

Success and failure of Ukrainian language revitalization in the Eastern Ukraine

Ania Voz'naia

Department of Language and Literacy Education, University of British Columbia

annavozna@email.arizona.edu

Draft: not to be cited without the author's permission.

Introduction

There is a growing research literature on biliteracy development. Researchers have examined the role of translanguaging in it and concluded that it is a crucial component for the biliteracy development (Hornberger: 2012). They have pointed out that translanguaging often becomes stigmatized in contexts with monolingual ideologies which results in the impediment of the process of biliteracy development (Hornberger:2012; Garcia and Wei:2013). They often explain the stigmatization of translanguaging by the oppression of the speakers of a dominant language variety by the speakers of a less prestigious language variety, thus often raising the awareness of how discourses of deficiency promoting low status of indigenous and minority languages and lack of their acceptance as a legitimate resource in the society contribute to the low acceptance of translanguaging that utilizes literacies in these languages as a resource (Garcia and Wei:2013).

However, there is as yet little research which addresses possibilities of stigmatization of translanguaging in the language revitalization contexts where both revitalized and the former colonizer's languages enjoy high status and are generally accepted in most contexts. It yet remains unclear how discourses of revitalization contribute to the perception of the revitalized and the former colonizer's languages as a resource and what implications such perceptions eventually have for the acceptability of translanguaging and the development of biliteracy.

The inspiration for this project came from Nicholas' (Nicholas: 2014) ethnographic study of acceptability of hybrid language and cultural practices in Hopi and English in Hopi communities undergoing revitalization. There she pointed out that although younger Hopi generations have diverse hybrid linguistic and cultural repertoires that they consider appropriate, traditionalist elders tend to valorize essentialized Hopi practices over the hybrid ones, arguing that it is not attainable to transmit and embrace authentic Hopi values through the medium of English.

This example showed that on the micro level purist revitalization ideologies could be mobilized to delegitimize hybrid language and cultural practices as inauthentic. I wondered if the same was true about the revitalization ideology on broader scales, for example, if not a community within a country but the whole country is undergoing revitalization and what the implications of such delegitimization can be in the

communities where hybrid literacy practices have become deeply ingrained in the lives of speakers to the point when they have become bilingual in the revitalized language and the language of their immediate surroundings.

The paper reports that such delegitimization of hybrid literacy practices on the pretence of preserving authenticity of the revitalized language seems to be true on a broader scale: it reports general unacceptability of translanguaging among Russian speakers in the Eastern Ukraine.

Here I will argue that promotion of “authentic” language varieties characteristic for language revitalization impedes the development of literacy in Ukrainian among Russian-speakers in Eastern Ukraine since it reduces acceptability of Russian-speaking Eastern Ukrainians’ first language and translanguaging. I will do so by first suggesting that Russian speakers in the Eastern Ukraine are, to a certain extent, bilingual in Ukrainian and Russian. I will further outline the optimal conditions needed to develop literacy in Ukrainian in such bilingual contexts particularly emphasizing the role of translanguaging in this process. Then, I will argue that authenticity-oriented revitalization ideology is likely to impede this process through delegitimizing hybrid literacy practices on the pretenses of preserving of authenticity of the revitalized language and analyze the impact of such delegitimization on the (bilingual) Russian-speakers socialization into literacy in Ukrainian and motivation to continue learning and to use Ukrainian.

Background

Language revitalization in the East of Ukraine and contexts of biliteracy

The purpose of this section is to outline the scope of the contexts in which Russian speakers and bilingual Russian speakers¹ are likely to encounter Ukrainian and thus to develop literacies in Ukrainian. Since at the time of collapse of the Soviet Union, Kharkiv region was mostly Russian-speaking with Kharkiv being almost entirely Russian-speaking (Bilaniuk:2005; Pavlenko: 2008), this section finds it reasonable to assume that the scope of the contexts where Ukrainian is likely to be found in the Kharkiv region directly correlates with the scope of the revitalization contexts affected by revitalization policies since independence.

This paper uses the term language revitalization to refer to the macro and micro level top-down and bottom-up processes and efforts aiming to reverse the language shift (and

¹ While aware of the complexities of language and cultural identities and patterns of language use in Eastern Ukraine, the paper will further use the term Russian speakers to refer to the Eastern Ukrainians whose daily use language is Russian and who might or might not be bilingual to some extent in Russian and Ukrainian. It will use the term Ukrainian speakers to refer to those Ukrainians who use Ukrainian or a regional dialect of Ukrainian daily and might or might not be bilingual in Ukrainian and Russian. It will use term bilingual Russian speakers to refer to the Eastern Ukrainians definitely bilingual in Ukrainian and Russian, but whose dominant language in the bilingual pair remains Russian.

its consequences) that took place in Eastern Ukraine as a result of long-term colonial impact of Russia (first, Russian Empire, and then the Soviet Union).

This section juxtaposes the scope of the contexts in which revitalization in Ukraine was undertaken to the scope of the contexts suggested by Fishman as the ones to which revitalization efforts need to be directed for the revitalization to take place. According to Fishman's Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale, revitalization efforts need to be undertaken on eight scales, beginning with the micro-scale of individual households and finishing with the macro-scale of the national policies.

Overall, Ukraine seems to have so far engaged only in some of the eight steps towards revitalization suggested by Fishman (Fishman:1991). For example, it has encouraged the use of the language in compulsory state education, in local government services and mass media, higher education and government (Pavlenko:2008; Bilaniuk:2005; Friedman:2009). At the same time, there seems to be no evidence of encouragement of acquisition of the language by adults, creation of a socially integrated population of active speakers (or users) of the language, encouragement of the use of the informal use of the language through the establishment of local neighbourhood institutions in which the language is encouraged, protected and (in certain contexts at least) used exclusively², encouragement of literacy in the language, but in a way that does not depend upon assistance from the state education system, or encouragement of the use of the language in the workplace.

Thus, the scope of the contexts where a Russian speaker is likely to encounter Ukrainian is rather limited: for all we can know, they will definitely study Ukrainian at schools since it is a mandatory subject in Ukraine. They might or might not develop literacies in Ukrainian in the contexts of higher education, government and local government services depending on what languages their instructors prefer to use and on how often they use state services. Besides, they may choose not to engage with Ukrainian media content. Thus, educational system remains the only . Therefore, it is the pattern of socialization into literacy into Ukrainian that is utilized in schools that is the most common one for the Russian-speakers.

Languages in the Eastern Ukraine. Micro-level community biliteracy contexts

This section further explores the scope of biliteracy contexts in Eastern Ukraine analyzing how likely Russian speakers are to engage in biliteracy practices in their communities and private contexts. This section suggests that high numbers of Russian speakers in Eastern Ukraine increases the likelihood of them remaining in monolingual Russian-speaking environments and not engaging in the biliteracy events and practices. Ukrainian and Russian are the two most widely used languages in the East of Ukraine (Kulyk: 2018: 318). However, assessing precise numbers of speakers of the two

² I have observed some increase of context-specific uses of Ukrainian during my trip to Kharkiv in 2018 as compared to my previous visit in 2013. For example, Ukrainian is becoming occasionally used in state service branches, some cultural (bookstores, theatre's and cinema's ticket offices, museums) and food service establishments, the contexts where Russian was used almost exclusively in the past.

languages as well as their levels of literacy in each and both of them is challenging due to the differences that language ideologies of individual speakers and survey designers impose on their perceptions of what counts as first and native language, and what counts as proficiency in them (Arel:2002). Moreover, bilingualism of at least some Eastern Ukrainians in Ukrainian in Russian and the commonality of dialects further complicates the assessment³

Data regarding preferred language use is most relevant for the purposes of this paper. According to Kulyk (Kulyk: 2017), 14.5 percent use Ukrainian daily in Eastern Ukraine even though 40.8 percent of people in this region consider Ukrainian their native language. At the same time, 44.2 percent of Eastern Ukrainians consider Russian their native language and 54.3 percent use it daily. Since only 19.5 of all Russian speakers would respond to Ukrainian in Russian (Kulyk:2017), the chances of Russian speakers to engage in biliteracy practices beyond educational system remain rather low which reinforces the point from the previous section and further encourages the focus on the language socialization practices present in the educational system to analyze biliteracy development of Russian speakers and bilingual Russian speakers in Eastern Ukraine.

Languages of education in Kharkiv region

The purpose of this section is to outline the scope of exposure to Ukrainian enabled via educational system in Kharkiv region⁴. This system socializes Russian speakers and bilingual Russian speakers into Ukrainian literacies via classes of Ukrainian as a subject in the Russian-medium schools and via Ukrainian as a subject and Ukrainian as a medium of instruction in Ukrainian-medium schools. Such different schools are characterized by different levels of exposure to Ukrainian.

According to the Institute of Educational Analytics (Institute of Educational Analytics: 2017), there were 16365 secondary schools in Ukraine, with 15020 (or 92 percent) being Ukrainian-medium schools and 581 (or 3.5 percent)– Russian-medium. At the same time, in Kharkiv region there were 765 secondary educational establishments in 2016, among which 585 (or 76,4 percent) were Ukrainian-medium schools⁵, 115 (or 15

³ 31.3 percent people in the Eastern Ukraine region claim to use “both” languages daily (Kulyk:2018:), however, it is unclear whether these people mean that they are bilingual in Ukrainian and Russian and use both of these discrete languages daily, or they used this category to indicate that they theoretically assume that they are bilingual in Ukrainian and Russian and could use both languages, but in practice only use one of them, or if they use regional code-mixed dialects of Russian and Ukrainian known under the umbrella term Surzhyk, in which case, it would be misleading to attribute them to the category of bilinguals since such speakers are often monolingual in their dialects. How other people would categorize the speakers of “both” languages and what language they would use to talk to them remains unclear.

⁴ This paper uses the terms Eastern Ukraine and Kharkiv region interchangeably with accordance to how they were mentioned in the sources referred to. I consider it a legitimate substitution since the category “East” used to include Kharkiv, Donetsk, and Luhansk regions, the latter now often approached as “Donbass”, Kharkiv region the only region remaining within the “East” category referred to, for instance, by Kulyk (Kulyk:2017).

⁵ Official title of a Ukrainian-medium school in the Russian-speaking region does not necessarily mean that content subjects are taught in Ukrainian: language of instruction rather depends on teachers’

percent) were Russian-medium schools and 65 (or 8.5 percent) were schools with several languages of instruction⁶. At the same time, reverse dynamics can be observed in the offerings of Ukrainian and Russian as subjects at Kharkiv regions schools: thus, 193 schools offer Ukrainian as a subject in Kharkiv, and 596 schools offer Russian as a subject. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that most of the students of Kharkiv region schools study both Ukrainian and Russian in some combination of these languages. On the individual level, out of 227815 students in Kharkiv region, there were 62051 (or 27 percent) students studying in schools with Russian as a medium of instruction as of 2017 and 165764 (or 72.5 percent) students studying in schools with Ukrainian as the medium of instruction.

Overall, all the Russian speakers who have attended schools since independence in 1991 were exposed to Ukrainian to a different extent depending on whether their school was with Russian or Ukrainian as the medium of instruction. The majority of Russian speakers in Kharkiv region have studied in Ukrainian-medium schools.

Theoretical background

In this paper I draw on the work of Hornberger (Hornberger and Link:2012), Cameron (Cameron: 2007; Cameron: 2012) and Costa (Costa:2013; Costa:2016) to make the argument that promotion of pure language varieties characteristic for language revitalization reduces acceptance of Russian-speaking Eastern Ukrainians' first language in school and community Ukrainian language socialization and consequently impedes their development of literacy in Ukrainian.

Hornberger's emphasis on the use of L1 and L2, and hybrid language practices such as translanguaging as resources in language education is especially useful to this analysis as it allows us to think through the ways in which Russian (L1), and Ukrainian learner's hybrid language practices such as translanguaging are utilized in language education in the Eastern Ukraine.

To this end Hornberger's conceptualisation of language proficiency in bilingual communities as emerging via a continuum of biliterate development in L1 and L2 is generative for grasping how utilization of L1, L2, and code-switching in the language instruction in bilingual communities can indeed be instrumental for the development of both L2 and L1. It is here also that Hornberger's attention to dominant and subjugated literacies is of value for informing how to understand how schools' focus on dominant literacies (or more powerful ends of the continuum of biliterate development) such as written, L2, and production literacies impedes the development of oral, reception, and L1 literacies. In their turn, Costa's and Cameron's emphasis on purism of language revitalization ideologies (Cameron:2007, Costa:2013) is especially useful to this analysis as it allows us to think through the ways in which purist revitalization ideologies can be

preference (Polese:2010). At the same time, the likelihood of content subjects being taught in Ukrainian in Ukrainian-medium schools is higher than in the Russian-medium schools.

⁶ The document does not explain what is meant by "several languages of instruction." From my personal experience with schools in Kharkiv, it is highly likely that these are Ukrainian and English bilingual schools.

used to limit acceptability of Russian as a resource in Ukrainian language education in the Eastern Ukraine.

The theoretical background section proceeds as follows. Firstly, it outlines biliteracy perspective on the development of literacy in L2, the role of translanguaging in this process, and the conditions enabling the productive use of this practice based on the existing research on the use of translanguaging for biliteracy development. The goal of this subsection is to argue that translanguaging is crucial for development of biliteracy, and consequently, translanguaging in Russian and Ukrainian is crucial for development of literacy in Ukrainian.

It further examines the conditions that purist language revitalization (on the example of Ukrainian language revitalization policy) grants to the use of translanguaging through the lens of critical language revitalization theory as outlined by Cameron and Costa to argue that purist language revitalization discourse does not grant ideological spaces for acceptance of translanguaging. This section concludes with theoretical implications of the lack of acceptance of translanguaging for the future of language revitalization among the Russian-speakers in Ukraine.

Translanguaging and the development of biliteracy

Hornberger broadly defines biliteracy as “any and all instances in which communication occurs in two (or more) languages in or around writing” (Hornberger: 2002: 36). Her framework of continua of biliteracy depicts the development of biliteracy

“along intersecting first language– second language, receptive-productive, and oral-written language skills continua; through the medium of two (or more) languages and literacies whose linguistic structures vary from similar to dissimilar, whose scripts range from convergent to divergent, and to which the developing biliterate individual’s exposure varies from simultaneous to successive; in contexts that encompass micro to macro levels and are characterized by varying mixes along the monolingual-bilingual and oral-literate continua; and with content that ranges from majority to minority perspectives and experiences, literary to vernacular styles and genres, and decontextualized to contextualized language texts” (Hornberger: 2002: 36).

Complex as the definition of biliteracy may seem, it can be relatively easy comprehended though the constituent parts of this theory. This theory is rooted in the theories of literacy and multilingualism (Hornberger: 2008: 5).⁷, outlining which may clarify the definition of biliteracy as it is supplied by Hornberger. Biliteracy theory understands literacy as situational, meaning that literacy is not just decontextualized learning how to read and write, but also knowing how to apply this knowledge for specific purposes in specific contexts of use, without which contexts that are determined by culture, literacy has no use (Hornberger: 2008). On an individual development level, biliteracy theory is rooted in Cummins’s view of bilingualism stating that ‘a child’s first language skills must become well developed to ensure that their academic and linguistic performance in the second language is maximized’ (Baker and Hornberger 2001, 18)

⁷ While acknowledging that neither the complete theory of literacy, nor a complete theory of bilingualism yet exists

On a wider scale, it is also rooted in the multilingualism theory suggested by Ruiz in his *Orientations in Language Planning* (Ruiz: 1984) that posits that society multilingualism develops only if languages are treated as a resource, meaning that language learning is most productive when it is based on the foundation of a language that people already speak (Hornberger, 2002). Overall, Hornberger views biliteracy as simultaneous existence and development of the intersecting literacies in L1 and L2 (and L3, L4....).

In the Eastern Ukrainian, applying the conceptual framework of biliteracy instead of the more commonly used second language acquisition theory to analyze Russian-speakers' literacy practices would mean understanding that these practices are Ukrainian-culture specific as they have developed in the Ukrainian contexts. It consequently means viewing Russian speakers from Ukraine as different from the Russian speakers from Russia in that they can draw on their biliteracy resources emerging from the Ukrainian cultural contexts while the latter would rely on Russian culture-specific literacy resources.

Besides, and what is most relevant for this study, application of the biliteracy theory in the Eastern Ukrainian context means viewing Russian-speakers' literacies in their first language as a resource for the development of the literacy in Ukrainian language as well as reconceptualizing the process of development of literacy in Ukrainian. In the Eastern Ukrainian context, it means viewing literacy in Ukrainian as developing on the basis of the literacy in Russian and with hybrid literacy practices inevitably involved in this process.

It also means discarding the concepts of code-mixing and code-switching and using the concept of translanguaging to refer to some phenomena denoted by these concepts before.

Translanguaging is a necessary and productive practice in the development of literacy in the second language (Hornberger:2012). While earlier research in second language acquisition conceptualized the simultaneous use of both languages in a bilingual pair as code-mixing or code-switching, thus suggesting the existence of two somehow strictly compartmentalized "codes" or independent decontextualized language systems in bilingual people's and language learners' minds, biliteracy research has taken another approach to the analysis of such language uses (Hornberger:2012).

Hornberger has suggested to view the development of second language through the lens of literacy, or contextualized language use. According to Hornberger, second language learners and bilinguals do not develop separate proficiencies in all the languages they learn, but rather develop biliteracy in any given and all contexts.

In this view a person literate in a certain context in one language is able to mobilize their resources in another language to function in a similar context in this other language. In this view, understanding of the mixed uses of languages shifts from that of an interference to that of a creative application of the resources from one language variety to another in similar contexts. Overall, translanguaging is what helps learners connect their literacy in one language with the literacy in the second one.

In Ukrainian context, translanguaging refers to the speech that Ukrainian learners produce in the course of development of literacies in Ukrainian to connect their literacies in Ukrainian and Russian. Accepting the Ukrainian learner's speech as legitimate thus would allow to enable Russian-speakers develop literacies in Ukrainian. In order for this goal to be reached, their Russian language resources based on which translanguaging occurs should also be considered legitimate within the educational system.

Perceptions of acceptability of translanguaging in the purist revitalization ideologies

This section explores how purist revitalization ideologies construct resources in revitalized and in the colonizer's languages as a problem or as a resource as well as how they construct hybrid language practices as a problem or as a resource. It begins with outlining the basic premises of purist revitalization ideologies and proceeds with the outlining of ideological spaces remaining within purist revitalization ideologies to consider anything besides the revitalized language (in its pure form) as a resource.

Purist ideologies of language revitalization

In critical revitalization scholarship, purist ideologies of revitalization are viewed as potentially oppressive. Potential oppressive vectors of essentializing ideologies have long been noted by critical scholars in the field of linguistics. Here, I am citing two of such theorists whose contributions help to problematize revitalization ideologies in particular. First one is Hutton (Hutton:2012) who warned about the still existing potential negative impact of the uncritical application of linguists' ideas to the real world by tracing Nazi's ideas about the deficiency of Jews to their fascination with essentialist linguistic discourses suggesting that there necessarily exist connections between the languages we speak and the people we are. Pointing out to the fact that Jews in Germany did not have their own "mother tongue" consequently allowed them to suggest that they were not real people. Hutton warned that eradication of Nazi's ideology does not necessarily mean eradication of the theoretical premises on which it was built. He observed that

Many of [the] descriptive or methodological principles [of the linguistic thought] reflect the politics of European nationalism in the last two centuries. Notions such as 'native speaker' and 'native speaker intuition', 'natural language', 'linguistic system' [and] 'speech community' have their roots in nationalist organicism and the fundamental vernacularism of linguistic needs to be seen as an ideology with a complex history and real political consequences. That ideology is alive and well today... (Hutton:2012:1)

Cameron (Cameron:2007; Cameron:2012), following Hutton's argument, located essentializing discourse in the contemporary rhetoric of language revitalization and preservation by highlighting the similar premises on which the two rhetorical stances are constructed. Among such premises she particularly highlights the overreliance of both ideologies on the "strong" version of "Whorfian"⁸ linguistic determinism argument,

⁸ I use quotation marks here to highlight that this is argument is only attributed to Whorf in the Western academia as a consequence of misinterpretation of his ideas by the initial interpreters of his scholarship (Pavlenko)

that language shapes how we see reality and their consequent intention to remove the elements “alien” to the languages concerning them since such elements, according to these ideologies, distort the “pure” worldviews encoded in these languages.

This intention to clear the language of alien elements, according to Cameron, has a potential to be oppressive towards the users of such elements. While not all revitalization rhetoric is necessarily oppressive, as Cameron pointed out, it is important to bear in mind that the oppressive potential of essentialism is real since when built into authoritative policies, essentialist ideas may encourage coercion of those who do not conform to the ideal images promoted in them (Cameron:2007:272)

Compatibility of purist language revitalization ideologies with biliteracy development

This section outlines the scope of the language practices approached as a problem within the purist revitalization paradigm to argue that purist revitalization ideology is counterproductive to the goal of attaining of literacy in the revitalized language since it stigmatizes translanguaging and the use of the former colonizer’s language.

Firstly, purist revitalization ideology promotes the view of the prior colonizer’s language as a problem. As the previous section has demonstrated, the goal of the purist revitalization ideologies lies in promotion of “cleaning” the revitalized language from the influence of the alien elements. Since it is the elements of the colonizer’s culture and language that have penetrated the revitalized language on the stage of language shift, it is these elements that are problematized within the purist revitalization paradigms. In Ukrainian context adopting a purist revitalization paradigm would mean approaching Russian as a problem.

Moreover, another set of resources that purist revitalization ideologies consider problematic are the hybrid practices since they potentially threaten the purity of the revitalized language in the long run by introducing alien elements to the revitalized language. Problematization of the hybrid practices is naturally connected to the problematization of the language of the former colonizer in the first place: since revitalization occurs in the contexts where the language of the colonizer is still used, problematization of hybrid practices is, again the problematization of the language of the colonizer.

In Eastern Ukrainian context, adoption of the purist revitalization ideology would mean approaching Ukrainian learners translanguaging as a problem since it could be seen as having a potential to bring in the elements of Russian to Ukrainian again.

According to the biliteracy theory, such practices could theoretically impede the development of the literacy in the revitalized language since for the development of the latter in the contexts when people are bilingual in the revitalized and the colonizer’s language or monolingual in the colonizer’s language or have the colonizer’s language as a significant component of their literacy background, using the colonizer’s language as a resource would be necessary. In Ukrainian context it would mean that if the Russian-speakers’ first language resources and the hybrid language practices are considered a

problem in the language socialization contexts, then, literacy of the Russian-speakers in Ukrainian is unlikely to develop.

Research methodology

This pilot study utilizes a combination of policy analysis and narrative inquiry to analyze how Ukrainian language revitalization ideology constructed Russian literacy and translanguaging as a resource or as a problem and what implication it had for the Russian-speakers' desire to use Ukrainian. It utilizes policy analysis to answer the first part of the question, and narrative inquiry was used to answer the second.

Revitalization ideology

To assess how Ukrainian revitalization ideology has constructed Russian and hybrid language practices as a problem or as a resource, this section analyzes the ground setting policy document outlining the principles of Ukrainian language policy “On the Principles of language policy”⁹ following the criteria suggested by Cameron (Cameron:2008), Costa (Costa:2016), and Heller (Heller:2016). Costa (Costa: 2013; Costa:2016) and Heller (Heller:2016; Duchene and Heller: 2008) identified discrete discursive threads in the rhetoric of revitalization, in which essentialization is particularly prominent. According to Costa and Heller, essentialization can be best observed in the following three components of this discourse: firstly, the narrative of the idealized past during which the descendants of the potential new speakers shared the same language and culture and lived happily, which, though was lost due to the pressures of the external obstacles; secondly, the idea of the external obstacle that is to be overcome to establish the similar scenario in the future and, lastly, the idea of means by which this obstacle can be overcome. Thus, this section analyzes the abovementioned discursive threads.

Firstly, it establishes that this document is advocating for the revitalization of Ukrainian by highlighting the elements pertinent to the revitalization discourse. Then, it analyzes these elements to see if they tend to essentialize language, culture, people, and territory to argue that Ukrainian revitalization discourse tends to be essentializing and, thus, tends to approach other languages in Ukraine as a problem rather than as a resource.

Firstly, the document begins with the preamble that essentializes Ukrainian language, culture, people, and territory. For example, several times it constructs the link between Ukrainian language, people and territory framing it is necessary and unavoidable. For example, the document states that “Ukrainian language is a determining factor and the main feature of identity of Ukrainian nation that historically lives on the territory of Ukrainian.” This proposition entails several implications: that Ukrainian nationals necessarily speak Ukrainian (since speaking it is the main feature of Ukrainian

⁹ This document is considered ground-setting for the revitalization policy in Ukraine since further legislation in Ukraine is developed based on it, which it (as the 2019 Law “Pro zabezpechennia funktsionuvannia ukrains'koi movy iak derzhavnoi” (On ensuring that Ukrainian functions as the state language)) explicitly mentions.

nationals) and that Ukrainian territory rightfully belongs to Ukrainian nationals (because they have historically lived there), and, consequently, that Ukrainian language has to be used on the whole territory of Ukraine (because Ukrainian nationals live there). Besides, the document essentializes connections between Ukrainian language and statehood: “The concept of Ukrainian language is a component of a broader [...] concept “constitutional order,” another component of which is national symbols,” “Ukrainian language [...] is the principal system-forming component (cornerstone) of Ukrainian statehood and Ukrainian people – citizens of Ukraine of all nations.” Such propositions further entail such implications that Ukrainian is without Ukrainian language, Ukrainian statehood would not exist.

Examples of such essentializing connections between language, culture, statehood and territory already demonstrate that Ukraine has adopted monolingual essentializing language ideology on the state level. Such ideology itself is already problematic since it does not leave space for the legitimate presence of other languages on Ukrainian territory.

The document further goes on to problematize the role of other languages in an essentialized manner. Since the focus of this paper is Russian, essentialization of Russian and of its role in Ukraine is the focus of the further discussion. In this document, Russian is mentioned several times in a way that uses the concepts of Russian state, Russian imperialism interchangeably, which seems to be in accord with the essentialist and monolingual framing of the document.

For example, it begins the narrative of the past injustices towards Ukrainian with the description of the negative impact that Russia (first, Russian Empire, and then, Soviet Russia) has had on the livelihood of Ukrainians, Ukrainian language, and Ukrainian statehood (which seem to be undistinguished in the essentialist ideology). For instance, it argues that “distorted language situation [has shaped in Ukraine] due to assimilation of Ukrainians [as a result of policies] fighting “Little Russian separatism” and “Ukrainian bourgeoisie nationalism.”” Given that the latter terms were widely used in the Russian Empire and in the Soviet Union, the author of the document blames these countries and their colonial influence on Ukraine for the “distorted language situation.” This point is developed further as the document states that “the language situation that has shape in Ukraine is a consequence of explicit an implicit coercion.” Given the colonial history of relationship between Ukraine and Russia, and implicit reference to Russia as the source of the damage done to Ukrainian, it is reasonable to assume that in this passage, Russia is problematized as well.

While the negative impact of Russian colonialism seems reasonable to mention in the context of the document promoting reversing the language shift that occurred as a result of colonial policies, further development of the argument seems to be problematic as it continues problematizing the role of Russian in Ukrainian society today using the same discursive framing as it used to frame the role of the Russian state on the Ukrainian society in the past.

For example, it uses the framing as threat to refer both to the past actions of Russia towards Ukraine, and to the presence of Russian on the Ukrainian territory, or, as the document frames it “in the Ukrainian cultural, media, and informational space.” For example it states that “national language and cultural and language and informational space is overflowed with foreign content, and, in some regions, the use of Ukrainian in the TV and radio broadcasting remains minimal” and that “foreign language and cultural expansion [contributes to] strengthening of the processes of de-Ukrainization of the language and cultural and language and informational space, which leads to the mass violation of language rights of Ukrainians.” These propositions entail the implication that all the non-Ukrainian content in Ukraine is foreign and that it is threatening to the Ukrainian.

What seems to be especially interesting in the context of this study is that this document negatively valorizes “intentional distortion of the Ukrainian language”: the document seems to even request prosecution of those who “intentionally distort” Ukrainian language. While the scope of the “intentional distortion is not specified”, it is not unreasonable to assume that any non-standard Ukrainian speech might be considered distortion of the Ukrainian language. This point demonstrates that the Ukrainian revitalization discourse negatively assesses hybrid language practices.

Overall, analyzing the cornerstone of Ukrainian revitalization policy relying on the features of essentialist discourses outlined by Hutton (Hutton:2012) and Cameron (Cameron: 2008) as a guide, this section demonstrated that Ukrainian ideology of language revitalization is essentialist in that it constructs strong discursive links between Ukrainian language, culture, statehood, and territory. Further analysis following the discursive themes pertinent to language revitalization as outlined by Costa (Costa:2016) and Heller (Heller:2016), showed that such essentialist ideology can have potential negative implications for the development of literacy in Ukrainian among the speakers of Russian since the revitalization narrative is both rooted in the problematizing of the role of Russian in the Ukrainian society and fails to distinguish between Russian language and Russian state, the combination of both factors entailing the discursive framing of Russian language (without distinction on the Russian language from Russia and the Russian language from the Eastern Ukraine) as a threat to the Ukrainian society.

Thus, ideology of revitalization of Ukrainian that essentializes language, state, and culture seems to treat Russian language as a problem in Ukrainian society along with treating Russia as the source of problems for Ukraine. Acknowledging that Russian-language content can be Ukrainian seems to be made impossible by the essentialist ideology that suggests that only Ukrainian can be Ukrainian. It means that neither Russian language nor translanguaging relying on Russian may not be considered legitimate resources within the revitalization paradigm.

Learners' experiences

This study examined learning trajectories of Eastern Ukrainian Russian speakers utilizing narrative research methodology to elicit the data about attitudes to their

translanguaging practices that they encountered in educational and other contexts while learning Ukrainian and the impact of these attitudes on their motivation to use Ukrainian. Overall, so far four interviews have been analyzed. Two interviewees have expressed strong stances on not using Ukrainian in Kharkiv. Contrastingly, the other two have begun to use Ukrainian already and strongly believe that this goal is attainable for others as well.

Interviews were collected over videocalls. 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 four cases selected for this paper demonstrate how contrasting experiences with translanguaging that participants have shaped their language ideologies.

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 are analyzed employing thematic analysis.

Literacy learning backgrounds

Pasha and Olya

Pasha and Olya were both born in Kharkiv. Both Pasha's and Olya's parents are of mixed backgrounds: Pasha's father is from an Eastern Ukrainian city and his mother is from Russia. Olya's father is from Kharkiv, or, more specifically, from a small suburban town close to Kharkiv (so close that living in it Olya attended school and university in Kharkiv), and her mother is from Russia. Both grew up in Russian-speaking environments using Russian in all contexts of their lives before school. Thus, both developed their oral contextualized literacies in Russian first. Both studied during the Ukrainian independence years, Pasha started school in 1996, and Olya, in 1998. Both attended Russian-medium schools with Ukrainian language and literature subject classes, which was the only context where they used Ukrainian. Thus, they would have developed productive dimension of their literacy in Ukrainian only in the academic context through decontextualized media. Moreover, they recollect only having

developed written literacy in Ukrainian during their school education: the oral production that they recollect was only reading written text aloud. They have also developed receptive standard literacies in Ukrainian through their use of Ukrainian media beyond schools: listening to Ukrainian bands, watching Ukrainian news and Ukrainian-dubbed movies. Besides, Pasha developed a rather specific productive literacy in Ukrainian: he used to belong to a football fan community and attended football games and events during which he chanted Ukrainian slogans and chants in Ukrainian. He did not use Ukrainian other than for these chants there. Pasha and Olya both consume Ukrainian-language entertainment and social media content, however, they engage with it in Russian, thus not developing oral production literacy in Ukrainian at all.

Volodymyr and Andrii

Volodymyr and Andrii were the participants I hoped but did not expect to encounter: they both started using Ukrainian in adulthood while never have used before previously, and continue using it in Kharkiv in their still Russian-speaking environments. Both Volodymyr's and Andrii's backgrounds were different from the ones that I expected to analyze at the beginning: I planned to remain coherent and to collect and analyze data only about the people of my generation, those born and educated in the independent Ukraine, however, data collection process constraints resulted in me not being able to interview those of them who switched to Ukrainian. However, I was lucky to encounter Volodymyr and Andrii, Kharkiv based university lecturers from Sumy region (they are unaware of each other existence) who used to identify as Russian speakers in the past but started using Ukrainian in all contexts in adulthood.

Both Volodymyr and Andrii were born in the Sumy region. Volodymyr's parents are from the Western Ukraine, originally, Ukrainian speakers. However, they used Russian at home fearing past prosecutions of their family members for Ukrainian nationalism in the Western Ukraine. Volodymyr's parents are from Sumy region. He first claimed that they used Russian at home but then rather unwillingly admitted that now he believes it might have been "surzhyk"¹⁰.

Both went to Russian-medium schools with Ukrainian language as a mandatory subject. For both of them, school was the first context where they developed literacies in standard Ukrainian. Thus, like Pasha and Olya, they developed decontextualized, written production, standard literacies in Ukrainian while the contextualized, oral production, non-standard literacies they had were in Russian. At their schools contexts for the use of Ukrainian and Russian were strictly differentiated, and they used Ukrainian only in Ukrainian classes for a long time.

Both became interested in the Ukrainian independence movement in 1989 and began perusing literature in Ukrainian thus also developing their receptive standard literacy in Ukrainian which was more contextualized than the school one since they read the

¹⁰ I am aware that the speaker of a Ukrainian dialect is not, strictly a Russian-speaker, however, I still consider the interview with him relevant for this study since he identifies as a former Russian-speaker.

materials of their choice. At the same time, they still discussed what they read with others in Russian. After graduation they did not use Ukrainian for a while, but started using it in all contexts several years ago: Andrii was preparing to meet the President of Ukraine, at that time Petro Poroshenko, decided to practice Ukrainian “not to get embarrassed” and has spoken Ukrainian ever since. Volodymyr has started to speak Ukrainian with his girlfriend from the Western Ukraine several years ago and has not stopped even though they broke up.

Attitudes to translanguaging

Pasha and Olya

Pasha’s and Olya’s attitudes to translanguaging and to the possibility of using Ukrainian are rather similar: they both assess translanguaging unsympathetically and do not see themselves using Ukrainian, however, for somewhat different reasons. Pasha contemplated using Ukrainian in the past and practiced doing so during his travelling to the Western Ukraine for football games. During his trips he communicated with the like-minded people and attempted to do so in Ukrainian first but soon switched back to Russian: he explained this switches by his unwillingness to “sit and think half an hour before every sentence like an idiot while others are talking”. Apparently, he only considered it appropriate to produce standard Ukrainian speech, but not to use translanguaging to rely on his Russian and Ukrainian resources simultaneously.

Later he confirmed my assumption by explaining why he gave up on the idea to use Ukrainian. He told me that it would not be natural for him anyway since he believes that there are people who speak Ukrainian and there are people who speak Russian and that he does not want to be like other people who begin to use Ukrainian. He told me about his friends, a Russian-speaking couple who started to use Ukrainian and confessed that he did not think that it was Ukrainian at all. Instead, he assessed it as a “nasty Surzhyk”.

Similar assessment of Ukrainian-learners attempts to use Ukrainian came from Olya who while showing support for Ukrainian revitalization movement, did not see the need to use Ukrainian herself. She used similar rhetoric, that Ukrainian-learners speech was not, according to her interpretation, appropriate Ukrainian speech. Olya, who works at a university told me that for her to listen to people who attempt to use Ukrainian during meetings evokes feelings of shame, and that delivering speeches in Ukrainian herself is often a struggle since she fears the embarrassment of mispronouncing something.

Volodymyr and Andrii

Volodymyr and Andrii demonstrated slightly different attitudes to translanguaging and awareness of their own translanguaging practices: Overall, both had negative attitudes to non-standard language, be it translanguaging or dialects, while none of them seemed to be aware of their own translanguaging and the non-standardness of the Ukrainian learners’ speech they used as they only started speaking Ukrainian.

Andrii practiced his oral production in Ukrainian at work. He remembered having occasionally used Ukrainian to teach his classes before this final solution. When I asked him, how his students reacted to these unannounced cases of instruction in Ukrainian he revealed that he was either unaware of his learning process or unwilling to disclose it. He suggested that the only reaction in which he was confident was that students paid more attention and then joked that he could not be sure if they thought that he lost his mind or spoke not well enough since, after all, they were students and could not openly criticize him.

This seemed noteworthy to me as he indicated that he could be aware that during his first attempts to use Ukrainian, his speech could be non-standard which made him susceptible to the criticism. At the same time, it seemed that the lack of criticism of the audience of his translanguaging practice played a significant role in his literacy development: the comfort of the familiar context in which he was dominating, seemed to have alleviated his insecurities about speaking Ukrainian in a non-standard way and he soon developed his literacy in Ukrainian.

Volodymyr did not seem to be aware of his own translanguaging either. He seemed to evade all the questions about translanguaging. However, certain other recurring themes and silences in his interview allowed me to suggest that Volodymyr's unwillingness to talk about translanguaging in relation to himself was due to his pursuit of a specifically pure Ukrainian identity.

Over the course of the interview he initiated threads about his Ukrainian origins a number of times: once, he started talking about his family members being prosecuted and executed under accusations of nationalism in the Western Ukraine. Then he talked about how he believes his home language was Russian since the remaining family members felt threatened to use Ukrainian and how regretful this fact was to him.

Overall, these two longer threads along with other smaller instances of mentioning of his passion for postcolonial Ukrainian historical literature convinced me that not only he strongly identified as Ukrainian but also wanted to restore that pure Western Ukrainian identity that he felt was a part of his background but was never transmitted to him due to the de-Ukrainizing impact of oppressive colonial policies on his family.

Besides, Volodymyr avoided talking about his process of learning to speak Ukrainian other than reporting that he began speaking Ukrainian to his Western Ukrainian girlfriend who lived in his apartment in Kharkiv for several month. Him avoiding the development of this thread as well as of the questions related to his possible uses of non-standard Ukrainian at the beginning of his speaking this language, allowed me to assume that it was important to him to present his pure Ukrainian identity to this woman. At the same time, he could feel uncomfortable disclosing the details of his relationship to me, so my other interpretation, that the comfort of practicing Ukrainian in a hospitable environment of his home has allowed him to alleviate insecurities of using non-standard Ukrainian. Whatever the reason behind his lack of awareness of his own translanguaging and non-standard practices was, what remains clear is that he has

either never experienced the discomfort of being criticized for using non-standard speech or does not think that mentioning it would be coherent with his narrative.

Discussion

Overall, the literacy backgrounds of the participants of the study who decided to use Ukrainian and who decided not to had a number of similarities and differences. While their micro contexts in which they developed literacy in standard Ukrainian were similar, as they all learned it in Russian-medium schools with Ukrainian as a subject, their macro learning contexts were different as the status of Ukrainian was different in the Soviet Union and in the Independent Ukraine.

The major differences though could be found among participants' perceptions of translanguaging practices, both their own and that of others'. While all of them indicated negative attitudes to translanguaging in general, Volodymyr and Andrii, participants who use Ukrainian seem to have experienced negative attitudes to their own translanguaging to a significantly less extent than Pasha and Olya who insist on using Russian. Firstly, their schooling experiences were characterized by different attitudes to translanguaging: the former were not exposed to purist type of Ukrainian instruction and thus have not developed a perception of themselves as deficient speakers of Ukrainian. In the long run, it helped them reach confidence in developing literacy in Ukrainian. Conversely, Pasha and Olya have experienced pressures of authenticity-oriented language instruction which delegitimized their translanguaging practices marked by the presence of Russian. Beyond the educational system, Volodymyr and Andrii developed their literacies in Ukrainian in the contexts where nobody criticized their translanguaging practices which allowed them to develop literacy in Ukrainian with confidence. Conversely, Pasha and Olya's perceptions of their own translanguaging were impacted heavily by the purist ideologies, positioning Ukrainian speech with Russian interjections as a problem: now they associate their "impure" Ukrainian learners' speech with shame and embarrassment. Even more so, they seem to judge others who translanguage as deficient and embarrassing.

Overall, error-correction aiming for derussification of Ukrainian that originated from the purist language ideology of revitalization in the independent Ukraine seemed to have contributed negatively to the motivation of the Russian speakers to use Ukrainian.

¹¹

Conclusion

¹¹ This comparison of the attitudes to translanguaging while learning Ukrainian in the Soviet Union and in the independent Ukraine is not to say that Soviet Union created better conditions for the revitalization of Ukrainian: it is plainly not true. Most likely, acceptance of translanguaging in the process of learning of Ukrainian in the Soviet Union was itself problematic as it resulted from negligence stemming from the lack of concern for preserving authentic Ukrainian. Nevertheless, it seems to have incidentally resulted in the development of confidence in the acceptability of their Ukrainian speech by the Russian speaking Ukrainians.

I have argued that promotion of “authentic” language varieties characteristic for language revitalization impeded Russian speaker’s development of literacy in Ukrainian since it reduced acceptability of Russian-speaking Eastern Ukrainians’ first language and translanguaging relying on their first language in school and community Ukrainian language socialization consequently

The findings of the study showed that purist ideology of revitalization of Ukrainian stigmatizes translanguaging practices involving Russian elements. Contrasting examples of the Russian-speakers educated in the educational systems characterized by different approaches to Russian language resources and to the hybrid practices showed that purist ideology of revitalization adopted in Ukraine deterred Russian speakers from using Ukrainian. Overall, this study demonstrates that purist language revitalization ideologies seem to be counterproductive for the development of the literacies in the revitalized languages.

Bibliography

- Arel, Dominique. 2002 "Interpreting" Nationality" and" Language" in the 2001 Ukrainian Census." *Post-Soviet Affairs* 18 (3): 213-249.
- Bilaniuk, Laada, and Svitlana Melnyk. 2008. "A tense and shifting balance: Bilingualism and education in Ukraine." *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism* 11 (3 - 4): 340-372.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050802148731>
- Bilaniuk, Laada. 2017. "Purism and Pluralism: Language Use Trends in Popular Culture in Ukraine since Independence." In *The Battle for Ukrainian. A Comparative Perspective*. Edited by Michael Flier and Andrea Graziosi, 343 – 365. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cameron, Deborah. 2007 "Language endangerment~ and verbal hygiene: History, morality and Politics" In *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages*. Edited by Alexandre Duchene and Monica Heller. 268 - 285. New York: Continuum
- Cameron, Deborah. Verbal hygiene. Routledge, 2012.
- Costa, James, and Médéric Gasquet-Cyrus. 2013 "What is language revitalization really about? Competing language revitalization movements in Provence." *Keeping languages alive: Documentation, pedagogy and revitalisation*. Edited by Mari C. Jones and Sarah Ogville. 212-224. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Costa, James. 2016 *Revitalising language in Provence: A critical approach*. John Wiley & Sons Limited.
- Baker, Colin and Nancy H. Hornberger, eds. 2001. *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. Vol. 29. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1991. *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Vol 76. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.
- García, Ofelia, and Lei Wei. 2013. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Springer.
- Heller, Monica, and Alexandre Duchêne. 2008 "Discourses of endangerment: Sociolinguistics, globalization." In *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages*. Edited by Monica Heller and Alexandre Duhene. 11-13. New York: Continuum.
- Heller, Monica. 2011. *Paths to post-nationalism: A critical ethnography of language and identity*. Oxford University Press.

Heller, Monica. 2016 "Analysis and stance regarding language and social justice." In *Language rights and language survival*, pp. 290-293. Routledge, 2016.

Hornberger, Nancy H. 2002 "Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach." *Language policy* 1 (1): 27-51.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014548611951>

Hornberger, Nancy H. 2008. "Continua of biliteracy." *Encyclopedia of language and education* Vol 6. Language Socialization. Edited by Patricia A. Duff and Nancy Hornberger. 3152-3169. New York: Springer.

Hornberger, Nancy H., and Holly Link. 2012 "Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: A biliteracy lens." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 15(3): 261-278.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.658016>

Hutton, Christopher. 2012 *Linguistics and the Third Reich: Mother-tongue fascism, race and the science of language*. Routledge.

Institute of Educational Analytics. 2017. "Vidomosti pro movy navchanniâ ta vyvchenniâ movy iâk predmet u dennykh zahal'noosvitnykh navchal'nykh zakladakh Ministerstva osvity i nauky Ukraïny, inshykh ministerstvakh i vidomstvakh ta pryvatnykh zakladakh (2015/2016 ta 2016/2017 n.r.)", April 18.
<http://iea.gov.ua/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/7.pdf>

Kulyk, Volodymyr. 2017: "Language Attitudes in Independent Ukraine: Differentiation and Evolution." In *The Battle for Ukrainian. A Comparative Perspective*. Edited by Michael Flier and Andrea Graziosi, 309 – 343. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Nicholas, Sheilah E., 2014. "How Are You Hopi if You Can't Speak It?": An Ethnographic Study of Language as Cultural Practice among Contemporary Hopi Youth. In *Ethnography and language policy*, 69-92. Routledge.

Pavlenko, Aneta. 2008. "Multilingualism in post-Soviet countries: Language revival, language removal, and sociolinguistic theory." *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism* 11 (3-4): 275-314.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050802271517>

Polese, Abel. 2010 "The formal and the informal: Exploring 'Ukrainian' education in Ukraine, scenes from Odessa." *Comparative Education* 46 (1): 47-62.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060903538673>

Ruiz, Richard. 1984. "Orientations in language planning." *NABE journal* 8(2): 15-34.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464>

President of Ukraine. 2010. UKAZ PREZYDENTA UKRAÏNY №161/2010 Pro Kontseptsiïu derzhavnoi movnoi polityky, February 15.

<https://www.president.gov.ua/documents/1612010-10098>

Ukrcensus. 2001. "Distribution of the population of Ukraine`s regions by native language by Region, Indicated as a native language, Year and Contents".

<http://database.ukrcensus.gov.ua/MULT/Dialog/Saveshow.asp>