

UDC 94(477.75)“1954/1991”: [910.4(036):316.7]
DOI <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2786-5118/2026-55-1>

HOW THE IMAGE OF A PLACE SHAPES IDENTITY: FRAME, AFFORDANCE, AND FRONTIER (ON THE MATERIAL OF A SOVIET GUIDEBOOK TO CRIMEA)

Vil Sviatoslav Oleksiiovych,
*Postgraduate Student at the Department of History,
Archaeology and Teaching Methodology
Kherson State University
svil@ksu.ks.ua
orcid.org/0000-0002-2136-1337*

Purpose. To clarify how the image of a place shapes the identity of a historical subject and to propose a theoretical and methodological model that explains not only the content of an image but also the mechanism of its influence. The classical imagological approach, while productive in describing images, stops at the level of representation and leaves open the “black box” problem – the gap between the image offered and its actual reception by a concrete person. **Methods.** A three-level model is applied, integrating frame analysis (E. Goffman, R. Entman), affordance theory (J. Gibson, D. Norman, I. Hutchby), and frontier theory reconceptualised through the notion of the “contact zone” (M.-L. Pratt), complemented by a human-centred approach and the optics of memory politics. The model is tested on the Soviet tourist guidebook “Crimea. Guidebook” (Simferopol, 1969). This source is used purely as an object of scholarly analysis, not as a reliable source of facts – the study of the very mechanisms by which the Soviet regime constructed images of Crimea is precisely what this article is about. **Results.** The study shows how the frame of a “resort paradise” is embodied in a material carrier; how the affordances of the edition – durability, the visual priority of the cover, the hierarchy of visibility in its structure, and the programming of movement through the tourist route – render the image effective and turn it into lived experience; and how the notion of the frontier explains the opposing reception of the same carrier by different subjects, above all the deported Crimean Tatars, Armenians, and Greeks. The analysis demonstrates that frame, affordance, and frontier operate not as separate instruments but in synergy: the frame defines what is offered to be seen, the affordance shows through which properties of the carrier this offer becomes effective, and the frontier indicates where and by whom this experience is lived. **Conclusions.** An image becomes identity not automatically but through a material carrier lived by a concrete subject in a concrete space of displacement. The proposed model expands the theoretical foundation for studying the transformation of identities and mass images of Soviet Crimea (1954–1991) and can be applied to a broader corpus of sources – film materials, posters, and the press.

Keywords: Southern Ukraine, Crimea, identity, frontier, politics of memory, tourism, guidebooks.

ЯК ОБРАЗ МІСЦЯ ФОРМУЄ ІДЕНТИЧНІСТЬ: ФРЕЙМ, АФОРДАНС І ФРОНТИР (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ РАДЯНСЬКОГО ПУТІВНИКА КРИМОМ)

Віль Святослав Олексійович,
*здобувач третього освітньо-наукового рівня
«Доктор філософії»
кафедри історії, археології та методики викладання
Херсонського державного університету
svil@ksu.ks.ua
orcid.org/0000-0002-2136-1337*

Мета. З'ясувати, як образ місця формує ідентичність історичного суб'єкта, та запропонувати теоретико-методологічну модель, яка пояснює не лише зміст образу, а й механізм його впливу. Класичний імагологічний підхід продуктивний в описі образів, проте зупиняється на рівні репрезентації й лишає відкритою проблему «чорної скриньки» – проміжок між пропозицією образу та його реальним сприйняттям конкретною людиною. **Методи.** Застосовано тривірневу модель, що інтегрує фрейм-аналіз (Е. Гофман, Р. Ентман), теорію афродансів (Дж. Гібсон, Д. Норман, І. Хатчбі) та теорію фронтиру в переосмисленні через концепт «зони контакту» (М.-Л. Прагт), доповнену людиновимірним підходом і оптикою політики пам'яті. Модель апробовано на матеріалі радянського туристичного путівника «Крым. Путеводитель» («Крим. Путівник», Сімферополь, 1969). Це джерело залучається виключно як об'єкт наукового аналізу, а не як достовірне джерело фактів: саме дослідження механізмів, якими радянська влада конструювала образи Криму, і становить суть цієї статті. **Результати.** Показано, як фрейм «курортного раю» втілюється в матеріальному носії; як афроданси видання – довговічність, візуальне випередження обкладинкою, ієрархія видимості у структурі та програмування руху туристичним маршрутом – роблять образ дієвим і перетворюють його на прожитий



досвід; як поняття фронтиру пояснює протилежне сприйняття того самого носія різними суб'єктами, насамперед депортованими кримськими татарами, вірменами та греками. Аналіз засвідчує, що фрейм, афорданс і фронтір працюють не як окремі інструменти, а в синергії: фрейм задає, що пропонується побачити, афорданс – через які властивості носія ця пропозиція стає дією, а фронтір – де й ким цей досвід проживається. **Висновки.** Образ перетворюється на ідентичність не автоматично, а через матеріальний носій, що проживається конкретним суб'єктом у конкретному просторі витіснення. Запропонована модель розширює теоретичну базу дослідження трансформації ідентичностей і масових образів радянського Криму (1954–1991) та може бути застосована до ширшого корпусу джерел – кіноматеріалів, плакатів, преси.

Ключові слова: Південь України, Крим, ідентичність, фронтір, політика пам'яті, туризм, путівники.

1. Introduction

The relevance of this article stems from the need to rethink the theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of historical processes, taking the tourist materials of Soviet Crimea as a case in point. The classical imagological approach is the first to require supplementation. This approach is known for its dichotomy of “one’s own” and “the alien”; it rests on the opposition between one’s own identity and the image of “the other”. Imagology also makes it possible to analyse media, literary, or artistic works not as documentary facts but precisely as a system of symbols and visual codes.

Such classical approaches make it possible to describe images, yet they do not provide a holistic understanding of how an image is transformed into a mechanism that shapes identity. The problem is not that these theoretical approaches may appear outdated, but that they stop at representation and do not reach historical reception or the subject. It should be noted, however, that the imagological approach still remains productive for describing images, although it requires supplementation with instruments that explain the mechanism of their influence. It is appropriate here to recall the “black box” problem, since classical approaches leave the gap between the image offered and its actual reception by a concrete person without due attention, whereas this gap needs to be conceptualised.

Despite a considerable body of scholarship on the Crimean peninsula and its population – in particular on the political history of the peninsula (A. Ivanets, S. Hromenko, M.-O. Kyslyi), on the history of the Crimean Tatar people (H. Bekirova, A. Fisher), and on biographical studies (M. Hrymych) – the visual image as a mechanism of influence on identity has remained outside the scope of scholarly attention.

The theoretical framework of the study is provided by three groups of works. Frame analysis is represented by the studies of E. Goffman and R. Entman and, in its Ukrainian reception, by the work of H. Riabokon; affordance theory by the works of J. Gibson, who introduced the concept, and of his successors D. Norman and I. Hutchby, who extended the concept to printed texts; frontier theory is represented by F. Turner and by M.-L. Pratt with her notion of the “contact zone”. A separate stratum consists of studies of the image of Crimea and of Southern Ukraine in travel guidebooks of the late eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century (O. Cheremisin, H. Mykhailenko). These works show that travelogues became a

new genre of tourist literature and shaped the image of Crimea and of the southern Ukrainian lands as a “paradisiacal”, civilised space distinct from the rest of the empire. Juxtaposing this tradition with the Soviet guidebook makes it possible to ask whether the Soviet image of a “resort paradise” continues the line of the travelogues and of nineteenth-century Russian “sentimental literature”, in which an “ideal Crimea” was likewise constructed, or whether it emerges as a fundamentally new genre – that is, whether the tourist image of Crimea was imported from outside or was of local origin.

The scholarly novelty of the article lies in the development of a three-level analytical model that combines frame analysis, affordance theory, and frontier theory and makes it possible to move from describing the content of an image to reconstructing the mechanism of its influence on identity. For the first time, a Soviet tourist guidebook is examined not as a source of information about Crimea but as a material carrier of a frame, the analysis of which allows the question to be raised of the origin of the peninsula’s tourist image – whether imported from the tradition of travelogues or formed by Soviet propaganda as a qualitatively new genre.

The article is an attempt to clarify how the image of a place may shape identity, combining frame analysis, affordance theory, and frontier theory with a human-centred approach and the optics of memory politics, using the example of a Soviet tourist guidebook to Crimea.

To achieve this aim, the author sets himself the following tasks: to reveal the analytical potential of frame analysis for identifying the interpretive frameworks of Soviet representations of Crimea; to show how affordance theory explains the role of material carriers in transmitting these frameworks, taking tourist guidebooks as an example; and to substantiate the supplementation of the model with the notions of the frontier and of human-centredness seen through memory politics, which return the historical subject to the analysis.

The sources of this article are the works of Western and Ukrainian scholars who have worked and continue to work on frame analysis, affordance theory, frontier theory, and memory politics. The principal source used consists of the tourist guidebooks to Crimea published in the Soviet period.

Methodology of the study. The study is carried out at the intersection of history, memory studies,

and media studies. Its basis is a three-level analytical model: frame analysis (E. Goffman, R. Entman) is applied to identify the interpretive framework within which Crimea was offered to be seen; affordance theory (J. Gibson, D. Norman, I. Hutchby) to establish through which properties of the material carrier this framework became effective; and frontier theory, reconceptualised through the notion of the “contact zone” (F. Turner, M.-L. Pratt), to explain the divergence in the perception of one and the same carrier by different subjects. The model is complemented by a human-centred approach and the optics of memory politics. Use was also made of the methods of source criticism (with regard to the Soviet edition as a propaganda text), of the comparative-historical method (juxtaposing the Soviet guidebook with the travelogues of the late eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century), and of qualitative analysis of the visual and structural components of the edition.

The article seeks to show that, in order to understand how the image of a place turns a person into the bearer of a particular identity, the historian needs not only archival sources but also new theoretical instruments.

The logic of the exposition follows the movement from the level at which the image is offered to the level at which it is lived. The first section reveals the analytical potential of frame analysis and shows the embodiment of the “resort paradise” frame in a concrete carrier. The second juxtaposes the Soviet guidebook with the tradition of travelogues. The third analyses the affordances of the edition on four levels – physical, visual, structural, and route-related. The fourth introduces the notions of the frontier and of the contact zone; the fifth introduces the human-centred approach, which returns the historical subject to the analysis, and sums up the synergy of the model’s three levels.

2. The Frame: The Level at Which the Image Is Offered

One of the founders of this theory is Erving Goffman. He notes that “primary frameworks” differ by class into natural and social ones (Goffman, 1974: 22). Natural frameworks are purely physical occurrences, determined from beginning to end by natural determinants. Social frameworks, by contrast, involve human effort – what may also be termed “guided doings”. Todd Gitlin should also be mentioned: he regarded frames as a means of obtaining information in order to present it in the news format most effective for perception (Riabokon, 2016: 76). Another scholar, Doris Graber, as H. Riabokon notes, sees in frame theory a way in which the audience perceives and actively processes information in order to construct the meaning of current events on the basis of existing cognitive models and clichés. Robert Entman, in his article “Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm”, notes that framing consists in selection and salience (Entman, 1993). To frame means to single out certain elements

of reality and to make them more noticeable in external communications (Entman, 1993: 52). For R. Entman, “salience” means rendering a piece of information more distinct, more meaningful, or more memorable for the audience. Such an increase raises the likelihood that the information will be retained in memory. He also notes that frames define problems, diagnose causes, deliver judgements, and propose ways of solving problems (Entman, 1993: 52).

The carrier in which this frame is embodied and becomes available for analysis is the tourist guidebook. It relates that, upon arriving in Crimea, life immediately becomes merrier, or that the peninsula has industrial prospects – and these are not trifles (Krym, 1969: 3). Such accounts possess force and influence over their recipients. They are symbolic means by which Soviet power acquired legitimacy on the peninsula (Pan & Kosicki, 1993: 17). Indeed, as H. Riabokon notes, a great many political actions are performed at the level of speech acts (Riabokon, 2016: 76). He identifies the principal communicative genres of such discourse: propaganda, political and electoral advertising, speeches, and so on. In the context of Soviet Crimea it may be argued that the communicative genre of propaganda is the one that applies here. For it was precisely by promoting the frame of a “resort paradise” that the Soviet authorities imposed on their citizens an image of Crimea as a place of rest, renowned for its history, its vineyards, and its nature. H. Riabokon argues that a recipient who falls within the sphere of such influence develops a particular mode of thinking, which shapes his view of reality and becomes firmly imprinted in consciousness in the form of frames. He also notes that such stereotypes are fairly stable and rarely subject to correction. Consequently, if we take, for example, the peoples deported from Crimea, their claims about Crimea as a lost homeland could, consciously or unconsciously, be rejected by citizens of the Soviet Union owing to the dominance of the “resort paradise” frame.

If we take guidebooks to Soviet Crimea, at first glance we obtain books with illustrations of the peninsula and its architecture, with professionally composed routes and with places that must be visited. A good example is the collective work “Крым. Путеводитель” (“Crimea. A Guidebook”, Simferopol, 1969) (Krym, 1969). On the cover of this book we are met by the image of a girl in a vyshyvanka (an embroidered shirt), wearing a wreath and sitting on the seashore beside grapes and mountains. If we open the first pages of this source, we learn that the beginning of Crimea “is not yet Crimea”, and that, besides its vineyards, the peninsula is also quite heavily industrialised. And finally, that “extraordinary” people live here, followed by a list of surnames in which we shall not see representatives of the Crimean Tatars, Greeks, or Armenians who were deported from the peninsula.

The example given demonstrates that texts or images can make pieces of information more noticeable through their placement or repetition, or by linking them with culturally familiar symbols (Entman, 1993: 53). The frame also helps to determine what information people will notice, how they will understand it, and what they will remember. As a consequence, R. Entman argues that framing plays a major role in the exercise of political power. W. Gamson should be mentioned separately here: he observes that a frame can exert great social influence if it is encoded in terms (Entman, 1993: 55). An example is the term “resort paradise” or “all-Union health resort” (vsesoiuzna zdravnytsia) which, once entrenched, likewise displaced competing images of Crimea.

It should be emphasised separately that the concept of framing also contains dominant meanings. R. Entman notes that a dominant meaning has the highest probability of being noticed, processed, or accepted. One should also guard against a simplified interpretation of frames, since people, despite the dominance of frames or their large number, are capable of establishing their own interpretations or connections that are not made by the frames in texts or audiovisual materials. R. Entman also notes that the audience must genuinely rethink the message, and that such rethinking cannot be a by-product of the research itself, such as a focus-group discussion (Entman, 1993: 56).

3. The Guidebook in the Tradition of Travelogues

It should be emphasised that the Soviet guidebook was not the first attempt to construct an attractive image of Crimea. As early as the late eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, travel guidebooks (travelogues) by foreign and Russian travellers became a new genre of tourist literature which shaped the image of the peninsula and of Southern Ukraine as a “paradisical”, civilised space distinct from the rest of the empire (Mykhailenko, 2023; Cheremisin, 2020; Cheremisin & Mykhailenko, 2022; Cheremisin & Mykhailenko, 2019). In parallel, nineteenth-century Russian “sentimental literature” constructed an image of an “ideal Crimea” as a place for enjoying nature and antiquity. The Soviet frame of a “resort paradise” inherits many features of this tradition – the admiration of nature, of vineyards, and of the classical heritage – yet it radically changes the subject: whereas the travelogue was written from the standpoint of a guest from outside, the Soviet guidebook speaks in the name of an authority that already possesses the space and has displaced the indigenous population from it.

Hence a question fundamental to the novelty of this study arises: was the tourist image of Crimea imported from outside (a continuation of the travelogues and of the sentimental tradition), or was it of local, Soviet origin as a qualitatively new genre of propaganda? The proposed model provides an instrument for answering

it, by tracing precisely what the Soviet carrier retains from the earlier tradition and what it adds to it by means of the frame, the affordances, and the frontier.

4. The Affordances of the Guidebook: Four Levels

Frames, however, while explaining which image of Crimea was offered to be seen, leave open another question: through which properties of the carrier did this offer become effective? And why did one and the same guidebook speak differently to different readers? It is precisely here that the next level of the model is required – affordance theory.

The term “affordance” was introduced into scholarly usage by James Gibson in his work *“The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception”*. In his classic work, an affordance denotes what the environment offers animals – possibilities for action (Gibson, 1979: 119)¹. He states that affordances are unique to a given species of animal and that they should be measured relative to the animal. For example, a tree may afford food to a giraffe and shelter from predators to a squirrel. And, most importantly, affordances point both ways – to the environment and to the observer. That is, an affordance exists at the junction of environment and perceiver: it concerns both the object and the one who perceives it. The author emphasises separately that the affordance of something does not change as the observer’s need changes. The observer may or may not perceive the affordance depending on his needs, but the affordance itself is invariant; it always exists in order to be perceived (Gibson, 1979: 130). An object offers what it offers because it is what it is. The author also speaks of misinformation with regard to affordances. Just as, when information is picked up, perception arises, so, accordingly, if misinformation is picked up, misperception arises. Thus, if we perceive affordances correctly, we say that they are what they are. But we must, of course, understand what these things can be.

Let us also turn to Donald Norman, who effectively transferred the notion of affordance into design and came to regard an affordance as a cue as to what the object itself offers one to do. An example may be a properly designed room, whose navigation seems itself to tell the recipient what he is to do in it.

Ian Hutchby’s media affordances are also worth mentioning. This scholar effectively legitimises the transfer of affordance to printed publications. In his article he speaks of texts as technologies that are written in a particular way by their authors and are to be interpreted by their users or consumers (Hutchby, 2001: 1). The author cautions us, however, that neither the writing nor the reading of texts is determined.

¹ Here and below, page references to Gibson (1979), Hutchby (2001), and Pratt (1991) follow the pagination of the electronic (PDF) copies used, which differs from that of the printed editions given in the bibliography.

These processes are open and negotiable for both parties. The scholar asks whether objects can be subject to the same set of interpretations and answers in the negative. For affordances constrain the ways in which they can be “written” or “read”. They may also differ from species to species and from context to context (Hutchby, 2001: 5). The affordances of artefacts are not things that impose themselves upon human actions with them, around them, or through them. But they do set limits on what it is possible to do with an artefact, around it, or through it. For there is a variety of ways of responding to the range of affordances for action and interaction. We can analyse the development of these responses empirically, but in order to do so we must understand that technological artefacts are not reducible simply to what their users make of them.

There are a great many formats through which a person can obtain information – newspapers, posters, films, leaflets, guidebooks. Each of them has its own set of affordances: different genres make it possible to obtain a unique kind of information. A poster, for instance, can deliver an instantaneous emotional image; a newspaper, a sense of “lived experience” in the first person. The guidebook is in fact something else, and so it is worth analysing what precisely it offers a person. This analysis can be carried out on four levels. The first is the physical level. The collective work “Крым. Путеводитель” (“Crimea. A Guidebook”, Simferopol, 1969) is a carrier of information small in format and modest in length, in a hard binding, priced at 77 kopecks. This book offers a person prolonged contact, the possibility of returning to it when needed, and its preservation in a home library after the trip. This guidebook can outlive the journey and, remaining at home, it sustains the image of Crimea. The durability of the carrier creates the conditions for the durability of the image. A poster acts once and disappears; a guidebook in a hard binding can remind one of Crimea at home for years. This is the material mechanism by which the “resort paradise” settles into cultural memory and is not open to challenge.

The second level is the visual layer. What does the viewer perceive before he begins to read? The cover, of course. On the cover, as has already been noted above, we are met by a girl in a vyshyvanka, a wreath, the sea, a grapevine, and mountains. What does the vyshyvanka make it possible to see, and for whom? Whose presence on the peninsula does it affirm? And whose does it render invisible? The book contains a great many drawings and photographs, carefully selected. The drawings depict Crimean landscapes; the photographs show the Soviet presence on the peninsula – for instance, a photograph of the Ukraina Hotel or of the Obelisk of Glory on Sapun Hill.

The guidebook also shows architectural monuments of the khanate period and a great many places for rest and holidaymakers. Yet whose presence do we not see? There are no references, for example, to

living Crimean Tatar culture, since the Bakhchysarai Palace is present as scenery for an exotic past. Affordances also operate through what the carrier does not show – for example, through the Crimean Tatars, Armenians, or Greeks. In effect, the cover visually “assigns” Crimea to a particular identity even before one begins to engage with the text. The absence of the deported peoples and of their cultural markers is not accidental but an affordance of selection. The carrier makes it possible to see Crimea as Ukrainian or Slavic-Soviet and provides no means of seeing it as Crimean Tatar or Armenian.

The third level is structure and navigation. Here it is important to understand how the sequence of sections governs what the reader is to notice first and what he is to remember. The guidebook opens with an introduction to the peninsula, in which it is portrayed as a place possessing various images of Crimea – industrial, recreational, Slavic, and so on. The guidebook then immerses us in the nature of the peninsula, describes its flora and fauna, and moves smoothly on to the history of the peninsula from the earliest times to the Soviet era. Here one should ask what the small print conceals, or what is left out of the contents altogether. In this guidebook it is telling that the history of the Crimean Khanate is given only a few sentences in passing, and even then this state is not always called by its own name (Krym, 1969: 20–21). Further on in the guidebook we see specific regions and towns and advice on how to engage with them. The guidebook also contains a separate map with routes across the peninsula. It should be understood here that the structure of the guidebook is a hierarchy of visibility. It technically decides what “exists” in Crimea and what “does not”. The deported peoples are almost never mentioned in the texts and indexes – this is an affordance at the level of the book’s architecture.

The fourth level is the route as a script of behaviour. Here we should consider the places proposed for visiting, the logic of movement, and what is connected with the marking of places worthy of a visit and of territories that remain “empty”. This tourist map, appended to the guidebook, can in effect programme a person’s movement through space and therefore constitutes the strongest affordance, one that passes from perception into action. Where does the map lead, which towns does it show, and which places does it leave out of view? In effect, this map makes a particular route of movement possible, leaving most cultural markers of the deported population outside the route. That is, the traveller will certainly be able to see the excavations of Scythian Neapolis, but will not see a Crimean Tatar village, because it no longer exists. The route turns the frame into lived experience, and it is precisely here that affordance touches the frontier, since the tourist empirically assimilates a contact zone from which part of the population had been deported and erased.

Returning to invariance as a property of affordances in Gibson’s sense, it should be emphasised that the guidebook objectively makes certain actions possible (invariantly), but that different groups actualise different possibilities – and the divergence of perception may follow from this.

5. The Frontier, the Contact Zone, and Displacement

As we have already understood from affordance theory, the carrier makes different readings possible; but why do particular groups actualise opposing ones? Affordance can answer this only in part, for it lacks the perceiver with his experience, his memory, and his place in space. Frontier theory and the theory of sites of memory can help us here. The notion of the “frontier” was first introduced by Frederick Turner (Turner, 1920). His notion of the frontier was rather about the settlement of free space. His work should also be approached critically, since his view of the borderland was ethnocentric. He described this space as an emptiness awaiting settlement. And it is precisely this emptiness that we need in our study, but as an object of criticism, since the Soviet guidebook constructs Crimea in exactly the same way – as an “empty” space ready for settlement and resort development.

Crimea, however, should be seen not as an “emptiness” but as a space where cultures meet or collide under conditions of asymmetrical power. This is described in detail by Mary Louise Pratt in her article “Arts of the Contact Zone”. She uses the term “contact zones” in order to revise models of community and to designate social spaces where cultures meet, collide, and contend with one another, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power – colonialism, slavery, or their aftermath (Pratt, 1991: 2). She also introduces the terms “autoethnographic text” and “ethnographic text” and explains the difference between them: the former helps one to describe oneself on the basis of representations of other communities – for example, the “New Chronicle” by the Andean Guaman Poma, written in Quechua and in Spanish on a Spanish model (Pratt, 1991: 3). Ethnographic texts represent to themselves their others (usually their conquered others) (Pratt, 1991: 3). An example here may be the guidebook, which functions as an ethnographic text in which the Soviet Union represents the conquered “other”, and in which the autoethnographic voice of the deported peoples is almost absent, for it is displaced by the metropolis. Autoethnographic texts, in the author’s view, are not autochthonous forms of expression or self-representation but rather a selective collaboration with the idioms of the metropolis or of the conqueror and an appropriation of them. She also notes that in this way a subject can lend itself authority in the language and speech repertoire of the coloniser (Pratt, 1991: 3).

The most valuable of the author’s theses for the present article is that so-called legitimate moves are

in fact named as part of a system in which legitimacy is defined from the standpoint of the party endowed with power. The Crimean peninsula is not an “empty frontier” but rather a contact zone in which one population has been displaced and in whose place the frame of a “resort paradise” has been erected by the party endowed with power, by means of the guidebook. It should also be added that the guidebook operates differently for different readers: readers stand on opposite sides of the frontier, and this is something that neither frame analysis nor affordance can explain.

6. Human-Centredness and the Synergy of the Model

Above all, however, in every historical study it is important for us to see the human being; we therefore need to shift the emphasis from space to the person. Frame and affordance describe the offer made from above, whereas human-centredness demands a different approach. It demands an answer to the question of how this offer is lived by a concrete subject. Biographical studies or in-depth interviews can help us here. For only by understanding a person’s life experience can we understand whether the frame of a “resort paradise” will “work”. For what is a promise of a new life for an inhabitant of the RSFSR or of the Ukrainian SSR is, for a Crimean Tatar or an Armenian, a lost homeland. One carrier – two incompatible trajectories, because of different positions in the contact zone.

The proposed model gives the author’s dissertation research an instrument for analysing the transformation of the images of Crimea in the Soviet period and makes it possible to draw various recent methods and practices into its theoretical basis, reinforced by memory studies and studies of propaganda. It brings us to the understanding that frame, affordance, and frontier are not three separate instruments; they work in synergy. We see this best in the example of the Crimean guidebook. It constructs a frame – Crimea as a resort paradise – that is, what the guidebook offers us to feel. The affordances of the carrier – prolonged contact, visual priority, the programming of movement along a route – are that through which the image becomes effective. And finally the frontier: in whose place this resort locality was built, and who was displaced from this space. It gives us the answer to the question of where and by whom this experience is lived.

7. Conclusions

Thus, the classical approaches describe the image but stop at representation and do not reach the mechanism of its influence on identity. Using the example of the Crimean guidebook, we have been able to see how the synthesis of the three-level model works. First, frame analysis made it possible to identify the interpretive framework within which the Soviet authorities offered the peninsula to be seen – the frame of a “resort paradise”, which selected and made noticeable

certain elements of the image of Crimea (nature, vineyards, recreation, industrialisation) and displaced competing ones. Second, affordance theory showed through which properties of the material carrier this framework became effective: the durability of a hard-bound edition, the visual priority of the cover over the text, the hierarchy of visibility in the structure, and the programming of movement by the tourist route map turned the offer of an image into lived experience. Third, the notion of the frontier (the contact zone), together with the human-centred approach, explained why one and the same carrier acts in opposite ways for different subjects: for an inhabitant of the RSFSR or of the Ukrainian SSR the guidebook promised a new life, whereas for the deported Crimean Tatars, Armenians, and Greeks the same image meant displacement from a lost homeland – the difference in perception follows not from the carrier but from the subject's position in the contact zone. Taken together, this model closes the very gap that the classical approaches leave empty. This model is able to reconstruct the conditions of possibility for identification, but it does not give direct

access to the actual perception of a concrete person in the past – the “black box” is not fully opened, and this is a matter of principle rather than a shortcoming.

It should be understood that an image becomes identity not automatically but through a material carrier lived by a concrete subject in a concrete space of displacement. From this a prospect may follow: the application of the model to a broader corpus of sources (film materials, posters, the press) and to other Soviet images of “place”. Ultimately, the analysis carried out demonstrates that, in order to understand how the image of a place turns a person into the bearer of a particular identity, the historian needs not only archival sources but also contemporary theoretical instruments.

In preparing this work, the author used Claude (Anthropic, PBC) to correct grammatical and stylistic errors in the author's own text. The tool was applied solely for editing text written by the author; all ideas, arguments, scholarly propositions, and conclusions belong to the author, who bears full responsibility for the content of the publication.

Bibliography:

1. Михайленко Г. М. Образ росіян у подорожніх путівниках кінця XVIII – першої половини XIX ст. Південний архів (історичні науки). 2023. Вип. 44. С. 19–26. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2786-5118/2023-44-3>.
2. Рябоконь Г. Л. Теорія фреймів крізь призму прагма-семантичної побудови дискурсу. Наукові записки НаУКМА. Філологічні науки. 2016. Т. 189. С. 76–82. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/NaUKMAfn_2016_189_17 (дата звернення: 14.06.2026).
3. Черемісін О. В. Образ євреїв в міському просторі Півдня України у подорожніх путівниках мандрівників кінця XVIII – першої половини XIX ст. Zaporizhzhia Historical Review. 2020. Vol. 3 (55). С. 16–22. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26661/zhv-2020-3-55-02>.
4. Черемісін О. В., Михайленко Г. М. Образ українців у подорожніх путівниках кінця XVIII – першої половини XIX ст. Південний архів (історичні науки). 2022. Вип. 40. С. 37–43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2786-5118/2022-40-5>.
5. Черемісін О., Михайленко Г. Образ Півдня України у подорожніх путівниках іноземців наприкінці XVIII – на початку XIX століть. Scriptorium nostrum. 2019. № 1 (12). С. 111–118.
6. Крым : путеводитель / Крым. отд. Геогр. о-ва Союза ССР ; ред. И. П. Полякова. 2-е изд. Симферополь : Крым, 1969. 176 с. : ил., [9] л. цв. ил.
7. Entman R. M. Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. Journal of Communication. 1993. Vol. 43, № 4. P. 51–58. URL: <https://fbaum.unc.edu/teaching/articles/J-Communication-1993-Entman.pdf> (дата звернення: 05.06.2026).
8. Gibson J. J. *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Boston : Houghton Mifflin, 1979. 316 P.
9. Goffman E. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University Press, 1974. ix, 586 p.
10. Hutchby I. Technologies, Texts and Affordances. Sociology. 2001. Vol. 35, № 2. P. 441–456. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/240729307_Technologies_Texts_and_Affordances (дата звернення: 14.06.2026).
11. Pan Z., Kosicki G. M. Framing Analysis: An Approach to News Discourse. Political Communication. 1993. Vol. 10, № 1. P. 55–75. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.1993.9962963>.
12. Pratt M. L. Arts of the Contact Zone. Profession. 1991. P. 33–40. URL: https://mullin35.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/pratt_arts-of-the-contact-zone.pdf (дата звернення: 14.06.2026).
13. Turner F. J. The Significance of the Frontier in American History. The Frontier in American History. New York : Henry Holt, 1920. P. 1–38. URL: <https://archive.org/details/frontierinameric01turn> (дата звернення: 05.06.2026).

References:

1. Cheremisin, O., & Mykhailenko, H. (2019). Obraz Pivdnia Ukrainy u podorozhnikh putivnykakh inozemtsiv naprykintsi XVIII – na pochatku XIX stolit [The image of Southern Ukraine in foreigners' travel guidebooks at the end of the 18th – beginning of the 19th centuries]. *Scriptorium nostrum*, 1(12), 111–118 [in Ukrainian].
2. Cheremisin, O. V. (2020). Obraz yevreiv v miskomu prostori Pivdnia Ukrainy u podorozhnikh putivnykakh mandrivnykiv kintsia XVIII – pershoi polovyny XIX st. [The image of Jews in the urban space of Southern Ukraine in travelers' guidebooks of the late 18th – first half of the 19th centuries]. *Zaporizhzhia Historical Review*, 3(55), 16–22. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26661/zhv-2020-3-55-02> [in Ukrainian].
3. Cheremisin, O. V., & Mykhailenko, H. M. (2022). Obraz ukraintsiv u podorozhnikh putivnykakh kintsia XVIII – pershoi polovyny XIX st. [The image of Ukrainians in travel guidebooks of the late 18th – first half of the 19th centuries]. *Pivdennyi arkhiv (istorychni nauky) – Southern Archive (Historical Sciences)*, 40, 37–43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2786-5118/2022-40-5> [in Ukrainian].
4. Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. Retrieved from <https://fbaum.unc.edu/teaching/articles/J-Communication-1993-Entman.pdf> [in English].
5. Gibson, J. J. (1979). *The ecological approach to visual perception* (316 p.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin [in English].
6. Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press [in English].
7. Hutchby, I. (2001). Technologies, texts and affordances. *Sociology*, 35(2), 441–456. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/240729307_Technologies_Texts_and_Affordances [in English].
8. Krym: putevoditel [Crimea: A guidebook]. (1969). I. P. Poliakova (Ed.). (2nd ed.). Simferopol: Krym [in Russian].
9. Mykhailenko, H. M. (2023). Obraz rosiian u podorozhnikh putivnykakh kintsia XVIII – pershoi polovyny XIX st. [The image of Russians in travel guidebooks of the late 18th – first half of the 19th centuries]. *Pivdennyi arkhiv (istorychni nauky) – Southern Archive (Historical Sciences)*, 44, 19–26. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2786-5118/2023-44-3> [in Ukrainian].
10. Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, 10(1), 55–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.1993.9962963> [in English].
11. Pratt, M. L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession*, 33–40. Retrieved from https://mullin35.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/pratt_-arts-of-the-contact-zone.pdf [in English].
12. Riabokon, H. L. (2016). Teoriia freimiv kriz pryzmu prahma-semantychnoi pobudovy dyskursu [Frame theory through the lens of the pragma-semantic construction of discourse]. *Naukovi zapysky NaUKMA. Filolohichni nauky – NaUKMA Research Papers. Philology*, 189, 76–82. Retrieved from http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/NaUK-MAfn_2016_189_17 [in Ukrainian].
13. Turner, F. J. (1920). The significance of the frontier in American history. *The frontier in American history* (pp. 1–38). New York: Henry Holt. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/frontierinameric01turn> [in English].

Date of initial submission: 17.06.2026

Date of acceptance after peer review: 18.08.2026

Publication date: 05.10.2026