

Jelena B. Babić Antić

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4633-1991>

Anita V. Janković

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9161-1883>

University of Priština in Kosovska Mitrovica

Faculty of Philosophy

Department of English Language and Literature

УДК 81'27:159.923.2-057.875(497.11

Косовска Митровица)

DOI 10.46793/Uzdanica23.1.099BA

Оригинални научни рад

Примљен: 28. јануар 2026.

Прихваћен: 16. март 2026.

LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY: A SOCIOLINGUISTIC INSIGHT INTO IDENTITY PERCEPTION AMONG THE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN KOSOVSKA MITROVICA

Abstract: This study aims to examine how students at the University of Priština in Kosovska Mitrovica construct their identity claims within a specific geopolitical context. The research also examines the degree to which local sociopolitical circumstances influence students' self-positioning. The sample comprises 49 undergraduate students (aged 20–25; 47% female, 53% male) from eight faculties. The data were collected during the 2024/25 academic year using the written prompt “Who am I?”, requiring participants to complete the sentence “I am...” five times in Serbian (L1). The responses were qualitatively analysed at a micro-sociolinguistic level following Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) framework, focusing on positionality, indexicality, relationality, and partialness, with emergence treated as a foundational principle. The findings indicate that indexicality predominates across all faculties, with students primarily foregrounding personal traits and aspirations. Positionality is frequently realised through professional, gender, and national roles, while relationality reflects strong family and communal affiliations.

Keywords: language cues, context, identity, students.

INTRODUCTION

The question of identity is an important topic investigated within sociolinguistics, sociology, anthropology, psychology, and many other scientific disciplines (Zabrodska 2025; Alasal 2025; Shimada, Mikami 2023; Kurzwelly 2025, etc.). There are different theories which touch upon different ways individuals construct their identities, via group membership, cultural context, self-narratives, and other means (Filipović 2025; Grieve et al. 2024; Alshehri 2023, etc.). The students at the University of Priština in Kosovska Mitrovica are subject to geopolitical conditions that differ significantly from those affecting their peers in other university centers in the Republic of Serbia. The fact that these students come from various parts of Kosovo and Serbia alike, and are studying in the northern part of Kos-

ovska Mitrovica, creates a very specific cultural context. Acknowledging the challenges faced by students as they pursue their academic careers along a path that is not always calm and stable, as it is potentially affected by the political situation in Kosovo and Metohija, it can be expected that the students would exhibit salient identity positions. Therefore, this study addresses the research problem of identity as an emergent discursive phenomenon by investigating the tension between identity as a deliberate, intentional construct and identity as a habitual response to an unstable environment.

The primary aim of this study is to investigate the linguistic mechanisms through which students at the University of Priština in Kosovska Mitrovica construct their identity claims. By analysing the language used by a single generation of students, we aim to determine how these individuals perceive themselves within their unique social landscape. The students attend diverse faculties, as we acknowledge that while they share a common academic environment, their varied backgrounds, professional orientations and distinct career paths provide a rich, multifaceted data set.

To address the research problem and achieve its aim, the study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. How do students at the University of Priština in Kosovska Mitrovica utilise language to construct and articulate their identity claims?
2. To what extent do the specific geopolitical conditions of Kosovska Mitrovica shape the identity positions of the student population?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

From a sociological perspective, Giddens (1991) views the phenomenon of identity as a reflexive project of the self. Self-identities are constructed by a continual process of self-reflection on their personal and social experiences. Furthermore, Giddens (1991: 5–9) argues that “the self is not a passive entity; rather, it is a reflexive project that individuals work on throughout their lives”. Class, race, gender, and other forms of social categorisation can play a role in identity formation (Filipović 2025; Grieve et al. 2024; Alshehri 2023; Bucholtz, Hall, 2013, etc.). According to the social identity theory developed by Tajfel and Turner (2004), identity is constructed via group membership. Individuals form their identity partly from social groups they belong to, such as class, nationality, ethnicity, and other forms of stratification.

The idea that people can create identity through constructing stories about their lives has emerged over the last two decades. It presents a broadly integrative conception in both the humanities and social sciences (McAdams, McLean 2013; McAdams 2011). From the perspective of the narrative identity theory, McAdams

(1985), a prominent psychologist, conceptualises identity as an internalised and evolving life story that provides a sense of unity and purpose.

Acknowledging the interrelatedness between language and identity in various scientific disciplines, Bucholtz and Hall (2005) provide a sociolinguistic perspective by emphasizing that linguistic practices are closely tied to the construction of identity, including social identities. Nowadays, the divergent strands of sociolinguistic research still hold a mutual concern about something known in sociolinguistics as “real language.” Therefore, Bucholtz (2003: 398) continues to explain that sociolinguistics as an empirical discipline goes further from the Chomskian paradigm and considers the language “a systemic use of language by social actors in social situations.” In contrast to approaches that regard identity primarily as an analytical construct, identity may instead be conceptualised as an inherently relational sociocultural phenomenon. From this perspective, identity is constituted and negotiated through interaction; it is not a stable structure located within the individual psyche or within fixed social categories (Bucholtz, Hall 2010: 18). From this perspective, identity cannot be understood as an innate or pre-existing attribute: it is actively constructed by speakers and their particular use of linguistic forms, often consciously, and in response to immediate contextual demands and social environments. Furthermore, the interpretation of identity is likewise shaped by broader social norms and prerogatives, which influence how identities are recognised and evaluated.

As we already stated, the question of identity continues to be a concern of various scientific disciplines. In recent years, the need for linguistic research of identity has become increasingly popular (central) within sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, discourse analysis, and social psychology (Alasal 2025; Kurzwelly 2025; Shimada, Mikami 2023; Zabrodskaia 2025, etc.). After nearly two decades of sustained engagement with the question of identity in sociolinguistics and related disciplines, Mary Bucholtz and Kira Hall’s (2005) sociocultural linguistic framework emerges as particularly well suited to the present analysis. The framework is especially appropriate given the central aim of this study: to examine how students construct identity through language use. Because the data under investigation consist of situated linguistic performances rather than psychological measures or demographic variables, a theoretical approach that conceptualises identity as emergent in discourse is methodologically warranted.

Understanding identity as something shaped through relationships, interaction, and language fits perfectly with this study’s focus. The research looks at how students present themselves, connect with or move away from social groups, and create meaning through language. Models that see identity as fixed cannot fully explain these changing processes. Therefore, the framework by Mary Bucholtz and Kira Hall (2005) offers a clear and consistent theoretical and methodological basis for this study. They have a quite broad and open-ended definition of identity, stating that “identity is the social positioning of the self and other” (Bucholtz, Hall

2005: 585). Although different schools of thought within the identity literature tend to emphasise either personal or social contents, Vignoles (2017: 2) argues that it is precisely the personal and social nature of identity that gives the construct its greatest theoretical potential to provide insight into the relationship between an individual and a society. He also claims that the study of identity is the study of individuals and groups answering the *Who are you?* question. Within such a framework, identity is seen as emerging through discourse rather than reflecting a fixed internal self (Bucholtz, Hall 2005: 588–588). Their analyses—including interactions among California high school students, Korean American youth, domestic and marketplace conversations, and political discourse—demonstrate that identity is dynamic, interactionally achieved, and contextually shaped. The following principles conceptualise identity along five dimensions.

Emergency. The basic notion of this principle is that identity is something that comes from within the speaker. It is housed within the speaker's mind and emerges through their use of language. An individual's sense of self plays an important role in this identity conception. Bucholtz and Hall (2005) go on by explaining that "identity is best viewed as an emergent product rather than the pre-existing source of linguistic or any other practices." Therefore, they point out that it is a fundamentally social and cultural phenomenon. For example, a participant organising a group discussion may emerge as a leader, while a frequent explainer emerges as knowledgeable (Bucholtz, Hall 2005: 587–588).

Positionality. This principle looks at identity in relation to how the social actors (speakers) position themselves in social interactions and sees the identity as temporary. Within this principle, the social actors can choose from multiple facets in order to adapt to the ongoing discourse. Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 591) add that at the most basic level, "identity emerges in discourse through the temporary roles and orientations assumed by the participants (such as a joke teller, engaged listener, etc.)." For example, we can imagine the student in a lab session who takes the role of a note taker. According to Bucholtz and Hall, that would temporarily position him or her as the organiser of the information crucial for the ongoing lab practice.

Indexicality. This principle is founded on the mechanism that is crucial to the way in which linguistic forms are used to construct identity positions. Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 595), drawing on Ochs (1992), point out that this principle presents a semiotic link between language forms and social meanings. They further explain that the process in which a speaker attempts to assert an identity through particular language use and behavioural gestures is ideologically significant. For example, a student may use code-switching to his home dialect in order to explain a concept to a friend, thereby indexing cultural identity within that interaction.

Relationality. The fourth principle emphasises identity as a relational phenomenon, in which identity is constructed through social relations and interaction rather than existing independently. Identity depends on a broad range of relational

positions and processes. As Bucholtz and Hall (2005) explain, “Identities are inter-subjectively constructed through several, often overlapping, complementary relations, including similarity/difference, genuineness/artifice, and authority/delegitimacy” (Bucholtz, Hall 2005: 598). For example, students may position themselves as novices in relation to professors, while co-workers may construct themselves as collaborators, and similarly, a junior employee introducing an idea to a senior colleague may construct an identity that is both collaborative and respectful within that interaction.

Partialness. According to Bucholtz and Hall, identity is inherently relational, and therefore, it will always be partial:

Any given construction of identity may be in part deliberate, in part habitual and often less conscious, in part intentional contestation and in part an outcome of others’ perception and representations... It is therefore constantly shifting both as interaction unfolds and across discourse contexts (Bucholtz, Hall 2005: 605–606).

For instance, a relatively quiet student may become more talkative during small group projects, revealing only certain aspects of their personality in that context.

Similarly, the question of identity and language has been a matter of recent research in Serbian contexts. It mostly highlights the interplay between language and identity in diaspora and heritage settings. Miketić Subotić (2025) shows how language choices among the Serbian diaspora in Vienna reflect cultural belonging and identity negotiation, while Filipović (2025) emphasises the role of linguistic practices in constructing social identities. Petrović (2024) demonstrates how identity and agency shape students’ engagement with Serbian in heritage language education, while Vuković (2022) links language use to social stereotypes, illustrating how identities are indexed in broader social contexts. However, unlike these studies, which primarily focus on diaspora or heritage language environments, this study contributes a novel perspective by examining identity construction in a higher education EFL context, highlighting how students actively negotiate and position their identities through interaction in classroom discourse.

METHODOLOGY

The main idea of this study is to explore how students use language to describe themselves and what that language use reveals about their identities. This study is conducted from a micro-sociolinguistic perspective. It analyses the linguistic identity snapshots and identity categories, following Bucholtz and Hall’s (2005) identity taxonomy – Emergence (E), Positionality (P), Indexicality (I), Relationality (R), and Partialness (Pa). This analytical framework should enable the analysis of students’ responses (self-perceptions) and ensure a systematic exami-

nation of how their language reflects social positioning, personal traits, relational ties, and context-dependent aspects of identity (such as nationality, profession, personality, family roles, and gender, etc.). The selection of Mary Bucholtz and Kira Hall's (2005) sociocultural linguistic framework is directly motivated by the nature of this study, which analyses how students construct identity through language. Because the data consist of linguistic performances rather than psychological measures or demographic categories, a theory that conceptualises identity as emergent in discourse is methodologically appropriate. Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) model treats identity as relational, interactionally achieved, and linked to linguistic practice. We believe that this aligns precisely with the analytical focus of the study: examining how students' position, align with, or distance themselves from social categories, and negotiate meaning through language use. In contrast, the essentialist or static models of identity would not capture the dynamic processes. Therefore, Bucholtz and Hall's framework offers both theoretical coherence and analytical precision, making it a well-justified and methodologically consistent choice for this research.

Instrument. The data consist of students' written responses to a prompt requiring them to complete the statement “*I am ...*” five times. These responses were then qualitatively analysed to identify recurring themes and self-perceptual patterns among the participants. Focusing on how students begin to define themselves when completing the sentence, they were given instructions before their writing, which clearly specified that responses should be organised according to importance and personal preference. In line with Vignoles et al. (2011: 2), who state that “identity can refer to the self-definitions of individuals,” these expressions can be understood as self-definitions. Accordingly, self-definitions may be referred to as identity claims or identity positions.

Data Collection. To ensure the authenticity of identity claims and prevent limitations caused by foreign language proficiency, the “Who am I?” prompt was administered in the students' native Serbian (L1). The data collection was conducted in a controlled classroom setting during the 2024/25 academic year. All responses were strictly anonymised to ensure participant safety and confidentiality. The categorisation of students' descriptions will be presented in a tabular format, based on the taxonomy proposed by Bucholtz and Hall (2005).

Sample. The students attend eight faculties at the University of Priština, temporarily situated in Kosovska Mitrovica. The faculties in question are: The Faculty of Philosophy, the Academy of Arts, the Faculty of Economics, the Faculty of Technical Science, the Faculty of Civil Engineering, the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, the Faculty of Medicine, and the Faculty of Dental Medicine. All students were attending the course English Language 4. The study sample comprises participants aged approximately 20–25, with a gender distribution of 47% female and 53% male. While the initial number of participants exceeded 49, some entries were disregarded because they were unreadable or failed to meet the consistency

requirements. Participation was entirely voluntary, and all students provided informed consent before the study. The distribution of student participants across the various faculties is varied, with the Faculty of Technical Science forming the largest single cohort at 20.4%. This is followed by a consistent distribution among the Faculty of Philosophy, Academy of Arts, Faculty of Economics, and Faculty of Civil Engineering, each contributing 12.2% of the total sample. The remaining specialised fields, Mechanical Engineering, Medicine, and Dental Sciences, each account for 10.2% of the participants.

ANALYSIS

Following Bucholtz and Hall's theory (2005), all students' responses were treated as emerging from discourse rather than being premeditated, and *emergency* was therefore not included in the frequency column but regarded as a foundational principle underlying all instances of identity construction. The analysis was conducted on a total of 457 coded identity instances derived from 49 participants. Given the limited subgroup sizes across faculties and the absence of demographic balancing, inter-faculty comparisons would not yield statistically reliable conclusions. Therefore, results are presented in aggregate form.

The distribution of identity principles demonstrates a clear hierarchy. Indexicality is the dominant principle, accounting for 243 instances (53.2% of the dataset). Students most frequently construct identity through evaluative self-descriptions, personal traits, aspirations, and value-based orientations. The predominance of indexicality indicates that identity is primarily articulated through subjective and characterological attributes rather than institutional positioning. Positionality is present in 96 instances (21.0%), and it is realised through references to professional roles, gender positions, and national affiliations. These markers situate individuals within socially recognisable and institutionally structured categories.

Relationality appears in 66 instances (14.4%), predominantly through family roles and communal affiliations. This suggests that identity is partly constructed through embeddedness in interpersonal and collective networks. Partialness, comprising 52 instances (11.4%), reflects the selective and situational foregrounding of specific identity facets. These forms reflect the concept of identity as dynamic and non-exhaustive. The statistical distribution suggests that identity construction within this sample is primarily indexical and self-referential, supported by institutional positioning and relational embedding. The findings illustrate the theoretical assumption that identity is discursively enacted, hierarchically structured, and interactionally negotiated rather than static or essentialist.

Across all eight faculties, students' identity claims consistently cluster around the four dimensions proposed by Bucholtz and Hall: indexicality, positionality, relationality, and partialness (Appendix 1). Although frequency distributions

vary slightly across the sample, the qualitative patterns of linguistic realisation remain stable throughout the dataset. Indexicality emerges as the dominant mode of identity construction. Linguistic cues displaying gender, nationality, profession, and personal traits (e.g., *female, student, Serbian girl, dreamer, sentimental person, positive, naïve, and determined; kind, in love with travel and books*) primarily relate to instances of *indexicality*, showing what linguistic means are used for expressing deeply personal traits and lifestyle choices. Students most frequently define themselves through evaluative adjectives. Linguistic units such as *honest, emotional, determined, stubborn, sensitive, loyal, ambitious, quiet, shy, hardworking, and cheerful* foreground personal character as the primary site of identity articulation. Similarly, aspirational and reflexive formulations such as *a dreamer, everything I want to become, wants to improve, tries to be positive, capable, and stable* position identity as internally driven and developmental. The value-based expressions, including *believes in equality, hates injustice, values honesty, responsible, and just*, further demonstrate that identity is frequently anchored in moral and ideological self-positioning. Even lifestyle markers such as *sports lover, film lover, creative, loves to travel, or in love with books* function indexically by encoding social meaning through personal preference. Taken together, these forms indicate that students predominantly construct identity through subjective and characterological descriptors rather than through fixed institutional categories.

Positionality was expressed through professional roles such as *student, musician, actor, and actress*, highlighting social and career-based positioning. Gender positioning appears in forms such as *woman* and *girl*, while national identification is expressed through markers such as *Serb, Serbian girl, and a member of the Serbian nation*. In several cases, professional identity is articulated through explicitly future-oriented constructions such as *future bank CEO* or *future academic citizen*, suggesting that positional identity is often conceptualised as a projected trajectory rather than a present status. These linguistic choices suggest that students do not merely describe personal qualities but also anchor themselves within broader social structures and anticipated career paths.

Relationality becomes visible through kinship terminology and demonstrates that students' identity is constructed in relation to others. Expressions such as *daughter, son, brother, sister, first grandson, and child in an Orthodox family* show that family remains a central relational reference point. Broader social affiliations appear in phrases such as *friend, surrounded by good people, and neighbour*, while national and communal identification is sometimes intensified through affective formulations such as *patriot, proud of my language, contributing to the nation, or from Kosovo and Metohija*. Religious belonging is explicitly marked in references such as *Orthodox*.

Partialness, although less frequent, manifests in the facets of a multi-dimensional self (e.g., “a poet,” “dreamer”), indicating situational or selective aspects of identity. This dimension is realised through qualifiers and reflexive constructions

such as *my own person* or a person not defined by my attitudes, which resist categorical closure and foreground identity as dynamic. In some cases, isolated identity tokens such as *Darko* or playful self-labels like a *legend* function as fragmentary self-presentations, emphasising one salient facet rather than a comprehensive definition. Ideological self-positioning in expressions such as *feminist* or *someone who does not allow to be tortured* similarly points to one dimension of the self without claiming totality. These patterns demonstrate that students perceive identity as layered, situational, and open to negotiation.

Several cross-dimensional tendencies come to the fore. First, indexical self-description consistently outweighs purely institutional positioning, showing that students have a strong orientation toward interiority and personal evaluation. Second, professional roles frequently appear in future-oriented constructions, suggesting that identity is conceptualised as becoming rather than being. Third, family-based relational markers occur more consistently than peer-based affiliations. Fourth, national identity, when invoked, is often emotionally intensified rather than neutrally stated, which may reflect the broader sociopolitical context in which these students are embedded. Finally, gender identity is typically expressed through simple nominal forms without extended elaboration, indicating comparatively lower discursive expansion than personality or professional traits.

DISCUSSION

Students' descriptions reveal a complex and varied landscape of self-identities, shaped by multiple intersecting factors, including ethnicity, gender, social interactions, and professional orientation. As Vignoles et al. (2011) suggest, these identities are not static but are integrative processes of self-definition. It was established that students construct their identity through a complex interplay of multiple levels, as captured by Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) principles. *Indexicality* shows how personal traits and dispositions (e.g., *dreamer*, *responsible*, *sensitive*) convey social and cultural meanings, while *positionality* reflects the adoption of professional, social, and gendered roles (e.g., *student*, *daughter*, *athlete*), situating a speaker within specific social contexts, which aligns with Bucholtz and Hall (2013). In addition, consistent with Joseph's (2004) view on ethnolinguistic strategies, *relationality* highlights how identities are co-constructed in relation to others and communities (e.g., *friend*, *local patriot*, *family member*), and *partialness* reveals the fragmented, multifaceted, and aspirational nature of self-representation (e.g., *my own person*; *everything I want to become*; *try to be positive*).

Even though the subsamples are relatively small, which limits the statistical reliability of comparisons between faculties, the overviews are kept at the level of description rather than inference. The findings tentatively suggest that some variations can be observed across faculties. These descriptive overviews increase trans-

parency and serve an exploratory purpose, potentially indicating tendencies that may inform interpretation or guide future research with larger samples. Across the eight groups of students, patterns in language use reveal both shared and different perceptions of identity. Students from the faculties such as the Academy of Arts and the Faculty of Medical Science prioritise self-identity, personal traits, aspirations, and emotional states (*positionality*), while other groups, like the Faculties of Economy and Mechanical Engineering, emphasise professional or national identities (*indexicality*). Social identity, including family roles, community membership, and national pride, appears consistently across groups, particularly among students from the Faculties of Technical and Dental Science (*relationality*), echoing the negotiation of identities in contested spaces described by Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004). These orientations are also reflected by students' language choices, showing that they predominantly use descriptive, reflective, and aspirational expressions when they want to emphasise their nuanced personal traits (*partialness*).

On the other hand, students who want to highlight their social and communal belonging or affiliations, by reflecting on professional and national identity, mostly prefer using language forms to reflect these orientations: students emphasizing personal identity often used descriptive, reflective, and aspirational language (*partialness*), whereas those highlighting professional or national identity employed specific expressions focusing on their commitment and dedication (*indexicality*, *positionality*). A process of identification is often linked to the “communities of practice” described by Lave and Wenger (1991). These dimensions do not operate in isolation; rather, they dynamically interact. By acknowledging that *emergency* is not merely one layer among many and by choosing not to quantify it in this analysis, drawing on Sawyer's (2002) work on sociolinguistic emergence, it is emphasised that emergency functions as a foundational principle and a bedrock upon which all other dimensions of identity are constructed. It shapes choices, relationships, and self-perception in significant ways, illustrating that identity is continuously negotiated, performed, and transformed in discourse (De Fina 2012). Overall, the findings reflect that students' linguistic choices are layered and flexible, enabling them to articulate who they are and how they perceive themselves in an academic environment.

The findings of this study directly address the central research questions regarding the discursive construction of identity among students in Kosovska Mitrovica. In response to question 1, the analysis reveals that students utilise a sophisticated range of indexical and positional cues to navigate their identities. Regarding question 2, the high frequency of relationality markers indicates that the specific geopolitical conditions of the region act as a significant catalyst for collective and national identity claims.

While this research provides valuable insights, several limitations must be considered when interpreting the findings. Primarily, with a sample size of 49, the study should be understood as a preliminary, small-scale investigation of a spe-

cific cohort of the unique cultural ecosystem of Northern Kosovska Mitrovica, but the results cannot be generalised to the entire student population of the Republic of Serbia. Secondly, the analysis was conducted in the students' L1 (Serbian) to preserve indexicality; however, the data are presented in English to ensure accessibility for an international audience, which may result in the loss of some nuanced meanings in translation. To build upon these findings, a longitudinal analysis would be particularly valuable, tracking the same cohort of students and complementing it with a comparative study replicating this methodology at university centres in Central Serbia, which would provide a necessary baseline to contrast how varying geopolitical conditions influence the saliency of national versus personal identity.

CONCLUSION

The research at the intersection of language and identity remains a cornerstone of sociolinguistic inquiry. This study aimed to investigate the identity positions of students at the University of Priština in Kosovska Mitrovica, a population uniquely suited for such analysis due to the complex cultural, political, and social landscapes they navigate daily. The inquiry primarily focuses on the specific linguistic resources, including cues and markers, that students employ to signal various identity types. By categorising these linguistic choices through the lens of Bucholtz and Hall's (2005) performative identity framework, this research examined how student discourse reflects both internal self-perception and the intricate social contexts in which they are embedded.

The study shows that students at the University of Priština in Kosovska Mitrovica most frequently construct their identities by emphasising personal traits, future professional roles, and, to a lesser extent, their social and relational positions. Their self-representations are often framed through aspirations (e.g. becoming successful professionals), individual qualities (such as responsibility or persistence), and roles connected to their field of study. The analysis also indicates that these identity positions are shaped through both self-reflection and references to broader social and educational contexts. Given the size and structure of the sample, the study does not support firm conclusions about differences between faculties, and such variation is therefore not interpreted. Overall, the findings suggest that, in this context, student identity is constructed as dynamic and context-dependent, emerging through language as a flexible process of positioning rather than as a fixed or stable category.

REFERENCES

- Alasal, M. S. (2025). Investigating the role of social media language in digital identity formation: The mediating effect of social influence. *International Journal of Communication Studies*, 19(2), 101–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20427530251391105>
- Alshehri, S. A. M. (2023). The relationship between language and identity. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 6(7), 156–161. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2023.6.7.14>
- Bucholtz, M. (2003). Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3), 398–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00232>
- Bucholtz, M., Hall, K. (2005). Identity and Interaction: A Sociocultural Linguistic Approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4–5), 585–614. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407>
- Bucholtz, M., Hall, K. (2013). Epilogue: Facing Identity. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 9(1), 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2013-0006>
- De Fina, A. (2012). Discourse and Identity. In: C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. New Jersey: Wiley Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0326>
- Filipović, J. (2025). Identitet i jezik u studijama dijaspori. U: B. Dojčinović, J. Filipović (Eds.), *Jezik i identitet u srpskoj dijaspori*. Beograd: Društvo za strane jezike i književnosti Srbije, 7–28. https://doi.org/10.18485/dsjks_jidsrdij.2025.ch1
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Grieve, J., Bartl, S., Fuoli, M., et al. (2024). The sociolinguistic foundations of language modeling. *arXiv preprint*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.09241>
- Joseph, J. E. (2004). *Language and Identity: National, Ethnic, Religious*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kurzwelly, J. (2025). Reified identities and politics of ‘authenticity’: A critical commentary on Verbuyst’s metaphysics and politics. *Anthropological Theory*, 25(4), 413–420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14634996251368086>
- Lave, J., Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdams, D. P. (1985). *Power, Intimacy, and the Life Story: Personological Inquiries into Identity*. New York: Guilford Press.
- McAdams, D. P. (2011). Narrative Identity. In: S. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, V. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*. New York: Springer, 99–115. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9_5
- McAdams, D. P., McLean, K. C. (2013). Narrative Identity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 22(3), 233–238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721413475622>
- Miketić Subotić, S. (2025). The preferred language of media content among the Serbian diaspora in Vienna. *Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Prištini*, 55(3), 13–33. <https://doi.org/10.5937/zrffp55-60363>
- Pavlenko, A., Blackledge, A. (2004). Introduction: New Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts. In: A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 1–33.

Petrović, K. (2024). Teaching heritage language – why so different? Issues in teaching Serbian as a heritage language. *Facta Universitatis, Series: Linguistics and Literature*, 22(1), 135–150. <https://doi.org/10.22190/FULL2404190010P>

Shimada, T., Mikami, T. (2023). Language use and identity construction: The intersection between sociolinguistics and contemporary sociology. *The Japanese Journal of Language in Society*, 25(2), 9–24. https://doi.org/10.19024/jajls.25.2_9

Tajfel, H., Turner, J. C. (2004). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In: J. T. Jost, J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political Psychology: Key Readings*. East Sussex: Psychology Press, 276–293. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203505984-16>

Vignoles, V. L. (2017). Identity: Personal and Social. In: K. Deaux, M. Snyder (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 289–315.

Vignoles, V. L., Schwartz, S. J., Luyckx, K. (2011). Introduction: Toward an Integrative View of Identity. In: S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*. London: Springer, 1–27.

Vuković, A. S. (2022). Identitet i stereotipi. *Sociološki pregled*, 58(4), 1073–1085. <https://doi.org/10.5937/socpreg58-52137>

Zabrodskaia, A. (2025). Psychological perspectives on language, identity, and intergroup dynamics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 44(3–4), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X251323981>

APPENDIX 1

Table 1. Identity types expressed through language by the students from the

The Faculty of Philosophy		
Statement	Students' responses – Linguistic markers	Code frequencies
1st	Gender: female (2), Professional: student (2), National: Serb (1), Social/Patriot: patriot (1)	P:6, I: 6, R:1, Pa: 0
2nd	Social/Family: daughter, sister (3), National: Serbian girl, patriot (2), Gender: woman (1), Personal: dreamer (1)	P:6, I:6, R: 5, Pa:1
3rd	Family: son, brother, patriarchally raised (3), Professional: student, Anglicist (2), Personal: sentimental (1)	P:5, I: 6, R: 0, Pa:1
4th	Self-identity: sensitive, positive/naive/determined, sociable, ambitious (4), Professional: employed (1), Family: brother (1)	P:2, I:6, R:2, Pa: 4
5th	Self-identity/personal qualities: kind, a friend, in love with travel/books (3), National: Serbian girl (2), Social: sociable	P:2, I: 6, R: 3, Pa: 3
The Academy of Arts		
Statement	Students' responses – Linguistic markers	Code frequencies
1st	Self-identity: a dreamer; one who lives his life to the fullest; my own person (3), Social: a good friend; neighbour (2), Professional: student (1)	P:3, I:6, R:2, Pa: 1
2nd	Self-identity: worried for the future; arrogant; distracted; dancer (4), Professional: musician (1), Social: the one who despises the elite (1)	P:2, I:6, R: 1, Pa: 1

3rd	Self-identity: feminist; someone who does not allow to be tortured; true and devoted; a person not defined by his attitude; dreamer (5), Professional: actor (1)	P:1, I: 6, R:1, Pa:2
4th	Self-identity: clumsy; quiet; lazy; everything I want to be; a poet; stubborn (6)	P:0, I:6, R:0, Pa:2
5th	Self-identity: too honest; one who knows what he dislikes; angry when being stereotyped; highly emotional; self-pleased (5), Professional: an actress (1)	P:1, I:6, R: 0, Pa:1
The Faculty of Economics		
Statement	Students' responses – Linguistic markers	Code frequencies
1st	Professional: student of economics (4), Personal: girl who studies, trains and is always late; stubborn person (2)	P:4, I:6, R:0, Pa: 1
2nd	Personal: a resourceful person; spends time with family/friends; emotional; believes in equality (4), Professional: athlete (1), National: girl from Gora (1)	P: 2, I:6, R:1, Pa: 1
3rd	Personal: creative and a polyglot; loves to learn and evolve; determined; loves languages by watching movies; creative who loves to draw (5), National: Serb from Montenegro (1)	P:1, I:6, R: 1, Pa:1
4th	Gender: a girl who tries to accomplish everything; short girl with broad understandings (2), Social: son, grandson, brother; local patriot (2), Personal: loves to travel; curious with hobbies (2)	P:2, I:6, R: 2, Pa: 2
5th	Personal: disinterested; confused (2), Social: loves time with family; enjoys change; sociable (3), Professional: future bank CEO (1)	P:1, I: 6, R: 3, Pa: 1
The Faculty of Technical Sciences		
Statement	Students' responses – Linguistic markers	Code frequencies
1st	Professional: 3 (students), Personal: 3 (honest, dreamer, hedonist), Social: 2 (family/society), Gender: 1 (woman), National: 1 (girl from Gora)	P: 6, I: 10, R: 2, Pa: 2
2nd	National: 3 (Serbian girl, proud Serb), Social: 3 (family/community), Personal: 2 (aware of flaws, funny), Gender: 2 (woman, future woman architect)	P: 5, I: 10, R: 3, Pa: 2
3rd	Personal: 5 (quiet/shy, loyal, in battle with myself), Professional: 3 (future architect, 4th-year student, devoted student), Social: 2 (friend, daughter)	P: 3, I: 10, R: 2, Pa: 3
4th	Social: 4 (multi-ethnic/multi-cultural community, friend/future mother), Personal: 3 (honest, special, my own), Professional: 2 (future architect, student), Gender: 1 (successful woman)	P: 3, I: 10, R: 4, Pa: 3
5th	Personal: 4 (everything I am/want to become; capable; stable; strong), Social: 3 (family/ethnic/religious traits), Gender: 1 (future mother), Professional: 1 (future	P: 2, I: 9, R: 3, Pa: 2
The Faculty of Civil Engineering		
Statement	Students' responses – Linguistic markers	Code frequencies
1st	Social: 2 (proud of language; respects ethnic identity), Self: 3 (loves life; loves nature; goal-oriented), National: 1 (Serb)	P: 3, I: 6, R: 2, Pa: 1
2nd	Self: 2 (loves family/friends; loves to travel), Professional: 2 (future engineer; civil engineering student), National: 1 (Serb), Gender: 1 (woman)	P: 3, I: 6, R: 2, Pa: 1
3rd	Social: 3 (first grandson; daughter; son and grandson), Professional: 3 (civil engineering students/aspiring engineers)	P: 3, I: 6, R: 3, Pa: 0

4th	Professional: 2 (civil engineering student; civil engineer), Social: 1 (first child and brother), Gender: 2 (woman who loves to work; determined woman), Personal: 1 (endures and improves)	P: 3, I: 6, R: 2, Pa: 1
5th	Personal: 2 (empathy, responsibility, honesty; Darko), Professional: 2 (salesman; butcher), Gender: 1 (perceives gender as natural)	P: 2, I: 5, R: 1, Pa: 1

The Faculty of Mechanical Engineering

Statement	Students' responses – Linguistic markers	Code frequencies
1st	National: 4 (Serbian; Serbian; member of Serbian nation; man from Mitrovica – Serb in love with Kosovo and Metohija), Professional: 1 (student of mechatronics)	P: 5, I: 5, R: 0, Pa: 0
2nd	Personal: 3 (emotional; determined; loves nature), Professional: 1 (student of technical sciences), Social: 1 (daughter/sister)	P: 2, I: 5, R: 1, Pa: 1
3rd	Personal: 4 (sports lover; in love; sociable; healthy food lover), Professional: 1 (future engineer)	P: 1, I: 5, R: 0, Pa: 1
4th	Social: 2 (surrounded by good people; son/godfather/neighbour/grandson/uncle), Personal: 2 (believes in personal improvement; rocker), Gender: 1 (female student, pianist, fitness trainee)	P: 1, I: 5, R: 2, Pa: 1
5th	Personal: 4 (values honesty/determination; film lover; well-raised; cheerful), Professional: 1 (athlete)	P: 1, I: 5, R: 0, Pa: 1

The Faculty of Medical Science

Statement	Students' responses – Linguistic markers	Code frequencies
1st	Personal: 3 (hates injustice; always positive; believes in a better tomorrow), Professional: 2 (student aspiring to progress; wants to go forward)	P: 2, I: 5, R: 0, Pa: 1
2nd	Personal: 4 (loves to travel; second chances; despises lies; believes in a better future), Gender: 1 (girl)	P: 1, I: 5, R: 0, Pa: 1
3rd	Personal: 2 (different perspectives; better tomorrow), Social: 2 (ethnic/national pride; contributing to nation), Personal/Social: 1 (gender equality)	P: 1, I: 5, R: 3, Pa: 1
4th	Personal: 4 (loving; thankful; tries to be positive; values physical appearance), Social: 1 (disappointed in government)	P: 0, I: 5, R: 1, Pa: 1
5th	Personal: 4 (everything in life is a risk; content; wants to improve; positive effect on people), Gender/Social: 1 (woman respecting self and others)	P: 0, I: 5, R: 1, Pa: 1

The Faculty of Dental Medicine

Statement	Students' responses – Linguistic markers	Code frequencies
1st	Social: 2 (Serb; Serb), Professional: 2 (dentistry students), Personal: 1 (loved and surrounded by love)	P: 2, I: 5, R: 2, Pa: 1
2nd	Personal: 3 (a legend; good person; sensitive and thoughtful), Professional: 1 (student), Social: 1 (daughter to best woman)	P: 1, I: 5, R: 1, Pa: 1
3rd	Personal: 3 (truly happy; happy; in love), Social: 1 (sister, rich and loved), Professional: 1 (athlete)	P: 1, I: 5, R: 1, Pa: 1
4th	Personal: 3 (hardworking; sometimes too rigid; sensitive), Professional: 2 (farmer; dentistry student/future academic citizen)	P: 2, I: 5, R: 0, Pa: 1
5th	Personal: 4 (responsible; sometimes naive; hardworking; just), Social: 1 (orthodox)	P: 0, I: 5, R: 1, Pa: 1

Јелена Б. Бабић Антић

Анита В. Јанковић

Универзитет у Приштини

са привременим седиштем у Косовској Митровици

Филозофски факултет

Катедра за енглески језик и књижевност

ЈЕЗИК И ИДЕНТИТЕТ: СОЦИОЛИНГВИСТИЧКИ ПРИСТУП ПЕРЦЕПЦИЈИ ИДЕНТИТЕТА КОД СТУДЕНАТА УНИВЕРЗИТЕТА У КОСОВСКОЈ МИТРОВИЦИ

Резиме: Питање односа језика и идентитета представља важну тему у соци-
олингвистици. Проучавање идентитета кроз анализу лингвистичких избора и дис-
курзивну призму може пружити увид у то како појединци конструишу и изражавају
свој осећај „сопства”. У овој студији се фокусирамо на језичке изборе студената
Универзитета у Приштини са привременим седиштем у Косовској Митровици и
аспекте идентитета које они том приликом испољавају. Специфични културни, по-
литички и друштвени контекст који одликује њихов свакодневни живот чини ову
популацију посебно занимљивом за анализу. Фокус истраживања је на језичким
ресурсима, маркерима, које студенти користе, и њиховој перцепцији идентитета
који том приликом представљају. Класификацијом језичких облика и применом
перформативног оквира у изградњи идентитета (Bucholtz, Hall 2005), истражили
смо како језик студената о себи одражава њихову перцепцију сопства и друштве-
ног контекста којим су резултати условљени. Резултати показују да студенти своје
идентитете најчешће конструишу кроз истицање личних особина (нпр. одговорност,
упорност), будућих професионалних улога и, у мањој мери, друштвених и релаци-
оних позиција. Самопредстављање је често усмерено ка будућности и повезано са
академским и професионалним аспирацијама, док се шири друштвени и културни
контекст рефлектује посредно, кроз начин на који студенти позиционирају себе у
односу на окружење. Налази такође указују да се идентитет не испољава као стабил-
на категорија, већ као динамичан и контекстуално условљен процес који се обликује
кроз језик.

Кључне речи: језик, контекст, идентитет, студенти.