Data Documentation

for the Article "Morphological Analysis of Narratives of the Russian-Ukrainian Conflict in Western Academia and Think-Tank Community"

The data was selected to study the most popular narratives of the post-2014 developments in and around Ukraine that are employed by academics and policy analysts in seven countries of the broadly defined West: the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, Greece, and Poland. In the article "Morphological Analysis of Narratives of the Russian-Ukrainian Conflict in Western Academia and Think-Tank Community" we have employed the morphological analysis of cross-country narratives, and referred to national peculiarities only tangentially. An earlier book[i], using the same dataset, focused on deep in-country analysis of framing and naming the conflict.

The selection of data reflects the research team's interest in how differences in the countries' foreign policy orientation, intellectual environment, and Eastern Europe expertise affect the prevalent interpretations of the situation in Ukraine and Russia's involvement therein. It strives to cover the countries diverse in terms of political inclinations to and interest in Ukraine and the region in order to capture the most widespread narratives. Additionally, the choice of the countries takes into account the linguistic competencies of the research team: the whole team is fluent in English, and individual researchers in other languages, e. g. K. Zarembo in German and Italian, N. Koval in French and Modern Greek, and M. Riabchuk in Polish, which technically enables the analysis of the data in the respective languages.

The US was chosen for analysis as a geopolitical and intellectual heavyweight, which sets the standards and offers the most prestigious journals for academic publications, has a vast and influential think-tank community and influences global discourses on crucial questions of international politics in a number of ways. Next, we chose the three biggest European countries with different political and intellectual traditions regarding Russia and Eastern Europe but all playing an essential role in managing the current conflict in and around Ukraine, namely the UK, Germany, and France. These two factors ensure both the high political relevance of conflict interpretations and the variety of narrations within each country. Finally, we added three smaller European countries with apparent inclinations towards totally different perceptions, discourses, and policies regarding Russia and Eastern Europe. Poland reflects the prevalent mood among the nations of Eastern and Central Europe which are most concerned with the Russian threat and most optimistic about the prospects of further Eastern enlargement of the EU. In addition, as a neighboring and strategically important country Ukraine is quite thoroughly studied in Poland. On the contrary, Italy and Greece represent Europe's South which perceives Russia as an essential contributor to European security, not a threat to it, and do not manifest deeper interest in the region beyond general Russian studies.

The temporal frame for our analysis encompasses the years from 2014 to 2019 when the pertinent narratives were formed. Most of the think tank publications on the topic appeared in the first years of the conflict, and with its freezing and moving to the background of the international agenda, the number of texts considerably diminished. In contrast, scholarly texts require more time to produce and proceed; hence publications became more numerous in the second part of the examined period.

The source selection method also reflects our search for transnational narratives (for the article) and in-depth individual country analysis (the book) rather than any attempts of a rigorous cross-country comparison. Hence the attention to national peculiarities in source selection: the aim

was to make the most representative sample of texts for each country, taking into account the distinctiveness of its academic and analytical landscape. We chose from academic journals, think tank websites, and journals of political commentary (both in the respective national languages and in English). The relative weights of these categories vary considerably from country to country in accordance with their relevance to the topic under analysis. The selection of outlets in particular countries went as follows (alphabetical order):

France (data collected and analysed by Nadiia Koval)

To comprehensively analyze the French academic output on the topic of our interest, we searched the relevant databases cairn.info, persée.fr, openedition.org, and jstor.org combining keywords "Ukraine," "Ukrainian," "crisis," "conflict," and "war" (all in French, as we sought to focus on internal discourse). The results were filtered to include only those articles that deal with the ongoing Russian-Ukrainian conflict. Furthermore, we only considered texts by authors affiliated with French institutions and excluded books, book chapters, and popular publications. The resulting number of academic articles became 65. We also analyzed 44 policy papers (in French and in English) of six leading think tanks in foreign policy and security studies.

Germany (data collected and analysed by Kateryna Zarembo and Marianna Fakhurdinova)

Germany features a rather vibrant Ukrainian studies community, which is more pronounced in policy analysis circles than in academia. Out of the wide range of German think tanks, our examination of the five most prominent and independent (i.e., not financed by, or affiliated with any political party) yielded 65 policy papers and policy briefs related to the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. Moreover, we searched eleven academic journals that could potentially produce articles on the conflict but found such articles (total of 13) only in four of these. The analysis concerned the texts both in German and English.

Greece (data collected and analysed by Nadiia Koval)

A high level of internationalization characterizes Greek academic writing in political science and international relations. Most of the articles and book chapters relevant to our study were published in English, and only one piece appeared in Greek in a national journal. To cover local discourse, we decided to include books/chapters, as the Greek corpus of academic texts on the issue is visibly smaller than for other countries in this study. The primary journal for our analysis was the *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, which devoted two special issues to the conflict. In addition, we analyzed all relevant publications of five think tanks. The resulting corpus consists of 44 texts, including 17 academic and 27 analytical pieces (26 texts in English and 18 in Greek).

Italy (data collected and analysed by Kateryna Zarembo)

Given the somewhat limited Eastern Europe expertise in Italy (the corpus of selected texts from the Italian academic and policy analysis discourse consists of publications from a small number of outlets and organizations. These include three academic journals (out of eight that we preliminarily examined), the geopolitical monthly *Limes* (analogous to American journals such as *Foreign Policy* or *The National Interest* in scope and influence on the country's foreign policy), and two leading think tanks that deal with international affairs, namely the Institute of International Affairs and the Institute for Studies of International Politics. Altogether, we analyzed 90 texts, including eight academic papers, 52 policy papers, and 30 political opinion pieces from *Limes*. Sixty-three of these texts were in Italian and 27 in English (by Italian and foreign authors).

Poland (data collected and analysed by Mykola Riabchuk)

In the case of Poland, we analyzed relevant publications of nine Polish think tanks (primarily independent) and 18 academic journals (published mainly through universities). The think tanks produced 158 texts that refer in some way to the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. 60 of them come from two government-sponsored institutions, the Polish Institute of International Affairs (33 texts) and

the Center for Eastern Studies (27). The relevant articles in all 18 reviewed journals amount to 157. The outlets with the highest number of articles are *Stosunki Międzynarodowe* (International Relations, by the Warsaw University), *Wschód Europy* (East of Europe, by the Maria Sklodowska-Curie University at Lublin), *Przegląd Geopolityczny* (Geopolitical Review, by the independent think-tank), and *Sprawy Międzynarodowe* (International Affairs, by the Polish Academy of Sciences). Almost all journals are published in Polish, in contrast to the production of think-tanks, which in most cases is bilingual.

The United Kingdom (data collected and analysed by Mykola Riabchuk)

The first part of our UK corpus results from the thorough examination of 15 academic journals selected in view of their impact and attention on Ukrainian topics. Three of them (*International Affairs*, *Survival*, and *RUSI Journal*) are published by research institutions and combine academic analysis with explicitly expressed authors' positions and direct political recommendations. These three journals produced the lion share of Ukraine-related texts (37), more than the remaining twelve journals (35). Another group with a comparable number of Ukraine-related articles (13) includes those published by British scholars in American journals. We also have examined analytical products of eight leading UK think tanks and found 115 publications with some references to the Russia-Ukraine conflict. Nearly half of them come from RUSI and Chatham House.

The United States (data collected and analysed by Volodymyr Kulyk)

In the US, considering its enormous weight in the global scholarly production, we examined 22 English-language academic journals where we expected to find texts relevant to our inquiry (7 in area studies, 6 in ethnicity and nationalism, 6 in international relations and security studies, and 3 in comparative politics). We found 36 relevant articles authored or co-authored by scholars affiliated with US universities or research centers. However, the think tank and political commentary texts were much more numerous and dispersed in a larger number of outlets. Therefore, we decided to focus on two journals of commentaries with different political orientations, *Foreign Affairs* and *The National Interest*. We searched the ABI/INFORM Global database by keyword "Ukraine" and then selected texts about the Ukrainian domestic political and security situation or international processes involving Ukraine. This yielded 89 texts from *Foreign Affairs* and 78 from *The National Interest*.

As to the difficulties, we had to deal with the high degree of internationalization of scientific inquiry in most countries. In most cases we delineated "national" discourses based on the authors' affiliation. This allowed us to analyze those authors who were embedded in a specific academic/analytical community at the time of writing and were able to communicate their views in university classes and/or media debates in a given country. In this respect, they were closer to reflecting a "national perspective" than, for instance, invited authors for some special issues (although the latter undoubtedly influenced the general debate). Such a strategy helped us, on the one hand, to single out "American" authors from the plethora of texts from all over the world that are published in American outlets and, on the other, to track Greek authors who prefer to publish in internationalized outlets in English. We are aware that such delineation of discourses between the corpuses from different countries does not account for mixed identities of many internationally mobile scholars and diverse receptions of their texts in their countries of origin and current residence, especially when these countries share the main language as do the US and UK.

---

[i] Kulyk, Volodymyr, ed. 2020. *Interpretatsiī rosiis'ko-ukraïns'koho konfliktu v zakhidnykh naukovykh i ekspertno-analitychnykh pratsiakh*. Kyiv: IPiEND.