THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Performing Russianness:

Narratives and Everyday Conversations

of the Russian Communities in Scotland.

Author: Aldona Judina

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Edinburgh University

2014

Preface

Certificate of Authorship

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Candidate

_____

Date

_____

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Lara Ryazanova-Clarke, for her help and support and for her patience and ever inspiring guidance throughout my work.

I would also like to thank the participants in my research for allowing me into their lives, for sharing with me their stories, their worries and their joys.

I would like to give my special thanks to my family for their inexhaustible encouragement and endurance without which this work would not have been possible and for believing in me at every step of my journey.

I would like to give my very special thanks to Dr John Ross for his invaluable editing skills, his genuine interest in my work, for his patience and wisdom.

Abstract

The main aim of this project is to explore the construction of national identity as performed by members of the Russian-speaking communities living in Scotland through the analysis of intergenerational narratives and conversations between parents and their children appearing in families in everyday situations. The subject of the research is the Russian community living in Scotland.

This thesis aims to answer the following questions: How do Russian migrants construct and re-construct their Russianness during the constant process of interpretation of the new reality, new country, new culture. In what way do they attempt to exhibit their Russianness to their children in the process of everyday interaction? How do the children respond to these attempts and how do they contribute and co-construct the creation of identity? Which linguistic means and strategies are used to display and pass on the elements of the identity constructed? Are there any patterns used by adults in identity creations or any likely systematic actions undertaken during the identity performances? Do the adults achieve their intended aims, if they have any?

The methodological framework of the thesis exploits Foucault's, Goffman's and Blumer's theories in which the identity is seen as a discursive phenomenon created and shaped by interactions appearing in everyday situations. The empirical data are analysed using Bucholtz and Hall's sociocultural linguistic approach which enables the embedding of the study of interaction in a broader ethnographic context. Moreover, in the analytical part of the thesis the Conversational Analysis, Narrative Analysis and Membership Categorisation Analysis are employed.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Recent decades have been marked by a series of fundamental transformations that established entirely new forms of living that involve increased mobility of people, capital, material goods, information, ideas, discourses and meanings. The globalisation of production and work policies, elimination of barriers to the transfers of capital and services across national borders, the emergence and intensive development of the Internet and other forms of communication technologies facilitate extensive and multifaceted connections between people, places and cultures.

This intensive and complex mobility causes radical shifts in the established mechanisms of national identity construction. The familiar points of references become distant, while the bonds to common places of shared territorial, ethnic or cultural belongingness involved in the processes of identification are loosened or disrupted. In the age of cyberspace, the national identity of the communities dispersed worldwide is created and re-created 'through the mind, through cultural artefacts and through a shared imagination' (Cohen 1997: 516).

Like other countries Russia also joined the process of global migration. Since the 1990s, and especially in the last decade, the number of newcomers to the UK from the former Soviet Union has increased rapidly. The majority of the immigrants of the last, post-Soviet, wave are people in middle age who came here with their families. More than twenty years after radical geopolitical changes one can already speak about the second generation of Russian migrants in the UK, who at present are completing their University degrees and starting their independent lives (Morgunova 2009: 42).

My interest in Russian diaspora is not accidental but is grounded in my personal life situation. The subject of national identity constructed and transmitted between generations of Russian-speaking families living in Scotland is in my focus both as a researcher and as an immigrant and a parent. Moreover, the question of Russian national identity is interesting in the sense that two decades after the collapse of the Soviet Union both the immigrants and their compatriots back home are still trying to define and re-define their national self.

The last post-Soviet wave of migration to the UK is the subject of broad interdisciplinary study. Although the existing work concerning this phenomenon is extensive[1], the question of Russian-speakers living in Scotland is still under-investigated.

The main aim of this project is to explore the construction of national identity performed by members of Russian-speaking communities living in Scotland through the analysis of intergenerational narratives and conversations between parents and their children appearing in families in everyday situations.

The subject of my research is the Russian-speaking community in its widest sense. This group includes former and present Russian citizens living at the moment in Scotland, as well as Russian-speaking immigrants from other post-Soviet republics. This group represents the last wave of migration from the former USSR, which wave started after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990s and continues to the present day. The selection of this particular group was determined by its unique socio-cultural location. These people are representatives of the 'last Soviet generation' or 'generation of transition'[2], who were 'born in the former USSR roughly between the deaths of Stalin in 1953 and of Brezhnev in 1982, [and] whose formative identifications are therefore rooted, somewhat peculiarly, in a state and society that are no more' (Byford 2009: 62, 55).

The participants in my research are educated middle-class specialists who came to Scotland mainly for professional or social reasons[3]. All the informants are the parents of children who attend the Saturday Russian School "Russian Edinburgh"[4].

The main criterion for selection of the representative group of adults is the informant's declaration that Russian is his/her native or first language. Moreover, potential participants must identify with Russian nationality[5] and culture. Otherwise, the necessary condition for

[1] See for example: Darieva (2004), Kopnina (2005), Markova, Black (2006), Morgunova (2007, 2009, 2013), Byford (2009a, 2009b, 2012, 2014), Pechurina (2009, 2010, 2011), Malyutina (2012).
[2] Compare Oushakine (2000: 992).
[3] The more detailed description of the contemporary Russian migrants is given in Chapter One.
[4] The 'Russian Edinburgh' School is an initiative of Russian-speaking parents in Scotland and a recognised Scottish Charity established in 2004.
[5] I address the issue of Russian national identity in Chapter Three.

participation is the fact, that the language of whole family conversation (or, in the case of mixed couples, between a Russian-speaking parent and a child/children,) is Russian.
The question of parent-child family interaction in the diaspora and the issue of intergenerational transmission of values, ideas, beliefs, symbols and knowledges, coded as 'national', is the *core focus* of my research. Thus, in my investigation of national identity negotiations I will try to link two aspects that are usually studied separately, namely, the legacy of the native culture represented by the generation of parents born and brought up in the Soviet Union and also the impact of the cultural and social contexts of the host country represented by the generation of children.

I will also try to show identity as a relational and a sociocultural phenomenon that emerges and circulates in the local discourse contexts of everyday family conversations. My analysis will focus on both the linguistic details and the workings of culture and society in order to uncover the dynamics of the creation and re-creation of the national self in interaction. I will try to examine how broader cultural, social and ideological contexts determine identity construction and how they are employed by the generation of parents and the generation of children in the process of identity work.

In my thesis I will try to answer the following *research questions*:

- How do Russian migrants construct and re-construct their Russianness during the constant process of interpretation of the new reality, new country, new culture?
- How do they attempt to exhibit their Russianness to their children in the process of everyday interaction?
- How do the children respond to these attempts?
- How do the children contribute and co-construct the creation of identity?
- Which linguistic means and strategies are used by parents to display and pass on the elements of the constructed identity?
- Are there any patterns used by adults in identity creations or are there any probable systematic actions undertaken during the identity performances?
- Do the adults achieve the effects that they may intend?

In order to answer these questions I provide the necessary *theoretical background* and try to set my own investigation within the existing research. I critically analyse scholarship in the field of Russian migrants and diasporas. I also discuss the key concepts of the thesis – identity, narrative and conversation. Moreover, I address the questions of migrants' solidarities with the native and host countries.

The methodological framework of the thesis exploits Foucault's, Goffman's and Blumer's theories in which identity is seen as a product of discourses and at the same time as a phenomenon created and shaped by interactions appearing in everyday situations. The empirical data has been analysed by the Bucholtz and Hall sociocultural linguistic approach enabling the embedding of the study of interaction into a broader ethnographic context.

Moreover, in the analytical part of the thesis the Conversational Analysis, Narrative Analysis and Membership Categorisation Analysis are employed. This methodology enables investigating of the ways in which meaningful categories, values, and symbols are created, described and used, how Russian national identity is constructed and performed in the context of everyday interactions and how it is contributed to and received by family members. Moreover, it allows the observation and distinguishing of any potential regularities or likely systematic actions and patterns used by the participants in their actions.

The empirical data for my research includes sixteen hours of audio recordings of family conversations and narratives occurring in everyday settings. Each family has recorded approximately two hours of conversational material. The participants were asked to record their conversations with their children in their own homes without my presence, whenever they felt comfortable with this. This approach enables participants to feel free to engage in interactions, choosing the topics of their conversations as well as stopping the recording whenever they wished. Moreover, it avoided excessive interference by the researcher.

After the empirical data has been collected, I have chosen some conversational chunks for further analysis derived from detailed listening to the recordings. These chunks are related to the elements of cultural, social, political, and other forms of knowledge and also to the whole range of symbols, features, beliefs, memories or values which the participants of the interactions consider as meaningful and significant for the construction of their performances

of Russianness in the family circle. Later, these chunks have been transcribed and translated from Russian into English and analysed using the aforementioned methodology.

Dissertation Structure

The dissertation consists of six chapters. *Chapter One* presents and analyses scholarship concerning migrations in Russia in diachronic perspective comparing these migrations with global displacements and describes the representatives of the last wave of Russian immigrants now living in Great Britain. Moreover, it critically analyses the literature to date in the field of diasporas and presents various ideas and attitudes concerning the subject.

Chapter Two discusses scholarship in the field of identity and presents various perspectives on the subject. It compares different approaches, pointing out their advantages and limitations, leading to a working definition of identity. Finally, this chapter introduces the key concepts of the thesis – narrative and conversation.

Chapter Three discusses various theoretical approaches to the issue of migrants' assimilation in the host culture. Moreover, it critically analyses the literature concerning questions of migrants' solidarities with the native and host country and the re-imagining of their collective identity. Finally, it discusses Russian national identity in the diachronic perspective.

Chapter Four establishes research criteria in terms of the objects and methods of investigation. It presents and discusses the methodological framework which will be employed in further investigations. Next, it describes the participants in the research and the procedures of data collection and presentation. Finally, it addresses the ethical issues affecting ethnography-oriented research.

Chapter Five presents the analytical part of the thesis. It contains the analysis of Narratives and Everyday Conversations of Russian-speaking families living in Scotland.
Chapter Six presents the conclusions and the main findings of the research. Innovative aspects of the investigation are highlighted, and some proposals for future research are suggested.

Chapter One: Migrations and Diasporas

In *Chapter One* I will present and analyse scholarship on migrations in Russia in diachronic perspective. I will discuss geography, participants and reasons for such migrations. Further, I will describe the representatives of the last wave of Russian immigrants living at the moment in the United Kingdom. In the last section of this chapter I will critically analyse literature that has been conducted up to now in the field of diasporas and present various attitudes to the subject.

1.1. Russian Emigration in the 20th century

In Russia, as in any other country, flows of emigration were tightly linked with the internal political, economic and social processes occurring at that time. The relevant literature accepts that Russian emigration in the 20th century consisted of three basic waves (and a fourth, or last, wave which occurred after Perestroika and the collapse of the Soviet Union). The first wave directly followed the Socialist Revolution and World War I (Vishnevskii and Zaionchkovskaia 1994: 239), the second covered World War II and the immediate post-war years (Kopnina 2005: 25) and the third started in the 1950s and lasted almost forty years, until the Perestroika time (Vishnevskii and Zaionchkovskaia 1994: 241; Kopnina 2005: 26). The first two waves are considered as forced and the last one as voluntary (Zaionchkovskaia and Vishnevskii 1992: 4). It seems, however, that such a consideration of the question leads to a certain simplification since the backgrounds, as well as the direct motivations, of the particular groups of people leaving Russia (and later the Soviet Union) were much more varied and complex[6].

The events of 1905 directly impacted the emigration processes in Russia. The October Manifesto by announcing the amnesty for all political prisoners was conducive to the return of masses of emigrants from abroad. But such a situation did not last long. Already in 1906-

[6] Pushkareva (1996) for example distinguishes between 7 waves of political, 3 of religious and 3 of economical emigration, similarly as Iontsev (2001) who discern 7 periods of migration.

1907 an outbreak of arrests went through the country, causing a new wave of political emigration.

At the same time an increased amount of people left the country for economic reasons as a result of agricultural overpopulation of the central parts of the country.

The economic situation also probably motivated Russian cultural emigration at that time. At the beginning of the 20th century interest in Russia and its culture in Europe significantly increased. Based on the interest in 'non-verbal' arts like music, painting and ballet, there arose later an interest in Russian literature[7].

When World War I began lots of these people were away and the further development of the warfare obstructed their return. Bonds with the motherland became untied. The international renown as a result of work abroad allowed many artists to gain recognition and fame and to find a new sense of life (Pushkareva 1996, Kaznina 2009).

The events of February 1917 started the new phase of political emigration which, after the October revolution, assumed an anti-bolshevist, anti-communist and anti-Soviet character. The majority of people leaving the country were those who did not accept the Soviet government and all the events which accompanied its establishment.

The main reasons for escaping were fear of terrorisation and violence and the Civil War. From the Ukraine and later from Crimea and Siberia together with White Army units the civil population was evacuated en-masse. At the same time there was the so-called 'peaceful emigration'. Skilled specialists and trades people tried to get travelling documents and exit visas on various pretexts in order to leave the country[8].

For obvious reasons this wave of political and economic displacements coincided with the stream of religious emigration. The country was being left not only by the high clergy but

[7] At that time, for example, the largest amount of translations of Russian literature in history were made (Kaznina 2009: 27).

[8] According to the information gathered in 1922 in Varna (3354 questionnaires) 95,2% of refugees were Russians, men 73,3%, middle age 85,5%, the educational level was quiet high: 75% had completed secondary education (Suomela 2004).

also by rank and file priests, deacons, lecturers and students of clerical seminaries. For many of them being an Orthodox meant being Russian. The Orthodox faith was a spiritual support for those believing in the revival of the life and social arrangement of pre-revolutionary Russian power and the destruction of communism and godlessness (Ziernov 1975: 131; Kaznina 2009: 33).

October 1917 started a huge wave of emigration of the intelligentsia incomparable to its first period at the beginning of the century. The country was left by thousands of educated and gifted people who resurrected their scientific and cultural activities abroad[9].

There were several destinations for the migrations which occurred after the year 1917. Firstly, people were directed towards the nearest areas: the Baltic countries, Finland and Poland. It is likely that settling in these countries was based on the hope of rapid return. Later, however, when such hopes failed, the refugees were forced to go further to the centre of Europe – to Germany, France, Belgium and Great Britain.

In the relevant literature the social, cultural and political life of Russian communities of that time is widely analysed and exemplified. Researchers repeatedly highlight the self-association and self-organisation of emigrants (Lebedeva 2001: 114). In many European countries the Russian diasporas existed as more or less isolated communities. Vladimir Nabokov, for example, in his memoirs wrote about such an isolated community in Berlin: '[…] during fifteen years of living in Germany I did not make a close acquaintance of any German, did not read any German newspaper or book and never felt the slightest inconvenience connected with lack of command of the German language' (Nabokov 2011: 197)[10]. Probably Great Britain was the only exception to this**.** Although the Russian colony had its well-defined boundaries on British grounds it did not attain cultural or intellectual

[9] During the fifteen years after the revolution Russian scientists published 7038 research works and held five congresses of academic organisations (Pushkareva: 1996: 59). The theatre, music and literary life also did not stop: on the contrary, the achievements of Russian artists and authors abroad which were not influenced by ideological deformations became a treasury of Russian culture (Kaznina 2009: 30-33). Research has also highlighted the particular role of the Russian-language press in preserving Russian culture abroad (Raeff 1990).

[10] In this thesis, all translations from named sources have been carried out by the author, with the exception of those where another translator has been identified.

independence as such and the processes of naturalisation of emigrants were here much faster then anywhere else (Sabennikova 2002: 11; Kaznina 2009: 33; Morgunova 2007: 19).

At the time of the beginning of World War II the number of Russian emigrants in all countries considerably decreased. Many representatives of the older generation died, others went back to Russia or obtained the new citizenship and were no longer emigrants[11]. Probably the period of World War II of Russian emigration is the least explored and described due its historical and political ambiguity. In the Soviet historiography for a long time there existed an opinion that the majority of emigrants during those years were Nazi collaborators. It seems, however, that labelling all of them as 'war traitors' was no more than an ideological guideline since unbiased investigations using archives and memoirs of emigrants suggested a broader research perspective (e.g. Struve 1996; Zhukov and Zhukova 1998; Zemskov 1991).

The outbreak of the war divided Russian compatriots who were living abroad. The left wing unconditionally condemned the Nazis. Another part of the emigrants comprised people with a contradictory position: their hopes rested in the Red Army, which was capable in their opinion of forcing the Germans back and then of liquidating bolshevism too; whereas the third part saw the Nazis as liberators from the 'red plague'.

The end of World War II signified a new era in the history of Russian migration. Into the country streamed thousands of people who had been persecuted during the preceding years. However, not all, nor even the majority of the present émigrés decided to return. Some of them were too old and afraid to start a new life, others were anxious about how they would fit into the new realities. In many families a split ensued – somebody wanted to go and the others wanted to stay. Those who did not return to the Soviet Union formed so-called 'old emigration' but at the same time the stream of new political emigration took shape. The new emigration comprised mainly "DP's" - displaced persons; among them were civilians, national minorities, prisoners of war as well as war criminals and collaborators (Zemskov 1991: 21).

[11] In France, comparing with the 1920s, the number of Russians shrank 8 times and came to 50 thousand, in Bulgaria – 30 thousand, same as in Yugoslavia. In China left about 1 thousand, while in the middle 20s there were 18 thousands of people (Pushkareva 1996: 59).

The main destinations were the USA, Canada, Australia and Great Britain. In processing documents the emigrants from the Soviet Union were called 'refugees' irrespective of whether they were victims of Nazis or collaborators. Similarly no survey according to ethnic identification was conducted, thus all of them were categorised as Russians. The American Embassy quite readily gave special consideration to immigration visas for those politically persecuted in Stalin's regime as potential fighters against Communism. The governments of European countries did not prevent the establishment of new or the renewal of old emigrants' organisations which were oriented against the USSR. The Cold War was intensifying and the Iron Curtain stopped the post-war mass emigration from the Soviet Union. The only way to escape abroad in the 1950s and 1960s was 'nevozvrashchentshestvo' of members of official delegations or rare tourist groups. These were, however, isolated cases (Pushkareva 1996: 63).

The new stream of emigration emerged at the end of the 1960s and consisted mainly of dissidents, national minorities and religious emigrants.

A particular turning point in the history of emigration of the 1970s was the Helsinki Declaration, signed in 1975, which claimed to respect human rights and the right to emigration among others in the countries of the Communist bloc. It caused the commencement of a movement for the rights for emigration among the dissidents and allowed the Soviet authorities to present every forced deportation as an act of humanity[12]. Later, apart from the deprivation of citizenship and voluntary departure, there appeared the third method to discard those who did not agree with the Soviet regime – the exchange of political prisoners. The number of people who left the country during that time was rather small, but as Andrei Sakharov highlighted: '[…] the point is not the arithmetic but the qualitative fact of the break of a psychological silence barrier' (Sakharov 2011: 41).

[12] Later, apart from the deprivation of citizenship and voluntary departure, there appeared the third method to discard those who did not agree with the Soviet regime – the exchange of political prisoners. The number of people who left the country during that time was rather small, but as Andrei Sakharov highlighted: '[…] the point is not the arithmetic but the qualitative fact of the break of a psychological silence barrier' (Sakharov 2011: 41).

Apart from dissidents the emigration of the Stagnation period was joined by some ethnic minorities (Jews, Germans, Poles, Greeks) and later by religious refugees - Baptists, Adventists, Catholics and Russian Pentecostals (Alekseieva 1992). The number of exit visas for emigrants was restricted to only 3,000 yearly (Voynova and Ushkalov 1994: 41) and even though in practice exceptions to this regulation were made, not before the liberalisation of emigration during Perestroika did the last wave of Russian emigration occur.

The last, fourth, wave of Russian emigration started in 1985 and is continuing up to now (Kopnina 2005: 26; Vishnevskii and Zaionchkovskaia 1994: 243). Its first phase began during Gorbachev's rule and lasted until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. The number of emigrants increased annually from 6,100 people in 1985 to 453,600 in 1991 (Kabuzan 1996: 341), while in its second phase already from 1992 to 2010 about 3.6 million people have gone abroad from Russia. That figure has even doubled if the emigrants from other republics are included (Beloborodov 2011). It is worth noting, also, that at this time a sizable internal migration of Russian-speakers from Russia was observed to the so-called 'near abroad' (former Soviet republics).

While on the one hand, there was an unstable political and economic situation together with national and ethnic tensions, on the other hand, the new possibilities and perspectives also inclined people to leave the country. Unlike the previous waves of emigration the current displacements of Russian-speakers are not limited to any particular political, social or ethnic features and the diversity of participants as well as the reasons of migration are considerable (Kopnina 2006: 26-27). The emigrants of the last wave can be divided into four groups, although their boundaries are not clear and the groups themselves often overlap. The first group is represented by repatriates (e.g. ethnic Germans or Jews)[13] who got a chance with their families to settle in the historical motherland. These resettlements were intended to have a permanent character but some families returned or moved to another country (Münz and Ohliger 2003).

The second group includes professionals and entrepreneurs who went abroad individually to work or to establish their own businesses. It is worth mentioning the considerable number of

[13] For example in Germany, Greece and Finland various governmental programmes were initiated allowing repatriation of the citizens of the former USSR.

Russian scientists working in foreign universities and academies as contract workers: in 1998 for example there were about 30,000 Russian researchers working abroad (Vishnevskii 2004: 152). The character of such displacements is temporary, but quite often, the émigrés would bring the rest of the family and prolong the working contract.

The third group consists of female emigrants who decided to leave the country for marital purposes. According to official data, during the fifteen years from 1994 until 2009 using the service of various matrimonial agencies almost 900,000 women went out from Russian Federation but the true figure could be much higher (Beloborodov 2011).

Finally, the fourth group involves undergraduate and postgraduate students studying abroad. According to Ledeneva and Tiuriukanova (2002: 100) only one quarter of them intend to come back after the completion of their degrees and 45% are determined to stay - although in the future a possibility of work in Russia cannot be excluded.

The main destinations of displacements after the collapse of the Soviet Union were Germany, Israel, and the USA which countries received about 94% of all migrants (Germany – 59%, Israel – 24%, USA – 11%) (Vishnevskii 2004: 149). The rest of the emigrants headed to other European countries: France, Greece, Great Britain, Finland, Sweden, Belgium, as well as to the countries of the former Socialist block such as Poland or the Czech Republic.

There is an extensive research body concerning the Russian-speaking migrants to these countries. For example, Esman (2009) and Niznik (2003, 2008) studied Russian migrants of the last wave in Israel, Roll (2003) and Darieva (2002, 2004) examined Russian-speakers in Germany, the focus of Laurelle's (2006, 2008) research is the Russian diaspora in France while Kishinevsky's (2004) investigations concern Russians in the USA.

The work of researchers focused on the intergenerational relationships among Russian migrants in different countries should be also noted. This examination includes family

language practices, child-rearing practices and adaptation of young generations of immigrants into the new environment[14].

The majority of emigrants of the last wave are characterised by an urban background. Initially the principal flows came from Moscow and Saint-Petersburg but later other Russian cities were also involved to the process[15]. The educational level of the migrants is quite high: every fifth has a University degree while among the native population of the country this figure comes to only 13%. A particularly high level of education distinguishes the emigration to Israel (one person in three) and to the USA (one in two) (Zaionchkovskaia 2004: 148). Ethnic Russians make up approximately one third of the total number of emigrants leaving the country during and after the Perestroika period[16].

The subject of my research are representatives of the 'last Soviet generation' (Byford 2009a), who were born in the Soviet Union between 1957 and 1974 and came to Britain in the late 1990s and early 2000s. All of them have urban backgrounds (Moscow, Saint-Petersburg, Kiev and Minsk) and came to Scotland for professinal reasons. All of them have higher education and 8 of 12 participants have PhD degrees. They work in the fields of Biology, Mathematics, Medicine, Linguistics and General Education. The younger generation of participants are children aged 5-16 who were born in Great Britain or came here at an early age.

To sum up, during the whole of the 20th century in the Soviet Union constant migration processes were taking place, intensifying and declining depending upon the economic, political and social situation inside the country. Important historical dates marked their turning points but their precise time-frames were difficult to define. Moreover, particular streams of emigration even occurring approximately at the same time were often guided by

[14] For example, Finland: Hague 2011, Solheim and Jasinskaja-Lahti 2013; Israel: Schwartz 2008, Niznik 2011, Zbenovich 2010, 2014; Germany: Stoessel, Titzmann and Silbereisen 2011, Michel, Titzmann and Silbereisen 2012; the USA: Nesteruk 2010.
[15] In 1992 Moscow and Saint-Petersburg gave 40% of total emigrants and in 2002 only 7% came from these cities (data from www.demoscope.ru).
[16] In the years 1993-2002 they made up 27% of the contemporary emigration to Germany, 43% to Israel and 53 % to the USA (data from www.demoscope.ru).

completely different political, economic, religious, cultural or other sometimes overlapping reasons.

1.2. Contemporary Russian Migrants in Great Britain

Contemporary migration processes appear to be very obvious and noticeable phenomena affecting all areas of the world economy, politics and culture but at the same time they are very difficult to quantify. In the UN Demographic Yearbook it is stated that 'although international migration may well in many cases entail a legal procedure it remains the most difficult of demographic phenomena to define and measure correctly' (United Nations 1991: 99).

The waves of contemporary migration differ greatly from the earlier displacements and could be best describe as 'a turbulent, a fluid, but structured movement, with multidirectional and reversible trajectories' (Papastergiadis 2000: 7). Associated with globalisation, understood broadly as 'intensification of worldwide social relations' linking distant localities (Giddens 1990: 64) the current displacements are often temporary and the participants are able to return or to move to another country.

Until recently, international migration was considered purely in terms of cause and consequence: the displacements were seen as determined by the demands of the current economic or political situation. Since the 1990s, however, such approaches have been criticised as simplistic and obsolete. Contemporary migrants have the ability to take conscious decisions about the place and duration of stay in order to improve their lives, which changes considerably the perception of the phenomenon:
'Curiosity, the desire to gain knowledge about different ways of living, the desire to pursue opportunities that might improve personal life opportunities, are some of the factors that remain at the heart of the impetus behind these migrations' (Brah 1996: 178).

Describing the modes of current migrations, which now are seen not only as economic or political tendencies but also in a wider cultural context of motivations and ideologies,

researchers tend to adopt various theoretical approaches, including elements of political economy (e.g. Sassen 1991), sociology (Castells and Miller 2000) or cultural studies (Giddens 1990). Scholars working on this subject highlight the importance of the studies of gender, cultural identity, educational and occupational background, conjunctures between various cultures and lifestyles and their influence on the processes of migration and settlement (Bhabha 1995, Papastergiadis 2000, Castels and Davidson 2000 etc.).

Despite the long history of Russian emigration to Great Britain, as mentioned previously, the number of migrants coming to the UK was low in comparison with such countries as the United States, Israel or Germany. Since the 1990s however, and especially in the last decade, the number of newcomers from the former Soviet Union increased rapidly.

There is an increasing body of research concerning post-Soviet Russian-speaking migrants in Britain. For example, Tsypylma Darieva examines the anthropology of migration highlighting the transnational character of contemporary diasporas. In her study of Russian-speaking communities in Berlin and London she argues that through developing their 'own' channels of communication, the migrants from Russia create new public spheres which firstly, provide a cosmopolitan attitude towards ethnicity, and secondly, keep the community connected both to contemporary Russia and the 'lost homeland', the Soviet Union (Darieva 2004).

The migrant communities in London and Amsterdam were widely described by Helen Kopnina in her study of Russian-speaking migrants of the 1990s (Kopnina 2005). She explored the concept of 'community', and in both cases found that this community is 'invisible'. She depicts migrants' networks as a number of non-connected individual memberships, highlights migrants' self-isolation and a kind of distancing from their Russian past. She argues that the community is divided by mutual antagonisms, prompting many to reject the idea of belonging to it at all. Considering, that Kopnina conducted her fieldwork in the 1990s, when the number of Russian migrants was much lower than the following decade, it can be assumed that her concept of the 'invisible' community does not fully describe the present situation. After achieving a kind of 'critical mass' these groups began to take part actively in various forms of institutional self-organisation and the creation and re-creation of their collective identity (Byford 2014).

In their study of East European immigrants who moved into the UK after 1989, Eugenia Markova and Richard Black explored the characteristics and life experiences of migrants from Russia, Ukraine, Albania, Bulgaria, Serbia and Montenegro (Markova and Black 2006). The researchers focused on the interaction between newcomers and local long-term residents in relation to problems of community cohesion.

Oxana Morgunova focuses her research on post-Soviet migrants' internet communications in the UK in the contexts of contemporary Russian Diaspora Debates. In her papers she argues that digital developments, community networks and social capital accumulation were always tightly connected to technological developments and changes in migrant flows. She argues that internet and digital communication between Russian-speaking migrants plays a key role in the creation of their collective self identification (Morgunova 2007, 2009, 2013).

The research interests of Andy Byford focuses on the Russian community in the UK viewed in diasporic terms. He understands diaspora as an effect of interactions and a tool of cultural mobilisation. In his research Byford examines what kind of symbolic work - variety of different practices, discourses and ideologies - Russian-speaking migrants invest in the construction of their national and migrant identities (Byford 2009a, 2009b, 2012, 2014).

Anna Pechurina explores the ways in which Russian identity is created and maintained by looking at the organisation of the domestic life and interiors of the homes of Russian migrants in the UK. She regards the migrants' material possessions as the visible representations and manifestations of their imaginings of their homeland (Pechurina 2009, 2010, 2011).

Unfortunately, there are no reliable statistics concerning the number of Russians, or those who consider themselves as such, living at the moment in the UK. Different sources give different figures as the definitions of the community targeted vary significantly. Sometimes the data concern Russian citizens only, sometimes Russian-speakers not only from Russia but also from other former Soviet republics. Moreover it is not clear if, for example, students or contract workers should be included. These groups tend to be associated with temporary migrations; however, for example, a student, who decides after graduation to take further

degrees could stay in the country as long as eight years and a standard 6-month work contract very often can be extended and also last for years. The same uncertain situation relates to entrepreneurs living and having their businesses both in Russia and the UK. The generation of Russians born in Britain or those who during the last twenty years emigrated, for example, to the Czech Republic or Poland and are now coming to Britain as citizens of these countries, not to mention illegal immigrants, are groups which are always difficult to assess statistically[17].

It is not clear which features of this internally heterogeneous migrant body should be taken into account as a common feature allowing it to be distinguished and separated as a 'Russian diaspora'. Certainly it could not be ethnic affiliations of the members, since the contemporary migration has the multiethnic character as emphasised previously in this chapter. Neither could it be citizenship, as Russian-speakers living at the moment in the UK came not only from Russia and the CIS itself but also from the EU (e.g. Baltic States) and non-EU (e.g. Georgia or Ukraine) countries. Probably it is most appropriate in these circumstances to consider the Russian language as a distinguishing feature, although Andy Byford argues that the term 'Russian-speaking' appears rather as a politically correct euphemism and is neither natural nor neutral (Byford 2009: 59). He admits however, that 'the rhetorical effect of this euphemism is to rework the formerly political boundaries of the USSR […] into the boundaries of the former USSR's lingua franca, which emerges as supposedly apolitical, because, in the post-Soviet era and in the context of migrant displacement, the Russian language is said to embody connections that are merely 'cultural' and/or 'pragmatic' rather than imperial and colonial' (*ibid.*). Therefore, rhetorically, the term 'Russian-speaking' fully reflects the political and cultural ambiguity and vagueness of this diaspora.

Estimations of the number of Russian-speakers living currently in the United Kingdom are usually based on other data related to migration, for example the number of entry visas issued by the UK consulates or number of work permits and asylum applications accepted/rejected by British Home Office etc. These estimations are highly imprecise, approximate and not officially confirmed by any authorities, however, the number 300,000 is the most frequently quoted (Work Permit UK: 2006).

[17] For example in the United Nations statistics temporary workers, students and refugees are not covered by the term 'emigrants' while in annual International Migration Outlook SOPEMI these categories are included in the statistics.

The vast majority of Russians are living in England. About 70% of all the Russian-speaking population settled in London. The second popular destination is Manchester, where about 10% of newcomers decided to stay. Then Birmingham, Brighton, Bristol and Cambridge follow, with almost equal proportion of 3% in each of the cities. It is estimated that in Scotland, mainly in Glasgow and Edinburgh, about 24,000 Russian-speakers live currently, which equates to about 8% of the whole amount (Dugarova 2010: 7). Obviously this list is far from complete and there is extensive evidence of the presence of various Russian organisations, communities and centres all over the United Kingdom.

During the last two decades the newcomers are primarily the people of working age, mostly families with children, with relatively high levels of education and mainly with urban backgrounds. Conventionally one can divide the representatives of the Russian diaspora living at the moment in Britain into four groups, but again the boundaries of these groups are highly provisional.

One of these groups is represented by qualified specialists, mostly scholars and university employees, who came to Great Britain through the various agreements between schools and colleges and also on temporary contracts offered by a range of leading companies. To this group also belong other professionals who applied for jobs in the UK independently. However, Britain was not the only country to which Russian intellectuals and specialists were invited. Other European countries and North America also readily received professionals from post-Soviet areas. Lately not only in the Russian media but also in the relevant academic literature the problem of the 'brain drain' is being widely discussed[18]. Although the magnitude of the 'catastrophe' is probably exaggerated and the whole situation rather reflects the international and global character of contemporary science, the number of Russian specialists working in many spheres of British science, especially in biology, mathematics, physics and informatics is relatively high. It is worth noting, however, that not all of those working at the moment in the UK tend to stay permanently –after the expiry of the contracts the majority will go back to Russia or to work in another country.

[18] See for example the article by G. Ushakov and I. Malakha, *'The Brain Drain as Global Phenomenon and its Characteristics in Russia'.*

The second sizable group of the newcomers from the former Soviet Union are women who emigrated for matrimonial purposes[19]. This group is probably the fastest growing and the most difficult to quantify since the opportunities given nowadays by online dating reduce to the minimum the problem of distance or state boundaries. The majority are women younger than 30 who intended to be married abroad, but there are also a considerable number of divorced women, very often with children from previous marriages, who came to Great Britain to set up another family. When describing the female migration to the UK it is impossible to ignore the other large group of women who came to the country recently – the wives and other members of the families of Russian qualified specialists. Therefore women make up a 'hidden majority' (Morgunova 2009: 39) of the Russian diaspora living in Britain. Although these women are well educated and were professionally active back in Russia, coming to Great Britain they often stay unemployed either because of lack of the qualifications required in the UK or sufficient fluency in English. At the same time, however, they actively participate in the community life and frequently are founders or involved members of numerous Russian centres, libraries, workshops or Saturday schools. Moreover, in their families these very women are conductive to the passing on their native culture and language to the next generations.

The third group of Russian-speakers living in the UK are the undergraduate and postgraduate students and junior research assistants. In the academic year 2009/2010 there were 3,863 students from the Russian Federation[20] and according to the British Council this number could increase significantly till the year 2020 (Böhm 2004: 7). Obviously the figure would differ greatly if one includes the Russian-speaking students from Baltic states enrolling at British universities as EU citizens. The majority of students came from Moscow and Saint-Petersburg but recently also from the University centres of Siberia. Almost a half of them intend to stay in the Great Britain and only about 27% are thinking about going back to Russia after graduation (Ledeneva and Tiuriukanova 2002: 100).

The fourth group includes EU citizens from Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia but also those who in the 1990s went to Poland or the Czech Republic and now after the entry by these countries

[19] See P. Heyse, *'Fixed Identities: An Intersectional Analysis of Russian-speaking Female Marriage Migrants. Self-representations'.*

[20] British Council, *Russian students in the UK*: www.britishcouncil.org/ecs/events/2010/1004/details/market.htm

to the European Union decided to move to Britain. Overall the representatives of this group are younger, less educated and often do not have their own families. In most cases they treat the stay in the United Kingdom as a temporary occurrence.

The categories described above represent the absolute quantitative majority of Russian-speaking diaspora living at the moment in Britain; however, this majority should be supplemented by referring to not numerous but influential group of wealthy Russians, as well as Russian refugees (mainly from the Caucasus) and the emigrants from the USSR who left before the Perestroika time together with their descendants.

1.3. Conceptualising Diasporas

Traditionally the concept of a diaspora was based on research in history, anthropology or geography. The emergence of such a phenomenon was seen as a consequence of particular historic events and was associated with forced displacements, alienation and collective trauma. Migrants were either refugees escaping from wars, hunger or ethnic persecutions or victims of slavery forcefully carried away from the native land. The word *diaspora* is still being used in relation to forced displacements, but nowadays it has been widened in order to include contemporary migration denoted by a voluntary character and considerable contacts with migrants in different countries as well as with compatriots in their native territories. International and temporary character of migrations, global mass media and development of communications create new forms of migrants' solidarities and networking. This has changed the understanding of the concept of diaspora and initiated discussion about migrant identity. The subject came into the focus of such disciplines as sociology, psychology or cultural studies, with researchers attempting 'to distinguish diasporas as a theoretical concept from the historical experiences of diaspora' (Brah 1996: 179).

According to recent scholarship which attempts to classify and frame the phenomenon (Appadurai 1997; Vertovec 1997, 2001), diaspora has at least three different meanings. One of them is based on its structure, the second on its consciousness, and the third on the culture of the community.

The first one derives from the historic perspective and refers to experiences of Jews associated with forced displacements, persecution and isolation. The diaspora is seen therefore as a kind of social structure emerging as a result of a forced or voluntary migration of a group of people from the place of origin to another place. The researchers working on this approach (Sheffer 1986, 1995, 2003; Safran 1991; Cohen 1995, 1997; Clifford 1994) underline the importance of conscious building of and keeping up the collective identity based on the common ethnic origin and historic experience. These common features, historical memories, shared interests and cultural affiliations are seen as necessary 'for turning a group of migrants into a more cohesive diaspora whose members follow similar patterns of organisation and behaviour' (Sheffer 2003: 51). The research focuses on the creating by the diaspora of new community organisations at the place of settlement, cooperating with the host institutions and organisations and developing and maintaining the relationships with compatriots dispersed globally and the homeland.

Undoubtedly taking into focus the migrants' ethnic features helps to identify the role of the ethno-national factors in the diaspora, while the building of a structure of new emigrant organisations is the most spectacular facet of their presence in the new country of settlement. Overall, however, the structural understanding of the diaspora does not reflect the multiplicity of migrants' solidarities emerging from the diverse systems of cultural and social affiliations they possess. Moreover, such an approach ignores the variety of motivations and reasons behind the displacements.

The second approach to studying diasporas takes into account a diversity of historic and cultural experiences, a state of mind and a sense of identity of the members. The 'consciousness of a diaspora' is understood as a kind of a self-awareness which is produced by transnational communities (Safran 1991, Clifford 1994). The nature of this self-awareness is two-fold: on the one hand, it is marked by a negative experience of discrimination and exclusion and, on the other hand, by a positive experience of identification with historic and cultural heritage (Vertovec 1997: 283). The awareness of multi-locality and the transnational character of contemporary diasporas involves the migrants in the various kinds of networks connecting them with people of the same origin in other countries. Transnational bonds 'no longer have to be cemented by migration or by exclusive territorial claims. In the age of

cyberspace, a diaspora can, to some degree, be held together or re-created through the mind, through cultural artefacts and through a shared imagination' (Cohen 1997: 516). Moreover, the diasporic consciousness is seen as a kind of resistance to globalisation (*ibid.*).

Such an understanding of the consciousness of a diaspora in terms of transnationalism represents 'a new analytic optic which makes visible the increasing intensity and scope of circular flows of persons, goods, information and symbols triggered by international […] migration' (Caglar 2001: 607). Moreover, such an approach allows the examination of the long-lasting forms of migrant connections to their homelands and the multiplicity of the reasons for these linkages. At the same time, however, this approach has some methodological drawbacks. The main weakness is that it disregards the processes of migrants' adaptation and integration. Migrants' constant everyday relations with the host culture, the mutual cultural influences and the intensive processes of learning and borrowing they are involved in their new settlements, are not taken into account.

The third understanding of a diaspora based on the culture of a community usually appears against the discussion of globalisation, where the globalisation itself is understood as 'the world-wide flow of cultural objects, images and meanings resulting in variegated process of creolisation, back-and-forth transferences, mutual influences, new contestations, negotiations and constant transformations' (Vertovec 1997: 292). Here diaspora appears as a phenomenon involved in the continuous construction and reconstruction of cultural forms and concepts (Appadurai 1991, Clifford 1994). Currently it is 'defined not by essence or purity, but by the recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity; by a conception of identity which lives with and through, not despite, difference; by hybridity. Diaspora identities are those which are constantly producing and reproducing themselves anew, through transformation and difference' (Hall 1990: 235). In such an understanding of a diaspora, the cultural concepts, messages and images produced by a particular community are being easily transferred through the global media and adopted by various communities worldwide.

This approach makes it possible to see the phenomenon in a wider context, expanding the boundaries of a diaspora worldwide, but at the same time it loses sight of a micro level analysis, although scholars working on the subject indeed observe a crisis of the national and territorial construction of the community (e.g. Ohmae 1994, Bauman 1998, Schopflin 2000,

etc.). The multidirectional and temporary character of current displacements, together with the contemporary means of communication change the perception of the diasporic community. The new realities induce the development of the range of networking with a variety of cultural affiliations instead of conventional oppositions between *us* and *the other*, or between *the local* and *the global*.

Taking into consideration the approaches presented above, while studying diasporas one should be aware of at least three different levels of solidarities attached to the concept. The first one is presented by permanent communication inside the community. This communication is based on the interest of migrants in other community members, an empathy with them. This interest leads to the collective efforts to establish links and relationships with each other, to self-organise, to elaborate a common sense of belonging and to renegotiate their collective identity.

The second level is presented by migrants' bonds with the place of origin, their interest in it and their maintaining of contacts with the homeland. Such contacts can be both real and symbolic. The real contacts take place through the material and cultural exchange and direct contacts and visits between the localities. When such contacts are impossible, however, the members of the diaspora refer to a metaphoric homeland in order to keep an illusion of real connections. Migrants' memories, family histories, cultural and historical narratives of origin reconstruct the homeland in the diasporic imagination.

The third level of solidarities is connected with a sense of new belonging, new loyalties emerging in relation to the host country, and collective efforts to define an attitude to the new culture and society. In the process of learning and valuing in relation to new points of references the migrants discover, rediscover and also produce their new identity. This new identity is structured now not just as migrants, but as migrants in a particular place.

Moreover, as suggested by Andy Byford, a diaspora should be treated 'as a frame of reference rather than a distinct object of analysis and definition' (Byford 2009: 56). Instead of considering the phenomenon simply as a structure, consciousness or culture, in his research Byford focuses on three analytically distinct but mutually related dimensions of diaspora: networks of exchange, performances of the community and discourses of identity. He admits

that ‘a shared socio-cultural background and a definable repertoire of common cultural markers are an essential precondition for mutual identification and social solidarity within diaspora’ but to have any analytical significance these features should be actualised through ‘very concrete enactment and interaction’ (*ibid.*). Diaspora then is identified not simply as a network, community or an identity, but emerges as a kind of specific pattern of exchange, performance and discourse actualised by all possible and variable situations of interactions between the members of the community, host society, compatriots worldwide and the homeland. The result of all these interactions is a political, economic and cultural mobilisation, so that diaspora ‘emerges as a particular form or tool of mobilisation, rather than its end-product’ (Byford 2009: 57).

My own research considers migrants’ identity discourses as essential for creating a diaspora. Diaspora therefore is understood as a configuration of solidarities between people who consider themselves as members of a community on the basis of shared socio-cultural background, life experience and common language. Participants in my research revolving around the ‘Russian Edinburgh’ School undoubtedly recognise themselves as belonging to such a community, especially as mutual identification and solidarity within the group can be seen to emerge against the *other* of the host environment. They actively participate in various events and celebrations organised both within and outside the school, invite friends and relatives from Russia to events, and very often engage in interactions with representatives of both Russian and British authorities. In such ways this community successfully maintains all three levels of solidarities: within the community itself, with the homeland and with the host country. In that sense the group under study should be seen as a part of diaspora, because in my understanding diaspora actualises itself and acquires its meaning only in the process of permanent interaction, which process allows negotiating and renegotiating the collective identity both with reference to the national and the host culture.

In the *First Chapter* I have presented the historical background to the field of migrations in Russia. Moreover, I have described Russian immigrants of the last wave in Great Britain, the group which forms the focus of this thesis. Finally, I have presented the theoretical background to the concept of diaspora. The next chapter will focus on the question of

identity. It will present also the main concepts of the thesis: narratives, everyday conversations and intergenerational relationships.

Chapter Two: Approaching the Subject

In *Chapter Two* I will critically analyse scholarship in the field of identity and present various perspectives on the subject. I will compare different approaches, pointing out their advantages and limitations, leading to the working definition of identity. Furthermore, the issue of language and national identity will be presented and discussed. Finally, the key concepts of the thesis – narrative and conversation – will be introduced. I will indicate their basis in the literature to date highlighting the applicability to these concepts in the context of intergenerational relationships.

2.1. Discursive Construction of Identity

Identity can be understood in two ways: firstly as an unfinished product of discourse, deeply determined by history, culture and politics; and secondly, as a performance - constructed and gaining its meaning during interaction (Benwell and Stokoe 2006).

Contemporary social sciences are strongly influenced by ideas such as those of Foucault and his theory of discursive production of identity or "subject" as he terms it (Foucault 1972). His ideas were opposed to the phenomenological understandings of a universal and timeless subject being a source of the whole thought and action. According to Foucault, the subject is nothing more than a closely monitored product of relations between power and knowledge. The individual is entangled in various social actions and practices and the discourse is seen as a power, which defines the boundaries and keeps the individual within them in order to rule and manage society. Foucault focused mainly on the question of discourse, presumably forming the basis of subjectivity, claiming that the subject has nothing to do with the creation of its own identity (Mills 1997). Thus, personal development becomes a process of obtaining a particular ideological version of the world, whereas identification becomes an oppressive power which creates and forms the individual.

Although Foucault himself was more interested in the processes of dissolution of identity rather than its creation, shaping, or maintenance, his work inspired various scholarly clines with regard to identity. Foucault's theory – which regards identity as a creation, product, result, or effect of discourse rather than the initiator of the whole of the action – has its followers (Derrida 1976, Laclau and Mouffe 1985, Howard 2000) as well as its critics (Butler 1997, Hall 2000). The main criticisms concern his static vision of identity. However, there is a growing body of empirical research based on Foucault's approaches to the objects of knowledge and rules of discourse.

Using Foucault's methodology, Carabine (2001), for example, shows how British public discourse of the 1990s branded unmarried mothers. Graham (2005) in her study of ADHD as a discursive construct combines Foucault's and Wetherall's (whose theory will be describes later in this chapter) approaches, while Cahnmann, Rymes and Souto-Manning (2005) use Foucauldian analysis together with CDA to investigate an identification process of bilingual adults in their decision to become teachers.

The theoretical works of Foucault also influence scholars investigating Russian, Soviet and Post-Soviet history, politics and public discourses. Cadiot, for example, in her work pinpoints 'nationality' as an object of knowledge under construction by the statistics of Tsarist Russia. Referring to Foucault's ideas she writes: 'Statistical studies were becoming a tool for disciplining and transforming the population, part of the state's increasing reliance on policies focused on the population**.** Like ethnographers, statisticians played a major role in the process of transforming nationality into a crucial indicator of individual identity' (Cadiot 2005, 441). In the same vein Kharkhordin analyses the discourse of selfhood in Tsarist and later Soviet Russia (1999). He approaches the Self as a concept shaped by various authorities of delimitation through particular discursive 'practices of individualisation': from 'the ritualistic techniques' in the public level to 'practices of self-development and self-fashioning that make possible the adoption of individualist ideas and attitudes' (Kharkhordin 1999, 3-4). Another attempt to use Foucauldian methodology in Russian studies was made by Kerov (2007) who analyses the debates in the Russian Duma at the beginning of the 20th century and investigates the authorities of delimitation in the parliamentary discourse[21].

[21] See also: Ryazanova-Clarke 2008c, Plamper 2002, Yurchak 2002, Morgunova 2007, Müller 2009.

My own objectives are to investigate migrants' identity negotiations which are grounded in, determined and constantly influenced by discourses of the country of origin as well as the host country in both synchronic and historic perspective. Therefore Foucault's methodology allows the tracing of all these complex dependences between the individual and higher ideological structures. However, such a fractional model of identity concerning the self as a static and rather passive product of dominating discourse, 'as a form of subjugation and a way of exercising power over people and preventing them from moving outside fixed boundaries' (O'Farrell 2005: 140) is not enough to fully reflect the multidimensional character of the phenomenon.

The Foucauldian vision of identity has been repeatedly criticised - for example by Butler in her *'Gender Trouble'*, where she presented her theory of 'performativity' explaining the ways in which identity is transferred to life through discourse (Butler, 1990). For her, identity is both a discursive practice and a performance staged by individuals in everyday situations, whereas performativity is a process of discursive production of self-presentation. Butler describes performativity as a 'reiterative power of discourse' producing 'the phenomena that it regulates and constrains' (Butler 1993: 2). And this 'production actually always happens through a certain kind of repetition and recitation' (Butler 1996: 112). Butler sees an identity as a theatre script which is constantly rehearsed and performed by actors again and again and which through these performances becomes reality. It is negotiated in interactions where all the participants add their own interpretation to the script.

The idea of negotiation of identity in interaction is not new. It derives from Mead's discursive understanding of the self regarded as a phenomenon situated not only in history, culture or politics, but also in everyday life and therefore produced and shaped through interaction (1934).

Mead distinguishes two components of identity: the *'Me'* and the *'I'*. The *'Me'* is based on the knowledge accomplished during the interactions with others including social roles, people's attitudes and expectations, general knowledge about the environment but also, importantly, about who the person is, because '[w]hat the individual is for himself is not something that he invented. It is what his […] others have come to […] treat him as being'

(Goffman 1972: 327). By contrast, the *'I'* component is an active and creative occurrence which allows the subject not only to identify with the internalised roles but also to distance from them. '[T]he *'I'* is the response of the individual to the attitude of the community' (Mead 1934: 196). Mead argues that it is 'only after we have acted that we know what we have done […] what we have said' (*ibid.*). The subject constructs a response on the basis of what one has learned, on the basis of *'Me'*. The subject's behavior is determined by the his/her attitude to him/herself and to the others, which attitude is a synthesis of two components of the identity: the *'I'* and the *'Me'*.

In the same vein Brubaker and Cooper describe identity as represented by a dialectic interplay of processes of internal and external definition. On the one hand, individuals must be able to distinguish themselves from others by drawing on criteria of community and a sense of shared belonging within it. On the other hand, this internal process of identification must be recognised by others for an objectified collective identity to emerge (Brubaker and Cooper 2000: 14-21).

In Mead's understanding, the self is built during the social interaction and the individual sees him or herself as he/she is seen by others. Mead argues that the process of perceiving self is a constant dialogue between the individual and the collective generalised 'other'. Individuals identify themselves as well as the others through the interactions in which they are involved. During the interaction the subject puts him/herself in the place of the person with whom he/she is interacting in order to enable the interpretation of his/her behavior. Thanks to constant swapping of the 'roles' the interaction itself becomes possible and the subject develops and shapes his/her identity which consists of the features produced during this interaction.

This thesis concerns the national identity negotiations occurring in everyday interactions between family members. Therefore Mead's findings are also essential since they allow visualisation of the identity not only as a static and passive phenomenon shaped by the external forces but also as fluid and active, outfitted with the ability of decision making, and constantly developing and unfolding in interaction and through interaction.

According to Mead, all the actions or objects appearing in the process of communication are interpreted by the participants symbolically. He used the term *symbolisation* to present the process of extracting ('absorbing') the main meaning from any given situation. 'Symbolisation constitutes objects not constituted before**,** objects which would not exist except for the context of social relationships wherein symbolisation occurs' (Mead 1934: 78). These symbols or symbolic gestures enclose allusions to other culturally determined symbols and evoke similar reactions to the actions of all the participants. We can observe the further development of Mead's theory in Goffman's (1959, 1967) and Blumer's (1969) writings as well as in the writings of their followers.

Erving Goffman's 'presentation of the self' (1959) is derived from Mead's theory. Goffman sees interaction as a performance shaped by the scene (understood as a background of the act, an interactional situation in which it occurs) and expectations of the addressees. For him, face-to face contact is a kind of acting where participants play their roles in order to gain an intentional effect on each other. Each of them is an actor and a viewer simultaneously.

One of the most central ideas of Goffman's work is that identity is a social product. Primarily it is a product of the performances in which people engage in social situations. There is no 'true self' waiting for expression inside an individual. Rather, a sense of self emerges as a result of publicly approved performances. Secondly, although individuals play an active role in creating these performances, they are constrained to produce such images of themselves that will be socially accepted and supported in a given context. So, the self is a social product dependent upon validation assigned (or abstained) according to social norms.

In his *Interaction Ritual* Goffman presents the idea of the self in a dualistic way: as an 'image pieced together from the expressive implications of the full flow of events in an undertaking', but also as a 'kind of player in a ritual game who copes honorably or dishonorably, diplomatically or undiplomatically, with the judgmental contingencies of the situation' (1967: 31). So, the self is understood not only as a mask, which the individual puts on in a particular social situation, but also as a human behind the mask, who chooses which mask is more appropriate at a given moment.

Such a dualistic description of the identity is also given in Goffman's *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* where he notes the distinctions between the 'all-too-human self' and 'socialised self' (1959: 56) and between the 'self-as-a-performer' and the 'self-as-character' (1959: 252). The all-too-human self is a psychobiological organism with various moods, feelings, impulses and energies (1959: 56), but simultaneously is the self which is engaged in the 'all-too-human task of staging a performance' (1959: 252). The researcher points out that the self-as-performer is not only a social product. The performer is also a thinking human being with his or her own desires, fears and a capacity to experience different feelings which motivate him or her not only to perform for others but also to prevent embarrassment.

While arguing that the self is a product of performance, Goffman does not suggest that a person is nothing more than a situationally defined social role. Acknowledging a distinction between the person and the situationally defined role he points out that this distinction itself is a social product.

Throughout Goffman's writings (1959, 1967, 1974), one of the constant points is that what a person 'really is' is rarely discovered and after all is not the real issue. 'What is important is the sense he provides to them through his dealings with them of what sort of person he is behind the role he is in' (1974: 298).

Goffman's ideas related to the social nature of identity together with his ideas of self as a product of performances are especially valuable to my own work. Such an approach allows investigating the roles, positions and stances which the members of Russian-speaking families take consciously or less consciously according to the binding social norms in everyday situations in order to achieve intentional effects on each other in the process of creating and negotiation of their national identity.

Herbert Blumer (1969), a proponent of Mead's theories concerning the communicative basis of social reality, claims that the interaction of the individual with the objective reality as well as with other individuals is possible due to common meanings and expectations shared between the participants. In such a way, subjects are living in the world of meanings and these meanings allow them to accustom themselves to the surrounding environment and, more importantly, to cooperate with each other.

Drawing on Mead's concepts, Blumer formulated the theoretical basis of symbolic interactionism. According to Blumer, '[s]ymbolic interactionism rests […] on three simple premises. The first premise is that human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that things have for them. [...] The second premise is that the meaning of such things is derived from, or arises out of, the social interaction that one has with one's fellows. The third premise is that these meanings are handled in, and modified through, an interpretative process used by the person in dealing with the things he encounters' (Blumer 1969: 2). Taking these premises as the starting point, Blumer crossed the boundaries of all the previous theories which treated the acting human being as determined only by the external (society) or internal (self) factors. Now the main focus became the creative and interpretative results of the subject's actions in the process of interaction. Blumer noted that 'the term *symbolic interaction* refers to the peculiar and distinctive character of interaction as it takes place between human beings. The peculiarity manifests in the fact that human beings interpret or "define" each other's actions instead of merely reacting to each other's actions. Their "response" is not made directly from the actions of one another but instead is based on the meaning which they attach to such actions. Thus human interaction is mediated by the use of symbols, by interpretation, or by ascertaining the meaning of one another's actions' (Blumer1969: 180).

Inspired by Mead's ideas, Blumer highlighted that interaction between humans is instrumental in the conception of meaning about any particular object. The meaning assigned to any object, action or event by an individual arises from the dispositions and reactions of others. Writing about the theory of symbolic interactionism, Abels pointed out the importance of the active role of the participant who selects the possibilities and composes the meanings in the process of communication: 'People impose meaning on the conditions and thus recreate the conditions in the interaction. The process of the meaning-making of the social actions is central to the theory, while in other theories these meanings are accepted as existing variables' (Abels 2000: 49). Such a research perspective stresses the significance of interactions among people, the use of symbols in the process of communication and interaction and considers free interpretation as an important part of the action. It focuses mainly on interactions shaped by everyday life and experiences rather than on those associated with the larger contexts such as social forces or laws. The central questions of such an approach are focused on how people behave during the interaction and how they modify

meanings in typical or specific situations. It emphasises the creative, flexible and inventive way in which humans use, exchange and maintain symbols which are always open to alteration or reappraisal.

Despite the fact that history, politics or ideologies were not central to Blumer's area of interests, in the context of my own work, I propose to adapt his research perspective. His methodology makes possible the examination of how symbols available in high-level discourses or common social and cultural knowledge are collaboratively interpreted in everyday settings by the members of Russian-speaking families and how these symbols achieve their meaning in a single interaction.

In Soviet and Russian sociology the issue of identity studies is a relatively new phenomenon. In the Soviet period it was mainly investigated by psychologists since examination of this subject in the field of sociology was greatly hampered by its ideological content. Igor Kon's investigations concerning problems of socialisation, age crises and historical-cultural tendencies of social identity development should be mentioned as probably the most important and influential works of this period (Kon, 1984, 1978, 1980). The theoretical base for his studies was founded in the theories of social roles very consonant with those of Mead (1934). According to Kon's early idea '[…] the main concept of the identity description is a concept of a social role […]' which is conceptualised as a social norm and is inflicted by social settings (Kon: 1967: 47). The individual acquires the social experience and builds his/her knowledge about the reality through the knowledge about the social roles which he/she plays as a member of various social groups – family, ethnic, age, gender, professional etc. The researcher highlights the consciousness of the choices that the individual does according to both, the social roles he/she plays and to other values, life aspirations and orientations.

Kon's ideas were further developed in the writings of another Soviet psychologist Lydia Bozhovich (1968). This researcher revealed the main concepts of the theory of roles – *role*, *cognition* and *I* – which determine the identity evolution. She writes that the individual takes in the society a particular position or post associated with a set of rights and duties. According to this point of view, society can be described as a system of interlinked posts and positions while the position can be seen as a structurally finished unit of a society (e.g.

neighbour, worker, son etc.). Bozhovich argues that the '[r]ole is an organised action aimed to fulfil the position, where the position is, actually, a system of expectations' (Bozhovich: 1968: 115). In this line '*I'* is understood as a structural unit of self, conceptualisation of knowledge which an individual experiences while playing particular roles. The researcher is focused on the investigation of mechanisms of an individual's experience acquisition, relationships with the social reality and especially the development of '*role*' and '*I*' in the process of identity evolution.

In the works of Nikolai Trubnikov (1987) the study of identity gains a cultural background in which identification is understood as a way of realisation of human life in a particular culture. Trubnikov argues that the dependence between human's existence vs. realisation should be seen as a relationship between two vectors operating at the same time. In the context of individual's cultural development the process of identification is one of the mechanisms of self-formation of a human being, his/her progression in the world of culture and experience of reality. In Trubnikov's writings this process is examined in the context of the exploitation by an individual of his/her potential in order to solve the contradiction between current and possible existence.

Among the post-Soviet researchers the work of Leonid Ionin is notable. This author uses for the first time the notion of *cultural identification* (Ionin 1995, 1996) and introduces a concept of *cultural pretence* in the process of identity achieving. He argues that in crisis conditions of a mass loss of identity (as happened after the collapse of the Soviet Union) the logic of this process is different from that described in traditional objectivist conceptions – from interest through its discovery in the framework of group affiliations to the new cultural form. In exceptional situations this process is reversible: behavioural actions and displays together with symbolic and material attributes are starting points rather than endings of the new emerging cultural form and appropriate cultural identification (as it occurs during the moulding of the personality in younger age-groups). If an individual or group does not know who they are, then they do not recognise their interests since articulated social interests in this case are absent. The interest is reduced to the elementary need for existence and elaboration of the new vision of reality which will be able to provide stable identification. The individual directs themselves to the new cultural forms available at that moment and by displaying and

performing these forms tries to identify his/her social interest and achieve a rational and coherent image of reality.

According to Ionin, examples of such displays of new cultural forms were manifested by an immense variety of organisations and movements which appeared in Russia after Perestroika: monarchists, Krishna's, pacifists, nationalists etc. (Ionin, 1996). He claims that in the setting up of a multi-stylistic environment – opposite to the mono-stylistic and mono-cultural existing in the Soviet period – the process of identity creation 'is not beginning but ending with the emergence of social interest, and does not end but begins with the presentation through behaviour. This process is opposite to the process of the emergence of cultural form and can be described as a process of cultural pretence' (1995:6). The main feature of loss of identification on the individual and group level is a loss of biographic continuity which causes a cultural gap – destruction of prospective life plans. The individual's reconstruction work concerning the re-establishing of a consistent and reliable picture of the world assumes a gaining of identity through cultural pretence.

In the 1990s due to transformational processes in Russian society the studies of identity acquired an interdisciplinary and particularly a sociological character. For example, the Soviet/Russian sociologist Vladimir Yadov in his research examines the mutual dependence between the system crisis in contemporary Russia and the contradictoriness of identification processes occurring in the Russian society (1993, 2000). On one hand, essential social transformations provide sufficiently wide, hitherto absent, possibilities for conscious attachment of the individual to the cultural values which make the 'historical memory' of a social community, the values which are important, prestigious, esteemed – suitable to a given individual. On the other hand, instability in the socio-economic, political and ideological reality results in mass 'cultural shock', loss of unwavering social identity and a state of social despondency and feebleness. Such a state creates in the majority of people a desire to 'fasten' onto something firm and persistent as soon as possible. It is exactly the situation in which the so called 'pretending groups' appear. Such groups possess only external features of identification and are unable to successfully fulfil the value, orienting or protective functions and complete the expectations of the majority of people. According to Yadov all these circumstances considerably obstruct the successfulness of identification processes for the great mass of the population. 'Our decisions, by influencing a varying degree identification

make our destiny dependent on ourselves. Through creating these new situations we will need prospectively to build adequately our line of behaviour concerning [these] situations. That is one point. The other point is that by taking one decision or another, the individual constitutes (identifies) him/herself' (Yadov: 1993: 64). The social changes offer wide possibilities for self-establishing, for entering into the new relationships and solidarities. At the same time, however, instability in economics and politics significantly deforms the notion of mutual relations between past, present and future. The past often appears as a direct determinant for present social identification while the future seems indefinite, causesing the narrowing of the life planning perspective.

Another Russian sociologist Nikolai Lapin proposed the understanding of the identity concept as a union of cultural and social onsets (2000). Lapin argues that such a union allows the most complete realisation and accomplishment of one's identity. He views culture as a constellation of methods and results of human activities, including ideas, values, norms and samples, with the social component as a constellation of relationships between the social subjects on the base of these values. The researcher examines the contemporary post-Soviet society as a kind of contradictory integrity 'containing complex intense relationships between individuals, groups and society in all possible combinations and interconnections' (Lapin: 2000, 24).

In the context of individual development identification is a process of a constant internal 'loyalty referendum' to one or another community in the frame of a particular sociocultural reality, the process of conscious choice of a value system and reference points. From the basis of these points the individual consciously joins a particular social group.

The cultural component of national identity of contemporary Russian society was investigated also by Mikhail Popov (2003). He argues that the members of a nation share common values elaborated during the common historical past (it can be the respect for the national symbols, cultural heritage or ideals) which lead to the cultural identification of the individual with a big community and the perception of one's own destiny in inseparable unity with the destiny of the community. According to Popov one can become a member of a nation independently of racial, ethnic or religious features but as a result of voluntary choice. Identification is seen as a harmony of individual's values, images, ideas and actions with a

psychological and social vision of a human dominant in the present historical moment. Thus identification is a kind of evaluating self-representation – the individual estimates his/her relativity to the external reality. Thereby, the cultural identification has two aspects. Firstly, it is a kind of mechanism which generalises and structures behaviour and internal schemes, criteria, valuations and categorisations. Secondly, it is a kind of structure description – presentation of an anthropological scheme of a human which is 'valid' in a particular culture at a given time. According to Popov, the people who previously identified themselves as 'Soviet people' at one moment are now achieving the new specific cultural forms - the language of ideological discourse, new life practices, styles, values – which forms embody themselves into the concept of cultural affiliation. The researcher argues that culture generates the feeling of belonging to the particular community, that is, the feeling of identification.

Popov's findings accord to some extent with Stuart Hall's vision of identity as 'positioned' in a particular culture and necessarily determined by the specific features of place and time (Hall 2000: 225). Moreover, the notion of national identity based on voluntary choice presented in Popov's work is a relatively new concept for the Russian humanities as well as for the Russian public sphere. Historically the idea of the 'nation' in the Soviet subject literature was understood rather to be based on ethno-cultural affiliations. In the post-Soviet period, however, the political and scholarly lexicon included such concepts as national (in the Western understanding), *'государственная'* (based on the state affiliation) or *'российская'* (concerning the Russian citizenship) identity considering the nation, in a big simplification, as the citizens of the state**.** There are reasons for such emphasis on the political notion of the nation rather than the ethnic one. At the moment, Russia is trying to create the new image of national identity and to unite the whole diversity of its society around the new common values. The same trend influenced by the dominant ideology is clearly visible in the research in the field of social sciences as for example in Popov's investigation.

In the last decade the problem of identity is widely discussed in politics, mass media and in humanity studies. Comparatively the cross-disciplinary discussions which consider this problem in the sphere of social sciences could be divided into two groups developing in somewhat different directions. The first one is related to the substance of identity – the norms, values, orientations of the citizens of Russia and other post-Soviet republics (e.g.

Magun 2006; Tishkov 2008). The second one concerns the relationships between the various kinds of identity - mainly the national, ethnic and regional (e.g. Gudkov 2004; Drobizheva 2007; Zudin 2007).

To sum up, the contemporary post-Soviet research on identity approaches the phenomenon mainly on the macro level of political, ideological or cultural discourses, while the micro level of conversation or everyday interactions is rather sparse. Nevertheless, it is significant for this study, since it exposes the specific features of the post-Soviet national identity which could set a starting point for my investigation of identity of migrants who came to Great Britain in the last twenty years. It is important to be aware that the last wave of immigrants after the collapse of the Soviet Union in some way lost their national identity even while being in their native land. Similarly to their compatriots back home, they are currently revising and reworking their attitudes to the old and new values and orientations. Therefore, the ideas presented in the contemporary post-Soviet research related to the creating of a national identity by Russian citizens (e.g. Ionin 1996; Yadov 2000; Magun 2006; Tishkov 2008) could be successfully exploited in my own work.

The analysis of various theoretical concepts of the self enables me to attempt a working definition of identity which is acceptable for this dissertation. Identity then is an unfinished, fragmentary and partial product of discourse (after Foucalt 1972) but situated not only in history, culture or politics but also in everyday life and therefore produced and shaped by interaction (after Mead 1934). Moreover it is a social phenomenon created by individuals in performances they play in various situations according to social norms in order to gain intentional effects on those other individuals involved (after Goffman 1959, 1967) while the symbolic meanings conveyed by these performances are actively interpreted by all the participants (after Blumer 1969).

2.2. Language and National Identity

According to the working definition accepted for the purposes of this thesis and presented in the previous subchapter, identity does not emerge as a completed absolute but demonstrates

its fluidity in the process of permanent interpretation, where images, narratives and routines attain their meanings through the way in which they correlate to each other while the actual meaning appears as a derivative of layered ongoing relations.

Although identity is a culturally based and socially defined discourse, every individual still possesses the ability to deliberate on it and recreate and reform it according to his or her own choices. People are able 'to continue to speak of reason, emotion, memory and the like' (Gergen 1991: 241) and create a kind of 'self culture' or the culture of 'life of one's own' (Beck 2000).

The process of self-identification is dependent on a variety of inner and outer signals. Identities are 'increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic discourses, practices and positions' (Hall 1996: 4). Central for this process is the influence of the context; therefore, the self never exists as 'a thing itself' but is always modified by external factors. These multidirectional modifications form an outline of existing power positions and shape a dynamic 'politics of identity' (Hall 1988: 44).

The tool kit necessary for the creation, interpretation and transmission of identity is language and the infinite processes of communication in the form of codes, symbols, values, practices and beliefs. Language conveys connotations with various historic and cultural experiences, national politics and practices and thus influences identity. Heinz Abels writes that '[b]y means of language social constructions articulate identity' (Abels 2000: 112) while John Joseph even proposes to consider identity 'as a third, distinct major function of language' beside its representative and communicative functions (Joseph 2004: 20). This researcher claims that 'identity is fundamental to the two traditional purposes of language' because '[o]ne's self-representation of identity is the organising and shaping centre of one's representations of the world. Similarly, in communication, our interpretation of what is said and written to us is shaped by and organised around our reading of the identity of those with whom we are communicating' (*ibid.*). The author argues that if understanding of language is reduced analytically to how the meaning is shaped and presented in sound or how it is transmitted from one person to another, something essential is being omitted: the people themselves. 'They are always present in what they say and in the understanding they

construct of what others say. Their identity inheres in their *voice*, spoken, written or signed' (Joseph 2004: 21). The speakers themselves and their reading of each other are always part of the meaning. Both the form and content of every linguistic production are formed and constantly guided by requirements of identity.

Identity discourse involves individual and collective 'skilful decoding' (Orr 2003: 37) according to a culturally conditioned particular set of rules, and at the same time 'successful negotiation' of one's own readings with the existing narratives (*ibid.*). According to Bourdieu, it is language that 'constitute[s] collective thought as much as express[es] it' (Bourdieu 1977: 167). Society takes part in identity construction in the process of social negotiation by considering experience and knowledge of previous generations while the collective memories are regarded as comprehensible only if they link with the available language of culture.

Taking into account Anderson's influential definition of the nation as an 'imagined community' (Anderson 1991: 6) it is possible to generalise that national identity is discursively constructed and is deeply 'grounded in the everyday, in the mundane details of social interaction, habits, routines and practical knowledge' (Edensor 2002: 17). National identity is about using 'resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being: not "who we are" or "where we came from", so much as "what we might become"' (Hall 1996: 4). But national culture, heritage or even history are only blurred and fluid sets of various facts which attain their structure and shape only through interpretation. While living in constant contact with each other either in the same territory, or in imagined community, members of a national group gather their personal experiences and modify their cultural dispositions during the constant process of collective valuating. Thus through the language and primary socialisation within the national culture the past emerges as a social possession. National identity in the form of a 'Grand Narrative' (Lyotard 1984: xxiii) emerges on the one hand as a phenomenon highly conservative and prescriptive but on the other hand it is open to any further elaborations and re-conceptualisations through new interpretations. The Grand Narrative of national culture is open-ended, subjected to re-evaluation and re-estimation and is relative rather than objective. 'The entire sense of what may be termed *the national reality* is not a picture of "what is the case", but a massive

linguistic production […] there are only words favoured by particular groups for particular purposes' (Gergen 1991: 121).

2.3. Theorising Narrative

The process of performing identities in narratives and everyday conversations within the Russian community is central to this dissertation. In order to introduce the subject I will provide a theoretical background concerning the analysis of narrative and talk-in-interaction.

Contemporary literature suggests that identity is constructed and performed moment-by-moment in everyday conversations as well as in stories people constantly create and tell in order to reflect and estimate their own lives and the lives of others. Telling stories is one of the most common and prevalent forms of human communication. According to Denzin (2000) we live in a 'storytelling society' through which we make sense of ourselves and our lives. Narrative theorists argue that people create and recreate their identities through the narratives they tell. Georgakopoulou (2002) claims that through storytelling people can create 'edited' portrayals of themselves and others, making some aspects of identity more visible and important than others whereas Benwell and Stokoe suggest that people can tell different stories about themselves to particular people in various situations and circumstances, so we can say that people produce 'different versions of self' (2009: 138). Daiute and Lightfoot, on the other hand, explain that 'narrative discourse organises life – social relations, interpretations of the past, and plans for the future' (2004: xi). 'Narratives are never 'flat' but always structured into units, segments, episodes. Relations within and between such units are patterned and structured, and such forms of patterning reflect cultural ways of organising knowledge, orientations to knowledge, and affect into discourse' (Blommaert 2005: 84).

In narrative theory perhaps the most influential study was made by the American sociolinguist Labov, who examined a large quantity of oral narratives in order to compare verbal skills across different sociolinguistic categories (Labov 1972, Labov and Waletsky 1967). According to Labov, a piece of talk can be named a narrative when it contains a number of necessary components. A 'fully formed' narrative 'begins with an orientation,

proceeds to the complicating action, is suspended at the focus of evaluation before the resolution, and returns the listener to the present time with the coda' (1972: 369). Narrative should therefore have a narrator, characters, a plot, settings and events that develop over time. Only then can we classify a bit of discourse as a narrative.

Despite the fact that Labov's work was very influential and many of the features he pointed out are present in the majority of narratives, his theory was not free of critics. The main reproach was related to the fact that some of the narratives did not always fit the suggested patterns (Edwards 1997a, Brockmeier and Carbaugh 2001). Barthes writes that 'narrative analysis is condemned to a deductive procedure, obliged first to devise a hypothetical model of description […] and then gradually work down from this model towards the different narrative species which at once conform to and depart from the model' (1977: 81).

Labov's narrative analysis has also been criticised for analysing idealised examples devoid of context, and for neglecting the way narratives are told in a particular interactional situation. Edwards writes that the focus on recognizing the components of the narrative structure fails to deal with the interaction being accomplished in the narrative (Edwards 1997b). Storytelling fulfils many various interactional functions (to inform, amuse, accuse etc.) (Goodwin 1997). That is why, for example, conversational analysts argue that during the analysis of stories the focus should be on how the stories are constructed turn-by-turn in interaction and on how they are managed and settled rather than on their internal structure (Schegloff 1997b).

The alternative way of studying narrative data was proposed by Wooffitt in his work *Telling Tales of the Unexpected: The Organisation of Factual Discourse* (1992) in which he analysed narratives about paranormal phenomena from a conversational analytic perspective. He focused on the very detailed and interaction-oriented structure of the narratives, not only on its distinctive components. From this point of view 'stories – especially those of the self – are now analysed as much for the ways in which storytellers and the conditions of storytelling shape what is conveyed as for what their contents tell us about the selves in question' (Holstein and Gubrium 2000: 103). Antaki writes that from this new perspective identity attribution is 'occasioned by the specifics of the interactions' and 'is a part of the dynamically emerging trajectory of the conversation' (1998: 85).

One of the distinguishing features of storytelling is that it adds to the discourse-based identity construction theories something very essential: the concept of temporality (Ricoeur 1991, Linde 1993). In narratives people tell about themselves a sense of identity, integrity and coherence is produced by combining notions of connectedness with temporal unity. In his article 'Narrative and Self-Concept' Polkinghorne uses the term 'emplotment' to explain how identities are constructed by assembling together various temporal components and 'directing them towards a conclusion or sequence of disconnected events into a unified story with a point or theme' (1991: 141).

Another important feature of narrative identity theories is the fact that every story we tell is linked in a particular way to wider cultural stories or master narratives. The world created and presented in a narration provides a 'backdrop of cultural expectations about a typical course of action; our identities as social beings emerge as we construct our own individual experiences as a way to position ourselves in relation to social and cultural expectations' (Schiffrin 1996: 170). This connection between storytelling and wider master narratives grows out of narrative identity work based on positioning theory. When analysing narratives positioning theorists examine the co-construction of selves appearing in stories between storyteller and audience. The term 'positioning' means the process through which speakers offer, adopt, or resist 'subject positions' available in master narratives or discourses (Benwell and Stokoe, 2009: 43, 139). For example, speakers can position themselves, as well as others, as failures or winners, victims or perpetrators, experts or amateurs.

Although there are many theorists examining the problems of narrative analysis and plenty of significant frameworks of the subject and innumerable examples of empirical research there is no single commonly agreed universal method for analysing narrative data (Tannen, 2010; Meinhof and Galasinski, 2005; Cameron, 2000; Johnstone, 2008). The main aim of narrative analysis is to examine people's lives through the stories they create about themselves. Narrative analysts ask the questions: 'Why was the narrative developed that way, and told in that order? In what kinds of stories does the narrator place him/herself? How does he/she strategically make preferred identity claims? What other identities are being performed or suggested? What was the response of the listener/audience, and how did it influence the development of the narrative and interpretation of it?' (Riessman 2003: 8).

2.4. Theorising Everyday Conversations

Identities are constantly produced in everyday conversations and even the smallest element of the talk could be an important identity marker. Through talking people live their lives, create and perpetuate social links and establish 'who we are to one another' (Drew 2005: 74). For Schegloff, talk is 'the primordial scene of social life … through which the work of the constitutive institutions of societies gets done' (1996a: 4), whereas Bucholtz and Hall claim that the social life is built through interactional moves (2008: 158). The very detailed and scrupulous, turn-by-turn analysis of people's talk is able to answer the question of how exactly individuals 'fashion, stylise, produce, perform' their identities in discourse (Hall 2000: 27).

Research interest in analysing talk-in-interaction in everyday situations arose in the 1960s and 1970s thanks to the work of the American sociologist Sacks and his colleagues Schegloff and Jefferson, who developed their theory as an alternative to the mainstream way of studying society. According to Sacks, the main aim of their theory - conversation analysis (CA) - is to investigate social action that could be embedded in the 'details of actual events' (Sacks 1984a: 26). Conversational analysis generally attempts to explain the order, structure, and sequential patterns of interaction, both institutional or in personal conversation.

One of the important features of CA is the fact that it uses naturally occurring data rather than interviews, fieldnotes or experiments, which data are too much a result of the researcher's manipulation (Heritage and Atkinson 1984: 2). The transcriptions of the audio and audio-visual recordings of the conversations appearing in natural situations are 'surrogates for the observation of actual behaviour' (*ibid.*).

Paul Drew (2005) presents an explanation of four basic concepts of CA based on the observations of Sack, Schegloff and Jefferson. First of all, conversations are made up of *turns* which follow one after another. During the conversation speakers know when to start speaking and what is appropriate to say next.

The second main concept relates to *turn design*. This depends on the aim of a particular turn and what is needed in terms of the 'details of the verbal constructions through which that action is to be accomplished' (Drew 2005: 83).

The third concept is that every conversation performs a social action. During conversations people make propositions, accept or refuse them, articulate invitations or accusations etc. This means that 'when we study conversation, we are investigating the actions and activities through which social life is conducted (Drew 2005: 75). Speakers analyses the previous speaker's turn, and then the result of this analysis 'can be found in the construction of their fitted responsive turn' (*ibid.*). In that way CA examines how the participants of the conversation orient to interaction.

The fourth CA concept described by Drew is *sequence organisation*. Conversational turns do not occur in isolation – they are linked with each other 'in systematically organised patterns of sequences of turns' (2005: 89). An example of sequence organisation can be the *adjacency pairs* like: offer/acceptance, complaint/excuse, question/answer. The first part of the adjacency pair produces a context for the second part by making it conditionally relevant (*ibid.*).

Taking into account the above concept we can conclude that the main interest of conversation analysis rests upon the internal structure of the talk taking no notice of the context. The central question of CA is, then, how the conversational actions are produced in a sequentially ordered interaction rather than why they are produced. Being a micro level approach to identity studies CA does not seem to involve any wider cultural, historical or social settings, instead it examines how people present their identity in interaction.

Conversational analysis is therefore often criticised for being too narrow, limited, restricted and too much oriented to participants and the structure of the conversation itself at the expense of considering backgrounds or any wider contexts (Holmes and Meyerhoff 2003, Wetherell 1998). Such 'pure' data allow the researcher to see how the talk is constructed, produced and displayed in a collaborative way between participants and it can be an important starting point for further analysis of sociolinguistic practices. In the investigation of identity, however, greater advantage seems to be achieved by combining, according to the

researcher's needs, micro and macro levels of analysis - allowing one to make sense of the specific elements of interaction and also to address the broader social, cultural or political contexts in which interaction develops and to which it is complementary.

Margaret Wetherell (1998), for example, proposes her own solution to the problem: a 'synthetic' attitude to analysis, which combines a great attention to conversational detail with wider cultural and historical contexts. The resulting approach is a 'genealogical' perspective which examines normative practices, values and meanings through both diachronic and synchronic intertextual analysis. This approach suggests 'that in analysing our always partial piece of the argumentative texture we also look to the broader forms of intelligibility running through the texture more generally' (Wetherell 1998: 403). Holstein and Gubrium in their research concerning narrative identity also use the ethnomethodological approach combined with discourse analysis: '[A]s varied and inventively distinct as [stories of the self] are, they are stories "disciplined" by the diverse social circumstances and practices that produce them all' (2000: 3).

Taking into account the various lines in the study of narratives and everyday conversations outlined above for the purpose of this research I have adopted the sociocultural linguistic approach combining micro and macro levels of analysis which will be comprehensively presented in chapter four.

2.5. Everyday Interactions and Narratives in the Context of Intergenerational Relationships

The concept of identity constructed in everyday situations during interactions between parents and their children is the central theme of this research. In order to approach the subject I will provide some theoretical settings concerning intergenerational relationships.

There are basically two significant streams of research concerning the parent/child relationship in terms of education, discipline and social control (Prusank, 1993). The first one focuses on the strategies which parents use to influence, modify or correct the behaviour of their children. The aims of this type of investigation are to determine the links between such

parental strategies and the reactions produced by children in response to them (e.g. Baumrind, 1967; Steinmetz, 1979; Abelman, 1985; Carter and Welch, 1981). However, for my own research the more informative is the second direction of study represented by the British sociolinguist Basil Bernstein (1974). The main direction of this line of study is towards defining the linguistic choices parents make in building control strategies they use towards their children. The focal issue is the link between a family's relationship to, as well as its position within, the direct interactional situation and, at the same time, within the larger cultural context. The aim of this kind of investigation is to analyse the linguistic strategies used by the adult and 'the resultant transmission of culture to the child' (Prusank, 1993: 133).

Very significant and influential research investigating the role which language plays in the socialisation of children across cultures was produced by Ochs and Schieffelin. (Schieffelin and Ochs, 1986; Ochs, 1988). The central point of these scholars' work is not the identity but the culture, defined as social knowledge that is 'created, negotiated and refined by people' (Coupland, Nussbaum and Grossman 1993: xxiv). According to Ochs, cultural knowledge and cultural norms both inform and are informed by language use. 'Given that meanings and functions are to a large extent socio-culturally organised, linguistic knowledge is embedded in socio-cultural knowledge. On the other hand, an understanding of the social organisation of everyday life, cultural ideologies, moral values, beliefs, and structures of knowledge and interpretation are to a large extent acquired through the medium of language' (Ochs, 1988: 14).

The adult/child relationships occurring both in institutional settings and in families are inherently asymmetrical. These asymmetries are not only related to hierarchical order in terms of domination/subordination or authority/legitimacy but also to the background knowledge which is necessary for acting in various social or cultural situations in fully appropriate ways. Following from Brown and Gilman (1989), Aronsson and Evaldsson argue that 'social distance between two generations can be described both in terms of vertical distance, that is, power differences between two parties, and horizontal distance, that is, interactive distance or affective distance between two parties' (Aronsson and Evaldsson, 1993: 104). In their sociolinguistic analysis concerning different norms and socializing strategies used in two different child day-care centres, these scholars investigated how talk is constitutive of social life and in which ways social distances between adults and children are

constantly being negotiated during the interactions. The researchers distinguished several methods oriented to decrease the vertical and horizontal distances between generations (such as co-narration, joint laughter or self-disclosures). However, they underlined that every type of adult/child interaction definitely involves adult control (Aronsson and Evaldsson, 1993).

The different kinds of intergenerational interactions concerning narratives which grandparents tell their grandchildren form the main subject of Baranowski's research. Baranowski found that by sharing stories about past experiences grandparents provide the youngsters with a source of identity development (Baranowski, 1982). Margaret Mead, on the other hand, argues that in sharing life stories with their children, adults achieve a sense of contentment and satisfaction knowing that their memories will be carried by the next generation into the future (Mead, 1974). Moreover, this researcher claims that through this kind of intergenerational interaction the adults have the possibility to attain continuity, both in terms of understanding their own life and also by influencing the lives of their children (Mead, 1972).

Telling the life story in different ways gives the opportunity to satisfy such personal needs as self-actualisation and self-esteem (McKay 1993). 'Oral history provides a way of making concrete one's experiences and wisdom and of creating from them a heritage to hand down to one's family and communal heirs' (Baum, 1980: 49).

Apart from personal importance the stories which adults tell to their children have cultural functions. Such stories are the means by which ideas, beliefs and values are presented and passed on between generations (Ong, 1980). Because of the intergenerational character of the relationships, the role which narrative plays in interaction is twofold. Firstly, it allows the adult storyteller to re-evaluate, reinterpret and reflect upon the past, and secondly, allows them to project their own viewpoints and perspectives onto children's future lives.

To sum up, in analysing the processes of identity construction during the interactions between parents and their children the specific character of the relationships should be taken into account. Because of the inherent asymmetry of such relations the adult will always be positioned as a powerful care-taker, teacher or advisor, who informs, instructs and controls.

In *Chapter Two* I have presented the theoretical background for the focal questions of the thesis and critically analysed the scholarship in the field of identity, language and national identity, narrative, everyday conversations and intergenerational relationships along with a variety of attitudes to these subjects. The next chapter will be focused on the question of Russian national identity and its conceptualising within the migrant's identity discourse.

Chapter Three: Migrants' and Russian Identity

This chapter will firstly discuss various theoretical approaches to the issue of migrants' assimilation with the host culture. This will be followed by a critical analysis of the literature concerning questions of migrants' solidarities with the native and host country and the re-imagining of collective identity. Finally, in the second part of the chapter, Russian national identity in the diachronic perspective will be discussed.

3.1. Migrants' Identity

3.1.a. The New Understanding of 'Assimilation'

The national identity of migrants is a dynamic balance of solidarities, commonalities and multifaceted affiliations. Two forces maintain this balance: the habitus **(**Bourdieu 1977) of the receiving country and the collective identity of a group. Although according to recent research the concepts of nation state or nation culture in their pure form, understood as particular cultural or habitual practices within a particular geographical territory, are no longer sufficient, it is still believed that national or ethnic identity is an important quality of cultural identity (e.g. Appelbaum and Robinson, 2005; Bhabha, 2007).

Migrants' identity is a dialogue and a constant negotiation between the norms, habits, values and beliefs acquired back in the homeland and those binding them to the new country. Therefore the identity expressed in the diaspora is not the same as that presented by compatriots back home. Hall underlines that 'identity as a "production" is never complete, always in process' (Hall 1990: 225). He highlights that any process of identity formation is always determined by the specific features of place and time. 'We all write and speak from a particular place and time. […] What we say is always "in context" positioned' (*ibid.*). Every shared identity created and recreated within the diaspora is always embedded in the context

of a particular country. While emerging diasporic identity necessarily reflects particular aspects of the culture in which newcomers create their self-representations. New points of reference appearing in this process allow the building not just of the identity of migrants as such but migrants *somewhere*. The processes of construction of migrants' identities are in many respects universal and show a lot of similarities, but at the same time differ considerably according to the country in which they occur. Therefore, these processes reflect on and conversely are reflective of practices, texts, symbols and values of at least two cultures. The arising diasporic identity exists as an intercultural and discursive body and presents an entirely new open-ended product different to both the native and the host culture.

Probably the most researched areas of migrants' identity are those concerning the relations to the host country. Pfandl indicates three types of strategies of social and cultural behaviour of migrants. *Assimilative* – when the people try to assimilate with the new culture and society, *antiassimilative* – when people voluntarily or involuntarily (for example, because of lack of sufficient language) isolate themselves from the new culture and society; and *bicultural* – when relations with both (or more) cultures are maintained concurrently (Pfandl 1994: 104). It is worth noting that the word 'assimilation' is not used with any pejorative connotation. 'In the general and abstract sense, the core meaning is increasing similarity or likeness. Not identity, but similarity. To assimilate means to *become* similar […] or to *make* similar or *treat* as similar […]. Assimilation is thus the process of becoming similar or of making similar or treating as similar' (Brubaker 2001: 533).

Although this typology is still utilised widely in current research it seems to oversimplify the problem to some extent. Theorizing migrants' identity within this frame of reference assumes its bipolar nature and understands it as a rather static construction. The similarities and differences of both cultures emerge here as absolute values and the integration with the culture of the host country is expected to occur at the cost of rejection of national culture and vice-versa.

In the recent literature on migration, however, the notion of assimilation has been significantly transformed. Brubaker highlights a shift from *transitive* to *intransitive* understandings of assimilation. 'The former see populations of immigrant origin as mouldable, meltable, *objects*; the latter see persons comprising such populations as active

subjects. […] "[A]ssimilation" is not something done *to* persons, but rather something accomplished *by* them, not intentionally, but as an unintended consequence of myriad individual actions and choices in particular social, cultural, economic and political contexts' (Brubaker 2001: 542-543). The questions of both the likelihood and desirability of assimilation are also brought into focus. Moreover, in the current understandings of the phenomenon this process is regarded as domain-specific (e.g. language, spatial or cultural assimilation) and can vary according to a particular reference population (Banton 1983: 144-146).

When studying migrants' identities, one further issue should not be omitted: the level on which the processes of assimilation or dissimilation occur. These changes, in some cases, take place not at the individual but rather at the intergenerational level and are related to the whole community. This community-level assimilation can appear without any individual-level assimilation. Linguistic assimilation at the community level, for example, can occur without knowledge of a new language by adults, just through the acquisition of the language by children. Of course, it is a simplification to some extent and in practice we can frequently observe language shifts at the individual level. The key changes, however, in language or in other domains occur intergenerationally: 'they occur not within persons but within abstractly constructed multi-generational populations, as new (genealogical) "members" of the population turn out to be different – dissimilate […] – from other, older members of the source population, in ways that make them more similar to members of some reference population' (Brubaker 2001: 543).

To sum up, the contemporary approach to the issue of migrants' identity has fundamentally transformed the notion of assimilation/isolation of migrants within the host country. Now the newcomers are seen not merely as objects of transformations but as subjects actively participating in the processes of identity negotiation. The assimilation itself therefore is understood as a multifaceted, domain-specific and intergenerational occurrence concerning the migrants' community in a particular reference population.

3.1.b. Migrants' Identity and the Native Land

As mentioned earlier, diasporic identity is defined through at least three different conceptual levels of solidarities. The first one is presented by migrants' bonds with the place of origin, the second is connected with a sense of new belonging and the third concerns the solidarities between migrants inside the community. Because one of the main questions of this thesis is migrants' identity, it is necessary to narrow the focus and to investigate further what exactly the 'native land' means for immigrants, how they perceive and understand the host culture and how their own new self-identification is represented within the diaspora.

Although in recent years it has been strongly suggested that because of globalisation processes the 'national, regional and local specificities are erased in the production of homogeneity' (Edensor 2002: 64), the identification of every individual with the place of origin is still a powerful factor. The ways in which the nation is spatialised are extremely complex and multifaceted. 'The complicated geographies of national identity depend on a range of institutional and everyday practices, from the drawing of boundaries between countries and at home, to convivial collective celebrations at places of congregation to the habits of the home, from the representation and ideological use of particular landscapes to the inured enactions grounded in taskscapes. To engage with the deep ways in which the nation is embedded in notions of space, it is vital to conceive of space as multifaceted: as evidence of […] power, as symbolically and semiotically loaded, as aesthetically interpreted and fashioned, as sensually apprehended and part of embodied identity, and as a setting for reflexive and unreflexive practices' (Edensor 2002: 65).

Every region, town or village remains tied to the nation as a greater ontological framework within which the local interactions, performances and practices take place. Distinct customs and traditions, dialects, cuisine, styles in architecture and clothing, historical and cultural episodes, all these local differences compose a kind of national geography, a 'code of larger significance' (Sopher 1979: 158).

The constant reconstruction and re-imagining of solidarities to the native land seems to be a heterogeneous process. There is a growing body of research reflecting the diversity of the readings of what the native land is. Indeed, even without any migration the attitude to the

concept of ‘Motherland’ among people living at the same place differs greatly. For some people the notion of the native land should necessarily have a strong connection with the historical and political basis, for others it is just the family, friends and the closest neighbourhood.

In her study of post-Soviet Central Asia, for example, Natalya Kosmarskaya describes a specific situation of ethnic Russians living in Kirghistan after the collapse of the Soviet Union (Kosmarskaya 2006). In fact, in Kirghistan, as well as in the other post-Soviet republics, the Russian part of the population, and also other nationalities different from the titular nation, suddenly found itself in a ‘wrong country’ that they previously considered to be part of their native land. In her research Kosmarskaya shows that there are at least five different concepts of motherland presented by Russians living in Kirghistan. The first one concerns native land as a repository of national spirit; the second understands it as a defending body and emphasises its protective features; the third one, in contrast, sees the native land as a purpose of servicing; the fourth is presented as a synonym of primary/local communities (family, neighbours) and the last one associates the native land with the Soviet Union as a symbol of the past (Kosmarskaya 2006: 517-525).

Another study of different levels of identification with the native land was presented by Ulrike Meinhof and Dariusz Galasinski (Meinhof and Galasinski 2002). They described a case of a town on the Polish-German border divided between two communities. The researchers found that for Polish respondents the most meaningful and significant fact in identity construction remains the fact of being Polish. German respondents, however, showed a multi-layered form of identity ‘with the national dimension considerably less important than the town/village or even the transnational levels. In that sense post-war Germans fit better the post-modern concept of multiple and hybrid identities than their Polish neighbours’ (Meinhof and Galasinski 2002: 80).

The previous two examples illustrate the different levels of solidarity with the native land presented by people who were not physically displaced. However the next cases demonstrate that a similar situation may also occur in strictly migrant communities. For example, Loretta Baldassar’s ethnographic research describes communities of Italian migrants living in Australia. She studied various contacts between migrants from the same village, town,

province, region and country and came to the conclusion that all the migrants occasionally demonstrate their attachment to each of the places depending on the precise communicative situation (Baldassar 1997).

In another study concerning the communication of Indian migrants living in America, Radhakrishnan discovers that Indians create their national identity as an ethnic Asian-Indian minority. While elaborating the common diasporic self-conception they ignore local differences in customs, traditions or cuisine, which are very important within their native country. The researcher concludes that national selves presented by migrants differ greatly from the identities within India (Radhakrishnan 1994).

Thus, it is important to consider the fact that within the same diaspora the native land and native culture can be imaged and re-imaged in different ways and different levels according to the personal experiences and affiliations of the migrants and also depending on the particular situation in which the communication or interaction takes place.

3.1.c. Migrants' Loyalties to the Host Country

Relationships between migrants and the culture of the host country have always been a focus of studies on migration and newer research perspectives are constantly appearing because of the complex nature of the subject. Any migration always induces a rethinking and renegotiation of identity and a creation of new concepts and meanings. Stuart Hall highlights that 'identity does not proceed in a straight unbroken line from some fixed origin' (Hall 1990: 226). On the one hand, identity is patterned with the hierarchy of personal roles, values and demands embedded in individual primary socialisation while on the other hand migrants are exposed to a life-long secondary socialisation – enculturation. 'The past continues to speak to us. But it no longer addresses us as a simple, factual past, since our relation to it, like the child's relation to the mother, is always already "after the break"' (*ibid.*).

Studying the process of identity reproduction of black Caribbeans, Hall points out that it is '"framed" by two […] vectors, simultaneously operative: the vector of similarity and

continuity; and the vector of difference and rupture. [Migrants'] identities always have to be thought of in terms of the dialogic relationship between these two [vectors]. The one gives us some grounding in, some continuity with, the past. The second reminds us that what we share is precisely the experience of a profound discontinuity' (1990: 227).

A process of appropriation and participation of migrants in the new identity discourse is always multilayered and complex. In research concerning Jewish communities living in the United States in 1890-1940, Ewa Morawska comes to similar conclusions as Michael Banton (Banton 1983) showing the domain-specific ways of migrants' adaptation to the host country. Morawska claims that the inception of a migrant's new sense of belonging and building of new dependencies with the host culture take place in at least four different domains. The researcher distinguishes economic, political, social and religious dimensions of a migrant's assimilation and highlights that this process could be quick and of wide scope in one domain but slower and more partial in another (Morawska 1996).

There are several studies presenting various aspects of migrants' relationships with the host culture that attempt not only to show positive or negative attitudes to the host culture but to present the dialectical nature of the phenomenon. Gordon Mathews, for example, studying identity discourse in today's Japan, describes cases when people make conscious choices of their national identity in a search of one's 'true self'. In their self-representations the informants are choosing not only their national belonging but also re-inventing their ethical and temporal belonging (Mathews 2000). Another approach shows that tight bonds inside the diaspora could be an alternative to the programmes of immigrant integration and provide a kind of help in dealing with discrimination or prejudice (Guarnizo and Smith 1998). On the other hand, Garcia Canclini describing the life of temporary workers from Latin America in the USA presents a kind of 'portability' of national identity. The scholar claims that because of frequency and regularity of migrations of Mexican workers their national culture is deterritorialised (Canclini 2005).

Arjun Appadurai writes: 'Deterritorialisation in general is one of the central forces of the modern world, since it brings labouring populations into the lower-class sectors and spaces of relatively wealthy societies […]' (Appadurai 1997: 78). Migrants literally 'take' their local culture to other places. This cultural strategy includes non-involvement in the life-style of the

host country, disregard of new experiences and living according to the norms and values of the native culture.

In contemporary research it is frequently highlighted that in modern diasporas there appears a tendency towards declaring membership of more than one country (Lotman 2001). Migrant communities comprise of '[…] dense networks across political borders created by immigrants in their quest for economic advancement and social recognition. Through these networks, an increasing number of people are able to live dual lives. Participants are often bilingual, move easily between different cultures, frequently maintain homes in two countries, and pursue economic, political and cultural interests that require their presence in both' (Portes 1997: 812).

3.1.d. Re-Imagining of Collective Identity

Probably one of the least researched issues is that related to the investigation of influences of everyday reality and solidarities within the community on the creating and changing of migrants' identity discourses. The ideas of 'transplantation of a narrative' from one culture to another formulated by Julia Kristeva more than thirty years ago explained the processes of identity reconstruction initiated by migration (Kristeva 1991 [1980]). These ideas have been developed further, for example, in the research of Mary Orr concerning a detailed analysis of possible mechanisms of cross-cultural influences in particular sets of interdiscursive practices. She presents the possibilities of such a 'transplantation' and distinguishes: 'traditional influence' (people influencing each other or narrative influencing people), 'imitation in the transmission of cultural texts' (unconscious copying of various patterns and models), and 'influence as recognition' (appreciating and acceptance through conscious change) (Orr 2003: 66, 67).

According to this approach, the dynamics of re-imagining a collective identity by the displaced people should not be seen as a mosaic of random impressions, but rather as a coherent structure in which particular meanings are elaborated and interpreted by people. Such a negotiation of meanings takes place in everyday interactions and is dependent on the whole spectrum of individual features of participants, beginning with their ethnicity, age or

gender and ending with their personal experiences, knowledge or beliefs. However '[w]hat mediates between difference and identity is structure – the way differences are articulated into a significant pattern, as is in the narrative. Culture as identity values collective particularity' (Eagleton 2001: 73).

To sum up, while studying diasporic identity one should consider that within the same diaspora migrants may demonstrate various levels of identification with the native land and native culture depending on particular communicative situations or individual features of participants. Similarly, migrants' attitude to the host country is complex and is constantly changing in the process of assimilation. This process is domain-specific and does not necessarily run evenly, covering all the spheres of cultural and social life. When thinking about migrants' solidarities with the native and host culture the phenomenon of multiculturalism and deterritorialisation should also be taken into account. Every displacement initiates a rethinking and recreating of previous systems of norms, values and beliefs. The collective elaborating of new self-representation takes place in everyday life through particular rituals and practices, being strictly dependent upon a variety of internal and external factors.

3.2. Russian National Identity

In order to investigate the dynamic character of the contemporary national identity discourse presented within the Russian community living in Scotland, it is necessary to analyse the concept of Russian national identity in diachronic perspective. The cultural and historical past constantly influences the present. As Bourdieu notes: 'It is yesterday's man who inevitably predominates in us, since the present amounts to little compared with the long past in the course of which we were formed and from which we result. Yet, we do not sense this man of the past, because he is inveterate in us; he makes up the unconscious of ourselves' (Bourdieu 1977: 79).

The investigation of the concept of Russian national identity is complicated by its ambiguity and inherent contradictions. Even the notion of the concept itself is highly indistinct and

vague. It can be construed in at least four different ways. Firstly as a purely ethnic representation: ethnically Russian people (*руские люди*). Secondly it can be seen as a political concept: the citizens of Russia (*граждане России, российские люди, россияне*). It can also have a linguistic implication and comprise the people, even those not ethnically Russian and who do not perceive themselves as Russian but whose first or native language is Russian (*русскоговорящие*). Lastly it can be viewed geographically and mean the people living within the territory of the Russian Federation irrespective of their ethnic origins or citizenship (*жители России*).

Robin Milner-Gulland notes that if researchers attempt to define Russianness as a 'sum of such features of a shared way of life as received social attitudes, folk wisdom and customs, notions of justice, symbolic systems, religion' they inevitably come to the conclusion that this definition is 'too fluid and complex for well defined answers, particularly if investigated diachronically' (Milner-Gulland 1999: 38).

According to Geoffrey Hosking, at the beginning of the twenty first century Russia in general still has essential questions of national identity unresolved. The researcher refers to the 'variety of identities which Russia has assumed over the centuries' (Hosking 2001: *iii*). The same situation can be observed if one tries to analyse the national identity performed by the Russian community currently living in Great Britain. These performances are a kind of cultural mixture 'to which different members of this migrant population are likely to subscribe to very different degrees' and can range 'from community folk dancing (of by no means always clear regional origins) to the nostalgic revisiting of old Soviet rock numbers, from pious performances of Orthodox Christianity to ironic displays of Soviet military paraphernalia, from mock-tsarist balls for the jet-set to the obligatory 8th [March] Woman's Day celebrations' (Byford 2009: 60).

This study does not attempt to focus on any chosen specific feature or understanding of Russianness but rather tries to see identity negotiations within the migrant community as a complex and multidimensional phenomenon. Russian national identity is understood as a diversity of discourses induced and developed by various political and historical occurrences, social realities and cultural heritage. At the same time these discourses are distinguished through various modalities as gender, age, educational background or place of origin. Being

dynamic phenomena, they are derived from a specific habitus, to use Bourdieu's term (1977: 72), but simultaneously they are never finished and always open to further modifications and interpretations.

In the following subchapter I will present several specific cultural, historical and social conditions which determine the contemporary Russian national identity discourse and contribute significantly to the construction of Russianness. I will investigate the question of othering with regard to the dilemmas of Russian and the West as well as the Russian imperial and Soviet legacy. Finally, I will discuss the issue of ethnic selves in Russian cultural discourse and current Russian national identity politics.

3.2.a. Russia and the West

Through the centuries the notion of the 'West' has had a special place in the Russian national identity discourse. The 'West' has been seen as Russia's great Other and, according to current needs, the content of its concept has been constantly imagined and re-imagined, reflecting the changes occurring in Russia itself. The idea of 'West' emerges as 'the main Other in relation to which the idea of Russian is defined' (Neumann 1996: 1). As Stuart Hall argues, identity is 'constructed through, not outside, difference, through the relation to the Other' (Hall 1996: 4) while the Western culture represents 'the culture in whose mirror we better appreciate our own' (Hosking 2001: *iii*). The concept of the Russian Self has organically absorbed the notion of the imaginary 'West' and the comparison with it has actually been an 'indelible part of the Russian national consciousness' (Greenfield 1990: 254) and 'the most important ingredient of modern Russian identity' (Tolz 2001: 69).

For centuries the Byzantine Empire was considered by Russia as a model for emulation with regard to its unsurpassed culture, law, state and social systems. However, approximately in the seventeenth century, the changes in Russian economic and political interests caused changes in relation to cultural interests as well. 'Russia's elite culture was reoriented in the opposite direction, towards Western Europe, where the most attractive commercial opportunities lay, but from where the most serious threats also came' (Hosking 2001: 21).

This ardour for the West and its particularly favourable image at that time was built on an oversimplified contrast. The West and Europe were associated with progress, dynamic development, civilisation and enlightenment while to Russia, and the East in general, were assigned such features as stagnation, backwardness and fatalism. However, this image of the West was not free from a kind of paradoxical ambivalence: along with admiration it also evoked feelings of suspicion, unwillingness and even 'suppressed feelings of envy and hatred' (Greenfeld 1992: 222) in Russian society. This contradiction was precisely underlined by the eighteenth century dramatist Denis Fonvizin: 'How can we remedy two contradictory and most harmful prejudices: the first, that everything with us is awful, while in foreign lands everything is good; the second, that in foreign lands everything is awful, while with us everything is good' (*ibid.*).

Such a contradictory attitude to the West can be explained by the binary model of Russian culture, with its predispositions to resorting to opposite values and preferring essences over processes. For example Yuri Lotman and Boris Uspensky write about 'dualism and the absence of a neutral axiological zone' in Russian public discourses (Lotman and Uspensky 1984: 5), while Robin Millner-Gulland examines the binary oppositions that have determined the Russian folk beliefs and social practices (Millner-Gulland 1999: 90). Analysing the implications of opposite meaningful pairs *'правда'/'неправда'* and *'мы'/'они'* on the level of local communities and the state, Hosking comes to the conclusion that the mechanisms of duality in Russian culture become apparent in the 'tendency to seek extreme solutions to the problems and to lurch from one set of cultural patterns to their diametrical opposite' (Hosking 2001: 22). He also highlights that this 'bipolar world found its reflection in many aspects of the Russian politics and culture' (*ibid.*). While examining the political and social transformations that took place during the entire Russian history he emphasises 'the tendency to introduce reforms in total packages, rejecting previous ways as utterly wrong' (Hosking 2001: 176).

In his research James Billington noted the tempestuous character of borrowing and implementation by Russia of new foreign social and political concepts. He names this phenomenon as the 'old Russian tradition of suddenly instituting sweeping changes by adopting wholesale the model of their principal foreign adversary' (Billington 2004: 48). He

noted also that 'Russians have repeatedly tended to adopt the end product of another civilisation, without replicating the process of thought and institution building that made it possible' (*ibid.*).

Taking into account that there was no single, universal western culture to follow, the simultaneous adoption by Russia of various European cultural, social and political models and ideas was naturally discrepant and contradictory. For example, Robert Williams underlines the paradoxical fact that while the philosophical and intellectual conceptions of nationalism were borrowed by Russia from the West, the very conceptions enabled Russians 'to imagine themselves different from, hostile to, and superior over the West' (Williams 1997: 2). He points out as one of the bedrocks of the Russian national identity discourse, inspired by Rousseau and Herder, the idea of the moral superiority of the Russian peasant who symbolically incarnates the national 'soul' of the folk lost by the West. Moreover he refers to the fact that the ideas of Slavophiles were also inspired by Western, particularly German, Idealism (Williams 1997: 17). Thus the Russian national discourse employed the structure and language of western discourses in order to reflect and define its own specific character.

Fonvizin's witty maxim pertinently reflects the situation which occurred in Russia in the first half of the nineteenth century when the Russian intelligentsia split up into two camps. The Westernizers, appreciating European progressiveness, agreed with the first part of the aphorism, while the Slavophiles, believing in 'Russia's special path and spiritual light' (Ryazanova-Clarke 2011: 3), with the second. The members of both camps had much in common in terms of social background and education. However, the greatest difference between them consisted of their assessment concerning Russia's past: 'whether Russia had gained or lost from lack of contact with the more advanced West, and therefore whether Russia would progress by preserving her distance virtues or, on the contrary, by borrowing as fast as possible from the West, using the advantages of relative cultural immaturity and inexperience to make up lost time' (Hosking 1997: 198). Thereby in either case the image of Russia itself again depended on how the West was viewed.

For the discourse of the Russian national self the West became a kind of a myth. Such a myth is described by George Schopflin as 'one of the ways in which collectivities – in this context,

more especially nations – establish and determine the foundations of their own being, their own system of morality and values. In this sense therefore, myth is a set of beliefs, usually put forth as a narrative, held by a community upon itself' (Schopflin 1997: 19). The Russian society in the process of creation of the idea of Self through the comparison with the West re-imagined and re-interpreted its concept according to its current needs. Thus the comparison itself was made with the 'imagined West' rather than the real one.

In the Russian national identity discourse of the nineteenth century Europe and the West appear 'not as a cultural and political reality, but as a construct of mental geography' (Morgunova 2007: 90). In fact, not infrequently Russian Westernizers did not take any interest in real life in Europe but rather preferred discussing their own image of the West. For example, in his work Lotman refers to several nineteenth-century memoirs. He notes that while *Западники* 'spiritually lived' in idealised Europe they refused to account for its authentic reality. Very often real contacts with the life in Europe had dramatic consequences and a Westernizer became a passionate critic of the West (Lotman 2001: 330). Lotman comes to the conclusion that the myth of the West was indeed, in Schopflin's words, held by a community upon itself, while the narrative of this myth was of importance of a 'higher reality' (*ibid.*).

A similar observation was made by Williams while investigating intellectual life of Russian emigrants of the first wave, who left the country after the revolution. The researcher notes that being in Europe, the émigrés of this period began re-creating the image of Russia in an entirely opposite, anti-Western way, alleging 'the general decline of the West' (Williams 1999: 149).

In the Soviet era the attitude to the West and Europe in public discourse remained ambiguous. On the one hand, the West was considered as a birthplace of revolutionary ideas and socialism. On the other hand, however, on the level of official ideology, it was depicted as the greatest enemy, while the Cold War was the demonstration of 'a specific form of rejection of the "Western" civilisational route' (Ryazanova-Clarke 2011:3).

3.2.b. Imperial and Soviet Legacy and National Identity

Nationalism in its cultural and political forms constitutes an essential component of the processes of nation-building and the emergence of national consciousness. According to Liah Greenfield, it initially emerged in sixteenth century England and later started to spread across Europe. As she notes, since then 'the emergence of national identities in other countries was no longer a result of original creation, but rather of the importation of an already existing idea' (Greenfield 1990: 550).

In Russia the process of national identity building started later than in the rest of Europe, as early as the eighteenth century under the reigns of Peter the Great and Catherine II (Greenfield 1990, 1992; Gooding 1996; Hosking 2001). Before this time Russia was already a Eurasian empire and represented a kind of Asian autocracy, being 'a multiethnic […] without a dominant nation, ruled by a dynasty and heterogeneous aristocracy […] heir to the lands of the Golden Horde and of more besides' (Hosking 2001: 5, 175). In order to preserve its status Russia had no alternative other than to become a European power in terms of its political and cultural interests. The reorganisation of such an Empire was related to Russia's current fascination with the West mentioned earlier in this chapter, in which nationalism was one of the political concepts available to adopt. As John Gooding notes, nationalism was 'hijacked' from Europe in order to enforce the Russian state (Gooding 1996: 51). The formation of the Russian nation however 'did not precede the process of tsarist colonial expansion, but instead coincided with it. The simultaneity of the two processes blurred the ethnic and cultural definition of Russian nationality and made Russia's political identity heavily dependent on the tsarist state's imperial exploits' (Dawisha and Parrot 1994: 26). Hosking also agrees that Russian nationhood 'has never existed outside the framework of Empire, which has left it stunned and underdeveloped' (Hosking 2001: 610). In the same vein Ilya Prizel describes the fact that when nationalism became a potent global force Russians were 'ill-prepared to separate their own identity from that of the empire', while the link between the Russian Self and empire remained the most constant feature of Russian national psychology (Prizel 1998: 186).

Initially, the idea of national identity on Russian grounds represented an 'elitist concept in terms of those who were interested in acquiring it' (Morgunova 2007: 84). According to

Greenfield, the idea of nationhood introduced to the Russian nobility during the period of Peter's the Great reforms provided them with a more secure status. Now Russian nobles served not only the tsar himself, but also something beyond him – the state. 'They were beginning to experience the therapeutic effects of national pride, and their identity as noble men was giving way to the national identity of Russians' (Greenfield 1990: 568).

Russia has always occupied a very specific place in history and international politics. Throughout the centuries the country has faced danger from every side: the Mongols and the Turks from East and South and the Swedes, Poles, Germans and French from North and West. Not surprisingly, such geo-political conditions have created in Russia a strong dependence upon military forces. The attitude to the army significantly contributes to the construction and definition of the concept of arising Imperial nationalism. In analysing the range of successful Russian armed campaigns from medieval to modern times, Graham Smith highlights the importance of the narratives of military victories in public discourse. At the same time he observes that these narratives have been interweaved with the narratives about the moral superiority of the Russian army contained in the spirit of the Slavophiles' philosophy of the messianic role of Russia. He writes that in these narratives 'the dominant self-image has been sacrificial rather than triumphalist. The spiritual qualities of moral goodness and patience, together with physical courage, are held to have overcome evil and cunning' (Smith 1990: 21).

The Napoleonic period and especially the Patriotic war of 1812 was undoubtedly also a significant stage in the building of Russian national consciousness. Anatole Mazour states that Russian nationalism 'came as an answer to the fiasco of cosmopolitan idea of the French Revolution and the failure of Napoleon to bring Europe to a federation of states and bend Russia to that scheme' (Mazour 1955: 30).

In the situation when there was not any plane of contact between the state elites and the rest of the population of the country the highly military style of education for both, the Russian aristocracy and Russian ordinary soldiers became a 'nursery for imperial nationalism' (Morgunova 2007: 85). According to Hosking, the military forces established the social base for developing the imperial Russian consciousness. He writes that '[s]oldiers became in a sense imperial citizens […]. This is why tsars identified themselves so strongly with the

army, seeking in it the microcosm of an empire, whose solidarity elsewhere was shadowy and uncertain' (Hosking 2001: 197).

In fact, considering that Russia became an empire before it was a state, until the beginning of the twentieth century its national identity was still not defined. 'One of the paradoxes and tragedies of Russia's national development was that while the empire was unable to satisfy the growing needs of Russian nationalism, the Russian national consciousness remained fused to the empire' (Malfliet 2003: 17).

The seventy years of the Soviet period did not help the Russians to solve the issue of their national self. The policies of the new regime did not change the character of the national identity discourse and in many ways repeated and continued the practices used by its predecessors. 'The Bolsheviks broke down the preceding political institutions of Russia and cleverly adjusted the people's everyday notions to the new reality' (Sikevich 2002: 2). Also in terms of central governmental control over the immense multiethnic territories together with the hegemonic tendencies of its domestic and foreign policies the USSR remained an empire.

During the initial stages the new regime attempted to legitimise itself by referring to universalist ideologies. In this situation the distinct Russian national identity was a rather politically inconvenient concept. Therefore it was skilfully replaced by the Soviet 'internationalist' identity, enabling incorporation of all the minority nations and 'binding' together all the peoples of the new country. The Soviet nation-building project was bolstered with the narratives of the Soviet Union as a superpower that enabled 'liberation' of several European and Asian nations and 'guaranteed' their security and stability. Through ideologies of internationalism and friendship between peoples, supported and enforced by the authorities, the USSR established an idea of Soviet patriotism and supplied the concepts of imperial citizenship and national identity with the new Soviet labels.

During the Soviet period the army continued to play an important role in society while military service was 'the sacred obligation of Soviet citizens', as recorded in the Constitution of the USSR (Zaloga 1987: 3). After the October revolution an 'army of a new type' was created – the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army. It had to 'serve the people, defending them

from foreign and class enemies', and according to the idea of a messianic role for the Soviet Union, 'carry Marxist revolutionary ideals and freedoms to the enslaved nations of the world' (Reese 2000: 2). Heroic narratives of victorious armed campaigns, especially those of the Great Patriotic War, were still widely used in Soviet public discourse. After the collapse of the Soviet Union military narratives also remained considered by both official discourse (e.g. Ryazanova-Clarke 2008a) and Russian citizens (e.g. Sikevich 2002) as one of the essential factors in national identity. It should be also noted that during the whole existence of the USSR national identity politics was distinguished by 'chronic insecurity; a tendency to keep population mobilised as for war' while the idea of the Soviet Union as a 'besieged fortress' (Gooding 1996: 5) was recognised by many scholars as one of the crucial features of Soviet consciousness (Smith 1990, Kantor 2002).

In fact, until the post-Soviet period, Russia existed as an Empire - 'a multi-ethnic project defined and controlled by the state' while '[m]ost Russians have regarded themselves as members of a super-ethnos which had both the right and the duty to embody a universal mission and therefore to assimilate other peoples, at least politically' (Hosking 2003: 32). Currently various researchers are attempting to investigate how the new political, social, and economic realities influence Russian national identity discourse. For example, Billington states that '[w]ith the breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991, Russia became, for the first time in its history, a nation rather than an empire' (Billington 2004: 47). He notes also that '[f]aced with such sudden, disorienting change, Russians had to rethink their politics, economics, history, and place in the world. In their new state of freedom, they have produced one of the most wide-ranging discussions of a nation's identity in modern history' (*ibid.*: 48). Susanne Birgerson writes that 'Russia finds it particularly difficult to reconcile itself to the loss of superpower status and to the loss of territories that had long been considered an integral part of its national/political identity' (Birgerson 2002: 10). Conversely, Milner-Gulland claims rather that Russians were not disappointed with their loss of imperial status. He writes that Peter the Great 'left behind him the Empire of Rossiya – a legacy that Russians have on the whole found distinctly uncomfortable, and sloughed off with some relief with the collapse of the communist state' (Milner-Gulland 1997: 80).

In any case, more than two decades after the collapse of the USSR, the process of searching for Russian national self-definition is still ongoing, while Russia's imperial legacy leaves a

set of ‘shadow identities’ (Hosking 2002: 610) which undoubtedly influence to a great extent its adjustments to the new realities.

3.2.c. Ethnicity

Ethnic identity represents probably the most indefinite and vague component of the Russian identity discourse of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. As Neil Melvin notes ‘[t]sarist and Soviet nationalities policies had created little sense of a well-defined ethnic […] nation’ (Melvin 1995: 5). The Russian national self during the last two centuries was recognised in terms of historical, cultural and territorial unity. Despite the fact that by the middle of the nineteenth century the Russian Empire had grown into ‘one of the most ethnically diverse and polyglot polities that the world had known’ (Dowler 2001: 3) the ethnic identities of its inhabitants were rather disregarded.

It should be noted that in a state such as the Russian Empire and later the Soviet Union, where domestic and imperial politics were not separated from each other, the concept of ethnic identity had its own very specific features. On the one hand, over many years, the notion of ethnic Russianness was incorporating more and more Russified ethnically non Russian people of the country, which people were gradually losing the sense of their own ethnicity. On the other hand, however, ethnic Russian identity was a concept that was highly diluted and weak in itself, since it was frequently equated to the Imperial/Soviet self in national terms and manipulated and defined according to the political and ideological needs of the state.

Until at least the second half of the nineteenth century, Russia was conceptualised not as the land of Russians but rather as the territory of the Russian Empire. The concepts of Russianness of that time were based on three basic loyalties: to the Tsar, autocracy and the Russian Orthodox Church. However, by the second half of the century, the emergence of several internal political challenges accompanied by the lively dispute between Westernizers and Slavophiles sat the issue of Russian national self at the centre of domestic politics. ‘Russian nationalism was forged in part from the tension between a feeling of kinship with western Europe, on the one side, and the contrary feeling of difference from European culture

and political and social forms, on the other' (Dowler 2001: 3). In the discourse of nationhood of this time a concept of otherness emerged not only against Europe but also against the peoples within the Empire, particularly those of the south and east. The feeling of otherness turned into the romantic fascination with the 'exotic' lands and their inhabitants which was widely reflected in the literature and arts of the time (e.g. the Caucasus theme). By the time of the Great Reforms of the 1860s, an apparent interest in ethnography had arisen based on this fascination with the East. In 1867 the president of the first Russian Ethnographic Exposition, introducing the life of various peoples of the Empire, declared that 'every educated Russian should study our native land' (Dowler 2001: 4).

One of the biggest reforms of the period concerned education. Popular literacy and mass education were seen by the government as one of the basic conditions for modernisation. However, in such a linguistically diverse country as the Russian Empire the issue of the language of education immediately came to the forefront. On the one hand, popular literacy was a binding tool with which the state could implant the idea of nationhood, on the other hand, it implied the whole complexity of the relationships between the variety of ethnic groups involved. As Merwin Crawford Young notes, '[t]he schoolhouse was thus at once a weapon of integration and detonator of ethnicity' (Crawford Young 1992: 71).

At that time Russia entirely accepted the civilizing mission of Western Europe in the world. Even those who disagreed with the idea of imperialist economic exploitation of the colonies believed in the progress which Europeans brought with them into other societies. At the same time the Russian intelligentsia, who 'shaped the opposition to Russian autocracy in the nineteenth century, broadly concurred that Russia had a duty and right to civilise and culturally assimilate the peoples of the eastern empire' (Dowler 2001: 10). Moreover, the Russian language was seen as a language of this civilisation and assimilation since many 'raised doubts about the capacity of the little languages, especially those with only an oral tradition, to bear the great […] European' ideas (*ibid.*).

The policy of gradual Russification of the peoples living within the territory of the Empire was the Russian way of nation-building in the midst of ethnic diversity. Ethnic identities of the inhabitants of the country were widely ignored. According to the binary judgements inherent to Russian culture, as mentioned above (Lotman and Uspensky 1984; Millner-

Gulland 1999; Hosking 2001), some of the nations of the Empire were categorised simply as *'иноверцы'* – 'people of other faith'. This category, included for example Muslim Tatars together with Polish or Ukrainian Catholics, without distinguishing between their religions or admitting any other differences between them. At the same time, ethnic or cultural features of the representatives of the same confession were understated or levelled. Ethnic Russianness itself was a phenomenon that was not defined clearly. For example, according to the 1897 Census, which was the first comprehensive statistical arrangement of the time, the category 'Russian' included, in addition to ethnic Russians, also Byelorussians and Ukrainians (Rowney and Stockwell 1978: 225). The same situation concerned Byelorussian and Ukrainian languages, which were not recognised by the government as being separate from Russian (Dowler 2001: 8).

Explanations for this tendency to ignore ethnic (and linguistic) differences between the citizens of the Empire vary greatly. For example, Theodore Week supposes that the Russian government was simply unable adequately to recognise and categorise the ethnic features of particular peoples living on the territory of the country (Week 1996). Other scholars consider that ethnic differences were deliberately shrouded in order to reinforce and support loyalties to the Empire, since any idea of a multi-ethnic Russia could disrupt the vision of Russia as autocratic, orthodox and culturally homogeneous (Riasanovsky 1959; Perrie 1998). Although both assumptions contribute to the whole picture, it seems, however, that one of the main reasons for such policies, at least initially, was simply to extend Russian administration to the whole Empire and establish Russian as the administrative language. As Wayne Dowler notes, '[b]ehind the Russian drive toward linguistic unity in governance lay a desire for rationalisation characteristic of all European states of the era of nation building' (Dowler 2001: 14). Later, at the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the policies of administrative Russification were expanded to the cultural Russification of the peoples that formed a part of Russian Empire. This creation of cultural uniformity continued during the Soviet period until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.

After the October revolution there emerged a close bond between the notions of Russian and Soviet, which assured Russians a special and very powerful position in the newly established country. As Melvin states, '[t]he Soviet regime relied on the political acquiescence of the Russians who were encouraged to regard the successes of the USSR as advancing the

interests of Russian people' (Melvin 1995: 8). This special position was strengthened by the public discourse promoting the Russian culture together with the Russian language, which was seen not only as the *lingua franca* of the Soviet Union but also as a language of progress and success. This promotion of Russian/Soviet culture was a tool for assimilation of other ethnic groups into the 'great Soviet family' – *Советский народ* – which was one of the main goals of the new regime. At the same time the government pursued a policy of administrative Russification at the level of local authorities at all Soviet republics. The period between the First and the Second World Wars 'was a time of massive reidentification with the Russian ethnos'. According to the results of the Soviet census during this time about 10 million non-Russians may have registered themselves as Russians (*ibid.*).

One of the fundamental aspects of the Soviet political attitude towards ethnicity was to connect a particular nationality to a particular territory. All of the Soviet peoples, large or small, were ascribed specific places in the Soviet space which were considered as their ethnic homelands, regardless of whether the titular nationality formed the minority in this land or whether the majority of this nationality lived on other territory. As Roman Szporluk notes, all these ethnic homelands 'enjoyed under the Soviets the status of political entities, and even the smallest, and thus ranking lowest in the hierarchy of autonomous regions and republics, formally enjoyed at least rudiments of "statehood"' (Szporluk 1994: 5). The purpose of creating of such 'contractual' republics and nations was to create one unified Soviet people living in one Soviet state.

Expansion of the Sovietised Russian culture and Russian language during this period was accompanied by the mass migration of ethnic Russians, Slavic peoples and other Russian-speakers to various, mainly urban and industrial, regions outside the Russian Federation and linguistic Russification of the peoples settled on these territories. To a great extent the Soviet regime relied on the Russian-speakers spread all over the territory of the state in order to diminish the powers of the titular nations and to enforce the Soviet rule. Moreover, these migrant communities were strategically at the very centre of the Soviet political economy – especially the military sector of heavy industry - and were not tied to any particular republic but rather to the whole Soviet national economy (Melvin 1995: 9).

The Russian Federation existed within the larger structure of the Soviet Union. However, neither Russians nor non-Russians perceived it as the Russian nation-state or the national homeland of Russian people. In the prevailing view of that time 'the whole of the USSR was the real Russia', while the Soviet policy of 'internationalisation' became 'synonymous with, and was perceived by other nations as Russification' (Szporluk 1994: 5, 6). On the one hand Russians were privileged in being a 'leading nation', on the other hand, however, they were an object and victim of political manipulation, since their identity was constructed and reconstructed according to the current needs of the party and state.

The close bond between Russian and Soviet reached its highest point during the Great Patriotic War when the Soviet authorities actively promoted Russian nationalism. After Stalin's death, however, there began the process of a gradual release of Russian identity embedded in culture and history from the Soviet one defined politically and ideologically. A survey conducted by the Moscow Institute of Ethnography in the 1970's noted a growing ethnic awareness among Russians (see e.g. Basilov, 1975). Despite the fact that their ethnic self remained weaker in comparison to emerging ethnic sentiments of other, non-Russian, peoples of the Soviet Union, Russians began to perceive themselves as a group with an identity other than Soviet.

During the Gorbachev period there were escalating national movements all over the Soviet Union. Emerging political mobilisation in the Russian Federation appealed to an independent Russia, while national campaigns in the Soviet republics incorporated both pro-independent (anti-Soviet) and anti-Russian features simultaneously. Such a situation compelled Russians - both those living in Russian Federation and those scattered all over the USSR - to rethink their role and position within, and their attitude towards, the Soviet Union, Russia itself, and their host republics.

The confrontations of the late 1980s increased the split between Russian identity and the Soviet state and fostered the rise of the 'Russian national idea' (Melvin, 1995: 10). In 1991 'Russia found itself in a state of revolt against Moscow and "the centre"' (Szporluk 1994: 6). Thus the events of that time, apart from the personal struggle between Gorbachev and Yeltsin, represented *de facto* an uprising of Russia against the Union and the Russian against Soviet.

3.2.d. Contemporary Russian National Identity Politics

Two decades after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, today's Russia is still 'seeking to redefine its past as well as searching for an identity in the future' (Guroff and Guroff 1994: 98). The crisis of Russian national identity and the ways this state is attempting to adapt to the new geo-political situation is widely discussed both in Russia itself and abroad[22]. As Billington writes: '[w]hat has taken place is one of the most wide-ranging and many-voiced discussions about national identity and political legitimacy of modern times. In broad outline Russia is struggling between its authoritarian tradition and its new freedoms' (Billington and Parthé 2003: 4).

Although the Russian Constitution of 1993 states explicitly that Russia will have no state ideology, already in 1996 Yeltsin declared that in order to unite the population of the country a new ideology needs to be created (Kolstø 2004: 327). A team of aides was tasked to produce 'a new "Russian idea" […] another variant of a Russian "special path" a notion further developed under Vladimir Putin's rule' (Ryazanova-Clarke 2011: 3).

Researchers investigating the issue of post-communist identity describe it as a 'battlefield between different, often incompatible myths' that are 'able to inspire collective loyalties, affinities, passions and actions' (Tismaneanu 1998: 15). Igor Chubais, a philosopher of the 'Russian idea' and a member of the democratic movement in Russia from 1987-1992, terms the inconsistency of attempts to overcome the identity crisis as 'the mixed-salad alternative (*путь винегрета*). […] So, there is the official burial of the remains of Nicholas II, and the hospitably open doors of the Lenin Mausoleum, when the latter is responsible for having killed the former – and people bow respectfully to one and the other. We restore the Order of St. Andrew, and celebrate the anniversary of the KGB and the Young Communist League'. He adds, that '[t]hese are things that cannot be joined together – you either go in one direction or the other' (Billington and Parthé 2003: 63). Such a disparity in the area of official symbols reflects the ongoing search for national identity.

[22] See for example: Drobizheva 1998; Zaslavskaja 2000; Gudkov 2004; Kosmarskaya 2006; Tishkov 2008; Dawisha and Parrot 1994; Melvin 1995; Shalin 1996; Petersson 2001; Tolz 2001; Billington and Parthé 2003; Billington 2004.

In the late 1990s, James Billington and Kathleen Parthé ran three colloquia with a group of twenty-seven prominent Russian thinkers and politicians in order to investigate the prospects for the search for a Russian national identity in the post-Soviet era. During these seminars, the dominant conception was an idea of continuity and succession of pre-revolutionary Russian history and culture and thereby a distancing from the Soviet legacy. The politicians participating in the debates believed in the restoration of identity: 'Russia can link up with its traditions, with the logic of its development, with its history. […] We parted the Iron Curtain, but the red substructure that was built after 1917 still has not been dismantled. We understand that we have been cut off from the outside world, but we've understood only poorly how we were torn away from our own roots and our own history. The path of self-reunification is also a path of returning to our roots […]. This is the path to restore our identity' (Billington and Parthé 2003: 63).

However, from the beginning of the millennium, under Putin's rule, in official and public discourses the elements of the Soviet past are being widely used in the building of the new national Self. Serguei Oushakine argues that such a situation is a result of the inability of the state to provide proper 'signifiers for the signifieds of the new socio-political regime' (Oushakine 2000: 994). Deliberate usage of the Soviet cultural markers in the official national identity discourse serve as a means of construction of a common knowledge frame. In her analysis of the 'Direct Line with the President' (Putin's question and answer session with the general public), Lara Ryazanova-Clarke showed that during the conference both the president and journalists were referring widely to the common Soviet past in terms of heroic history, shared territory and international friendship between the former Soviet republics (Ryazanova-Clarke 2008: 320, 315, 318).

The search for the new Russian identity is challenged additionally by the contemporary post-imperial reality, where ethnic selves of the peoples of the Russian Federation are currently also at the stage of crystallisation. As Billington highlights, Russia, for the first time in history, is facing and attempting to reflect on the otherness inside itself (Billington 2004: 135-150; see also Popova 2012).

Without any doubt, the great Other for Russia remains the West, which 'continues to be a crucial factor in identity construction in Russian public discourses' and 'a constant

comparator against which Russian national qualities are interpreted' (Ryazanova-Clarke 2011: 16,12). The attitude to the concept traditionally keeps its ambiguity. On the one hand, the West emerges as an object worthy of emulation in terms of democratic rights and freedoms or social institutions. On the other hand, however, it is widely associated with globalisation and a drive for material goods and is opposed to Russian spirituality and uniqueness. As Ryazanova-Clarke states, the Russian public identity discourse 'demonstrates a combination of attraction and repulsion' of the West which 'emerges as an unreliable, scheming, and deceiving "Other", a place that needs to be constantly debunked for its spurious qualities, which in general are far inferior in comparison with those of Russia; but also as a place of decency and standards to be aspired to and as a model for reluctant followers to pursue' (*ibid.*: 16).

To sum up, on the one hand, the contemporary Russian national identity discourse demonstrates continuity in terms of an imperial and Soviet legacy and retains its ambiguous attitude to the West. On the other hand, it is challenged by the newly emerged ethnic consciousness of those peoples living within the territory of Russia, throughout the whole complexity of their relationships with the state.

In *Chapter Three* I have presented the theoretical background to the questions of migrants' identity, as well as migrants' attitudes to the native and the host countries. Moreover, I have analysed the Russian national identity discourse in diachronic perspective and demonstrated how particular cultural values as well as economic, social and political necessities determined the national identity construction in post-Soviet Russia. The next chapter will present the methodological framework of the thesis. It will also describe the procedures of data collecting and presentation. Finally, it will outline the ethical concerns connected with the research.

Chapter Four: Methodology

In *Chapter Four* I will establish research criteria in terms of objects and methods of investigation. I will also present and discuss the methodological framework which will be employed in further investigations as well as other methods which I will use in my analysis. I will point out their advantages and limitations and justify the suitability of my choices. Next, I will describe the participants of my research and procedures of data collecting and presenting. Finally, I will address the ethical issues affecting ethnography-oriented research.

4.1. Establishing Research Criteria

In order to investigate the linguistic performances of Russianness appearing in everyday family conversations and narratives it should be clearly decided how this problem should be examined in terms of the objects and methods of investigation.

First of all, it should be determined whether the language being used by community members in their family talks is an object or a resource of the analysis. According to the working definition that I proposed in Chapter Two, I consider identity as a discursive phenomenon (after Foucault 1972) which is situated not only in historical or cultural macro contexts but also in everyday life and therefore produced and shaped by interaction (after Mead 1934). Moreover, I view identity as a social phenomenon created by individuals in performances they play in social situations (after Goffman 1959, 1967) while the symbolic meanings conveyed by these performances are actively interpreted by all participants (after Blumer 1969). Therefore, in the framework of my thesis I do not concentrate on the structure of the language but rather on its use, and view it as a resource for examination of interactional events as well as wider discursive contexts, symbols, values, experiences and shared knowledge within which identity creations and performances take place.

Secondly, it should be settled, whether the analysis is focused on the process or content of the interactions presented. In my investigation I privilege the content of the conversations over the process of communication. It should be noted however, that my analysis will be strongly concerned with the interactional process itself, where the turn-by-turn development of a talk would enable me to make visible and discuss the dynamics of identity negotiations and re-negotiations as they unfold in a particular interactional event.

Thirdly, it should be decided whether the research uses quantitative or qualitative methods. Quantitative research is preoccupied with *representativeness* as the most important principle for data collection and interpreting (Silverman 1998: 70). It is focused also on 'exceptions and variation' of the norm (*ibid.*: 71). Such an approach rests on putting the problem into data and estimating the frequency of its occurrence instead of placing a version of this problem into data and attempting to explain what, how and why it occurs there (Sacks 1995). Following such theorists as Sacks (1995), Silverman (1998) or Garfinkel (2002) I am convinced that social forms as well as processes of their mediations are omnipresent and noticeable in every interactional data. It is not possible prior to analysis to tell whether and in what ways something is meaningful and significant (Sacks 1995: 31), but certainly 'if something matters it should be observable' (Silverman 2007: 29). Focusing on the everyday talks and interactions of ordinary people enables me to recognise and trace those values and features which are 'overwhelmingly true' (Silverman 1998: 71) to that aspect of social reality with which my work is concerned. Moreover, these recognised values and features are likely to evoke associations with other aspects of reality which will contribute to my investigation and of which I was not previously aware (Sacks 1995: 322, 323). Such a research perspective does not presuppose that finding meanings in the data is accomplished before the analysis but views the validity of research as dependent on the 'theoretically derived quality of the analysis' (Silverman 1998: 71).

Adopting such an approach to data collecting and analysis enables me to address the whole complexity of identity negotiations occurring in everyday settings. In order to put into practice the qualitative methods described above in the framework of my own research I employ methodological tools and strategies provided by the Sociocultural Linguistic Approach to interactional data proposed by Bucholtz and Hall (2005).

4.2. Methodological Framework: Sociocultural Linguistic Approach

In recent years the linguistic research of identity has increasingly become a focal subject for a range of disciplines including sociolinguistics or discourse analysis - which incorporate it in their own theoretical approaches and methodologies. The main aim of this thesis is to examine how the Russian diasporic identity is produced in conversations, interactions, and narratives appearing in families in everyday situations. Therefore from the variety of existing theories concerning these issues for the purpose of my own research I have adopted the sociocultural linguistic approach to identity as proposed by Mary Bucholtz and Kira Hall in their article 'Identity and Interaction: A Sociocultural Linguistic Approach' (2005). This theoretical framework allows me to consider insights from a variety of fields and to approach identity not as a stable construct situated predominantly in the individual psyche or in fixed social categories but as a relational and cultural phenomenon that emerges and exists in interactions placed in local discourse contexts. This comprehensive and detailed concept consolidates the theoretical findings I have presented in Chapter Two basing the study of identity on the empirical evidence of interaction and at the same time embedding the study of interaction in ethnography. Moreover, the researchers' view of the subject is based on the findings of social psychology including social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner 1979; Meyerhoff 1996; Meyerhoff and Niedzielski 1994) and speech accommodation theory (Giles et al. 1991). Apart from that, the theories of language ideology (Irvine and Gal 2000; Silverstein 1979) and indexicality (Ochs 1992; Silverstein 1976, 1985) from the field of linguistic anthropology, together with the sociolinguistic research in models of identity (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985) and theories of style (Eckert and Rickford 2001; Mendoza-Denton 2002), were especially informative of Bucholtz and Hall's notion of identity (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 586). Such a wide and comprehensive approach makes it possible to 'make sense of locally specific elements of interaction as well as to get at the sociocultural context in which interaction unfolds and to which it contributes' (Bucholtz and Hall 2008: 152).

This way of conceptualizing the relationship between identity and language derives from the researchers' 'deliberately broad and open-ended' definition of identity as 'the social positioning of self and other' (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 586). By using the term *sociocultural*

linguistics the authors mean the broad interdisciplinary area connecting language, society and culture. According to them this term 'encompasses the disciplinary subfields of sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, socially oriented forms of discourse analysis (such as conversational analysis and critical discourse analysis), and linguistically oriented social psychology' (*ibid.*). The main aim of the approach is not to introduce a new theory or outline new disciplinary borders, but rather to acknowledge the whole variety of existing work concerning the subject of language and identity and to propose an integrated tool for referring to this research.

The proposed framework challenges the supposition that society is inevitably reflected in language and that identity is determined *a priori*. The same concept can be found in the notion of 'demythologised' sociolinguistics (Cameron 1990) with its argument that "language itself must be seen as social structure, as structuring society' (Gafaranga 2005: 283). Likewise, in Bucholtz and Hall's concept the role of interaction in identity construction is privileged because it is exactly 'interactional moves' which are 'the building blocks of social life' and it is exactly through the interaction that identity acquires its social meaning (Bucholtz and Hall 2008: 158).

Bucholtz and Hall's *sociocultural linguistic approach* is built upon five fundamental principles:

1. *The emergence principle*: 'identity is best viewed as the emergent product rather than the pre-existing source of linguistic and other semiotic practices and therefore as fundamentally a social and cultural phenomenon' (2005: 588).
2. *The positionality principle:* 'identities encompass (a) macro level demographic categories; (b) local, ethnographically specific cultural positions; and (c) temporary and interactionally specific stances and participant roles' (2005: 592).
3. *The indexicality principle*: 'identity relations emerge in interaction through several related indexical processes, including: (a) overt mention of identity categories and labels; (b) implicatures and presuppositions regarding one's own or others' identity position; (c) displayed evaluative and epistemic orientations to ongoing talk, as well as interactional footings and participant roles; and (d) the use of linguistic structures and systems that are ideologically associated with specific personas and groups' (2005: 594).

4. *The relationality principle*: 'identities are intersubjectively constructed through several, often overlapping, complementary relations, including similarity/difference, genuineness/artifice, and authority/delegitimacy' (2005: 598).
5. *The partialness principle*: 'any given construction of identity may be in part deliberate and intentional, in part habitual and hence often less than fully conscious, in part an outcome of interactional negotiation and contestation, in part an outcome of others' perceptions and representations, and in part an effect of larger ideological processes and material structures that may become relevant to interaction. It is therefore constantly shifting both as interaction unfolds and across discourse contexts' (2005: 606).

4.2.a. Emergence Principle

The first, *emergence* principle, is a kind of response to the traditional view of identity as located essentially in the individual's mind. In such an approach the only possible relationship between language and identity is for language to depict the individual's internal states of mind. Bucholtz and Hall's own view of the problem derives from the concept of emergence in linguistic anthropology and interactional linguistics. In linguistic anthropology the idea of emergence was introduced by Dell Hymes. He considered linguistic performance as a dialogic rather than a monologic phenomenon what allowed him to comprehend 'structure as sometimes emergent in action' (Hymes 1975: 71). The idea was developed further by Richard Bauman and Charles Briggs who claimed that performance itself is emergent in the process of its unfolding in specific encounters (Bauman 1977; Briggs 1988; Bauman and Briggs 1990).

The concept of emergence is not new and is widely used across the various branches of sociocultural linguistics. The idea is present for example in West and Zimmermann's ethnomethodological study about 'doing' different kinds of identity (West and Zimmerman 1987), in Antaki and Widdicombe's conversation-analytic examination of identity as an interactionally related accomplishment (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998a) and in Butler's poststructuralist theory of performativity (Butler 1990). All of the above approaches, despite essential differences between them allow us to see the identity not only as a psychological device of self-classification reflected in individuals' social behavior but primarily as a

dynamic phenomenon which is still emergent and is produced and demonstrated through social action and through language in particular.

Bucholtz and Hall note that the identity as an emergent phenomenon is probably most apparent in those cases when the speakers' language use does not fit with the social category to which they are usually allocated, for example in cases of cross-gender performance or racial, ethnic or national boundary crossing. Such cases 'illustrate in diverse ways that identities as social processes do not precede the semiotic practices that call them into being in specific interactions' (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 588).

To display the *emergence* principle Bucholtz and Hall use two examples involving various groups of speakers. The first one depicts the discourse practices of hijras, a transgender category in India (Hall 1997). Hijras identify themselves as neither men not women although mostly they were born male. One of the methods available to them to distance themselves from their masculinity is the linguistic system of Hindi which requires defining gender while speaking. In the presented example the hijra reports the speech of the members of her family as referring to her in masculine gender while referring to herself in her own voice she uses feminine. Gender marking becomes here a linguistic tool used by hijra to constitute herself as a woman inversely to her family perception of her as a man and such identity positioning is determined by the demands of this particular interaction.

Bucholtz and Hall argue that the process of identity construction occurs in interaction every time one attributes a gender to another participant. The constant repetition of such practices produces not only gender identity of particular individuals but also a category of gender itself understood as a socially meaningful system (Butler 1990; West and Zimmerman 1987).

The second example concerns Korean American men's identities (Chun 2001). Most Asian Americans do not use English fitted with ethnically specific meanings therefore some of them employ elements of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) in order to position themselves in racist discourses. In the presented example a group of young Korean Americans uses elements of AAVE in order to critique white colleagues and the white people in general. The use of AAVE therefore becomes a tool for the refusal of dominant racial

ideology. The authors note that an antiracist Asian American identity in this case emerges in coalition with black and probably other people of colour.

In both of the above examples people use linguistic forms which usually are not 'ascribed' to their social categories but by the destruction of naturalised association the very usage of language produces the new forms of identity. These forms emerge in these particular situations and are dependent on the demands of the immediate social context.

The constant negotiations and re-negotiations of migrant identity between the discourses of the national and host culture are focal points for my research. Therefore I find it useful to employ the *emergency* principle proposed by Bucholtz and Hall for my own analysis in order to illustrate the performances of identity while crossing the boundaries of national or cultural allocations according to immediate demands of unfolding interactions occurring in everyday situations.

4.2.b. Positionality Principle

The second, *positionality* principle challenges another very prevalent idea of understanding identity simply as a set of social categories. This point of view is presented mainly in the quantitative social sciences which examine the relationship between social behavior and macro identity categories such as gender, age or social class. Identity seen as a wide social structure is typical for early variationist sociolinguistics (e.g. Labov 1966) and the sociology of language (Fishman 1971). Such an approach is particularly valuable for providing evidence of wide-ranging sociolinguistic tendencies but is probably less effective in depicting the more detailed and flexible kinds of identity occurring in local contexts. The analytic gap which arises underlines the meaning of ethnography which in turn enables the researcher to observe that apart from pure sociolinguistic categories language users often orient to locally significant identity categories and social styles. Moreover, account should be taken of micro details of identity created moment by moment in interaction, such as temporary roles and orientations of participants. These details 'no less than larger sociological and ethnographic identity categories contribute to the formation of subjectivity and intersubjectivity in discourse' (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 591).

To exemplify how macro level categories, locally specified positions and temporary interactional roles are reflected in identity workings, Bucholtz and Hall use two short extracts taken from ethnographic interviews conducted by Bucholtz with European American teenage girls. The girls grew up at the same town and were attending the same school so the language they used was comparably similar but the authors showed that through different uses of innovative quotative forms in their speech, the girls positioned themselves as different kinds of teenagers. The basic form of quotative marker is *'say'* but recently *'be like'* is widely adopted by American youth (Blyth et al. 1990; Dailey-O'Cain 2000) and *'be all'* especially on the West Coast (Waksler 2001). In the presented examples the authors show that by various combinations of usage of these new and old quotative markers the girls co-elaborate simultaneously the shared social macro level identity (the youth), local identity (members of the particular high school) and on the micro level ascribe to themselves the momentary interactional roles such as nerd or cool/popular student.

I find the *positionality* principle entirely applicable to my own research as well as to any research focusing on identity in interaction. This principle emphasises the importance of combining macro and micro levels of analysis and also highlights the fact that different types of positions on different levels usually appear at the same time in a single interaction. The temporary positions which members of Russian-speaking families take up during their everyday interactions may accumulate discursive associations with both large-scale and local categories of identity. Moreover this principle enables investigation of the workings of the interaction itself. By analysing the transitory positions of the interaction participants (such as topic initiator, topic supporter, listener etc.) it is possible to recognise the techniques and potential patterns of actions undertaken by parents in order to perform Russianness in front of their children and the contingent reactions of the children to these performances.

4.2.c. Indexicality Principle

The third principle of the presented methodological framework relates to *indexicality* seen as a 'mechanism whereby identity is constructed' (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 593). This mechanism is essential for understanding the way in which various linguistic forms are used

to produce identity positions. The principle is based on Silverstein's early work in which he considered the index, in its basic meaning, as a particular linguistic form. The meaning of this form depends on the interactional context in which it appears (Silverstein 1976). In Silverstein's later work, as in Ochs' research, the study of indexicality was developed further. These authors presented the concept of indexicality which engages with the creation of semiotic relationships between particular linguistic forms and the social meanings they obtain in the interactional situations. Moreover, the researchers claimed that indexical processes are deeply immersed in ideological structures, cultural beliefs and values and arise at all levels of language structure and use (Silverstein 1985; Ochs 1992).

Particularly important for Bucholtz and Hall's understanding of *indexicality* are works of sociocultural linguists studying processes of labeling and categorisation which are understood as social actions used to address the question of identity (e.g. Sacks 1995; Murphy 1997). 'The circulation of such categories within ongoing discourse, their explicit or implicit juxtaposition with other categories, and the linguistic elaborations and qualifications they attract (predicates, modifiers, and so on) all provide important information about identity construction' (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 594). For example, the very identity label 'hijra' from the sample described above has a very strong derogatory meaning while associated in everyday discourse with impotence and places hijras outside normative Indian family structures (Hall 1997).

Equally important for developing the concept of *indexicality* is research concerning the less direct strategies for positioning self and other in discourse – implicature (Liang 1999) and presupposition (Ehrlich 2001), as well as work by Du Bois (2002) for the analysis of stance, demonstrating the ways in which other dimensions of interaction can be sources for identity creation. Liang, for example, argues that lesbians and gay men while interacting in a wider company use implicatures such as gender-neutral references to their lovers in order to avoid possible hostile reactions from the outgroup members (Liang 1999). Ehrlich (2001) on the other hand investigates how individuals are being placed in discourses through use of presuppositions. In her research she analyses the college rape tribunal hearings and shows how the defense exploits presuppositions to present rape victims as powerful and in sexual control. Repeated references to the actions, choices and behavior of the attacked women presuppose that they could prevent the situations. In such a way defenses frame these women

as agents or at least willing participants in the whole set of actions contrary to the prosecution's presentation of them as victims.

A similarly indirect strategy for discursive positioning of self and other is presented in recent work on stance (Du Bois 2002; Jaffe 2009). Du Bois, for example, describes stance as social action: 'I evaluate something, and thereby position myself, and align or disalign with you' (Du Bois 2002: 47). He highlights the multidimensional character of stance and distinguishes three points important for fully understanding stance. Firstly, the researcher should locate the 'stance taker' concerning all the available information (e.g. relations with the participants, gender, ethnic, regional categories, accent, voice quality, intonation etc.). Secondly, the object of stance, or what exactly the participants are evaluating, should be located. Finally, the researcher should be aware to what stance the 'stance taker' is responding and why such a response occurs under the present circumstances (Du Bois 2007: 163).

Another approach concerning the principle of reflecting on the interactional roles of participants' conversation and focusing on the linguistic marking of a speaker's orientation to the unfolding interaction was proposed by Erving Goffman (see Chapter Two) in his work on footing, participant roles, and participation frameworks (1974: 1981). Similar concepts appeared in related fields, including conversation analysis (Heritage and Raymond 2005), social psychology (Davies and Harré 1990) and language and gender research (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2003) among others.

Tracing the way in which stances coalesce into more durable identity structures is made possible by examination by Ochs and Taylor of family dinnertime narratives (1995). The researchers analyse a dinnertime conversations between a middle-class, heterosexual European American couple. At first they distinguish such interactional roles as primary teller, primary recipient or protagonist and then show that such distribution of gendered momentary interactional roles is true not only for this conversation but also for other conversations between demographically similar married couples they recorded. Therefore it is possible to make the generalisation that gendered identities built in interaction concern not only couples but specific kinds of couples and consequently have not only local but also broader characteristics. The researchers argue that interactional identities produced through stance by

constant repetition expand into more stable identities such as gender and also shape the rules of gender appropriate interactional practices.

In the field of style, understood as a repertoire of linguistic forms associated with personas or identities, Bucholtz and Hall's *indexicality* principle is based on the study of such researchers as Bell (1984), Coupland (1980) or Eckert (2000). Bucholtz and Hall argue that 'social meanings of style often require ethnographic investigation to uncover groups that may seem homogeneous through a wider analytic lens, but become sharply differentiated when ethnographic details are brought into close focus' (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 597). Moreover the researchers highlight the importance of the work in the field of language and globalisation and language choice, especially the findings of Besnier (2004) and Hall (2003).

Besnier, for example, in his study of conversations taking place at the secondhand market in Tonga shows that in the dialogue between a seller and a buyer they both use English rather than Tongan (Besnier 2004). Moreover, the seller use New Zealand style English instead of Tongan-accented English. The author claims that the language choice in this particular situation builds the speakers identity as modern and cosmopolitan (where New Zealand English displays even further cosmopolitanism of the seller) and shows how the workings of the processes of globalisation influence the everyday lives of ordinary people.

The *indexicality* principle and the methods it brings with it emphasise the great variety of the linguistic resources that contribute to the interactional production of identity which is the focus for my research. By simultaneously analysing the identity structure appearing in everyday interactions at different indexical levels rather than concentrating on only one, it is possible to achieve a more comprehensive and multidimensional depiction of the phenomenon.

4.2.d. Relationality Principle

The aim of the fourth, *relationality* principle, is to emphasise the fact that identity is never independent but always obtains its social meaning in relation to other available identities presented by other participants of social action at a given moment. The relations presented in

this principle were comprehensively described by the authors in their earlier works (Bucholtz and Hall 2004a, 2004b) with the reservation that the list of identity relations 'is not intended to be exhaustive but rather suggestive of the different dimensions of relationality created through identity construction' (2005: 599).

Similarity/Difference. In the first of three pairs presented in the framework, the term *similarity* (or adequation, in Bucholtz and Hall's words) highlights the fact that 'in order for groups or individuals to be positioned as alike, they need not – and in any case cannot – be identical, but must merely be understood as sufficiently similar for current interactional purposes' (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 599). For example, in the case described above (Chun 2001), the Korean Americans, by using elements of AAVE, do not position themselves as black but as non-white and opposed to the ideology of white racism. In such a way they represent themselves as not as identical but similar (adequate) enough in identity to African Americans to make a common case with them in this particular situation.

On the other hand, *difference* (distinction) focuses on the aspect of differentiation of being a highly visible process and also the most broadly discussed in sociolinguistic identity research. Bucholtz and Hall claim that '[j]ust as adequation relies on the suppression of social differences that might disrupt a seamless representation of similarity, distinction depends on the suppression of similarities that might undermine the construction of difference' (2005: 600). It is clearly evident that in the above example concerning the Tongan market place (Besnier, 2004) the similarity between English-speaking modernity and cosmopolitanism is identified by the interaction between the seller and the buyer. At the same time, however, an evident distinction is created: by using the more prestigious New Zealand variety of English the seller not only associates herself with modernity but also separates herself from the local lower-class identity.

Genuineness/Artifice. The second pair of intersubjective relationships is described by the authors as authentication and denaturalisation and is understood as the processes by which participants of the conversation respectively make their claims to realness and artifice. *Genuineness* concentrates on the means by which identities are discursively verified, while *artifice* focuses on how 'assumptions regarding the seamlessness of identity can be disrupted' (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 601). Both relationships are linked with authenticity – that is, what

kinds of language and its users are recognised as genuine or valid for a given situation. The authors however highlight the distinction between authenticity understood as an inherent essence and authentication which has temporary interactional character and is seen 'as a social process played out in discourse' (*ibid.*).

To illustrate the phenomenon of authentication Bucholtz and Hall use Bauman's analysis of Icelandic legends about the kraftaskáld, a poet possessing magical powers (Bauman 1992). In his study Bauman identifies the opening and closing parts of the narrative as the places where the narrator authenticates both the story and also himself as its teller. The author claims that by using detailed descriptions of the circumstances in which the teller heard the story such as '*I don't remember that now*' or '*Gudrún, his daughter, told my father this story*' (Bauman 1992: 130) he provides the confirmation for his right to tell it. In such a way he authenticates both the narrative itself and also his interactional identity as its narrator.

In denaturalisation, conversely, the rightness and legitimacy of identity is undermined. Denaturalisation concerns the ways in which identity is false or infringes ideological expectations. In his study on the identity of Dominican Americans Bailey underlines that in the US racial context their language-based Spanish identity is shifted to African American or just black identity because of their phenotype (Bailey 2000). In Bailey's example two Dominican American teenage boys conspire in jest against the girl from their school in order to convince her that one of the boys is black, not Spanish. They collaboratively create and unfold a false ethnic identity of the boy as black by referring to his made-up alleged black origins. At the end of the interaction the boy manifestly destroys his only just created identity by speaking Spanish fluently and in such a way exposes himself as 'not really' black. This sample contradicts the dominant assumptions that black skin necessarily means a black identity and hence denaturalises the dominant American racial ideology.

The last pair of relations, *authority/delegitimacy* (authorisation/illegitimation) is concerned with structural and institutional facets of identity construction. *Authority* means 'the affirmation or imposition of an identity through structures of institutionalised power and ideology, whether local or translocal', while *delegitimacy* 'addresses the ways in which identities are dismissed, censored, or simply ignored by these same structures' (2005: 603).

The depiction of authorisation has been demonstrated, for example, in an analysis of president Putin's 'Direct Line' – an annual live questions and answers session with Russian citizens (Ryazanova-Clarke, 2008a). It has been shown that throughout the president's speech he uses first-person plural pronouns '*we*' or '*our*' in order to unite the president and his administration with Russia in general and to construct a shared national identity. This construction is strengthened by Putin's ability as president to position himself as if speaking on behalf of the whole nation. Using his presidential position during the Direct Line he creates and authorises ideological knowledge about what the Russian nation is today.

The processes of authorisation and illegitimation could certainly occur even without the presence of any palpable authority. In the following example Park shows how the dynamics of interaction itself may support ideological structures (Park 2004; in Bucholtz and Hall 2005). Investigating ideologies of English language in Korea, Park notes that if one of the participants is speaking English fluently it is seen as culturally inappropriate or un-Korean. The conversation takes place between young Korean men attending one of the American graduate schools. The participants mock an absent Korean friend who left a message on the answer-phone in which he used an Americanised pronunciation of the word *Denver*. By repeating the pronunciation of the word in various manners and laughing, the participants show that the pronunciation of their friend was inappropriate for a Korean. In doing this they co-produce a shared national language ideology in order to deligitimise an Americanised identity considered inappropriate in this situation.

This set of pairs of intersubjective relations proposed by Bucholtz and Hall in their *relationality* principle is not intended to be either comprehensive or complete. It rather aims to suggest the variety of ranges of relationality and to show the different ways in which it works through discourse, while the principle itself stresses that identity emerges only in relation to other identities and acquires its meaning in interaction.

One of the aims of this thesis is to examine intergenerational interactions appearing in families in everyday life. Therefore the *relationality* principle proposed by Bucholtz and Hall is also valuable for my own analysis. Firstly it allows the viewing of identity not as existing autonomously but only in relationship with other identity positions available at the same moment. Secondly it widens the oversimplified understanding of identity relations as simply

an oscillation between two single features: sameness and difference. The nature of the relationship between a parent and a child is primarily asymmetrical. This asymmetry results not only from established power positions within the family but also from social and cultural background knowledge, practical experience and skillfulness. By approaching the identity as shaped by complementary interactional relations described in the *relationality* principle it is possible to trace the linguistic choices that parents make to build the strategies which they use to influence or control their children as well as the linguistic choices made by the children responding to those actions. Moreover, such an approach brings into the focus of the analysis both an immediate interactional situation and a larger cultural context.

4.2.e. Partialness Principle

The last, *partialness* principle challenges the widespread attitude to analysing forms of social life seen as internally coherent. The principle develops from a postmodern critique of this analytical perspective and relies on the ethnographically based view that all manifestations of culture are essentially 'partial accounts' (Clifford and Marcus 1986: 19). In such an approach the reality itself is seen as intersubjective in nature and built through the details of self and other in any particular encounter. This point of view corresponds with the postmodern understanding of identity as fragmentary and scrappy. As Visweswaran writes, 'Identities are constituted by context and are themselves asserted as partial accounts' (1994: 41). Because of the relational character of identity 'it will always be partial, produced through contextually situated and ideologically informed configurations of self and other. Even seemingly coherent displays of identity, such as those that pose as deliberate and intentional, are reliant on both interactional and ideological constraints for their articulation' (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 605).

Moreover, the proposed principle allows clarification of the role of agency vs. structure in identity workings. Bucholtz and Hall theorise that agency is much broader than a merely individualistic and fully deliberate action. In recent research especially within sociocultural linguistics the agency is considered in regard to its utility for work on identity. The researchers do not try to estimate the degree of autonomy/dependence or intentionality/accidentality in any particular act but rather note the agency as the accomplishment of social action (Ahearn 2001). Such an understanding of agency is essential

for any discipline trying to consider simultaneously the whole complexity of social subjects together with discourses and larger cultural and power structures which limit, constrain and shape them, especially in respect of sociocultural linguistics because the very use of language is an act of agency itself (Duranti 2004: 455).

Using the methods proposed by the *partialness* principle enables the making visible and discussing the dynamic, multivariant and complex nature of identity. Moreover it enables the avoidance of an oversimplified dichotomy between structure and agency since they are working together as elements of micro and macro articulations of identity. Adhering to this principle in my own analysis allows me to demonstrate a 'mosaic' nature of identity in which family habits and customs, intentional or accidental actions, interactional negotiations and not only the tiniest movements but also the larger ideological and cultural contexts of both native and host countries are all equally important as components of a larger picture.

The five principles proposed by Bucholtz and Hall represent the various approaches researchers use in order to examine different aspects of identity. As the authors mention, 'it is not a matter of choosing one of these aspects […] over others, but of considering how some or all of them may potentially work with or against one another in discourse' (2005: 607).

Such a combined sociocultural linguistic approach, including the micro level of conversation analysis and the macro level analysis of ideological, historical and cultural processes, qualitative analysis of linguistic structures along with a particular ethnographic focus on local contexts allows the researcher not only to understand 'interaction from the point of view of those who participate in it, but also [to] view talk not as a chunk of text removed from any broader context but as a dynamic interactional process embedded in and inseparable from the social and cultural world from which it emerges' (Bucholtz and Hall 2008: 152).

The sociocultural context provides the deeper understanding of initial conversational or narrative data and allows the researcher to recognise the social, cultural or historical patterns and categories to which participants orient in their interaction. It also allows the linking of

particular linguistic patterns to interactional procedures and subsequently to wider identities rooted in social and cultural processes, history and ideologies.

Currently the sociocultural linguistic approach proposed by Bucholtz and Hall is being widely used by scholars studying language and identity in interaction. For example Ashley Williams (2008) investigates family members' different stances regarding Mandarin language and each other in a conversation in a Cantonese/English bilingual family in the USA. In her analysis of a conversation between an English-dominant daughter and Cantonese-dominant parents concerning the importance of learning Mandarin, Williams demonstrates that the speakers both valuate Mandarin as 'necessary' and 'easy' to learn but at the same time as 'different' and its speakers as 'annoying'. In order to broaden the social background of analysis the researcher uses the idea of 'brought-along' identities, which highlights the spatial and temporal displacements of the identity in immigrant communities. In the presented example the ideology of positive language valuation coexists smoothly with more negative and xenophobic attitudes. Moreover, at the interactional level of analysis Williams shows that these valuations are directly connected to the interactional goals which the participants have in their expression of these particular views.

Using Bucholtz and Hall's methodology Holly Cashman (2008) explores how children can adopt and use impoliteness as a conversational resource for constructing and negotiating identities during interaction with their peers. The researcher describes several examples of Spanish/English conversations between pupils participating in collaborative activities in one of the American schools. The English-speaking monolingual teacher asks two bilingual boys to help a new Spanish-speaking monolingual pupil and in doing so unwittingly enables them to bully him verbally in Spanish with impunity. In her analysis Cashman shows how by using code-switching, incorrect behaviour and other interactional resources the children align themselves with and against other students and through these alignments they maintain both local identities such as offender/victim, leader/follower and broader social categories such as gender or ethnicity. Cashman refers to the local contexts but also to the broader context of language and nationality ideologies and demonstrates how the discourses of ethnic and social inequalities are reflected in interaction.

Similarly Helena Bani-Shoraka (2008) by following Bucholtz and Hall's framework together with conversation and membership categorisation analysis, investigates the use of hypothetical future dialogues creating identity representations in informal talks between female members of a bilingual Azerbaijani family in Iran. By engaging in the co-construction of hypothetical dialogues between persons known to the participants, the female relatives show their disobedience or disagreement toward these persons without breaking the existing social hierarchies. Bani-Shoraka demonstrates how by using various interactional resources such as style-shifting, mode of addressing or choice of medium (Azerbaijani, Persian or Stylised Persian) the women create different characters presented in their dialogues. By using these resources the speakers index various ideological configurations at different moments while the interaction unfolds. The researcher traces the complex links between interactional moves and dominant discourses and shows empirically how the speakers use their knowledge about these discourses in their bilingual practices.

Similarly Lisa Del Torto (2008) by using this methodology investigates intergenerational practices of language brokering among Italian immigrant families in America and Canada. She describes how second-generation immigrants, who as children served as interpreters to their Italian-speaking parents, now as adults extend their language brokering practices in the family by interpreting between their Italian-dominant parents and English-dominant children. The researcher points out the importance of the temporal dimension of identity creation: she argues that identity does not simply emerge in a single interaction but rather is produced by the accumulation of various interactional stances and positions over a period of time. The role of a language broker which lasts for many years may be so integrated in the second-generation speakers' identity that the tiniest interactional problem between the first and third generations immediately pushes him or her to intervention and mediation. Del Torto argues that such a behaviour has both interactional and ideological demands and is based on the second-generation's perception of themselves as 'in-betweeners', as bilingual and bicultural in contrast to their relatives. Moreover, she notes that this very generation, especially women, joins the families together linguistically and culturally.

One more example concerning the use of the sociocultural linguistic approach in identity studies is presented in Katherine Chen's (2008) analysis of the use of a distinctive code-switching style by Cantonese/English bilingual young people who have returned to Hong

Kong after studying or living abroad. The researcher distinguishes between the 'returnee' code-switching style and the local one. She highlights that this difference is especially meaningful while positioning and repositioning the speakers in the local society. In the data presented by Chen, the seemingly more privileged group of returnees (who had the possibility to study overseas) were compelled to conform to the less privileged group of locals in order to protect themselves from peer scolding. The returnees (who, against the local norms were using English more widely) were perceived by locals as 'pretentious', the same were valuations of the locals of English language regarding Cantonese language. What is remarkable is that in her analysis Chen approaches the code-switching not at the interactional level but rather at the level of indexicality, as a semiotic marker of social identity demonstrating its direct connection to the social benefits, privileges and hierarchies.

Although in their framework Bucholtz and Hall do not initially intend to focus on bilingual interaction the examples presented above show that a sociocultural linguistic approach is also effective in this area of studies. The described examples draw from a large variety of regions, languages and situational contexts and similarly investigate a wide range of identity types beginning with macro level identities such as gender, ethnic or national, and finishing with micro level identities such as family members, classmates or friends. Such a broad area of research presented above demonstrates that Bucholtz and Hall's methodology can be adopted specifically for various kinds of empirical studies and is easily compatible with other research perspectives regarding the creation, negotiation and presentation - the accomplishing identity in interaction.

The performing of national identity in everyday life among the Russian-speaking families living in Scotland is the main focus of this thesis. Therefore I find the sociocultural linguistic approach proposed by Bucholtz and Hall (2005) and the methods it brings with it of the utmost value in my own work.

First of all, such a multidisciplinary approach allows the uncovering of the dynamic, multifaceted and complex nature of identity. It enables the tracing of the very process of creation and re-creation of Russian national identity by parents in concert with or contrary to the expectations and anticipations of their children and is concurrent and dependent on the demands of the immediate interactional situation. Moreover, it highlights the temporality and

fluidity of the phenomenon which is emergent moment-by-moment and achieves its symbolic meaning in a single interaction.

Secondly, such an approach allows focusing on the intergenerational character of the analysed interactions. Because of the relational nature of identity it cannot exist autonomously but only according to other identity positions available in a particular moment. The identity positions of the parent and child are primarily unequal in terms of their power relations, authority, social and cultural background knowledge, experience. The proposed approach not only facilitates the monitoring of the ways parents use their superiority in order to influence and control their children on the family level, but is also used to examine children's responses to the parent's actions.

Moreover, the sociocultural linguistic approach provides the necessary tool kit for analysing a great variety of linguistic and interactional resources that contribute to the production of identity in conversations and narratives occurring in everyday situations. Analysing the identity created in family talks simultaneously at different indexical levels achieves a more comprehensive and multidimensional depiction of the subject. This approach allows the investigation of the linguistic choices and recognition of the techniques, strategies and possible patterns of linguistic behaviour which the parents undertake in order to perform Russianness in front of their children and also the children's linguistic and interactional reactions to these performances.

Eventually, drawing on this approach acknowledges the view of the identity as multilayered and operating simultaneously on the macro level categories and ethnographically informed cultural positions and micro level interactional stances and participant roles. This approach enables, on the one hand, the linkage of everyday family interactions with the locally specific ethnographic elements which assign these interactions with social meaning, and ground them within the broader social, cultural and ideological contexts. On the other hand, it allows the investigation of how higher level sociocultural and socio-political processes and ideologies are reflected in everyday life, how they influence it and how they are employed by the members of Russian-speaking family members in the process of identity work.

4.3. Other qualitative methods

In order to uncover the dynamic, contradictory and complex nature of identity, apart from Sociocultural Linguistic Approach which allows considering insights from a variety of fields and disciplines, this thesis exploits also other qualitative micro and macro level research perspectives: Conversational Analysis, Narrative Analysis and Membership Categorisation Analysis. Moreover, it should be noted, that in order to gain a more comprehensive view of the phenomenon the methods exploited in this dissertation are constantly open to influence from other research perspectives.

4.3.a. Conversational Analysis

The everyday conversations between the members of Russian-speaking families occurring in natural settings are the focus of this thesis. That is why using Conversational Analysis (CA) (Sacks 1984a, 1984b; Schegloff 1992, 1996) and its methods is essential to my research. As an approach derived from ethnomethodology, CA is concerned with 'people's methods' and aims to 'take singular sequences of conversation and tear them apart in such a way as to find rules, techniques, procedures methods, maxims […] that can be used to generate the orderly features' (Sacks 1984b: 413). CA adopts a context-bound, indexical view of identity oriented to 'production and accomplishment of interaction' (Benwell and Stokoe 2006: 36). Its aim is to show that 'context and identity have to be treated as inherently locally produced, incrementally developed, and, by extension, as transformable at any moment' (Heritage 2005: 111) according to the unfolding momentary demands of the sequential environment of the conversation.

Being a micro level empirical approach, CA focuses on the turn-by-turn organisation and sequencing of the talk, and is the only approach enable to reflect intergenerational character of the interactions I study. What is especially important for my own research is that by employing this approach in the study of identity, the researcher does not assume its relevance ahead of his or her analysis and instead concentrates on what the participants themselves orient to in their interaction. 'Showing that some orientation to context is demonstrably

relevant to the participants is important […] in order to ensure that what informs the analysis is what is relevant to *the participants in its target event*, and not what is relevant in the first instance to its academic analysts by virtue of the set of analytic and theoretical commitments which they bring to their work' (Schegloff 1992: 192).

In order to trace the meaning-making practices to which the participants orient themselves while the interaction unfolds and which contribute the identity construction, I investigate the ways conversational exchange is organised. I analyse how and by whom a particular topic is introduced and which potential responses, according to participants' competences, shared knowledge and temporary interactional roles (e.g. listener, topic initiator, supporter) this introduction may cause. Then, I examine which conversational devices (e.g. rejection, ascription, confirmation etc.) the participants exploit in their response to this introduction. Finally, I investigate the ways the participants indicate the completion of the conversational sequence.

In my analysis I focus also on such semiotic information incorporated in pieces of conversation such as intonation, distribution of pauses, prosody, breathiness, laughter and so on. I am not concerned, however, with the absolute value of these elements of turn-by-turn organisation of a talk. For example, the exact length of a particular pause or the direction of a breath (in-breath or out-breath). These semiotic resources interest me in terms of the functions they carry out in a particular interaction, in terms of the meanings the participants assign to them and in terms of the ways the participants employ them in achieving their goals in the frame of a particular conversation.

The micro level turn-by-turn indexical analysis of everyday conversations enables me to visualise and discuss which categories, accounts, values are meaningful to the social actors and how they become noticed, recognised and accounted to them in interaction. Moreover, it allows reflection about the dynamic, fluid and constantly shifting nature of identity and the tracing of the process of its negotiations and performances in the frames of unfolding conversational settings.

4.3.b. Narrative Analysis

In order to contribute the examination of discursive construction of identity for the purpose of my thesis I adopt also a macro level empirical methodology offered by narrative analysis.

The telling of stories is a prevailing part of social life. Through storytelling people recollect, recount, reappraise and reflect on their lives and lives of others. People's lives become coherent and meaningful due to the narrative work they do in everyday settings. 'Through life stories individuals and groups make sense of themselves; they tell what they are or what they wish to be, as they tell so they come, they *are* their stories' (Cortazzi 2001: 388).

I understand identity as performed rather than primordial, as dynamic rather than static, as embedded in society, culture and history, as constantly constructed and re-constructed in interactions, as fluid, ambiguous and highly situational phenomenon. Thus, the detailed analysis of the practice of family narrations occurring in everyday settings enables me to detect and discuss the possible patterns and strategies of 'doing' of identity by members of the Russian-speaking community living in Scotland.

In my analysis I do not focus on the internal structure or particular structural components of the narratives, but rather, approaching them from a conversation analytic perspective, I concentrate on how they are co-constructed and managed turn-by-turn in unfolding interaction, which interactional functions they have (e.g. to inform, amuse, complain, justify etc.) and how these functions are accomplished.

The everyday stories which people tell about themselves and others do not exist in a vacuum but are necessarily connected in some way to wider cultural stories and discourses - to master narratives, while social actors 'when they speak, do not create their own language, but they use terms which are culturally, historically and ideologically available' (Billig 2001: 217-18). People are engaged in a continuous process of production and reproduction of the world through their words. In my thesis I consider a master narrative both as a founding myth or idea and at the same time as a frame of interpretation. Thus, the meaning and significance of the narratives appearing in everyday interactions cannot be recognised hermeneutically inside

the narratives themselves - in the plotlines or particular events described - but should be comprehended taking into account their wider discursive context. The implication of the signifiers can be identified through the analysing of 'their associations with, and oppositions to, other signifiers prevalent in the discourse from which the respective narratives spring' (Urban 1998: 972).

My analysis of identity narratives occurring in everyday settings is influenced also by Positioning Theory (Davies and Harré 1990; Harré and Moghaddam 2003; Bamberg 2004). The methods offered by this theory enable me to trace the co-construction of the selves in the narratives between the storyteller and audience. The term 'positioning' refers to the process through which the participants of the interaction, by preserving individual agency in identity construction, offer, resist, adopt, refuse, modify – through which they negotiate various subject positions available in master narratives or discourses.

In my analysis I attempt to trace the ways in which the narrator makes his/her preferred identity claims in a particular narrative and the ways these claims are linked to the wider discursive contexts. Moreover, I try to identify the potential strategies or patterns he/she uses to construct and offer this identity to the listener(s). I also try to make visible and discuss other identities which are being offered or suggested in the frames of the analysed narrative. Employing the conversation analytical approach to storytelling, I investigate the responses of the audience to the offers made by the narrator and the influence of these responses on the further development of the narrative and its interpretation by the participants of the interaction. In doing this I identify the elements of shared knowledge (discursive categories or accounts, labels, names, symbols, values, descriptions) which social actors notice, distinguish, recognise as relevant, significant and meaningful for the creation and performance of their Russianness in the stories they tell in everyday settings.

4.3.c. Membership Categorisation Analysis

For the purpose of this thesis in order to examine discourse mechanisms through which the members of Russian-speaking families ascribe themselves and each others to particular categories and construct and reconstruct memberships across various sets of references

bolstering identity negotiations, I also adopt the methodology of Membership Categorisation Analysis (MCA). As an approach rooted in ethnomethodology, MCA focuses on 'the organisation of common-sense knowledge in terms of the categories members employ in accomplishing their activities in and through talk' (Francis and Hester 2004: 21) and, what is most important, on the participants' methods, rules and patterns through which memberships and identity negotiations are generated and applied in interactional settings - issues which this thesis aims to investigate.

'Membership of a category is ascribed (and rejected), avowed (and disavowed), displayed (and ignored) in local places and at certain times, and it does these things as part of the interactional work that constitutes people's lives' (Antaki and Widdicombe 1998b: 2). In line with Sacks (1995) I treat talk as a *culture in action* (see also Hester and Eglin, 1997). Everyday ordinary talks make visible how categories are being linked and unlinked in interaction by native speakers of a culture. As Widdicombe notes, '[T]he fact that categories are conventionally associated with activities, attributes, motives and so on makes them a powerful cultural resource in warranting, explaining and justifying behaviour' (1998: 53). These activities, experiences, values or descriptions associated with particular categories represent a part of the common knowledge sharing between the participants of the interactions, while the common knowledge functions as the marker of belongingness to these categories. It is through negotiation of this knowledge, through approving, resisting, correcting or challenging of the proposed associations the memberships are constructed and reconstructed within a particular interaction. Analysing these sets of associations and categories to which they become discursively ascribed enables me to demonstrate and discuss how, by recognizing and orienting themselves towards them in particular ways, the members of Russian-speaking families construct, negotiate and perform their identities in everyday settings.

The methods that I use to carry out this analysis consist in tracing the ways in which the categories are established and used by the social actors in the variety of interactional situations. Firstly, I identify a choice of category-bound features (e.g. objects, symbols, values) across the multiple conversational events, which the participants use in their actions to evoke an association to a particular category. Secondly, I discuss how these features were introduced and what kind of action (e.g. ascription, correction, rejection) they cause. Lastly, I

analyse the responses generated in order to show the relevance (or irrelevance) of a particular category-bound feature.

The methodological procedures outlined above enable me to show how the interactional moves in which the members of Russian-speaking community engage in their everyday lives, are constructed, performed and become recognizable through categorisational work. Moreover it allows me to demonstrate how within this work the participants position themselves and each other in regard to the diversity of categories associated with various aspects of reality and in so doing create, negotiate and perform their identities within the proposed categories.

4.4. The Participants and Data Collecting

My academic interest in the Russian community living in Scotland is closely intertwined with my personal experiences. Being myself an immigrant to Great Britain, I am also a mother of bilingual children, a teacher at the 'Russian Edinburgh' School and an active member of the Russian community living in Edinburgh. The position of researcher, who is at the same time deeply engaged with the subject of the investigation, has its own benefits and concerns. How this affects the study, will be discussed by me later in this chapter.

The subject of my research is the Russian-speaking community in its widest sense. This group includes former and present Russian citizens living at the moment in Scotland, as well as Russian-speaking immigrants from other post-Soviet republics, including the Baltic states. This group represents the last wave of migration from the former USSR, which started after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990s and continues to the present day. The participants in my research are mainly middle-class educated specialists who came to Scotland mainly for professional reasons[23].

The main criterion for selection of the representative group of adults is the informant's declaration that Russian is his/her native or first language. Moreover, potential participants

[23] The more detailed description of the contemporary Russian migrants is given in Chapter One.

should identify with Russian nationality[24] and culture. Apart from that, the necessary condition for participation is the fact, that the language of family conversation (at least between a Russian-speaking parent and a child/children, in case of mixed couples) is Russian.

There are eight families involved in my research. Apart from Edinburgh, the participants' families are settled in Glasgow, Dunfermline, Longniddry and Jedburgh. In some of them both parents are Russian-speaking, in others - one of the parents/carers is English-speaking. The data collected includes only conversations in the Russian language between Russian-speaking parents and their children.

The representative group of adults is aged 38-55. This choice of age group is not random. The selection of this particular group was determined by its unique socio-cultural location. These people (including myself) are representatives of the 'last Soviet generation' or 'generation of transition'[25] in Byford's words, who where 'born in the former USSR roughly between the deaths of Stalin in 1953 and Brezhnev in 1982, [and] whose formative identifications are therefore rooted, somewhat peculiarly, in a state and society that are no more' (Byford 2009: 62,55).

The younger generation of participants are children aged 5-16 who were born in Great Britain or who came here at a very early age but for whom Russian language remains the first or native language. All of them are former or present pupils of the 'Russian Edinburgh' Saturday School.

The 'Russian Edinburgh' School is an initiative of Russian-speaking parents in Scotland and a recognised Scottish Charity established in 2004. It is 'a voluntary association with its main purpose being to help bilingual children and their families integrate into life in Scotland. The centre aims to break down the barriers of social isolation, to build up confidence and create opportunities for skill development for members of the Russian-speaking community' (Russian Edinburgh, Homepage). At the moment the school includes more that 100 pupils and offers several classes and subjects taught by qualified teachers: Russian, Russian Literature and History, Art, Maths and also Russian as a foreign language for adults. The

[24] I address the issue of Russian national identity in Chapter Three.
[25] Compare Oushakine (2000: 992).

school is also an organiser of social events for the community, such as: 'Russian poetry seasonal festivals, New Year, Easter and Maslenitsa celebrations, Russian sightseeing excursions' (*ibid.*) and many others.

The 'Russian Edinburgh' School brings together not only ethnically Russian, Belarusian or Ukrainian families (peoples usually given the common label 'Russian'), but also families where none of the parents are in any way connected with the aforementioned ethnicities: Armenian, Azerbaijani, Lithuanian or Kyrgyz families, together with mixed couples from the former Soviet Union and Great Britain[26].

The group of people participating in my research was thoroughly informed about the aims and objectives of my investigation. I have explained to them the methods of data collection and assured them of their anonymity and the possibility of stopping cooperation in every stage of the investigation. The ethical questions connected with the conducting of a participant involved research I address later in this chapter.

The empirical data for my research includes sixteen hours of audio recordings of family conversations and narratives occurring within the everyday environment. Each family has recorded approximately two hours of conversational material. The participants were equipped with an audio recording device (Olympus Digital Voice Recorder VN-7800) and were asked to record their conversations in their own homes without my presence, whenever they felt comfortable with this. Such a method of data collection is used for example by Jennifer Coates (1996; 2003) in her analysis of identity construction in everyday conversation. This approach enables participants to feel free to engage in interactions, choosing the topics of their conversations as well as stopping the recording whenever they wished. Moreover, it avoided excessive interference by the researcher.

4.5. Representing the Data

One indispensable aspect of the analysis of oral discourse, such as narratives and everyday conversations, necessarily involves the production of data transcripts (Gumperz 1993,

[26] The question of ethnicity of the post-Soviet peoples in diachronic perspective are addressed in Chapter Three.

Edwards 1993; Sacks 1995). This process requires a process of choosing (or if necessary designing) and applying a coding system in order to convert the recorded spoken data into the format of the text. Such an action allows the researcher to access and manage the oral material and make it available for the analysis through the conventional printed medium.

According to Jane Edwards (1993), despite considerable differences (e.g. in terms of choice of used symbols or graphic layout) all the coding systems should represent the data in the ways that meet several necessary functional requirements. Firstly, the presentation of the data should be exhaustive and cover as many linguistic phenomena as possible. Secondly, it should draw upon readers' already acquired competences. And lastly, it should be selective and clear and not overloaded with details which are unimportant for the particular analytical purpose (Edwards 1993: 5,6).

In my own research I attempt to meet the above requirements by employing the approach to the transcription of conversational data proposed by John Gumpertz (1993). This approach is based on the principle of 'situated interpretation' (*ibid.*: 92). This means that the primary focus is verbal and nonverbal signs which the speaker and listener use in order to pass and understand information and to maintain what Goffman describes as 'conversational involvement' (Goffman 1957: 50). Gumpertz argues that only those features of conversational data 'that can be shown to affect situated interpretation at the interactive or relational level as well as at the level of content' should be taken into account (Gumpertz 1993: 92).

Such a functional perspective in the presentation of conversational data works well with the empirical and analytical principles of my research. Within the limits of my thesis I am not interested in absolute values of the conversational features, but rather on their 'interpretive evaluation' (*ibid.*: 92), i.e. the significance, role and functions they have in a particular analytical context of a given interaction.

Apart from the choice of an appropriate approach to the transcription of the data, I should address one more issue – that of translation, because the narratives and everyday conversations which constitute the empirical base of my thesis take place in Russian. The multilingual conversational data is being widely used by researchers, it should be noted

however, that the translation of such data (as of any text) probably never ideally reflects the original and always remains an 'indirectly controlled guess' (Moerman 1988: 7), while during converting this data every 'investigator trades on his knowledge of language' (*ibid.*: 37).

When dealing with multilingual data, such conversation analysts as Moerman (1988), Gumperz (1993) or Du Bois (1993) employ a very detailed translation and transcription of every utterance at the phonemic, morphemic and semantic levels. My own research concerns the processes of discursive and social performances occurring in interactions, rather than sequential and functional linguistic values of interactional data. Therefore, in my translations of the recorded talks from Russian into English, as the main 'relevant unit of meaning' I consider not the word but the 'message' it conveys (Nida 1959: 190 in Moerman 1988: 6). In order to convert my empirical data from Russian into English I translate the transcripts used in my analysis. Moreover, I note para-verbal and non-verbal behaviour (pauses, laughter) as well as other elements of speech behaviour that could be significant to the interpretative purposes of my analysis.

Every data transcript employed in the framework of my thesis is presented in both Russian and English languages in order to facilitate navigation through the examples for both Russian-speaking and non Russian-speaking readers. Every data excerpt is introduced with a headline consisting of a short description of the participants and the circumstances in which the interaction took place. All the audio recordings of the conversations are attached to the thesis as a CD. The table of contents of the CD is presented in the Appendix.

In terms of graphic layout, the examples are presented in *italics* in order to ensure, that they are segregated within the main body of the dissertation text. All the utterances are numbered in order to facilitate reference to them in the course of the analysis and to make it easier for the reader to navigate through the examples. Each new speaker's utterance begins with a separate line with a participant identifier followed by a colon mark. To identify the adult participants of the conversations I use the names of family members or persons (e.g. mother, father's friend, aunt). In order to meet the anonymity demands, to identify the children participants, I do not use their real first names but pseudonyms. I have chosen this method of participants' presentation instead of other ways of indicating the speakers commonly used in

CA (e.g. Speaker 1, Speaker 2) in order to maximally preserve the speakers' anonymity and at the same time to gain for the reader a better understanding of the nearest ethnographic context. In line with Edwards' requirements of functionality in presenting conversational data (Edwards 1993: 5,6) I use syntactic punctuation marks '.', '!', and '?' to indicate respectively declarative, exclamatory and interrogative sentences which are easily decodable by the reader. Para-verbal and non-verbal behaviours of the conversation participants appear in the transcript in parentheses (e.g. (laughter), (long pause)).

The following table is based on simplified HIAT (Heuristic Interpretative Audiovideo Transcription) system (Ehlich, 1993) and presents the symbols used in transcripts and their functions.

Table 1.

NR1(Mother aged 42, Father aged 48, Danya aged 7)	Transcript Header
(1)	Number of Utterance
Mother:	Participant Identifier
Sasha:	Anonimysed Participant Identifier (Pseudonym)
.	Declarative Utterance
!	Exclamatory Utterance

?	Interrogative Utterance
[…]	Unfinished Utterance (usually before pause or interruption)
(..)	Short Pause (slightly longer then required by conversational turn-taking)
(…)	Long Pause (relatively longer than other pauses within the utterance)
who	Stressed Element of Speech
(laughter)	Non-Verbal Behaviour
(with anger)	Description of Tone or Pitch of Voice
//	Interruption

Very often scholars claim that the presentation of analytical data should necessarily be based in the authentic reproduction of the details and to be as close to the original as possible (Ehlich 1993: 124; Silverman 1998: 61). It seems, however, that no data presentation can be claimed to be an identical copy of the original (see Edwards 1993: 3,4). All analytical data during collection, saving and presentation is influenced by various theoretical, technical and

personal circumstances. I believe, nevertheless, that by accurate recording and attentive transcribing and translation of the oral data, by addressing every semiotic feature significant for the analytical purposes of my research I have designed a method of data presentation which is clear and easily readable, optimally apt and adequate for my work.

4.6. Addressing Ethical Issues

My academic interest in the Russian community living in Scotland is closely interwoven with my personal experiences connected with moving to another country and crossing real and symbolic national borders. These experiences strongly influence and facilitate my approach to the research work. At the same time, the conceptual and analytical perspective that my work provides me allows a deeper understanding of the dynamics and diversity of diasporic living. Such a coexistence of personal and scholarly points of view enables me to have an insight into the problem from both the perspective of a researcher, but also, at least partly, from the perspective of a subject of the investigation. This perspective provides me with an awareness of a variety of issues, values or dimensions of living in a migrant community that could have remained unnoticed within the framework of a different research project. On the other hand, however, my deep involvement with the community life, engagement with the Russian school and participation in the social events of organising this life bring up several ethical concerns.

One of the main concerns is connected to the multiplicity of the researcher's roles which he/she plays in relation to participants and while conducting participatory forms of research (in my case audio recordings). In the framework of my study I simultaneously adopt the role of a researcher, a member of a Russian-speaking community, a teacher in the 'Russian Edinburgh' school, and, very often, just a friend of my participants. These relationships were constructed, negotiated and re-negotiated during several years of engagement with my academic work as well as with the community life itself. Over the years I gained more and more personal knowledge about the community members/my participants – their life stories, their values and beliefs, their worries and hopes. This knowledge is invaluable background information in terms of my analytic work, but at the same time it is the knowledge with which my participants entrusted me not only as a researcher, but also as a teacher of their

child or a friend. Therefore, the way I distribute and exploit this knowledge within the framework of my project is the main ethical challenge I should address.

This challenge involves a task of recognition and deciding which personal or other information I have received from my participants according to their conscious agreement, and which I have gained randomly because they may have forgotten about my status as a researcher. The same applies to recorded material. My participants were equipped by me with a recording device and have recorded their family conversations in their homes without my presence, whenever they felt able to do it. While switching on the device they certainly were aware of the recording and its purpose but after some time, busy with their family talk, they sometimes forgot about it. For example, they went to another room without taking the recorder with them or just left it switched on for hours, which means that at least the last part of a conversation recorded was a 'real' family talk. On the one hand, such naturally occurring data, with minimal researcher involvement, are ideal data for analysis. On the other hand, in such a situation it should be clearly distinguished which information enclosed in the recorded data could be used within the framework of the study and which could not. Every researcher at every stage of the investigation should be aware of the great responsibility for the material and information that the participants shared and entrusted to him or her. Being ethically responsible involves reflexive, imaginative and contextual recognition and assessment of 'ethically important moments' (Guillemin and Gillam 2004: 271).

Very often discussions about research ethics are based on the demands of research objectivity. This objectivity is understood as an ability of a researcher to keep neutrality or 'analytical distance' through the course of his or her investigation, and in terms of research ethics is concerned with 'impartiality and detachment' in research practices (Baarts 2010: 434). In the last decades, however, several scholarly works have appeared (Latour (2005), Law (2004), Baarts (2010)) criticising such attempts to see 'everything from nowhere' (Law 2004: 68). John Law, for example, defines such an escape from the settings and subjects of the research pretending to represent neutrality and analytical distance as 'a form of irresponsibility' (*ibid.*). In line with this criticism goes 'relational ethics' (Ellis 2007) advocating 'epistemological shift from a knower-known relationship' between the researcher and the research participants 'to a relationship between "two knowing subjects"' (Gunzenhauser 2006: 627).

Such a reframing of a researcher/participant relationship complies fully with the methodological principles of my own study based on the conceptual claims of the Sociocultural Linguistic Approach discussed earlier in this chapter. This research perspective, proposed by Bucholtz and Hall (2005), requires the researcher's close involvement with the participants and the social practices which shape the macro contexts of every interactional event. Moreover it rejects the researcher's monopoly of being the 'knower' and advocates the recognition of the agency, knowledge and analytical capacities of the social actors.

According to Charlotte Baarts (2010), behaving ethically entails recognising and clearly defining one's partiality in research and using 'strong imaginative powers' (*ibid*.: 434) to predict the consequences of one's own involvement. Such an imaginative work can only be accomplished by a researcher who is 'authentic' (*ibid.*: 436) who is honest with him/herself and his/her participants. Being 'authentic' also requires sensitivity and a sincere interest in the needs, expectations, and concerns of the people involved in the project.

My own deep involvement with Russian community life strongly facilitates my research and enables me to gain extensive knowledge about my participants. This knowledge, together with my authentic interest in the subject and constant ethical awareness, allows me to recognise 'ethically important moments' (Guillemin and Gillam 2004: 271) and to predict the consequences of my involvement as well as recognise and meet the research expectations of my participants. Within the framework of my project I strongly respect the participants' choices concerning their involvement in the project being aware that at every stage of the research they might decide to terminate our collaboration. I respect also the participants' anonymity in presenting personal data in the transcripts used in the text, as well as in the main body of the dissertation including comments. I believe that such an engaged, interaction-oriented, dialogic and ethically aware approach to the research practices, which employs wide background information provided by participants and their actions, as well as researcher's personal and academic abilities and experience give the best results in every ethnography-oriented investigation.

In *Chapter Four* I have presented the objects and methods of my research. I have introduced and discussed the Sociocultural Linguistic Approach to identity in interaction, which I employ in the framework of my research. I have also discussed the other qualitative methods which influence my approach to data examination – Conversational Analysis, Narrative Analysis and Membership Categorisation Analysis. Finally, I have described the participants of my investigation, procedures of data collection and presentation, as well as those ethical concerns connected with the research.

Chapter Five: Performing Russianness. Analysis of Narratives and Everyday Conversations

Earlier in this thesis I have presented and critically analysed scholarship in the field of identity (see Chapter Two). I have discussed various, often contradictory perspectives and approaches to the subject, pointing out their advantages and limitations. On the basis of this theoretical discussion I have proposed a working definition of identity which I view as a dynamic phenomenon constructed and re-constructed by social actors in everyday interactions (in this case in migrant families) and embedded in broader cultural, historical and political contexts. Thus, I understand migrants' identity as neither formed by an isolated set of features or values, nor as based on simple dualisms such as 'us/them', 'native/host'. In the framework of my research I view it rather as a complex balance of memberships, solidarities, commonalities and multifaceted affiliations appearing simultaneously at many levels and at many points of reference.

The main aim of this thesis is to explore the construction of national identity performed by members of the Russian-speaking community living in Scotland through the analysis of intergenerational talks and narratives appearing in everyday settings. In order to uncover, trace and discuss this process I have chosen the analytical methods proposed by the Sociocultural Linguistic Approach, Conversational Analysis, Narrative Analysis and Membership Categorisation Analysis described in Chapter Four.

In this chapter I will analyse the everyday family talks using the aforementioned methodology by investigating the ways in which meaningful categories, values, symbols and knowledges are established or evoked, described and used by the family members in their identity claims, how these claims are negotiated in the variety of interactional situations and how they are linked to the wider discursive contexts. This analysis will enable me to answer my research questions, i.e. how Russian national identity is constructed and performed in the context of everyday interactions and how it is contributed to and received by family members. Moreover, it will allow the observation and distinguishing of any potential regularities or likely systematic actions and patterns used by the participants in their actions.

This chapter has five subchapters. The first analyses several examples of family interactions which consider the concept of 'Russianness' itself. It attempts to explain how the participants of the research attempt to deal with the problem of ethnic and national selves appearing in their talks with children. It exemplifies also the notion of the *positive other* emerging in everyday talks.

The second subchapter analyses conversational chunks, chosen by me during a detailed listening to the recordings. These chunks are related to the elements of cultural, social, political, geographical and other forms of knowledge and also to the whole range of symbols, features, beliefs, memories or values which the participants of the interactions consider as meaningful and significant for the construction of their performances of Russianness in the family circle.

The next two subchapters are organised around the topic of child-rearing practices – the food-related discourse and educational discourse. This topic is chosen for a particular reason. The rearing of children is the most repetitive and widely discussed subject among the community studied here, which is evidenced not only by my recorded data but also by numerous talks between Russian-speaking parents at the Russian school and during various community events and meetings which I have witnessed and in which I have participated as a researcher, parent and a community member. Finally, the fifth subchapter summarises my research findings.

I have divided this chapter into subchapters and short sections in order to represent my analytical data in the most transparent and reader-friendly way. However, this division is only provisional. As previously mentioned, the process of negotiation and performing of identity is occurring simultaneously at many levels and is related to diverse reference points of macro and micro contexts at the same time. That is why, in order to trace and visualise the dynamics of this multimodal process in the course of my analytical work, I will constantly move between various levels of analysis as well as between various analytical sections of my data represented across the structural units of the chapter.

5.1. What does 'Russian' mean?

The concept of Russian national identity in diachronic perspective was discussed in detail in Chapter Three (3.2.) of this thesis. The notion of Russianness itself is highly ambiguous and indefinite which has also been noted repeatedly throughout the dissertation. In my study I do not attempt to focus on any particular concept but to present identity negotiations as a complex and multidimensional phenomenon.

The analysis of the following examples will demonstrate how the concepts of national and ethnic selves emerging during everyday family talks are negotiated and re-negotiated by the participants of the interactions. Moreover, several examples described in this subchapter will display the positive attitude to the host country demonstrated by members of the Russian-speaking community. The latter must be included as it contributes significantly to the construction of Russianness presented by the members of the Russian-speaking community living in Scotland.

In the first example a mother and her primary school daughter talk about a new girl in the daughter's school. The daughter was informed by a member of the school staff that the new girl is probably Russian.

Example 1

DS (Mother aged 39, Sveta aged 9)

(1) Мама: Ну чё ты, Свет, нашла ту новую русскую девочку в школе?

(2) Света: А, эту? Да, нашла. Но она не русская, она сказала, что она (..) э-э (..) литувка (sic).

(3) Мама: Из Литвы что ли? Но она же с тобой по-русски говорила?

(4) Света: Да, по-русски.

(5) Мама: Ну, значит, всё равно нашинская. Сколько вас теперь? (...) Двое поляков, она и ты. Вот как вам хорошо.

(1) Mother: And what, Sveta, have you found that new Russian girl at school?

(2) Sveta: Ah, that one? Yes, I've found her. But she is not Russian, she said that she is (..) a-a (..) Lithunian (sic).

(3) Mother: From Lithuania or something? But she was speaking with you in Russian, wasn't she?
(4) Sveta: Yes, in Russian.
(5) Mother: So, it means that she is ours anyway. How many of you are there now? (…) Two Poles, she and you. See, how good it is.

In utterance (1) the mother asks her daughter if she has found the new Russian girl at her school. The daughter confirms that she has found her but denies that she is Russian (2). The member of the school staff gave the girl incorrect information since usually all the emigrants from the former Soviet Union (at least from the European part) are considered by the British as Russians. A related situation can be observed when Russians use the adjective 'English' as a synonym of British or Scottish. For example, Russian-speakers living in Scotland very often say: 'At my child's English school' or 'My child's English friend' meaning simply a local (Scottish) school and a child's friend who is (probably White) British.

The new girl at school gave Sveta very clear information about her ethnic origin – Lithuanian - and in doing so, very clearly highlighted her inclusion into the category of *Lithuanians* and her exclusion from the category of *Russians*. In the conversation with her mother, Sveta did not immediately recollect the name of the new girl's nationality *(..) э-э (..)* and eventually mispronounced this, probably not very well known to her word: *литувка* (*sic*) (2). According to the flow of the conversational situation, in her next turn, the mother should repair the mispronounciation of her daughter's word, especially since the troublesome word is in Russian. Russian-speaking parents in everyday talks with their children care very much about the language correctness and in the great majority of cases immediately amend any mispronunciations or wrongly used grammar forms, as well as supporting the children with vocabulary appropriate to the situation (see Example 17).

In this case, however, the mother ignores her daughter's mistake and asks an additional question: *Из Литвы что ли?* (3). By formulating the question in this way she accentuates and emphasises the state (in terms of the territory or citizenship) which the new girl has come from rather than her ethnic origin. She diminishes the significance of the new girl's clearly named ethnicity and makes the categories *Lithuanians/Russians* established by her (and repeated by Sveta) less uncompromising. The mother builds a new category - *From Lithuania*

– a category which raises the possibility that people of other than Lithuanian ethnic origins are also members. In order to minimise the new girl's ethnic affiliation and justify the newly emergent category *From Lithuania*, the mother asks an additional question about the language the girls used in their talk at school. In order to show her expectation of getting a positive answer she uses an adversative conjunction *но* and emphasising particle *же*: *Но она же с тобой по-русски говорила?* (3). The positive answer of her daughter (4) allows her immediately to establish the new *we*-category by labelling the new girl with a colloquial word *нашинская* (5). The mother makes the Russian language the marker of belonging to this newly established category of *Russian-speakers* (or maybe *Russians (?)*). In order to finally remove the question of the new girl's ethnicity and to ascribe her to this *we*-category she uses a particle *всё равно*: *Ну, значит, всё равно нашинская* (5).

In this short fragment of conversation the mother, starting with the category *Lithuanian*, successively builds two other categories, to which she ascribes the new girl. Each subsequent category is built in such a way, that it increases the distance from the category *Lithuanian* and decreases the distance to the initial category *Russian*, to which the new girl was mistakenly ascribed by a school staff member and to which she denied her membership in the talk with Sveta (*Lithuanian → From Lithuania → Russian-speaker → Russian*).

It seems that at this stage of conversation the mother achieved her presumed goal – her categorisational work described a circle from initial *Russian* to *Russian-speaker* (again *Russian* (?)). Unexpectedly, however, in the last (5) utterance, she builds a new *we*-category. To this category she includes Poles, the Lithuanian girl and her daughter, who is Russian. The criteria of the membership of this new category are not clear. Not all members of it are Russian-speakers, nor do all of them come from the former Soviet Union. Maybe it is a category of *Slavs*, mistakenly including a Lithuanian, or a category of recent migrants, who came from the post-socialist Eastern Bloc countries. The fact is, however, that this new *we*-category emerged through establishing a complementary relational pair of similarity and difference (Chapter Four: 4.2.d.) - as an opposition to *them* (Scottish, British). In this case, it is not so important how the members of the *in*-group are similar to each other, but rather that they are different from the members of the *out*-group. The mother concludes the topic about a new girl with the statement *Вот как вам хорошо* (5), suggesting, that her daughter should

appreciate the fact, that the small group of *non-Scottish* (*non-British*) pupils at her school has gained a new member.

In this conversational chunk the 9 year old girl is rather passive. The mother initiates the topic by asking a question about the daughter's new school-mate, and she also finishes it. Her daughter only answers the mother's direct questions, and in utterance (2) refutes incorrect information about the new girl. The mother probably does not expect any reaction from her daughter, as she is not sure whether all the categories she has made, are meaningful and recognisable for the girl. In utterance (5) she asks the question *Сколько вас теперь?* and after a pause answers it herself, as it is not obvious about whom she is asking – about the whole number of pupils in her daughter's school or class, or about any other group which she names *'вы/you'*.

The Russianness performed by the mother in the analysed short conversation is greatly influenced by Soviet ideologies (Chapter Three: 3.2.b., 3.2.c.). In the statements she makes, she equates being Russian with being a Russian-speaker. She also ignores any potential ethnic differences, ascribing the Lithuanian girl to the particular territory rather than acknowledging her ethnic origins. Eventually, according to the Soviet ideology of internationalism and friendship between peoples, she establishes a category, the members of which are children from various post-Socialist countries, and enthusiastically closes the topic by showing her approval (and encouraging her daughter to share it) of the whole situation. In this example, however, the daughter does not respond in any way to her mother's performance of national identity.

The next example also shows how the problem of 'unsuitable' national identity, which occurred in a family talk, is solved by a Russian parent. In this example a mother and her 13 year old son talk about a boy's school homework concerning the national cuisine.

Example 2

ST (Mother aged 40, Alyosha aged 13)

(1) Алёша: Мам, нам в школе нужно про национальную кухню приготовить. Я выбрал русскую.

(2) Мама: Ну, молодец.

(3) Алёша: А про что мне написать?

(4) Мама: Ну, про что хочешь. Что тебе больше всего нравится из того, что я дома готовлю?

(5) Алёша: Борщ украинский.

(6) Мама: Вот и пиши.

(7) Алёша: Но он же украинский, а не русский.

(8) Мама: Ну (…) украинский, украинский (…) Его же и в России всю жизнь готовили, и в Казахстане, и в Эстонии, и вообще везде (..) Значит он и есть русский (…) Ты напиши просто 'борщ', без 'украинский' (…) и всё. (..) Чтоб проще было.

(1) Alyosha: Mum, we have to prepare about national cuisine for school. I've chosen Russian.

(2) Mother: Well done.

(3) Alyosha: And what should I write about?

(4) Mother: About what you want. What do you like the most from the things I cook at home?

(5) Alyosha: Ukrainian borsch.

(6) Mother: So, just write.

(7) Alyosha: But it's Ukrainian, not Russian.

(8) Mother: Well (…) Ukrainian, Ukrainian (…) But people always cooked it in Russia, and in Kazakhstan, and in Estonia, and generally everywhere (..) So it is Russian indeed (…) Write just 'borsch', without 'Ukrainian' (…) and that's all. (..) To make it easier.

In utterance (1) the boy informs his mother about his homework concerning the national cuisine. He also reports, that he has chosen Russian cuisine, which receives his mother's approval (2). He asks his mother for advice about what he should write (3) and the mother answers that he can choose whatever (4). She asks a question *What do you like the most from the things I cook at home?* (4). On the conversational level she simply helps her son to make a choice of a particular dish he needs to describe for his homework. On the discursive level, however, by asking this question, the mother makes an implicature (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 594) regarding her family's Russianness. She makes it clear that everything she cooks for the family is Russian cuisine. At the same time she discursively positions herself as a person responsible for taking care of the family's Russianness, at least in terms of dining practices.

The boy answers that his favourite home-made dish is Ukrainian borsch[27] (5) and the mother advises him to write about it (6). The boy, however, declares his objection, as he considers this dish as Ukrainian, not Russian (7). After the boy points this out, the mother also recognises this dish as not Russian (or at least as that which can be considered not Russian). It drives her into a temporary inability to take the next conversational turn, as she cannot find any counter-argument to her son's statement. This is represented by the repetition of the word 'Ukrainian' and two pauses: *Well (...) Ukrainian, Ukrainian (...)* (8).

After the second pause she begins her response. She states that the soup was cooked in the whole Russia, Kazakhstan and Estonia *and generally everywhere* (8) – referring probably to the whole territory of the former Soviet Union and describing a possibly greater area from Estonia on the North-West throughout the whole of Russia up to Kazakhstan on the South. She tries to support her statement with an authoritarian cliché *'in the whole USSR'*, which is not pronounced in fact but is very clearly implied. In order to add more 'weight' to her account she uses the emphasising particle *же* and time expression *всю жизнь* (8). Initially, she finds her 'territorial' and 'temporal' argumentation sufficient enough to make a conclusion *Значит он и есть русский* (8). She equates the territory of the Soviet Union with the territory of Russia (Chapter Three: 3.2.b., 3.2.c.) which allows her to make a paradoxical statement, that the fact that the soup was cooked in e.g. Kazakhstan proves that it is a Russian dish.

Taking into account the partialness principle (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 606) of the construction of the Self, it should be noted that the mother's identity claims and representations together with the choice of argumentation were probably not fully conscious or deliberate. After a pause she recognises that her line of reasoning does not have any logical basis, which creates a dilemma. On the one hand, it seems apparent, that the cuisine used in the family is not fully Russian, as the mother has indirectly declared in utterance (4) which slightly diminishes the constructed Russianness of the family itself and the mother's position as its keeper. On the other hand, the majority of Russians on first thought would probably describe this dish as a Russian one.

[27] Borsch is a beetroot and cabbage soup of Ukrainian origin (probably first originating on the territory of Kievan Rus) that apart from Ukraine and Russia is very popular in many Eastern and Central European countries.

The point is that the multiple varieties of borsch are popular in many countries all over Europe and in Russia among others. For example, the traditional Russian soup shchi, which, according to the recipe is very similar to borsch, has been known in Russia as far back as the ninth century. Thus, borsch can also be undoubtedly considered as a dish of Russian national cuisine. Moreover, *borsch* is a kind of stereotype, which together with *balalaika* or *samovar* is immediately associated with Russia. 'Ukrainian borsch' is rather a kind of 'trade mark' which has been already known in Russia before the revolution but became even more popular during the Soviet period, when the national cuisine of the peoples from all the Soviet republics was widely promoted.

In utterance (8), after a pause, the mother finds a way to escape this 'uncomfortable' situation. She proposes to her son the use in his homework of a small ruse: to present just *borsch*, omitting the 'uncomfortable' modifier *Ukrainian*. On the discursive level her proposal also repairs to some extend the Russianness of her family, which became temporarily damaged while the interaction was unfolding. It seems that it is the only solution that she is able to offer to the boy, which she confirms with a short statement after a pause: *(...) and that's all* (8). After the next short pause she justifies her advice: *To make it easier* (8). Recognising herself that the problem is *not easy*, the mother does not make any other attempt to explain to her son the resulting paradox – how it is possible that Ukrainian borsch can be considered as a Russian traditional dish. Probably in this way she tries to avoid a troublesome investigation of the issue she does not fully understand herself, as maybe she has never thought about it, taking *a priori* the truth that 'Ukrainian borsch is a Russian dish' because it was cooked *везде* (in the Soviet Union) and *всю жизнь* (8). The boy does not respond to his mother's searching for a national Self and will probably follow her advice. Maybe he is not interested in further exploration or simply prefers to escape from the problem, which even his mother finds difficult and is unable to solve at the moment of conversation.

In the analysed talk, as in the previous example, the national identity performed by the mother is closely determined by the Soviet ideology. The mother discursively describes her family as Russian but when in the momentary demand of the conversation she needs to explain to her son the concept of Russianness, she is unable to do it. She uses the Sovietised language which refers to the national space by describing a circle around large expanses of

the Soviet Union. Next, she attempts to present the national identity in terms of geographical space identifying the territory of Russia with the territory of the whole Soviet Union. Eventually, recognising herself that the arguments she has presented have no logic and that she has no other arguments to offer, she simply escapes from the problem.

In the next example a mother and her High school son Andrey are present. The conversation takes place during the meal. The son tells his mother about a new boy from one of the Southern post-Soviet republics who recently came to enrol at the football club which Andrey belongs to.

Example 3

TL (Mother aged 38, Andrey aged 16)

(1) Андрей: Тут у нас один вчера пришёл (..) из Че́чня или с Азербайджана (…) Играть.

(2) Мама: А ты говоришь: "Ты чё пришёл?"

(3) (Смех).

(4) Мама: "А я хотел вот, тут, на ослике".

(5) (Смех).

(6) Андрей: Я говорю: "Тут в футбол играют больше, чем там, у вас". Ну он пришёл, там одел новые носочки, одел кроссовочки (…) И стоит.

(7) Мама: Может купил всё по дешёвке (…) в "Примарке".

(8) Андрей: Ну (..) Стоит ждёт (..) чтоб его впустили. Я говорю: "Ну, пошли". И отвёл его к тренеру. Говорю: "Вот, играть пришёл".

(9) Мама: Он Че́чня, да? Ужас (..) Нет такой страны – Че́чня (..) Есть Раша (…) Ну молодец ты, Андрюша, хороший парень.

(1) Andrey: One came to us yesterday (..) from Chechnya or Azerbaijan (…) To play.

(2) Mother: And you say: 'What did you came for?'

(3) (Laughter).

(4) Mother: 'Well, I wanted to be here on a donkey '.

(5) (Laughter).

(6) Dima: I say: 'Here people play football more than there, at your place'. So, he came, put on new socks, new trainers (…) And is standing.

(7) Mother: Maybe bought everything as a bargain (…) in 'Primark'.

(8) Andrey: Well (..) Standing and waiting (..) for somebody to let him in. I say: 'Let's go, then'. And I took him to the coach. I say: 'Look, he came to play'.
(9) Mother: Is he Chechnya, yes? What horror (..) There's no such country as Chechnya (..) There is Russia (…) But you are a good boy, Andryusha, good lad.

In utterance (1) Andrey informs his mother about a new boy who came to enrol to his football club (1). He labels the new boy *'один'* which (unlike e.g. *'один парень'*) together with the adverb of place *'тут'* produces a pejorative meaning. Moreover, he diminishes the significance of the potential place the new boy comes from by naming both of the places, rather deliberately, in a careless way: *из Че́чня* (in English style – without the change of ending and stressed first syllable) and *с Азербайджана* (in Russian). He uses also different prepositions *из* and *с*, where *с* is used incorrectly probably also in order to produce an impression of low-style provincial language. He ascribes himself to the membership of the club's players and creates the *we*-category by using the pronoun *we* - *у нас* (*at ours*) (1) and at the same time separates himself from the new boy. The whole utterance has an overtone of reluctance and discursively describes the new boy as an intruder from the provinces (or at least from an unimportant place).

The mother immediately recognises her son's hint and joins the conversation by further development of the discourse of reluctance and prejudice to the intruder from the South but turns it ironic. She makes a joke by asking the hypothetical question in behalf of her son: *Ты чё пришёл?* (2), which causes joint laughter (3). Since she has achieved her interactional goal and her joke was recognised by her son as funny, she makes another joke by answering this hypothetical question on behalf of the new boy: *А я хотел вот, тут, на ослике* (4). In this way the mother discursively describes him as a boy from a province whose wishes and desires do not go further than to hope to possibly ride a donkey. She implies also that he is a person with an absolute lack of social experience unable to recognise how to behave and adapt to a particular social situation. Additionally, she indirectly describes him as childish or naïve, since in her joke, the new boy uses the word *ослик* with the diminutive suffix *-ик-* which linguistic form is typical rather typical for children's language. And again the mother's joke generates joint laughter (5).

In utterance (6) Andrey continues his story about the new boy. In his narrative he says to the boy: *Here people play football more than there, at your place.* On the conversational level it is just an informative statement. On the discursive level, however, Andrey expresses his doubts about the ability of the new boy to be good enough (at least as good as him, Andrey) to play in a Scottish football club. He makes a clear opposition between *here* (in Scotland) and *there* (in Chechnya, *at your place*). Then, Andrey continues to describe the new boy. In his description he, the same as his mother, uses two nouns *носочки* and *кроссовочки* with a diminutive suffix *-очк-* suggesting the childishness of the new boy. In addition, these *носочки* and *кроссовочки* are new which fact may suggest his provincial background.

The mother makes the next joke by expressing her assumption about the boy's new socks and trainers as allegedly bought *as a bargain in 'Primark',* a cheap clothes store (7). Her son, however, that time ignores her joke as his initial interactional purpose was to tell his mother a story about the new boy, thus he continues his narrative. He tells his mother that he has offered his help to the new boy and introduced him to the coach. He says that he *took him to the coach* (8) suggesting that the boy is a person who rather needs to be taken to the coach, as a child would.

In the analysed example both the son in his narrative and the mother in her jokes and comments co-construct an image of the *other* – the intruder from one of the southern post-Soviet republics. By the construction of this image, the mother and the son display their memberships of both the category of *Russians* and category of *locals* (Scottish, British).

They discursively describe the boy as a funny provincial lad, who behaves slightly inadequately to the social situation and needs some help, care and protection. This description has much in common with the Soviet ideological image of the *'younger brother'* – the representative of a non-Russian nation. In this case, Andrey regards himself as a representative of the Russian super-nation and as the *'older brother'* who takes care of the new boy.

In utterance (9) the mother makes a concluding comment about the story her son has just told her. She asks again a question about the boy's nationality in a disrespectful way *Is he Chechnya, yes?* and not waiting for an answer expresses her disapproval by adding *What*

horror (*Ужас*) (9). She summarises that *There's no such country as Chechnya (..) There is Russia* and in doing this refuses to acknowledge the boy's nationality or ethnic identity and ascribes him to the political and ideological category *Russian citizens*. Next, the mother compliments her son by naming him with the endearment *Андрюша, молодец* and *хороший парень* for his care of the 'younger brother' from Chechnya (9).

In the analysed chunk of conversation the national identity performed by the mother and the son is defined in relation to the *other* – the boy from the Southern post-Soviet republic. Their Russianness again emerges as a product of Soviet ideology. They both consider themselves as representatives of the Russian super-nation, since the new boy is seen as the *'younger brother'* who needs some care and protection. During the whole interaction, the sixteen year old son is active and seems to understand the political jokes and comments of his mother. It is difficult to say why. Maybe it is because he is older than other children participating in the research and he talks with his mother about political and ideological issues. It could also be that he gets this information from other sources (Russian television, Internet sites, visits to Russia). The fact is, however, that he recognises and shares the knowledge about the Soviet past as common with his mother, which does not prevent him from ascribing himself to the *we*-category of *locals* (1).

Throughout my recordings I have identified several instances in which the participants express their positive attitude to the new place of residence – the *West*. As the notion of *negative other* is present in the majority of examples analysed in the following subchapters, I find it very important to include these few representations of the *positive other* into this section. It avoids a one-sided vision of migrants' attitude to the *West* and also the misleading impression that, in Fonwizin's words, 'in foreign lands everything is awful' (Greenfeld 1992: 222) and it contributes to the construction of Russianness performed by Russian-speaking migrants in everyday settings.

In this conversation two persons are present – a mother and her teenage son. They are watching celebrations of Victory Day on Scottish television.

Example 4

TL (Mother aged 38, Vasya aged 13)

(1) Вася: Смотри, мам, Эдинбург показывают.
(2) Мама: Да-а, бабушки со второй мировой войны. Смотри, в шляпках какие. У-у, дедок в котелке (…) У нас уже там поумирали все. А нет, тоже смотри сидят (…) в платочках, с деревни.

(1) Vasya: Look, mum, they are showing Edinburgh.
(2) Mother: Ye-eah, grannies from the time of the Second World war. Look, grannies in hats. U-uh, a grandpa in a bowler (…) Ours have all died already. Oh no, look they are also sitting there (…) in headscarves, from the village.

In utterance (1) the son informs his mother that Edinburgh is being shown on television right now. The mother makes her comments about what she is seeing. She names the British Second World war veterans in Russian manner *бабушки* and *дедок* (2). It might have been to provide an ironic overtone to her comment as Russian words *бабушки* and *дедок* evoke associations rather different than *hats* and *a bowler* (2). The mother expresses her approval of the appearance of the veterans: *Ye-eah, […] grannies in hats. U-uh, a grandpa in a bowler* (2). After a pause she makes her assumption that while British veterans are alive and look quite well, the Russian (*ours*) veterans *have all died already* (2). Probably, at this moment Russian veterans were also shown on television: *Oh no, look they are also sitting there* (2). After a short pause the mother makes a resumptive comment about Russian veterans: *in headscarves, from the village* (2).

In this short fragment of conversation a very clear opposition is present. In the mother's comments the Scottish/British veterans (and, probably, Great Britain in general) represent an embodiment of elegance, culture, civilisation and Europeanism[28] while the Russian veterans (and Russia itself) is represented by *бабушки […] в платочках, с деревни* (2).

In the next example Great Britain emerges as Russia's (the Soviet Union's) positive *other* in terms of social freedoms (here freedom of the press). In this example a mother and her 14 year old son are present. The mother tells a story from her youth when it was not easy to get the books one wanted to read.

[28] The issues of culture, civilisation and Europeanism as the objects of Russian migrants' discourse are discussed e.g. by Oxana Morgunova (2007: 209-268).

Example 5

ACh (Mother aged 40, Petya aged 14)

(1) Мама: Я вот, помню в университете училась и знакомая дала мне почитать первую часть "Властелина колец". Вот знаешь, "Хранителя" – и всё. В общем, так было обидно. Представь: дочитываешь эту первую книгу до конца – и всё.

(2) Вася: А что, купить нельзя было?

(3) Мама: Нет, не выпускали как-то.

(4) Вася: А чё не выпускали-то? Пропаганда американская, или там, европейская, или что?

(5) Мама: Ну, не знаю, не издавали и всё. Тут, зато, смотри, какое раздолье.

(6) Вася: Это – да.

(1) Mother: I remember when I was studying at the University and an acquaintance gave me the first part of 'The Lord of the Rings' to read. You know, 'The Fellowship of the Ring' – and that's all. All in all it was such a pity. Imagine: you are finishing this first volume and that's all.

(2) Vasya: And what, was it impossible to buy?

(3) Mother: No, they just weren't publishing it for some reason.

(4) Vasya: But why weren't they publishing at all? American propaganda, or European, or what?

(5) Mother: Well, I don't know, just weren't publishing and that's all. Here instead, look, what abundance.

(6) Vasya: Yes, that's right.

In utterance (1) the mother tells her son that in her University times she had the chance to read only the first part of 'The Lord of the Rings'. The boy asks whether it was impossible to buy the other parts (2). The mother replies that *they just weren't publishing somehow* (3). The boy wonders about the reason that the book was not published and makes his assumptions that maybe it was considered as American or European propaganda (4). The mother states that she does not know the reason by rephrasing her previous answer: *just weren't publishing and that's all* (5). In the end of her statement she adds *and that's all* in order to show that she really does not know the reason why the book was not published in the Soviet Union and that

the further investigation of the problem is useless. Then she shifts the frame of reference to the British (Scottish) ground: *Тут, зато, смотри, какое раздолье* (*Here instead, look, what abundance)* (5). She uses an adversative conjunction *зато* (*instead*) in order to build a stronger opposition. The boy agrees with his mother: *Yes, that's right* (6).

In the presented example the Soviet Union emerges as a place where books were forbidden without any logical reason, while Great Britain is presented as a literary Eden (discursively signified by untranslatable word *раздолье* (Chapter Two: 2.2.)) where one can get every book he/she wishes.

Apart from culture, civilisation and social rights and freedoms, the Russian-speaking immigrants certainly also appreciate the material welfare which Great Britain can offer. In the next example a mother and her teenage son are present. They are making jokes about their relatives living in Russia.

Example 6

TL (Mother aged 38, Andrey aged 16)

(1) Андрей: Там у них мышь сдохла в холодильнике!

(2) (Смех).

(3) Мама: Последняя мышь в холодильнике сдохла, от голода!

(4) (Смех).

(5) Андрей: Шаром покатить! В морозилке даже льда нет!

(6) (Смех).

(7) Мама: В холодильнике греться можно, знаешь?

(8) (Смех).

(9) Мама: Ну всё, хватит! Шутки шутками, а у них там работы нет ни у кого (...) А мы тут тортик сидим едим – нам-то хорошо!

(1) Andrey: A mouse died in their fridge!

(2) (Laughter).

(3) Mother: The last mouse died of hunger in the fridge!

(4) (Laughter).

(5) Andrey: It's called nothing! There is not even ice in the fridge!

(6) (Laughter).
(7) Mother: In the fridge you can get warm, you know?
(8) (Laughter).
(9) Mother: Enough! Joking aside, none of them has any work (…) And we are sitting here and eating a fancy cake – how lucky we are!

In utterances (1), (3), (5), (7) the mother and the son are joking about their relatives. Probably starting with a true fact that *a mouse died in their fridge* (1) they collaboratively develop a comic description of the hypothetical life of their relatives in Russia. They imply that the mouse *died of hunger* (3) because *there is not even ice in the fridge* (5) and that inside the fridge it is even warmer than outside (7). Every stage of production of this description generates joint laughter (2), (4), (6), (8).

In utterance (9) the mother suddenly stops the next peal of laughter by an exclamation *Ну всё, хватит!* (*Enough!*). She moves the frame to reality. This reality acquires its meaning with regard to the previously created one. In Bucholtz and Hall's words it is constructed through complementary relation of *artifice/genuineness* (2005: 598). The mother explains that *none of them has any work* (9), a statement which implies that even if their situation is not that bad as this described in the comic story, they nevertheless might experience some financial difficulties. Then, in order to shame herself and her son for such a thoughtless attitude to the problem, she makes a very clear contrast between the relatives' difficult life in Russia and their secure and rather prosperous life in Scotland where they can sit and eat *a fancy cake* (9). At the end of her utterance, in order to make the contrast even stronger, she makes a comment: *нам-то хорошо!* (*how lucky we are!*) (9).

To sum up, in the above examples, the Russianness performed by the members of the Russian-speaking community living in Scotland corresponds to a great extent with the concept of Russian national Self in terms of attitude to the West, ethnicity and Imperial and Soviet legacy discussed in Chapter Three (3.2.a., 3.2.b., 3.2.c). The notion of Russianness presented in migrants' discourse is vague and unclear and the adult participants of the analysed conversations are unable to explain it to their children (Examples1, 2).

The Russianness performed by parents in the analysed talks above is strongly influenced by Soviet ideologies and the Soviet/Imperial past. For example, the participants of the interactions in their statements equate being Russian with being a Russian speaker. They consider nationality as ascribed to a particular territory with no regard to the ethnic differences (Examples 1, 2) and identify the territory of Russia with the territory of the whole Soviet Union (Example 2). Moreover, in the analysed conversations they refer to the ideologies of international friendship (Examples 2, 3) and consider themselves as representatives of the Russian super-nation (Example 3).

The migrants' attitude to Scotland (Great Britain, Europe, the West) remains ambiguous. The examples (4, 5, 6) analysed above show that Russian-speakers living here consider this country to be an embodiment of culture and civilisation and appreciate the social rights and freedoms together with the material welfare it can offer. The examples of a negative attitude to the migrants' new place of residence, lifestyle, culture, values and beliefs will be analysed in the following subchapters.

In their creations and performances of Russianness in front of their children, the adults refer to the elements of Russian/Soviet cultural, historical, and political knowledge by building various kinds of oppositions such as: *here/there, us/them* (Examples 1, 3, 4, 5, 6). Moreover they negotiate and re-negotiate memberships to various kinds of meaningful categories: *Russian, Russian-speaker, non-Scottish (non-British), non-Russian* (Examples 1, 2, 3, 4).

In the above examples the children are rather passive participants who only answer parents' direct questions or agree with them with a minimal response. The only exception is the sixteen year old boy who seems to recognise and share knowledge about the Soviet past in common with his mother (Example 3). The rest of the children probably do not recognise such ideologically saturated knowledge as common or are simply not interested in an exploration of the topic of the Russian Self.

5.2. Evoking Russian and Soviet[29] Common Knowledge

[29] The relationship between Russian and Soviet was discussed in Chapter Three.

Throughout my recorded analytical data it can be easily observed that there are repeated examples of using by the participants of the interactions their Russian and Soviet cultural knowledge – the whole range of symbols, values, discursive descriptions, experiences, memories, cultural and historical facts. The constant references to these categories presuppose the existence of a shared cultural background, enabling the Russian-speaking migrants to define, reinforce and display their national affiliations and orientate themselves towards the new realities. It is not surprising that parents try to accustom their children to this common background by teaching them the Russian language or introducing Russian literature and culture to them, both at home and at Russian school. Moreover, the transnational character of contemporary migrations (discussed in Chapters One and Three), together with the possibilities offered by global mass media and development of communication, create new forms of migrants' solidarities with their native country. These solidarities include regular visits to Russia in order to see relatives, various forms of Russophone on-line communication and following Runet sites, as well as watching Russian television and films, listening to the radio and CDs. Thus, even children born in Great Britain have constant contact with Russian customs, traditions, cuisine, lifestyle and together with their parents and other members of the migrant community are integrated within this common cultural background.

In this subchapter I will examine how the participants (parents (5.2.a.) and children (5.2.b.)) in their family interactions produce and make significant these shared categories by moving across the numerous sets of features, meanings and values. Moreover, I will analyse how these categories become (or do not become) recognisable by other participants and how they are employed in the formulation of various temporary and fluid memberships, which are involved in the identity construction.

5.2.a. Evoking Russian and Soviet Knowledge by Parents

In the first example two persons (a mother and her teenage son) are present. The conversation takes place at mealtime. The mother is complaining about the constant lack of time.

Example 7

TL (Mother aged 38, Vasya aged 13)

(1) Мама: Что делать, да? А когда ещё, ну когда?

(2) Вася: Мы на работе, в школе.

(3) Мама: Что ж мы, целый день дома сидим тут беседуем? О любимых книгах? О ребятах и зверятах?Ну чё, вкусные эти (..) вареники?

(1) Mother: So, what can we do? And when, just when?

(2) Vasya: We are at work, at school.

(3) Mother: Are we sitting all day at home discussing things? Favourite books? Kids and animals? Well, are they nice these (..) dumplings?

In utterance (1) the mother addresses her son in a complaining way trying to find an excuse for lack of time. She ascribes herself and her family to a category of underprivileged and very busy people. By repetition in the second question (*when, just when?)* she indexes the seriousness of her complaints. In utterance (2) the son attempts to join the conversation and co-construct this category. He supports and exonerates her by confirming that the lack of time has its objective reasons and does not result from the voluntary decisions of family members. By using the pronoun *we* he confirms his membership of the category of *busy people* created by his mother. The mother, however, ignores his contribution and continues by herself to build up this category of underprivileged busy people by asking in utterance (3) three rhetorical questions about spending time. The first question builds an opposition *underprivileged busy people/privileged free people* and every succeeding question is set in such way that it increases the split between these categories. The juxtaposition of the questions exaggerates the problem and gives the whole utterance an ironic overtone. The first question generally suggests people who have the privilege of being able to afford time spent discussing things. The second question refers to the past and the privilege of being young (probably as schoolchildren or students) when discussing favourite books was an ordinary activity. In this way the opposition presented by the mother is deepened by the time dimension. Finally, in the third question the mother refers to the TV programme 'For Kids about Animals'[30] (*Ребятам о зверятах*), which was very popular in the Soviet period and served as a kind of Soviet cultural cliché. This question therefore relocates the frame of reference to the USSR and indexes an implicature (cross-ref) of the privilege of being free

[30] *'For Kids about Animals'* was a popular in the Soviet period TV program aired 1967-1990.

and young in a particular place - the Soviet Union. Thus, apart from the time dimension, the opposition presented also gains a space dimension. In that way, by referring to the Soviet children's TV programme, the mother indirectly and in an ironic way discursively creates the implication of opposition between the family's present disadvantaged life in Great Britain and the past advantaged and happy existence in the Soviet Union - between *here* and *there*. She highlights her preference for the past life in the native land and her affiliation to the native culture and lifestyle - rejecting at the same time the present 'busy' life with no place for favourite books or TV programmes.

In this example the mother does not expect any response or reaction from her son to her demonstration of national identity and using her position in a family hierarchy as well as her interactional stance of a topic initiator promptly redirects the conversation to another topic. This food-related topic, concerning *dumplings* (3), is also a performance of Russianness and will be discussed later in this chapter.

It is difficult to say why in this short conversation the boy does not respond to his mother's performance of national self: maybe he has a different attitude from his mother to the present life in Great Britain, considering himself as a part of it, or maybe he simply does not remember or has no knowledge of the TV programme and does not fully understand his mother's hint. However, the fact is that he leaves his mother's statement without any reply and the mother does not expect any and redirects the talk to another subject.

In the next example three persons (mother, father and their 7 year old son) are present. The conversation takes place at mealtime and the parents try to encourage their son to eat some soup.

Example 8

NR (Mother aged 42, Father aged 48, Danya aged 7)

(1) Папа: Это даже не полная (тарелка), даже не половина – это "на дне" называется.

(2) Мама: Это даже меньше половины.

(3) Папа: Для настоящего Данилы-богатыря (...) Он бы это, просто, съел бы в одну минуту - настоящий Данила-богатырь (..) который на шестом уровне надувает шарики.
(4) Даня: Я ж на шестом уровне!
(5) Папа: Ну да, шарики надуваешь. Но затем чтоб их надувать нужна сила, понимаешь?
(6) Даня: Ага.

(1) Father: It's not even a full (bowl), not even a half – you can say it's just "a bit at the bottom".
(2) Mother: It's even less than a half.
(3) Father: For a real Danylo-Bogatyr (...) He would simply, eat it in just one minute – the real Danylo-Bogatyr (..) who blows up balloons on the sixth level.
(4)Danya: But it's me, who is on the sixth level!
(5) Father: Well, yeah, you are blowing up balloons. But for blowing them up you need strength, understand?
(6) Danya: Yeah.

In utterance (1) the father tries to convince the son to eat his meal by appealing to his son's sense of logic, explaining that the amount of soup that needs to be eaten is not that large. In utterance (2) the mother, by re-cycling and re-formulating the father's argument (*not even a half/even less then a half*), supports him in his attempts to move the conversation into the negotiation-format. This strategy, however, does not yield any results. The child does not respond to the parents' collaborative efforts to draw him into the negotiation and in utterance (3) the father changes the strategy. He refers to *Danylo-Bogatyr*[31], the hero from the medieval Russian epics – a powerful, strong, brave and ready-to-fight mighty knight. The name *Danylo* is chosen deliberately: the son's name Danya is an abbreviation of the Russian Danylo (Daniel) and the epithet *Bogatyr*, together with the attribute *real*, creates a discursive description which involves all the merits of an epic hero. The father draws a parallel between

[31] Danylo Ignat'evich – one of the Russian epic characters who performed several heroic acts and is immortalised in Russian medieval epic poems called Bylinas together with Alyosha Popovich, Dobrynya Nikitich, Ilya Muromets and other Bogatyrs. See for example *The Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary:* http://www.bibliotekar.ru/bed/65.htm

his son and the hero, encouraging the boy to identify with the Russian medieval knight and emulate his behaviour. The reference to the Russian cultural cliché represented by *Danylo-Bogatyr* had probably been used before in this particular family and is employed as a strategy of parenting practices. The parents want to elicit from their son appropriate ways of behaviour or action and create a stance of competence and authority within the Russian epic hero discourse. By referring to the Russian epic hero the parents also demonstrate their affinity with the Russian national culture and try to pass to their son what is, in their opinion, important cultural information and to impart to him the idea of national heritage. In the present example, however, the epic hero strategy fails and Danya does not reply to the father's provocation. The father attempts to add more 'weight' to the hero by repeating his name with the attribute twice (*For a real Danylo-Bogatyr… the real Danylo-Bogatyr...)* but, noticing no response from his son, immediately shifts the frame to the realm of cyber-space, which subject is undoubtedly more familiar to the boy. Now *Danylo-Bogatyr* is not only strong, brave and able to fight but is also able to *blow up balloons on the sixth level* of a computer game. The boy immediately realises the implication made by his father and identifies himself with the modified hero. In utterance (4) he joins the conversation recognising himself: *But it's me, who is on the sixth level!* In utterance (5) the father, by repetition of his previous statement, confirms that speaking about the hero he meant him, Danya: *Well, yeah, you are blowing up balloons.* Now that the boy is immersed in the negotiation the father simply appeals to his pragmatism, explaining that for blowing up balloons he needs strength and the boy agrees (6).

The above example shows how by referring to the Russian cultural discourse in everyday settings the parents dmonstrate their affiliation with Russian culture and attempt to pass it to their child and to build a shared cultural ground with it. At the interactional level, it shows also how the father, using his authority, exploits a familiar epic narrative, skilfully modified for the needs of a particular interactional situation, in achieving his parenting goal – in this case encouraging his son to eat his meal.

In the next example four persons (mother, father and their 7 year old son and 5 year old daughter) are present. The conversation takes place after mealtime. The family played a word game which the seven year old son Seriozha lost because he mispronounced the word 'forbidden'.

Example 9

LB (Mother aged 42, Father aged 45, Seriozha aged 7, Lena aged 5)

(1) Лена: Он проиграл!!!

(2) Мама: Нет-нет. Серёжа! Он не проиграл! Скажи просто "нельзя" правильно, давай!

(3) Серёжа: (Громко) Нель-зя!!!

(4) Мама: Ещё раз!

(5) Серёжа: (Ещё громче со злостью) Нель-зя!!!

(6) Мама: Молодец!

(7) Папа: А вы знаете, что в баснях Крылова часто слышим, что где-то было сказано "льзя"?

(8) Мама: "Льзя", да?

(9) Папа: "Льзя", да.

(10) Мама: То есть, было такое слово?

(11) Папа: Да, было такое слово.

(12) Мама: Раньше, в старину//

(13) Серёжа: //Пап, я не проиграл!

(1) Lena: He lost!

(2) Mother: No-no. Seriozha! He didn't lose! Just say "forbidden" properly, come on!

(3) Seriozha: (Loudly) For-bid-den!!!

(4) Mother: Once again!

(5) Seriozha: (More loudly and angrily) For-bid-den!!!

(6) Mother: Well done!

(7) Father: Did you know that in Krylov's fables we often heard that somewhere it was said "bidden"?

(8) Mother: "Bidden", yes?

(9) Father: "Bidden", yes.

(10) Mother: Really, there was such a word?

(11) Father: Yes, there was such a word.

(12) Mother: Earlier, in the old times//

(13) Seriozha: //Dad, I didn't lose!

In utterance (1) Lena makes an informative statement that her brother lost in the game. The boy mispronounced the word *'forbidden'* and by doing this put himself out of the game. In order to change the situation and prevent a probable conflict the mother denies that Seriozha lost and encourages him to correct his mistake by saying the word *'forbidden'* properly (2). She gives Seriozha the simplest directive to act by adding at the end of the utterance an imperative *come on!* Seriozha, angry with his loss, loudly syllabifies the word required (3). In order to ease the tension the mother proposes to Seriozha a kind of a game by asking him to repeat the word once again (4). This proposal however has an opposite result and at utterance (5) the boy syllabifies the word even more loudly and more angrily. The mother following the turn-taking rule of the conversation and her sense of obligation to react to her son's action in the game proposed by herself, replies to Seriozha's shouting with just an exclamation of approbation: *Well done!* (6). Then, when the tension has reached its highest point and the mother does not have any other proposals to solve the conflict the conversation is joined by the father (7). Using his top position in the family hierarchy he sets the new thematic frame linked with the word which caused the argument, and redirects the conversation to a different topic. The father introduces the new topic using references to Russian literature i.e. the use of an old-fashioned word *'льзя'* in Ivan Krylov's[32] fables, which were very popular in the Soviet times and were included to the compulsory school curricula[33]. To initiate the topic the father employs the Soviet (and Russian) clichéd formula: *'Did you know that…'* (which phrase would also often start various curiosity columns in newspapers). The parents again do not expect any reaction from the children to their father's question. Therefore, in order to keep alive what seems to be such an important topic for the parents, the mother immediately reacts to the father's question by repeating its fragment. She uses this strategy to strengthen the sense of importance of the information conveyed by the father (8). To attract the interest of their children the parents create a complementary relational pair authority/delegitimacy (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 598) where the father is a 'knowing' subject and the mother pretends to be engaged to the receiving of the valuable information. In utterance (9) the father joins the mother in the repetition/echoing strategy. Both parents attempt to keep and support

[32] Ivan Krylov - (1769 – 1844) the most famous Russian fabulist but also writer, translator and journalist. He is the author of more then 200 fables. His earlier fables were often loosely based on Aesop's and La Fontaine's, while later ones were original work. Krylov is often called the 'Russian Aesop'.

[33] At present Krylov's fables are not included into the Russian school curricula except for several of the most popular: *The Dragonfly and the Ants*, Aesop's *The Fox and the Crow*, or *Swan, Pike and Crawfish*.

the topic as long as possible, even if their children do not show any interest to the new topic and are absolutely passive in this part of the conversation: *'Bidden', yes? / 'Bidden', yes (8/9), Really, there was such a word? / Yes, there was such a word (10/11)*. Conveying this message like a ping-pong ball to each other, they also indirectly try to pass the information to their children.

By referring to the facts from Russian literature and the history of Russian language the parents attempt to show to their children their inclusion in Russian culture and to introduce its elements to them. In utterance (12) the mother begins a new informative statement, probably considering some historical details, but is interrupted by Seriozha who is not interested at all in the information the mother wanted to present to him and his sister. The boy simply returns the conversation to the previous topic more important to him: *Dad, I didn't lose!* (13).

In the next example three speakers (mother and her two teenage sons) are present. They are talking about a *'Harry Potter'* film which the boys have just seen in the cinema.

Example 10

TL (Mother aged 38, Andrey aged 16, Vasya aged 13)

(1) Вася: А почему он, Гарри, когда он с ней по-змеиному, с той бабушкой говорил, он не понял, что она змея?
(2) Андрей: Потому что он понимает, и, как, по змеиному языку, и просто. И бабушка его специально позвала наверх туда, чтобы Гермиона не могла услышать, потому что, Гермиона б поняла, что она не по-человечески сказала, а Гарри так не понял, потому что он на обоих[…]
(3) Мама: А что Гермиона не должна была знать? Скажите мне. Я ж не умею ни по змеиному, ни по змейгорынычеву. Ну, вообще, может кто-то ошибся, конечно, номером, да?
(4) Андрей: Ну, может.

(1) Vasya: And why did, Harry, while he was speaking with her, with that granny, in snake language, not understand that she was a snake?

(2) Andrey: Because he understands both, snake language and normal. And the granny called him upstairs on purpose, so that Hermione could not hear, because otherwise Hermione would understand that she spoke non-human language, but Harry, he didn't realise, because he spoke both […]
(3) Mother: So, what is it Hermione shouldn't know? Tell me (addressing both sons). I cannot speak Snake nor Zmey Gorynych language. But maybe somebody got the wrong number, hmm?
(4) Andrey: Yeah, maybe.

The younger brother Vasya asks a question about an episode from the film (1). Andrey, as the older and more competent brother, explains it (2). While speaking about one of the characters of the episode, an old witch, both brothers, instead of naming her *old lady* or just *witch*, discursively label her as *бабушка (granny)*. The word itself, even for a non Russian-speaker, is immediately associated with a set of stereotypes about Russia. It should be noted also that in the Soviet Union as well as in today's Russia and some post-Soviet republics it is common practice for children to address every old lady, even one they do not know, as *бабушка*.

By using this label the boys co-construct their common membership to the category of those who know and recognise its discursive meaning. The labelling of the film character as *бабушка* adds to the conversation a comic overtone, since the cruel, cunning and powerful witch has very little in common with the features associated with the word *бабушка*.

In utterance (3) of the above example the mother joins the conversation. She asks a question about this episode, inverting the usual power relation *competent parent/incompetent child.* By employing this strategy she both creates a stance of incompetence, nominating herself as the least expert participant of the conversation and minimises the distance between speakers. In this chunk of conversation the mother plays an active role, takes control over the dynamics of the interaction and provokes particular ways of verbal behaviour by her sons. She pretends to be even less competent then her younger son, asking both boys for explanations. She encourages them to answer her question by using the imperative in the plural form: *скажите мне*. Then, not waiting for any potential explanation, the mother excuses her unawareness in a playful way by her lack of ability to speak Snake or *Zmey Gorynych* language. She associates herself unexpectedly to *Zmey Gorynych*, the dragon from Russian fairytales, and

by mentioning both supernatural creatures together shifts the frame and at once creates the opposition *here/back to Russia*. In this way by referring to one of the Russian fairytale characters the mother reminds her sons of the existence not only of Harry Potter's magic world but also of the world of Russian folklore, which, according to her, belongs to the sphere of cultural capital which parents need to pass to their children. By doing so she opposes herself to the British (or Western) culture and exhibits her belonging to Russian cultural background.

In the analysed conversation, however, the mother again does not pre-suppose any reaction to her performance of 'Russianness' from her sons. She ignores the turn-taking assumption in the dialogue and without any delay redirects the conversation to another topic concerning a missed telephone call - asking the question about it and eliciting the answer from one of her sons (4).

The next two examples consider a fairy-tale made up by the father, which he tells to his 7 year old son. The story is being told in parts every evening before bedtime and is based on the plot of the 'Star Wars' film. It also includes lots of references to other film and literature characters and plotlines.

Example 11

NR (Father aged 48, Danya aged 7)

(1) Папа: (Медленно, нараспев) А тогда (..) полетели они все на ту планету (...) А лететь до неё нужно было це-е-елый год (...) А называлась та планета – планета Плюк.

(1) Father: (Slowly, with a singing accent) And then (..) all of them flew to that planet (...) And they needed to fly the who-ole year to reach it (...) And the name of that planet was planet Pluke.

The father is telling the story slowly, in a singing manner prolonging certain syllables: *це-е-елый год* (*the who-ole year*) and in doing so creates a stylisation of a folk fairy-tale and authenticates himself as its narrator. In order to produce a folk-like prosody of his narration, he uses lots of pauses and repetitions (e.g. the word *planet* is repeated three times in short

three sentences) and cyclically begins every sentence with the adversative conjunction *a* (*and*). He also employs a verb – noun (pronoun) inversion, in which a predicate precedes a subject, which is typical for folk literature genres (*полетели они, называлась она)*, as well as a time expression *the whole year* to describe a long distance instead of a period of time.

The planet, the father tells about, is called Pluke – the name associated with the setting in a late Soviet science-fiction black comedy cult film *'Kin-dza-dza!'*[34]. By referring to this film the father builds a link between the Western and the Soviet pop-cultures, between *here* and *there*. This reference also includes an ironic implication. The planet which the characters of the father's folk-like fairy-tale travel to has nothing in common with the world of magic. Pluke is the home of people living in the depressing reality of destroyed nature and decaying society.

Taking into account the partialness of any identity claim appearing in any kind of interaction (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 606) it is difficult to say if the father's performance of Russianness in the fragment of the analysed narrative is deliberate, and if so, then to what extent. Nor is it possible to guess whether the 7 year old son has already seen the film and the name of the planet is familiar to him or if this is just the name of an invented planet from his father's tale. His temporary interactional position of a listener probably does not presuppose any reactions or comments. The fact is, however, that the father in his narrative evokes a piece of cultural knowledge from the Soviet past which is common (or supposed to be common) for the representatives of his generation both living in Scotland and back in Russia. Even if in this particular interactional situation there are likely to be no potential recipients of the display of his membership of the category of people who share this knowledge, the father exploits it as a resource for his own story, and, intentionally or not, passes this knowledge to his son[35].

In Example 6 the father continues telling his story.

[34] *'Kin-dza-dza!'* is a film directed by Georgiy Daneliya released in 1986 by the Mosfilm. It is a kind of dystopia depicting a desert planet depleted of its resources and populated by primitive impoverished people living in a society full of severe inequality and oppression.

[35] This narrative can also be considered as an example of hybridity of diasporic knowledge frames (Chapter Three: 3.1).

Example 12

NR (Father aged 48, Danya aged 7)

(1) Папа: (Медленно, нараспев) До-олго тренировались рыцари Джедаи (…) це-елый месяц. Учились сражаться световыми мечами (…) решили много задач (..) сделали много упражнений на русском языке (..) на английском.

(1) Father: (Slowly, with a singing accent) The Jedi Knights have been practicing for a ve-ery long time (…) the who-ole month. They have been learning to fight with lightsabers (…) have solved a lot of maths problems (..) have done a lot of exercises in Russian (..) in English.

The characters of the father's fairy-tale are Jedi Knights – guardians of peace and justice from 'Star Wars' movies. They are typical children's and youth's positive fictional role models. They serve and protect the galaxy and study a mystical power called the Force. In the father's tale Jedi Knights are studiously practicing their skills. The father discursively describes their insistence and diligence in their work by building a symmetrical pair of time expressions with prolonged vowels: *До-олго тренировались (…) це-елый месяц* (*a ve-ery long time (…) the who-ole month*). This indirect positioning strategy categorises the Jedi Knights as those who are working hard and implicates all the personal merits this category could include. On the conversational informative level the father just notes that the Knights have been practicing a long time. On the discursive level however, he shows his approval of the Knight's action and indirectly encourages his son to identify with this category of hardworking and persevering people and emulate their behaviour.

The father continues to expand this category by listing the skills which the Knights are practicing. This category gets enlarged gradually while the narrative unfolds and becomes increasingly complex. The first and most important skill the Jedi Knights must have, both in the movie and in the father's tale, is an ability to fight with lightsabers – laser swords. By juxtaposition of this skill with the next skills he names in sequence – school subject skills, the father makes a parallel between the world of fiction and the real one. By connecting two worlds he diminishes the distance between them and facilitates the identification of his son with the Knight's category. He suggests that solving maths problems and doing language exercises is the everyday work not only for him but also for the great space heroes. Specifying the skilfulness at school subjects as a necessary feature of being a Jedi Knight has

a reason. Russian parents usually treat the education of their children very seriously. Thus including the school subjects within the desirable set of competences that every hero must have could be treated as a performance of Russianess itself, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

The school subjects listed by the father are the main ones; the list does not include what he possibly sees as less important subjects, such as social sciences or art. It is impossible to say, however, why he ranks them in this particular order: maths, Russian, English. The short pauses between the names of the subjects may indicate that they were chosen at least partly deliberately. Maybe they are the subjects causing the problems to the boy, starting with his least favourite. Maybe they are just the subjects the father finds the most important. It could also be that Russian is inserted between two other subjects from the boy's 'main' school in order to 'camouflage' it – to make it less visible, *one of the* subjects. It is obvious however, that in this short fragment of narrative, the father very clearly states that in order to become a Jedi Knight/hero/the person who deserves his (father's) consideration one should be skilful not only in fighting with lightsabers but also in Russian among other subjects.

In the next example three speakers - a mother, her teenage son and his friend - are present. Both boys are the pupils of The Russian Edinburgh School. The conversation takes place during a meal.

Example 13

ST (Mother aged 40, Alyosha aged 13, Alyosha's friend aged 12)

(1) Мама: Одна неделя осталась до конца февраля. И всё, и весна, да? А вы, знаете, кстати, в начале марта, какой праздник будет?

(2) Алёша: Пасха.

(3) Мама: Нет, пасха в апреле. А что до пасхи? Когда пекут блины-ы-ы? (...) Как это называется?

(4) Алёша: Э-э-э(...) Забыли.

(5) Алёшин друг: (торжественным голосом) День блинов.

(6) Мама: Нет, на букву "м".

(7) Алёша: Масленица.

(8) Мама: Масленица, да. Пекут блины, с разными начинками, да? Празднуют масленицу, она длится неделю(..) неделю, как правило, потом начинается что?
(9) Алёша: Пасха.
(10) Мама: Пасхе предшествует сорокадневный пост. Да?
(11) Алёша: Когда никто ничего не ест.
(12) Мама: Нет, когда не едят молочные продукты и мясные продукты. Да?
(13) Алёша: У-гу.

(1) Mother: It's only one week left till the end of February. And that's all, and then it's spring, yeah? Do you know, by the way, what holiday is at the beginning of March?
(2) Alyosha: Easter.
(3) Mother: No, Easter is in April. And what is before Easter? When people bake pa-ancakes? (...) What is it called?
(4) Alyosha: A-a-a (...) We've forgotten.
(5) Alyosha's friend: (in a ceremonial voice) Pancakes day.
(6) Mother: No, begins with the letter 'm'.
(7) Alyosha: Maslenitsa.
(8) Mother: Maslenitsa, yes. People bake pancakes with various fillings, yeah? They're celebrating Maslenitsa, it lasts a week (..) a week, as a rule, and then begins what?
(9) Alyosha: Easter.
(10) Mother: Easter is preceded by a forty day fast. Yes?
(11) Alyosha: When nobody eats anything.
(12) Mother: No, when people don't eat dairy products and meat products. Yes?
(13) Alyosha: U-hu.

In utterance (1) the mother initiates a neutral conversation with the boys about the seasons. She calculates that only one week is left until the end of winter. She invites the boys to agree with her by adding at the end of the sentence a particle of agreement *'da?'*. Then, not waiting for any reply, rather implied here according to the turn-taking organisation of conversation and her own request for a response, promptly redirects the talk to another topic, probably more important for her. She connects two topics by the adverb 'by the way' placed after the clichéd phrase *'Do you know'*. The new topic concerns cultural information and is connected with spring holidays. By using the phrase *'Do you know'* the mother establishes power

relations authority/delegitimacy (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 598), takes an interactional stance of a *knowing and asking subject* and the boys join her by trying to answer her questions.

The mother asks the question '*what holiday is at the beginning of March?'* (1) and her son, without any delay, answers that it is Easter (2). The mother meant a Russian Orthodox holiday *Maslenitsa*[36] (*there*, back in Russia) but she did not specify it in her question, assuming that it is obvious and recognisable for both herself and the boys. Her son's answer, however, considers the nearest holiday *here* – in Scotland/Great Britain/Europe. In order to repair this lack of recognition at the conversational level the mother replies that Easter is in April and asks an additional question about what holiday is before Easter (the first question) (3). The second additional question contains a prompt word, which the mother highlights by prolonging the vowel: *Когда пекут блины-ы-ы* (*people bake pa-ancakes*). This word is a kind of stereotype associated with Russian cuisine and being Russian in general. By accentualising the word, the mother exploits it in order to move the frame of reference to the Russian cultural ground. Then, when the frame becomes shifted, she rephrases her previous question from utterance (1) - *What is it called?* - and tries to elicit from the boys a very definite answer to it – i.e. the name of the holiday she means (3).

Now both boys understand that the mother's question refers to Russian culture and traditions but neither of them is able to give a satisfactory answer (4) (5). Here Alesha's friend answer '*День блинов*' probably does not refer to the English equivalent of the name of the holiday *'Pancake Day'* but is rather 'invented' by the boy for the immediate demands of the conversation, by mocking the Russian pattern for naming holidays (e.g. *День учителя* (*Teacher's Day*), *День космонавтики* (*Kosmonaut's Day*) etc.) The mother, however, does not give up and uses the repairing strategy by offering one more prompt to the boys. She suggests that the name of the holiday *begins with the letter 'm'* (6). She continues her attempts to elicit the right answer to her question as she presupposes that this cultural information is known to both boys not least because this holiday is celebrated every year in Russian school which they attend. Her presupposition, as well as the repairing strategy she has chosen, appear to be justified and Alyosha recollects the name of the holiday and gives the correct answer to the initial question - *Maslenitsa* (7).

[36] *Maslenitsa* is an Eastern Slavic religious and folk holiday known also as Butter or Pancake Week. It is celebrated during the last week before the Great Lent preceding the Orthodox Easter.

The mother confirms the correctness of the answer (8). She provides some additional detailed information about the celebrations (which is probably also known to both boys) in order to revise what is to her important cultural knowledge. She asks the boys for approval or confirmation that the information is known or received – *∂a?* (8). The boys do not answer verbally but probably they nod their heads or show their approval or confirmation in some other non-verbal way. Then the mother asks the next question about what begins after *Maslenitsa*, having Lent in mind (8). Her son, however, gives a wrong answer (9). The mother answers her question herself, as she probably recognises that this cultural information is possibly unknown to the boys (10). Again, she finishes her informative statement by checking if the information is recognised/approved/received – *Да?* (10). Alyosha tries to confirm that this information is known to him by explaining it (11). He explains it wrongly, however. Probably, instead of the Orthodox fast he meant the Muslim fast for Ramadan - when during the day people do not eat or drink at all. The notion of Muslim fast is undoubtedly more familiar to him, as a member of the British multinational society, in which information about culture of various ethnic minorities is available and popularised. The mother amends the wrong information given by her son and again checks if the proper correct information is received - *Да?* (12). In order to confirm that the information is received Alyosha gives his mother a minimal response *U-hu* (13).

In this short conversation only the mother and her son are active – the son's friend pronounces only one short sentence. It can be that he finds this topic unusual for the family conversation, or he indeed does not know that much about these cultural facts as Alyosha does. It can also be that he drew back from the conversation because when he attempted to joke about the name of the holiday *Pancakes day* (5) the other participants did not support him, probably treating the topic more seriously. But even as a passive participant he has received the information that the mother aimed to convey. Using her authority position, as well as the interactional situation, in which all three of them are sitting at the dinner table (and will remain there at least for several minutes), the mother arranges a school-like revision of Russian cultural information she finds necessary for the children to know in the environment of emigration. By doing this she displays her own affiliation to Russian culture and traditions and on this base builds a common ground with the children.

In the next example three speakers (mother and her two teenage sons) are present. The conversation takes place in the evening after the meal. The family is having tea.

Example 14

TL (Mother aged 38, Andrey aged 16, Vasya aged 13)

(1) Вася: За рулём ещё будешь?

(2) Мама: Я?! Ты что?! Я уже сегодня никуда.

(3) Андрей: За рулём – в кровати!

(4) (Смех).

(5) Мама: Московское время - девять тридцать. Какой уже за рулём! Я ни-ку-да!

(6) Андрей: Московское – не девять тридцать.

(7) Мама: Ну, это так считается.

(8) Вася: На-ше – девять тридцать!

(9) Мама: На-ше – это московское. Ясно?

(1) Vasya: Are you going to be behind the wheel again?

(2) Mother: Me?! Are you joking?! Today I'm not moving anywhere.

(3) Andrey: Behind the wheel – in bed!

(4) (Laughter).

(5) Mother: Moscow time – nine thirty. What an idea behind the wheel! I don't go a-ny-whe-re!

(6) Andrey: Moscow time – isn't nine thirty.

(7) Mother: Well, it's considered like that.

(8) Vasya: O-urs is nine thirty!

(9) Mother: O-urs is Moscow. Clear?

In utterance (1) the younger son Vasya asks the mother if she is planning to go anywhere by car this evening. He asks this question using a phrase *за рулём* (*behind the wheel*) which phrase both, in Russian and in English, is rather rarely used colloquially. The mother expresses her astonishment to his son's idea by asking two counter questions: *Я?! Ты что?!* and states that she will not go anywhere that evening (2). The older son Andrey recognises the stylistic incorrectness of the phrase *'за рулём'* and makes a joke about his brother's

question: *За рулём – в кровати!* (*Behind the wheel – in bed!*) (3). This sentence sounds rather like a slogan or newspaper heading which generates joint laughter (4).

When the laughter subsides the mother explains her unwillingness to drive this evening by referring to the late hour. She makes an informative statement that *Московское время - девять тридцать*, where *'Московское время'* is a Soviet cliché (5). During the Soviet period there were only three radio channels. Two of them were central (Moscow) and one local, which broadcast for only part of the day. Time-signals were transmitted centrally and people living in other time zones just added an appropriate number of hours to the Moscow time. Thus for all Soviet people the time was always *Московское время*. By evoking this Soviet cliché the mother demonstrates her membership of the category of *Soviet people* and sets the frame of reference in the USSR (*there*). She does not expect any reaction from the boys to this performance of her Russianness (or rather Sovietness) and returns to her son's idea for her to be *'за рулём'*. She expresses her strong reluctance to going anywhere that evening by syllabifying the word *ни-ку-да* (*a-ny-whe-re*) (5).

Then, in utterance (6), the older son Andrey unexpectedly returns to the *'Moscow time'* topic in order to correct the statement about the time, his mother has made. He notices his mother's mistake on the informative level but does not recognise the Soviet cliché she has used in her expression. He claims that *Moscow time isn't nine thirty*. The mother tries to justify her factual inaccuracy (7). Then, in utterance (8) the conversation is re-joined by the younger brother Vasya, who was inactive since utterance (1). He ignores the explanation made by the mother and supports his older brother's claim by refining that *'nine thirty'* is not Moscow but local time. He discursively describes the local time by using the pronoun '*ours*' and emphasises it by syllabifying – *На-ше* (*O-urs*) (8). By doing this he shifts the frame back to Scotland and builds a new membership, opposite to his mother's, of the category of the *locals* (*here*). The mother, however, does not give up and by exploiting her son's emphasised pronoun *на-ше* makes a definite affirmation and shifts the frame back to the USSR (*there*): *На-ше - это московское* (*O-urs is Moscow*) (9). In order to confirm her victory in this mocking argument at the end of utterance the mother asks a question: *Ясно?* (*Clear?*) (9). By doing this she, in a playful way, creates a stance of power and authority and leaves her sons no room for negotiation.

5.2.b. Evoking Russian and Soviet Knowledge by Children

This section will present the analysis of three family conversations where Russian/Soviet cultural knowledge is being evoked by children. In the first example a father and his primary school daughter have a telephone conversation before going to sleep. The Russian-speaking parents are divorced and the girl lives with her mother. The father calls his daughter in order to ask how she has spent the day.

Example 15

DS (Father aged 42, Sveta aged 9)

(1) Папа: Ты уже в пижаме?

(2) Света: Ну да, потому что я в это время уже "Спокойной ночи, малыши!". Ну, знаешь.

(3) Папа: А, ясно(...) А как там в школе?

(1) Father: You're already in pyjamas?

(2) Sveta: Yes indeed, because by now I am already 'Good Night, Little Ones!' You know.

(3) Father: Oh, I see (...) How was school?

In the first utterance by asking a question about pyjamas the father is expressing his wonderment about the daughter being ready for bed early. The parents divorced some years ago, the father does not live with his family and probably is not well acquainted with his daughter's daily routine. In utterance (2) the daughter confirms her readiness to go to bed in a metaphorical way. She refers to the popular Soviet and Russian TV programme '*Спокойной ночи, малыши!*'[37], which has been broadcast from the late Khrushchev era to the present day. By relating to this programme she indexes in a circuitous way the time expression - *я в это время уже 'Спокойной ночи, малыши! '* – as well as her affiliation to the category '*малыши*'. By labelling herself as a '*малыш(ка)*' the girl responds at the conversational level to her father's wonderment about her being ready for bed early. Apart from this, linking to the programme, she probably refers also to a kind of a habitual family practice. This practice may apply to the past, when the family was together and before going to bed the girl was

[37] **'***Good Night, Little Ones!'* is a long-running children's television program continuously aired since 1964. At present it is broadcast on the *'Rossiya 1'* TV channel.

watching this program on Russian satellite TV or at the present time, when she visits her father at weekends. In both cases this practise is mutual for the father and daughter and is recognised as such by both of them. Especially by adding at the end of the utterance the meaningful - *Ну, знаешь* - the girl checks and/or confirms that the knowledge about this cultural fact is (or supposed to be) shared between her and her father. She indexes a solidarity and emotional connection with her father and underlines her and her dad's membership in a 'circle of the initiated' – the *we*-category. The father recognises and confirms his affiliation to this category created by his daughter - *А, ясно*. Then, according to his interactional stance of the information seeker, redirects the conversation to another topic asking a stereotypical parent's question about school (3).

This short example illustrates how by evoking the name of Russian children's TV programme during the conversation with her father, the 9 year old girl establishes a category of *'those who know'* and demonstrates her membership of it. The example also shows the father's response to this demonstration. The father recognises the fact, that his daughter has chosen to be potentially recognisable to him and confirms his affiliation to this *we*-category established by the girl.

In the next example there are three participants: a mother and her two teenage sons Andrey and Vasya. They are making jokes about accidentally waking up Andrey.

Example 16

TL (Mother aged 38, Andrey aged 16, Vasya aged 13)

(1) Мама: Ой, Андрей, мы ж тебя разбудили!

(2) Вася: Когда Вася тарабанил!

(3) (Смех).

(4) Андрей: Я думал, почтальон, думаю: "Какая посылка?"

(5) Мама: (Изменённым смешным голосом). Какая такая посылка?

(6) Андрей: Ага – такая!

(7) (Смех).

(8) Андрей: Как почтальон Печкин!

(9) Мама: Точно!

(10) (Смех раздаётся с новой силой, продолжается какое-то время, затем стихает).

(11) Мама: Вася, вот ты пойдёшь в понедельник в школу […]

(1) Mother: Oh, Andrey, we woke you up!
(2) Vasya: When Vasya was banging!
(3) (Laughter).
(4) Andrey: I thought it was a postman, I am thinking 'What parcel?'
(5) Mother: (With changed funny voice). What parcel indeed?
(6) Andrey: Yes – that one!
(7) (Laughter).
(8) Andrey: Like postman Pechkin!
(9) Mother: Exactly!
(10)(The new stronger peal of laughter outbursts, lasts for a while and then fades).
(11) Mother: Vasya, when you will go to school on Monday […]

In the first utterance the mother realised that she and her younger son woke up the other son. The younger son Vasya confesses that it was he who woke up Andrey (2). He speaks about himself in a comical way referring to himself in the third person and using a colloquial verb *тарабанить* (*to bang*) which generates laugher (3). Andrey expresses his wrong assumption about the parcel being delivered (4). The mother joins this kind of game initiated by the boys and by doing this diminishes the distance between the participants. She rephrases her son's question with a changed funny voice: *'Какая такая посылка?'* (*What parcel indeed?*) (5). Continuing the game Andrey suggests that Vasya himself was that parcel (probably pointing at him, or using some other form of non-verbal expression) (6) which again causes joint laugher (7).

Finally, concerning the whole situation which emerged as a result of joint interactional work between all the participants, Andrey frames the behaviour of his younger brother as the behaviour of *postman Pechkin*, the character from a well known cartoon from the Soviet period[38], who was a bit annoying and always arrived at the wrong time (8). By referring to a Soviet cartoon character which belongs to the sphere of common cultural knowledge of the collocutors Andrey constructs solidarity between the conversation participants and highlights

[38] *'Three from Prostokvashino'* is a 1978 Soviet animated film based on the children's book *'Uncle Fyodor, His Dog and His Cat'* by Eduard Uspensky.

their affiliation to the *we*-category in which every member in some way is related to the Soviet/Russian cultural frame. The mother recognises and accepts her membership of the category which her son has just created of those sharing this cultural knowledge. She responds to Andrey's statement with the strong confirmation: *Точно!* (*Exactly!*) (9). As the mother has the highest position in this family, her approval and acceptance of her son's new frame proposal allow the participants of the conversation to burst into a new stronger peal of laughter (10). The laughter lasts for a while and then when it fades and the topic comes to an end in a natural way the mother redirects the conversation to another topic (11).

Similarly as in the previous example, in this chunk of conversation the 16 year old boy shows his solidarity with the other family members and creates the *we*-category by evoking the name of a character from the Soviet animated film and assuming that this fact is known to all the participants. This fact is indeed known to the other participants, and they admit and confirm their membership of this category. Probably, the boy is more interested in addressing his performance of Russianness to his mother rather than to his twelve year old brother, in order to gain her approval and to please her. But it is only a guess. The fact is that this performance is immediately and strongly appreciated by the mother through her exclamation *Точно!* which causes joint laughter of all the family members.

In the last example of this section, two persons, a mother and her 9 year old daughter, are present. The conversation takes place in a bus.

Example 17

DS (Mother aged 39, Sveta aged 9)

(1) Света: Мам, я видела наш флаг русский! Только что за окном.

(2) Мама: Да ты что?

(3) Света: Да, вот он такой //

(4) Мама: //Висел на доме?

(5) Света: Нет. Он такой (...) Белый дом (...)

(6) Мама: Да-а.

(7) Света: Синяя такая вот, знаешь (..) м-м-м (..) такая 'To Let'.

(8) Мама: Надпись такая.

(9) Света: Да, надпись такая. А внизу – красная машина.

(10) Мама: Да, получилось да (…) Композиция цветов нашего флага (..) русского.

(1) Sveta: Mum, I've seen our Russian flag! Just now outside the window.
(2) Mother: Really?
(3) Sveta: Yes, it was like//
(4) Mother: //Was hanging on the house?
(5) Sveta: No. It was like (…) White house (…)
(6) Mother: Ye-es.
(7) Sveta: A blue one, you know (..) m-m-m (..) like 'To Let'.
(8) Mother: Some kind of a sign.
(9) Sveta: Yes, like a sign. And below – a red car.
(10) Mother: Yes, it makes yes (…) The composition of colours of our flag (..) Russian.

In utterance (1) the girl informs her mother that she has just seen the Russian flag outside the bus window. She discursively describes it by using the pronoun *наш*. In such a way the girl creates a *we*-category of Russian people. She includes herself and her mother in this category and at the same time negates her and her mother's membership of the category of Scottish/British people – *they*-category. The mother recognises and approves her daughter's categorisational work. She immediately reacts to the daughter's informative statement showing her strong interest: *Да ты что?* (2). The mother's response can be described as slightly exaggerated. The girl's statement does not contain any information about an exceptional or extraordinary fact and probably the responses *Да?* or *Правда?,* (or even minimal responses, such as *М-м* or *У-гу*), are more relevant for this conversational situation.

The girl starts her description of the flag (3) but the mother interrupts her and asks an additional question about it (4). By interrupting and asking the additional question, the mother shows her impatience about getting more information concerning the flag her daughter saw through the window. At the same time she indirectly shows her strong interest and engagement with the topic and also its importance for her. The girl continues describing the flag, which turns out to be not a real flag but a composition of three objects on the street in the colours of the Russian flag.

She states that the white colour is represented by a white house (5). The mother shows her interest and engagement by the confirmative *Да-а* pronounced with a prolonged vowel (6). In utterance (7) the girl has a problem with naming in Russian a sign-board which represents the colour blue and the mother repairs that troublesome part of the daughter's description - *Надпись такая* (*Some kind of a sign*) (8). The daughter accepts her mother's repair by repetition *Да, надпись такая*, and names a red car as an equivalent to the red colour (9).

In utterance (10) the mother makes a short summary of her daughter's description of an imaginative Russian flag. She shows her understanding of her daughter's idea as well as her approbation to it by using the particle of agreement *'да'* twice - *Да, получилось да...* (*Yes, it makes yes…*) – and names her description 'the composition of colours'. In order to confirm once again her and her daughter's affiliation to the category of Russian people, which the girl has established at the beginning of the conversation, the mother uses for a second time, repeating after her daughter, the pronoun '*наш'* for the description of the flag - *Композиция цветов нашего флага* (*The composition of colours of our flag*). Then, after a short pause, she adds *русского*. In doing this she makes it absolutely clear that their (her and her daughter's) flag in not any other but the Russian flag and closes the discussion of this topic by a symmetrical repetition of the discursive description of the flag from the (1) utterance: *наш флаг русский (1) / нашего флага .. русского (10)*.

Considering the partialness principle of the identity construction (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 606) it is difficult to say if the girl has decided to make up this description of the Russian flag deliberately and intentionally or it simply happened accidentally. It is possible that in order to please her she wanted to show to her mother her inclusion within the Russian cultural background (to which, she knows, her mother considers herself to belong). It might also be possible that had it been any other combination of object colours, she could have made up a description of the flag of any other country, not necessarily those of Russia. Independently of the girl's reasons however, the mother very enthusiastically approved and supported her daughter's demonstration of Russianness.

The above analysis (5.2.a., 5.2.b.) shows how by evoking Soviet and Russian cultural knowledge (customs and traditions, names of literary characters, the titles of Soviet TV programmes and various facts from language/literature/history) during family conversations in everyday situations parents in various ways create and perform in front of their children the elements of Russian national identity. For example, they build the different kinds of oppositions between two cultures and lifestyles such as: *us/they, here/there, now/then* (Examples 7, 10, 14). They negotiate and re-negotiate memberships to various kinds of meaningful categories such as: *busy people, hardworking people, Knights, Soviet people, locals* (Examples 7, 11, 12, 14) or they simply transmit the important cultural information to their children using their family power positions (Examples 9, 13).

Using their authority the parents constantly draw the children's attention to facts from their native history, literature and folklore. They seem to value the Russian culture and their previous life in the Soviet Union/Russia more than the culture and lifestyle of their present country of residence as they often demonstrate their inclusion in the Russian culture and at the same time the exclusion from the British culture. The Russian-speaking adults try to make their children identify with the values, norms and symbols which they themselves identify with.

In the examples analysed above, however, the children do not respond to their parents' performances of Russian national identity - at least in the majority of cases. We can assume the reasons why the children do not react to the parents' performances of Russianness. It may be a lack of interest in the cultural information which parents attempt to pass on to them. They might not understand the facts which the parents refer to, or even if they ever knew them they might have forgotten them by now. The children may eventually develop a different attitude to their present life and the country which they live in. They are being brought up in Scotland and unlike their parents they may consider Scotland as their native land and its culture and society as the culture and society to which they belong[39]. The parents nevertheless do not expect any reactions from their children but they carefully and skilfully dose and, if necessary, modify the Russianness which they try to convey to their children,

[39] The questions of migrants' hybrid identities and integration to the host culture were discussed in Chapter Three.

possibly in order not to 'overdose' or discourage them and they also persistently reiterate their attempts.

Throughout the sixteen hours of my recorded data I have found only three examples in which children spontaneously and independently evoke the Russian/Soviet cultural knowledge during their everyday talks with their parents (Examples 15, 16, 17). It is difficult to say, why there are no more such examples. It is likely that the children do not demonstrate their Russianness simply because they do not consider themselves as Russians. However, by referring to the Russian/Soviet knowledge they presuppose that their references will be recognised by parents, as they know that their parents belong to Russian/Soviet culture. In these three examples analysed above the children evoke this common knowledge in order to show their solidarity with the parents within this shared cultural ground and also in order to confirm their common membership in the *we*-category rather than to perform their national identity. In none of the analysed examples do the parents leave their children's references without a response and always react positively to these rare pronouncements of Russianness by their children.

5.3. *Our* Food – *Their* Food

Despite the fact that everyday practices and experiences such as raising children, familial relationships, religious rituals, dining practices or spending free time are central to human lives, very often they are not given appropriate attention in migrants' identity research.

Within the Russian-speaking community living in Scotland social life is to great extent organised around food itself or food-related practices. At all kinds of celebrations, parties or meetings within the community, food is present both in its material form – as a variety of dishes the participants prepared and brought with them, as well as in its discursive form – as a variety of stories the participants tell about this food.

Various kinds of dishes, products, ingredients which the participants consider as *Russian* or *ours* are discursively described as *healthy*, *real*, *wholesome*, *best*. Within the child-rearing

discourse the fact of feeding children with *our Russian* necessarily *home-made* food is equated to the fact of caring after them and loving them:

TL (Mother aged 39, Andrey aged 16, Vasya aged 13)
Мама: Ну как, хорошие я вам котлет<u>очки</u>и нажарила? Любит вас мама?
Андрей: Да-а.
Вася: Да-а.

Repeated referencing by the members of the community to the topic of *our Russian food* implies the existence of shared ground, of a common understanding of the concepts related to it. The important fact is that while referring to the concept of food the participants very rarely have in mind its primary meaning – i.e. nourishment but rather connect it with other discourses, such as: the discourse of health, of child-rearing, of nationality, of religion etc.

In the following subchapter I will analyse examples of family conversations where Russianness is constructed within the food-related discourse.

In the first example parents and their seven year old son are present. The parents are trying to convince their son to eat the meal freshly prepared by the mother.

<u>Example 18</u>
NR1(Mother aged 42, Father aged 48, Danya aged 7)
(1) Даня: Пап, я не люблю эту еду. Я не хочу её есть.
(2) Папа: Но она же очень полезная, ты же знаешь.
(3) Даня: Да, полезная, только я её не люблю.
(4) Мама: А её не надо любить, её надо есть. Иди сюда, что-то тебе по-секрету скажу (...) Вся домашняя еда тебе полезна (...) Всем полезна.
(5) Даня: (Громко) Мама! Я не хочу!
(6) Папа: (Обращаясь к маме) Ну вот видишь, опять какой-то дряни в школе наелся!

(1) Danya: Dad, I don't like this food. I don't want to eat it.
(2) Father: But it is very healthy indeed, you know, don't you?
(3) Danya: Yes, healthy, but I don't like it.

(4) Mother: You don't need to like it, you just need to eat it. Come here, I'll tell you something in secret (...) All the home-made food is healthy for you (...) Healthy for everybody.
(5) Danya: (Loudly) Mum! I don't want it!
(6) Father: (Addressing the mother) You see, he ate plenty of rubbish at school again!

In utterance (1) the boy makes a very clear and categorical statement about the food needed to be eaten: *I don't like it / I don't want to eat it.* The father attempts to convince him to eat it by appealing to the boy's sense of logic and labels the food as *'healthy'* (2). He uses the emphasising particle *же* twice. The first time, in order to prove that the food is indeed healthy. The second time, in order to get the boy to recognise that this information is already known: *ты же знаешь*. (Probably the boy has already been repeatedly told that the food his mother prepares at home is tasty, healthy, appropriate for him *etc.*). By doing this, the father diminishes the distance between him and his son and ascribes them both to the category of *those who share particular knowledge*.

This strategy, however, does not yield any positive results. The boy confirms that he has recognised this knowledge as common but still denies eating his meal: *Yes, healthy, but I don't like it* (3). Then the mother enters the conversation in order to join forces with the father in encouraging the boy to eat. She states that liking food and eating it do not necessarily have anything in common: *You don't need to like it, you just need to eat it* (4). Then she calls the boy to come closer to her and promises to tell him a secret (4). In that way she diminishes not only distance in terms of power relations, but also of factual spatial distance. The secret the mother promises to reveal to the boy turns out not to be a secret at all. Not having any other arguments, she simply rephrases the father's statement that *All the home-made food is healthy* for the boy (4). After a pause, in order to strengthen her argument, she makes a generalisation: *Healthy for everybody* (4).

The boy probably feels defrauded by his mother and reacts to her statement more aggressively and loudly: *Mum! I don't want it!* (5). At this stage, the parents lost – both on the interactional and on the pedagogical level. They have no arguments apart from their own belief, shared probably with the whole generation of Russian parents and grandparents, that home-made food is healthy and good for children and therefore should be eaten by them. In

this chunk of conversation, the boy shows his recognition of this knowledge in common with the adults. However, he refuses to consider the fact that the food is home-made and healthy as a reason for eating it.

Discontented with the situation, the father attempts to find a reason why the boy doesn't want to eat his meal and indirectly also to justify his and the mother's pedagogical loss. He addresses to the mother his assumption that the boy is not hungry because he ate something at school (maybe school lunch) or was treated by his colleagues (6). The father labels this food *rubbish (дрянь)* opposing it to *healthy* home-made (Russian) food. This 'fight' between local *rubbish* and Russian *healthy* food was probably already discussed in this family which indexes the use of an adverb *again* by the father: *опять какой-то дряни в школе наелся!* (*he ate plenty of rubbish at school again!*) (6)**.**

There are three levels on which the father's statement may be discussed (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 592). On the conversational informative level he points only the reason why the boy does not want to eat: he is not hungry because he ate at school. Considering the Russian food-related discourse, the father clearly states that *their* local food is *rubbish* and that *our* home-made is *healthy*. However, it can also be viewed in a wider context of child-rearing discourse. By making his statement the father implies that the local school, as well as the local parents (who give their children such *rubbish*), are unable to feed the children properly and, consequently, to take care of them properly. It means that *they* are bad carers and *we* are good ones.

The next example also shows how *their* food is opposed to *ours*. In this example two persons are present - a mother and her teenage son. The conversation takes place in the morning. The boy is in a hurry to get to school.

Example 19

TL1(Mother aged 38, Vasya aged 13)

(1) Мама: Ты что, уходишь уже? Я ж тебе блинчики пеку! Как без завтрака-то!

(2) Вася: Мам, ну я в школу опаздаю. Я в школе чего-нибудь поем.

(3) Мама: Ну вот ещё – всухомятку там давиться ихними сэндвичами! Подожди, пока ты там пальтишко наденешь и ботиночки – я тебе как раз горяченьких напеку.

(1) Mother: Are you leaving now? Look, I'm baking pancakes for you! No way to go without breakfast!
(2) Vasya: Mum, I will be late for school. I'll eat something at school.
(3) Mother: No way – to choke there with their dry cold sandwiches! Wait, till you put on your coat and boots – I'll bake the hot ones for you right away.

In utterance (1) the mother asks if the boy is leaving just now and not waiting for any response informs that she is baking pancakes for him. By using the emphasising particle *ж* (*же*), which has here the adversative function, she opposites the first sentence to the second and suggests that he can not leave right now *because* she is baking pancakes for him. By adding the third sentence she makes her statement even stronger. The third sentence contains a colligation (strengthen by adding a particle *–то: Как без завтрака-то!*) that people (children) should not go out without breakfast in general (1).

The boy answers that if he waits for pancakes he will be late and reassures his mother that he will eat at school (2). He uses an indefinite pronoun *something* in order to show a kind of indifference to the fact what exactly he will eat at school. At his age of thirteen, maybe he would like to demonstrate to his mother his independence and resist in some way her (in his opinion) excessive protectiveness. His statement, however, generates the mother's immediate and firm objection: *Ну вот ещё […]!* (3).

The mother assumes that the *something* her son is going to eat at school is *dry cold sandwiches*. To show her disapproval of the boy's intention she discursively describes this kind of food using an adverb *всухомятку* and a verb *давиться* (*choke with […] dry cold sandwiches*), both expressions having a strong pejorative meaning (3). She also uses a borrowed English word *сэндвич* (instead of the also borrowed from German but adopted in Russian *бутерброд*) in order to definitely contrast *their* foreign *dry* and *cold* food with *our* domestic freshly made one**.** The mother names *our* food блинчики - with the diminutive suffix -*чик* (1) and opposites it with *their* sandwiches using a colloquial pronoun *ихние* (3).

In this utterance the mother also uses an adverb of place *там*[40] in order to make another opposition. *Там* (*there*) means at school, outside, in the hostile and dangerous world where one can choke with a dry cold sandwich, while *тут* (*here*) means at home, inside in a friendly and safe place, where one is surrounded by love and care and where the mother bakes pancakes especially *for you* (*тебе*) (which is repeated twice in (1) and (3)).

The mother is discursively positioning her thirteen year old son as a small child by addressing him in a way in which small children are usually addressed (Chapter Four: 4.2.a., 4.2.b.). She destroys the identity of an independent teenager which he attempted to perform in utterance (2) by using diminutives *пальтишко* and *ботиночки* (and *горяченькие*). In doing this she also justifies her role as a diligent carer who feeds and, consequently, loves her child. Using her top position in the family hierarchy she shows her son that he should not be indifferent to the food he eats and that the choice of food is very important and very simple. She implies that while she is his mother and he is her son he will eat *our/home-made/domestic/Russian горяченькие блинчики* ((3), (1)) instead of *their/ready-made/foreign/British (Scottish) dry cold sandwiches* (3). She also implies that in order to fulfil her parental responsibilities she must feed him properly before letting him go to the hostile and dangerous outside world.

In the next example a mother and her twelve year old daughter are present. The conversation takes place during a meal and considers the food the mother has freshly prepared.

Example 20

AK 5 (Mother aged 42, Alena aged 12)

(1) Мама: Вкусно, да?

(2) Алёна: Да, очень вкусно.

(3) Мама: Домашняя приготовленная еда – самая лучшая.

(4) Алёна: Конечно. Не такая, как готовая в магазинах - просто ужасная.

(5) Мама: Да, очень много соли и консервантов (...) Здесь вообще хорошо готовить не умеют.

(6) Алёна: М-м.

[40] The word *там* used in this case can, but not necessarily, be considered as a linguistic parasite. The same word used later in this utterance certainly does not convey any semantic meaning: *пока ты там пальтишко наденешь* (3).

(1) Mother: Tasty, isn't it?
(2) Alena: Yes, very tasty.
(3) Mother: Home-made food is best.
(4) Alena: Sure. Not like that ready-made in the shops – just terrible.
(5) Mother: Yes, very much salt and preservatives (…) Generally they can't cook well here.
(6) Alena: M-m.

In utterance (1) the mother initiates the topic by asking a question whether the meal prepared by her is tasty. She invites her daughter to agree with her by adding at the end of the sentence a particle of agreement *да?* (1). In this way she at the same time invites her to the membership of a category of those *who like this food*. The daughter readily accepts her mother's invitation by agreeing that the meal is not just *tasty* but *very tasty* (2).

In utterance (3) the mother makes a generalisation that all *home-made food is best*. In doing this she ascribes herself to the category of *those who know that home-made food is best* and makes a claim that the meal she has prepared is best *because* it is home-made. The daughter shows her firm agreement with the maxim which her mother has stated - *Конечно* (*Sure*) (4). In order to prove that she recognises and shares with her mother the knowledge that *home-made food is best* she builds an opposition *home-made food / ready-made food*. The girl describes the ready-made food available in the shops labelling it as *просто ужасная* (*just terrible*) (4). In that way she exactly repeats the pattern used by her mother and makes a parallel between two kinds of food:

Mother: *home-made food is best* (3)
Daughter: *ready-made food (is) just terrible* (4)

The mother supports her daughter's account by beginning her own turn with a particle of agreement *Да* (5). In order to demonstrate her approval and to justify her daughter's statement the mother begins a rational explanation why this food is *just terrible*. In doing so she once again proves her and her daughter's membership to the *we*-category of those who share this knowledge.

To identify the deficiency of the ready-made food the mother names an excessive amount of salt and preservatives which the food contains. It seems, however, that they are the only examples which she can give at the moment. Her inability to produce more evidence is represented by a pause *(...)* (5). After the pause she ceases her attempt. She does not make any more efforts to explain why the *ready-made food* is *just terrible*. She is doing this either because of her failure to find more examples or possibly the fact that she considers this statement as a given truth which does not need any further evidence (the same as the truth - *home-made food is best* – shared probably by the whole Russian-speaking parents living both, in the United Kingdom and in Russia).

Instead of further explanation the mother makes a summarising statement: *Generally, they can't cook well here* (5) and the daughter confirms this with a minimal response *M-m* (6). In doing this she creates a category of *them* (locals, Scottish, British), who are living *here*. *They* can't cook well themselves and in addition the ready-made food offered in the shops is *just terrible*, consequently *they* do not eat well and do not feed their families (and children) well. According to the relationality principle of identity construction (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 598) in the presented example the Russianness emerges through the relation of difference to *them*. The *Russians* (unlike the *locals*) cook well themselves and do not eat ready-made food, thus, they eat well (because *home-made food is best*) and feed their families well.

In the analysed example the mother constructs her (and her daughter's) Russian national identity within the food related discourse. The notion of Russianness emerges gradually while the interaction unfolds (*ibid.*: 588): *food* (today's tasty meal) → *home-made food* (which is always best) → *our Russian food* (as an opposition to *their* food).

The daughter shows her recognition of her mother's references to the examples of common knowledge and beliefs (which are probably discussed at home) and she confirms this recognition at every stage of the conversation: *Yes, very tasty* (2) / *Sure* (4) / *M-m* (6). She even makes her own contribution to the discussion of the topic by the exact repetition of the pattern used by her mother in the previous turn: *Not like that ready-made in the shops – just terrible* (4). In doing so, however, she probably does not aim to support her mother's construction of identity but rather to demonstrate solidarity with her and to confirm her and her mother's membership in the *we*-category.

The next example considers *творог* (*cottage cheese*)[41]. This dairy product is the subject of so many discussions within the Russian-speaking community that it can be regarded as 'a recognisable discursive token of migrational experiences' (Zhukova Klausen 2011: 134). In the following example a mother and her teenage son are present. The mother proposes to her son that he should try *творог* which she has just made for tomorrow's celebration of *Maslenitsa* (Chapter Five: 5.1.a.) in the Russian School.

Example 21

ST 3 (Mother aged 40, Alesha aged 13)

(1) Мама: Лёш, хочешь творог попробовать?

(2) Алёша: Не, не.

(3) Мама: Лёш! На! (..) Да попробуй ты!

(4) Алёша: (С закрытым ртом) М! М!

(5) Мама: Дать попить?

(6) Алёша: Хватит! (…) Не люблю я творог.

(7) Мама: Ну, это потому что без сахара. (..) Не дуйся.

(1) Mther: Alesha, would you like to try cottage cheese?

(2) Alesha: No, no.

(3) Mother: Alesha! Take! (..) Just try it!

(4) Alesha: (With his mouth closed) M! M!

(5) Mother: Need to drink?

(6) Alesha: Enough! (…) I don't like cottage cheese.

(7) Mother: That's because it is without sugar. (..) Don't sulk.

In utterance (1) the mother asks his son if he wants to try *творог* and the boy answers that he does not (2). He repeats negative particle *no* twice to demonstrate his unwillingness to try it: *Не, не* (2). The mother, however, repeats her proposal more persistently. She calls her son by name with emphasis *Лёш!* and uses a particle *На!* which in this case has an incentive function and means *Take it!* (3). After a short pause she attempts to encourage her son to try

[41] Tvorog (also cottage cheese or curd) is a dairy product made from soured milk. Tvorog is an ingredient of many traditional Russian and European dishes.

the cheese again. She produces the subsequent exclamatory sentence using an imperative *попробуй* and a particle *да* which has here an emphasising meaning: *Да попробуй ты!* (*Just try it!*) (3).

In utterance (4) the boy makes unarticulated sounds *М! М!* which might indicate that his mother has forced him to try *творог* against his will. In order to correct her abuse or apologise for it, she asks her son if he needs to take some water after the cheese, as after a medicine or something which has a bad taste: *Дать попить?* (*Need to drink?*) (5).

By feeding the boy against his will with cottage cheese which he does not want to try and by offering him a drink directly after that, the mother discursively positions her teenage son in this interaction as a *small child* (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 592). At the same time she positions herself as a *parent* who feeds and, consequently, loves. This position is, however, not just a position of a *parent* but a *Russian parent* who feeds her child with the most Russian food (or at least, considered as such by the majority of Russian parents abroad) (Zhukova Klausen 2011: 134) – the home-made freshly prepared *творог.*

The boy demonstrates his resistance to the treating of him as a small child and his feeding with cottage cheese with the exclamation *Хватит!* (*Enough!*) (6). After a pause he makes a very clear statement that he does not like cottage cheese. In this statement, however, he uses a verb - pronoun inversion, with a predicate preceding a subject, probably in order to alleviate his previous exclamation and make it less categorical *Не люблю я творог* (instead of *Я не люблю творог*) (6).

The mother does not accept her son's declaration that he simply does not like *творог*. For her the fact that *творог* is a healthy diet product appropriate for children and that every child should eat it, is a piece of knowledge which had probably been passed within the child-rearing discourse from generation to generation in her own family, as well as in the families of the majority of other Russian parents. She attempts to legitimise the fact that her son does not like it by making a suggestion that that is because it lacks sugar - *Ну, это потому что без сахара* (7) - implying that if it had sugar he would certainly like it.

Possibly the boy looks offended, and after a short pause the mother addresses him again in a manner in which a small child is usually addressed: *Не дуйся* (*Don't sulk*) (7). In this way she probably attempts to subdue the nascent minor conflict and to indicate that the topic is finished.

In this chunk of conversation the mother attempted to perform her Russianness through positioning herself as a devoted Russian parent. She demonstrates her love and care of her son by attempting to feed him with one of the best, in her opinion, products which a parent can offer to a child – freshly prepared home-made cottage cheese. As the conversation takes place a day before the celebration of *Maslenitsa* in the Russian School and the cheese is prepared by the mother especially for this occasion, the boy certainly knows that this product is considered as a Russian one. It might be also that over the years on repeated occasions he had heard (from his parents, grandparents, on Russian television, radio etc.) that this product is healthy and appropriate for children's diet. Despite these conditions, however, he does not want to admit this knowledge as shared with his mother and demonstrates his firm resistance when the mother attempts to feed him with *творог.* On the other hand, it might also be that he recognises that this product is to some extent special and important for his mother and this is why his declaration that he does not like it is moderated by inversion.

The examples analysed in this subchapter demonstrate how Russian national identity is performed by parents within the food-related discourse. The parents attempt to pass to their children their beliefs, convictions, *a priori* truths, stereotypes connected with food and food-related practices they consider as important and significant.

The notion of *our Russian* (necessarily home-made) *good food* emerges as an opposition to *their local* (Scottish/British) *bad food*. In order to create such opposition the parents use discursive descriptions of particular meals and products (Examples 18, 19, 20). For example, such linguistic means as diminutive suffixes or exploitation of numerous combinations of particles, conjunctions and exclamations conveying a specific meaning. They also use labels while referring to food or products: *healthy, rubbish, terrible* (Examples 18, 20).

In their talks with children the parents position them as *small children* while they position themselves as *devoted carers* who feed them properly and, consequently, love them

(Examples 19, 21). They use also another positional pair: *they* are *bad carers* (because they feed their children badly) and *we* are the *good* ones (Examples 18, 19).

In all of the interactions analysed in this subchapter the parents build in common with their children memberships of the category of *those who share the knowledge about our Russian good food*. The children seem to recognise this knowledge as common. Even if they do not like particular products (*творог*, Example 21) or meals (*я не люблю эту еду*, Example 18) they *know* that this food is *healthy, healthy for everybody, tasty, best* (Examples 18, 20). The smallest resistance by children to admitting their membership to this common category of *those who know* evokes an immediate parental reaction to such 'improper' behaviour: *Ну вот ещё – всухомятку там давиться ихними сэндвичами!* (Example 19), *Не дуйся* (Example 21).

Over the years the Russian-speaking children will certainly hear the iterative discussions of food-related topics in their homes between parents, grandparents, friends, as well as on Russian television or radio. Moreover, the information about *our good Russian food* is constantly transmitted directly to them by their parents. That is why, even if they do not always share their parents' attitude to this food, they recognise the Russian food-related discourse as a common ground between them and their parents.

5.4. To Educate

Apart from the food-related discourse another one which is strongly represented in everyday talks within the Russian-speaking community is connected to child-rearing practices – i.e. children's education.

Members of the Russian-speaking community have a very serious attitude to the education of their children. There are reasons for such an attitude. From the very beginning of the Soviet Union free education available for all the citizens became one of the main aims of the newly

established state[42]. During the whole existence of the USSR it was indeed available and strongly promoted by the government. Education was considered as a right and a duty of every citizen, while the word *'learn'* (not without the influence of Lenin's maxim[43]) became a kind of rhetorical figure of speech.

The other reason for such an attitude to education among the Russian-speaking parents living in Scotland, connected in a way with the first one, is the fact that they are representatives of the last wave of Russian emigration to Great Britain (Chapter One: 1.3.). All of the participants in my research as well as at least one of their own parents have a University degree. In any case this attitude to education is strongly demonstrated by them in their everyday conversations with their children.

In this subchapter I will analyse the examples of intergenerational conversations where Russian national self is constructed within the educational discourse.

5.4.a. Learn, Learn and Learn

In this example a mother and her nine year old daughter are present. The conversation takes place in the evening. The mother has just listened to the radio weather forecast for the day after.

Example 22

DS (Mother aged 42, Sveta aged 9)

(1) Мама: Завтра будет целый день дождь.

(2) Света: (с надеждой в голосе) Значит завтра мы в русскую школу не пойдём?

(3) Мама: Нет, мы ***пойдём*** *в русскую школу (...) Если даже гром и молния. (..) Эта бедная русская школа и так только раз в неделю.*

[42] In 1919 the new governmental policy *likbez* (liquidation of illiteracy) was introduced. According to this policy the new system of compulsory education for children was established while millions of illiterate adults were enrolled into special literacy schools.

[43] *Learn, learn and learn* – a Soviet slogan which arose after a publishing in 1923 in *Pravda* Lenin's article *'Better Fewer, But Better'* (Lenin's Collected Works, 2nd English Edition, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, Volume 33, pages 487 – 502).

(1) Mother: It's raining tomorrow all day.
(2) Sveta: (with hope) Does it mean that tomorrow we will not go to the Russian school?
(3) Mother: No, we ***will*** *go to the Russian school (...) Even if there's thunder and lightening.*
(..) As it is this poor Russian School is only once a week.

In utterance (1) the mother makes an informative statement that tomorrow it is raining all day. The daughter asks with hope in her voice whether it means that because of rain they will not go to the Russian School (2). The girl uses a plural pronoun *we* because her mother usually takes her to school and picks her up after the classes. Apart from this, it might suggest that the girl recognises the attending of the Russian school as her mother's idea – not as her own choice or an obligatory duty such as, for example, attending the main primary school compulsory for all the children of school age. The mother, however, denies her daughter's assumption about missing the school and replies that they will go. She emphasises the verb ***пойдём*** in order to make her statement more categorical (3). After a pause she confirms that they will go *Если даже гром и молния* (*Even if there's thunder and lightening*) (3). In this way she highlights the importance of the fact of going to the Russian school and makes a clear claim that nothing can stop them doing that. In this utterance the mother increases the distance between her and her daughter and displays her strong authority in order to prevent any possibility that the conversation will slip into a negotiation format.

After a short pause the mother justifies being demanding and inflexible in her decision by stating that the Russian school is only once a week. To make her statement stronger she uses a particle *и так*: *и так только раз в неделю* (3). By doing this she demonstrates her disappointment and regret that Russian classes are so infrequent. She personifies the school by labelling it *бедная* (*poor*) - *Эта бедная русская школа* (3). She implies that the *poor Russian school* is treated 'unfairly' by them (her and her daughter) as probably, considering various circumstances, the girl sometimes misses the classes - but certainly only with her mother's permission and approbation. Because the mother implies that *both of them* are guilty of treating the *poor Russian school* 'unfairly', both of them therefore should make a sacrifice (or be punished) and this is why they will go tomorrow to the school *even if there's thunder and lightening* (3).

It is not surprising that the girl is not very keen to go to the Russian school on a rainy Saturday morning. If it were any other additional classes of her parents' choice, she would probably not be very keen to go either. It is also unsurprising that the mother will do everything she can to take her daughter to school because it was she, the mother (or the parents), who decided that the girl should attend the Russian school. The family lives in Glasgow and on Saturday mornings the mother takes the girl to the Russian Edinburgh School where she stays till midday. In the afternoons they return to Glasgow, where she attends Russian afternoon classes in the Glasgow Russian School. Such an attitude to the child's education in Russian shows that this issue is very important to the parents. However, it is not only the children's studying of Russian that is considered important by the Russian-speaking parents living in Scotland. The next example shows how a mother encourages her daughter to do her history homework.

In this example two persons are present– a mother and her teenage daughter. The conversation takes place in the evening. The mother asks her daughter about her homework for tomorrow.

Example 23

AK (Mother aged 42, Alena aged 13)

(1) Мама: Какие уроки тебе нужно делать, красавица?

(2) Алёна: Очень короткая штучка по истории.

(3) Мама: Ну так делай же! Я тебя умоляю!

(4) Алёна: Ну, мам!

(5) Мама: Я не хочу, чтобы у тебя была такая оценка! Я думаю это тебя совсем не достойно! У тебя должна быть "Эй", а не "Би/Си"!

(6) Алёна: Ой, ну мама, хорошо-о-о.

(1) Mother: Which subjects should you prepare, my beauty?

(2) Alena: Very short thing for history.

(3) Mother: So, just do it! I beg you!

(4) Alena: But, mum!

(5) Mother: I don't want you to have such a mark! I think this is not worthy of you at all! You must have 'A' but not 'B/C'!

(6) Alena: Oh mum, oka-ay.

In utterance (1) the mother asks her daughter about the school subjects she needs to prepare for tomorrow. She labels her daughter as *красавица* (*beauty*). Usually, by naming a girl *красавица* the speaker, who is necessarily at the higher position in terms of power relations, in an ironic way suggests that the girl's actions or behaviour are in some way inappropriate or do not meet expectations connected with a particular social situation. The label *красавица* which directly considers external merits but indirectly implies the person's internal 'emptiness' is opposite to the label *умница* (*clever*) which is used in order to approve, not necessary somebody's cleverness, but rather behaviour which is appropriate to the situation. Both labels are often used by parents or school teachers towards the girls in order to show approval or disapproval of their actions.

In the analysed fragment of conversation, by labelling her daughter *красавица* the mother discursively positions her as a girl who avoids her duties and implies that she, instead of doing her homework or, (in her opinion), any other useful work, certainly was busy with useless things (see Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 594).

The daughter answers that her only homework is *очень короткая штучка по истории* (*Very short thing for history*) (2) but the mother calls her to immediate action. She uses the verb *делай* in imperative and the emphasising particle *же* in an exclamatory sentence: *Ну так делай же!* (*So, just do it!*) (3). In order to make her appeal stronger she adds *Я тебя умоляю!* (*I beg you!*) (3). By using this expression, which can be described as slightly exaggerated in the situation, the mother shows that her daughter's history homework is very important for her.

The daughter attempts to resist *Ну, мам!* (4). The mother, however, does not react to her daughter's protest and does not allow the conversation to move into the negotiation format. In utterance (5) she makes three short and clear statements and positions herself as a rigorous and strict parent. In the first one she explains why she wants her daughter to do her history homework: *Я не хочу, чтобы у тебя была такая оценка!* In the second, she explains why she considers her daughter's mark as inappropriate: *Я думаю это тебя совсем не*

достойно! Finally, in the last sentence she informs which mark would satisfy her (the mother): *У тебя должна быть "Эй", а не "Би/Си"!* (5).

In Soviet schools the subject of pupils' marks was very important. Successful pupils were publicly complimented while unsuccessful ones were publicly criticised. The pupil's bad marks were not only his or her problem. Apart from condemning less successful pupils at various school meetings, their parents were usually called to school for 'pedagogical talks' and their stronger school colleagues were asked for help in improving the situation. The mother from the above example was a pupil of the Soviet school herself and the only educational system she knows was that one. This is why she moves the frame of the Soviet educational discourse to the local ground and attempts to rear her daughter within this discourse. For the mother it is absolutely clear that everybody should strive to get better results and never rest on what has been achieved.

The line of argument used by the mother in utterance (5) of the analysed example is very clear and coherent: *I don't want you to have this mark → because this is not worthy of you → you must have 'A'*. In utterance (6) the girl ceases her attempt to resist: *Ой, ну мама, хорошо-о-о*. She uses an interjection *ой*, a particle *ну* and prolongs the last syllable of the word *хорошо-о-о* in order to show the annoyance about her mother's claims. Probably the girl frequently hears similar claims and explanations and prefers to give up instead of listening to them once again. Thus, in this example the mother achieves her pedagogical aim and makes the girl do her history homework which her mother feels is very important.

In the education of Russian-speaking children living in Scotland there is often involvement of whole families including relatives and friends living back in Russia, who, for example, supply the children and their parents with necessary Russian books, special jotters for handwriting or other educational materials. The next example describes another kind of help which children can receive from their Russian relatives. In this example two persons – the mother and her 14 years old son Petya are present. The conversation takes place after breakfast.

Example 24

ACh (Mother aged 40, Petya aged 14)

(1) Мама: Вы уже таблицу Менделеева в школе проходите?
(2) Петя: Ну, нам её только показали. Мы её, наверное, на следующий год проходить будем. Но я уже всё знаю. Я с бабушкой и задачки уже решал.
(3) Мама: Ну, молодец.

(1) Mother: Are you already learning Mendeleyev's table at school?
(2) Petya: Well, it was just mentioned so far. We will learn it probably next year. But I know it all already. I was even already solving the problems with Granny.
(3) Mother: Well done.

In utterance (1) the mother asks her high school son whether they are already learning Mendeleyev's table. The boy answers that the table was only mentioned and suggests that they will study it next year (2). He adds, however, that he already knows it all. He begins his statement with a coordinating conjunction *но* which has here a contrasting function and an adverb of time *уже*: *Но я уже всё знаю* (*But I know it all already*) (4). In this way the boy creates an opposition between his local main school (where the Mendeleyev's table *was just mentioned so far*) and himself (*who already knows it all*).

The boy does not ascribe himself to the category of his classmates but builds another *we*-category instead - *я с бабушкой*. He states that he with his Granny *и задачки уже решал* (*was even already solving the problems*) (2). By the iterated use of an adverb of time *уже* and a conjunction *и* before a noun (*и задачки*), which has in this position an emphasising function and means *даже* (*even*), the boy increases the distance between these two categories.

The boy's grandmother lives in a Russian city but is in constant contact with her grandson. They often have the Skype sessions during which the grandmother explains extracurricular maths, chemistry or science topics to the boy and they do various kinds of tasks and exercises together.

Petya is the only child participating in my research who demonstrates the recognition of himself as *different* from his classmates from the Scottish school (at least partly and at least in terms of school education). In the majority of cases it is not the children but the parents,

either deliberately or subconsciously, who position the children as different from their school colleagues. In Petya's case the Scottish local school is not the only school he knows empirically. Because his parents consider the level of education proposed by local schools insufficient, apart from a High school in Edinburgh, the boy is also a pupil of one of the state schools in Russia. He studies the Russian school curriculum by himself using the online school resources and goes to Russia only for assessments and exams.

The boy's Russianness which he performs in the above chunk of conversation is constructed within the frame of Russian/Soviet educational discourse and can be described in terms of the relationality principle described by Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 598). It emerges as pronounced not directly but through the relation of *difference* to the *other* – the local schoolchildren.

The fact that the boy solves chemistry tasks and yet while at the local school he did not even learn Mendeleyev's table does not surprise his mother. She is probably convinced (similarly to the grandmother and the majority of the immigrants of the last wave living in the United Kingdom) that there is never enough knowledge and education and she rears her children according to these beliefs. In the above example she does not express any excitement about this fact but remarks on it blandly: *Ну, молодец* (*Well done*) (3).

5.4.b. *Us* and *Their* Bad Pupils, Parents, Schools

In this section I will analyse family talks in which *our* attitude to education is juxtaposed with *their bad pupils*, *parents* and *schools*. In the first conversation a mother and her primary school daughter are present. The conversation takes place in a bus. The mother and daughter are talking about the daughter's school.

Example 25

DS (Mother aged 39, Sveta aged 9)

(1) Света: Мне учительница сказала, что на следующий год я пойду в другой класс, не вместе со всеми. Ну, не в 4/5 как все, а в 5/6, потому что мест нету.

(2) Мама: Ну ничего (…) ты быстренько их догонишь.

(3) Света: Мне так сказала, и ещё одной Кэйти из нашего класса. А Кэйти говорит: "Нет, я не хочу, там мне нужно будет больше учиться!"
(4) Мама: Фу, какая лентяйка!

(1) Sveta: My teacher told me, that next year I will go to the other class, not together with all the children. It means not to 4/5 like everybody but to 5/6, because there are not enough places.
(2) Mother: Well, never mind (...) you will catch up with them very quickly.
(3) Sveta: She told me and also Katy from our class. And Katy said: 'No, I don't want to, I will have to study more there!'
(4) Mother: Fie, what a lazy bone!

In utterance (1) the daughter informs her mother that because of lack of places in her own class, next year she will go to the higher class of the same school. The mother replies that it is not a problem: *Ну ничего* (*Well, never mind*) (2). However, the pause after this phrase may suggest that the mother is a bit surprised at such information and she considers the potential effects of such a move.

After the pause, in order to encourage her daughter, the mother voices an assumption that the girl will quickly catch up with the rest of her new class (2). She exploits an adverb of time *быстро* with diminutive suffix *-еньк-* (*быстренько*) in order to diminish the range of the arisen problem: *ты быстренько их догонишь* (2). By doing this she uses an indirect strategy of discursive positioning and builds an implicature (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 594) that her daughter is a clever, diligent and hardworking girl and that is why she will quickly catch up with the rest of the class. Moreover, the mother suggests that she is convinced that her daughter has these merits and that she believes in her.

In utterance (3) the girl informs her mother that apart from her, Sveta, one more girl from her class will go to the higher class. Sveta certainly properly understands the implicature made by her mother. She tells the mother about this other girl, who does not want to go to the higher class because, presumably, it will be necessary to study more there. In this way Sveta builds an opposite implicature and positions this other girl as lazy and not interested in using the opportunity to achieve higher results in learning: *that lazy girl from school* (who does not

want to achieve more) / *me, who is diligent and hardworking* (and always wants to achieve more).

The mother immediately reacts to such an 'improper' attitude to learning of the other girl by criticising her. She employs an exclamation beginning with an interjection: *Фу, какая лентяйка!* (*Fie, what a lazy bone!*) (4). While the mother directly criticises the other girl she indirectly compliments her daughter, who is not lazy and certainly appreciates the opportunity to study harder. It might be that this indirect compliment was Sveta's interactional goal which she has achieved.

In the above conversation both the mother and the daughter easily navigate within the shared ground of the educational discourse. Despite there are being no direct reference to the Russianness, the values, beliefs and attitudes to learning undoubtedly belong to the Russian/Soviet common knowledge. In this example the girl's Russian self again emerges as an opposition to the *other* – the girl's classmate, who is *lazy* and has an improper (non-Soviet) attitude to learning.

In the next example, not only *their* 'bad' pupil but also the pupil's 'bad' parents will be presented. There are two persons in this example – a mother and her teenage daughter. The conversation takes place after a meal and considers the girl's forthcoming drama assessment at school. The boy, with whom Alena is paired for her assessment, has not prepared for it well.

Example 26

AK 5 (Mother aged 42, Alena aged 13)

(1) Алёна: Он не готов вообще.

(2) Мама: Кошмар! Из-за него у тебя оценка будет ниже! Ты спроси учителя: "Что мне делать, если он забудет слова, надо его слова говорить?"

(3) Алёна: Ну, конечно радо!

(4) Мама: Ужас какой! (...) Но ты его слова тоже ведь знаешь наизусть, да?

(5) Алёна: Почти.

(6) Мама: Ой, кошмар! Бедный мой ребёнок! Почему тебе всегда попадаются какие-то (...) дети?

(7) Алёна: Идиоты.
(8) Мама: Да. Непорядочные (..) безответственные! А родители что его думают?! Почему родители не принимают в этом участия?!

(1) Alena: He isn't prepared at all.
(2) Mother: What a nightmare! Because of him you will get a lower mark! Ask the teacher: 'What I should do if he forgets his lines, should I tell them?'
(3) Alena: Of course, I should!
(4) Mother: What a horror! (...) But you know his lines by heart, don't you?
(5) Alena: Almost.
(6) Mother: Oh, what a nightmare! My poor child! Why do you always come across such (...) children?
(7) Alena: Idiots.
(8) Mother: Yes. Dishonourable (..) irresponsible! And what are his parents thinking about?! Why don't the parents participate in it?!

In utterance (1) the girl makes an informative statement that the boy with whom she is doing her drama assessment has not prepared for it. The mother reacts to this statement in a rather exaggerated way: *Кошмар!* (*What a nightmare!*) (2). However, her reaction does not consider the fact that the boy is not prepared but the fact that because of this her daughter might get a lower mark: *Из-за него у тебя оценка будет ниже!* (2). She advises her daughter to ask her teacher for confirmation whether she should speak the boy's lines if he forgets them (2). The daughter confirms that she knows for sure that she should (3) which again generates the mother's immediate reaction: *Ужас какой!* (*What a horror!*) (4). The mother's reaction considers the fact that her daughter needs to do additional work (instead of her classmate) in order not to *get a lower mark* (2).

After a pause the mother asks whether her daughter knows the lines of her classmate by heart. In order to show that she expects a positive reply, the mother begins her question with an adversative conjunction *но*, uses a conjunctive adverb *тоже* and an emphasising conjunction *ведь* and finishes her turn with an interrogative particle of agreement *да?*: *Но ты его слова тоже ведь знаешь наизусть, да?* (4).

It turns out however, that the girl does not know the boy's lines by heart but knows them *почти* (*almost*) (5). This again causes the mother's strong reaction: *Ой, кошмар!* (*Oh, what a nightmare!*) (6). As previously, her reaction concerns the fact that if her daughter does not know her classmate's lines yet, it might be that she *will get a lower mark* (2).

The mother's three exclamations - *Кошмар!* (2) / *Ужас какой!* (4) / *Ой, кошмар!* (6) - after her daughter's different statements in fact, consider the same issue – the issue of the daughter's potential mark.

The boy is not prepared for the assessment / *Кошмар!* / it can cause the daughter's lower mark → The daughter should speak his lines / *Ужас какой!* / she must do additional work in order not to get a lower mark → She does not know his lines by heart yet / *Ой, кошмар!* / she might get a lower mark.

Such, rather exaggerated reactions concerning everyday school issues might suggest that the girl's school marks are very important for her mother and that she is emotionally engaged in the fact that her daughter might potentially get a lower mark at her assessment. In order to demonstrate her engagement the mother makes a generalisation by labelling her daughter as: *Бедный мой ребёнок!* (*My poor child!*) (6). Then she asks a rhetorical question: *Почему тебе всегда попадаются какие-то (...) дети?* (*Why do you always come across such (...) children?*) (6). In order to strengthen and make it more general she uses an adverb of time *всегда* (*always*). The mother builds an opposition between her *бедный ребёнок* and *какие-то (...) дети*. An indefinite pronoun *какие-то* (*such*) in this case evokes a pejorative meaning. Probably, initially the mother intended to use a derogatory label in order to strongly contrast it with the label *бедный мой ребёнок* however, after a pause decided to use a neutral and more politically correct noun *дети*.

The daughter recognises her mother's intention to label pejoratively a category of pupils/children to which she ascribed her classmate who did not prepare himself for the assessment properly. She helps her mother by supplying her with an appropriate label (in the girl's opinion) for this category – *идиоты* (7). The mother at first thought agrees with the label proposed by her daughter but then, probably recognising her agreement as educationally

incorrect, attempts to decrease its strength by describing this new category of children as *непорядочные* and *безответственные* (*dishonourable* and *irresponsible*) (8).

Then the mother asks two rhetorical questions about the boy's parents: *А родители что его думают?! Почему родители не принимают в этом участия?!* (*And what are his parents thinking about?! Why don't the parents participate in it?!*) (8). By asking these questions the mother suggests that the boy's parents should be more interested and involved in their son's school life. In doing this the mother discursively positions the boy's parents as *bad* parents (as, similarly to their son, *dishonourable* and *irresponsible*) and implies that they improperly rear their child because they do not pay enough attention to his education. At the same time she position herself as a *honourable* and *responsible* mother who cares very much for her daughter's education and therefore is a *good* parent.

In the analysed example the Russianness performed within the educational discourse emerges as an opposition to the *other* – a pupil from the local school and his parents. The Russian-speaking *poor child* (who is well prepared for the drama assessment) is opposed to *such children/idiots* (who are not prepared for the assessment and are *dishonourable* and *irresponsible*). Similarly, the *bad* parents who do not care about their child's education are opposed to the Russian-speaking *good* mother.

In the next example not *their* pupils or parents but the school itself is *bad* as it does not fulfil expectations of a Russian-speaking mother. In this example the mother and her 7 year old son are present. The son is going to do his English homework.

Example 27

NR (Mother aged 42, Danya aged 7)

(1) Мама: Так, ровно сядь. Два раза пишешь слово, а потом предложение с ним составляешь.

(2) Даня: У-гу.

(3) Мама: Вот я ручку хорошую принесла и черновики. Сначала в черновике пиши, а потом красиво в тетрадь перепишешь.

(4) Даня: У-гу.

(5) Мама: Дай, я тебе черновик расчерчу, чтобы прописи такие были, да? А то ведь не учат вас в этой школе ничему!

(1) Mother: Well, sit straight. You are writing the word twice and then making a sentence with it.
(2) Danya: U-hu.
(3) Mother: I've brought a good pen and rough jotter. First write in the rough jotter, and then rewrite nicely into your jotter.
(4) Danya: U-hu.
(5) Mother: Let me line your rough jotter to make a kind of a copy-book, ok? They don't teach you anything in this school, do they?!

In utterance (1) the mother displays her authority by giving to her son a short command: Так, ровно сядь (Well, sit straight). This command, together with *не горбись* (*don't stoop*), *держи правильно ручку* (*hold your pen properly*) or *положи локоть на парту* (*put your elbow on your desk*) - are commands connected with doing writing exercises which Soviet children have usually heard both at their homes and school. Then the mother tells her son his task in order to confirm that he understands exactly what he is expected to do (1). The son confirms that he understands his task with a minimal response: *U-hu* (2).

In utterance (3) the mother informs her son that she has brought a *good pen* and *rough jotter*. The *good pen* means a pen which is appropriate for the child and is comfortable to hold and write. Apart from diligence and perseverance, the using of a *good pen* together with *rough jotter* were considered both by Soviet teachers and parents as necessary preconditions for the ability to develop good handwriting. The mother asks her son first to write his exercise in the *rough jotter* and then to *rewrite it nicely* into his jotter (3). This task probably is not part of his school homework as it is rather unlikely that he was asked by his school teacher to exercise first in his *rough jotter* before *rewriting it nicely* to his homework jotter. However, such practices were strongly advised for younger pupils at Soviet schools. The boy is not surprised by his mother's request to do this 'extra homework' as he certainly recognises this procedure as usual. He again indicates his understanding and agreement with a minimal response: *U-hu* (2).

In utterance (5) the mother proposes to her son that she will line his rough jotter in order to make *a kind of a copy-book*. These copy-books are no longer being used in contemporary British schools but they are being widely exploited at schools in Russia as well as at the majority of Saturday Russian schools abroad. The mother begins her proposal with a phrase *Дай, я тебе* – which makes her language less official and decreases the distance between her and her son. Moreover, using a personal pronoun *тебе*, which can be easily omitted in this case, the mother suggests that she will do something especially for him, her son: *Дай, я тебе* (5). Now she discursively positions herself not as a strict teacher but as a caring mother. She ends her utterance inviting the boy to agree with her proposal and also indirectly with her new position as a caring parent: *да?* (5). Eventually, she explains why she lines her son's rough jotter and in doing so shows that she cares about his education and, consequently, about him. The reason is that *their* school does not meet her, mother's, expectations: *А то ведь не учат вас в этой школе ничему!* (*They don't teach you anything in this school, do they?!*) (5).

In this chunk of conversation the boy is rather passive. He reacts to his mother's turns with only minimal responses. He complies with her statements, requests/commands as well as with his additional duties (for example rewriting his homework two (or more) times) because he is probably accustomed to such actions.

This piece of talk is essentially a monologue by the mother. During this monologue she implies that she has no choice but to be a strict teacher at home because the son's school teacher does not fulfil his duties (does not ask him to *sit strait, write in the rough jotter*, and then *rewrite nicely* into another jotter and does not care whether he has a *good pen*). She also has to be a caring parent who lines her son's rough jotter in order to develop his handwriting and is concerned with her son's education, because *their* school does not care about it at all.

The conversational chunks analysed in this subchapter demonstrate how Russianness is performed by adults in everyday settings within the educational discourse. The parents show to their children a very serious attitude to learning and education. Such an attitude was probably conveyed to them by their own parents' generation and was strongly promoted in the Soviet period from the very beginning of the Soviet state. In everyday interactions the parents attempt to pass their beliefs and ideas to their children.

Within the educational discourse the parents position themselves not as excessively protective (as within the food-related discourse) but rather as strict and authoritarian carers. They react in exaggerated fashion to their children's school failures (e.g. bad marks, Example 23) and even to potential ones (drama assessment, Example 26) or to the children's perceived 'improper' attitude to learning (assumption that Russian classes can be omitted because of rain, Example 22). At the same time, they treat their children's successes (e.g. in chemistry Example 24) or potential future stronger efforts in achieving results (e.g. omitting a year in school, Example 25) as the norm.

In the analysed examples the notion of Russianness emerges as an opposition to the *locals* (*Scottish, British*). In order to establish this opposition between *us* and *them* the adults use several indirect strategies of discursive positioning of *self* and *other*. For example, they build categories of *their pupils, parents, schools* and imply that they are *bad* as they do not fulfil their duties or have improper (non-Russian/Soviet) attitude to education (*А родители что его думают?!, Не учат вас в этой школе ничему!*, Example 25, 26, 27) and juxtapose these categories with *our good pupils, parents, schools.* They also use labels, such as: *лентяйка, идиоты*, Examples 25, 26, 27) or discursive descriptions: *непорядочные, безответственные* (Examples 22, 26).

In all of the interactions analysed in this subchapter the children seem to recognise and share the parent's convictions, beliefs and attitudes to education. Despite there being no direct reference to 'Russianness' (apart from in the Example 22), the values, beliefs and convictions demonstrated by adults are greatly influenced by Soviet/Russian educational discourse. In the analysed family talks the children comply with their parents' statements, requests or commands which involve doing extra homework or attending additional classes or even learning in two schools at the same time and probably also consider these practices as normal. Similarly to their parents they are convinced that there is never enough learning and thus in this case the parents achieve their pedagogical aims.

Chapter Six: Conclusions and Overview of the Research Findings

6.1. Conclusions

6.1.a. Innovative Aspects of the Study

This thesis concerns intergenerational communications within the Russian-speaking community living in Scotland**.** I can find no previous relevant extensive research concerning Russian-speaking migrants in Scotland.

Moreover, on the level of migrants' identity negotiations this study links two aspects that are usually studied separately, namely, the legacy of the native culture represented by the generation of parents born and brought up in the Soviet Union and also the impact of the cultural and social contexts of the host country represented by the generation of children.

In terms of methodological innovation this thesis approaches identity as a relational and sociocultural phenomenon that emerges and circulates in the local discourse contexts of family interactions. In this way, the analysis of identity performances focuses on both the linguistic details and the workings of culture and society.

6.1.b. Contributions of the Thesis

This thesis represents an interdisciplinary investigation and contributes in several ways to current research concerning issues of migration and identity.

Firstly, it contributes to the field of Russian studies as it focuses exclusively on Russian migrants' national identity performances within the Russian-speaking community living

abroad. Moreover, it takes a broader view of the findings in the area of diaspora studies and connects them to extensive scholarship on Russian emigration, culture and national self.

Secondly, it contributes to nationalism and migration studies by providing a much needed insight into identity negotiations of migrants' to the United Kingdom. The study demonstrates the ways in which the native and the host cultural and social discourses influence these negotiations.

Finally, this thesis contributes to the studies of identity because it is strongly focused on the dynamics of the production of the self as it emerges in interaction and enables the tracing of the very process of its creation and re-creation. It also demonstrates how broader cultural, social and ideological contexts determine identity construction and how they are employed by members of interactions in the process of identity work.

6.1.c. Directions for Future Research

The analysis conducted in this study has revealed several areas which invite further investigation. Evidently, the comparative study of Russian national identity construction in multigenerational families living in Russia would enhance current findings. Apart from this**,** a comparative study in different European countries would reveal specific features of migrants' intergenerational self representations and would help us to understand the complex processes of migrants' integration into the culture of the new country of residence.

6.2. Overview of the Research Findings

The concept of Russianness presented in family conversations and narratives among the Russian-speaking community living in Scotland appeared to be a very vague and unclear phenomenon. As it emerged from the analysis of recordings, the Russian national self performed by migrants in everyday settings is highly influenced by the Soviet past. It can be argued that it is not Russianness but 'Sovietness' which more precisely reflects these migrant's national identity claims. The distinctive feature of the post-Soviet diasporas is the

fact that their national identity remains embedded in a country and society that do not exist any more. The post-Soviet migrant discourse retrospectively re-thinks and re-builds the Soviet past in new territorial, cultural and social contexts, and this 'imagined Soviet Union' (Byford 2009b) becomes its essence.

The particular role which characterises the Soviet past in identity strategies is certainly different for different migrants. It can depend on their age, education, social position, life experiences etc. Thus, it is rather difficult to make any generalisations. For the subjects of my research this 'imagined Soviet Union' is primarily the nostalgic world of their childhood and youth. Currently, being themselves parents, they try to transmit to their children all the values, attitudes, knowledges from their own childhood. They use the same child-rearing and educational practices which their parents used, they prepare for their children the same food and read them the same nursery rhymes and fairy tales. They try to raise their children exactly as they were raised by their own parents.

In my research, however, I was less interested in what the Soviet past meant to my subjects, but more in how the elements of the 'imagined Soviet Union' (understood in discursive terms) were employed by them in the performances of their national self in front of their children.

Apart from the discourse of nostalgia the performances of national identity are embedded also in the discourse of the Soviet empire. Very often, in family conversations the adult participants equate the concept of being Russian with being a Russian-speaker. Moreover, they consider nationality as ascribed to a particular geographical territory with no regard to ethnic differences. They also identify the territory of Russia with the territory of the whole of the Soviet Union. In their performances of national identity the parents frequently refer to Soviet ideologies of international friendship and consider themselves as representatives of a super-nation and as treating other non-Russian peoples as 'younger brothers'[44].

As my analysis has shown, the migrants' attitude to Scotland (Great Britain) remains ambiguous. On the one hand, they associate their new country of residence with culture, civilisation, civil rights and freedoms and material welfare. On the other hand, however, it

[44] The issue of the Imperial / Soviet legacy as well as problems of ethnicity are discussed in 3.2.b. and 3.2.c.

emerges as a *negative other* of the *Russian self* performed for example within the food-related or educational discourses.

When food-related topics appear in everyday family conversations the notion of *our Russian good food* emerges as an opposition to *their local (Scottish/British) bad food*. In order to create such an opposition on the linguistic level, the adults frequently use labels or discursive descriptions of particular meals and products using, for example, such linguistic means as diminutive suffixes or exploitation of numerous combinations of particles, conjunctions and exclamations which aim to convey a specific meaning.

Similarly, within the educational discourse the Russian national self emerges as an opposition to the *other (Scottish/British)*. Despite there being no direct reference to Russianness in the analysed family talks, the values, beliefs and attitudes to learning demonstrated by adults are greatly influenced by Soviet educational discourse. In order to establish the opposition between *us* and *them* the adults repeatedly use several indirect strategies of discursive positioning of *self* and *other*. For example, they build categories of *their pupils, parents, schools* and imply that they are *bad* as they do not fulfil their duties or have an improper (non-Russian/Soviet) attitude to education and juxtapose these categories with *our good pupils, parents, schools.* They also widely use labels and discursive descriptions.

The numerous examples analysed in this thesis show that during their family talks the parents often evoke Soviet and Russian cultural knowledge (customs and traditions, names of literature characters, the titles of Soviet TV programmes and various language/literary/history facts) in order to create and perform in front of their children the elements of Russian national identity. For example, they build different kinds of oppositions between two cultures and lifestyles such as: *us/they, here/there, now/then*. They negotiate and re-negotiate memberships to various kinds of meaningful categories or, if necessary, they simply transmit the important cultural information to their children using their family power positions.

The children, however, very rarely spontaneously and independently refer to such cultural knowledge. It is likely that the children do not demonstrate their Russianness simply because they do not consider themselves as Russians. However, if sometimes they refer to the Russian/Soviet cultural information they presuppose that their references will be recognised

by parents, as they know that their parents belong to Russian/Soviet culture. The children evoke this common knowledge in order to show their solidarity with the parents within this shared ground and also in order to confirm their common membership in the *we*-category rather than to perform their national identity. In none of the analysed examples do the parents leave their children's references without a response and always react positively to these rare pronouncements of Russianness by their children.

Using their authority in family interactions the parents constantly draw children's attention to facts from their native history, literature and folklore. They seem to value the Russian culture and their previous life in the Soviet Union/Russia more than the culture and lifestyle of their present country of residence as they often demonstrate their inclusion in the Russian culture and at the same time their exclusion from the British culture. The Russian-speaking adults try to make their children identify with the values, norms and symbols, and with the knowledge which they themselves identify with.

Within the food-related discourse it seems that children recognise this knowledge in common with the adults. Over the years they certainly hear the iterative discussions of food-related topics in their homes between parents and relatives. Moreover, the information about *our good Russian food* is constantly transmitted directly to them by their parents. That is why, even if they do not always share their parents' attitude to this food, they recognise Russian food-related discourse as a common shared ground between them and their parents.

Similarly, the children seem to recognise and share with their parents their convictions, beliefs and attitudes to education. In the analysed family talks they always comply with their parents' statements, requests or commands when considering doing extra homework or attending additional classes and probably identify these practices as a norm, thus in these cases the parents have achieved their aims.

However, when in everyday interactions the adults spontaneously refer to various Soviet and Russian cultural, linguistic, literary, or historical facts the children do not respond to their performances of Russian national identity - at least in the majority of cases. We can only speculate as to why the children do not react to the parents' displays of Russianness. It may be a lack of interest in the cultural information which parents attempt to pass on to them.

They might not understand the facts which the parents refer to, or even if they ever knew them they might have forgotten them. The children may eventually develop a different attitude to their present life and the country in which they live. They are being brought up in Scotland and unlike their parents they may consider Scotland to be their native land and its culture and society the culture and society to which they belong[45]. The children have no similar symbolic value for the cultural elements that the parents have. This is an area in which their communication falls apart. The parents nevertheless do not expect any reactions from their children. They carefully and skilfully dose the Russianness which they try to convey to the next generation and persistently reiterate their attempts.

[45] The questions of migrants' hybrid identities and integration to the host culture were discussed in Chapter Three.

Bibliography

Abels, H. (2000), *Integratsia, Identichnost`, Presentatsia* , St-Peterburgh, Alateya.
Abell, J., Stokoe, E.H. and Billig, M. (2000), 'Narrative and the discursive (re)construction of events', in M. Andrews, S. Day Sclater, C. Squire and A. Treacher (eds), *Lines of Narrative: Psychosocial Perspectives*, London: Routledge.
Abelman, R. (1985), 'Styles of Disciplinary Practices as a Mediator of Children's Learning from Prosocial Television Portrayals', *Child Study Journal* 15, 131-45.
Ahearn, L. (2001), 'Language and Agency', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30, 109-37.
Alekseeva, L. (1992), *Istorya inakomysliya v SSSR: Novieishii period*, Moskva: Viest'.
Almarik, A. (1982), *Zapiski dissidenta*, Ann Arbor: Ardis.
Anderson, B. (1991), *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.
Antaki, C. (1998), 'Identity ascriptions in their time and place', in C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe (eds), *Identities in Talk*, London: Sage.
Antaki, C., Condor, S. and Levine, M. (1996), 'Social identities in talk: Speaker's own orientations', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 35, 473-92.
Antaki, C. and Widdicombe, S. (eds) (1998a), *Identities in Talk*, London: Sage.
Antaki, C. and Widdicombe, S. (1998b), 'Identity as an achievement and as a tool', in C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe (eds), *Identities in Talk*, London: Sage.
Anthias, F. (1998), 'Evaluating Diaspora: Beyond Ethnicity', *Sociology* 32:3, 557-580.
Appadurai, A. (1990), 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy', in M. Featherstone, (ed.), *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity,* London: Sage.
Appadurai, A. (1991), 'Global ethnoscapes: Notes and queries for a transnational anthropology', in R. G. Fox (ed.), *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
Appadurai, A. (1997), *Modernity at Large*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Appelbaum, R. P., Robinson, W. I. (eds) (2005), *Critical Globalization Studies,* New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
Apresyan, Y. (1995), *Izbrannye trudy. Tom II: Integral'noe opisane yazyka I sistemnaya leksikografiya*, Moscow: Shkola 'Yazyki Russkoy Kul'tury'.
Apresyan, Y. (ed.) (2000), *Yazykovaya karta mira i sistemnaya leksikografiya*, Moscow: Yazyki Slavianskoy Kul'tury.
Aronsson, K. (1998), 'Identity-in-interaction and social choreography', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31(1), 75-89.
Aronsson, K. and Evaldsson, A. C. (1993), 'Pedagogic Discourse and Interactional Orders: Sharing Time and Control', in N. Coupland and J.F. Nussbaum (eds), *Discourse and Lifespan Identity*, London: Sage, 103-31.
Arutyunova, N. and Levontina, I. (2000), *Logicheskiy analiz yazyka. Yazyki prostranstv*, Moscow: RAN.
Attwood, L. and Kelly, C. (1997), 'Programmes for Identity: The New Man and the New Woman', in C. Kelly and D. Sheppard (eds), *Constituting Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution: 1881-1940,* New York: Oxford University Press.
Baarts, C. (2010), 'Stuck in the Middle: Research Ethics Caught between Science and Politics', *Qualitative Research, 9* (4), 423-439.

Bailey, B. (2000), 'Language and Negotiation of Ethnic/Racial Identity among Dominican Americans', *Language in Society* 29(4), 555-82.
Bailey, J.A. (2002), 'Turning Transnational: Notes on the Theorization of International Migration', *International Journal of Population Geography* 7(6), 413-428.
Baldassar, L. (1997), 'Home and Away: Migration, the Return Visit and Transnational Identity', *Communal/Plural* 5, 69-94.
Bamberg, M. (2004), 'Positioning with Davie Hogan: Stories, telling, and identities', in C. Daiute and C. Lightfoot (eds), *Narrative Analysis: Studying the Development of Individuals in Society*, London: Sage.
Banton, M. (1983), *Racial and Ethnic Competition*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
Bani-Shoraka, H. (2008), 'Challenging social hierarchy: Playing with oppositional identities in family talk', *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 27 (1-2), 13-35.
Baranowski, M. D. (1982), 'A Continuity Theory of Normal Aging', *The Gerontologist* 2, 183-90.
Barker, C. and Galasinski, D. (2001), *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity*, London: Sage.
Barthes, R. (1977), *Image, Music, Text*, London: Fontana.
Bartlett, R. (ed.) (1990), *Land Comune and Peasant Community in Russia: Communal Forms in Imperial and Early Soviet Society*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
Bartlett, R. and Edmondson, L. (1998), 'Collapse and Creation: Issues of Identity and the Russian Fin du Siecle', in C. Kelly and D. Sheppard (eds), *Constituting Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution: 1881-1940*, New York: Oxford University Press.
Bartminski, J. (1986), 'Czym zajmuje sie etnolingwistyka?', *Akcent* 4(26), 16-22.
Bartminski, J. (2005), *Yazykovoy obraz mira: ocherki po etnolingvistike*, Moscow: Indrik.
Basilov, V. N. (ed.) (1975), *Polevye Issledovaniya Instituta Etnografii v 1974 godu*, Moscow: Institut Etnografii RAN.
Bassin, M. (1991), 'Russia between Europe and Asia: the Ideological Construction of Geographical Space', *Slavic Review* 50 (1), 1-17.
Baudrillard, J. (1987), *The Ecstasy of Communication*, New York: Autonomedia.
Baum, W. (1980), 'Therapeutic Value of Oral History', *International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 2, 49-53.
Bauman, R. (1977), 'Verbal Art as Performance', in *Verbal Art as Performanc*, Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
Bauman, R. (1992), 'Contextualization, Tradition and the Dialogue of Genres: Icelandic Legends of the *Kraftaskáld*', in A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds), *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Bauman, R. and Briggs C. L. (1990), 'Poetics and Performance as Critical Perspectives on Language and Social Life', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19, 59-88.
Bauman, Z. (1996), 'From pilgrim to tourist – or a short history of identity', in S. Hall and P. du Gay (eds), *Questions of Cultural identity*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
Bauman, Z. (1998), *Globalization: the Human Consequences*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
Baumrind, D. (1967), 'Child Care Practices Anteceding Three Patterns of Preschool Behaviour', *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 75, 43-88.
Beck, U. (2000), 'Cosmopolitan manifesto: the cosmopolitan society and its enemies', *paper presented at Theory, Culture and Society Conference*, Helsinki.
Bell, A. (1984), 'Language Style as Audience Design', *Language in Society* 13, 145-204.
Beloborodov, I. (2011), 'Demograficheskaya situatsiya v Rossii 1992-2010 gg. Dva desiatiletiya depopulatsii', *http://www.demographia.ru/articles_N/index.html?idR=21*.

Benwell, B. and Stokoe E. (2006), *Discourse and Identity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Bernstein, B. (1974), *Class, Codes and Control*, New York: Schocken Books.
Besnier, N. (2004), 'Consumption and Cosmopolitanism: Practicing Modernity at the Secondhand Marketplace in Nuku'alofa, Tonga', *Anthropological Quarterly* 77(1), 7-45.
Bhabha, H. (1994), *The Location of Culture*, London: Routledge.
Bhabha, H. K. (2007), 'Notes on Globalization and Ambivalence', in D. Held, H. L. Moore and K. Young (eds.), *Cultural Politics in a Global Age: Uncertainty, Solidarity and Innovation*, Oxford: Oneworld.
Billig, M. (2001), 'Discursive, Rhetorical and Ideological Messages', in M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S. J. Yates (eds), *Discourse Theory and Practic*, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
Billington, J.H. (2004), *Russia in search for itself*, Washington: Woodrow Wilson Centre Press.
Billington, J.H. and Parthé, K. (2003), *The Search for a New Russian National Identity: Russian Perspectives*, Washington D.C: Library of Congress.
Birgerson, S. M. (2002), *After the Breakup of a Multi-Ethnic Empire: Russia, Successor States, and Eurasian Security*, Westport, Connecticut, London: Praeger.
Blackledge, A. (2005), *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Blumer, H. (1969), *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*, NY: Prentice-Hall.
Blyth, C., Recktenwald, S. and Wang, J. (1990), 'I'm like, «Say What?!»: A New Quotative in American Oral Narrative', *American Speech* 65(3), 215-27.
Bolter, J. and Grusin, R. (2000), *Remediation: Understanding New Media*, Cambridge:MA.
Bourdieu, P. (1977), *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Boym, S. (1994), *Common Places. Mythologies of Everyday life in Russia*, Cambridge: MA.
Boym, S. (2001), *The Future of Nostalgia*, New York: Basic Books.
Bozhovich, L. (1968), *Lichnost' I ee formirovanie v detskom vozrastie*, Moscow: Prosvieshchenie.
Böhm, A. (2004), *Vision 2020: Forecasting international student mobility - a UK perspective*, British Council: London.
Brah, A. (1996), *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*, London: Routledge.
Braziel, J.E. and Mammur, A. (2003), *Theorizing Diaspora: a Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Briggs, C. L. (1988), *Competence in Performance: The Creativity of Tradition in Mexicano Verbal Art*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
British Council, www.britishcouncil.org/ecs/events/2010/1004/details/market.htm
Brockmeier, J. and Carbaugh, A. (eds) (2001), *Narrative and Identity: Studies in Autobiography, Self and Culture*, Ansterdam: John Benjamins.
Brown, B. and Cousins, M. (1994), 'The Linguistic Fault: The Case of Foucault's Archaeology', in B. Smith (ed.) *Michel Foucault: Critical Assessment*, London: Routledge.
Brown, R. and Gilman, A. (1989), 'Politeness Theory and Shakespeare's Four Major Tragedies', *Language in Society* 18, 159-212.
Brubaker, R. (1992), Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany**,** Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Brubaker, R. (2001), 'The Return of Assimilation? Changing Perspectives on Immigration and Its Sequels in France, Germany, and the United States', Ethnic and Racial Studies, 24 (4), 531-548.

Brubaker, R. and Cooper, F. (2000), 'Beyond "identity"', *Theory and Society*, 29(1), pp. 1-47.
Bruner, J. (1990), *Acts of Meaning*, Harvard: Harvard University Press.
Bucholtz, M. (2003), 'Sociolinguistic Nostalgia and the Authentication of Identity', *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(3), 398-416.
Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2004a), 'Language and identity', in A. Duranti (ed.) *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, Oxford: Blackwell, 369-394.
Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2004b), 'Theorizing identity in language and sexuality research', *Language in Society* 33, 469-515.
Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2005), 'Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach', *Discourse Studies* 7(4-5), 585-614.
Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2008), 'Finding identity: Theory and data', *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 27(1-2), 151-163.
Burke, K. (1989), *On Symbols and Society*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Butler, J. (1990), *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity,* New York: Routledge.
Butler, J. (1993), *Bodies that Matter: on the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*, London: Routledge.
Butler, J. (1996), 'Gender as Performance', in P. Osborne (ed.), *Radical philosophy*, London: Routledge.
Butler, J. (1997), *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*, Stanford, CA: Stanforg University Press.
Byford, A. (2009a), 'The last Soviet generation in Britain', in J. Fernandez (ed.), *Diasporas: Critical and Inter-Disciplinary Perspectives*, Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press.
Byford, A. (2009b), '"Posledneye Sovetskoye Pokoleniye" v Velikobritanii', *Neprikosnovennyi Zapas*, 2009 (2).
Byford, A. (2012), 'The Russian diaspora in International Relations: "Compatriots" in Britain', *Europe Asia Studies*, 64(4), 715-35.
Byford, A. (2014), 'Razygryvaya "Soobshchestvo"5 Russkoyazychnyye Migranty Sovremennoy Britanii', 377-394.
Cadiot, J. (2005), 'Searching for Nationality: Statistics and National Categories at the End of the Russian Empire (1897–1917)', *Russian Review* 64(3), 440-455.
Caglar, A. (2001), 'Constraining Metaphors and the Transnationalisation of Spaces in Berlin', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27(4), 601-613.
Cahnmann, M., Rymes, B. and Souto-Manning, M. (2005), 'Using Critical Discourse Analysis to Understand and Facilitate Identification Processes of Bilingual Adults Becoming Teachers', *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: an International Journal* 2(4), 195–213.
Calhoun, C. (1994), *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*, London: Blackwells.
Cameron, D. (1990), 'Demythologizing sociolinguistics: Why language does not reflect society', in J.E. Joseph and T. J. Taylor (eds), *Ideologies of Language*, London: Routledge, 79-93.
Cameron, D. (2000), *Good to Talk?: Living and working in a communication culture*, Sage.
Canclini, N.G. (2005), *Hybrid Cultures. Strategies for entering and leaving modernity,* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Carabine, J. (2001), 'Unmarried motherhood 1830-1990: a genealogical analysis', in M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S.J. Yates (eds), *Discourse as Data: a Guide for Analysis*, London: Sage, 267-310.
Carter, D. and Welch, D. (1981), 'Parenting Styles and Children Behaviour', *Family Relations* 30, 191-95.

Carter, J. (2004), 'Research note: reflections on interviewing across the ethnic divide', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 7(4), 345-353.
Cashman, H. R. (2008), 'Accomplishing Marginalisation in Bilingual Interaction: Relational Work as a Resource for the Intersubjective Construction of Identity', *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 27 (1-2), 129-150.
Cashman, H. R. (2008), 'Introduction: Accomplishing identity in bilingual interaction', *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 27 (1-2), 1-12.
Castles, S. and Davidson, A. (2000), *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*, London: Macmillan Press.
Castles, S. and Miller, M. (1993), *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*, London: Macmillan.
Chen, K. (2008), 'Positioning and repositioning: Linguistic practices and identity negotiation of overseas returning bilinguals in Hong Kong', *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 27 (1-2), 57-75.
Chun, E.W. (2001), 'The Construction of White, Black and Korean American Identities through African American Vernacular English', *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1), 52-64.
Clifford, J. (1994), 'Diasporas', *Cultural Anthropology* 9, 302-38.
Clifford, J. and Marcus, G. E. (eds) (1986), Writing Culture: *The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
Coates, J. (1996), *Women Talk*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Coates, J. (2003), *Men Talk*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Cohen, A. (1994), *Self Consciousness: An Alternative Anthropology of Identity*, London: Routledge.
Cohen, R. (1995), 'Rethinking 'Babylon': iconoclastic conceptions of the diasporic experience', *New Community* 21, 5-18.
Cohen, R. (1997), *Global Diasporas: an Introduction*, London: UCL-Press.
Colic-Peisker, V. and Walker, I. (2003), 'Human capital, acculturation and social identity: Bosnian refugees in Australia', *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 13, 337-360.
Condor, S. (2000), 'Pride and prejudice: Identity management in English people's talk about "this country" ', *Discourse and Society* 11 (2), 163-93.
Cortazzi, M. (2001), 'Narrative analysis in ethnography', in P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland and L. Lofland (eds), *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage.
Coupland, J. (1996), 'Dating advertisements: Discourses of the commodified self', *Discourse and Society* 7 (2), 187-202.
Coupland, J. and Gwyn, R. (eds) (2003), *Discourse, the Body and Identity*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Coupland, N. (1980), 'Style-Shifting in a Cardiff Work-Setting', *Language in Society* 9(1), 1-12.
Coupland, N., Nussbaum, J. F. and Grossman, A. (1993), 'Introduction: Discourse, Selfhood, and the Lifespan', in N. Coupland and J.F. Nussbaum (eds), *Discourse and Lifespan Identity*, London: Sage.
Cross, A. (1997), *By the Banks of the Neva: Chapters from the Lives and Careers of the British in Eighteenth-Century Russia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Crawford Young, M. (1992), 'The National and Colonial Question and Marxism: A View from South', in A. J. Motyl (ed.), *Thinking Theoretically about Soviet Nationalities. History and Comparison in the Study of the USSR*, New York, Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press.

Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2000), 'The Sociolinguistic Distribution of and Attitudes toward Focuser *Like* and Quotative *Like*', *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4(1), 60-80.
Daiute, C. and Lightfoot, C. (eds) (2004), *Narrative Analysis: Studying the Development of Individuals in Society*, London: Sage.
Dale, E. and Piscatori, J. (1990), *Muslim Travellers: Pilgrimage, Migration and the Religious Imagination*, New York: Princeton University Press.

Darieva, T. (2002), 'Von "anderen" Deutschen und "anderen" Juden. Zur kulturellen Integration russischsprachiger Zuwanderer in Berlin', in T. Hauschild and B. J. Warneken (eds), *Inspecting Germany*, Münster: LIT-Verlag..

Darieva, T. (2004), *Russkij Berlin: Migranten und Medien in Berlin und London*, Münster: Lit Verlag.
Davies, B. and Harré, R. (1990), 'Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20(1), 43-63.
Dawisha, K. and Parrot, B. (1994), *Russia and the New States of Eurasia. The Politics of Upheaval*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Deegan, M. and Tanner, S. (2002), *Digital Futures: Strategies for the information age*, London: Library Association Publishing.
Del Torto, L.M. (2008), 'Once a Broker, Always a Broker; Non-professional Interpreting as Identity Accomplishment in Multigenerational Italian-English Bilingual Family Interaction', *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 27 (1-2), 77-97.
Denzin, N.K. (1978), *The research act: a theoretical introduction to sociological methods*, New York, London: McGraw-Hill.
Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1998), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials. The landscape of qualitative research: theories and issues*, London: Sage.
Denzin, N.K. (2000), 'Foreword', in M. Andrews, S. Day Sclater, C. Squire and A. Treacher (eds), *Lines of Narrative: Psychosocial Perspectives*, London: Routledge.
Derrida, J. (1976), *Of Grammatology*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Dinello, N. (1994), 'Religious attitude of Russian Minorities and National Identity', in V. Shlapentokh, M. Sendich and E. Paylin (eds), *The New Russian Diaspora: Russian minorities in the former Soviet Republics*, New York, London: M.E.Sharp, 195-209.
Drew, P. (2005), 'Conversation analisys', in K. L. Fitch and R. E. Sanders (eds), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Dowler, W. (2001), *Classroom and Empire: The Politics of Schooling Russia's Eastern Nationalities, 1860-1917*, Montreal: McGinn-Queen's Universtity.
Drobizheva, L. (1998), *Ethnic Conflict in the Post-Soviet World: Case Studies and Analysis*, Moscow: Political Science.
Drobizheva, L. (2008), 'Vozmozhnost' sovmiestimosti grazhdanskoy i etnicheskoy identichnosti', in L. Drobizheva and E. Golovaha (eds), *Natsional'no-grazhdanskie identichnosti i tolerantnost'. Opyt Rossii i Ukrainy v period transformatsiy*, Kiev: KIS NAN Ukrainy.
Du Bois, J.W. (2002), 'Stance and Consequence', Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orlean.
Du Bois, J.W. (2007), 'The stance triangle', in R. Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Dugarova, E. (2010), *Russian Immigration to the UK. Review and Summary of Relevant Literature*, CCPN Working Paper, London School of Economics and Political Science.

Dundes, A. (1972), 'Folk ideas as units of worldview', in A. Parades and R. Bauman (eds), *Towards New Perspectives in Folklore,* Austin: University of Texas Press.
Duranti, A. (2004), 'Agency in Language', in A. Duranti (ed.), *Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, Malden MA: Blackwell.
Eagleton, T. (2000), *The Idea of Culture*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Eckert, P. (2000), *Language Variation as Social Practice,* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Eckert, P. and McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003), *Language and Gender,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Eckert, P. and Rickford, J. R. (eds) (2001), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Edensor, T. (2002), *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life*, Oxford, New York: Berg.
Edwards, J. A. (1993), 'Principles and Contrasting Systems of Discourse Transcription', in J. A. Edwards, and M. D. Lampert (eds), *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research,* Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Edwards, J. A. (1994), *Multilingualism,* London: Routledge.
Edwards, D. (1997a), *Discourse and Cognition*, London: Sage.
Edwards, D. (1997b), 'Structure and function in the analysis of everyday narratives', *Journal of Narratives end Life History* 7(1-4), 139-46.
Effrat, M.P. (1974), *The Community: Approaches and Applications*, New York: Free Press.
Ehlich, K. (1993), 'HIAT: A Transcription System for Discourse Data', in J. A. Edwards and M. D. Lampert (eds), *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research,* Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Ehrlich, S. (2001), Representing Rape: Language and Sexual Consent, New York: Routledge.
Elias, N. and Scotson, J. (1974), *The Established and the Outsiders*, London: Frank Cass.
Ellis, C. (2007), 'Telling Secrets, Revealing Lives: Relational Ethics in Research with Intimate Others', *Qualitative Inquiry 13* (1), 3-29.
Emmer, P. (1992), *The Organization of Inter-oceanic Trade in European Expansion, 1450-1800,* Aldershot: Variorum.
Esman, M. J. (2009), *Diasporas in the Contemporary World* , Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fabre, G. and Benesch, K. (2004), *African diasporas in the New and Old Worlds: consciousness and imagination,* Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Fairclough, N. (1992), *Discourse and social change*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
Fairclough, N. (1995), *Media Discourse,* London: Edward Arnold.
Faircough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997), Critical Discourse Analysis in T. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction,* London: Sage.
Faist, T. (1999), *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Places*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Featherstone, M. (ed.) (1990), *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity,* London: Sage.
Fishman, J.A. (ed.) (1971), *Advances in the Sociology of Language*, 2 vols., The Hague: Mouton.
Fishman, J.A. (1972), *The sociology of language (An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society)*, Rowley: Newbury House.
Foner, N. (1997), 'What's new about transnationalism? New York immigrants today and at the turn of the century', *Diaspor*a 6(3).
Foucault, M. (1972), *The Archaeology of knowledge,* New York: Harpers and Row.
Foucault, M. (1977), *Discipline and Punish*, London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1982), *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*, Brighton: Harvester Press.
Foucault, M. (1980), *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Francis, D. and Hester, S. (2004), *An Invitation to Ethnomethodology*, London: Sage.
Franklin, S. and Widdis, E. (eds) (2004), *National Identity in Russian Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Freinkman-Khrustaleva, N. and Novikov, A. (1995), *Emigratsia i Emigranty,* St Peterburg.
Gafaranga, J. (2005), 'Demythologising language alternation studies: conversational structure vs. social structure in bilingual interaction', *Journal of Pragmatics* 37 (1), 281-300.
Garfinkel, H. (1984), *Studies in Ethnomethodology,* Malden: Polity Press/Blackwell Publishing.
Garfinkel, H. (2002), *Ethnomethodology's program: Working out Durkheim's aphorism* (Vol. 6), Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
Gauntlett, D. (2000), *Web Studies: rewiring media studies for the digital age*, London: Arnold.
Georgakopoulou, A. (2002), 'Narrative and Identity Management: Discourse and Social Identities in a Tale of Tomorrow', *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 35 (4), 427-51.
Geertz, C. (ed.) (1973), *Interpretation of Cultures*, London: Fontana.
Gell, A. (1992), *The Anthropology of Time. Cultural Construction of Temporal Maps and Images,* Oxford: Berg.
Gergen, K. (1991), *The Saturated Self: dilemmas of identity in contemporary life,* London: Basic Books.
Giddens, A. (1990), *The consequences of modernity*, Cambridge: Polity.
Giles, H., Coupland, J. and Coupland, N. (eds) (1991), *Contexts of Accomodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gilroy, P. (1993), *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*, London: Verso.
Glad, J. (1993), *Conversations in Exile: Russian Writers Abroad*, Newcastle: Duke University Press.
Goffman, E. (1957), 'Alienation from interaction', *Human Relations* 10, 47-60.
Goffman, E. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre.
Goffman, E. (1967), *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*, Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Anchor Books.
Goffman, E. (1972), *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*, London: Penguin.
Goffman, E. (1974), *Frame Analysis*, Boston: Northeastern University Press.
Goffman, E. (1981), *Forms of Talk*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Goffman, E. (1986), *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice Hall; NY Touchstone Books, Simon and Schuster.
Golbert, R. (2001), 'Transnational Orientations from Home: Constructions of Israel and Transnational Space among Ukrainian Jewish Youth', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4), 713 – 731.
Gold, S. (1997), 'Transnationalism and Vocabularies of Motive. International Migration: The Case of Israelis in the United States', *Sociological Perspectives* 40(3).
Goodwin, M.H. (1997), 'Toward families of stories in context', *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7(1-4), 107-12.
Gooding, J. (1996), *Rulers and Subjects. Government and People in Russia 1801-1991,* New York, Sydney, Auckland, London: Arnold.

Graham, L. (2005), 'Discourse Analysis and the Critical Use of Foucault', in *Research in Education*, Sydney: Australian Association for Research in Education.
Greenfeld, L. (1990), 'The Formation of the Russian National Identity: The Role of Status Insecurity and Ressentiment', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 32(3), 549-591.
Greenfeld, L. (1992), *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*, Cambridge: MA.
Guarnizo, L. and Smith, M. (1998), *Transnationalism from below,* New Brunswick: Transaction.
Gudkov, L.D. (2004), *Negativnaya identichnost',* Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie.
Guillemin, M. and Gillam, L. (2004), 'Ethics, Reflexivity, and "Ethically Important Moments" in Research', *Qualitative Inquiry 10* (2), 261-280.
Gumperz, J. J. (1982), *Discourse Strategies,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gumperz, J. J. (1993), 'Transcribing Conversational Exchanges', in *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research,* Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Gundelach, P. (2000), 'Joking Relationships and National Identity in Scandinavia', *Acta Sociologica* 43(2).
Gunzenhauser, M. G. (2006), 'A Moral Epistemology of Knowing Subjects: Theorizing a Relational Turn for Qualitative Research', *Qualitative Inquiry 12* (3), 621-647.
Guroff, G. and Guroff, A. (1994), 'The Paradox of Russian National Identity', in R. Szporluk (ed.), *Ethnicity in Russia and the New States of Eurasia,* M. E. Sharpe: New York.
Hague, Sh. (2011), 'Migrant family language practices and language policies in Finland', *Apples – Journal of applied Language Studies,* 5 (1), 49-64.

Hall, K. (1997), '«Go Suck Your Husband's Sugarcane!»: Hijras and the Use of Sexual Insult', in A. Livia and K. Hall (eds), *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender and Sexuality,* New York: Oxford University Press.
Hall, K. (2003), 'English, Sexuality and Modernity in Hindi-Speaking India', paper presented at the Workshop on Language, Gender and Political Economy, University of Toronto, October.
Hall, S. (1980), 'Encoding/decoding', in S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe and P. Willis (eds), *Culture, media, language,* London: Hutchinson.
Hall, S. (1988), 'The Question of Identity', in S. Hall and D. Morley (eds), *Critical Dialogue in Cultural Studies,* London: Routledge.
Hall, S. (1990), 'Cultural Identity and Diaspora', in J. Rutherford (ed.), *Identity, Community and Cultural Difference,* London: Lawrence and Wishart.
Hall, S. (1992), The Question of Cultural Identity', in S. Hall, D. Held and T. McGrow (eds), *Modernity and its Futures,* Cambridge: Polity Press.
Hall, S. (1996), 'Introduction: Who Needs Identity?', in S. Hall and P. du Gay (eds), *Questions of Cultural Identity,* London: Sage.
Hall, S. (2000), 'Who needs identity?', in P. du Gay, J. Evans and P. Redman (eds), *Identity: A Reader,* London: Sage.
Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1985), *Ethnography: Principals in Practice,* London: Tavistock.
Hannerz, U. (1996), *Transnational connections: culture, people, places,* London: Routledge.
Harré, R. and Moghaddam, F. (eds) (2003), *The Self and Others: Positioning Individuals and Groups in Personal, Political and Cultural Contexts,* Westport, CT: Praeger.
Heritage, J. (2005), Conversational Analysis and Institutional Talk', in K. L. Fitch and R. E. Sanders (eds), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction,* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Heritage, J.C. and Atkinson, J. M. (1984), 'Introduction', in J. M. Atkinson and J. C. Heritage (eds), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Heritage, J. and Raymond, G. (2005), 'The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Talk-in-Interaction', Social Psychology Quarterly 68(1), 15-38.
Hester, S. and Eglin, P. (eds) (1997), Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis, Boston, MA: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and University Press of America.
Hexter, J. (1971), 'The Rhetoric of History' in J. Hexter *Doing history*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Heyse, P. (2010), 'Fixed identities: An intersectional analysis of Russian-speaking female marriage migrants. Self-representations', *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 31(1), 65-80.
Hobsbawm, E. (1987), *The Age of Empire, 1875–1914*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
Holmes, J. (2001), *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, London: Pearson Education Ltd.
Holmes, J. A. and Meyerhoff, M. (eds) (2003), *The Handbook of Language and Gender*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Holstain, J. A. and Gubrim, J. F. (2000), *The Self We Life By: Narrative Identity in the Postmodern* World, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hosking, G.A. (1997), 'The Russian National Myth Repudiated', in Hosking G. and Schopflin, G. *(eds), Myth and Nationhood,* London: C. Hurst and Co.
Hosking, G.A. (1998), *Russia: People and Empire, 1552-1917*, London: Fontana Press.
Hosking, G. (2001), *Russia and the Russians: A History from Rus to the Russian Federation,* London: Allen Lane the Penguin Press.
Howard, J. (2000), 'Social psychology of identities', *Annual Review of Sociology* 26, 367-93.
Huntington, S. (1996), *Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of the World Order*, New York: Simon and Schuster.
Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt R. (eds) (1998),*Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*, Malden: Polity Press.
Hymes, D. (1975), 'Breakthrough into Performance', in D. Ben-Amos and K. S. Goldstein (eds), *Folklore: Performance and Communication*, The Hague: Mouton, 11-74.
Ionin, L. (1995), 'Identifikaciya I inscenirovka (k tieorii sociokul'turnyh izmienieniy', *Sociologicheskie issledovaniya* 4, 6-11.
Ionin, L. (1996), *Sociologiya kul'tury. Put' v novoe tysiacheletie*, Moscow: Logos.
Iontsev, V. (2001), *Mirovye migratsii*, Moscow: Znanie.
Irvine, J. T. and Gal, S. (2000), 'Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation', in P.V. Kroscrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities and Identities,* Santa Fe NM: School of American Research Press.
Yadov, V. (1993), 'Social'nye i social'no-psihologicheskie mehanizmy formirovaniya social'noy identichnosti lichnosti', in V. Yadov (ed.), *Social'naya identifikaciya lichnosti*, Moscow: Institut Sociologii RAN.
Yadov, V. (2000), 'Rossiya kak transformiruyusheesia obshchestvo: resume mnogoletniey diskussii sociologov' in T. Zaslavskaya (ed.), *Kuda idiet Rossiya?*, Moscow: MVSSEN.
Jaffe, A. (ed.) (2009), *Stance: sociolinguistic perspectives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Jenkins, R. (1996), *Social identity*, London: Routledge.
Johnstone, B. (2008), *Discourse Analysis*, Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Joseph, J. (2004), *Language and Identity*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Kabuzan, V. (1996), *Russkie v mire: Dinamika chislennosti i rasseleniya (1917-1989). Formirovanie etnicheskih i politicheskih granic russkogo naroda*, Sankt-Petersburg: Blic.

Kabuzan, V. (2004), 'Migratsiya v rossiyskoy imperii', *Otechestvennye zapiski* 4 (18), 41-46.
Kantor, V. (2002), 'Europe's East and West: European Fate of Russia', *Russian Journal/Politics*/ english.russ.ru/politics/20020412.html
Kaznina, O. (2009), 'Russkaya emigratsia v Anglii v piervoy treti XX veka', in N.Makarova and O.Morgunova (eds), *Russkoe prisutstvie v Britanii*, Moskva: Sovremennaya ekonomika i pravo.
Kelly, C. (ed.) (1998), *Russian Cultural Studies,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kelly, C. and Volkov, V. (1998), 'Directed Desires: Kul'turnost' and Consumption', in C. Kelly and D. Shepherd (*eds*), *Constructing Russian culture in the age of revolution, 1881-1940*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kerov, V. (2007), Otnoshenie Kraine-pravykh k Dumskim Uchrezhdeniam Predvoennogo Perioda, *Ezhegodnik Istoriko-Antropologicheskikh Issledovanii*, Moscow: Ekon-Inform.
Kharkhordin, O. (1999), *The Collective and the Individual in Russia: A Study of Practices,* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Kishinevsky, V. (2004), Russian Immigrants in the United States. Adapting to American Culture, New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
Kitchin, R. M. (1994), 'Cognitive Maps: What Are They and Why Study Them?', *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 14, 1-19.
Klier, J.D. (1995), *Imperial Russia's Jewish Question, 1855-1881*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kolstø, P. (2004), 'Epilogue: Values and State Ideology in Post-Communist Russia', in P. Kolstø and H. Blakkisrud (eds), *Nation-Building and Common Values in Russia*, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
Kon, I. (1967), *Sociologiya lichnosti*, Moscow: Politizdat.
Kon, I. (1978), *Otkrytie "Ya"*, Moscow: Politizdat.
Kon, I. (1980), *Psihologiya starsheklassnika*, Moscow: Prosvieshchenie.
Kon, I. (1984), *V poiskah siebie. Lichnost' i ee samosoznanie*, Moscow: Politizdat.
Kon, I. (1996), 'Moral Culture' in D. Shalin (ed.), *Russian Culture at the Crossroads: Paradoxes of postcommunist consciousness,* Las-Vegas: Westview Press.
Kopnina, H. (2005), *East to West Migration: Russian Migrants in Western Europe*, London: Ashgate.
Kosmarskaya, N. (2006), *'Children of the Empire' in Post-Soviet Central Asia: Mental Shifts and Practices of Adaptation (Russians in Kirghizia, 1992-2002)*, Moscow: Natalis Press.
Kristeva, J. (1991 [1980]), *Strangers to ourselves*, London: Harwester Wheatsheaf.
Kulikowski, M. (2007), *Rome's Gothic Wars: from the third century to Alaric*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Labov, W. (1966), *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*, Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Labov, W. (1972), *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Philadelphia Press.
Labov, W. and Waletzky, J. (1967), 'Narrative Analysis', in J. Helm (ed.), *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*, Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
Laclau, E. and Mouffe C. (1985), *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*, London: Verso.
Lapin, N. (2000), *Puti Rossii: sociokul'turnaya transformacia*, Moscow: Institut filisofii RAN.
Laruelle, M. (2004), 'The two faces of contemporary Eurasianism: an imperial version of Russian nationalism', *Nationalities Paper* 32(1), 115 – 136.
Laruelle, M. (2006), 'La question des Russes du proche-étranger en Russie (1991-2006)', *Les Etudes du Centre d'études et de recherches internationales*, (12)6.

Laruelle, M. (2008), 'Les Russes de l'étranger proche: le thème diasporique et ses lobbies en Russie', *Revue d'études comparatives Est-Ouest*, (39)1.

Latour, B. (2005), *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*, New York: Oxford University Press.
Law, J. (2004), *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*, Oxon: Routledge.
Lebedeva, N. (2001), 'Russkaya Emigratsia v Zerkale Psikhologii', in A. Bondarev (ed.), *Emigratsia i Repatriatsia v Rossii*, Moskva: Svetlyi Put'.
Ledeneva, L. and Tiuriukanova, E. (2002), *Rossiiskie studenty za rubezhom: perspektivy vozvrashcheniya v Rossiyu*, Moscow: Strahovoye Reviu.
Le Pagne, R.B. and Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985), *Acts of Identity: Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*, Cambridge University Press.
Lepper, G. (2000), *Categories in Text and Talk*. London: Sage.
Levy, A. and Weingrod, A. (*eds*) (2005), *Homelands and diasporas: holy lands and other places*, Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
Liang, A. C. (1999), 'Conversationally Implicating Lesbian and Gay Identity', in M. Bucholtz, A. C. Liang and L. A. Sutton (eds), *Reinventing Identities*, New York: Oxford University Press, 293-310.
Linde, C. (1993), *Life Stories: The Creation of Coherence*, New York: Oxford University Press.
Lotman, Y. (2001), *Semiosphera: kul'tura i vzryv,* SPb: Isskusstvo.
Lotman, Y. and Uspensky, B. (1984), 'The role of Dual Models in the Dynamics of the Russian Culture', in Y. Lotman and B. Uspensky, *The Semiotics of Russian Culture*, Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press.
Lyotard, J. (1984), *The Postmodern Condition*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Magnifico, L. (1988), *Contemporary American Immigrants: Patterns of Filipino, Korean and Chinese Settlement in the United States*, New York: Praeger.
Magun, V.S. (ed.) (2006), *Grazhdanskie, etnicheskie i religioznye identichnosti v sovremennoy Rossii*, Moscow: IIS RAN.
Malfliet, K. (2003), 'Introduction: Some Ideas on the «Russian Idea»', in K. Malfliet and F. Scharpé (eds.), *The Concept of Russia. Patterns for Political Development in the Russian Federation*, Leuven: Leuven University Press.
Malyutina, D. (2012), *Migrant sociality in a 'global city': friendship, transnational networks, racism and cosmopolitanism. A study of Russian-speaking migrants in London*, London.
Manakin, V. (2004), *Sopostavitel'naya leksikologiya*, Kiyev: Znannia.
Markova, E. and Black, E. (2006), *East European immigration and community cohesion*, London: Rowntree Foundation.
Maslova, V. (2007), *Vvedenie v kognitivnuyu lingvistiku*, Moscow: Flinta.
Massey, D. (1997), 'Making spaces', in H. Mackey (*ed*.), *Consumption and everyday life*, Milton Keyns: Open University Press.
Mathews, G. (2000), *Global Culture/Individual Identity; Searching for Home in The Cultural Supermarket*, London, New York: Routledge.
Mazour, A. G. (1955), *Russia Past and Present*, New York: D. Van Nostrand.
McKay, V.C. (1993), 'Making Connections: Narrative as the Expression of Continuity between Generations of Grandparents and Grandchildren', in N. Coupland and J.F. Nussbaum (eds), *Discourse and Lifespan Identity*, London: Sage, 173-85.
Mead, G.H. (1934), *Mind, Self and Society*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Mead, M. (1972), *Blackberry Winter*, New York: William Morrow.
Mead, M. (1974), 'Grandparents as Educators', *Teachers College Record* 76, 240-49.

Meinhof, U. and Galasinaski, D. (2002), 'Reconfiguring East-West identities: cross-generational discourses in German and Polish border communities', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 28(1), 63- 82.
Meinhof, U. and Galasinski, D. (2005), *The language of belonging*, Palgrave Macmillan.
Melvin, N. (1995), *Russians beyond Russia. The Politics of National Identity*, London: Royal Institute of International Affairs.
Mendoza-Denton, N. (2002), 'Language and Identity', in J.K. Chambers, P. Trudgill and N. Schilling-Estes (eds), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Meyerhoff, M. (1996), 'Dealing with Gender Identity as a Sociolinguistic Variable', in V.L.Bergvall, J.M. Bing and A.F. Freed (eds), *Rethinking Language and Gender Research: Theory and Practice*, London: Longman, 202-27.
Meyerhoff, M. and Niedzielski, N. (1994), 'Resistance to Creolization: An Interpersonal and Intergroup Account', *Language and Communication* 14(4), 313-30.
Michel, A., Titzmann, P., and Silbereisen, R. K. (2012), 'Psychological adaptation of adolescent immigrants from the former Soviet Union in Germany: Acculturation vs. age-related Time trends', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 43, 59-76.
Miller, G. and Fox, K. (2004), 'The possibility of analytic dialogue between ethnography, conversation analysis and Foucault' in D. Silverman, (ed.), *Qualitative research: theory, method and practice*, London: Sage.
Mills, S. (1997), *Discourse*, London: Routledge.
Milner-Gulland, R. (1999), *The Russians*, Oxford and Malden: Blackwell.
Morawska, E. (1996), *Insecure Prosperity: Small-Town Jews in Industrial America 1890–1940*, Princeton University Press: Princeton.
Morawska, E. (1999), *The new-old transmigrants, their transnational lives, and ethnicization: a comparison of 19th /20th and 20th /21st situations*, Florence: European University Institute Working Papers EUF No. 99/2.
Morgunova, O. (2007), *Discursive Self-Representations in Russian-Language Internet Forums: a Case of Russian Migrants in the UK*, Edinburgh.
Morgunova, O. (2009), 'Den' Segodniashniy: Britanskie Russkie ili Russkie Britantsy', in N. Makarova and O. Morgunova (eds), *Russkoe prisutstvie v Britanii*, Moskva: Sovremennaya ekonomika i pravo.
Morgunova, O. (2013), 'Russians in the City – "patriots" with a touch of spleen', *Digital Icons: Studies in Russian, Eurasian and Central European New Media*, 2013 (9), 51-68.
Morley, D. (2000), *Home territories: media, mobility and identity*, London: Routledge.
Morley, D. and Robins, K. (1995), *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries*, London and NY: Routledge.
Murphy, M. L. (1997), 'The Elusive Bisexual: Social Categorization and Lexico-Semantic Change', in A. Livia and K. Hall (eds), *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender and Sexuality*, New York: Oxford University Press, 35-57.
Müller, M. (2009), *Making Great Power Identities in Russia: An ethnographic discourse analysis of education at a Russian elite university*, Munster: Lit Verlag.
Münz, R. and Ohliger, R. (eds) (2003), Diasporas and Ethnic Migrants: Germany, Israel and Post-Soviet Successor States in Comparative Perspective, London: Frank Cass.
Nabokov, V. (2011), *Drugie berega*, Sankt-Petersburg: Azbuka.
Nesteruk, O. (2010), 'Heritage language maintenance and loss among the children of East European immigrants in the USA', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 31 (3), 271-86.

Neumann, I. B. (1996), *Russia and the Idea of Europe: A Study in Identity and International Relations*, London: Routledge.
Nisbett, R.E. (2003), *The Geography of thought*, New York: Free Press.
Niznik, M. (2003), 'Specifics of the Cultural Integration of theRussian-Speaking Immigrants in Israel', *Diasporas. Independent Academic Journal*, Vol.1, pp.48-67
Niznik, M. (2008), 'How to be an Alien? Cross-Cultural Transition of Russian-Speaking Youth in Israeli High Schools', *Israel Studies Forum*, Vol. 23(1).
Niznik, M. (2011), 'Cultural practices and preferences of "Russian" youth in Israel', *Israel Affairs*, 17 (1), 89-107.
Noble, T. and Goffart, W. (2006), *From Roman provinces to Medieval kingdoms*, London: Routledge.
Ochs, E. (1988), *Culture and Language Development*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Ochs, E. (1992), 'Indexing Gender', in A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds), *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 335-58.
Ochs, E. and Taylor, C. (1995), 'The "Father Knows Best" Dynamic in Dinnertime Narratives', in K. Hall and M. Bucholtz (eds), *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*, New York: Routledge.
O'Farrell, C. (2005), *Michel Foucault*, London: Sage.
Ohmae, K. (1994), *The Borderless World: Power and Strategy in the Interlinked Economy*, London : Harper Collins.
Okorokov, A. (2001), 'Istoriya Velikih Rossiyskih Pereseleniy', in A. Bondarev (ed.), *Emigratsiya i Repatriatsiya v Rossii*, Moscow: Svetlyi Put'.
Ong, W. J. (1980), 'Literacy and Orality in our Times', *Journal of Communication* 30, 197-204.
Orr, M. (2003), *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*, Cambridge: Blackwell.
Oushakine, S. (2000), 'In the State of Post-Soviet Aphasia: Symbolic Development in Contemporary Russia', *Europe-Asia Studies*, 52(3), 991-1016.
Panayi, P. (1994), *Immigration, Ethnicity and Racism in Britain1815-1945*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Papastergiadis, N. (2000), *The Turbulence of Migration: Globalization, Deterriorialization and Hybridity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
Park, J.S.-Y. (2004), *Globalization. Language and Social Order: Ideologies of English in South Korea*, unpublished dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.
Pechurina, A. (2010), *Creating a home from home: Russian communities in the UK*, Manchester.
Pechurina, A. (2011), 'The National Taste of Home: Researching Identity through Home Possessions',
https://www.academia.edu/1768576/The_National_Taste_for_Home_Researching_Identity_through_Home_Possessions
Pechurina, A. (2011), 'Russian Dolls, Icons and Pushkin: Practicing Cultural Identity through Material Possessions in Immigration',
https://www.academia.edu/6535762/Russian_Dolls_Icons_and_Pushkin_Practicing_Cultural_Identity_through_Material_Possessions_in_Immigration
Penitsch, R. (2003), *Migration and identity. A micro-study among Moroccan students in Berlin*, Berlin: Weißensee Verlag.
Perrie, M. (1998), '«Narodnost»: Notions of National identity', in C. Kelly and D. Shepherd (eds), *Constructing Russian culture in the age of revolution, 1881-1940*, Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Petersson, B. (2001), *National Self-images and Regional Identities in Russia*, USA: Ashgate.
Pfandl, H. (1994), 'Russkoyazychny Emigrant Tret'ey i Chetviertoy Volny: Nieskol'ko Razmyshleniy', *Russkiy Yazyk za Rubiezhom* 5-6, 101-108.
Plamper, I. (2002), 'Foucault's Gulag', *Kritika*, 3.2, 255-80.
Polkinghorne, D. E. (1991), 'Narrative and self-concept', *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 1(2 and 3), 135-53.
Popov, M. (2003), *Problema kul'turnoy identichnosti sovietskogo cheloveka*, Stavropol: Stavropol'skiy GU
Popova, E. (2012), *Self and Other Representations in Contemporary Russian Discourse on Migration*, Edinburgh University.
Portes, A. (1997), 'Immigration theory for a new century: Some problems and opportunities',*International Migration Review* 31, 799-825.
Prizel, I. (1998), *National Identity and Foreign Policy. Nationalism and Leadership in Poland, Russia, and Ukraine*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Prusank, D. T. (1993), 'Contextualizing Social Control: An Ethnomethodological Analysis of Parental Accounts of Discipline Interactions', in N. Coupland and J.F. Nussbaum (eds), *Discourse and Lifespan Identity*, London: Sage, 132-52.
Pushkareva, N. (1996), 'Vozniknovenie i formirovanie rossiyskoy diaspory za rubezhom', *Otechestvennaya istoriya* 1, 53-65.
Pushkareva, N. (1997), *Russkie za Rubezhom*, Moscow: Nauka.
Radhakrishnan, R. (1994), 'Is the ethnic authentic in the Diaspora?' in K.A. Juan (*ed.*), *The State of Asian America: Activism and Resistance in the 1990s*, Boston MA: South End Press.
Raeff, M. (1990), *Russia abroad : a cultural history of the Russian emigration, 1919-1939*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Rancour-Laferriere, D. (1995), The slave soul of Russia: moral masochism and the cult of suffering, New York , London: New York University Press.
Reese, R. R. (2000), *The Soviet Military Experience*, London: Routledge.
Riasanovsky, N. V. (1959), *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia 1825-1855*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California.
Ricoeur, P. (1991), 'Life in quest of narrative', in D. Wood (ed.), *Paul Ricoeur: Narrative and Interpretation*, London: Routledge.
Ries, N. (1997), *Russian Talk: Culture and Conversation during Perestroika*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Riessman, C. K. (2003), 'Performing identities in illness narrative: Masculinity and multiple sclerosis', *Qualitative Research* 3(1), 5-33.
Roll, H. (2003), 'Young Ethnic German Immigrants from the Former Soviet Union: German Language Proficiency and it´s Impact on Integration', in R. Münz and R. Ohliger (eds), *Diaspora and Ethnic Migrants: Germany, Israel and the Soviet Successor States in Comparison*, London: Frank Cass, 272-288.
Rowney, K. and Stockwell, G. (1978), 'The Russian Census of 1897: Some Observations on the Age Data', *Slavic Review*, 37(2), 217-227.
Russian Edinburgh, Homepage, http://www.russianedinburgh.org.uk/
Ryazanova-Clarke, L. and Wade, T. (1999), *The Russian language today*, London , New York: Routledge.
Ryazanova-Clarke, L. (2006), '«The State Turning to Language» Power and Identity in Russian Language Policy Today', *Russian Language Journal* 56, 37-55.
Ryazanova-Clarke, L. (2008a), 'Putin's Nation: Discursive Construction of National Identity in «Direct Line with President»', *Slavica Helsingiensia* 34, 311-31.

Ryazanova-Clarke, L. (2008b), 'Re-creation of the Nation: Orthodox and Heterodox Discourses in Post-Soviet Russia', *Scando-Slavica* 54(1), 223-239.
Ryazanova-Clarke, L. (2008), 'On Constructing Perestroika: Mikhail Gorbachev as Agent of Linguistic Heresy', in E. Andrews (ed.), *Linguistic Changes in Post-Communist Eastern Europe and Eurasia*, New York: Columbia University Press.
Ryazanova-Clarke, L. (2011), 'The «West» in the Linguistic Construction of Russianness in Contemporary Public Discourse', in R. Alapuro, A. Mustajoki and P. Pessonen (eds), *Understanding Russianness*, Routledge.
Sabennikova, I. (2002), 'Pravovoie polozhenie russkoy emigratsii v Anglii v mezhvoennyi period' in *Kul'turnoe i Nauchnoe Nasledie Rossiyskoy Emigratsii v Velikobritanii*, Moscow: Russkiy Put'.
Sacks, H. (1984a), 'On doing «being ordinary»', in J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sacks, H. (1984b), 'Notes on methodology', ed. Gail Jefferson, in J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sacks, H. (1995), *Lectures on Conversation*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Safran, W. (1991), 'Diasporas in modern societies: Myths of homeland and return', *Diaspora* 1, 83-99.
Sakharov, A. (2011), 'Trevozhnoie vremia', in A. Bebenyshev (ed.), *Sakharovskii sbornik*, Moskva: RGGU.
Sandomirskaia, I. (2001), *Kniga o Rodine. Opyt Analiza Diskursivnych Praktik*, Vienna: Gesellschaft zur Förderung slawistischer Studien.
Sassen, S. (2002), *Global networks, linked cities*, New York; London: Routledge.
Schegloff, E. A. (1992), 'In another Context', in A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds), *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schegloff, E. A. (1996), 'Issues of relevance for discourse analysis: Contingency in action, interaction and co-participant context', in E. H. Hovy and D. R. Scott (eds), *Computational and Conversational Discourse: Burning Issues – an Interdisciplinary Account*, New York: Springer.
Schegloff, E. A. (1997b), 'Narrative analisys: Thirty years later', *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7(1-4), 97-106.
Schieffelin, B. B. and Ochs, E. (eds) (1986), *Language Socialization across Cultures*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schiffrin, D. (1996), 'Narrative as self-portrait: Sociolinguistic construction of identity', *Language in Society* 25,167-203.
Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. and Hamilton, H. E. (eds) (2001), *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Schlesinger, P. (2002), 'Identities: traditions and New communities', *Media, Culture and Society* 24, 643-648.
Scholte, J. A. (2000), *Globalization. A critical introduction*, London: Palgrave.
Schopflin, G. (1997), 'The Functions of the Myth and a Taxonomy of Myths' in G. Hosking and G. Schopflin *(eds), Myth and Nationhood*, London: C. Hurst and Co.
Schopflin, G.(2000), *Nations, Identity, Power*, London: Sage.
Schwartz, M. (2008), 'Exploring the relationship between family language policy and heritage language knowledge among second generation of Russian-Jewish immigrants in Israel', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 29 (5), 400-18.*

Scollon, R. and Scollon, S.W. (2002), *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*, Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Shalin, D. (ed.) (1996), *Russian Culture at the Crossroads: Paradoxes of postcommunist consciousness,* Las-Vegas: Westview Press.
Sheffer, G. (1986), 'A new field of study: Modern diasporas in international politics', in G. Sheffer (ed.), *Modern Diasporas in International Politics*, London: Croom Helm.
Sheffer, G. (1995), 'The emergence of new ethno-national diasporas', *Migration* 28, 5-28.
Sheffer, G. (2003), *Diaspora politics: at home abroad*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Shmelev, A. (2002), *Russkiy yazyk i vnieyazykovaya deystvitel'nost'*, Moscow.
Shmelev, A. (2005), 'Leksicheskiy sostav russkogo yazyka kak otrazhenie «russkoy dushi»', in A. Zalizniak, I. Levontina and A. Shmelev, *Kluchevye idei russkoy yazykovoy kartiny mira*, Moscow: Yazyki Slavianskoy Kul'tury.
Shore, B. (1996), *Culture in mind: Cognition, culture and the problem of meaning*, New York: Oxford University Press.
Silverstein, M. (1976), 'Shifters, Linguistic Categories and Cultural Description', in K. H. Basso and H. A. Selby (eds), *Meaning in Anthropology*, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 11-55.
Silverstein, M. (1979), 'Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology', in P.R. Clyne, W.F. Hanks and C. L. Hofbauer (eds), *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
Silverstein, M. (1985), 'Language and the Culture of Gender: At the intersection of Structure, Usage and Ideology', in E. Mertz and R. J. Parmentier (eds), *Semiotic Mediation: Sociocultural and Psychological Perspectives*, Orlando, FL: Academic Press, 219-59.
Silverman, D. (1998), *Harvey Sacks: Social Science and Conversation Analysis*, New York: Oxford University Press.
Silverman, D. (2007), *A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and Reasonably Cheap Book about Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
Smith, A. (1997), 'The "Golden age" and National Renewal', in G. Hosking and G. Schopflin *(eds), Myth and Nationhood,* London: C. Hurst and Co.
Smith, A.D. (1991), *National Identity*, London: Penguin.
Smith, G. E. (*ed.*) (1990), *The Nationalities Question in the Soviet Union,* London and New York: Longman.
Solheim, E., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2013), 'Prejudice-reduction in Culturally Mixed Classrooms: The Development and Assessment of a Theory-driven Intervention Among Majority and Minority Youth in Finland', *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 10.
Solovei, T. (2003), Russkie Mify v Sovremennom Kontekste, *in Bazovye Tsennosti Rossian,* M: Dom Intellektual'noi Knigi.
Sopher, D. (1979), 'The Landscape of Home: Myth, Experience, Social Meaning', in D. Meinig (ed.), *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscape*, New York: Oxford University Press.
Steinmetz, S. K. (1979), 'Disciplinary Techniques and their Relationship to Aggressiveness, Dependency, and Conscience', in W. Burr, R. Hill and R. I. Nyles (eds), *Contemporary Theories about the Family*, New York: Free Press.
Stites, R. (1992), *Russian Popular Culture: Entertainment and Society since 1900,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stoessel, K., Titzmann, P. F., and Silbereisen, R. K. (2011), 'Children's psychosocial development following the transitions to kindergarten and school: A comparison between natives and immigrants in Germany', *International Journal of Developmental Science*, Vol. 5, 41-55.
Stolcke, V. (1995), 'Talking Culture: New Boundaries of Exclusion in Europe', *Current Anthropology*, 36, 1-24.
Struve, P. (1996), *Razmyshlenia o Russkoy Revolutsii*, Moscow: Slovo.
Suomela, J. (2004), Zarubezhnaya Rossia: Ideino-politicheskie Vzgliady Russkoy Emigratsii na Sctranitsakh Russkoy Evropeiskoy Pressy 1918-1940: St-Peterburg: Kolo.
Szporluk, R. (1994), 'Statehood and Nation Building in Post-Soviet Space', in R. Szporluk (ed.), *Ethnicity in Russia and the New States of Eurasia*, M. E. Sharpe: New York.
Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. C. (1979), 'An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict', in W.G. Austin and S. Worchel (eds), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
Tannen, D. (ed.) (1982), *Analyzing discourse: text and talk*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
Tannen, D. (ed.) (1993), *Framing in discourse*, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Tannen, D. (2010). *You Were Always Mom's Favourite!: Sisters in conversation throughout their lives*, Random House Digital, Inc.
Tannen, D. and Alatis, J. E. (eds) (2003), *Linguistics, language, and the real world: discourse and beyond*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
The Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary: http://www.bibliotekar.ru/bed/65.htm
Tishkov, V.A. (ed.) (2008), *Rossiyskaya natsiya: Stanovlenie i etnokul'turnoe mnogoobrazie*, Moscow: IEA RAN.
Tismaneanu, V. (1989), *Fantasies of Salvation: Democracy, Nationalism, and Myth in Post-Communist Europe*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Tolstoy, N. (1995), Yazyk i narodnaya kul'tura. Ocherki po slavianskoy mifologii i etnolingvistike, Moscow: Indrik.
Tolz, V. (1998), 'Conflicting "Homeland Myths" and Nation-State Building in Postcommunist Russia', *Slavic Review* 57 (2), 267-294.
Tolz, V. (2001), *Russia*, London: Arnold.
Trubnikov, N. (1987), *Vriemia chelovecheskogo bytiya*, Moscow: Nauka.
United Nations (1991), *Demographic yearbook 1989*, New York: United Nations.
Urban, M. (1998), 'Remythologising the Russian State', *Europe-Asia Studies* 50 (6), 969-92.
Ushakov, G. and Malakha, I. (2000), 'The brain drain as global phenomenon and its characteristics in Russia', *Russian Education and Society* 42 (12), 18-34.
Vertovec, S. (1997), 'Three meanings of 'diaspora', exemplified among South Asian religions', *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 6 (3), 277-99.
Vertovec, S. (2001), 'Transnationalism and identity', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27(4).
Vishnevskii, A. (ed.) (2004), *Naselenie Rossii 2002. Desiatyi yezhegodnyi demograficheskiy doklad*, Moscow: KDU.
Vishnevskii, A . and Zayonchkovskaia, Z. (1994), 'Emigration from the former Soviet Union: The fourth wave', in H. Fassmann and R. Münz (eds), *Europeanm igration in the late twentieth century: historical patterns, actual trends, and social implications*, Aldershot: Elgar, pp. 239-261.
Visweswaran, K. (1994), *Fictions of Feminist Ethnography*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Voynova,V. and Ushkalov, I. (1994) 'Sovremennye emigratsionnye protsessy v Rossii', *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovanya* 21(1), 39–49.
Wahlbeck, O. (2002), 'The concept of diaspora as an analytical tool in the study of refugee communities', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 28(2), 221-238.
Waksler, R. (2001), 'A New *All* in Conversation', *American Speech* 76(2), 128-38.
Week, T. R. (1996), *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia: Nationalism and Russification on the Western Frontier. 1863-1914*, DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.
Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (eds) (2003), *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
West, C. and Zimmerman D.H. (1987), 'Doing Gender', *Gender and Society* 1(2), 125-51.
Wetherell, M. (1998), 'Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue', *Discourse and Society* 9(3), 431-56.
Wetherell, M. and Potter, J.(1992), *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and legitimisation of exploitation*, London: Harvester.
Widdicombe, S. (1998), '«But you don't class yourself»: The interactional management of category membership and non-membership', in C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe (eds), *Identities in Talk*, London: Sage.
Wierzbicka, A. (1972), *Semantic Primitives*, Frankfurt: Athenaeum.
Wierzbicka, A. (1997), *Understanding cultures through their key words: English, Russian, Polish, German and Japanese*, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wierzbicka, A. (1999), *Emotions across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and universals*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Williams, A. M. (2005), 'Fighting words and challenging expectations: Language alternation and social roles in a family dispute', *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(3), 317-328.
Williams, A. M. (2008), 'Brought-along Identities and the Dynamics of Ideology: Accomplishing Bivalent Stances in a Multilingual Interaction', *Multilingua – Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 27(1-2), 37-56.
Williams, R. C. (1976), *Keywords: a vocabulary of culture and society*, London: Croom Helm.
Williams, R. C. (1997), *Russia Imagined: Art, Culture and National Identity, 1840-1995*, New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
Willis, P. (1990), *Common Culture*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
Wodak, R. *et al.* (1999), *The Discursive Construction of the National Identity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Wooffitt, R. (1992), *Telling Tales of the Unexpected: The Organization of Factual Discourse*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
Work Permit UK, http://www.workpermit.com/news/2006_12_19/uk/russians_londongrad.htm
Yurchak, A. (2002), 'Entrepreneurial governmentality in post-socialist Russia: a cultural investigation of business practices', in V. Bonell and Th. Gold, *The Entrepreneurs of Europe and Asia*, Armonk: M. E. Sharpe.
Zaionchkovskaya, Zh. (2002), 'Migratsiya', in A. Vishnevskii (ed.), *Naselenie Rossii 2002. Desiatyi yezhegodnyi demograficheskiy doklad*, Moscow: KDU.
Zaionchkovskaia, Zh. and Vishnevskii, A. (1992) 'Volny migratsii. Novaya situatsia', *Svobodnaya misl'* 12, 4-16.
Zalizniak, A. (2006), *Mnogoznachnost' v yazykie I sposoby ee priedstavleniya*, Moscow: Yazyki Slavianskoy Kul'tury.
Zalizniak, A. and Levontina, I. (2005), *Kluchevye Idei Russkoy Yazykovoi Kartiny Mira*, Moscow: Yazyki Slavianskoy Kul'tury.

Zalizniak, A., Levontina, I. and Shmelev, A. (2005), *Kluchevye idei russkoy yazykovoy kartiny mira*, Moscow: Yazyki Slavianskoy Kul'tury.
Zaloga, S. J. (1987), *Inside the Soviet Army*, Oxford: Osprey Publishing.
Zaslavskaya, T. (ed.) (2000), *Kuda idiet Rossiya?*, Moscow: MVSSEN.
Zbenovich, C. (2010), 'The Experience of Parenting and Growing Up as Immigrants: A Discourse Analysis of Child-Rearing Practices in Russian-Israeli Families', *Laboratorium*, Vol.3, 58-71.
Zbenovich, C. (2014), 'Linguistic performance of "Russianness" among Russian-Israeli parents: Discourse analysis of child-raising practices in immigrant community', in L. Ryazanova-Clarke (ed.), *The Russian Language Outside the Nation*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Zhukov, A. and Zhukova, L. (1998), *Istoria I Sud'ba Russkoy Emigratsii*, Sankt-Petersburg.
Zhukova Klausen, J. (2011), *Transnational Living in Everyday Practices: A Study of Social and Discursive Aspects of Transnational Networking and its Role in Identity Construction*, Aalborg: SPIRIT & Department of Culture and Global Studies Aalborg University.
Zemskov, V. (1991), 'Rozhdenie vtoroi emigratsii', *Sotsiologicheskie issledovania* 4, 3-24.
Ziernov, N. (1975), 'Russkiy religioznyi opyt i yego vliyaniye na Angliyu', in N. Poltoratskiy (ed.), *Russkaya religiozno-filosofskaya mysl' XX veka*, Pittsburgh: Otdel slavianskih yazykov i literatur Pittsburgskogo Universiteta.
Zudin, A.J. (2007), 'Traditsionalizatsiya I ukorenenie politicheskih innovatsiy: k postanovkie problemy', *Puti Rossii: preemstvennost' I preryvistost' obshchestvennogo razvitiya*, Moscow: MVSh SEN.

Appendix

List of Recordings

1 OX

OX 1 00 01 34

OX 2 00 00 13

OX 3 00 07 38

OX 4 00 01 25

OX 5 00 13 49

OX 6 00 19 58

2 LB

LB 1 00 00 53

LB 2 00 03 30

LB 3 00 02 02

LB 4 00 00 12

LB 5 00 04 38

LB 6 00 04 08

LB 7 00 06 09

LB 8 00 05 06

LB 9 00 05 54

LB 10 00 06 15

LB 11 00 03 26

LB 12 00 10 13

LB 13 00 05 16

LB 14 00 23 08

LB 15 00 04 22

LB 16 00 04 55

3 ST

ST 1 00 07 44

ST 2 00 06 09

ST 3 00 04 41

ST 4 00 21 42

ST 5 00 01 37

ST 6 00 04 43

ST 7 00 19 40

ST 8 00 20 33

ST 9 00 01 33

ST 10 00 08 33

ST 11 00 04 25

ST 12 00 15 55

ST 13 00 11 51

4 ACh

A Ch 1 00 53 21

A Ch 2 01 15 11

A Ch 3 01 19 19

5 AK

AK 1 00 00 08

AK 2 00 00 20

AK 3 00 04 17

AK 4 00 01 05

AK 5 00 32 30

AK 6 00 07 13

AK 7 00 21 02

AK 8 00 23 06

AK 9 00 21 13

6 TL

TL 1 00 01 46

TL 2 00 13 38

TL 3 00 28 58

TL 4 00 19 47

TL 5 00 30 40

TL 6 00 26 13

7 NR

NR 1 00 08 24

NR 2 00 00 05

NR 3 00 07 29

NR 4 00 08 26

NR 5 00 21 30

NR 6 00 12 53

NR 7 00 09 25

NR 8 00 00 53

NR 9 00 43 13

8 DS

DS 1 00 00 07

DS 2 00 00 09

DS 3 00 00 07

DS 4 00 11 50

DS 5 00 05 53

DS 6 00 04 56

DS 7 00 01 43

DS 8 01 05 11

DS 9 00 30 43