de la Maison des Sciences de L'Homme*. URL: <http://www.e-diasporas.fr/working-papers/Morgunova-Russophones-EN.pdf>.
36. National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic (2020, August 9). Monthly Review. Retrieved from <http://www.stat.kg/ru/>
37. Newland, K., & Tanaka, H. (2010). *Mobilizing diaspora entrepreneurship for development*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
38. Nourzhanov, K. & Bleuer, C. (2013) Forging Tajik Identity: Ethnic Origins, National-Territorial Delimitation and Nationalism, in Nourzhanov, K. & Bleuer, C. (eds.) *Tajikistan: A Political and Social History*, Anu Press
39. Pavlenko, A. (2009). Language conflict in post-Soviet linguistic landscapes. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 17(1-2), 247-274.
40. Riddle, L., & Brinkerhoff, J. (2011). Diaspora entrepreneurs as institutional change agents: The case of Thamel. com. *International Business Review*, 20(6), 670-680.
41. Riddle, L., Hrivnak, G. A., and Nielsen, T. M. (2010) 'Transnational diaspora entrepreneurship in emerging markets: Bridging institutional divides', *Journal of International Management*, Vol. 16 No.4, pp.398-411

42. Sahradyan, S., & Elo, M. (2018). The role of linguistic resources in the institutional organization of the Armenian Diaspora in Finland. In *Diaspora Networks in International Business* (pp. 299-319). Springer, Cham.
43. Sinkovics, R. R., & Alfoldi, E. A. (2012). Progressive focusing and trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Management International Review*, 52(6), 817-845.
44. Suleymenova, E.D. (2010). К осмыслению вероятности варианта русского языка в Казахстане [К осмыслению вероятности варианта русского языка в Казахстане]. *Instrumentarium of Linguistics: Sociolinguistic Approches to Non-Standard Russian. Arto Mustajokiet. al.(Eds). Helsinki*, 252-265.
45. Tenzer, H., Terjesen, S., & Harzing, A. W. (2017). Language in international business: A review and agenda for future research. *Management International Review*, 57(6), 815-854.
46. The Ministry of Investments and Foreign Trade of the Republic of Uzbekistan: Statistics about Uzbekistan (2020, August 2). Retrieved from <https://mift.uz/en/menu/ob-uzbekistane>
47. Tung, R. L. (2008). Brain circulation, diaspora, and international competitiveness. *European Management Journal*, 26(5), 298-304.
48. Тсугуаркина, Ю. Н. (2015). Русские в Узбекистане: языковые практики и самоидентификация (на примере полевых исследований в Фергане) [Russkiye v Uzbekistane: yazykovyye praktiki i samoidentifikatsiya (na primere polevykh issledovaniy v Fergane)]. *Tomsk Journal of Linguistic and Anthropological Research* (3), 18-28.
49. World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples: Kazakhstan (2020, August 2). Retrieved from <https://minorityrights.org/country/kazakhstan/>