

# How Russophone Identity Has Developed in Independent Ukraine: The Case for Ukrainian Russian

**Author: Anna Vozna, University of Ottawa, [annavozna@email.arizona.edu](mailto:annavozna@email.arizona.edu)**

**Paper Presented at the 2021 ASN World Convention, 5-8 May 2021**

**Do No Cite Without the Permission of the Author.**

## **Abstract**

Some recent studies have argued that Russian has become a pluricentric language. For instance, Puleri has shown that Ukrainian Russian has been acquiring cultural autonomy from the Russian in the Russian Federation in certain domains such as the literary one<sup>1</sup>. Yet, this thesis has not yet been explored in other domains even though it seems reasonable to assume that the cultural autonomy of Ukrainian Russian can be observed elsewhere. After all, it has been demonstrated to be the case in other Post-Soviet spaces. For instance, in the context of Kazakhstan, Alisharieva, Ibrayeva, and Protasova<sup>2</sup> have shown that Russian used there has become autonomous from the “global” Russian language in media and everyday use. This paper addresses the gap in research on the role and scope of the use of Russian in Ukraine and explores whether it can be true for the Russian in Ukraine that it has acquired cultural autonomy from the “global” Russian in everyday use. To do so, it analyzes literacy practices of Ukrainian Russophones focusing on the cultural content through which they have developed their literacies in Russian. The paper suggests that the Russophones from Ukraine who developed their literacies in Russian through the local Russophone content integrated in local community literacy practices have developed identities that are at the same time markedly Ukrainian and markedly Russophone. That these Russophone identities are different from those of Russian speakers from the Russian Federation suggests that Russian has become a pluricentric language.

## **Introduction**

Scholarship on language identity in Ukraine sees the Russian language and frames Russophone identities differently. Some scholars, mainly in social sciences, approach the Russian language as a monocentric language and, as a result, tend to see Russophone identity as homogenous. This trend can be observed, for instance, in political science scholarship where the assumption of the homogeneity of the Russophone group in Ukraine underlies researchers’

---

<sup>1</sup>Marco Puleri, *Ukrainian, Russophone, (Other) Russian. Hybrid Identities and Narratives in Post-Soviet Culture and Politics*. Peter Lang, 2020.

<sup>2</sup> Akbota Alisharieva, Zhanar Ibraeva, and Ekaterina Protasova. "Kazakhstan Russian: A view from the outer side." *Ab Imperio* (2017): 231-263.

predictions about the political behavior of the speakers of different languages in the country. In their interpretation, language remains the strongest predictor of political choices in Ukraine<sup>34</sup>.

Meanwhile, in the humanities, there has emerged a perspective on the Russian language as pluricentric. Literature scholars, in particular, have noted that Russophone writers from the post-Soviet spaces often depart from the canon of Russian literature and keep poetic distance and difference from the mainstream Russian writers<sup>5</sup>.

This paper suggests that it is the latter perspective that reflects how the Russophone identity has become fragmented during the years of the independence of Ukraine and that there has developed a Russophone identity that's independent of the Russophone culture of the Russian Federation.

The paper analyzes how the Russian identity of Eastern Ukraine has developed separately from the Russian identity of the Russian Federation by focusing on the language that Ukrainian Russophones use. It particularly focuses on the cultural content through which they have developed their literacies in Russian and suggests that becoming literate in Russian through different literacy practices centered around different cultural content has resulted in Ukrainian Russophones developing different Russophone identities marked by different attitudes to Russian and Ukrainian languages and by different views on the roles of these languages in their community and country.

The paper contributes to the field of Ukrainian studies by providing theoretical ground for focusing on the cultural content of Ukrainian Russophone identities in the social sciences research. The paper proceeds as follows.

The theoretical framework part lays out Norton's<sup>6</sup> theory of language and identity and Kachru's World Englishes framework. The former is helpful for understanding how Ukrainian Russophones may develop different Russophone identities through different ways of becoming literate in Russian, and the latter is helpful to elicit the dimensions in which the Russian Russophone and the Ukrainian Russophone identity may be different.

The literature review focuses on how scholars from the humanities and social sciences disciplines view Russian as a pluricentric or monocentric language. It also discusses how the different methodological approaches contribute to the conceptualization of Russian as monocentric or pluricentric and Russophone identities in Ukraine as homogeneous or heterogeneous. It highlights that, unlike those humanities scholars who view Russian as pluricentric, social scientists who view it as monocentric tend to not take into account the variability of cultural content that may shape the Russophone identities differently. The methodology part of the paper then discusses how the category of the cultural content of the identity can be analyzed in the social science research through the methods of literacy education

---

<sup>3</sup>Volodymyr Kulyk. "Shedding Russianness, recasting Ukrainianness: The post-Euromaidan dynamics of ethnonational identifications in Ukraine." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 34, no. 2-3 (2018): 119-138.

<sup>4</sup>Grigore Pop-Eleches and Graeme B. Robertson. "Identity and political preferences in Ukraine—before and after the Euromaidan." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 34, no. 2-3 (2018): 107-118.

<sup>5</sup>Naomi Caffee, *Russophonia: Towards a Transnational Conception of Russian-Language Literature*. PhD diss. University of California, Los Angeles (2013). Available at: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3z86s82v>.

<sup>6</sup>Bonny Norton. *Identity and language learning*. Multilingual matters, 2001.

research such as narrative inquiry focusing on literacy biographies. Finally, the study itself exemplifies how the focus on literacy socialization biographies can elicit the cultural content of participants' Russophone identities.

## **Theoretical framework. Situated language and literacy learning and pluricentric languages**

### *Situated literacy and identity*

This study takes language socialization and situated literacy perspective on language learning and sees the processes of literacy development and of identity formation as interrelated. It relies on Norton's<sup>7</sup> concept of identity. Norton uses the term identity to "reference how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future"<sup>8</sup>. Norton suggests that identity is connected to the language and takes a situated learning perspective to explain how people learn languages and develop their identities.

The situated literacy perspective on language learning put forth by Heath<sup>9</sup> and developed by Street<sup>10</sup>, Lave and Wenger<sup>11</sup>, and Barton and Hamilton<sup>12</sup> suggests that language learners develop literacies in their target languages through participation in literacy events and literacy practices of their immediately accessible or imagined communities of practice. Norton, in her turn, sees these situated literacies as "constitutive of and constituted by a language learner's identity."<sup>13</sup>

By literacy event, following Heath, this paper understands "any occasion in which a piece of writing is integral to the nature of participants' interactions and their interpretive processes."<sup>14</sup> Following Burton and Hamilton and Street, it views literacy practices as literacy events that are repeated, habitualized, and integrated into the lives of communities and, following Lave and Wenger, it calls the communities through which the language learners become socialized into literacy practices, communities of practice.

Following Bourdieu and Passeron<sup>15</sup>, and Heller<sup>16</sup>, Norton sees learners' opportunities to participate in the communities of practice as determined by the limitations of the linguistic

---

<sup>7</sup> Norton, "Language, Identity."

<sup>8</sup> Norton, "Language, Identity," 5.

<sup>9</sup> Shirley Brice Heath, "Protean shapes in literacy events: Ever-shifting oral and literate traditions." *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy* 9 (1982): 91-117.

<sup>10</sup> Brian Street, "Introduction: The new literacy studies." *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy* (1993): 1-21.

<sup>11</sup> Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger, *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge university press, 1991.

<sup>12</sup> David Barton and Mary Hamilton. "Literacy practices. Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context." *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. London: Routledge (2000).

<sup>13</sup> Norton, "Language, Identity," 5.

<sup>14</sup> Heath, "Protean shapes in literacy events," 82

<sup>15</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, Jean-Claude Passeron, Jaume Melendres, and Marina Subirats. *La reproducción: elementos para una teoría del sistema de enseñanza*. Barcelona: Laia, 1977.

<sup>16</sup> Heller, Monica. "Language choice, social institutions, and symbolic domination." *Language in society* (1995): 373-405.

marketplace. Thus, like Bourdieu and Passeron, she suggests that different forms of cultural capital have different values in different communities of practice, and that a person can gain or be denied access to certain communities of practice or certain literacy practices within these communities based on their status, as measured by the value of their cultural capital in a given community of practice. And, like Heller, she suggests that it is through exploring their opportunities to speak and thus acquiring the understanding of the value of their cultural capital and, through it, their status in various communities of practice, that language learners develop their sense of identity. In other words, every time the language learners speak, they organize and reorganize their sense of who they are and how they relate to the world.

Overall, Norton's perspective on language and identity suggests that learners of the same language may develop different identities through and in this language based on how they learned it, on the scope of communities of practice and literacy practices they had access to.

Applying this perspective to analyze how Ukrainian Russophones have developed their Russophone identities entails viewing their Russophone identities development as mediated by the different texts (broadly understood) in Russian they had access to and different ways their communities of practice engaged with these texts.

### *How Russian can be viewed as pluricentric analogously to English*

To elicit the criteria that may allow us to differentiate between the different Russophone identities, this paper relies on Kachru's conceptual framework of World Englishes<sup>17</sup>. Like Norton's framework, Kachru's is, essentially, built on the situated literacy perspective. While Kachru doesn't explicitly mention or rely on the work of the literacy scholars, he, similarly to them, believes that different conditions of language learning result in different learners' profiles or their different identities. The monolithic linear model of development of English language from the Old English to the Middle English to the Modern English "culminating with Darwinian elegance in the standard international language of newspapers and airports"<sup>18</sup> he suggests, doesn't account for the sociocultural realities in which the language has developed in different parts of the world. Differences in political and cultural realities, he suggested, meant different forms of social organization and got translated to the differences in contexts of communicative situations and communicative goals, and, therefore, to the differences in pragmatic and content choices across the varieties of English<sup>19</sup>.

The classification of Englishes he developed relied on Quirk's view of the spread of English along the three models: the demographic, the econo-cultural, and the imperial. By demographic model, he meant the spread of English that accompanied population spread, such as in the cases of Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. The ethnocultural and imperial models, according to Kachru have resulted, over time in different ethnocentric varieties of English in Africa, Asia, and the Philippines. Sometimes, the difference between the ethnocultural and the

---

<sup>17</sup> Braj B. Kachru, "World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources." *Language teaching* 25, no. 1 (1992): 1-14.

<sup>18</sup> Yamuna Kachru and Larry E. Smith, *Cultures, contexts, and world Englishes*. Routledge, 2008.

<sup>19</sup> Kachru, "World Englishes."

imperial model in Kachru isn't clearcut, though. Where English initially spread with the spread of British colonial rule, such as in the African countries, it remained in wide use even after the dissolution of the colonial rule of the British Empire due to the economic advantages the use of English could provide, thus its later spread following the ethnocultural model.

Kachru suggested that these differences in how English has spread have produced three types of English: Inner Circle English, Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle English that have emerged through the demographic, imperial, and ethnocultural models accordingly. While Kachru acknowledges the differences among the local varieties of English that comprise each of the Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circle ones, he suggests that these differences are merely differences in form which are, largely, irrelevant. Instead, he groups them with respect to four aspects - pragmatics of the use of the varieties, their functionality, cultural content that comprises them, and attitudes of their speakers to other varieties. Kachru asserts that these aspects are, to a great extent, common for the speakers of various varieties of Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circle English and will vary across the three groups. Thus, functionality of the Expanding Circle English will be different from the functionality of the Inner and of the Outer Circle of English.

For instance, speakers of the Expanding Circle Englishes such as the English spoken by the Japanese or the German may use it to facilitate workplace interactions in multinational corporations, international trade, etc, importantly, on roughly equal terms with other interlocutors. This is in contrast to the speakers of the Inner Circle varieties who may use it, on roughly equal terms with each other, for interpersonal communication, and to the speakers of the Outer Circle varieties who may learn it to communicate with the metropole, in subordinate roles.

The World Englishes theory has been applied, mostly, in the context of World Englishes, that is where English remains in wide use beyond the states that are traditionally associated with the use of English and Anglophone culture such as Great Britain, the USA, Australia, and Canada. Kachru and Smith call such states the Inner Circle of English. They use this term in contrast to the Outer Circle of Englishes and the Expanding Circle of English, where the former refers to the countries where English began widespread as a result of the colonial rule of Britain, such as in Nigeria, and the latter refers to the countries such as Germany or Japan where people learn and use English in the contexts brought about by globalization, for example, to facilitate trade internationally or communication between speakers of different languages intranationally.

In these contexts, the World Englishes theory has been used to critically examine the assumptions about the homogeneity and uniformity of English across the world. By comparing and contrasting pragmatic and functional aspects of the use of English in the Inner and Outer Circles, the cultural content of these varieties, and the attitudes of speakers to them, World English scholars have demonstrated that literacy in one variety of English does not necessarily entail literacy in others. Thus, Kachru and Smith demonstrate how lack of familiarity with culture-specific conversational conventions results in communication breakdowns even when both interlocutors speak the same language.

It has also been applied to the context of Kazakhstan to highlight the differences between the Kazakhstani Russian and the Russian from Russian Federation. Alisharieva, Ibraeva, and

Protasova have also focused on the intelligibility of different varieties of Russian language for the speakers of these varieties<sup>20</sup>. In their analysis of the intelligibility of Kazakhstani Russian for the Russian speakers from the Inner circle of Russian in Russia, they focused on how well the latter can interpret and distinguish between the names of local places, personalities and events mentioned in local newspapers in Russian. That they couldn't, allowed the authors to argue that Kazakhstani Russian has developed into a new variety different from that of the Russian from the Russian Federation.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to conduct the typology of Russians and, therefore, to assert whether we can consider the varieties of Russian spoken in Ukraine to be those of Inner, Outer, or Expanding Circle. This may require a more thorough analysis of how Russian is used across different countries and contexts, not just in the Eastern Ukraine. In fact, if carried out, such analysis may result in a typology of Russians that would be significantly different from the typology of Englishes given the differences in how the two languages have spread historically and the roles they play in the world today. Rather, the goal of this paper is to use Kachru's criteria of cultural content to highlight the differences between the different varieties of Russian, and consequently, between the different Russophone identities in Ukraine.

Focusing on cultural content through which Ukrainian Russophones are socialized into Russian, this paper views the speakers of the Russian language in Ukraine as perceiving themselves as parts of different imagined Russophone communities depending on the scope of the literacy practices that have shaped their Russophone identities. The paper suggests that had the Ukrainian Russophones been socialized into their literacies in Russian through mainstream literacy artifacts coming from or directly related to Russian Federation, they would perceive Russian as a monocentric language with the center in Russian Federation. Thus, equating the Russophone with something that necessarily either comes from or is related to the Russian Federation, they would have the same attitudes to the Russian language as to the Russian Federation and see scope of the functionality of the former directly tied to the role that Russian Federation plays in Ukraine.

Meanwhile, having been socialized into literacies in Russian through non-mainstream literacy artifacts and practices that don't have direct relation to the mainstream Russian Federation ones, other Ukrainian Russophones would perceive their Russophone identity as not directly tied to the Russian Federation and, therefore, Russian as a pluricentric language. Thus, not equating Russophone with something that necessarily comes from or is related to the Russian Federation but rather viewing Russophone literacy artifacts as pertinent to their local communities of practice, they would differentiate between their attitudes to the local Russophone culture and that of the Russian Federation and, accordingly, not base their beliefs about the functionality of Russian language to their beliefs about the role of Russian Federation in Ukraine.

The World Englishes framework thus allows us to elicit the pluricentric nature of contemporary Russophonia by focusing on the cultural content of the local Ukrainian variety of

---

<sup>20</sup> Alisharieva, Ibraeva, and Protasova, "Kazakhstan Russian"

Russian while literacy socialization theories provide the ground for viewing the content through which Ukrainian Russophones socialized into Russian as a factor that has significantly contributed to the development of their identities.

## Literature Review

### Ukrainian Russophone identity(ies)

One doesn't have to dig deep to find the lack of congruence in framing Ukrainian Russophone or Russian identities. It may be sufficient to briefly browse through the titles of the recent publications and events dealing with the use of Russian in Ukraine. Some refer to using Russian in Ukraine as to Russianness as Kulyk in his article *Shedding Russianness, recasting Ukrainianness*<sup>21</sup>, some describe writing in Russian in Ukraine as Russophone as Chernetsky in his chapter *Russophone Writing in Ukraine*<sup>22</sup>. Others are wary of choosing one name and use both at the same time like Puleri in his recent book *Ukrainian, Russophone (Other) Russian*<sup>23</sup> and in an online event organized by him and his colleagues, *Russophone Voices: The Words and Worlds of Russian-Language Literature*<sup>24</sup>. In just four titles we can already see the terms Russian, Russophone, and Russian-language used to describe Russian language use in Ukraine. This lack of terminological coherence is reflective of the fact that the discussion about the content of an identity of a Russophone or a Russian speaker in Ukraine, the prospects of, and the implications of performing one is ongoing.

The following paragraphs review the recent publications dealing with the use of Russian in Ukraine. The review is guided by the following questions: How has the use of Russian language in Ukraine been described in the academic literature? How have the different conceptualizations of Russophone identities contributed to the authors' understanding of the phenomena they focus on in their research? How the criteria the research on Russophone identities is guided by differ across disciplines?

### Viewing Russian as pluricentric

Lately, humanities scholarship has seen a trend towards conceptualizing the use of Russian in non-essentialist terms and viewing Russian language as pluricentric. Scholars such as Caffee, Chernetsky, Platt<sup>25</sup>, and Puleri who study Russian texts in global contexts have observed that the writers who write in Russian from beyond the mainstream of the Russian Federation often hold distance from the canonic Russian literature. For example, in Kazakhstan where,

---

<sup>21</sup> Kulyk, "Shedding Russianness."

<sup>22</sup> Chernetsky, "Russophone Writing."

<sup>23</sup> Puleri, "Ukrainian, Russophone (Other) Russian"

<sup>24</sup> Puleri and Caffee, *Russophone Voices: The Words and Worlds of Russian-Language Literature*

<sup>25</sup> Kevin M.F. Platt "Introduction: Putting Russian Cultures in Place." In *Global Russian Cultures*, edited by Kevin MF Platt, 3 - 20. University of Wisconsin Press, 2019.

while using Russian, writers often explored the themes, experiences, and identities untypical for the canonic Russian literature, such as experiences of visible minorities<sup>26</sup>. These observations have given rise to the interest in framing and categorizing this new Russian-language writing and to analyzing the content that the writers who distance themselves from the mainstream Russian canon produce.

Besides the content (or the themes that Russophone writers explore in their works), when analyzing and categorizing Russophone literature, the strand of academic literary criticism that operates from the perspective of pluricentricity of the Russian language, accounts for writers' ethnic self-identification, their intended audience, and the purpose of using Russian in their works (which I'll further refer to as functionality). Different authors tend to have different approaches to combining these and ascribe different degrees of salience to each factor in their analysis and it is by combining them in different ways that they try to elicit heterogeneous Russophone identities.

In Caffee's categorization of the Russophone literature, ethnolinguistic, content, and functionality criteria are of equal salience. She refers to all literature written in Russian as Russophone and distinguishes between three major categories: Russian-language texts written by non-Russian identified authors, Russian-language texts written and published outside the Russian Federation by authors of any ethnicity or nationality (including Russian), and bilingual or multilingual writing and self-translation<sup>27</sup>. Thus, the first category is based on authors' ethnic self-identification, the second - on the content of their writing as she points out that to be included in the second category, it is important that the writers aren't merely emigres but also explore the topic of Russianness "through the author's adaptation of the Russian language to non-Russian experiences and themes."<sup>28</sup> In its turn, the third category places functionality at its center as the writers whom Caffee sees belonging to it, use the Russian language to reach wider (as in the case of self-translation), or, narrower (as in the case of bilingual writing) audiences. Notably, concerning the second category, Caffee never comprehensively explains which themes count as Russian and non-Russian or what sources can be consulted to classify a given theme as Russian or non-Russian. She seems to simply assume that the themes that deal with the experiences that take place outside of Russian Federation are non-Russian, thus, to some extent, reproducing the essentialist criteria she aims to transcend by setting forth the idea of pluricentricity of Russian.

This shortcoming of relying on geographical determinism in analyzing culture was (indirectly) addressed by Platt who questioned the uncritical essentialist assumptions that shape definitions of Russian and Russophone cultures by posing the question "Where is Russian culture properly located?" in the introduction to his edited volume *Global Russian Cultures*.<sup>29</sup> The chapters comprising the volume seem to suggest that it might or might not be located in every user of Russian depending on whether they believe it's located within them. Thus,

---

<sup>26</sup> Caffee, *Rusophonia*.

<sup>27</sup> Caffee, *Rusophonia*, 38.

<sup>28</sup> Caffee, *Rusophonia*, 39.

<sup>29</sup> Platt, "Introduction," 3.



Chernetsky assumes authors' self-identification as the primary criteria for categorizing their writing as Russian, non-Russian, or other Russophone. In doing so, in his classification of Ukrainian Russophone literature, he follows Mikhail Gendelev's approach to classifying Russophone literature of Israel and sees it divided into at least three different groups: Russophone writers who primarily identify as members of a global Russian speaking diaspora; those who primarily identify with Russian literature of the metropole; and a portion of writers who believe that local realities "demand new means of expression, aesthetic models that did not exist earlier in Russian literature."<sup>30</sup>

Such an approach to categorization is shared by other literary scholars who also adopt self-identification as the primary criteria for differentiating between Russian and other Russophone writers as well as among the latter. Puleri, for instance, uses authors' self-identification as the primary criteria for classifying Ukrainian Russophone writers. It is only in his further analysis that follows from this initial placement that Puleri elicits the themes common for the writers self-identifying as Ukrainian Russophone writers.

Overall, this strand of scholarship takes the content of Russophonia into account virtually without exception when categorizing Russophone writers. Whether the authors rely on the content analysis in their categorization somewhat, like Caffee, or elicit the themes common for the different self-identified groups of Russophones, like Puleri, they seem to agree that the content of Russophonia matters. In that, especially when they analyze this content against the backdrop of the local sociopolitical realities, they seem to acknowledge that "'being Russian' or 'performing Russian culture' is everywhere subject to local constraints, but those constraints, and therefore the content of 'Russianness' as well, are distinct in each new context"<sup>31</sup> and, therefore, conclude that Russian has become a pluricentric language.

This conclusion allows them to assert that Russophone identities in Ukraine are non-homogenous and that, thus, some of them don't necessarily conform to what's considered mainstream Russian or Ukrainian ones. Puleri, for instance, suggests that the former are distinct from the latter in that they produce "new symbolic codes in order to interpret the existential and cultural condition of Ukrainian postcoloniality"<sup>32</sup>. Similarly, Chernetsky has referred to the Russian language Ukrainian writing as a "rich site for developing a new sociocultural project."<sup>33</sup> These Ukrainian Russian-language cultural actors and their allies, Puleri suggests, are "prompting the formation of a new "civic" identity today."<sup>34</sup> Puleri explains that unlike the ethnic Ukrainians speaking Ukrainian who could readily fit into ethnonationalist paradigm, Russophone Ukrainians had to look for other ways to conceptualize their relationship with Ukrainian state and, thus, were in a more productive position to arrive at envisioning civic values as the core of the Ukrainian society. Here, quoting Pavlyshyn, he also offers that "the rise of hybrid

---

<sup>30</sup> Chernetsky, "Russophone Writing," 61.

<sup>31</sup> Platt, Platt, "Introduction," 6.

<sup>32</sup> Puleri, *Ukrainian, Russophone, (Other) Russian*, 121

<sup>33</sup> Chernetsky, "Russophone Writing," 66

<sup>34</sup> Puleri, *Ukrainian, Russophone, (Other) Russian*, 166

subjectivities in Ukrainian society could potentially become the only way to “transcend both colonial arrogance and anti-colonial rancour.”<sup>35</sup>

### Viewing Russian as monocentric

The focus on the content that allows the pluricentricity-oriented authors to see the variation within the Russophone writings and, by extension, within the Russophone identities in post-Soviet spaces is only natural for the literary scholars who analyze both the sociopolitical and socioeconomic conditions in which writers produce their texts and the texts themselves. Meanwhile, scholars analyzing Russophone identities from other disciplines’ perspectives tend to not ascribe a similar degree of salience to the cultural content of Russophone identities and focus on ethnolinguistic categories instead, thus often reproducing essentialist views of Russophone (along with Ukrainophone and other) identities in Ukraine.

Notable in this respect are the perspectives of the political scientists working in the Ukrainian context. The authors from this field like Kuzio<sup>36</sup> and Kulyk<sup>37</sup> acknowledge regional variations in how Ukrainian Russophones shape their political outlooks but interpret these variations in ethnolinguistic terms thus suggesting that ethnicity, but also the very fact of using Russian impacts Ukrainian citizens’ political identities.

The idea that political outlook correlates with language use in Ukraine has emerged in the aftermath of the 1990s presidential elections when the researchers noted that the distribution of votes for candidates correlated with language use in the country. Then Ryabchuk suggested his paradigm of two Ukraines, an idea that the country is divided into two major regions with their political orientations and, therefore, identities, corresponding to the use of Ukrainian or Russian, where the use of Ukrainian corresponded to the support of nationalist Ukrainian and Western-oriented policies, and the use of Russian - to the support of the Russian-oriented policies<sup>38</sup>. Thus, he perceived the Russophone identity in essentialist terms, as necessarily connected to the Russian Federation.

Not long after, political scientist Kuzio and historian Hrytsak introduced more detailed views of political identities in Ukraine based on the combination of ethnic and geopolitical factors<sup>39</sup>. Ukraine, they suggested is divided not only along the ethnolinguistic lines but also by virtue of regional differences, which they saw even more salient than the former since, as they believed, neither Ukrainian nor Russian nationalities were fully developed<sup>40</sup>. Meanwhile, in the

---

<sup>35</sup> Puleri, *Ukrainian, Russophone, (Other) Russian*, 233

<sup>36</sup> Taras Kuzio, "National identity in independent Ukraine: An identity in transition." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 2, no. 4 (1996): 582-608.

<sup>37</sup> Volodymyr Kulyk, "Shedding Russianness, recasting Ukrainianness: The post-Euromaidan dynamics of ethnonational identifications in Ukraine." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 34, no. 2-3 (2018): 119-138.

<sup>38</sup> Riabchuk, Mykola. "Dvi Ukraïny." *Krytyka*, 5, 10 (2001): 10–13.

<sup>39</sup> Yaroslav Hrytsak, "Odna? Dvi? Dvadsyat' Dvi?" *Zbruch*. Available at: <https://zbruc.eu/node/95051>

<sup>40</sup> Kuzio, "National Identity," 589.

absence of the fully developed national discourse, it was local elites that played key roles on the shaping of the political elites of local citizens, they suggest<sup>41</sup>.

Foregrounding the salience of regional geopolitical factors in Ukraine they thus effectively rejected essentialist homogenization of Russophone identities. Kuzio, for instance, acknowledged variations across the Russophone identities in Ukraine by suggesting that “[t]o equate these Russians and Russophone Ukrainians as the same as Russians in the Russian Federation, as a population that supports separatism just because they are Russian speakers simplifies a very complex issue.”<sup>42</sup>

While the regional perspectives on identities in Ukraine did somewhat transcend the essentialist ethnolinguistic compartmentalizations, the authors who put them forth did not extend their analysis to the language itself: they kept referring to the Russian language as to a single entity.

A regional perspective on language appeared later and came from Kulyk<sup>43</sup>. Reflecting on the roles of and beliefs about the Russian language in Ukraine he identified three major roles ascribed to it by Ukrainian citizens: Russian as the language of the East and the South, Russian as the language of the former USSR, and Russian as the language of the Russian Federation<sup>44</sup>. However, even though Kulyk seemingly differentiated between the Russian language of the Russian Federation and the Russian language of the East and South, he fell short of describing how the two are different, thus implying that those who speak Russian in the East and South of Ukraine speak the language of the Russian Federation (or of the former Soviet Union).

The only political science study so far that attempts to acknowledge and measure the impact of the surroundings on the content of the linguistic identity is the study by Onuch and Hale<sup>45</sup> which, though, when trying to discern variation among the Ukrainian Russophones and thus transcend linguistic determinism that often guides interpretations of their identities, nevertheless, falls short of doing so as it fails to overcome essentialist perspective on Ukrainian language and identity. In this study, the authors introduce the concept of language embeddedness or “language use made under the influence of social environments in which one is embedded.” They suggest that being embedded in a Ukrainian speaking language environment “regardless of what language one might actually prefer to speak is likely to be associated with interests or viewpoints that may be shared by or conveyed through Ukrainian-speaking networks.”<sup>46</sup>

### Russian or Russophone(s)

---

<sup>41</sup> Kuzio, “National Identity,” 589.

<sup>42</sup> Kuzio, “National Identity,” 599.

<sup>43</sup> Volodymyr Kulyk, “What is Russian in Ukraine? Popular beliefs regarding the social roles of the language,” *The Russian language outside the nation* 1 (2014): 117-140.

<sup>44</sup> Kulyk, “What is Russian in Ukraine.”

<sup>45</sup> Olga Onuch and Henry E. Hale. “Capturing ethnicity: the case of Ukraine.” *Post-Soviet Affairs* 34, no. 2-3 (2018): 84-106.

<sup>46</sup> Onuch and Hale, “Capturing Ethnicity,” p. 9.

The previous two parts of this literature review have outlined how pluricentric and monocentric perspectives on the Russian language have been adopted in research dealing with the use of Russian language in Ukraine and other post-Soviet spaces. I will further use the example of Onuch and Hale's study to demonstrate why the latter allows for a narrower view of Russophone identities and elaborate on how we can utilize the former to enrich our perspectives on these identities.

One can see that Onuch and Hale's view of Ukrainian identity is rooted in essentialist premises as they somewhat uncritically assume that using the Ukrainian language necessarily means holding certain viewpoints. They, in fact, explicitly point out that their analysis is rooted in the linguistic determinism perspective on language. Thus, they explain their focus on embeddedness in linguistic environments by "a possibility that linguists have documented" that certain "belief structures or behavioral norms may be intrinsic to the Ukrainian language itself and thus cognitively activated when using the language." What's problematic with this view is that not only such automatic correspondence of beliefs with the language has never, in fact, been documented<sup>47</sup>, but also that research in applied linguistics consistently shows quite the opposite - that different languages aren't compartmentalized in the brains of biliterate and multiliterate speakers and that, rather, they tend to non-discriminatively draw from continua of literacies in different languages so long as they allow them to reach their communicative (or other) needs<sup>48,49</sup>. Importantly then, when dismissing these applied linguistics perspectives on language, the authors also dismiss the possibility that these same viewpoints or beliefs they have in mind could have been uttered in Russian, English, or any other language, or for that matter, never uttered in Ukrainian in the Ukrainian-language networks their research participants were embedded.

This assumption of the homogeneity of Ukrainian Russophones eventually results in the shortcomings in the explanations regarding lack of homogeneity of the political outlooks of Ukrainian Russophones. Thus, essentialism-rooted research doesn't seem to be well-equipped to address the variability within and across the identities performed in the same language. Meanwhile, the non-essentialist approaches to analyzing Russophone identities do allow to capture this variability.

While both approaches take into account ethnolinguistic and geopolitical factors, it is the non-essentialist approach that has been lately adopted in the literary scholarship that critically accounts for the content of Russophone identities. As a result, this approach elicits Russophone positionalities in a more detailed way that provides the ground for interpreting variability of views across Ukrainian Russophones.

So, this paper suggests that to better account for variability within and across Russophone identities, studies could incorporate the category of content of identity, following the approach of the literary studies field. What presents a challenge here is that unlike literary scholars who can

---

<sup>47</sup>Aneta Pavlenko, *The bilingual mind: And what it tells us about language and thought*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

<sup>48</sup> Pavlenko, "The bilingual mind."

<sup>49</sup> Nancy H. Hornberger, (Ed.). (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (Vol. 41). Multilingual Matters.

analyze the literary works of the writers, whose work they focus on, social scientists face an apparent lack of readily available compatible content produced by the Russophones who are not writers. The following section of the paper suggest methodological ways to incorporate the category of the content of identity into social science research.

### Methodology

Literacy perspective on language and identity provides methodological tools to elicit content of linguistic identities. Literacy education scholars working from the identity approach to language learning have long employed narrative inquiry as the primary methodological tool. They favor narratives for the affordances they provide to foreground the complexity of learners' language socialization experiences, both formal and private, that would otherwise remain inaccessible for researchers. To elicit and reconstruct narratives, they rely on data collected from existing autobiographical accounts like Pavlenko<sup>50 51</sup> and Kramersch<sup>52</sup>, from fieldwork like Early and Norton<sup>53</sup> and Barkhuizen<sup>54</sup>.

Following the literacy education scholars working from the identity perspective on language learning, this study employs narrative inquiry as the primary methodological tool. To elicit the content of Ukrainian Russophones' identities, it focuses on the literacy events and practices through which they have developed their literacies in the Russian language. What this paper aims to elicit, thus, is not the cultural content that was merely present in the surroundings of our participants, but the content with which they interacted actively and that stood out as significant for them.

Such a focus may allow us to overcome the methodological challenges that the researchers working with language and identity in Ukraine often face: ideological barriers that may prompt participants to manifest what they believe are acceptable identities instead of their actual ones; and lack of availability of language identity categories that would allow for accurate self-identification.

The two challenges are interconnected and have been addressed in relevant literature in great detail. It is because the ethnolinguistic categories that accurately reflect participants' identities are not available that they choose the ones that don't reflect their actual language use. And it is because language choice in Ukraine is highly politicized that they opt for the choices that they believe to be ideologically correct.

---

<sup>50</sup> Aneta Pavlenko, "Language learning memoirs as a gendered genre." *Applied linguistics* 22, no. 2 (2001): 213-240.

<sup>51</sup> Aneta Pavlenko, "How am I to become a woman in an American vein?": *Transformations of gender performance in second language learning*. De Gruyter Mouton, 2011.

<sup>52</sup> Claire J. Kramersch, "The multilingual subject: What foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters." Oxford University Press, 2009.

<sup>53</sup> Margaret Early and Bonny Norton. "Narrative inquiry in second language teacher education in rural Uganda." *Narrative research in applied linguistics* (2013): 132-151.

<sup>54</sup> Gary Barkhuizen, "A narrative approach to exploring context in language teaching." *ELT journal* 62, no. 3 (2008): 231-239.

It has thus been noted that there exist discrepancies between actual and reported language use in Ukraine. Arel, for instance, noted that in the 2001 Census bilingual respondents were prompted to choose between Ukrainian and Russian when indicating their native language in the absence of the options allowing them to indicate both<sup>55</sup>. Although recent surveys have incorporated the choices reflective of bilingual Ukrainians' language use and preferences, many still often tend to opt for "ideologically correct" choices such as indicating the Ukrainian language as their native language when in fact they have grown up in Russian-speaking communities and Russian has thus been the first language they were socialized into<sup>56</sup>.

The focus on literacy practices and events may help us elicit a more detailed picture of the language use in Ukraine as it may alleviate ideological pressures and allow respondents to concentrate on the texts that shaped their identities. The interview questions thus focus on the literacy events and practices which involved Russophone cultural content.

The interview data was collected in 2018 as a part of a study on attitudes towards translanguaging in the context of the revitalization of the Ukrainian language and culture in the East of Ukraine. While the focus of the study was on the attitudes to the revitalization, its goal was to contextualize these attitudes in participants' language education experiences. Thus, the study for which the data was initially collected didn't explicitly focus on the identities of Russophones. Meanwhile, the focus on language education experiences has allowed collecting the data, sufficient in scope to reconstruct the participants' narratives of learning Russian and developing Russophone identities.

Interviews were collected over video calls. Participants were found via a questionnaire that was distributed on Facebook for recruitment purposes. This anonymous survey asked questions about the prospective participants' language learning backgrounds and ideologies, such as where and how they have learned Ukrainian and Russian, where, with whom and how they use it, and how they see themselves using these languages in their and their children's future. In the end, the survey asked if the participants agree to be contacted for a more detailed interview. Interestingly enough, even though the description to the survey explicitly stated that the goal of the survey was to recruit participants to the study and that thus only those who are ready to participate in the further steps of the study are encouraged to fill it (since the survey data would not be used for research purposes anyway), the number of responses to the survey was significantly higher than the number of the respondents who agreed to participate on further stages. Thus, out of fifty-two respondents who completed the whole survey, only fourteen agreed to participate in the interviews. Later on, only six participants were left as the rest withdrew their consent to participate. The three cases selected for this paper demonstrate how different literacy practices in Russian have shaped participants' Russophone identities differently.

Stories of participants were collected via different means: by asking participants to produce oral stories of their experiences during the interviews and by reconstructing the stories from interview data and other sources such as texts exchanges with the researcher, participants' social media profiles. After collection, the stories were analyzed employing thematic analysis based on Norton's and Kachru's frameworks. Thus, the analysis focused on eliciting the content

---

<sup>55</sup>Dominique Arel, "Interpreting" Nationality" and" Language" in the 2001 Ukrainian Census." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 18, no. 3 (2002): 213-249.

<sup>56</sup> Kulyk, "Shedding Russianness."

of Ukrainian Russophone identities through the literacy practices and events the participants engaged along with their beliefs about the functionality of Russian in Ukraine and their attitudes towards Russian. The three stories are presented below.

### Literacy narratives of Ukrainian Russophones

Mitya, Lilya, and Lyosha were born and raised in Kharkiv and still live there. They all speak Russian and Ukrainian. They are all in their early thirties and, thus, were educated in independent Ukraine. The educational system is where they developed their literacies in Ukrainian. Mitya and Lilya studied in Russian-medium schools, so they only encountered Ukrainian texts in the Ukrainian language and literature classrooms. Lyosha's encounters with Ukrainian were more numerous as he studied in the Ukrainian-medium school. Meanwhile, their communities were Russophone which meant that most of the literacy practices they engaged in beyond school were in Russian.

#### *Mitya*

Mitya has engaged in a variety of literacy practices, mainly in Russian, since childhood. His parents encouraged reading and, what they called well-rounded development. When he was a child, the books in his home library were mainly in Russian. A significant part of what he read though, weren't Russian authors, but Russian translations of the Western ones. He loved adventure stories and science fiction. There was a lot of Soviet and translated Western science fiction in his home, which, Mitya assumes, was due to his father's profession - he was a professor in an aircraft engineering school. He read mainly by himself, though, and didn't talk much about his favorite books to anyone as he doesn't remember that his friends would read books. In school, he read some excerpts from Ukrainian literature but he doesn't remember much from Ukrainian language and literature curriculum as the focus of his education has always been on math and science - he had known since childhood that he would study in his father's school. Gradually, he dropped reading almost altogether and instead developed music literacy that was connecting him to his community more. He started learning to play the guitar in elementary school and, by the time he was a teenager, he used this skill to entertain his friends. One of the most common ways he spent time with his friends was singing songs to the guitar. However, guitar players weren't that rare in his neighborhood of Kharkiv, and Mitya wanted to stand out. Most of them played "the same three songs" - mainly by Russian singers and bands from the eighties and the nineties. So, Mitya, instead, learned to play all songs by the Kharkiv band he liked, 5'nizza. Over the years to come, he would play mainly the songs by this band and by its participants, Sergey Babkin and Andriy Zaporozhets (more widely known as Sunsay) as they started their solo careers. Mitya feels that these practices both helped him feel more like a part of a local community and shaped the local community - Mitya played his guitar around the campus of his school during all his undergraduate and some graduate school years, in such a way socializing students from different parts of the country into the culture of this school and familiarizing them with the local artists. Equally important for him in terms of community

belonging and building was the culture of his school. His university is one of the few universities in Ukraine that has its own Western-school-like campus - it occupies a neighborhood on the outskirts of Kharkiv and comprises academic buildings, student and employee housing. As a result of this secludedness, this university has a strong community with numerous traditions and rituals. Almost without exception the extracurricular literacy practices in which the students of this school engaged were in Russian. A significant part of the student life in this school was going to a student summer camp located in Crimea. There, for a month, undergraduate students lived according to a Soviet-style summer camp routine that involved daily displays of creativity through musical and other artistic performances. Preparing for these activities, Mitya reflects, was the time when students reflected on their school and life experiences and learned to express them through different media. He doesn't remember the language other than Russian ever used for this purpose.

Mitya believes that through participating in these traditions and rituals he developed a strong university-related identity (indeed, now Mitya teaches at the same university). He thinks that the most salient part of his identity is his identity as a person from his university. When reflecting on the fact that Russian was the dominant language of the literacy practices that shaped his identity, he says that he doesn't see a problem in the fact that they were in Russian but does see the problem with their scope - "singing and drinking is great," he says, "but it would also be great if we all learned how to survive." To address the lack of extracurricular activities useful for life beyond the university, Mitya has founded a program that helps students transition to workplaces. There, he invites various speakers such as this university's alumni who found successful employment, representatives of attractive companies, and media personalities to encourage lifelong learning among the students of this school. The program leaves the choice of the language to the speakers' discretion. What matters, Mitya asserts, is the content. After all, he says, it's either Ukrainian or Western companies that these speakers come from. If the person working in Google talks about how they started working in Google in Russian, it will hardly make their audience want to work in Skolkovo.

Extending this thought, Mitya doesn't see Russian as a problem in Ukraine. Nor does he see Russian as just the language of Russian Federation. "We here talk in Russian to each other, about what matters to us here, I don't see how it has any relation to Russia," he says.

### *Lilya*

Cinema literacy occupies an important place in Lilya's life. She grew up watching movies and discussing them with her mother. Mainly, these were foreign (Western) movies in Russian translation or old Soviet movies. When Lilya grew up, she started seeking more movies by Western directors and developed a sophisticated knowledge of Western cinema by herself. The main source of her initial searches was a Russian-based website Kinopoisk. As she started learning English, she transitioned to more Anglophone sources.

Around the same time, she found a fellow lover of cinema in the face of her friend from her mother's hometown in the South of Ukraine. They began to film their own movies together.



When Lilya came to visit, they would actually film together, mostly either documentaries or ironically dramatic short films. When they were apart, they would combine each others' footage. Over the years and through continuing communication with her friend, Lilya's love to cinema only grew. She didn't make it her career although she participated in the filming of Khrzhnovsky's *Dau* when it was filmed in Kharkiv.

Like Mitya, Lilya believes that Russian isn't a problem for Ukraine, but for entirely different reasons. It's the language of Block and Akhmatova, she says. Until this land produces something compatible, it would be "stupid" to erase the "decent culture", she suggests.

### *Lyosha*

Lyosha's literacy biography and its outcomes are different both from Lilya's and from Mitya's. He hasn't experienced any desire to connect with culture in his childhood as he was playing the ball with his friends, he explains. The literacy practices that have shaped him most significantly were in Ukrainian. Lyosha used to be a part of a football fan culture - he supported his team on local stadiums with chants of, what he referred to as nationalistic patriotic content and followed it to the cities across Ukraine. The content and the ideology of the football fan culture literacy practices thus became the content of his Ukrainophone identity, significant enough for him to attempt to use only Ukrainian after the beginning of the conflict with Russia. However, the fact that his surroundings remained Russophone has made Lyosha return to using Russian. He regrets this though and wishes he spoke Ukrainian instead of Russian. He believes that the use of the Russian language will eventually fade away in Ukraine because of the war with Russia.

Lyosha believes so since he strongly associates Russophone culture with the content from Russian Federation. At the same time, he distinguishes between the Russian in Ukraine and the Russian in the Russian Federation. He suggests that Russia is where "real" Russian culture happens while only its "low" manifestations make it to Ukraine. He rejects the idea that there is a Russophone culture in Ukraine by observing that there is no "real" culture, only bad pop culture and prison songs. It is this image of the Russophone culture that makes it easy for him to consider its fading away in Ukraine. Lyosha doesn't see a place for Russian in Ukraine. He suggests that the future of the country is with Western countries and that everyone would rather benefit from learning English and other European languages. In Lyosha's life, his literacy in English plays a significant role - he earns his living by playing poker online with English being a primary language of communication among the players.

## **Discussion**

The literacy biographies of the participants of the study illustrate three examples of how different literacy practices result in different understandings of the content of the Russophone culture in Ukraine.

From Mitya's example, we can see how engaging with Russophone content through local community literacy practices may engender local Russophone identities that are at the same time Ukrainian ones. As the students in Mitya's university created literacy artifacts, they worked through the medium of the Russian language to interpret and express the ways of living and seeing the world that are specific to Kharkiv. As Mitya followed local Russophone artists, he started seeing Russian as a legitimate means for expressing local experiences. Now that Mitya is actively engaged in creating conditions for his students to apply their knowledge beyond the educational system, he exhibits a strong civic identity as he volunteers his time for the benefit of his community.

At the same time, we can see how engaging with more mainstream Russophone content be it "high culture" or pop culture has encouraged Lilya and Lyosha to associate the Russian language directly with the culture of the Russian Federation. As such, their attitudes to the Russian language are consistent with their attitudes towards mainstream Russian culture. Notably, they are different. While Lilya, whose literacy practices centered around the literacy artifacts from Russia values the Russian language and culture highly, Lyosha, for whom the Ukrainian language-centered literacy practices were the most significant, values Russian language and culture lowly.

What's notable about Mitya's example is that extensive engagement in local literacy practices through the medium of the Russian language has taught him to differentiate between the Russian language coming from Russian Federation and the local Russian language in which locals function with each other.

### Further directions

The three stories have illustrated three possible trajectories of learning the Russian language in Ukraine and implications of these trajectories for the Russophones' beliefs about the functionality and possible roles of the Russian language in the country. The study doesn't claim though that these examples are extensive, so it seems feasible to continue exploring the content of Russophone identities in Ukraine to elicit more data and ensure that it's generalizable.

Besides, it seems feasible to elicit more data on the sociocultural and socioeconomic backgrounds of Ukrainian Russophones to account for how their socioeconomic status may impact their access to the different kinds of literacy practices in Russian. The preliminary findings of this paper suggest that Russophones with higher socioeconomic standing may have more access to a diverse range of local literacy resources. For instance, Mitya's parents being university professors might have impacted their valuing diverse literacies, having a home library, and encouraging their son to develop music literacy. While the interviews for this paper did elicit some data on socioeconomic profiles of the Ukrainian Russophones, they didn't focus on broader language ecology and global dynamics in which the status and the roles of Ukrainian and Russian are negotiated. Follow-up interviews for this study and similar studies could address this

gap by exploring how Ukrainian Russophones' literacies in global and European languages may impact their Russophone identities.

## **Conclusions**

The paper has demonstrated how different content through which Ukrainian Russophones have developed their literacies in Russian has resulted in them having different Russophone identities. Having engaged with local Russophone culture through local community-based literacy practices Ukrainian Russophones develop strong Ukrainian Russophone identities in which the Russian language plays an important role in their understanding of self, and functioning in the world. That they are based on the cultural content that is not related to the Russian Federation and that the people embodying them strongly feel Ukrainian suggests that Russophone identities are heterogenous and that Russian has become a pluricentric language with East of Ukraine, and, particularly, Kharkiv, being one of the centers of Russophone culture.

Importantly, this paper also highlights the potential of analyzing literacy practices of Ukrainian Russophones to elicit the content of their heterogeneous identities.

The paper suggests that differentiating between different types of Russian in Ukraine can help us understand, among other things, differences in political preferences among the different groups of Russophones. Besides, such differentiation can aid language and literacy educators who could create Russian and Ukrainian learning programs that would more fully take into account the home and community language resources of Ukrainian Russophones.

## Bibliography

- Alisharieva, Akbota, Zhanar Ibraeva, and Ekaterina Protasova. "Kazakhstan Russian: A view from the outer side." *Ab Imperio* (2017): 231-263.
- Arel, Dominique. "Interpreting" Nationality" and" Language" in the 2001 Ukrainian Census." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 18, no. 3 (2002): 213-249.
- Barkhuizen, Gary. "A narrative approach to exploring context in language teaching." *ELT journal* 62, no. 3 (2008): 231-239.
- Barton, David, and Mary Hamilton. "Literacy practices. Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context." *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. London: Routledge (2000).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, Jean-Claude Passeron, Jaume Melendres, and Marina Subirats. *La reproducción: elementos para una teoría del sistema de enseñanza*. Barcelona: Laia, 1977.
- Caffee, Naomi (2013). *Russophonía: Towards a Transnational Conception of Russian-Language Literature*. PhD diss. University of California, Los Angeles. Available at: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3z86s82v>.
- Chernetsky, Vitaly, "Russophone Writing in Ukraine: Historical Contexts and Post-Euromaidan Changes." In *Global Russian Cultures*, edited by Kevin MF Platt, 48 - 68. University of Wisconsin Press, 2019.
- Early, Margaret, and Bonny Norton. "Narrative inquiry in second language teacher education in rural Uganda." *Narrative research in applied linguistics* (2013): 132-151.
- Heath, Shirley Brice. "Protean shapes in literacy events: Ever-shifting oral and literate traditions." *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy* 9 (1982): 91-117.
- Heller, Monica. "Language choice, social institutions, and symbolic domination." *Language in society* (1995): 373-405.
- Hornberger, N. H. (Ed.). (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings* (Vol. 41). Multilingual Matters.
- Hrytsak, Yaroslav. "Odna? Dvi? Dvadsyat' Dvi?" *Zbruch*. Available at: <https://zbruc.eu/node/95051>
- Kachru, Braj B. "World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources." *Language teaching* 25, no. 1 (1992): 1-14.
- Kachru, Yamuna, and Larry E. Smith. *Cultures, contexts, and world Englishes*. Routledge, 2008.
- Kanno, Yasuko, and Bonny Norton. "Imagined communities and educational possibilities: Introduction." *Journal of language, identity, and education* 2, no. 4 (2003): 241-249.
- Kramsch, Claire J. *The multilingual subject: What foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford University Press, 2009.

- Kulyk, Volodymyr. "What is Russian in Ukraine? Popular beliefs regarding the social roles of the language." *The Russian language outside the nation* 1 (2014): 117-140.
- Kulyk, Volodymyr. "Shedding Russianness, recasting Ukrainianness: The post-Euromaidan dynamics of ethnonational identifications in Ukraine." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 34, no. 2-3 (2018): 119-138.
- Kuzio, Taras. "National identity in independent Ukraine: An identity in transition." *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 2, no. 4 (1996): 582-608.
- Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge university press, 1991.
- Norton, Bonny. "Language, identity, and the ownership of English." *TESOL quarterly* 31, no. 3 (1997): 409-429.
- Norton, Bonny. *Identity and language learning*. Multilingual matters, 2001.
- Norton, Bonny. *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation*. Multilingual matters, 2013.
- Norton, Bonny, and Peter I. De Costa. "Research tasks on identity in language learning and teaching." *Language Teaching* 51, no. 1 (2018): 90-112.
- Onuch, Olga, and Henry E. Hale. "Capturing ethnicity: the case of Ukraine." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 34, no. 2-3 (2018): 84-106.
- Pavlenko, Aneta. "Language learning memoirs as a gendered genre." *Applied linguistics* 22, no. 2 (2001): 213-240.
- Pavlenko, Aneta. "How am I to become a woman in an American vein?": *Transformations of gender performance in second language learning*. De Gruyter Mouton, 2011.
- Pavlenko, Aneta. *The bilingual mind: And what it tells us about language and thought*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Platt, Kevin M. F., "Introduction: Putting Russian Cultures in Place." In *Global Russian Cultures*, edited by Kevin MF Platt, 3 - 20. University of Wisconsin Press, 2019.
- Puleri, Marco. *Ukrainian, Russophone, (Other) Russian. Hybrid Identities and Narratives in Post-Soviet Culture and Politics*. Peter Lang, 2020.
- Puleri, Marco and Naomi Caffee. *Russophone Voices: The Words and Worlds of Russian-Language Literature*. Available at:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a22kWaKBr1w&fbclid=IwAR3HfplKrn9erOJmiq-nKZIY81jB69w0aO1VCGdMlyRpFI1Ku8-GmeVlzNA>
- Pop-Eleches, Grigore, and Graeme B. Robertson. "Identity and political preferences in Ukraine—before and after the Euromaidan." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 34, no. 2-3 (2018): 107-118.
- Riabchuk, Mykola. "Dvi Ukraïny." *Krytyka*, 5, 10 (2001): 10–13.
- Street, Brian. "Introduction: The new literacy studies." *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy* (1993): 1-21.

