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Introduction

On behalf of the editorial team of the *Russian Language Journal*, it is with great pleasure that we present Volume 73, Number 1. This issue, available exclusively online, features six articles and two book reviews that span a broad spectrum of topics within Russian language studies. The issue opens with Nadezhda Braun's exploration of how Russian minority languages are minimized through Russian educational policies. Sofya Yunusova investigates the educational potential of literary texts in eliciting affective responses in the language-literature classroom. Joan A. Chevalier's study explores the semantic value of connecting phrases and conjunctions, providing insights into the linguistic characteristics of Russian "*vvodnye slova*" through a systematic corpora study and its implications for Russian (L2) pedagogy. Further contributions by Marina Tsylina, José Luis Carrido Rivera & Hadis Gaedi, and by Natalia Sletova, present empirical research on the acquisition of Russian as a second language: the former article focuses on Russian (L2) teachers’ and learners’ perceptions of learning affordances, and the latter on the impact of writing tasks on grammatical accuracy in oral production in Russian (L2) learners. The issue concludes with Ksenia Turkova’s sociolinguistic analysis of euphemistic expressions and propaganda language in media discourse regarding Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Turkova uncovers the dual role of euphemisms in media discourse used by authorities for control and by dissenting citizens for safe expression of opposition during the ongoing war and repression. This article also introduces the theme of the forthcoming 2023 special issue on teaching media literacy in the Russian language classroom (Volume 73, Issue 2), guest-edited by Karen Evans-Romaine and Liudmila Klimanova. Collectively, the articles in this issue address the diverse interests of the RLJ readership, covering pedagogy, linguistics, second language acquisition, and discourse studies.

We extend our gratitude to everyone who submitted and reviewed articles this year for the *Russian Language Journal*, as these contributions and our reviewers’ careful reading make the publication possible.
The *Russian Language Journal* plays a vital role in our field, serving a diverse audience and providing a publication venue for serious scholarship which might not otherwise fit into the other fine journals in our field. We owe special thanks to Jennifer Bown, the previous editor-in-chief of the *Russian Language Journal*, for her unwavering dedication to RLJ readers and for her efforts to modernize the journal by transitioning it to an online platform. In 2024 we expect our journal to transition entirely online and become an open-access publication venue for researchers and Russian language teaching practitioners. The editorial board looks forward to new developments in the journal’s operations and distribution, and we invite our readers to consider contributing articles to the *Russian Language Journal*.

Liudmila Klimanova, Ph.D.
Editor, Russian Language Journal
rlj@americanCouncils.org
Minority Language Education in Russia: An Example of Social and Cultural Reproduction and Correspondence Theories

NADEZHDА BRAUN

The Russian Federation’s ethnic and linguistic diversity is underrecognized in the educational research space. Whereas conversations about the importance of Indigenous languages and cultures in Western nations, such as Canada, Australia, and the United States are increasingly prominent, many are unaware of the Indigenous languages present in what is now the Russian Federation. Part of the reason for this lack of knowledge is Russia’s own self-presentation. Russia frequently portrays itself (and is portrayed) to the West as a single, monolithic, ethnically Russian nation-state, rather than the diverse country that it is (Prina, 2018).

However, Russians are very aware of the ethnic diversity within their country and the Russian language distinguishes between those who are ethnically Russian (русские - rouss-ki-yeh - russkie) and those who are Russian citizens but are not ethnically Russian (россияне - ross-ee-yan-yeh - rossiiane) (Kuzmin, 2015). After the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, rossiiane was the preferred terminology to highlight a united, multicultural Russian Federation, rather than a Russian ethnic identity (Blakkisrud, 2016). Individuals representing 193 different ethnic identities live in the Russian Federation, and at least 100 of these identities are Indigenous. Diverse identities represent approximately 20% of the population in the Russian Federation (Kuzmin, 2015; Prina, 2016). However, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) lists 131 of Russia’s languages as endangered (Font, 2014). Many of these languages have fewer than 50,000 speakers, and represent the Indigenous languages of the Far North, Siberia, and the Far East (Kuzmin, 2015).

At the same time, the structure of the Russian Federation emphasizes the ethnic and linguistic diversity through its administrative designations. Two of these designations, autonomous okrugs and republics, are reserved for states with a large ethnic minority population, and the minority or Indigenous language can then be designated as an
official state language by in the republics. Autonomous okrugs may have a “titular language,” but it is not a state or “official” language (Zamyatin, 2012a and b). Of note is that the literature on linguistic diversity in Russia uses both “minority” and “Indigenous” as terms to describe languages. Consequently, I use both terms interchangeably here, as both are accurate descriptions of many of the languages in Russia. Although there are minority languages, such as Armenian or German, within the Russian Federation that are not indigenous to Russia, they are beyond the scope of this discussion.

The outward presentation and nationalist foreign policy of the Russian Federation conflicts with Russia’s internal recognition of diversity, and particularly linguistic diversity, which will be further explored in this article. Although there is literature, as cited here, that discusses the problematic minority language policies in the Russian Federation, the literature does not apply social and cultural reproduction theory or correspondence theory to this topic. This article seeks to address this gap by applying these two theoretical perspectives, social and cultural reproduction theory and correspondence theory, to explore how Russia, despite the recognition of ethnic and linguistic diversity, promotes a singular “Russian” identity through the maintenance of Russian as the dominant language. The application of both theories provides lenses through which to view this problem, while also providing frameworks for solutions.

I first give an overview of social and cultural reproduction and correspondence theories and how both theories inform the maintenance of the status quo in minority and Indigenous language teaching in Russia. I then provide the historical-political context for the study of minority and Indigenous languages in what is now the Russian Federation. Next, I discuss effective methods of minority and Indigenous language teaching. I then present the state of minority language teaching in Russia, including some examples of specific regions and languages: Chuvash in Chuvashia and Nenets, Khanty, and Selkup in the Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug (YNAO). Finally, I provide conclusions and discuss future lines of inquiry in this area.

1. Theoretical Perspectives
Social and cultural reproduction and correspondence theories are both derivatives of Marxist theory, which applies a critical lens to analyze existing
power structures (Kubow, 2007). Bourdieu’s theory of social and cultural reproduction proposes the idea that current hierarchical structures are reproduced through the educational system. In particular, the “educational system...[contributes] to the reproduction of the structure of class relations and by concealing, by an apparently neutral attitude, the fact that it fills this function” (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 258). Hierarchical structures are created and maintained using cultural capital, where the “language and knowledge [of the dominant class] act as a kind of currency” in society (Kubow, 2007, p. 99). Putin, for example, at the beginning of his rule, referred to Russianness most often as rossiiskii (the adjective form of rossiiane), as in his 1999 speech where he referred to the “primordial, traditional Russian (rossiiske) values” (as cited in Blakkisrud, 2016, p. 251). Gradually, however, he has prioritized the ethnic Russian majority in his rhetoric, emphasizing their centrality to the Russian state (Blakkisrud, 2016). In Russia, despite the nominal recognition of linguistic diversity, Russian is prioritized at the expense of minority and Indigenous languages, as these languages are not seen as “valuable” by the ethnically Russian population.

Correspondence theory emphasizes the correlation between school and the workplace, wherein students are prepared to enter the “modern, industrial workplace” (Kubow, 2007, p. 49). Bowles and Gintis (1975), “document the proposition that schools produce ‘better’ workers primarily through the structural correspondence of the social relations of education with those of capitalist production” (Bowles and Gintis, 1975, p. 77). Since minority and Indigenous languages are perceived as not having a place in the modern workplace, the languages are not prioritized (Laptender, 2016; Zamyatin, 2012a). Both social reproduction and correspondence theories criticize the maintenance of the status quo through schooling. In Russia’s case, the status quo is the maintenance of the dominant Russian language at the expense of minority languages.

2. Historical Context
Historically, minority and Indigenous languages were undermined through the conditions explained by social and cultural reproduction and correspondence theories. Therefore, to understand the current linguistic context in the Russian Federation, we must look back at the historical-political linguistic context of the past 100 years. During the 1920s, the early period of the Soviet Union, there was support for minority ethnic
groups, which led to the creation of “titular nations,” so called because they are named after the largest minority ethnic group in the region (Alpatov, 2000; Suleymanova, 2018; Zamyatin, 2012a). This also led to the creation of alphabets and education systems to teach minority and Indigenous languages, called “national schools” (Suleymanova, 2018; Zamyatin, 2012a). In 1958, the Soviet Union passed the Soviet education reform, where parents chose the language of instruction (Alpatov, 2000; Zamyatin, 2012a). This ultimately led to the “virtual dismantling of the national schools system which taught in the languages of the many titular peoples of the USSR” (Zamyatin, 2012a, p. 19). Ultimately, in the 1980s, less than half of the minority and Indigenous population of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic were studying in national schools where minority languages were primarily taught (Zamyatin, 2012a).

With the fall of the Soviet Union, and the decentralization of the education system, there was a resurgence in interest in ethnic identities and rights, leading to 34 languages being enshrined in the constitution of the Russian Federation as “government languages” (Bodarenko & Putilo, 2019). This situation also led to a renewed increase in the teaching of minority languages (Zamyatin, 2012a).

With the rise of Vladimir Putin, however, Russia has seen a shift away from multiculturalism towards Russo-centrism (Suleymanova, 2018). In the education context, this culminated in the 2018 passing of a federal law “giving schoolchildren and parents the right to choose which language would be taught to the child as their native language” (Tishkov, 2019). Much like the 1958 Soviet education reform, this law is leading to a situation where “parents are forced to choose Russian for their children, rather than their native language, as a language of opportunity” (Zamyatin, 2012a, p. 19). Situating Russian as the “language of opportunity” is a perfect example of correspondence theory, where families must choose Russian for their children to succeed in the economic sphere.

3. Effective Minority and Indigenous Language Teaching
Part of maintaining the dominance of the Russian language in Russia happens through inadequate provision of Indigenous language instruction. However, to understand the ineffective language teaching strategies used, we first need to understand what effective language teaching strategies are. Effective approaches to minority and Indigenous language instruction
are well documented, although not always practiced, throughout the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia (Disbray et al., 2018). There are many components to successful and effective minority language instruction, but “research... shows two factors are strong predictors of high language proficiency achievement; the number of teaching hours per week and continuity of teaching across the school years” (Nikolov & Mihaljević Djigunović, 2011, p. 100; Enever, 2011 in Disbray et al., 2018). Because both factors are necessary, the most effective programs are usually bilingual or immersive language programs for the target (minority or Indigenous) language. The literature on Russia uses the term “language of instruction” to refer to bilingual or immersive programming, as opposed to a subject language, where the language is taught as a separate class. Only 41.5% of Indigenous students were being taught their native language as a subject in 2012-2013, whereas only 10% are learning their native language as the language of instruction (Zamyatin, 2017). Additionally, high-quality instruction and resources are critical to learners’ success (Enever, 2011; Nikolov & Djigunović, 2006, in Disbray et al., 2018). In the Russian Federation, materials for minority and Indigenous languages are frequently limited or outdated (Font, 2014; Iksanova, 2022; Laptender, 2016). Finally, the status of the language and the ability to use the language in everyday life are also contributing factors to the successful learning of minority and Indigenous languages (Nikolov & Mihaljević Djigunović, 2011 in Disbray et al., 2018). In most Russian cities, Russian is the primary language taught and spoken, with minority and Indigenous languages pushed out of the public sphere (Font, 2014; Laptender, 2016). Few effective teaching practices for minority and Indigenous language instruction are commonly present in the Russian education system.

The Russian education system is, in many ways, set up so that Indigenous languages can be taught effectively and with autonomy (Prina, 2020). All students legally have the right to receive their education in any official language of the Russian Federation (Arutyunova & Zamyatin, 2021). Since many Indigenous languages are recognized by the government as official regional languages, many students have the right to receive an education in their native language. This right also means that students must be taught in a language that reflects the “will of the parents” (Zamyatin, 2012a, p. 33). However, as mentioned in Disbray et al. (2018), the status of the Indigenous language in the community is
a key factor in the success of Indigenous language programs. Since this linguistic right also extends to citizens who are ethnically Russian, there is often pushback when “state and native languages [are] being taught at the expense of Russian” (Zamyatin, 2012a, p. 34). Kuzmin (2015) offers an additional example to mandatory teaching of Indigenous languages:

One of these problems is that certain ethnic autonomies promote their languages at the expense of Russian, on whose use and tuition limits are imposed. Local authorities’ dedication to their language occasionally leads to absurdities, for instance, teaching it to ethnic Russian children since the age of four, when they don’t properly speak even their native Russian. (p. 42)

However, as noted by Disbray et al. (2015), “there are advantages to acquiring new languages early,” including improvement in the language skills of one’s first language. Regardless of the facts of language learning, the pushback against the teaching of Indigenous languages serves as a powerful deterrent for families considering the pursuit of Indigenous language instruction in Russia (Bowring, 2018). This social deterrent is a powerful example of social reproduction theory, as the dominant language is reproduced through the imposition of the dominant ethnic group (Russians) on minority language speakers.

4. Minority Language Teaching and Workforce Preparation in Russia

The language requirements of the Russian education system are another powerful deterrent to the pursuit of Indigenous language instruction. Although students have the right to study in any official language of the Russian Federation, at a minimum, it is required to teach Russian as a subject in all levels except for pre-school (Zamyatin, 2012a). Additionally, one of the required subjects on the final state exam needed for entrance to university is Russian. Students have an option to take an exam in a minority language, but this examination is completely optional for university admissions. Font (2014) elaborates on this issue:

‘the Unified State Exam somehow may make education in the national tongues seem worthless, until school-leavers decide to study these languages at the universities’. In fact, examination
systems have been pointed to in the literature as being able to exercise pressure and control on the language decisions of pupils, parents and teachers. (Protassova, 2010, p. 165; Spolski, 2009, p. 98 in Font, 2014, p. 62)

These exams serve as an example of correspondence theory at work. To access the workforce, students must first pass a series of examinations, including Russian. This necessitates a level of Russian proficiency on the exam, leading schools and families to prioritize the study of Russian over the study of minority languages.

5. Examples of Minority Language Teaching in Russia
Social and cultural reproduction and correspondence theories can help to explain the status of many minority and Indigenous languages in Russia. The four languages examined here were chosen for their geographic and linguistic diversity, since they represent two different regions, Chuvashia and the Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug (YNAO), and two different linguistic branches, Turkic and Uralic (Font, 2014; Laptender, 2016).

5.1. Chuvash
The Chuvash language provides an excellent example of the maintenance of linguistic hierarchy in the Russian Federation. Chuvash has about 1 million speakers and is a state language in the titular Republic of Chuvashia. In the Republic of Chuvashia, about 67.7% of the population identify as Chuvash. Despite the clear Chuvash majority, 90.2% of children in the republic study in Russian, even though Chuvash is a compulsory subject of study for all students. Chuvash is usually the language of instruction (immersion) in rural schools until the fourth grade (Font, 2014). Upon entering fifth grade, students move entirely to Russian language instruction, except for one hour a week for the subject ‘Culture of the native land’ (kul’tura rodnogo kraya), taught in some small villages (Font, 2014).

Due to the legal right to choose the language of instruction, families can choose between “Chuvash,” “Tatar” (another minority language with its own titular republic, Tatarstan), and “Russian” schools. In “Chuvash” schools, more time is dedicated to Chuvash, whereas in “Russian” schools it only receives a maximum of three hours per week. “By comparison, Russian is usually taught for five or six hours per week, with two further
hours devoted to Russian literature” (Font, 2014, p. 68). However, there are not any “Chuvash” schools available in urban areas, which significantly decreases the number of students that have access to more intensive study of Chuvash. Additionally, even in “Chuvash” schools, the Chuvash language is generally taught for a maximum of two hours per week in upper secondary school (10th and 11th grade) (Font, 2014).

As previously discussed, the number of hours per week and number of years dedicated to the study of an Indigenous language are critical to fluency in that language. In decreasing access to more intensive language education in urban areas and limiting the number of years of immersive study to primary school, education authorities send a clear message that Chuvash is beneath Russian in the language hierarchy. Due in part to these language policies, Chuvash has seen a 14% decline in the number of speakers between 2002 and 2010 (Font, 2014). As Font (2014) notes, “a substantial language shift is occurring in Russia which is affecting even large nationalities with republican structures” (p. 53). This language shift is further demonstrated by the suggestion that less than 4% of students were “receiving an education through the medium of a minority language” in 2006-2007 (Prina, 2016, p. 132).

5.2. Nenets, Khanty, and Selkup

Indigenous language teaching in the Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug (YNAO) provides another example of both social and cultural reproduction and correspondence theories at work in the Russian Federation. Within this region, there are three major Indigenous languages spoken: Nenets (both Tundra and Forest Nenets. Forest Nenets makes up only 5% of Nenets speakers.), Khanty, and Selkup. UNESCO considers both Nenets and Khanty to be endangered languages, and Selkup and Forest Nenets are critically endangered (Laptender, 2016). All three languages are considered “native languages” of the YNAO. Unlike Chuvashia, only 8.2% of the population of the YNAO is Indigenous. However, as of 2002, this region had one of the highest rates of Indigenous people who can speak their native language, with a rate of 80% (Laptender, 2016). Moreover, Nenets, Khanty, and Selkup all increased their numbers of speakers between 2002 and 2010, in contrast to most minority languages (Laptender, 2016). At the same time, evidence of social-cultural reproduction theory and linguistic hierarchies remains in the YNAO schools.
The education system of the YNAO presents some challenges, simply because of the rough terrain of taiga and tundra. To combat the rough terrain, both boarding and nomadic schools are an important part of the education system and serve mostly Indigenous families. These schools are critical, as often the Indigenous languages are more widely taught in boarding and nomadic schools due to the high percentage of Indigenous students. However, as in Chuvashia, there are not any schools using Indigenous languages as the language of instruction in urban areas (Laptender, 2016). Throughout the educational process, in both urban and rural settings, as well as at all grade levels, Russian is the primary language of instruction. Indigenous language classes are most frequently taught as an additional subject, which is not as effective as using the language for the method of instruction. Laptender (2016) notes that “it appears that the focus in these classes on native pupils’ languages is not substantial enough in order for students to actively use their native language” (p. 25). Another struggle is the lack of teachers and teacher training. Post-upper-secondary graduation, there are few options for the study of the Indigenous languages of the YNAO. Students can take optional Indigenous languages classes at the YNAO pedagogical branch of the vocational school. However, to study these Indigenous languages in higher education, students must leave the okrug and go to Herzen State Pedagogical University in St. Petersburg (Laptender, 2016). During the 2014-2015 school year, 16 students were studying Nenets, 10 studying Khanty, and 5 studying Selkup at the Institute of the Peoples of the North in St. Petersburg. However, many graduates are unable to find jobs using these languages upon graduation (Laptender, 2016). Against this backdrop, the inadequacy of time devoted to language instruction continues to impede Indigenous language stability or growth in the region. This disconnect and disinvestment in teacher preparation is representative of social-cultural reproduction, where Russian is reproduced as the dominant language since the Indigenous languages are not given sufficient time and resources. Correspondence theory is once again at play here, too, as students are not taught their native languages in school because of a “lack of economic value” and then are unable to find jobs using their language skills because the language is not valued by the government.
6. Conclusions

Despite recognition of its linguistic diversity through the establishment of republics and recognition of the right to learn in one’s native language, Russia has propagated a language policy that serves as an example of social and cultural reproduction and correspondence theories, reinforcing the existing linguistic hierarchy with Russian at the top. Russia’s approach to Indigenous languages flies in the face of effective language teaching practices. These practices hold that the number of hours and years of instruction should be maximized to achieve the highest level of proficiency (Disbray et al., 2018). Indigenous language instruction in Russia is minimized across diverse languages and regions, in number of both hours and years of instruction, as Indigenous language instruction is largely absent from urban areas, where the majority of the population lives. Minority and Indigenous language teaching practices in both the Republic of Chuvashia and the Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okrug (YNAO) provide evidence of this minimization. If minimization continues, “there is a real risk that these vibrant languages will become languages in need of revitalization, a task more difficult than fostering and maintaining multilingualism” (Disbray et al., 2018, section 13). Russia instead needs to identify a language policy that promotes multilingualism and diversity instead of homogenization and assimilation, enabling the country to celebrate its diversity, not just nominally, but authentically (Arutyunova & Zamyatin, 2021; Iksanova et. al, 2022; Saarikivi & Marten, 2012).

Further lines of study will be helpful in this endeavor. First, comparative studies of minority and Indigenous language teaching in Russia and other linguistically diverse countries (e.g., the United States, Indonesia, Australia, Kazakhstan, etc.) are needed to uncover effective minority language-maintenance practices worldwide. Second, an analysis of access to both language materials (e.g., textbooks) and teacher training programs for minority and Indigenous languages should be completed. Furthermore, research questioning if there are any minority languages that do not have decreasing numbers of speakers in Russia should be carried out. If so, how and why? Finally, further evaluation of variation in laws and policies among different administrative districts (e.g., autonomous okrugs and republics) and their impact on minority language learning is needed. These lines of inquiry will help to determine
the extent of minority and Indigenous language instruction and loss throughout Russia. With these questions answered, one can determine effective policies to mitigate the language hierarchy described by social and cultural and correspondence theories, preventing further language extinction.
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Literature as an “Affective Magnet“:
Defining, Engaging and Investigating Emotions
in a (Russian) Language-Literature Classroom

SOFYA YUNUSOVA

To evoke in oneself a feeling which one has experienced and, having
evoked it in oneself, then by means of movements, lines, colors,
sounds, or forms expressed in words, so to transmit that feeling that
others may experience the same feeling - this is the activity of art.
(Tolstoy, 1925, p. 173)

1. Introduction
The mobilization of emotions is a distinctive feature and intrinsic part
of literary reading.¹ Yet it is only very recently that this side of literature
reception has attracted the attention of reading researchers. Reading
research, focusing for decades on “cold cognition,” has remained silent
with regards to “the affective and aesthetic processes that without doubt
constitute a significant part of the reading act” (Jacobs, 2015, pp. 135,
137). A similar state of affairs has characterized the field of literature
in foreign-language education, including Russian foreign language
(RFL) teaching. While the educational potential of literary texts in terms
of engaging learners’ emotions has been foregrounded in some RFL
studies, such as those by Kostin et al. (2017), Kulibina (2015b), and Miller
(2016), the field has a relatively poor research base for discussing the
nature of these affective responses and ways to systematically promote
them in a language-literature classroom. To address this lack, this study
first conceptualizes the different types of emotions that are arguably
involved in foreign-language (FL) literary reading, and then formulates
a set of pedagogical principles to foster their emergence in a language-
language classroom. The study describes a real-life class session

¹ Emotions in this article are defined as affective responses of readers to literary texts.
These include such general states as enjoyment, frustration, boredom, satisfaction, sense of
accomplishment, and the more specific responses to narrative events and formal features
of a literary text that are described in Section 3.
developed following these principles and conducted with volunteer Russian language students at an Australian university, and it presents the results of that intervention. The final part of the article discusses the implications of the study for both the development of classroom activities and research data collection.

2. Background
Literature has held a privileged place in RFL didactics since the early 19th century (Miloslavskaya, 2012) and continues to attract considerable scholarly and pedagogical attention today, despite the predominance of more “functional” models of learning. Some important publications on the methods of working with literary texts in RFL classrooms of the last twenty years include Blech (2007), Comer (2008; 2016), Keefe (2004), Reyfman (2014) and Rosengrant (2000), while analogous studies in the field of Russian second language (RSL) instruction comprise Avlova (2005), Balandina (2007), Filimonova (2004), Iatsenko (2018), Kulibina (2015a; 2015b), Potëmkina (2015), Taktashova et al. (2020), Tolstukhina (2015), among others. While each of these studies or pedagogical editions of literary texts advances an effective model for working with literary texts in an RFL/RSL classroom, most of existing proposals tend to concentrate more on the cognitive processing of the text rather than on the affective. This is evidenced by the focus on reading comprehension scaffolding and language-building exercises (including post-reading lexical and grammar drills) at the expense of classroom discussions, and the predominance of comprehension questions over interpretative ones. While it is clear that such pedagogical choices are, to a great extent, driven by the FL learners’ limited language proficiency as well as by the time constraints of a FL classroom, it is also true that the scarce attention to the affective dimension of literary reading does not allow teachers or students to fully capitalize on its didactic potential. The relatively few studies in the didactics of Russian and other more commonly taught European languages that have attempted to foreground the affective dimension have mainly developed under the influence of reader-response criticism, and within what has been defined as the experiential approach to the use of literature in FL education.²

² Within this perspective, a literary text is viewed as intrinsically more open and multi-layered compared to other types of texts and therefore has the potential to engage learners’ imaginations and emotions (Olsbu, 2014).
In one of the earliest studies that applied the reader-response framework to working with literary texts in a FL classroom, Davis (1989) developed a lesson plan for an experiential reading of a short story in French. Davis convincingly argued that by presenting the text in short segments and engaging students in a dynamic text-questioning activity, it was possible to both aid comprehension and draw learners into the text emotionally. The teacher’s role was defined by Davis as that of a “mediating reader” who encourages students to produce their own meanings of the text, drawing, on the one hand, on the instructions contained in it and, on the other, on their personal life experiences. More recent proposals based on the reader-response framework in the EFL context can be found in Carlisle (2000), Kim (2004), Liaw (2001), and Pattison and Redlich (2020).

In the RFL/RSL field, the most prominent method within the experiential approach remains Kulibina (2015b). Kulibina identifies two levels of literary text processing, 
\[\text{когнитивный (cognitive) and психопоэтический (psycho-poetic),}\]
 and holds that non-native readers of literature require assistance at both levels of processing. At the cognitive level, these readers need guidance in decoding the literal and contextual meanings of key linguistic units of the text, while at the psycho-poetic level they need to be assisted in constructing personal representations of these key linguistic units in the form of mental images. Kulibina persistently argues that a literary text should not only be understood, but also emotionally experienced by a non-native reader, which can be achieved by reflecting on the meanings of key linguistic units. Kulibina specifies that while in the case of poetic texts all words should be considered as key word-images as each of them carries a “maximal aesthetic load,” in prose texts key word-images should be selected for analysis and discussion by the instructor (p. 73).

In sum, all the above-mentioned studies have proposed valuable ways to foster non-native readers’ emotional engagement with literature. However, none of them have looked more closely at the different forms this affective response can take. Reading-induced emotions in these and

---

3 Kulibina (2015b) acknowledges that this division is somewhat artificial but is necessary as it represents the structure of the reader’s activity more precisely and thus allows it to be modelled by means of questions and tasks (p. 69).

4 “Художественный текст должен переживаться читателем, а не просто пониматься” (Kulibina, 2015b, p. 73).
analogous studies have simply been defined in general terms such as enjoyment, emotional participation, pleasure of reading, and personal engagement with the text. Arguably, a more comprehensive and nuanced theory of emotions in reading literature in an FL would benefit the field from both theoretical and pedagogical perspectives.

3. Affective processes in literary reading

In reflecting on the interrelation between cognitive and emotional aspects in reading comprehension, Kneepkens and Zwaan (1994) claimed that the textual information that gives rise to emotions and interest is processed more rapidly and easily since it requires fewer cognitive resources. These two scholars also advanced a useful taxonomy of emotions in literary reading. The first group of emotions, fiction emotions (F-emotions), are engendered by the events in the fictional world: they relate to the contents of the story, its characters and the course of events. In contrast, artefact-emotions (A-emotions) are stimulated by the aesthetic qualities of the text. Kneepkens and Zwaan also distinguished between F-(a)-emotions (a standing for altercentric), related to the characters and situation described in the story, and F-(e)-emotions (e standing for egocentric), directed to the self. However, they stressed that, in practice, “there is no strict separation between both types of F-emotions [and] there will be a continuous interaction between F-emotions focused on the other and on the self during reading” (p. 132).

An alternate oft-quoted taxonomy of emotions in literary reading was proposed by Miall and Kuiken (2002), who defined these feelings at four levels. The first level includes evaluative feelings such as enjoyment, pleasure, frustration, or satisfaction. The second level is represented by narrative feelings “toward specific aspects of the fictional event sequence, such as empathy with a character or resonance with the mood of a setting” (p. 223), equivalent to F-emotions in Kneepkens and Zwaan. The third level of feelings are aesthetic feelings which arise “in response to the formal (generic, narrative or stylistic) components of a text, such as being struck by an apt metaphor” (Miall & Kuiken, 2002, p. 223). These correspond to A-emotions in Kneepkens and Zwaan’s classification. Narrative feelings include empathy, sympathy, identification, and a general absorption into the story world, while aesthetic feelings include surprise, admiration, and appreciation. Finally, the fourth level refers to self-modifying feelings
that “restructure the reader’s understanding of the textual narrative and, simultaneously, the reader’s sense of self” (Miall & Kuiken, 2002, p. 223). Miall and Kuiken claim that this fourth level of feelings is similar to Aristotle’s concept of catharsis and is distinctive to literary reading. However, they remark that these feelings are mobilized “only among certain readers – and among them only some of the time” (p. 229).

Many of the above-mentioned claims about the nature of emotions in literary reading have recently been empirically verified within the growing field of the empirical study of literature. For example, Hakemulder (2004), Koopman (2016), Miall (2008), Miall and Kuiken (1994), and van Peer et al. (2007), among others, have looked at how formal features of literary texts such as foregrounding can trigger the emergence of emotions in readers. The term foregrounding (orig. Czech *aktualizace*) was coined by Mukařovský (1964) and stands for “a range of stylistic variations that occur [...] whether at the phonetic level (for example, alliteration, rhyme), the grammatical level (for example, inversion, ellipsis), or the semantic level (for example, metaphor, irony)” (Miall & Kuiken, 1994b, p. 390). Foregrounding thus makes a linguistic utterance stand out from the surrounding linguistic context (Leech & Short, 2007). Widely present and exploited in many other discourses such as advertisements, nursery rhymes, proverbs, and ordinary conversation, foregrounding is considered to be one of the distinctive features of literature.

Empirical research has demonstrated that foregrounding affects both the cognitive and the emotional side of reading. These textual elements are normally processed more slowly and effortfully, and are generally described by readers as striking, aesthetically pleasing, and rewarding, thus indicating the mobilization of A-emotions (Hakemulder, 2004; Miall & Kuiken, 1994; van Peer et al., 2007). The effects of foregrounding on the rise of F-emotions and in particular on the feelings of empathy have been recently documented by Koopman (2016).

Other studies on the affective processes in literary reading, conducted within the new interdisciplinary field of *neurocognitive poetics*, further support both the key role of affect in this type of reading and the taxonomies of emotions described above. For example, Jacobs (2015) distinguishes between *foreground* and *background* information processing in literary reading. The background of a literary text refers to the familiar linguistic structures it contains, as well as to “the repertoire of familiar...
literary patterns and recurrent literary themes and allusions to familiar social and historical contexts” (p. 147). In Iser’s (1974) terms, this is the primary code of a text, against whose backdrop the secondary code (foregrounding) can emerge. Jacobs (2015) further specifies that different texts present a different mixture of back- and foreground elements, as can be easily understood by comparing a novel by Stephen King with one by James Joyce. Jacobs’s model holds that:

[B]ackground elements are implicitly processed mainly by the left hemisphere (LH) reading network, evoke non-aesthetic (fiction) feelings and are characterised by fluent reading (for example, high word per minute (wpm) rates) [...]. In turn, foreground elements are explicitly processed involving more right hemisphere (RH) networks, produce aesthetic feelings, [and] a slower reading rate [...]. (p. 147)

According to Jacobs, background reading facilitates immersive feelings (transportation, absorption), while foreground reading produces aesthetic ones.

4. Affective processes in FL literary reading
This discussion of the affective processes in literary reading raises the question of how this conceptualization relates to reading literature in a foreign language. Although learners’ emotional response to literature at lower levels of FL proficiency (below CEFR B2) might be limited by their restricted FL knowledge, recent studies have demonstrated that the emotional response of students at higher levels is comparable to that of native readers. For example, Hsu et al. (2015) and Kim (2004) have found that Upper-Intermediate and Advanced FL learners do experience a wide range of emotions when reading literary texts. Similarly, Hanauer (2001), and Chesnokova and van Peer (2016) supplied evidence for the effects of foregrounding on Advanced EFL learners when reading poetry. In short, these research studies suggest that the emotional response to literature, while being weaker and less differentiated in the case of FL readers, is nevertheless similar for both native and FL readers who have advanced expertise. It is thus deemed possible to extend the taxonomy of emotions discussed above to readers with fluent FL reading skills.
An additional point to consider in the case of FL literary reading, however, is the contribution of achievement emotions. Achievement emotions are “emotions tied directly to achievement activities or achievement outcomes” in learning contexts (Pekrun, 2006, p. 15) and are classified according to three dimensions: valence (positive vs negative), focus (activity vs outcome), and activation (activating vs deactivating). While it is not the goal of this study to analyze the various achievement emotions in FL reading, it is evident that this type of emotion must be considered when defining emotions in a language-literature classroom. For example, FL readers who see themselves capable of understanding such notoriously demanding and prestigious writings as literary texts are likely to experience positive activating achievement emotions such as joy and satisfaction, whereas comprehension breakdowns may lead to the rise of negative emotions such as frustration. The taxonomy of emotions in FL literary reading therefore looks as follows:

(1) General, evaluative emotions towards the text

(2) Fiction (or narrative) emotions (F-emotions)
   a. general absorption emotions
   b. altercentric emotions (F-(a)-emotions)
   c. egocentric emotions (F(e)-emotions)

(3) Artefact (or aesthetic) emotions (A-emotions)

(4) Self-modifying emotions

(5) Achievement emotions

The question that still needs to be addressed for the purposes of the current study is how this advanced taxonomy applies to working with literary texts in FL classrooms, and at different levels of FL proficiency. Pedagogical practice shows that literary texts are usually introduced in FL classrooms in the form of excerpts, whose reduced
length might impair the rise of such F-emotions as transportation and absorption. Moreover, being the “nonintended readers” of literary texts written in their target language (Kramsch, 1985), FL learners, especially at lower levels of FL proficiency, often struggle with accessing what has been defined by Jacobs as the background of a literary text, which further impinges on the rise of F-emotions. At the same time, non-fluent FL readers of literature have difficulty also in decoding and emotionally responding to the foreground of the text, which may lead to reduced A-emotions. It seems, therefore, unclear whether literary emotions as defined in the present article can be realistically promoted in a FL language-literature classroom and by what means. In what follows, I reflect on this problem, and formulate several theory-driven pedagogical principles that are aimed at promoting the above-described emotions in a language-literature classroom.

5. Engaging emotions in a language-literature classroom: pedagogical principles
Although much currently remains unknown about the role of emotions in discourse processing including the processing of written texts (Bohn-Gettler & Kaakinen, 2022), a growing number of empirical studies (Bohn-Gettler, 2019; Jacobson et al., 2022; Mason et al., 2018; Mensink, 2022) have documented the interrelation and inseparability of cognition and emotion in the act of reading. In the field of L2/FL reading, Bernhardt’s compensatory model (2011) drew attention to the unexplained variance in L2 reading performance, which was found to predict up to 50% of the latter and was associated by Bernhardt with such factors as comprehension strategies, engagement, content and domain knowledge, motivation, and interest. While an exhaustive list of these factors remains unknown and Bernhardt does not explicitly refer to emotions in her model, the inclusion of such reading performance predictors as engagement, motivation, and interest acknowledges the contribution of “hot” affective processes to L2/FL reading comprehension. At the same time, as described in the previous section, literary texts have been found to be particularly conducive to emotional responses. It follows then that by systematically fostering student emotional engagement, language educators not only promote the essence of literary reading but also capitalize on the potential of emotions to aid reading comprehension.
The first way to foster the affective dimension of reading in a language-literature classroom consists in carefully assessing the emotional potential of the target literary text. Up until now, very few studies in the RFL field have drawn attention to a text's emotional potential as a key criterion for its selection.\(^5\) I contend that the taxonomy of emotions in FL literary reading advanced above can represent a valid pedagogical instrument for assessing the suitability of a text from this perspective. What the language instructor needs to do in this respect is to carefully analyze the structure, the language, and the content of the text, to identify all elements that may be conducive to the five types of emotions defined in the taxonomy. While it is clear that, given the uniqueness of each reader's life experience and personality, it would be impossible to predict all the various individual responses to a selected text, such an analysis is crucial for deciding on the suitability of a text in a given didactic context. Some specific advice on how to conduct such an analysis is provided in the following section.

A further way to foster affective processes in a language-literature classroom can be seen in the development of pre-reading, during-reading, and post-reading classroom activities targeted at fostering each type of emotions identified in the taxonomy. Due to the fundamental functions of emotions in reading and, in particular, literary reading, these activities should constitute an integrative part of a language-literature classroom, just like reading comprehension scaffolding aimed at supporting cognitive processing. Some specific ideas for these classroom activities are described in the following section.

The final recommendation consists in selecting literary texts that match not only students' interests but also the language educator's personal tastes. In this sense, it is difficult to disagree with Kulibina

---

\(^5\) The criteria for literary text selection that are traditionally identified in RFL/RSL pedagogical literature are as follows (Avlova, 2005): художственно-эстетическая значимость [artistic-aesthetic value]; культурно-образовательная ценность [cultural informativeness]; воспитательная, образовательная и познавательная ценность [educational and informational value]; доступность языковых форм [linguistic accessibility of the text at the given stage of language learning]; доступность содержательной формы [thematic and conceptual accessibility at the given stage of language learning]; соответственность с тематикой программных требований [correlation with curricular requirements in terms of themes and topics] (p. 113).
(2015b), who specifies that language instructors should opt for those texts that they enjoy reading themselves (p. 86), an argument corroborated by abundant research on the transmission of emotions, in particular, teacher enthusiasm, in learning situations. It is thus plausible that the language educator’s enthusiasm for a selected text can contribute to the rise of both evaluative and achievement emotions in readers.

In what follows, I describe and present the results of a Russian language-literature class session that was developed with these pedagogical principles in mind. The goal of this session was to demonstrate the proposed pedagogical approach through the example of one literary text, and collect some empirical data on its functioning.

5.1. Selecting the text
The class session described below was developed for Intermediate learners of Russian with a language competence between Bl and B2 levels. The analysis of the suitability of the selected text for this student audience from the cognitive perspective was performed using the model for assessing the accessibility of a FL literary text proposed in Yunusova (2018).

The selected literary text was a short story by a contemporary Russian writer, Evgenii Grishkovets, Встреча с осенью [Meeting Autumn].

The emotional potential of this text was assessed, first of all, by considering the evaluative emotions it could engender in learners. The story is a first-person, autobiographical narration about the writer’s perception of autumn. At the beginning of the story, the narrator asks himself when he fell in love with autumn, and describes how the birth of his first child on 1 October made him realize the beauty of this season. In the following paragraphs, he describes what made him dislike Russian autumn before that, and then recounts several episodes from his personal life that had made his experience of autumn positive. He finally realizes that he has always loved this season, and asserts that his daughter will also fall in love with it in her time.

See, for example, Frenzel et al. (2009), Keller et al. (2014), Kunter et al. (2011), and Patrick et al. (2000).

Due to the time constraints of a standard university lesson, a shortened version (806 out of 1311 words) of this short story was used. The shortening of the text did not involve any alterations to the original language of the work. The full text of the short story can be found on the writer’s personal website: https://odnovremenno.com/archives/714.
As this brief description suggests, the short story expresses a positive mood and touches on the theme of love, which is one of the five themes (together with death, danger, power, and romance) that normally evoke the interest of readers (Kneepkens & Zwaan, 1994). Moreover, the selected text is part of contemporary, present-day, Russian literature that has been found to attract RFL learners' particular attention (Iatsenko, 2015, 2017; Kulibina, 2015b; Vorozhtsova & Ursegova, 2015). It was thus concluded that reading this text would be conducive to positive evaluative emotions such as enjoyment and pleasure in Russian learner-readers.

In assessing the potential of the selected text in mobilizing F-(a)-emotions, even the shortened version of the text was found to contain descriptions of several highly emotional events – the birth of a child, the discovery of the beauty of nature, and the recounting of childhood memories. Many of the events and feelings evoked in this short story were also of a universal nature and could be easily related to even by non-native readers. The story was thus thought likely to promote such F-(e)-emotions as empathy and self-identification. The autobiographical, first-person narrative form and consequent internal focalization of the story was also considered to further contribute to the rise of self-identification feelings in readers. As noted by van Peer and Chesnokova (2019), the technique of internal focalization “gives readers information about characters’ (sometimes also narrators’) thoughts and emotions. It is assumed in narratology that this will have an effect on the reader” (p. 4). Leech and Short (2007) argue that “the very exposure […] to a character’s point of view, his thoughts, emotions, experience tends to establish an identification with that character, and an alignment with his value picture” (p. 221). The results of an experimental study by Hartung et al. (2016) confirmed that first-person narrations could lead to higher levels of transportation into the story world and mental imagery during reading.

Grishkovets’s text was also found to be conducive to A-emotions. In fact, while neither the original text nor its shortened version contained many instances of foregrounding, some of the expressive devices used by the writer, such as lexical repetitions and syntactic parallelisms, can arguably foster the rise of A-emotions. For example, in the first paragraph, the triplicate repetition of the stem люб [love] not only highlights the
key idea of the passage but also arguably aims at eliciting an affective response in reader. Moreover, the repetition of the word вопрос [question] and the question word когда [when] foregrounds the focus on time and the importance of the time of the year, thus facilitating the cognitive processing of this passage:

Когда я полюбил осень? Я задал себе этот вопрос недавно. Когда?
И как только я себе его задал, я тут же понял, что люблю это время года. Без любви к осени не возник бы сам вопрос. Когда же это со мной случилось?

[When did I fall in love with autumn? I asked myself this question recently. When? And as soon as I asked it, I understood immediately that I love this time of the year. Without the love for autumn this question would not have arisen. When did it happen to me?]

A similar effect is produced by the anaphora “my daughter, my first child, my Natasha:”

Я полюбил осень в тот год, когда родилась моя дочь, мой первый ребёнок, моя Наташа.

[I fell in love with autumn the year when my daughter was born, my first child, my Natasha.]

Other passages conducive to A-emotions are contained in the aesthetically pleasing descriptions of the autumn landscapes and the narrator’s feelings around the birth of his child, among others. Lastly, while it was difficult to predict whether the text would elicit self-modifying feelings in readers, it was contended that, in reading and comprehending this text, an audience of Russian language learners would experience positive achievement emotions such as joy and a sense of accomplishment. It was also considered that the rich background of culture-specific information about the everyday life of Russians contained in the text would further contribute to the rise of both evaluative and achievement emotions in learners.
5.2. Designing classroom activities

As mentioned earlier, research in reading comprehension has recently drawn attention to the inextricable interrelation between cognition and emotion in the act of reading. It is thus assumed that any classroom activity aimed at the support of cognitive comprehension processes will have an impact on learner-readers’ emotional engagement with the text, and vice versa. For example, a well-designed pre-reading background knowledge development or activation task arguably promotes not only top-down comprehension processes during reading but also stimulates learners’ interest in the text. The latter, in its turn, may contribute to the rise of both evaluative and narrative emotions during reading.

The language-literature class session based on Meeting Autumn thus started with a background knowledge development activity that consisted in reading a short biographical note on the writer. This was followed by a content predicting activity. The third and fourth pre-reading activities were aimed at the activation of learners’ topic-specific background knowledge and pre-teaching key vocabulary, which consisted in word-picture matching. The goal of these activities was to increase the linguistic, cultural, and conceptual accessibility of the target text to learners and in this way expand its background (Jacobs, 2015). The researcher also promoted word retention by asking students to vocalize and rehearse the target words as much as possible. It was expected that these pre-reading activities would decrease the cognitive load of the text, thus facilitating the rise of F-emotions in readers.

In contrast, the fifth pre-reading activity was aimed at preparing learners for the reading by building up their emotional engagement with the topic of the text. The researcher had the students watch the famous picnic episode from the 1979 Soviet film Москва слезами не верим [Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears]. Students were encouraged to try to feel the atmosphere created in the video, and to identify as many previously discussed words as possible (жёлтые листья, шапляки на природе, хмарь, и грусть). Students were also asked to share their impressions about the image of Russian autumn conveyed in the video.

---

8 The pre-reading activities are contained in Appendix 1.
in English. These pre-reading activities occupied approximately 25 minutes.

As in the pre-reading phase, the during-reading phase engaged students in cognitive comprehension and affective activities that fed into each other. The first didactic intervention consisted in dividing the text into five parts at central narrative points. This was expected to promote both attention focusing and engagement. After having students read each part, the researcher made sure the meanings of the key words of the passage were clear to students by explicitly asking for their translation. The researcher also probed students’ understanding of potentially unfamiliar grammatical structures (participles and gerunds) and syntactically dense sentences. Upon the completion of these cognitive comprehension activities, the researcher drew students’ attention to what she had identified as the central image of each passage and stimulated students’ response to it by asking pre-prepared questions. These questions were formulated in English and students were expected to answer them in English as well, although they sometimes attempted to answer in Russian.

In order to assist students in perceiving the mood of the text, the researcher drew their attention to the descriptions of nature that reflected the narrator’s emotional states. In this regard, a helpful activity consisted in having students identify the colors used to describe autumn in different parts of the short story. Bright colors such as yellow, pale yellow, blue,
and white, at the beginning of the text are in sharp contrast with grey and the “color of the sludge” in the middle part, only to re-emerge towards the end of the text in the image of festive and “juicy” gladioli. It was expected that drawing students’ attention to these revealing details of the text would stimulate their reflection on its overall message and composition, and encourage the development of narrative and evaluative emotions. To achieve the latter, the researcher also occasionally enriched the discussion with some culture-specific details by drawing on her native experience of Russian culture. Finally, students were asked to visualize the depicted scenes while reading and discussing the text. The performance at this task was not verified but students’ written recall protocols suggested that they did attempt to visualize some of the narrated scenes. While all of the above-described activities were conducted mostly in English, they enabled students to rehearse some new vocabulary from the text.

Targeted instructional interventions were also implemented to foster A-emotions. First, student attention was drawn to the instances of foregrounding, which, as described earlier, in the chosen text are mostly represented by lexical repetitions and syntactic parallelisms. The researcher had students reflect on the meanings the writer wished to convey by using these forms of foregrounding. Students also read some sentences from the text aloud to get a sense of the rhythm of Grishkovets’s prose. Students were also asked to reflect on the communicative effects of some colloquialisms (for example, высоченное) or diminutives (квартирка, деньги, маечки).

Finally, special care throughout the class session was taken to promote positive achievement emotions in learners and to minimize negative ones. The researcher welcomed all students’ reactions to the text and tried to use the occasional comprehension breakdowns as an opportunity to analyze and reflect more deeply on the language of the text. The students were also regularly commended for their comprehension efforts and insights into the text. This phase of the class session lasted approximately 70 minutes.

12 For example, the researcher provided some background information on the day of September 1 (the start of school year in Russia traditionally celebrated by bringing flower bouquets to teachers) to facilitate students’ comprehension and emotional response to the description of bright and colorful gladioli – the source of the teacher’s admiration and of the narrator’s pride at the end of the story.
5.3. Collected data

Four volunteer Russian language students at an Australian university took part in the class session. The participants (two females, two males) had attended a minimum of five and a maximum of eight semesters of Russian language instruction. The language competence of all participants in the study fell within the Intermediate level of RFL proficiency.

After participating in the class session, students were asked to answer several comprehension questions, share the emotions that the text elicited in them in writing, and complete a lexical recall exercise and a written recall of the text. The analysis of the student answers to the cognitive questions showed that they understood the events described in the text very well, were able to recall words from it, and had developed their knowledge of the Russian culture. As for the responses to affective questions, these revealed that all participants enjoyed reading the text. All participants also reported that this short story evoked feelings in them. While two students mentioned feelings of nostalgia, revealing that the short story had evoked personal memories in them (the birth of a little sister; the arrival of a pet), another student mentioned that the main sensation experienced when reading this text was “cozy.” One student wrote that the story evoked the feeling of “the beauty of autumn and mystery and joy around the birth of a child.”

When asked whether they could relate to the story and/or identify with the narrator, one student mentioned that they could relate to the descriptions of this season because they were born and grew up in a Northern European country and their memories of autumn in that

---

13 See Appendix 2 Post-reading questionnaires 1 and 2.
14 When prompted to provide translations for some of the key words of the text (Post-reading Questionnaire 2, Task 3), all participants were able to recall the forms and meanings of at least eight words out of ten. When asked to freely recall the words they learnt from the text (Task 1), learners were able to write down an average of seven words. While there were some misspellings (e.g., сладость, грязь, соковырода), most of the words were recalled correctly.
15 The cultural gains mentioned by the students consisted mainly in having discovered some of the associations Russians have with autumn. One participant also mentioned that they were not aware that Russians enjoyed picnics just like Australians, and another pointed out that they did not know school in Russia started on September 1. Another learner was not familiar with the concept of sludge (слюда) and was quite surprised to discover it. Three participants additionally mentioned having learnt that fathers were not allowed into maternity hospitals in Russia at that time.
country were “very similar to the ones Russians feel about autumn.” Another student mentioned that they could relate to this literary text “to the degree there are similarities to Australia” and personally enjoyed autumn too. One participant pointed out that while they could not relate to the narrator, they could relate to the idea that “sometimes one event can make someone love or hate something.” Another student confessed that although they had never experienced the birth of a child or autumn in Russia, they could relate to:

[T]he sense of wonder and awe that he experiences, and the way that emotion changes his outlook. That is to say, while reading the text, I felt as if I could relate to him, despite the fact that I have not experienced these things myself.

In addition to the altercentric and egocentric F-emotions described above, several participants also exhibited the rise of some A-emotions in reading this text. One participant recalled:

[T]he description of the yellow leaves covering the ground of the yard and the description of the sky that was only just a bit lighter than the colour of the sludge.

Two other students referred to the poetic descriptions of the autumn landscape in the initial parts of the text. The exact wording of one of these responses is as follows:

I liked the bit about the grounds being covered in leaves. I particularly liked the way the words were ordered so that the words ‘covered’ and ‘grounds’ surrounded the instrumental phrase about the leaves. I think this is quite elegant word order, and something we cannot control so easily in English.

In contrast, none of the students reported to have experienced self-modifying feelings while or after reading this short story. However, one pointed out that the reading induced reflection “on the way Russians perceive autumn.” The student also shared the following considerations:
This short story made me realize how little I know about Russian culture and the Russian way of life. It made me want to read more and understand more about everyday Russian life. The story paints an idyllic picture of everyday life, which is attractive, and makes me want to know more.

Overall, the collected data suggested that students’ emotional engagement with the target text was significant. Moreover, students expressed their general enthusiasm about the class session in which they took part and about what they were able to learn from it. One of the participants even chose this reading as the topic of their oral Russian language examination at the end of the semester.

6. Implications of the study
Although the goal of the above-described class session, its small scale, volunteer nature,16 and the absence of controlled research methods, do not allow the generalization of its findings, it seems that the designed didactic interventions were effective in assisting students to emotionally engage with the text. The collected data confirmed the hypotheses advanced earlier regarding both the emotional potential of the selected text and the design of classroom activities targeted at fostering an affective response in readers. The results of the study suggest that, despite the reduced length of the text, the presence of unfamiliar vocabulary and culture-specific references, and the learners’ limited reading skills, they were able to experience a range of literary emotions. This speaks to the possibility of promoting the appearance of different types of literary emotions in non-fluent readers of literature by means of targeted didactic interventions. As described earlier, these didactic interventions should concern both the selection of literary texts and the design of classroom activities. The systematic analysis of the emotional potential of a literary text should become part of the language educator’s classroom preparation routine, just like the traditional assessment of the text’s linguistic and cultural accessibility. This classroom preparation routine should also arguably include the development of specific activities for the pre-reading, during-

16 As pointed out by Blech (2007): “volunteer students are likely to be interested in the subject matter before volunteering, thereby not giving a clear representation of what role initial interest may play in the results” (p. 121).
reading, and post-reading phases, aimed at fostering different types of literary emotions.

Another implication of the study concerns the possible benefit of the proposed teaching approach for the retention of vocabulary and development of culture-specific knowledge. Despite the limitations described in the previous section, the collected data suggest the effectiveness of the developed class session not only in fostering emotional engagement with a literary text but also in promoting language learning. This finding draws attention to the close interrelation and essential inseparability of cognition and emotion in learning, and, more specifically, language learning, and calls for more research in this growing area.

More generally, the results of the study foreground the enormous didactic potential of literature in language education in terms of engaging student emotions. From this perspective and in Shanahan’s (1997) words, literature represents a real “affective magnet” that can attract students to the exploration of a new language and culture. It seems that the particular focus on emotion in reading proposed in the present study can further assist language educators in developing effective and engaging activities for both language-literature and regular language lessons based on literary texts.

The final pedagogical implication of the study relates to the methods of research data collection. In the current study, data on learners’ emotional engagement with the text was collected by means of a brief post-reading questionnaire that probed the emergence of narrative, aesthetic, and self-modifying emotions. While the collected data generally showed the suitability and efficacy of this method, it was also felt that a greater number of more nuanced questions would have increased the volume and quality of the collected data. Thus, the researcher expanded the questionnaire with additional questions within each group of emotions as identified in the taxonomy.17 The questionnaire draws on questionnaires of emotions in native literary reading that were proposed by Koopman (2015), and Miall and Kuiken (1995). Although tentative and preliminary in nature, the questionnaire represents an additional resource for FL pedagogy and FL literary reading research. It should be, however, noted that, given that each literary text will be unique both in its content and form, the wording and number of questions composing the questionnaire

17 See Appendix 3.
will need to be adapted to accommodate the specificities of each text and teaching/research context.

In pedagogical practice, adapted versions of the Questionnaire can be used both to investigate students’ emotional engagement with the text in the post-reading phase, and as a guide for the development of during-reading questions. Moreover, some questions in the questionnaire can be used as prompts to stimulate student responses in reading logs and response journals based on literary texts.

7. Limitations of the study
In addition to the limitations of the study identified in the previous section, a further caveat should be made regarding the amenability of the proposed approach to different kinds of literary texts. While all literary texts are generally thought to be conducive to emotional responses, some genres appear to aim at and rely on this response more than others. This is the case, for instance, for some first-person memoirs like those by Grishkovets, lyric poetry, adventure and romance writings. It follows then that these texts are particularly appropriate for considering the affective responses in readers both as a major component of a reader’s “comprehension” of the text and as one of the means to achieve the latter. It is thus expected that the proposed pedagogical approach may be partly or fully resistant to those literary texts or text types that are less reliant on evoking an emotional response in readers. Examples of such texts may be found in parodistic and satiric literature, speculative fiction, and narrative poetry, among others.

8. Conclusion
The goal of this article has been to conceptualize affective processes in reading literature in a foreign language. The proposed taxonomy of emotions in FL literary reading has been generated on the basis of an extensive literature review that has brought together research coming from literature theory, the empirical study of literature, second-language reading and educational psychology. From a theoretical perspective, this taxonomy represents an attempt to conceptualize the different types of emotions involved in the complex act of reading literature in a foreign language, while the pedagogical function of this construct consists in providing language educators with a nuanced and pedagogically informative view of emotions in FL literary reading. The results of a small-scale exploratory study among
Russian FL learners at an Australian university suggest that the proposed taxonomy could assist language educators in both selecting literary texts and designing classroom activities to engage learners’ emotions, especially when it comes to first-person memoirs, lyric poetry, and other genres that rely on the reader’s emotional response in a particular way. A further contribution of the article consists in offering the field a preliminary Questionnaire of Emotions in FL Literary Reading that can serve both for data collection and for the development of classroom activities.
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Appendix 1. Pre-reading Activities

Pre-reading activity 1
You are about to read a short story by a popular living Russian writer and playwright, Evgenii Grishkovets [Евгений Валерьевич Гришковец]. Have you ever heard of this Russian author?

Evgenii Grishkovets was born in Kemerovo, Western Siberia, in 1967. In 1998 he moved to Kaliningrad. The same year he released his first play, “How I ate a dog”, which brought him national fame and was followed by other ten plays, three novels, two novellas [повести] and several short story collections. Grishkovets is also a stage director and an actor in his plays. In his works, Grishkovets uses plain colloquial Russian language and narrates about simple everyday life experiences many Russian readers can easily relate to.

Pre-reading activity 2
The short story you are about to read is entitled Встреча с осенью. This short story is autobiographical. Based on what you have learnt about Evgenii Grishkovets, your knowledge of the genre of autobiography and the title of the short story, what do you think this text might be about?

---

18 Images referred to in this material were provided for class use only and have not been included in the article for copyright reasons.
What do you think the writer will describe in this text? **Formulate several hypotheses in Russian.**

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

**Pre-reading activity 3**
The representation of autumn and the emotional states linked to this season is a recurrent topos in Russian literature. By reading this text you will discover how many Russians experience and perceive autumn today. Try thinking of five most common associations with this season in your country/culture. List these words in Russian. Now let’s have a look at some of the most common associations Russians have with autumn.

**Pre-reading activity 4 (word-image matching)**

ОСЕНЬ В РОССИИ – АССОЦИАЦИИ

1 СЛАЙКОТЬ  [Image 1]
2 ЖЁЛТЫЕ ЛИСТЬЯ  [Image 2]
3 ШАШЛЫКИ НА ПРИРОДЕ [Image 3]
4 СОБИРАТЬ ГРИБЫ  [Image 4]
5 ПЕРВОЕ СЕНТЯБРЯ¹⁹  [Image 5]

¹⁹ This picture showed school children with flower bouquets during the traditional September 1 škol’naia lineika.
Pre-reading activity 5
To feel the atmosphere of Russian autumn, we will now watch a brief extract from a famous Russian film *Moscow does not believe in tears* [Москва слезам не верит, 1979]. While watching the video, try to identify some of the vocabulary discussed earlier.

[Image of the opening scene]

[After watching the extract]
Which words of those discussed earlier did you manage to identify? What image of autumn did the film-director want to convey? Going back to the portrayed scene in your mind, what colours do you visualize? Name them in Russian. Did this extract evoke any feelings in you? If yes, which? Try to name them in Russian.

Appendix 2. Post-reading Questions

Post-reading questionnaire 1
Please answer the following questions in English.

1. What important event in the narrator’s life happened in autumn?

2. What did the narrator see and understand on the day of that important event?

---

20 This picture showed a person with visible flu symptoms.

21 This picture showed a person in a sad emotional state.
Appendix 3

Questionnaire of Emotions in Foreign-Language Literary Reading
Эмоции читателя при чтении художественной литературы на иностранном языке. Анкета

Table 1: Questionnaire of Emotions in FL Literary Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative emotions</th>
<th>What kind of feeling do you have after reading this text?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Какое чувство (какие чувства) вы испытываете после прочтения этого текста?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How did this story make you feel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Какие чувства у вас вызвала эта история?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did you like this text? Why/why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Вам понравился этот текст? Почему / почему нет?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did you enjoy reading this text? Why/why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Вам понравилось читать этот текст? Почему / почему нет?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did this text evoke any feelings in you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Вызвал ли этот текст у вас какие-либо эмоции?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What feeling/s do/es best define your emotional state while reading the text (e.g., pleasure, frustration, satisfaction, enjoyment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Что вы чувствовали, когда читали этот текст? (например, удовольствие, раздражение, удовлетворённость, радость)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative/Fiction emotions</td>
<td>Did you, at any point in your reading, feel absorbed in the story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Самые сильные эмоции</td>
<td>Чувствовали ли вы в какой-либо момент чтения полное погружение в сюжет?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did you feel involved in the events of the story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Было ли у вас чувство вовлечённости в описываемые события?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were you, at any point of your reading, able to see the narrated events vividly in front of you? When?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Могли ли вы видеть описываемые события перед глазами? Какие именно?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the story’s world, at any point of your reading, feel closer to you than the world around you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Были ли вы так вовлечены в описываемые события, что в какой-то момент они казались вам ближе, чем мир вокруг вас?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How would you define the general mood of the text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Как бы вы описали общее настроение рассказа?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did this text touch you in any way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Тронул ли вас этот текст?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What emotional responses do you have to the characters? To the setting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Какие чувства у вас вызывают (вызывают) персонаж (персонажи) рассказа/описываемые события?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did you sympathize with the character/any of the characters?
Вызвал(и) ли персонаж (персонажи) у вас сочувствие?

Did you find the narrator an interesting person? Why?
Показался ли вам рассказчик интересным человеком? Почему?

What did you feel towards the narrator?
Какие чувства у вас вызвал рассказчик?

Can you relate to the narrator’s/character’s feelings?
Близки ли вам чувства рассказчика/персонажа?

Can you relate to the events narrated in this text?
Близки ли вам события, описываемые в тексте?

Can you identify with the narrator/characters? If yes, in which way?
Близок ли вам рассказчик/кто-то из персонажей? Если да, то в каком плане?

Did you feel the same emotions as the narrator/character?
Доводилось ли вам испытывать эмоции рассказчика/персонажа?

Were you, at any point of the reading, able to imagine yourself in the narrator’s/character’s shoes?
Могли ли вы почувствовать себя на месте рассказчика/персонажа? В какой момент?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetic/Artefact emotions</th>
<th>Were there any descriptions or phrasings in this text that you found aesthetically pleasing/original/striking?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Эстетические эмоции</td>
<td>Были ли в этом тексте какие-то фразы/выражения/описания, которые показались вам красивыми/оригинальными/яркими?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you happen to re-read a particular phrasing that you found pleasing/original/striking?

Была ли в тексте какая-то фраза, которая показалась вам красивой/оригинальной/яркой и вы решили её перечитать?

Did you, at any point of the text, slow down your reading to savor an aesthetically pleasing phrase or a beautifully put thought?

Останавливались ли вы при чтении текста - возможно, чтобы насладиться красивой фразой или красиво выраженной мыслью? Когда?

Can you remember any wordstring(s) or phrase(s) from the text that you found striking?

Запомнились ли вам какие-нибудь яркие фразы/выражения из текста?

How did you find the style of the text (e.g., interesting, beautiful, captivating, powerful, original)?

Как бы вы определили стиль текста? (например, интересный, захватывающий, запоминающийся, необычный)?
| Self-modifying emotions | Did this literary text make you reflect on any particular topic/issue?  
| Трансформирующие эмоции | Заставил ли вас этот текст задуматься о какой-то проблеме? |
| | Did this literary text change something in you?  
| | Изменил ли этот текст что-то в вас? |
| | Did this text help you to understand something new about the lives of people that differ from yours?  
| | Помог ли вам этот текст понять что-то новое о жизни других людей? |
| | Did this text give you insights into your own world?  
| | Помог ли вам этот текст понять что-то новое о себе? |
| | Did this text make you look at an event, fact, place, person or group of people with new eyes?  
| | Заставил ли вас этот текст по-новому взглянуть на какое-то событие, факт, место, человека или группу людей? |
| | Did this text evoke in you any new feelings towards a place, event, person or a group of people?  
| | Заставил ли вас этот текст испытать новые эмоции по отношению к такому-то месту, событию, человеку или группе людей? |
| | Did this literary text reveal something new to you about the human condition?  
| | Узнали ли вы благодаря этому тексту что-то новое о жизни людей? |
| | Do you continue to ponder this story after having finished reading it?  
<p>| | Продолжаете ли вы думать об этом тексте после прочтения? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement emotions</th>
<th>What feelings did you experience after reading the text in Russian? – (e.g., sense of accomplishment, frustration, pride, joy, discouragement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Учебные эмоции</td>
<td>Какие чувства вы испытали после прочтения этого текста на русском языке (например, чувство удовлетворения, раздражение, гордость, радость, недовольство)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What feelings did you experience while reading it in Russian? – (e.g., anxiety, interest, joy, irritation, boredom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Какие чувства вы испытывали во время чтения этого текста на русском языке (например, тревога, интерес, радость, раздражение, скука)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was this text too difficult for you to enjoy it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Был ли этот текст слишком сложен для вас и в результате вы не почувствовали удовольствия от чтения?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did you learn something new about the Russian life, society and culture while reading this text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Узнали ли вы из этого текста что-то новое о русской культуре, российском обществе и жизни в России?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did you learn any new vocabulary while reading this text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Узнали ли вы из этого текста какие-то новые слова?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were you able to understand the story line?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Смогли ли вы понять сюжет рассказа?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were you able to appreciate the language and style of the text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Получили ли вы удовольствие от того, как написан этот текст?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are you happy that you read this text in Russian?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Довольны ли вы тем, что прочли этот текст по-русски?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A Corpus-based Analysis of **vvodnye slova:**
Pedagogical Applications

JOAN F. CHEVALIER

1. Introduction

*Vvodnye slova,* “introductory words,” (henceforth VS) commonly known as parentheticals in English, are a linguistic category that has received little attention until recently. There are several reasons why this category has remained on the periphery. The generally accepted definition of VS is quite broad, resulting in a considerable lack of consensus about which words and expressions are VS. In fact, no two lists of VS, even from authoritative linguistic sources, are the same. Pedagogical materials produced for Russian language as a L2 typically lack any discussion of VS as a category. Textbooks that do include VS introduce them as connectors without explanation of their larger discourse functions. The central questions posed by this study is whether VS should be included in Russian language curricula, if so why, and which ones. Based on the evidence presented below, this study will argue that VS are important for text comprehension and for the development of written expression, especially for those seeking to reach higher levels of proficiency.

Although a number of labels have been used to describe words and phrases function as VS, including, discourse markers, pragmatic markers, and parentheticals, the Russian term *vvodnye slova* has been retained throughout the paper. As will be discussed below, although some VS can function as discourse markers and, in some cases, as pragmatic markers, both of categories, have “fuzzy” often overlapping definitions that are broader than the established lists of *vvodnye slova.* This paper focuses specifically on the category defined in the Russian linguistic tradition as VS in an effort to clarify the use and frequency of these expressions.

The study begins with a description of the linguistic characteristics of VS, summarizing recent efforts to characterize and classify them. The second half of the paper presents the results of a quantitative analysis of data from the Russian National Corpus, pertaining to the frequency
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of vvodnye slova and specific VS types in discourse. The purpose of this corpus-based inquiry is to establish which types of VS are used most frequently in Russian discourse. Based on this data recommendations are made about which VS should be included in L2 instruction and when. The data about which forms are used more frequently can inform curriculum designers about which VS forms would be most useful to learners.

2. Parentheticals and Vvodnye slova: Definitions and Types
Parentheticals are a “motley crew” (Dehé & Kavalova, 2007, p. 1); a heterogenous linguistic category that can take a variety of forms including but not limited to: sentences, adverbs, sentential adverbs, reporting verbs, comment clauses, nominal appositions, nonrestrictive relative clauses, question tags, prepositional phrases, noun phrases, interjections, adjectival and adverbial phrases, and clauses both with and without connectors (Kaltenböck, 2007). They can occur in spoken utterances and written text. As interest in this elusive category has grown in recent years, so too have the array of monikers applied to them, including: Extra Clausal Constituents (Dik, 1997), non-clausal units (Biber, 1999), supplements (Huddleston & Pullum (2002), and theticals (Kaltenböck et al., 2016; Heine et al., 2013), to name a few. All of these various approaches agree on two central defining facts about parentheticals: 1) that they are syntactically independent – they are syntactically “disjunct” from the host clause (Kaltenböck et al., 2016, 4; Burton-Roberts et al. 2006; Dehé & Kavalova 2007), but 2) their meaning is derived from the context in which they appear (Kaltenböck et al. 2016, p. 10). As Sonnenhauser (2020) observes, parentheticals are “linearly embedded in, or ‘hosted’ by, another syntactic sequence without being structurally anchored to it.” The syntactic independence of parentheticals has been established in generative literature by means of linguistic tests demonstrating that parentheticals are not part of the constituent structure of their host. The tests (sentences 1a-d below) show that parentheticals cannot be the focus of a cleft sentence, that they can be omitted without affecting the grammaticality of the sentences, and that they are syntactically outside of the scope of negative operators in the host clause (Kaltenböck et al., 2016, p. 4-5). These properties are demonstrated by use of the English adverb frankly in the examples below (1a-d).
1) *Frankly, those reasons are not good enough.*
   a. *It is **frankly** that those reasons are not good enough.*
       [no focus of *it*-cleft]

   b. How is that? *Frankly.*
       [no questioning]

   c. Those reasons are not good enough.
       [omissibility]

   d. **Frankly,** those reasons are good enough.
       [unaffected by negation of the host]

Examples taken from Kaltenböck et al., (2016, p. 4-5).

Studies of parentheticals in spoken discourse have pointed out that their syntactic independence is also signaled prosodically; they are often set apart by “comma” intonation – pauses – as well as shifts in pitch (Crystal, 1969; Dehé & Kavalova, 2007). Kaltenböck et al. (2016), however, show that parentheticals do not in fact display homogenous prosodic features. Likewise, Grenoble (2004, p. 1954) argues that a large number of parentheticals in written discourse are not separated by commas.

Semantically as well as syntactically, parentheticals are best described negatively – by what they are not (Kaltenböck, 2016; Kaltenböck, 2007). They are semantically unrestrictive (Huddleston & Pullum 2002; Kaltenböck et al., 2016). The meaning of parentheticals is “related to but not part of the main message” (Biber 1999). In example 1c above, we see that the parenthetical *frankly* can be omitted “without affecting the rest of that structure or its meaning” (Biber, 1999, p. 1067). Although parentheticals are semantically disjunct from the main discourse, they make vital contributions to the semantics of the utterance. They serve a metacommunicative function, commenting about the text in particular ways (Grenoble, 2004). The speaker can use them to express their subjective evaluations of the context, conveying their personal feelings, opinions or attitude about the host text. They can also supply supplementary or background information about the context and refer to the source of the information (Grenoble, 2004). As Urmson explains,
parentheticals provide “stage-directions” for the interlocutor, to “prime the hearer to see the emotional significance, the logical relevance, and the reliability of the statement” (1952, p. 484).

Semantically, parentheticals can be divided into two basic types: those that have a “conceptual meaning” and those that have “procedural meaning” (Grenoble, 2004, p. 1955). Parentheticals with conceptual meaning affect the truth conditions of the utterance and are a component of its propositional content. Procedural parentheticals do not affect the truth conditions of an utterance; they “carry information about how conceptual meaning is to be processed” (Grenoble, p. 1955). The original distinction between procedural and conceptual meaning was developed by Grice (1989), who provided sentence 1 below as an example of procedural meaning. In example 1, the phrase “on the other hand” does not affect the truth content of the sentence and therefore does not have conceptual meaning. In sentence 2, the parenthetical phrase enclosed in parentheses adds essential information about the subject of the sentence. The omission of the parenthetical clause in sentence 2 changes the propositional content of the sentence. The omission of “on the other hand” in sentence 1, however, does not affect propositional content.

1) My brother-in-law lives on a peak in Darien; his great aunt, on the other hand, was a nurse in World War I. (Grice 1989, p. 362; qtd in Grenoble, 2004, p. 1955)

2) The library (the six-storied building on Main Street) is open twenty-four hours a day.

This study focuses exclusively on procedural parentheticals in Russian, referred to in the Russian grammatical tradition as vvodnye slova, “introductory phrases.” The commonly accepted English translation for the term vvodnye slova is “parentheticals.” Although this translation is not incorrect, it can be misleading since in English the term “parenthetical” refers both to procedural and conceptual parentheticals. This paper focus specifically on VS, that is procedural parentheticals that are identified in the Russian grammatical tradition as vvodnye slova.

The Russian examples below (sentences 3 to 9) provide examples of the diversity of forms that can be used as parentheticals and the wide
range of meanings they can express. For example, in examples 3 and 4 below, the prepositional phrases к сожалению “unfortunately,” and к счастью, “fortunately,” express the speaker’s attitude about context conveyed in the text. In example 5 the speaker uses the verb кажется, “[it] seems,” to express some doubt about the authenticity of statement. The phrase честно говоря, “frankly speaking,” in example 6 indicates that the speaker believes he is being candid and confiding in the listener. In 7, the epistemic adverb очевидно, “evidently,” indicates that the information is not based on fact, but rather on supposition. In example 8 the speaker is addressing the interlocutor directly using the verb phrase поверишь ли, “if [you] can believe [it],” in an attempt to dispel any doubt about the veracity of events described. The adverbs во-первых, “firstly,” во-вторых, “secondly” and во-третьих, “thirdly,” are used in example 9 to order the descriptive adjectives and to provide a semantic link between them. In all of the examples below, the parentheticals contribute meaning critical to communication as a whole, and, more specifically, to the interpretation of the context even though they are not part of the “main message” of the host sentence.

3) К сожалению, не ездила. Но очень хочется.1

4) Но действительность, к счастью, сложней и интересней любой самой убедительной схемы.

5) По специальности он, кажется, не работал ни дня.

6) Я, честно говоря, не уверен, что сейчас все это происходит не во сне.

7) Те же результаты, очевидно, может дать и массовый социологический опрос.

8) Поверишь ли, бабушка, весь народ на ярмарке в пляс пустился.

1 All Russian examples are from the Russian National Corpus unless otherwise noted.
9) Это зрелище, во-первых, экзотическое, во-вторых, красивое, а, в-третьих, познавательно.

Morphologically, VS are a diverse group. VS can take the form of single lexical items: nouns (правда, словом), adjectives (главное), adverbs (вероятно, несомненно, кстати) and verbs (знаешь/знаете). Multi-word VS are morphologically quite diverse ranging from prepositional phrases (к счастью, в общем, между прочим), noun phrases (главное дело, иньими словами), and verb phrases (скажу тебе, видишь ты, бог даст, иначе говоря, как мне кажется). Verbal VS are a heterogeneous group comprised of finite verb forms (знаешь, видишь) and verb phrases with verbal adverbs or infinitives: собственно говоря, коротко говоря, так сказать, стало быть. Although most VS are fixed phrases (одним словом, словом), some are semi-fixed, containing an inflected form (на чей-либо взгляд). A small number of VS are morphologically and lexically unique; they only function as VS (впрочем, итак, следовательно) (Valgina et al., 2002). Many lexical items that appear as VS also have a non-VS use. Sentences 10-11 show examples of word forms that have both VS use and non-VS use. The A sentences illustrate parenthetical use of VS (VS are bolded). In the B sentences these same words are not parenthetical; they function syntactically and semantically as full sentential constituents.

10A) Вообще, хотелось бы знать что произошло.

10B) Он вообще выглядело чудаком.

11A) Казалось, он был не рад.

11B) Небо казалось тяжёлым.

It should be pointed out that despite the moniker vvodnye slova, “introductory words,” VS can occur in any position within a sentence. Although as a rule VS are more frequent in sentence initial position, each VS has particular distribution patterns. For example, sentences 12-14 below show the distribution patterns of the VS, откровенно говоря, “frankly speaking.” Data from the Russian National Corpus (RNC) establish that of the three positions exemplified below, откровенно
говоря most frequently appears in sentence initial position and is least likely to appear in sentence final position.

12) Откровенно говоря, я даже не слишком удивился.

13) Раньше это был, откровенно говоря, приговор.

14) Красавица, откровенно говоря.

Many vvodnye slova have become formulaic fixed phrases. These formulaic phrases have undergone a process of grammaticalization whereby the semantic link to constituent lexicon is weakened (Brinton, 1996, 2008; Traugott, 2010). As semantic bleaching progresses, some VS and other similarly grammaticalized connectors become formulaic and take on expanded discourse functions such as, topics shift markers, focus markers, hesitation markers, and so on. The process of grammaticalization can produce slova parazity, “parasite words” that seem to have little or no semantic value and are used with a high degree of frequency in speech. Contrary to popular perception, these “parasite words” are not semantically empty. As a growing body of research has established, these widely used phrases can take on highly nuanced pragmatic functions within spoken discourse (Bogdanova-Beglarian, 2021; Birzer, 2012).²

The Russian grammatical tradition, beginning with Vinogradov (2021 [1947]; Vinogradov, 1960), divides the linguistic category of parentheticals into two classes: vvodnye slova, “introductory words,” and vstawnye slova, “inserted words,” defined primarily in terms of their function. As Sonnenhauser (2020) points out, the understanding of vodnost’, “parentheticality,” in the Russian grammatical tradition is rooted in function and is not an “inherent grammatical feature.” In the 1960 Academy Grammar Vinogradov defines vvodnye slova as words and phrases that are syntactically independent from the host and serve a metacommunicative or discoursive function. A speaker or writer uses vvodnye slova to express opinions or evaluations of the utterance or

² For examples see Khachaturyan’s (2010) analysis of the meanings of tak skazat’ and Kolyaseva’s (2018, 2022) discussions about the discourse functions of tipa.
context, to identify the source of the information, and to organize the text. Vinogradov identifies VS as “modal” – they express the writer’s or speaker’s point of view. VS give clues to the interlocutor as to how to interpret the utterance or text (Valgina et al., 2002). They can also serve a pragmatic function, expressing the speaker’s subjective evaluation of the context in which they appear. Grenoble (2004) also points out that the semantics of vvodnye slova are derived not from their lexical meaning, but rather from “their pragmatic interpretation through a formulaic usage, a kind of codification or normalization” of their non-restrictive semantics (p. 1959). Grenoble’s assertion that VS are best defined by function rather than morphological form is confirmed by the lack of consensus among grammarians about what words and word strings are VS. “Comprehensive” lists of VS vary a great deal in content. The functional discoursive functions of VS are discussed in more detail in section 3 below.

Vstavnye slova, unlike vvodnye slova, are not codified and can occur in an “infinite number of possible phrases and clauses” (Grenoble 2004, 1957). Vstavnye slova are described in the Academy Grammar as “insertions in the sentence of a variety of additional information, side commentaries, and so on” (p. 165). As Grenoble (2004) points out, vstavnye slova have conceptual meaning; they affect the truth conditions of the utterance contributing to its propositional content. In written texts they are typically enclosed in parentheses or dashes unlike VS, which are usually marked by commas. Like parenthetical comments in English, vstavnye slova can occur in infinite combinations of words and phrases. Unlike vvodnye slova, vstavnye slova are not formulaic; their meaning is derived directly from the lexical semantics of the constituent words, but they also have a metatextual function. For example, the parenthetical phrases in 15 and 16, separated from the rest of the sentences by parentheses in 15 and by dashes in 16, augment the meaning of the matrix sentence in a fundamental way. These two examples demonstrate the inherent lexical flexibility and heterogeneity of vstavnye slova.

15) Солдаты (их было трое) ели, не обращая внимания не Пьера. (L. N. Tolstoy, War and Peace, as cited in Vinogradov, 1960, II, p. 167)
16) Она встала и, прикрывая - он был на протезе - подошёл к окну. (Kaverin, Two Captains, as cited in Vinogradov, 1960, II, 166)

The category of vstavnye slova is omitted from more recent Russian grammars and pedagogical materials. As Sonnenhausen points out (2020), this trend indicates an “increasing convergence with the general linguistic tradition in more recent descriptions.” Vstavnye slova have come to be understood as parentheticals in a general linguistic sense (see above description) and after 1960 are not described in Academy Russian language grammars.

VS are typically categorized into eight semantic groups, described and exemplified below (Vingradov, 1960). The semantic categorization presented below is used in this study to analyze the corpus data.

I) Express emotional assessment or reaction to the context:

16) К сожалению, в Англии или США не была.

17) Когда он подплыл ближе, я заметил, к удивлению, плывшего перед лодкой лебедя.

II) Modal meanings: Express certainty or uncertainty about the context:

18) Очевидно, так оно и было.

19) Мне, несомненно, повезло с третьим браком

III) Provide information about the source of the information:

20) Страна, по-моему, уже может позволить себе идти на такие реформы.

21) С точки зрения безопасности будет лучше, если это уменьшение будет минимально.
IV) Are used to structure and sequence information, indicating the relationships between elements of the utterance:

22) Он долго ждал, он терпел и, наконец, его прорвало.

23) Это с одной стороны плохо, а с другой хорошо.

V) Are used to express the relationship of the speaker to the utterance itself, or to the manner of the utterance, signaling a shift in style of speech:

24) Иными словами, глупо тратить жизнь, расходуясь на негатив, когда можно наслаждаться позитивом.

25) Короче говоря, он работал, работал и умер.

VI) Used to enhance the expressive nature of the utterance:

26) Честно говоря, я не совсем понимаю, зачем это.

27) Глупый человек, между нами говоря.

VII) Are used to attract the attention of the interlocutor/reader:

28) Всё может измениться, поверьте.

29) Понимаете, в чём дело: Путина окружают разные люди.

VIII) Assert the frequency of an event:

30) Как правило, открыты они с 12 до 2 часа.

31) Бывало, Андрюша заходил к нам после занятий.

In many ways these eight semantic groups determine how VS function in discourse.
3. Vvodnye slova in Discourse

*Vvodnye slova* are best defined functionally – by the ways they are used by the writer or speaker to interact with speakers and readers. The functions of VS are best captured by the term “metadiscourse,” a term widely used in applied linguistic research examining English academic written discourse (Hyland, 1996; 2005; Hyland & Jiang, 2020). Writing and speaking are fundamentally interactive; an author or speaker uses elements of metadiscourse to establish a relationship with the readers and listeners. Metadiscoursive elements establish the interactional meaning of a text. This interaction can take a variety of lexical, morphological, and semantic forms from direct appeals directed at readers, often in the form of imperatives, to adverbs expressing emotion and prepositional phrases used to structure the text. The common thread holding together the diverse sets of meanings conveyed by metadiscourse is that they communicate meaning outside of the propositional context of the text. As Hyland (2005) points out, metadiscourse has more of a rhetorical and pragmatic function than a primarily semantic one. Writers use it to position themselves in reference to the text and its message and to “shape and construct a text that meets the needs of particular readers” (p. 49).

Discussions of parentheticals often use the terms discourse marker and pragmatic marker to describe many of the functions that VS assume in discourse. There is, however, an on-going terminological debate about these two difficult to define categories. As Jucker and Ziv (1998) point out, there is no “generally agreed upon definition of the term “discourse marker’” (p. 1). A variety of terms have been used to describe elements that can take the form of procedural parentheticals, these include discourse marker (Shiffrin, 1987), pragmatic marker (Fraser, 1990, 1996; Brinton, 1996), discourse particle (Abraham, 1991), and connective (Blakemore, 2009). For the purposes of this study, I have adopted the definition of procedural parentheticals (VS) provided by Grenoble (2004). According to Grenoble, VS are discourse markers which have a “metacommunicative” function (p. 1968). They signal shifts in the discourse from propositional content to authorial comment, expressing the speaker’s or writer’s attitude towards what is said or written. All of the basic meanings of VS can be described as discoursive in that they are by definition parenthetical, and by the fact that authors use them for two main purposes: 1) to
express their relationship to the propositional content of the text, and 2) to organize the text. Authors use VS semantic types I and II (above) to express attitudes towards or evaluation of the text. Type I VS (examples 16, 17) are used to signal the author's emotional response to text. Type II VS with modal meanings (examples 18, 19) “highlight the subjectivity of a position,” signaling “the writer's decision to recognize alternative voices and viewpoints” and “withhold the writer’s commitment to the proposition” (Hyland 2005, p. 52). For example, in sentence 32 the author uses the adverb возможно parenthetically to signal uncertainty about the facts presented.

32) На территории КНДР, возможно, произошли два взрыва.

VS semantic types VI and VII elevate the expressive nature of the text by issuing direct appeals to readers. For example, in sentence 27 VS между нами говоря, the prepositional phrase with the first-person pronominal complement, attracts the attention of the reader by addressing him/her directly. With Type VII VS, typically 2nd person imperatives, the author issues a direct appeal to the readers (examples 28 and 29). All of these VS are “interactional”: the author uses them to comment on the propositional content, conveying his/her reaction to the text (Hyland, 2005, p. 171).

The second main discourse function of VS is to “manage the flow of information” (Hyland, 2005, p. 169-171). VS Groups IV and V (above) are used primarily to structure the informational content of texts. VS from group IV, such as: во-первых, во-вторых are used to organize argument structure, signaling the introduction of individual elements of argumentation. Group IV VS, such as итак, следовательно, наконец, таким образом, are used to establish transitions between the information presented, establishing relationships between parts of the text. They are used to structure arguments and to provide cohesion to the text.

Contemporary models of text comprehension (both L1 and L2) posit that text comprehension is a complex process whereby readers create mental representations of text (Kintsch, 2012). In order to produce a mental representation, readers must establish coherence
relations between chunks of text. The term “coherence” refers to the “ways in which the various parts of what a text says is linked together” (Bailin & Grafstein, 2016, p. 131). VS and other connectors provide cues about how texts are organized. These linkers lend text coherence by conveying underlying semantic relationships between parts of a text, setting up logical relationships such as sequence, relative importance of text elements, and exemplification. There is a substantial body of research indicating that connectives play a critical role in discourse comprehension enabling both L1 and L2 readers to establish coherence within a text. A number of studies investigating text comprehension in L1 and L2 learners indicate that connectors (including rhetorical organizers like VS) foster faster processing times and more coherent mental representations of written texts. Kintsch and Yarbrough’s (1982) study of L1 English-speaking university students found that textual organizers improved subjects’ ability to comprehend the rhetorical structure of texts. Cain and Nash’s 2011 study of 8–10-year-old L1 English readers provided evidence that connectives aid text processing in “typically developing” L1 readers. They found that the presence of connectors in text enhanced reading speeds. Silfhout et al.’s 2014 study of Dutch L1 learners found that the presence of textual coherence makers improved comprehension and processing time across genres. Mills and Just (1994) found that the use of connectives to connect two clauses in written texts improved text comprehension in the second clause. In Degand & Sander’s (2002) study of L1 French students learning Dutch and L1 Dutch speakers learning French, text connectors improved text comprehension in both L1 and L2 learners. Although equivalent comprehension studies of L1 and L2 learners of Russian have yet to be done, there is substantial cross linguistic evidence about the importance of connectors, including procedural parentheticals, for the comprehension of written discourse. VS are an important category of text connector providing critical cues about rhetorical structure, the sequence of text elements, and authorial attitudes towards propositional content. Learners who fail to identify VS are less likely to be able to identify supporting elements of argumentation, and they are more likely to misunderstand authorial intent and to misconstrue the text’s message. Given the important role they play in discourse, VS should be included in L2 curricula.
4. Vvodnye slova in L2 Russian Pedagogy: Why

Given the fact that vvodnye slova typically contribute meaning that is typically outside of propositional content, one could simply deem them peripheral and exclude them from L2 pedagogy. Russian language L2 pedagogical texts as a rule do not discuss vvodnye slova as a category, but rather introduce them as individual word combinations – as useful gambits that can be used in speech and writing. Given the lexical and semantic heterogeneity of VS and the challenge of making generalizations about them, it is not surprising that designers of L2 pedagogical materials neglect them.

There are a number of compelling arguments for the inclusion of the category of VS as a category in L2 curricula. First and foremost is the critical role that procedural parentheticals functioning as comment clauses to facilitate text cohesion and to improve text comprehension and reading speed. Procedural parentheticals are generally omitted from most Russian language pedagogical material. When they are included, they are typically presented in the form of lists as expressions to be memorized.3 The problem with limiting L2 learners’ exposure to VS and other comment clauses to vocabulary lists for rote memorization is that this approach ignores the important systemic role they play as text and rhetorical organizers.

There is another perhaps more basic argument to be made for including VS in L2 curricula. L2 learners can draw direct parallels to procedural parentheticals in their L1. While the meaning of VS type connectives from L1 to L2 may not completely overlap, their overall function as cohesive devices and rhetorical organizers is the same. In learning and practicing the use of VS in Russian L2 learners can draw from their understanding of how equivalent parenthetical connectors function in their native language. The notion of text cohesion and organization is rarely presented in pedagogical material for L2 Russian learners and when it is it is limited to more advanced textbooks specifically focused on the development of writing skills. It is assumed that any discussion of text cohesion should be postponed until learners have reached advanced stages of learning. However, since L2 learners already have some innate knowledge of how to use VS-type connectors in L1, introducing this category early would allow them to begin using them at lower levels of proficiency.

3 For example, see the presentation of VS and other connectors in pedagogical texts see Kashper et al. (2006).
The third argument for including VS in L2 Russian language curricula is that there is substantial evidence that explicit instruction about connectors improves both reading comprehension and reading speed of written discourse for both L1 and L2 learners (Kintsch & Yarbrough, 1982; Silfhout et al., (2014); Millis & Just, 1994; Cain & Nash, 2011). The role of connectors in comprehension of spoken language has yet to be investigated.

Given these strong arguments for the inclusion of VS in L2 Russian language curricula, the next question is which VS should be included? The corpus-based study examining the relative frequency of different types of VS presented in the next section provides some answers to this question.

5. Corpus-based Study
This study uses data from the Russian National Corpus to establish relative frequency counts for вводные слова. The goal of this quantitative study is to ascertain which semantic and lexical types of VS are used most often. The study shows that VS made up of a single word are used more frequently than VS composed of more than one word, including VS consisting of fixed phrases. Data was also gathered across semantic groups of VS. This data should be useful for curricula designers and L2 teachers, enabling them to decide which VS should be introduced to learners and at what level of instruction.

5.1. Methodology
In order carry out this corpus-based frequency study, a number of problems had to be solved. The first issue was how to select VS for inclusion in the study, given the fact that virtually no two lists of VS, no matter how comprehensive they claim to be, are alike. In order to maximize the scope of focus, this study was based on two “comprehensive” lists of VS 1) the list of VS provided in the Russian National Corpus with 217 VS and 2) the list of VS in Morkovkin (1997) with 208 VS. The final combined list of VS totaled 316 tokens. The RNC was used to compare the frequency, composition, semantics, and uses of the 316 вводные слова.4

4 The “old” version of the RNC used for this study was not set up to separate written texts from the RNC as a whole. For this reason, no comparison of frequency of VS in written texts to oral discourse was possible for this study. The data from the RNC as whole is included in this study as well as frequency data from the oral subcorpus.
In order to analyze VS, several challenges needed to be overcome. Many VS, as illustrated in sentence 10-11 above, particularly those consisting of a single lexical item, can overlap in form with uses of that word which are not parenthetical. It was critical for this study to distinguish VS uses from non-VS, particularly for tokens of high frequency. Due to the sheer volume of data, the only practical solution was to rely on the Russian National Corpus to mark and identify which words and expressions are VS and which were not. Unfortunately, although the RNC consistently identifies single word adverbial VS, single word finite verbal VS are rarely marked as VS. For this reason, single word verbal VS, except for a few exceptions which were marked as such in the RNC, are not included in this study and are omitted from the frequency list.⁵

There are currently two versions of the RNC available on the Internet. The default or “old” version has a comprehensive list of VS linked to the RNC search engine. This study used the “old” version of RNC, containing texts up to 2014. The “new” version, at least at the time this paper was written, does not contain a list of frequency statistics for VS. One of the goals of this study was to update the frequency list of VS in the RNC, which at present is based on data up to 2014.

5.2. vvodnye slova: Frequency Data
This study examined frequency data for 316 vvodnye slova obtained from the Russian National Corpus (RNC).⁶ The RNC was used to establish normed frequency counts for all VS across all registers and all genres, and to identify the 150 most frequently used VS.⁷ Normed frequency counts in this study are based on the frequency of use per 10,000 words. Normed frequency counts (per 10,000 words) corroborate that VS are used more frequently in oral speech. VS in the oral database occur with a frequency of 19 tokens per 10,000 words, while in the RNC as a whole

⁵ The RNC does not mark any finite verbal VS. 14 finite verbal VS listed in Morkovkin were omitted, including: бывало, говорят, знаешь, знаете, может, etc.
⁶ It is important to note that the frequency data listed in RNC (old version) lists frequency statistics for texts added up to 2014.
⁷ Normalized text frequency is a way to adjust frequency counts from texts of different lengths. In order to obtain normed frequency counts per 10,000 words for this study frequency data was divided by the total number of words in the corpus and multiplied by 10,000.
VS average 10 uses per 10,000 words. Although the reasons for the more widespread use of VS in speech require further study, a number of possible explanations can be postulated based on the data in this study. A high percentage of VS, especially of the most frequently used VS in both written and oral registers, are modals. Biber’s corpus-based study of English (1999) established that modals (not necessarily parenthetical modals) are generally used more frequently in speech than in writing. If this is true for Russian as well, it could suggest that the higher use of VS in speech simply mirrors the higher frequency of modals in speech as a whole.

Another possible explanation for slightly higher frequency of VS in speech is the tendency of some VS to develop into слова паразиты, “parasite words.” Some VS that appear high up on the frequency list for oral texts, such as значит, так сказать and короче, have undergone a process of grammaticalization. As semantic ties to these lexical items have weakened, they have assumed pragmatic functions taking on broader roles in the discourse such as topic markers, markers of topic shift, and marking speaker’s distance from their interlocutors, and other functions (Bogdanova-Beglarian, 2021; Khachaturyan, 2010; Kolyaseva, 2018, 2022).

Table 1 contains data pertaining to VS in the entire RNC, presenting information about the frequency of single and multi-word VS. For the purposes of this study, multi-word VS are identified by the linguistic definition of “multi-word items” provided by Moon (1997, p. 43): they are vocabulary items consisting of a sequence of two or more words that “semantically and/or syntactically form a meaningful and inseparable unit.” Multi-word VS are typically fixed phrases. Formulaic multi-word VS are distinct from collocations, which are lexical word associations that co-occur with a few other words to produce such frequently occurring lexical phrases as “blond hair,” “strong tea.” Multi-word VS are also distinguished from idioms in that the latter consist of lexical strings which are semantically non-compositional – their semantic meaning is not a sum of their parts (buy the farm). Multi-word VS are compositional in that their meaning is derived from lexical items that comprise them (к счастью). A small number of VS are semi-fixed expressions, allowing replacement of one or more of their components such as for example на (чей-л.) взгляд.
Data in Table 1 indicate that in the RNC multi-word VS are more frequent than single word VS. However, when we examine the list of the most frequently used VS, single word VS are predominant. As Table 1 below shows, 72% of the twenty-five most frequently used VS consist of a single lexical item, while only 28% are made up of more than one word. Out of the full list of 316 VS used for this study, only 14% of all VS are made up of a single word. Data collected for this study indicate that 70% of the fifty most frequent single word VS are adverbs. Most of them are either epistemic modals or are adverbs used to structure and sequence information, indicating the relationships between elements of the utterance (наприимер).

Table 1: Frequency of Single Word/Multi-Word VS by Percentage in the RNC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Multi-Word/Single Word VS By Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Most Frequent VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Most Frequent VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Most Frequent VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Most Frequent VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL VS IN RNC: 316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 presents the frequency of single and multi-word VS in RNC oral texts. The oral data shows several similarities with that of the RNC as a whole. As in the RNC, multi-word VS are much more frequent than single word VS in the oral database. However, single word VS (single word VS with modal meanings in particular) predominate among the 25 most frequently used VS in the oral database. The 100-150 most frequently used VS in oral texts are more likely to be multi-word in composition. A possible explanation for this tendency is the phenomenon of grammaticalization and concomitant pragmatic widening. As multi-phrase fixed phrase VS are used more frequently, the semantic link to the lexical items that make up the phrase weakens, and the phrase takes on pragmatic meanings and in turn becomes even more frequently used.
Table 2: Frequency of Multi-Word/Single Word VS by Percentage in Oral RNC Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Multi-Word/Single Word VS By Percentage in RNC Oral Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Most Frequent VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Most Frequent VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Most Frequent VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Most Frequent VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL VS IN DATABASE: 316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lists of the 25 most frequently used VS in the RNC and in the oral texts of the RNC in Table 3 exhibit several important features. While a more comprehensive review of semantic types of VS represented in the database follows below, Table 3 reveals the predominance of both modal and single-word VS in both lists. What is particularly striking about Table 3 is the high degree of overlap between the two data sets: half of the same VS appear in the top ten of both lists. The list of VS in oral texts not surprisingly contains a number of word “parasites.” These are VS that have taken on expanded pragmatic meaning as the semantic link to their constituent lexical items has weakened, these include: значит, в общем, так сказать и короче. Both lists contain a number of VS used to organize arguments. The RNC list, however, contains more text organizers (намек, например, главное, таким образом, прежде всего and кроме того).

Many of the same trends evident in Table 3 are also apparent in Table 4 showing the distribution of meaning types in the RNC. Tables 1 and 4 show that the most frequently used VS in the RNC are single word in composition, typically adverbs expressing epistemic modality or adverbs used to sequence information or argument elements. Research on the authorial expression of evaluation in English may provide a possible explanation for the high frequency of epistemic adverbs used as VS (Grey & Biber, 2012). Adverbs denoting probability, possibility, and certainty, are typically used in non-fiction English texts to express hedges. Hedging is a rhetorical strategy, “by which a speaker, using a linguistic device, can signal a lack of commitment to either the full semantic membership.
of an expression or the full commitment to the force of the speech act being conveyed” (Fraser, 2010, p. 22). Authors use hedges to imply that a statement is presented as based on opinion or, in some cases, as plausible reasoning rather than fact, providing readers with the opportunity to interpret the text in their own way. Hedges allow the author to appear open to other points of view (Frazer, 2010).

Table 3. 25 Most Frequently Used VS in RNS and in Oral Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Most Frequent VS in entire RNC</th>
<th>*= use per 10,000</th>
<th>Most Frequent VS in Oral Texts</th>
<th>*= use per 10,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>конечно</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>конечно</td>
<td>**********</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>может быть</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>значит</td>
<td>**********</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>однако</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>может быть</td>
<td>**********</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>наконец</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>с другой стороны</td>
<td>**********</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>лучше</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>в общем</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>кажется</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>действительно</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>значит</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>например</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>например</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>лучше</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>действительно</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>наверное</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>казалось</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>мне кажется</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>возможно</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>по-моему</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>главное</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>так сказать</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>таким образом</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>понятно</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>верно</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>наверное</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>наверное</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>кстати</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>вероятно</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>кажется</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>прежде всего</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>в принципе</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>кроме того</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>естественно</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>кстати</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>во-первых</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>словом</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>к сожалению</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>видимо</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>главное</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>в (таком, этом, данном) случае</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>короче</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>пожалуй</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>видимо</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>должно быть</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>возможно</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>в общем</td>
<td>&lt;=*</td>
<td>наконец</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The prevalence of adverbial hedges in English academic prose has been established in a number of studies (Hyland 1994, 1996, 2005; Hyland & Jiang, 2020; Biber, 1999). Breitkopf-Seipman (2012) observes that authors of English academic prose use hedges to avoid criticism. The use of hedges in Russian non-fiction texts has not been fully investigated.8

Table 4: Distribution of VS Meanings in the RNC by percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meanings</th>
<th>Distribution in the RNC</th>
<th>Distribution in the 25 most frequent VS</th>
<th>Distribution in the 50 most frequent VS</th>
<th>Distribution in the 75 most frequent VS9</th>
<th>Distribution in the 100 most frequent VS10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modal (II)11</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion (I)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence Info (IV)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive (VI)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style Shift (V)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract Attention (VII)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Info (III)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Events (VIII)</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 For discussions of hedges in Russian academic prose see also Breitkopf (2005, 2006).
9 Due to rounding the total of this column does not equal 100.
10 Due to rounding the total of this column does not equal 100.
11 Roman numerals in the table refer to the semantic groupings of VS presented in part 2 of this paper.
The distribution data in Table 4 show that among the most frequently used VS, single and multi-word expressions used to establish the sequence of information and arguments (наконец, таким образом) are the second most widely used type. The high frequency of VS in written texts may be particularly marked in written texts with a rhetorical or academic purpose, although this remains to be explored.

While VS have a wide range of uses within the RNC as whole, the distribution lists for the most frequently used VS included in this study can inform L2 curricula designers and language instructors about which types of VS to include in pedagogical materials and which should be prioritized. Of the 316 VS examined, adverbs expressing epistemic modality and adverbs used to sequence information are the most frequently used VS. Many of the epistemic adverbs used to express hedges have direct equivalents in English. L2 curriculum designers and instructors can draw from these parallels in targeting these highly used expressions.

Given the “fuzziness” of vvodnye slova as a category, it is not surprising that VS are mostly omitted from L2 textbooks for Russian as a Foreign Language. Not only are VS difficult to define, no two lists of VS are the same. One could argue that they are of secondary importance semantically since they introduce meanings that do not affect the propositional content of the sentences in which they appear. The data from this study establishes that the most frequently used types of VS are single word in composition, taking the form of epistemic and other adverbs, expressing either authorial evaluation or marking the information structure within a discourse. Learners that cannot identify VS are more likely to misinterpret authorial intent. Learners lacking mastery of VS functioning as text organizers are likely to have more difficulty in processing texts and in comprehending rhetorical arguments. For these reasons, VS should be included at all levels of Russian language instruction.

A strong argument can be made for including VS in curricula for advanced L2 learners. At more advanced levels, where learners are acquiring the lexical and syntactic tools to engage in persuasion in oral and written form, the inclusion of VS enable L2 readers and writers to develop more effective active and passive rhetorical skills. VS are a key tool for
organizing argumentation in discourse and are used extensively in writing and in speaking to express authorial stance and to organize arguments. Knowledge of VS is essential for the development of pragmatic competence. Lacking a working knowledge of the more frequently used VS, learners are more likely to miss the important clues that VS provide about the author’s relationship to the text, a critical element of text meaning. Mastery of VS gives L2 students the building blocks to construct effective argumentation in written and oral form. Studies in undergraduate writing in English show that the ability to express authorial stance is a crucial indicator of writing quality. Studies indicate that EFL students who receive instruction about how to use metadiscourse write “significantly better texts” (Cheng & Steffensen, 1996), and there is evidence that pragmatically procedural parentheticals are “indispensable” to interpreting academic discourse (Ifantidou, 2004, p. 1325). Few would argue with the importance of VS in academic prose. The introduction of VS in advanced L2 pedagogical material, particularly in pedagogical material targeted towards the development of writing skills, is generally accepted.

A strong case can also be made for including VS in lower-level instruction. Some of these arguments have already been presented. First, L2 learners can draw from their understanding of parenthetical connectors in their L1, many of which are similar in meaning and function. The second argument for introducing VS in lower-level instruction is rooted in the journey of L2 learners to develop language proficiency. That journey is a gradual one. The mastery of the syntactic, morphological, lexical, and cohesive devices needed to produce and comprehend advanced texts are not acquired overnight. Introducing the concept of parenthetical language to learners early in their study of Russian will provide them with powerful tools for expanding their semantic and syntactic repertoire.

The most frequently used VS, epistemic modal adverbs and adverbs used to organize argumentation, are undeniably important tools for rhetorical discourse. However, they need to be introduced at earlier stages of proficiency to foster active mastery. Beginning as early as intermediate level, according to the ACTFL guidelines, learners need to be able to formulate and understand comparisons. Even a Novice level student who has mastered the VS с одной стороны and с другой стороны can begin to express comparisons and thereby begin the long journey to acquire skills required for effective argumentation.
Another important issue is the methodology that should be followed in introducing VS to L2 students. Based on the data from this study three organizing principles for VS instruction are recommended. First, all VS uses and functions should be extensively modeled for learners. Modeling should include actual uses of VS in discourse, providing examples that they can learn from and emulate. Sentence-length examples cannot show the range of VS functions in the discourse as a whole. Students need to be provided with examples of VS in extended discourse in order to understand and master the critical cues VS as rhetorical organizers. Second, whenever possible L2 instruction should draw parallels with similar expressions in learners’ L1 and make these similarities implicit in instruction. In addition, those expressions that have direct semantic equivalents in L1 should be prioritized and introduced earlier. Pedagogical materials should provide lots of examples in larger chunks of discourse. Once VS have been modeled, initial phases of instruction should require students to identify VS and examine their function and meaning within a discourse. The third principle to be followed in introducing VS is that learners should be provided with ample opportunities to actively use VS in discourse.

One effective way of structuring the first stage of active use is to present students with texts that have been separated into multi-sentence parts and ask them to use VS to combine these parts into a complete discourse. These three components: extensive modeling, drawing parallels with L2, and structuring lessons to require active use of VS will provide a solid framework for the development of functional mastery of procedural parentheticals, important building blocks of effective argumentation.

7. Conclusion
This article reviews our current understanding of *vvodnye slova* and their main functions. VS have been typically deemed of peripheral importance for L2 Russian language learners because they are parentheticals, providing meaning outside of propositional structures. This review of the main functions of *vvodnye slova*, their meanings, and most frequent uses, suggests that VS play an important function in text cohesion and comprehension. A strong case has been made for including VS in L2 Russian language curricula and suggestions have been provided about effective methodologies for
introducing *vodnye slova* to the Russian language classroom.
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Russian L2 Learners’ and Teachers’ Perceptions of Learning Affordances
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1. Introduction
The concept of affordance was coined by psychologists to speak about what the environment offers an individual (Gibson & Carmichael, 1966). It was later applied to the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) to indicate that L2 learners are surrounded by a variety of possibilities and interactions that are offered by the environment (van Lier, 2000). Affordances, in their broadest sense, are considered as, but not limited to, physical objects, online materials, humans, and other resources which are embedded in the environment, and emerge from the interactions between the environment and a language learner. Examples of affordances could be online charts, songs, textbooks, instructors, fellow students, activities, such as pair work or PPT presentations, etc. However, these resources may be perceived differently, or not at all, by both language learners and teachers. For example, L2 instructors may spend time developing or using resources they consider beneficial for their students, while students may not even perceive the affordances offered by those resources, or alternatively, may not think of them as especially useful, enjoyable, or accessible. The mismatch between instructors’ and learners’ perceived affordances may result in ineffective use of time for both students and teachers, lower student motivation, and slow down the language learning process.

Many scholars have investigated learners’ and teachers’ perceptions of affordances; however, most studies have focused on one specific affordance, and mostly in more commonly taught languages, such as English. Only a few studies have examined perceptions of a variety of learning affordances offered in an environment (Jiang & Zhang, 2019; 1 While the authors acknowledge the distinction between second and foreign language contexts, for the purposes of this paper, the abbreviation ‘L2’ is used to denote any foreign language learners, teachers, environments, or research.)
Peng, 2011), and even fewer compared to what extent learners’ and teachers’ perceptions of affordances aligned (Kordt, 2018).

The present research is an exploratory study that aims to bridge this gap and examines L2 students’ and teachers’ views on affordances in order to (a) encourage scholars to conduct similar research with other L2s and at other institutions; and (b) enable conversations in program design to enhance language learning and teaching experience. Specifically, this study investigates L2 Russian learners’ and teachers’ perspectives on language learning affordances and the extent to which their perceptions match. In this study, we define affordances as all learning resources that students and teachers perceive through their active engagement in an L2 learning environment. Therefore, affordances are considered as only those language learning resources that are perceived by learners and teachers, as opposed to any other resources, which may exist in the environment, but are not recognized as affordances. Only once teachers are aware of what students do or do not identify as affordances, can they adjust their teaching practice by pinpointing those affordances that they identify but that students fail to recognize, and/or by making use of affordances that students favor.

2. Ecological Framework and the Concept of Affordance

Our study draws on the ecology framework in the field of SLA. Menezes (2011) explained that the ecological approach focuses on the interactions that human beings have with their learning process and on how learners’ concerns, attitudes, and perceptions interact in complex ways throughout that process. According to van Lier (2000; 2004; 2008; 2010), who adapted this approach to the field of SLA, the way learners perceive and interpret their learning environment can influence their engagement with and within their environment.

To help understand how the environment enables and/or constrains action, Gibson, a researcher of visual perception, coined the concept of affordance (Gibson, 1986). Gibson (2014) defined ‘affordance’ as:

The affordances of the environment are what it offers the animal, what it provides or furnishes, either for good or ill. The verb to afford

Readers should not be surprised by the reference to “animal” as Gibson’s ecological theory is based on the study of animal-environment systems.
is found in the dictionary, but the noun affordance is not. I have made it up. I mean by it something that refers to both the environment and the animal in a way that no existing term does. It implies the complementarity of the animal and the environment. (2014, p. 1)

Aronin and Singleton (2012), following Gibson (1986), discussed four major properties of affordances that are important for the current study. For them, affordances (1) are furnished according to the size of an animal; (2) are mutual for animal and environment; (3) can be nested within each other; and (4) accompany information about the environment. The first property indicates that perception of affordances depends on individual characteristics. For example, in L2 learning, some students may perceive the activity of listening to songs helpful if their proficiency level is high enough to allow for it. The second property suggests that affordances depend on dynamic relationships between individuals and environments (both physical and social situations) that change at each specific moment. The third property means that some affordances contain within them other affordances. For instance, a school as an affordance contains other affordances, such as classrooms, teachers, peers, etc. The fourth property of affordances concerns an individual’s ability to situate oneself in the environment based on the information that is received through interactions between the individual and the environment. In this vein, language learning also involves learning to perceive affordances (van Lier, 2008). Therefore, the theory of affordances raises the question of whether there is enough information from the environment so that affordances can be perceived, instead of focusing on simply whether specific affordances exist (Gibson, 2014).

The interaction of these four properties (i.e., affordances being furnished according to the size of an animal; mutual for animal and environment; nested within each other; and accompanying information about the environment) is examined in language studies using three key elements: users, environments, and language (Aronin & Singleton, 2012; Singleton & Aronin, 2018). Affordances emerge from the interaction of these three elements in any given situation. This means that affordances at a smaller scale derive from affordances at a larger one (i.e., nesting). For example, the affordances that emerge through the interactions between the users, environment, and language in a language classroom in the
United States will be nested within a broader network of affordances for language learning at larger scales, such as schools, communities, states, and the nation. Therefore, similar affordances are expected to be found across different classrooms that are nested in the same broader context.

However, the presence of an affordance in the environment does not guarantee its perception and use (Greeno, 1994). van Lier (2008) highlighted the role of active learners when describing affordances as the perceived properties in the learning environment. Similarly, Thoms and Poole (2017) defined affordance as “the learning opportunities that present themselves via an active learner who is engaged with the L2 learning environment—be that a physical or virtual classroom context” (p. 141). Given the important role of users in the perception of affordances, these perceptions may vary between and among students, instructors, and their corresponding contexts. For example, every classroom can provide a different range of affordances for every single learner since every learner can perceive the learning environment differently (Kordt, 2018). Therefore, it is important for teachers to emphasize resources from which students can benefit.

Overall, an ecological framework allows to identify language learning affordances that are absent for some users but may be beneficial for them. Nonetheless, as previously mentioned, the perception of these affordances relies on the individual abilities of the users, their active engagement in the learning process, their personal characteristics and contexts, as well as on the interaction between individuals and contexts (Aronin & Singleton, 2012; Gibson, 1986; Thoms & Poole, 2017; van Lier, 2008).

3. Learners’ Perceptions of Affordances
An L2 language classroom is an environment that potentially has a variety of tools, activities, and other resources that are beneficial for learners’ language development. It may be the only place where the process and the product of learning becomes tangible for classroom participants.

When scholars have explored learners’ perceptions of classroom affordances, they have discovered that these affordances vary from the general, when learners consider the whole classroom as an affordance, to the specific, or from the abstract to the concrete (Cotterall & Murray, 2009; Jiang & Zhang, 2019; Peng, 2011). For example, Jiang and Zhang
(2019) examined students’ perceptions of English learning affordances in a classroom where English is used to teach academic subjects. Although students found the whole class to be an English learning affordance, results suggested that the group presentation proved to be the students’ most preferred affordance of English learning, followed by teacher–student interactions. Additionally, learners noticed very specific resources (i.e., meaning-focused activities, familiar topics, support from the teacher and peers, teaching methods, and the outline of lesson goals) as affordances for learning the target language (Peng, 2011). Similarly, learners identified as learning affordances the opportunity to reflect on the learning process (Cotterall & Murray, 2009), or the use of material items, such as a tablet, in a language classroom (Shouma & Cardoso, 2019).

However, it has been noted that language classrooms alone cannot offer sufficient resources for learners to acquire, or to practice, linguistic and sociocultural skills. Learning beyond the classroom provides learners with different types of affordances from those found in classrooms. For example, scholars have reported that students have mentioned the use of mobile apps and web services, such as Duolingo, Google Translate, Wordreference, Babbel and Tandem outside of class (Pérez-Paredes et al., 2019). Another study specifically explored how and why high school students learned languages out of school in France (Bailly, 2011). Along with the conventional learning techniques learned at school (e.g., memorizing, using dictionaries, taking notes), the author identified several additional, mostly receptive, language learning activities related to students’ personal interests, such as watching movies, reading books, or listening to songs. One of the students perceived songs as an affordance for language learning through listening, translating, memorizing the songs, and imitating the singer.

To sum, scholars have claimed that learners perceive a range of language learning affordances inside and outside the classroom, and the perceptions of these affordances seems to depend on the learning environment and learners’ interaction with this environment.

4. Teachers’ Perceptions of Affordances
It is essential to consider not only learners’ views but also those of teachers on the learning environment and the resources that it offers. Researchers have investigated teacher’s perceptions regarding a variety of affordances
Many studies have focused on teachers’ beliefs about digital affordances, ranging from mobile devices to new emerging technologies (Dashtestani, 2013; Gamage, et al., 2011; Young, 2016; Xue & Churchill, 2020). These studies affirm teachers’ perceptions and attitudes toward how technology can affect their teaching and students’ learning processes. For example, Al-Maawali (2020) investigated teachers’ perceptions of the online affordances they created for students and explored the extent to which teachers addressed students’ needs. Their findings showed a strong correlation between these affordances and students’ perceived e-learning opportunities, which revealed the impact teachers could have on students and their learning processes through the affordances they perceive.

In a case study, Haines (2015) explored the perceptions of two experienced L2 teachers of Italian about the learning affordances of two new computer-assisted communication tools (blogs and Wikis) that they implemented in their individual classrooms at an Australian university. The author demonstrated how teachers using the same tools in the same courses perceived different learning affordances in relation to the language learning processes they prioritized. Liu and Chao (2018) studied how a teacher perceived the affordances of technology in an L2 classroom and highlighted the teachers’ role in raising learners’ awareness as “[they] can pinpoint affordances so that learners will be aware of the various possibilities the technology provides and choose what they need” (p. 83).

Other scholars, such as Kordt (2018), showed an interest in how teachers perceive and benefit from multilingual affordances and distinguished between the affordances that language teachers recognize and implement in a lesson and the learning affordances that are perceived by students. This allowed Kordt (2018) to explore the effect of educational interventions by analyzing how learners perceived and utilized the affordances the teacher intended them to use. Kordt suggested that “just as teachers should perceive and use teachable moments students should be able to perceive and use learnable moments” (2018, p. 143).

Given that affordances depend on the interaction between users and environment, not everyone can perceive or take advantage of all the affordances present in the environment (Menezes, 2011). As a result, the affordances perceived by teachers and students may not be the same or may not be perceived in a similar fashion. These differences in the perceptions
of affordances may result in students’ and teachers’ disappointment and frustration regarding learning procedures and eventual outcomes. Therefore, scholars must investigate not only affordances *per se* but also their usefulness, accessibility, and frequency of use (Pérez-Paredes et al., 2019) which together with enjoyment are the factors that are considered central to the issues of motivation (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2021).

5. Research on Affordances in L2 Russian
To the best of our knowledge, there are no studies that have explored and compared affordances that are perceived by L2 learners of Russian and their language teachers. However, some studies that have explored the effectiveness of language learning resources in Russian programs in the U.S. are relevant for the present research. For example, Murphy et al. (2012) conducted a study to investigate the perceptions of Russian language learners and tutors about the role of tutors in language learning in a Russian Flagship Program. The study found that both students and tutors perceived tutoring to be highly beneficial for language learning.

Other L2 Russian studies have focused on the use of various types of digital cultural artifacts in language instruction (Klimanova & Hellmich, 2021), the effectiveness of online language courses as compared with face-to-face classes (Merrill et al., 2021), and learners’ beliefs about intercultural virtual exchange (Klimanova & Vinokurova, 2020). For example, Klimanova & Vinokurova (2020) studied L2 Russian learners’ perceptions of virtual exchange in cross-institutional (with other target language learners) and cross-cultural (with native speakers from Russia) contexts. The authors found that the learners enjoyed the exchange project equally regardless of the context. However, students who participated in the intercultural exchange with native speakers from Russia rated this interaction as more useful for learning.

Overall, the review of the literature has shown that few studies have investigated learners’ perceptions of usefulness, accessibility, and enjoyment of affordances, and even fewer scholars have compared the extent to which learner and teacher perceptions of affordances match. Hence, this study offers an initial empirical investigation into what affordances are perceived by L2 Russian learners and their instructors, and how these affordances are perceived in terms of their usefulness, enjoyment, and accessibility.
To this end, this research is driven by the following questions:

1. What are the most commonly perceived language learning affordances among college learners and teachers of L2 Russian at a large U.S. university?

2. How do college learners and teachers of L2 Russian at a large U.S. university perceive those language learning affordances in terms of their levels of usefulness, enjoyment, and accessibility?

3. To what extent do learners’ and teachers’ perceptions of affordances match?

6. Methodology

6.1. Participants
Participants of this study were L2 college-level Russian learners (n=20) and teachers (n=9) in a Russian language program at a large Midwestern university in the United States. Tables 1 and 2 present a summary of relevant background information.

Table 1. Select Background Characteristics of Students (n=20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Participants in a Given Russian Course</th>
<th># of Participants of a Given Range of Other than Russian L2 Learning Experience (in Years)</th>
<th>Participants’ Average Age (and Range)</th>
<th># of Native Speakers of Other Languages</th>
<th># of Participants of a Given Sex/Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Select Background Characteristics of Teachers (n=9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Participants</th>
<th># of Participants of a Given Range of L2 Teaching Experience (in Years)</th>
<th>Participants’ Average Age (and Range)</th>
<th># of Native Speakers of</th>
<th># of Participants of a Given Sex/Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>4th year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student participants consisted of learners who were taking L2 Russian courses (1st – 4th year Russian) at the time of the study. One of these courses (4th-year) was a content-based Russian history course. The other three were regular language courses without a specific content focus. First-semester students did not participate in the study since they may not have had much L2 learning experience at the college level, and so may have been less able to identify a variety of L2 learning affordances. The average number of years of the Russian learning experience as reported by nine students, who answered this question in the Background Survey, was 3.9 (range 1.5-9). Of 14 students, who answered the background question, two reported that they had learned L2 languages other than Russian for 1-2 years, four learners had studied other L2s for 3-4 years, and eight students reported studying other languages for 5 years or more.

Teachers were graduate teaching assistants (n=7) and professors (n=2), who were teaching Russian courses at the time of the study, or who had taught them in the previous semester. Slightly more than half of the teachers (n=5) had five or more years of L2 teaching experience and four of them had between two to four years of teaching experience.

It has to be noted that the investigators of this study were not teachers of the student participants. Moreover, the researchers who collected the data from the participants did not work with Russian – they are native speakers and instructors of Persian and Spanish.
6.2. Research tools

The data for this study were collected using three main instruments: a background information survey (Survey I) and two quantitative surveys on affordances with qualitative components: one non-prompted (Survey II) and one prompted (Survey III). These surveys went through a short validation process. They were presented to eight Ph.D. students and one SLA professor, who provided us with feedback on the instruments. Then, the surveys were piloted among four students and one instructor who were not the participants of the study. Based on the input from the pilot stage participants, we added questions about the particular uses of those affordances, the locations where learners and teachers may access them, and how easy it is to access them and why.

Survey I. Background Information

Survey I had two different versions, one designed for students and one for teachers. Both students and teachers completed the background information survey asking for their course of study/teaching, age, nationality, and the number of years studying (or teaching for teachers) the target language.

Survey II. Non-prompted Survey on Affordances

Survey II had both a student and teacher version and aimed at eliciting the participants’ perceptions of learning affordances without any prompts to identify specific affordances. Participants were provided with a blank table and asked to list all resources that they thought could help students learn Russian and progress in the language. For example, students were not given any hints about categories of affordances, such as activities, people, or materials, so that they could provide a diverse set of non-prompted responses that would show their unique perspectives on language learning affordances. Below is an example of the instructions for Survey II (non-prompted).

"Please, list all resources you think can be used to learn and progress in your foreign language. Indicate how useful you think they are on a scale from 0 to 100 (0 – completely useless, 100 – very useful); what they are useful for (i.e., what do you seek to improve about the foreign language by using those resources?); their level of enjoyment (0 – extremely boring,
100 – totally fun); where inside or outside the classroom these resources can be found; how easy it is to access them from 0 (impossible to access) to 100 (very easy to access) and indicate why it is easy or not easy to access them."

A 0-100 scale was used for two main reasons. First, our intention was to have a continuous scale instead of a categorical one, given that the second requires explicit descriptors that could bias participants’ ratings. Additionally, a 0-100 scale allows for more flexibility in participants’ rating than a categorical scale, where a one-point change can be significant (e.g., rating an affordance from “very useful” to “extremely useful”).

Survey III. Prompted Survey on Affordances
Since affordance is a term that involves many different types of resources, such as materials (both online and offline), people, and activities, a more detailed survey (Survey III) was designed for both teachers and students. In this survey, both students and teachers were asked to provide their perceived language learning affordances based on three different categories: materials, people, and activities. For each category there was a blank table where participants, in an identical fashion to Survey II, were asked to list the affordances related to that category and rate them based on their level of usefulness, enjoyment, and accessibility. At the end of the survey, there was an additional non-specified category called ‘all other resources’ in case participants would think of affordances that did not fit in the three categories provided.

6.3. Data Collection Procedure
During Spring semester, we administered Surveys I, II, and III to L2 Russian students and teachers in Russian classes. We recruited participants by visiting their Russian classes and distributing a set of three surveys among all students enrolled in Russian classes and their instructors\(^4\). During these visits, the participants were informed that if they chose to participate in the study, they would complete the survey outside their classes, in their free time. We chose to administer surveys during the Spring semester (pre-

\(^4\) Roughly 60% of the student population and 90% of the teacher population of the Russian program completed the surveys.
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pandemic year) because that would guarantee students would have had at least one semester of experience learning Russian if they had started in the Fall semester. The surveys were distributed in the classrooms, and the participants were asked to take them home and bring them back on the following day. After all surveys were completed, participants returned them to one of the researchers and were monetarily compensated for their participation. The survey completion took up to 30 minutes based on the participants’ report. The students were informed that their teachers did not have access to their responses.

All surveys were administered at the same time. Together with the surveys, the participants received informed consent forms and detailed instructions to complete the surveys in the appropriate order, i.e., Survey I, followed by Survey II and Survey III. In such a way, the participants completed the non-prompted survey before the prompted survey. The participants were also asked not to skip parts or go back to make revisions.

6.4. Analyses
First, we performed a qualitative analysis of the survey responses from which we established categories, and then we used descriptive statistics to quantify the relative prevalence of categories in the respondents’ minds (by ‘prevalence’ we mean prevalence in the population, i.e., % of respondents with at least one response in a given category). Specifically, to facilitate data analysis5, we grouped students’ and teachers’ mentions of similar types of language learning affordances into one main affordance category. For example, participants’ mentions of the learning affordances “dictionary,” “Russian dictionary,” and “Reverso context dictionary” were grouped under the main affordance category of dictionaries, and mentions of the learning affordances “conversation table,” “Russian club,” “Russian activity in campus,” or “Russian tea” were grouped under the

5 The analysis of Survey II (non-prompted affordances) revealed that of 29 affordances mentioned by students and 19 mentioned by teachers, only 14 affordances overlapped between the two groups. Of these 14 affordances, only the affordance of textbooks was mentioned by at least 50% of the participants in each group. The rest were perceived by less than half of the members of each group. Due to the lack of sufficient overlap between the affordances mentioned by students and teachers in Survey II alone, the data from Survey II (non-prompted affordances) and Survey III (prompted affordances) were combined for the subsequent analysis.
affordance category of social spaces. In this study, each of the affordance categories are shown in italic. In case of doubts about the categorization of a mentioned learning affordance, we further considered information participants provided about what the affordance was useful for and how they justified its accessibility score. For instance, a student’s mention of “friends/people” was included under the native speakers category given that, for the accessibility of this affordance, they indicated that, “native speakers are difficult to find.” Appendix A features a list of all the main affordance categories and the teachers’ and students’ individual mentions of learning affordances grouped under them.

Only one mention from each participant was taken into account and if participants gave multiple responses in the same category, we averaged the ratings of these responses. For example, if a participant mentioned “Russian friends” and “Russian native speakers”, we considered them to belong to the “Native speaker” category and averaged the ratings that the participant assigned to the enjoyment, usefulness, and accessibility of these affordances.

The focus of analysis was placed on the affordance categories that were mentioned by at least 50% of participants in either of the groups, i.e., 10 out of 20 students, or 5 out of 9 teachers. We considered those affordance categories to be among the most commonly perceived for the respective group. We calculated the averages and ranges of usefulness, enjoyment, and accessibility for each affordance category based on the ratings provided by each group.

Unpaired two-samples Wilcoxon tests were utilized to compare the responses from the non-native and native-speaker teachers. Appendix B demonstrates the p-values of the differences between the perceptions of native and non-native teachers for each affordance. As shown in the table in Appendix B, the only difference that approaches significance is the perception of the enjoyment of flashcards ($p=0.07652$), while the other differences are far from being significant. Hence, these two teacher groups were combined into one

7. Results
In this section we present results of both quantitative and qualitative analyses of data collected from the surveys. The presentation of results follows the research themes together with the respective analytic methods.
7.1. Students’ and Teachers’ Perceptions of Learning Affordances

Table 3 demonstrates the most mentioned learning affordances, i.e., those that were identified by at least half of the student participants, the percentage and number of students who mentioned a given affordance, as well as the average percentages and ranges of the reported ratings for each affordance’s usefulness, enjoyment, and accessibility.

### Table 3. Students’ Most Commonly Perceived Learning Affordances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordance</th>
<th>% and # of Students Who Perceived a Given Affordance (n=20)</th>
<th>Average Percentages and Ranges of the Perceived Degree of a Given Affordance’s Usefulness</th>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>85% (n=17)</td>
<td>91% (60-100)</td>
<td>77% (50-100)</td>
<td>87% (50-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>75% (n=15)</td>
<td>88% (40-100)</td>
<td>57% (10-87)</td>
<td>90% (50-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Speakers</td>
<td>55% (n=11)</td>
<td>85% (58-100)</td>
<td>82% (50-100)</td>
<td>64% (30-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionaries</td>
<td>55% (n=11)</td>
<td>79% (40-100)</td>
<td>43% (0-100)</td>
<td>86% (50-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors</td>
<td>50% (n=10)</td>
<td>86% (60-100)</td>
<td>80% (50-100)</td>
<td>83% (60-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Spaces</td>
<td>50% (n=10)</td>
<td>78% (40-100)</td>
<td>79% (60-100)</td>
<td>70% (35-100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most students mentioned six affordances: instructors\(^6\), textbooks, native speakers, dictionaries, tutors, and social spaces as resources for learning Russian. Half of these affordances represented people (instructors, native speakers, and tutors), whereas just two were core classroom resources.

---

\(^6\) To distinguish between the affordance category “instructor” and the teachers who were participants in our study, we refer to the category of affordance as “instructor” and the participants who were language teachers as "teachers" throughout the paper.
(i.e., *textbooks* and *dictionaries*). In terms of usefulness and enjoyment, the three affordances that represented people and the affordance of *social spaces* were perceived as much more enjoyable than *dictionaries* and *textbooks*. Between the three affordances that represented people, *instructors* were perceived as more useful (91%) than *native speakers* (85%) and *tutors* (86%), but less enjoyable. In terms of accessibility, *native speakers* (64%) were found to be less accessible than *instructors* (87%) and *tutors* (83%).

Table 4 shows which affordances were mentioned by at least half of the teachers, the percentage and raw number of teachers who mentioned each of these affordances, as well as the average percentages and ranges of their perception of these affordances in terms of their usefulness, enjoyment, and accessibility.

**Table 4. Teachers’ Most Commonly Perceived Learning Affordances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordance</th>
<th>% and # of Teachers Who Perceived a Given Affordance (n=9)</th>
<th>Average Percentages and Ranges of the Perceived Degree of a Given Affordance’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Usefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/TV Shows</td>
<td>89% (n=8)</td>
<td>78% (60-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashcards</td>
<td>67% (n=6)</td>
<td>96% (75-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>56% (n=5)</td>
<td>99% (95-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>56% (n=5)</td>
<td>88% (80-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>56% (n=5)</td>
<td>86% (50-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>56% (n=5)</td>
<td>79% (70-95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most commonly perceived affordances by teachers included movies/TV shows, flashcards, instructors, textbooks, literature, and music. The most prominent affordance among the teachers was movies/TV shows, which was mentioned by a much larger percentage of teachers than any other affordance category. As shown in Table 4, half of the affordances perceived by teachers were cultural products (movies/TV shows, music, and literature), while the other half pertained to core classroom resources (flashcards, textbooks, and instructors). What is more, most of the affordances pertaining to cultural products (music and literature) were mentioned by a larger percentage of native speaker teachers (67%, n=4) compared to non-native speaker teachers (33%, n=1). Overall, the cultural product affordances were perceived as less useful, but more enjoyable, than the classroom resources, with the exception of the perceived enjoyment of instructors (91%).

Regarding accessibility, all six of these resources were perceived as highly accessible. In terms of the usefulness and enjoyment of the affordances concerning cultural products, movies/TV shows (78%) and music (79%) were perceived as less useful than literature (86%), while music (93%) was perceived as slightly more enjoyable than literature (90%) and movies/TV shows (88%). Regarding the affordances pertaining to core classroom resources, instructors (99%) and flashcards (96%) were perceived as slightly more useful than textbooks (88%), whereas flashcards and textbooks (61%) were considered much less enjoyable than instructors (91%).

7.2. Comparison of Students’ and Teachers’ Most-Perceived Affordances

Figure 1 displays the percentage of participants who mentioned each of the most commonly perceived affordances in either group. The bar graph helps to visualize the extent to which each of the most commonly perceived affordances by one participant group overlaps with the perceptions of the other group.

As shown in Figure 1, some of these affordances had a small overlap between the two groups. Among the students’ most commonly perceived affordances, the category of social spaces was barely mentioned by teachers (11%, n=1), while it was mentioned by half of the students (n=10). Regarding the most perceived affordances among the teachers, movies/TV shows overlapped the least, given that
only 35% of the students (n=7) mentioned this affordance compared to 89% of the teachers (n=8). Flashcards was another affordance that showed less of an alignment between teachers (67%, n=6) and students (30%, n=6). Among all of the affordances, only two (instructors and textbooks) were among the most commonly perceived affordances for both groups, since they were mentioned by at least half of the participants in each group. However, instructors and textbooks were perceived as affordances by a greater percentage of students (85%, n=17, and 75%, n=15, respectively) than teachers (56%, n=5), suggesting a stronger prominence of these two affordances among the students. To provide a narrower analysis of the differences in perception between these two shared affordances, Table 5 displays the averages and ranges of the ratings provided by the teachers and the students for these two affordances regarding their usefulness, enjoyment, and accessibility.
Table 5. Comparison of Students’ and Teachers’ Perceptions of the Affordances of ‘Instructors’ and ‘Textbooks’ for Usefulness, Enjoyment, and Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordance</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>% and # of Participants Who Perceived a Given Affordance</th>
<th>Average Percentages and Ranges of the Perceived Degree of a Given Affordance’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Usefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>85% (n=17)</td>
<td>91% (60-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>56% (n=5)</td>
<td>99% (95-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>75% (n=15)</td>
<td>88% (40-100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>56% (n=5)</td>
<td>88% (80-100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the average perceptions of these two affordances, the biggest discrepancy between the two groups pertains to the perceived level of enjoyment of instructors. The teachers seemed to consider themselves more enjoyable (91%) than the students perceived them (77%).

In terms of the ranges for each of the three measurements within each participant group (Table 5), the ranges within the student group are larger than within the teacher group. Students’ range for instructors’ usefulness is 40% (60%-100%), while it is only 5% (95%-100%) for teachers. However, there is only an 8% difference in the average perception of instructors’ usefulness between both groups (91%-99%). The differences in the students’ and teachers’ ratings for the enjoyment of instructors are stronger. While the students’ minimum enjoyment score is 50%, teachers’ lowest score is 80% and the difference between their average is 14% (77%-91%). Finally, the perceptions of accessibility among the two groups are close. Although the students’ lowest accessibility score
(50%) is much lower than that of the teachers’ (85%), the averages are very close (87%-93%).

In examining the perception of textbooks, the averages show a similar perception of this affordance between the two groups in terms of usefulness, enjoyment, and accessibility (Table 5). However, the minimum scores provided by the students for textbooks’ usefulness (40%) and accessibility (50%) were substantially lower than the scores provided by the teachers (80% for both usefulness and accessibility). Although students’ minimum score for the enjoyment of textbooks was very low (10% compared to 50% from teachers), the maximum score given by the students (86.6%) was higher than the teachers’ score (70%).

Unpaired two-samples Wilcoxon tests were conducted to further explore the differences in perception between students and teachers for the affordances of textbooks and instructors. The analyses of the differences in perception of textbooks yielded no significant results for usefulness (p-value = 0.8949), enjoyment (p-value = 0.5345), and accessibility (p-value = 0.5659). Similar results were obtained for the differences in perceptions of the usefulness (p-value = 0.1447) and accessibility (p-value = 0.2365) of instructors. The teachers’ and students’ ratings for the enjoyment of instructors were normally distributed. Thus, a t-test was performed, and no statistically significant results were found (p-value = 0.1051).

Even though this study focuses on teachers’ and students’ most commonly perceived affordances, it may be worth mentioning some of the less perceived affordances in each group and the (mis)matches between them. Some of these less perceived affordances were mentioned by a similar percentage of students and teachers. For instance, 40% of students (n=8) and 44% of teachers (n=4) mentioned fellow students, an affordance pertaining to people. Similarly, 15% of students (n=3) and 11% of teachers (n=1) reported the study abroad affordances. Other less commonly perceived affordances were more present in one of the two groups. For instance, language learning apps were listed by 15% of students (n=3) and 44% of teachers (n=4). Likewise, five students (25%) reported games as an affordance, while only one instructor (11%) listed them. Although the affordance of news was mentioned by the same number of students and teachers (n=4), the percentages differed in each group (20% and 44%, respectively).
8. Discussion

8.1. Learners’ Most Perceived Affordances

Our analysis revealed that among the many resources the learning environment offered to the students, most of them mentioned the six types of affordances we have analyzed. Those can be further grouped as: (a) core classroom affordances that can be found in nearly any L2 classroom context (i.e., instructors, textbooks and dictionaries); and (b) interpersonal affordances that are used specifically for interactions in- or outside the classroom (native speakers, social spaces, and tutors).

As for the core classroom resources, instructors and textbooks were perceived as the most useful. Both were mentioned as beneficial in introducing “grammar rules, lexicon,” new “concepts,” “subjects,” or “topics.” However, students seemed to perceive animate resources as more enjoyable than the inanimate resources. For example, the learners enjoyed instructors more than textbooks because unlike textbooks that presented static material, instructors were more interactive in that they tended to “clarify a subject,” “explain all concepts,” “answer specific questions,” and “correct mistakes.” Likewise, Cotterall & Murray (2009), who examined students enrolled in a self-study course, noticed that support from teachers, which was among the mentioned affordances, contributed to learners’ metacognitive and linguistic development. Also, Peng (2011) noted that learners recognized support from teachers as an affordance that positively influenced their beliefs about the target language.

Dictionaries are another core classroom resource and were also found to be mentioned as affordances in Bailly (2011) and Pérez-Paredes et al.’s (2019) studies. The student participants in our study found dictionaries useful and highly accessible but the least enjoyable of all perceived affordances. Evidently, there can be nothing enjoyable about “looking up words,” their “conjugations,” and “translations,” the only functions of dictionaries that the students noted. Students’ perceptions of the usage of dictionaries could potentially be enhanced if students were guided to use them not only for quick, basic translations, but also for discussions about word creation, etymology, or lexical contextual variability.

The students’ most commonly perceived affordances also included affordances that called for interpersonal interactions, namely
with native speakers, tutors, and social spaces. The students indicated that Russian native speakers were helpful for “improving conversation proficiency,” or simply for “conversation,” “practicing everyday vocab and grammar,” and “helping [them] to understand a concept.” Previous studies have also reported that learners look for interactions with native speakers that can become models for learning and can be key elements of a social network that facilitates learning outside and inside the classroom (Bailly, 2011; Klimanova & Vinokurova, 2020; Palfreyman, 2011; 2020). Although in this study students mentioned native speakers among the most enjoyable and useful affordances, they found them the least accessible of the three interactive affordances. The students seemed to recognize that native speakers could be hard to reach in the U.S. context, where Russian is studied as a foreign language. The affordance of tutors was noted as a highly useful, enjoyable, and accessible resource for language development, although it was mentioned by a smaller number of students. This finding may be explained by the fact that half of the student participants (10 out of 20) were enrolled in the Russian Flagship program, a federally funded initiative that provides opportunities for U.S. undergraduate students to reach a professional level of competence in a foreign language (Murphy & Evans-Romaine, 2017). Tutoring is an essential part of this program, where students are required to attend one to two mandatory tutoring sessions a week. These sessions mostly aim to develop students’ speaking skills through watching and discussing short videos, playing games, listening to songs, or simply chatting with tutors, most of whom are Russian native speakers. Indeed, similar to our findings, Murphy et al. (2012) found that learners perceived tutors in the Russian Flagship program to be highly beneficial for their language development due to several factors. First, tutoring provided increased opportunities for students to practice speaking Russian one-on-one, beyond the context of classrooms. Second, tutors were able to address students’ individual interests and needs, which could facilitate personalized learning. Finally, students perceived the learning environment in tutoring sessions to be less stressful than in language classes, which may have had a positive effect on their language learning experience.

It may be worthwhile for future research to investigate the reasons for students’ categorization of tutors as a separate group from teachers and native speakers. This research could shed light on the factors that
influence students’ conceptualizations of their teachers and peers, and how these conceptualizations impact their educational experiences.

Finally, social spaces was the third most commonly perceived affordance for interpersonal communications. Social spaces are a context for other affordances that grant students conversation opportunities and enable them to familiarize themselves more with the target culture. Students highlighted the value of social spaces in providing them with opportunities for interactions in informal settings, with benefits for “speaking and hearing,” “circumlocution, pronunciation, comprehension,” and “[speaking] practice and new vocab,” together with “learning about culture and getting to know others who know Russian.” This finding aligns with other studies (Bailly, 2011; Che & Ibrahim, 2018). For example, Che and Ibrahim (2018) found that online social networks helped learners create new identities and furnished them with daily practice and informal language learning, which is especially beneficial beyond the classroom. Likewise, Murray and Fujishima (2013) found that social spaces supported the development of a learner community and fostered autonomous language learning among L2 English and Japanese learners at a Japanese university. In other words, students value social spaces for their informal nature, opportunities for social networking, and cultural exposure. Future research could see if online social networks/communities have gained popularity among students as an affordance post-COVID.

8.2. Teachers’ Most Perceived Learning Affordances
Our analysis also focused on the L2 Russian teachers’ most perceived learning affordances (i.e., affordances that teachers thought could be used to learn and progress in the language) and the way they perceived them in terms of usefulness, enjoyment, and accessibility. The analysis showed that similar to students, most teachers mentioned core classroom resources likely to be found in any L2 classroom (flashcards, instructors, and textbooks). However, teachers’ most commonly perceived affordances also included cultural products of a multimodal and multipurpose nature (movies/TV shows, literature, and music). This finding can be explained by the fact that teachers are trained to combine multiple sensory and communicative modes to facilitate learners’ language acquisition. For example, along with traditional or core classroom resources, movies and music videos provide students with audio and visual support, while providing a greater cultural and linguistic context for students
learning in foreign language contexts. What is more, literature and music were perceived as affordances by a larger number of native speaker teachers than non-native speaker teachers. Perhaps, this finding can be explained by the native-speaker teachers’ higher language proficiency level or their greater exposure to the target culture.

Among the most commonly perceived core classroom resources, teachers reported flashcards to be highly useful and accessible but not very enjoyable for students. Undoubtedly, flashcards are great for “vocabulary memorization,” but creating them may not be very exciting, and memorization is hard work that is not necessarily accompanied by pleasure. Additionally, it can be assumed that teachers encourage their students to be more independent learners when they ask them to make flashcards.

Teachers perceived themselves to be the most useful and enjoyable affordance. They viewed themselves as being useful for learning in “all modalities,” and “everything” because “they [instructors] know what to do, how to explain things.” More specifically, they thought that instructors were helpful for “corrections, modeling,” “asking questions,” and “practicing materials.” In general, the teachers seemed to assign themselves the roles of active facilitators.

Finally, and not surprisingly, textbooks were also mentioned by most teachers and perceived as very useful. After all, they are usually used as the core of the language teaching curriculum and are often meant to be actively applied in classroom settings as well as outside the classroom for homework assignments.

Most teachers also perceived the cultural products of movies/TV shows, music, and literature as learning affordances. For the first two, teachers believed that they were highly enjoyable and accessible for students, yet the least useful among the most commonly perceived affordances. The low usefulness rating can be explained by the fact that teachers seem to think of visual media and music as resources which complement the content of textbooks, which are viewed as the primary source of knowledge. Yet the teachers recognized that these affordances could be “fun” for their students to watch or to listen to, could be used to learn about “culture”, and they were mostly advantageous for “listening comprehension.”

In addition, more than half of the teachers mentioned literature as a cultural-product affordance for their students to progress in the target language. The teachers seemed to find this affordance more useful than movies/
TV shows and music, although noting that, in addition to developing “grammar and writing skills” and being used as a basis for “discussion,” literature could be used to “increase cultural awareness” and “introduce new vocabulary.”

In sum, the teachers seemed to assume that language learning was more of an internal process, as the affordances that they recognized were primarily for individual learning and could be accessed by learners on their own. Also, the teachers tended to focus on resources that would make the students successful in courses (i.e., get good grades) rather than on resources for the larger, non-educational environment.

8.3. Comparisons Between Students’ and Teachers’ Affordances
The comparative analysis of students’ and teachers’ affordances aimed to expand on Kordt’s (2018) findings on how the affordances intended by teachers are perceived and used by learners. To that extent, we focused on the (mis)matches between the affordances perceived by teachers and students. This comparison not only allowed us to better understand which affordances teachers and students (dis)agreed on the most, but also suggested which affordances were most relevant for both groups.

When exploring the commonalities between perceptions of the teachers and the students as two distinct groups, only two core classroom resources (textbooks and instructors) were found to be mentioned by most members in each group. The teachers provided slightly higher scores across all three categories (usefulness, enjoyment, and accessibility) for these affordances, especially for instructors. The somewhat similar perceptions of the affordance textbooks may be explained by the fact that this affordance is actively used in classroom settings, as well as, outside the classroom and is usually part of a larger context for language learning. Although some programs may not require textbooks and opt for alternative resources or teaching methods, in programs that do use textbooks, they are typically seen as important tools “to get a good grade” and mastering the course material. However, the students recognized the expensiveness of this affordance which may have influenced their judgment of the degree of its accessibility.

The mismatches in the students’ and teachers’ perceptions of interpersonal affordances represent an interesting finding. Native speakers, tutors, and social spaces, the popular affordances among the students, were not mentioned by most of the teachers in this study. The disagreement between students’ and teachers’ perceptions of native speakers can be
explained by several motives. Possibly, like students, teachers recognized the difficulty of accessing native speakers in the foreign language context. Moreover, teachers may understand that native-speaker talk could present difficulties for comprehension due to its colloquial or idiomatic nature, especially at lower levels. Hence, teachers could think that students at lower proficiency levels do not benefit from interaction with native speakers. Perhaps, the difference in perception can be also explained by how students and teachers perceive native speaker communities. While students imagine more immediate and accessible communities (e.g., online native speaker communities), teachers may envision more remote groups of native speakers that would require students to travel abroad. Finally, teachers, more than students, may be aware of the fact that it can be energy and time-consuming to organize a meeting with a native speaker.

Another interesting mismatch is that most teacher participants mentioned cultural affordances (i.e., literature, music, and movies/TV shows), while these were not among the most commonly perceived affordances by the students. This finding partially contradicts Bailly’s (2011), who found that students used literature, music, and movies outside the classroom to develop their linguistic abilities. However, Bailly (2011) focused on individual students and the affordances they used, while our current study explored the affordances perceived by a group of students. The difference in the findings may be also explained by the fact that the sample of students in our study was skewed to second-/sixth-semester learners. Therefore, going back to Aronin and Singleton’s (2012) mention that the perception of affordances depends on a subject’s individual characteristics, the students’ proficiency level may not have been high enough to allow for the perceptions of these affordances. This finding stimulates further discussion about the role of cultural resources in learning a foreign language. Teachers may not clearly communicate learning objectives when using these cultural products and students may interpret the use of these products as a fun activity rather than an activity designed for learning.

So, what offers a helping hand for learners to progress in Russian? It seems that students consider that they receive a helping hand mostly when they are provided with the core classroom resources (textbooks and instructors) and opportunities for social interactions. In contrast, students did not report cultural artifacts like movies/TV shows, music, or literature, in their answers to the open-ended questions. However, this does not
necessarily imply that students did not find these cultural resources helpful, as they were not provided with a list of them to rate.

Overall, the affordances mentioned by students and teachers seem to reflect each group’s deeper beliefs about the process of language learning, raising the questions of whether this process is individual (what most of the teacher responses point to), or both individual and social (in classrooms, in out-of-class interactions) – which is what the students note.

9. Limitations

The main limitation of this study is the small number of participants in both groups. This limitation prevents us from generalizing our results to all L2 Russian learners and instructors. Additionally, this limitation restricted the types of analyses that could be conducted. For instance, given the low number of participants, we did not focus on some of the participants’ characteristics in the recruitment procedure. For example, we did not focus on the native speaker status of the teacher participants, gender, or more in-depth information about the teachers’ language teaching experience. Further research on perceptions of affordances would benefit from such information, as teachers’ background characteristics and experiences could help account for their perceptions of affordances. Likewise, the study would benefit from recruiting an equal number of students from each language proficiency level, or of the same gender to investigate possible differences or similarities across groups. Another limitation relates to the survey used in the study, given that it was not adapted from previous research. Therefore, the validity and reliability of the survey had not been extensively tested. Finally, the design of our study did not provide enough data to compare the teacher and student participants in the same classroom. Further research would gain from the investigation of (mis)matches between a teacher and their students in their perception of language learning affordances, since each classroom constitutes its own micro-context of affordances, which results from the interaction of the users (i.e., students and teachers), environment (i.e., classroom and beyond), and language. Overall, considering the limitations of this exploratory study, the findings should be treated with caution and should not be generalized to other contexts.

10. Conclusions and Pedagogical Implications

This study investigated the language learning affordances that L2 Russian students and teachers perceive in their learning and teaching
environments and the extent to which these perceptions match in terms of their usefulness, enjoyment, and accessibility. The findings suggest that the majority of the surveyed students and teachers strongly agreed in their perceptions of only two affordances belonging to the core classroom resources: **textbooks** and **instructors**.

Besides these core classroom affordances, most students emphasized affordances for interpersonal interactions (e.g., *native speakers*, *social spaces*, and *tutors*). Learners seem to appreciate opportunities to communicate in the Russian language in pressure-free environments. To support learners’ needs, departments and language programs may want to explore opportunities to provide students with better access to tutors, native speakers, or language partners. For example, social events of all kinds can be beneficial: movie nights, language tables, Russian tea hours, or thematic parties. Similarly, social events that involve playing cards or non-intensive sports can structure the verbal interactions between participants and limit the range of topics that learners need to talk about. It can also be advantageous to have a social space (a lounge) where students can come during the day to spend time with other Russian language speakers.

Unlike the students in our study, most of the teachers highlighted the affordances that represented cultural products (e.g., *movies/ TV shows*, *music*, and *literature*). Yet the majority of students did not think of those as resources to help them learn and progress in their target language. This finding raises further questions: Do students see literary works, movies, and songs as part of language learning at all? Why do students not recognize cultural products as beneficial for language learning? Do they think of them as only fun activities? These questions are beyond the scope of this research; however, teachers are the ones who can make changes in the education process since they decide what learning resources to use and/or encourage using and what topics need to be discussed and explored in classes. One thing teachers can do to raise learners’ awareness of these non-core classroom affordances is to be more explicit about the role that such affordances play in the learning process. For example, teachers can explain that while literature in an L2 classroom does not necessarily serve the purpose of developing daily real-life conversation skills, it provides cultural references to places, people, artifacts, social struggles, and historical events, which represent an integral part of the knowledge about a language and may facilitate real-life conversations with native speakers.
Appendix A

Participants’ Most Perceived Affordances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordance Categories created by researchers</th>
<th>Affordances mentioned by participants</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>Activity book</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workbook</td>
<td>Panorama textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textbook (Golosa)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coursepack</td>
<td>Textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Former instructor</td>
<td>Former instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professors/TAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors</td>
<td>Group tutor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal tutor</td>
<td>Tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-on-one Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private tutor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Spaces</td>
<td>Conversation table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conversation group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian activity on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native Speakers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Friends in the L2 community</strong></td>
<td><strong>Language spoken at home</strong></td>
<td><strong>Friend</strong></td>
<td><strong>Friends/people</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dictionaries</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dictionary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Glosbe (dict.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gramota.ru</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reverso context dictionary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature</strong></td>
<td><strong>Poems</strong></td>
<td><strong>Russian content literature</strong></td>
<td><strong>Short stories/novels</strong></td>
<td><strong>Books</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flashcards</strong></td>
<td><strong>StudyBlue</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quizlet</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flashcards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Movies/TV Shows</strong></td>
<td><strong>BBC Russia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Documentaries</strong></td>
<td><strong>Russian interviews</strong></td>
<td><strong>Movies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

**Wilcoxon test’s Results of the Comparison between Native and Non-native Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Learning</th>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movies/TV Shows</td>
<td>p = 0.1429</td>
<td>p-value = 1</td>
<td>p-value = 0.8801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashcards</td>
<td>p-value = 1</td>
<td>p-value = 0.07652</td>
<td>p-value = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>p-value = 0.4142</td>
<td>p-value = 1</td>
<td>p-value = 0.7469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>p-value = 0.8</td>
<td>p-value = 0.7469</td>
<td>p-value = 0.3329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>p-value = 0.6926</td>
<td>p-value = 0.6667</td>
<td>p-value = 0.6926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>p-value = 1</td>
<td>p-value = 0.4682</td>
<td>p-value = 0.2765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Participants’ Less Perceived Affordances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordance Categories created by researchers</th>
<th>Affordances mentioned by participants</th>
<th># and % of participants who mentioned each affordance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers (n=9)                          Students (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting</td>
<td>Acting</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Materials</td>
<td>Authentic materials (e.g. tickets, menus, etc.)</td>
<td>2/22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maps, cards, tickets, other authentic materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authentic texts, mems, pictures, short texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvas</td>
<td>Canvas</td>
<td>2/22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/Classroom</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom meetings</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking in class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative vocabulary lists</td>
<td>Cumulative vocabulary lists</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictations</td>
<td>Dictations</td>
<td>1/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow Students</td>
<td>Peers in higher courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classmates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group of Russian majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian speakers in student association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fellow ROTC cadets</td>
<td>4/44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group study sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studying with other students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends</strong></td>
<td><strong>Online game</strong></td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Games</strong></td>
<td><strong>Games (apps)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Trivia Crack</strong></td>
<td>1/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Board games</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jeopardy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grammar drills</strong></td>
<td>1/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grammar exercises</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grammar books/texts for reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cooljugator</strong></td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MasterRussian</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grammar webistes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Online grammar</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Handouts</strong></td>
<td><strong>2/22.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Worksheets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exercises created by instructor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homework</strong></td>
<td><strong>Homework</strong></td>
<td><strong>3/33%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Writing assignments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Independent study</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Language apps</strong></td>
<td><strong>4/44%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Duolingo</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Memrise</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Drops</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Library access collections</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Making videos</strong></td>
<td><strong>1/11%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Originals resources (news)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>News</strong></td>
<td><strong>4/44%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>News apps</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BBC Russian</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Radio programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Radio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Hours</td>
<td>Office Hours</td>
<td>1/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online forums</td>
<td>Online forum</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddit.com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online practice</td>
<td>Online practice</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online translate</td>
<td>Google translate</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online translate</td>
<td>Online translate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translator apps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-loud self talk</td>
<td>Thinking out loud</td>
<td>1/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pronunciation/vocab)</td>
<td>Conversation with yourself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice talking aloud, record self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen-pals</td>
<td>Pen-pals</td>
<td>1/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podcasts</td>
<td>Podcasts</td>
<td>2/ 22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Points</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>2/ 22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-life situations</td>
<td>Real-life situations</td>
<td>1/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian House</td>
<td>Russian House</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>3/33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking with son</td>
<td>Speaking with son</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>1/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips to Russian market, museum…</td>
<td>Trips to Russian market, museum…</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>Online practice (quizzes, articles…)</td>
<td>1/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yandex</td>
<td>Yandex (if for translation)</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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L2 Writing as a Tool for Improving L2 Speaking Accuracy through Text-Reconstruction Tasks in a Communicative Language Classroom

NATALIA SLETOVA

1. Introduction

“How can teachers help students improve their second language (L2) speaking accuracy?” is a question that most L2 educators teaching in a communicative language classroom ask themselves every day. Although a great number of studies in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research have emphasized the interdependence of L2 writing and speaking, they have mostly explored how speaking can be involved in scaffolding the process of writing and not vice versa, e.g., teacher and peer-feedback (Birjandi & Hadidi Tamjid, 2012; Meihami & Razmjoo, 2016; Suzuki, 2009), collaborative writing (Fernandez Dobao, 2012; Tabari, 2015; Zhang, 2018), socio-cognitive analysis of texts (Atkinson, 2014; Beach, Newell, & Vanderheide, 2016), and more.

More importantly, research of L2 writing as a scaffold on L2 speaking is still scarce; the current data either provides examples comparing learners’ linguistic performance in the two modalities (Adams, 2006; Angelovska, 2017; Ellis & Yuan, 2005), or presents qualitative analysis of expected benefits from employing writing in L2 instructional methods (Iida, 2019; Manchon & Roca de Larios, 2011; Nelson & Lu, 2008). Consequently, the consideration that L2 writing has the potential to act as a scaffold for L2 speaking accuracy in a traditional communicative language classroom has often been overlooked in the United States (Hirvela & Belcher, 2016).

Due to the main focus on oral communication, in contemporary L2 communicative classes writing is commonly assigned for practice outside of the classroom (Carter, 2007; Overland et al., 2021). Teachers who omit writing activities in classroom practice and concentrate primarily on practicing oral discourse thereby overlook the potential benefit of using L2 writing as a scaffold for L2 speaking accuracy. Additionally, L2 writing scholars tend to legitimize the field of L2 writing by distinguishing it...
from general classroom pedagogy, thus discouraging the view that practicing guided L2 writing in a communicative classroom can be used for improving accuracy of oral discourse (Belcher & Hirvela, 2016). According to Kang (2020), “further empirical studies need to be conducted about ways in which writing can scaffold speaking to fully understand the nature of speaking and writing connections” (p. 263). That said, the intent of the present research is to draw SLA researchers’ attention to the untapped potential that L2 writing has on improving the accuracy of L2 oral discourse when used in a traditional L2 communicative classroom 1.

The benefit of written output modality over spoken output modality for improving L2 learners’ oral accuracy is particularly evident in the areas of planning and noticing. The literature review that follows will describe the latest research comparing L2 writing and speaking in the areas of planning and noticing, and how L2 writing can potentially benefit L2 speaking accuracy in a communicative classroom.

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Planning

Unlike speaking, writing typically does not require immediate production, as it usually allows time for significant pauses or longer breaks. Also, writing results in visual output that allows for a type of inspection that spoken language does not have, making it possible to go back to the written output and change it, if necessary. In contrast, speakers usually do not go back to the beginning of their verbalizations to correct their grammar or lexical choices, although they can correct themselves in the moment. Moreover, the writing process facilitates monitoring, thus mediating self-correction more readily than speaking. In speaking, self-monitoring happens simultaneously with speech production, and the speaker does not have as much time to pause and go back to what they have already said. Additionally, written communication for most writers presupposes a need to follow formal conventions for the genre of text being produced, which,

---

1 In this study, the term ‘speaking accuracy’ is operationalized as accuracy on an oral recall task. Whether improvement in accuracy on a spoken recall task can lead to better accuracy in spontaneous speech is an empirical question that is beyond the scope of the present research, although it should be investigated in the future. In the same vein, ‘writing’ is defined as performance on written recall tasks and not ‘writing’ in the sense that one is composing a written text to express meaning.
depending on the task, could lead to improvements in morpho-syntax and lexical choices compared to spoken output. Writing also allows more time for planning than speaking, which in turn leads to greater attention paid to both form and meaning (Williams, 2008). More importantly, as Belcher and Hirvea (2008) suggest, writing tasks with on-going teacher’s feedback “may lower the affective filter enough to make learners to feel freer to try new forms of the target language, and hence, gain the level of confidence that may eventually transfer to speech” (p. 3). Thus, considering the differences between the two output modalities, it is possible to conclude that if L2 learners were provided the same planning conditions to perform an oral or written task in an L2 communicative classroom, their “writing may result in better output than speaking. By better, it is usually meant that it may be grammatically more accurate or complex, or lexically more complex or varied” (Manchón & Williams, 2016, p. 567). In brief, these benefits in output can be explained by the increased time learners have for accessing their linguistic command, the additional time available for their output production, and the lesser affective filter.

A large body of research analyzing planning in L2 writing and speech (Ahmadian & Tavakali, 2010; Bui & Teng, 2019; Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Khatib & Farahanynia, 2020) has demonstrated that pre-task planning enhances grammatical complexity and fluency in L2 speaking production, while untimed and online planning positively influences accuracy, grammatical complexity, and fluency of both written and oral production. Studies comparing planning in the two output modalities are unfortunately, however, extremely rare. To the best of my knowledge, only two previous studies have analyzed the effects of no planning, untimed and timed online planning in both speaking and writing (Ellis & Yung, 2005; Kim, 2018). Both studies indicated that the no-planning condition resulted in slower output for both speaking and writing and that speaking provided more fluent responses than writing in both planning conditions. Additionally, the trade-off between fluency and accuracy was much greater in speaking than in writing, with results confirming that writing allows more time for planning and monitoring output than speaking, thus leading to better accuracy.

In brief, the research has indicated that pre-task and online planning positively influence linguistic production in both modalities. However, L2 writing tasks demonstrate better results in grammatical
accuracy and syntactic complexity in the same planning conditions due to the slower pace and differences in the cognitive processes required for the two modalities. Therefore, it can be assumed that with more time available for planning during written output than spoken output, learners may attempt to practice new or more complex forms in unfamiliar contexts. Furthermore, repeated access to these forms may provide the opportunity for learners to transfer this written output into speech.

2.2. Noticing

According to Swain’s Output Hypothesis (1993), successful L2 skill development requires noticing during output. As she explains, noticing can be prompted when learners do not know the necessary forms to express intended meaning. In other words, for noticing to occur there should be a gap in the learner’s linguistic knowledge. If learners become aware of this gap and have access to correct input, they may be able to modify their output, which could lead to learners learning the previously missing structure. Noticing can occur “at any time or interval by focalizing on the samples of input and output tasks of learners through which learners become aware of their gap in their interlanguage” (Ögeyik, 2017, p. 3). The form of noticing in which learners can compare their own interlanguage forms with the target forms and determine where the discrepancies are is called ‘noticing the gap’ (Adams, 2003; Ögeyik, 2017).

Mackey’s (2006) study demonstrates that learners who are better at noticing target features of input during classroom oral interaction with feedback produce more accurate target morphosyntactic and lexical forms in their classroom speech. Additionally, Adams’s (2003) study indicated that learners who participated in noticing sessions (reformulation tasks) incorporated many more targeted forms in their post-test written assignments than those who did not participate in noticing sessions. The author concluded that providing opportunities for learners to ‘notice the gap’ can lead to increased L2 proficiency.

Both writing and speaking require learners to produce output. Also, both modalities allow learners to use forms previously noticed in language input and that allows them a chance to start internalizing them in their L2 production. The role of writing in L2 output, however, has typically been overlooked in L2 acquisition research (Adams, 2003). In
order for learners to notice the gap in their speech, they need “sufficient amount of processing space available to hold both versions [correct and incorrect utterance] in memory and compare them” (p. 349). With the ongoing processing demands of speech on memory, it is not always possible for learners to have enough time to make a comparison. Moreover, speaking is a process that does not always allow time for monitoring and corrections. In writing, however, learners typically give increased cognitive attention to meanings and forms and demonstrate the ability to keep information in their working memory longer (Kellog, 2007).

Research investigating differences in noticing during written and spoken output in L2 (Adams, 2006; García Mayo & Azkarai, 2016; Niu, 2009) has demonstrated that speaking provides more attention to meaning while writing provides more attention to form. Adams (2006), García Mayo and Azkarai (2016), and Niu (2009) compared collaborative work of L2 learners on text reconstruction tasks (Adams, 2006; Niu, 2009), picture placement, picture difference, picture story, and dictogloss tasks (García Mayo & Azkarai, 2016) in spoken and written formats. Their findings demonstrated that the students who worked on written tasks tended to use more language-related episodes (when the learner starts questioning their accuracy of language use) that focused on lexis and forms, while spoken tasks prompted more focus on meaning. In addition, writing tasks initiated more engagement and noticing from the learners, possibly due to the higher level of attention required in writing over speaking.

Thus, considering that the spoken output modality provides more attention to meaning while the written output modality provides more attention to form, it is possible to suggest that practicing writing may help learners to ‘notice the gap,’ correct their mistakes, and potentially transfer the uptake into their speech. Sletova (2023) investigated if a ‘noticing the gap’ activity performed in writing could help improve grammatical accuracy of the spoken output modality. Beginner and intermediate learners of Russian completed

---

2 Dictogloss is a text reconstruction activity. It usually includes four stages: setting the stage (instructor introduces the topic and vocabulary if necessary), delivery of the text (in a written or auditory mode), reconstruction (usually in pairs or in groups of three), comparison and analysis (students compare their versions with the original and analyze mistakes (Wong & Simard, 2017)
a ‘noticing the gap’ activity within a text-reconstruction task in both modalities. The results demonstrated that only after working with the text in writing did learners of both levels of proficiency improve their grammatical accuracy in oral speech. These findings indicated that L2 writing activities do improve the accuracy of spontaneous speech although more research investigating L2 writing as a scaffold for L2 speaking accuracy was warranted.

As the literature review has demonstrated, there is strong potential for L2 writing activities to scaffold L2 speaking in a communicative language classroom. Writing allows learners to practice new forms in new contexts, and repeated use of these forms in writing leads to learning additional dimensions of words, i.e., their spelling, their inflectional morphology, and perhaps their combinability, while speaking helps more with pronunciation and word stress. Writing also enhances more ‘noticing the gap’ than speaking and provides opportunities for learners to improve their communicative fluency, accuracy, and vocabulary knowledge.

3. The Present Study
Although previous research has demonstrated that the written output modality produces better results in grammatical accuracy and syntactic complexity than the speaking modality (Ellis & Yung, 2005; Johnson & Abdi Tabari, 2022; Kim, 2018) and that L2 writing provides learners with more opportunities to ‘notice the gap’ (Adams, 2003; Mackey, 2006; Ögeyik, 2017) than L2 speaking, whether practicing L2 writing can also lead to better speaking accuracy still needs to be investigated. If writing prompts learners to increase their attention to produced output, ‘notice the gap’, modify their output, and subsequently incorporate corrected forms into their writing, it is possible to assume that this uptake can be transferred into their speech.

This study expanded on Sletova’s earlier study (2023) and, first, analyzed the potential benefits of practicing a ‘noticing the gap’ activity in writing for improving speaking accuracy using a text reconstruction task for three levels of proficiency (beginner, intermediate, and advanced), then further examined the interaction between both output modalities among the three levels of proficiency. The present study addressed the following research questions:
1. To what extent can the proposed benefits of pushed output (planning, noticing, and uptake) in written modality transfer to the spoken modality?
2. Do learners who engage in practicing ‘noticing the gap’ via written recall make more gains in oral accuracy than learners who engage in practicing ‘noticing the gap’ via spoken recall?
3. What effect does proficiency level have on the relationship between both output modalities?

It was predicted that all three levels of proficiency who engaged in writing tasks would incorporate uptake from these writing tasks in their spoken recall.

4. Methods

4.1. Participants
Beginner (n=23; age: M=21.87; SD=3.81), intermediate (n=21; age: M=21.71; SD=3.58), and advanced (n=20; age: M=21.57; SD=2.36) learners of Russian participated in the study. The beginner and intermediate groups were drawn from the intact groups at one US university. The advanced group was drawn from intact groups from two different universities. All participants had English as their first language. The two universities follow similar ACTFL-oriented proficiency curricula and placement testing. While the participants were not tested for proficiency level before the study, it was assumed that they were of similar levels due to being in class together. The beginner learners participated in the study at the beginning of their third semester of Russian, the intermediate learners – in the beginning of their fifth semester of Russian, and the advanced learners – in the beginning of their seventh semester of Russian. Additionally, pre-test questionaries indicated that, with a few exceptions, the participants generally received As or A’s in their Russian courses. To avoid any interference with the results, only learners with no knowledge of any other Slavic languages were allowed to participate in the study. The learners participated in the study voluntarily, but a $25 incentive was offered.

4.2. Materials
All texts were taken from the Russian textbook Shkatulochka (Chubarova, 2008). Each level read a different text that was chosen in accordance with their level proficiency (Appendix A). The textbook includes narrations
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created as supplemental materials for each level of proficiency. The textbook was chosen because it is not commonly used in the United States, therefore, there was a better chance that the participants were not familiar with the texts presented in the book. As the posttest questionnaire indicated, none of the participants had encountered the texts before. The texts were typed in a Word document, double-spaced in Times New Roman 12-point font, and were projected on a screen during an individual Zoom meeting with the researcher. An iPhone XS was used to record oral responses. All quantitative analyses were completed in the program IBM SPSS Statistic for Mac OS Version 27.0.

4.3. Procedure
After signing a consent form in DocuSign, each participant was assigned a number. After that, participants completed an online pretest questionnaire related to their socio-linguistic background (Appendix B). At the next stage, each participant met with the researcher individually on Zoom. All instructions were read by the researcher in English, and the text version was projected for the participants for review on a computer screen. The participants were instructed to read the text carefully, because afterwards they would need to reconstruction the text in as much detail as they could.

Participants in each level were randomly assigned to one of two groups. One group for each level performed a text reconstruction task first in writing and then in speaking; the other group read the text and performed the same text reconstruction task first in speaking and then in speaking again (Table 1). Each group also completed a 'noticing the gap' activity after reconstructing the text the first time: Namely, the participants received the original text after the first reconstruction and compared it to the texts they had produced.

Table 1. Distribution of conditions across different proficiency levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Writing-Speaking condition</th>
<th>Speaking-Speaking condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Writing-Speaking condition, participants of each level were asked to silently read the provided text based on their proficiency level in Russian during a five-minute time frame (the approximate time necessary to read each text carefully twice). After that, the text was taken away so that the participants did not have access to the text during the reconstruction phase. Next, participants were asked to reconstruct the text to the best of their abilities on a piece of paper in writing. Next, they took a picture of the text they produced and e-mailed it to the researcher. After the first reconstruction phase, participants were asked to compare their written responses with the original text. Thus, opportunities for noticing the gap were provided. When participants were done, they were asked to reconstruct the original text again but orally. Although the reconstruction tasks were not timed, the time for each reconstruction task, on average, was no more than five minutes. The ‘noticing the gap’ activity, in turn, on average, was shorter than the first reconstruction phase.

In the second condition, participants were asked to silently read the provided text in Russian during a five-minute time frame. After that, the text was taken away and participants were asked to reconstruct the text to the best of their abilities orally. After the first reconstruction phase, participants were asked to silently read the original text again trying to identify differences between the text and their reconstructed version. Participants were allowed to verbalize the differences (if necessary), but the researcher was not allowed to comment on them. When participants were done, they were asked to reconstruct the original text again orally. Participants working in the second condition did not listen their first reconstruction so that the task could be as close to a classroom task as possible. The reconstruction tasks were not timed, although the time for each reconstruction task was not more than three minutes. Additionally, the researcher did not prompt either group to write or say more.

The oral responses were recorded and then transcribed by the researcher. The written responses were typed into a Word document by the researcher for further analysis. When participants were done with the reconstruction phase in both conditions, they were asked to answer the post-test questionnaire in English reflecting on the completed task (Appendix B).
5. Data Analysis and Coding

Two trained judges (the researcher and the departmental research assistant), native speakers of Russian, were trained to code the answers for the accuracy and complexity of the narrations. All responses were analyzed by both judges until the complete agreement was reached for all variables. The overall syntactic complexity of narrations was computed by calculating the mean length of unit per T-unit for the writing tasks (Wolfe-Quintero, Inagaki, & Kim, 1998) and AS-unit for the speaking tasks (Foster, Tonkyn, & Wigglesworth, 2000) (ML\textsubscript{per} T/AS). In addition, complexity by subordination was calculated by dividing the number of dependent clauses by the number of AS-units or T-units (DC\textsubscript{per} T/AS). Lexical diversity was measured using Guiraud’s index, which was calculated by dividing the number of types (individual words) by the square root of the number of tokens (total number of words) (T/\sqrt{2W}). For example, in the sentence Она работает ночью, спит днем, завтракает вечером, и идёт на работу вечером [She works at night, sleeps during the day, has breakfast in the evening, and goes to work in the evening], there are 12 tokens and 11 types (the word вечером is used twice).

To measure syntactic accuracy, the following error categories were analyzed: functional errors (prepositions, pronouns, conjunctions, and word order), verbal errors (subject-verb agreement, as well as conjugations), nominal errors (gender and plural number agreement in determiners and adjectives), and lexical errors (a word choice error occurs when the reconstruction uses a word in the wrong meaning). The total number of errors was divided by the number of AS-units or T-units (Err\textsubscript{per} T/AS).

The overall semantic accuracy of produced narrations was computed by calculating the number of correct and distorted propositions

---

3 T-unit can be defined as ‘one main clause plus whatever subordinate clauses attached to it’ (Hunt, 1965, p. 20) or ‘the shortest unit into which a piece of discourse can be cut without leaving any sentence fragments as residue’ (Hunt, 1970, p. 189). Examples of T-units: 1) When you make a milkshake, you mix it in a blender 2) ‘He goes to the bookmaker and gets some money’ (Foster et al., 2000, p. 362).

4 AS-unit is a single speaker’s utterance consisting of an independent clause or sub-clausal unit, together with any subordinate clause(s) associated with either (Foster et al., 2000, p. 365) Example of an AS-unit: 1) ‘That’s right; and...er... they told er... there there was not food crisis’ (Foster et al., 2000, p. 367).

5 The number of words, semantic complexity and lexical diversity of the original texts are presented in Appendix A.
(T-unit for written responses and AS-unit for oral responses) Any proposition that did not change the original meaning was counted as a correct proposition. If a proposition provided distorted information compared to the original text, the proposition was counted as a distorted proposition.

To answer the first and the second questions investigating the relationship between the two output modalities for each proficiency level, the participants' responses from both groups in both written and oral output modes (independent variables) were compared for syntactic and semantic accuracy and complexity (dependent variables) using a two-way repeated measures ANOVA. To answer the third research question analyzing the effect proficiency level has on the relationship between the two modalities, a one-way ANOVA was used. The null hypothesis postulated that there was no consistent difference or systematic variance between any two treatment situations.

Additionally, each dependent variable for all three levels of proficiency was checked for normal distribution using Shapiro-Wilk's test. The test confirmed that data was normally distributed for all variables \((p > .05)\). The Mauchly's test of sphericity assumed that sphericity was necessarily held for all six variables due to the two levels of a repeated factor for each variable. Also, the Leven's test of homogeneity of variables was conducted for the one-way ANOVA. If the Leven's test of homogeneity was violated \((p < .05)\), the Welch's test was used (no significance was found for any of the variables using the Welch's test, \(p > .05\)). Finally, although Norouzian and Plonsky's (2021) suggest that Cohen's (1988) proportion of variance effect size cut-off points (i.e. small = .0099; medium = .0588; large = .1379) should be applied to only 'partial eta squared' values and can be decreased for those of 'eta squared', the large values of 'eta squared' \((> .14)\) in this analysis allowed to account for the type two error.

The judges discarded three responses among the Beginner learners from the data since zero propositions were recalled. Although the three participants recalled phrases or words, they were not sufficient for recalling cohesive ideas. Although the researcher tried to provide as "safe" an atmosphere for the participants as possible, anxiety may have been a negative factor affecting participants' responses, though the researcher did not formally assess this with the participants.
6. Results

6.1. Beginner Learners

Descriptive statistics of semantic accuracy (correct (CP) and distorted (DP) propositions), syntactic accuracy (Err\textsubscript{perT/AS}), complexity by subordination (DC\textsubscript{perT/AS}), the overall syntactic complexity (ML\textsubscript{perT/AS}), and lexical diversity (T/✓2W) for the Writing-Speaking condition and for the Speaking-Speaking condition are provided in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Writing\textsubscript{1} (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking\textsubscript{1} (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking\textsubscript{2} (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking\textsubscript{2} (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Err\textsubscript{perT/AS}</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC\textsubscript{perT/AS}</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML\textsubscript{perT/AS}</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/✓2W</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To analyze the differences in improvements between the Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking conditions, a two-way repeated measures ANOVA was conducted for syntactic complexity (ML\textsubscript{perT/AS}), complexity by subordination (DC\textsubscript{perT/AS}), lexical diversity (T/✓2W), syntactic accuracy (Err\textsubscript{perT/AS}), and for the number of correct (CP) and
distorted (DP) propositions. The two-way repeated measures ANOVA conducted for all six variables did not demonstrate a significant difference or large effect size for the number of correctly recalled propositions ($F (1,18) = .12; p = .74; \eta_p^2 = .007$), for the number of distorted propositions ($F (1,18) = 1.47; p = .24; \eta_p^2 = .075$), for syntactic complexity ($F (1,18) = .46; p = .832; \eta_p^2 = .003$), complexity by subordination ($F (1,18) = .01; p = .91; \eta_p^2 = .001$), or for lexical diversity ($F (1,18) = 1.83; p = .19; \eta_p^2 = .093$). However, when comparing the syntactic accuracy, a statistically significant difference with a large effect size ($F (1,18) = 16.83; p < .001; \eta_p^2 = .48$) between the Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking conditions of the beginner groups (Fig. 1) was registered, which indicates significantly fewer mistakes in the spoken mode of recall in the Writing-Speaking condition. Interaction contrasts analysis revealed that the group working in the Writing-Speaking condition produced significantly fewer mistakes in the spoken mode recall compared to the second spoken mode recall of the group working in the Speaking-Speaking condition ($t (18) = 4.2; p < .001; d = 2.7$).

Figure 1. Changes in grammatical accuracy for the Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking conditions with the 95% confidence interval for beginner learners

---

6 For all ANOVA and t-tests, when necessary, a Bonferroni adjustment was applied.
6.2. Intermediate Learners
Descriptive statistics of semantic accuracy (correct (CP) and distorted (DP) propositions), syntactic accuracy (Err\textsubscript{perT/AS}), complexity by subordination (DC\textsubscript{perT/AS}), the overall syntactic complexity (ML\textsubscript{perT/AS}), and lexical diversity (T/\sqrt{2W}) for the Writing-Speaking condition and for the Speaking-Speaking condition are provided in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics by number of correct propositions (CP), distorted propositions (DP), syntactic accuracy (Err\textsubscript{perT/AS}), complexity by subordination (DC\textsubscript{perT/AS}), syntactic complexity (ML\textsubscript{perT/AS}), and lexical diversity (T/\sqrt{2W}) for the intermediate learners working in the Writing-Speaking condition (1) and in the Speaking-Speaking condition (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Writing\textsubscript{1} (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking\textsubscript{1} (n=11)</th>
<th>Speaking\textsubscript{2} (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking\textsubscript{2} (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>M = 8.81, SD = 1.53</td>
<td>M = 11.36, SD = 2.61</td>
<td>M = 11.1, SD = 4.04</td>
<td>M = 12.9, SD = 3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>M = .64, SD = .67</td>
<td>M = .18, SD = .04</td>
<td>M = .5, SD = .84</td>
<td>M = .6, SD = .69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Err\textsubscript{perT/AS}</td>
<td>M = 1.13, SD = .31</td>
<td>M = .61, SD = .24</td>
<td>M = .71, SD = .27</td>
<td>M = .74, SD = .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC\textsubscript{perT/AS}</td>
<td>M = .05, SD = .08</td>
<td>M = .06, SD = .07</td>
<td>M = .07, SD = .08</td>
<td>M = .12, SD = .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML\textsubscript{perT/AS}</td>
<td>M = 6.51, SD = .73</td>
<td>M = 6.83, SD = 1.27</td>
<td>M = 5.96, SD = 1.06</td>
<td>M = 6.65, SD = .88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/\sqrt{2W}</td>
<td>M = 4.27, SD = .45</td>
<td>M = 4.65, SD = .5</td>
<td>M = 4.4, SD = .63</td>
<td>M = 4.86, SD = .53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two-way repeated measures ANOVA conducted for all six variables between the two conditions (Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking) did not demonstrate a significant difference or large effect size for the number of correct propositions ($F (1,19) = .63; p = .44; \eta_p^2 = .03$), distorted proposition ($F (1,19) = 1.73; p = .21; \eta_p^2 = .08$), for syntactic complexity ($F (1,19) = .98; p = .37; \eta_p^2 = .02$), for complexity by subordination ($F (1,19) = 1.16; p = .22; \eta_p^2 = .07$), or for lexical diversity ($F (1,19) = .19; p = .67; \eta_p^2 = .01$). However, a two-way repeated measures ANOVA comparing syntactic accuracy between the two groups indicated a significant
difference with a large effect size between the Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking conditions (Fig. 2), indicating significantly fewer mistakes in the spoken mode of recall ($F(1,19) = 37.65; p < .001; \eta^2_p = .67$). Interaction contrasts analysis revealed that the group working in the Writing-Speaking condition produced significantly fewer mistakes in the spoken mode recall compared to the second spoken mode recall of the group working in the Speaking-Speaking condition ($t(18) = 6.1; p < .001, c = .16$). Furthermore, the analysis of within-subject conditions indicated a statistically significant change with a large effect size in the number of correctly recalled propositions for the participants working in the Writing-Speaking condition ($F(1,19) = 16.68; p < .05; \eta^2_p = .56$).

**Figure 2.** Changes in grammatical accuracy for the Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking conditions with the 95% confidence interval for Intermediate learners

6.3. **Advanced Learners**
Descriptive statistics of semantic accuracy (correct (CP) and distorted (DP) propositions), syntactic accuracy (Err\_perT/AS), complexity by subordination (DC\_perT/AS), the overall syntactic complexity (ML\_perT/AS), and lexical diversity (T/\sqrt{2W}) for the Writing-Speaking condition and for the Speaking-Speaking condition are provided in Table 4.
Table 4. Descriptive statistics by number of correct propositions (CP), distorted propositions (DP), syntactic accuracy (ErrperT/AS), complexity by subordination (DCperT/AS), syntactic complexity (MLperT/AS), and lexical diversity (T✓2W) for the advanced learners working in the Writing-Speaking condition (1) and in the Speaking-Speaking condition (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Writing₁ (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking₁ (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking₂ (n=10)</th>
<th>Speaking₂ (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ErrperT/AS</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCperT/AS</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLperT/AS</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T✓2W</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two-way repeated measures ANOVA conducted for all six variables between the two conditions (Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking) did not suggest a significant difference or large effect size in the means for any of the six variables, i.e., the number of correct propositions \(F (1,18) = .15; p = .7; \eta^2 = .008\), distorted proposition \(F (1,18) = .4; p = .55; \eta^2 = .06\), for syntactic complexity \(F (1,18) = .11; p = .74; \eta^2 = .006\), for complexity by subordination \(F (1,18) = .04; p = .83; \eta^2 = .002\), for lexical diversity \(F (1,18) = .0; p = 1; \eta^2 = .001\), or syntactic accuracy \(F (1,18) = 1.66; p = .21; \eta^2 = .08\).

7. Interaction Across All Levels of Proficiency
A one-way ANOVA comparing groups across all three levels of proficiency working in the Writing-Speaking condition revealed that there was a statistically significant difference with a large effect size in syntactic complexity and lexical diversity between any two groups \(F (2, 28) = 19.7, p < .01; \eta^2 = .68; F (2, 28) = 30.47, p < .01; \eta^2 = .71\). A Bonferroni post-hoc test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of syntactic
complexity for advanced learners was significantly higher than for both beginner and intermediate groups \( (M = 8.84, SD = 1.66; M = 5.18, SD = .84; p < .01; M = 6.51, SD = .73, p < .01) \) and the mean value of lexical diversity for advanced learners was significantly higher than that for beginner learners working in the Writing-Speaking condition \( (M = 4.56, SD = .43; M = 3.14, SD = .29; p < .01) \).

Furthermore, a one-way ANOVA comparing groups across all three levels of proficiency working in the Speaking-Speaking condition revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in syntactic complexity and lexical diversity between any two groups with a large effect size \( (F (2, 27) = 42.3, p < .01; \eta^2 = .75; F (2, 27) = 36.17, p < .01; \eta^2 = .73) \). A Bonferroni post-hoc test for multiple comparisons found that the mean value of syntactic complexity for advanced learners \( (M = 8.67, SD = .88) \) was significantly higher than for both the beginner and intermediate groups working in the Speaking-Speaking condition \( (M = 5.96, SD = 1.06; p < .01; M = 4.68, SD = 1.04, p < .01) \), and the mean value of lexical diversity for advanced learners \( (M = 4.75, SD = .53) \) was significantly higher than that for beginner learners working in the Speaking-Speaking condition \( (M = 2.96, SD = .28; p < .01) \).

8. Post-Study Questionnaire
The post-study questionnaire was analyzed with the purpose to see whether written or/and spoken conditions provided enough opportunities for learners to acquire new vocabulary from the context. All twenty beginner learners \( (n = 20) \) indicated that they had never previously read the provided text. Nineteen beginner learners stated that they had guessed the meaning of the words бандиты [bandits] and хулиганы [hooligans] from context. Although all nineteen learners stated that they guessed the meaning of the word полицейский [police officer], four learners had assigned a wrong meaning to the word, translating it as politician. One learner indicated that they knew all the above-mentioned words and did not have to guess anything from context. This learner was also the only one who guessed the meaning of the word опасный [dangerous] from context. Additionally, 16 learners mentioned that they did not know the

---

For comparison, the semantic complexity and lexical diversity of the original texts are as follows: beginners - MLperT/AS = 6.78; \( T/\sqrt{2W} = 3.71 \); intermediate - MLperT/AS = 8.64; \( T/\sqrt{2W} = 6.11 \); advanced - MLperT/AS = 9.83; \( T/\sqrt{2W} = 6.99 \).
word встречать [to meet] and could not guess the meaning from context. One learner noted that they had forgotten the word спать [to sleep], but the text reminded them of it. One learner indicated that they did not know the word защищать [to protect], and they did not guess the meaning of it from the text.

All intermediate participants (n=21) noted that they had not seen the provided text before the experiment. Twenty intermediate learners responded that they had not found any unfamiliar words or grammar structures in the text. One intermediate participant mentioned that they did not know the word известный [famous] but was able to guess the meaning from context. One participant mentioned that they had forgotten the words купаться [to swim] and загорать [to sunbathe] but that the text helped refresh the words in their memory.

Similar to the beginner and intermediate learners, all advanced learners (n=20) responded that they saw the provided text for the first time during this experiment. Eleven participants stated that they did not notice any unfamiliar words. Three learners noted that they did not know the word старинный [ancient] and confused it with the word старый [old]. One learner noted the text reminded them of the dative case, e.g., - памятник кому? - Ивану Федорову [the monument to whom? - to Ivan Fedorov]. That learner also wrote that they had expected a preposition для [for] instead of на [for] in the phrase: собирала деньги на него [collected money for it]. Three participants did not know the word for printing press but guessed it from context. Two participants recalled the word напечатанный [published] after reading the text. Finally, four participants mentioned that they confused the word лист [a piece of paper] with список [list].

9. Discussion
The first and second research questions centered on the possible effects that ‘noticing the gap’ via pushed written output can have on speaking accuracy as compared to ‘noticing the gap’ by engaging in oral production. It was hypothesized that learners of all proficiency levels who engaged in L2 writing tasks would incorporate uptake from these tasks to L2 speaking, more precisely to oral accuracy.

As predicted, a statistical comparison of the results demonstrated that the groups of beginner and intermediate learners who recalled the
text in writing before speaking significantly improved their syntactic accuracy in the second spoken mode of recall, unlike the groups of beginner and intermediate learners who had worked with the text in the spoken condition twice. These results are consistent with the view stating that writing can provide more time for planning (Ahmadian & Tavakali, 2010; Bui & Teng, 2019; Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Khatib & Farahany, 2020) and more opportunities for learners to ‘notice the gap’ (Adams, 2003; Mackey, 2006; Ögeyik, 2017). In writing, learners typically have sufficient processing space available to hold both correct and incorrect versions in memory and to compare them. With the ongoing processing demands of speech on memory, it is not always possible for learners to have enough time to make a comparison. Moreover, speaking is a process that does not always allow time for monitoring and corrections. In writing, however, learners typically have increased cognitive attention to produced output, and have enough time to correct their mistakes. More importantly, the fact that the number of mistakes significantly decreased in the second spoken recall for the beginner and intermediate groups working in the Writing-Speaking condition, indicates that writing provides enough opportunities for learners to not only ‘notice the gap’ and modify their output, but also transfer this uptake into their speech.

Although the syntactic improvement in the advanced learners working in the Writing-Speaking condition was not statistically significant, the number of mistakes in the speaking conditions were reduced by 25% overall, while the learners who worked in the Speaking-Speaking condition did not demonstrate any improvement. The fact that the improvement in syntactic accuracy did not demonstrate statistical significance most likely indicates that the improvement of L2 learners’ oral accuracy slows down as they become more proficient, i.e., a ceiling effect. Given this likelihood, it is possible to assume that, similar to the beginner and intermediate learners working with the text in writing, the advanced learners who completed the writing tasks also had more opportunities to ‘notice the gap’, modify their output, and incorporate this uptake in their speech, than the advanced learners who worked with the text in the Speaking-Speaking condition.

Below are some examples of how the students in the writing to speaking group improved their grammatical accuracy. Novice learners improved verb conjugations, nominal declensions, and prepositions
in the second spoken recall. For example, в ночь и в утром were corrected to ночной [at night] and утром [in the morning], or она идет спать was corrected to она идет спать [she goes to bed], бандиты знают его жена or он любит его женщин were corrected to бандиты знают его жену [bandits know his wife] and он любит свою жену [he loves his wife]. The intermediate group working in the writing to speaking condition improved verb conjugations, prepositions, nominal declensions, and lexical choices. For example, вечером были тихие тёплые was corrected to вечера были тихие и тёплые [evenings were calm and warm], what was initially Лена и дети любили кататься became Лена и дети любили купаться [Lena and children loved swimming], работал в известной компьютерной фирме was corrected to работал в известной компьютерной фирме [worked at a famous computer firm], он на дачу в свободное время became он приехал на дачу в свободное время [he came to dacha at his free time], семья Смирновый was corrected to семья Смирновых [the Smirnov family], жили в даче became жили в даче [lived at dacha], and others. Finally, Advanced group working in the writing to speaking condition also improved verb conjugations, prepositions, nominal declensions, and lexical choices. For example, у них были много ошибок was corrected to в них было много ошибок [they had a lot of mistakes], книги в печатном станке was corrected to книги на печатном станке [books on a printing press], what was initially вся страна дарила деньги became вся страна собирала деньги [the whole country collected money], первую книгу напечатали was corrected to первую книгу напечатали [first book was printed], памятник Ивану Фёдорову was corrected to памятник Ивану Фёдорову [monument to Ivan Fedorov], держит список будущей книги was corrected to держит лист будущей книги [holds a page of a future book], and many others.

Furthermore, the first spoken recall in the intermediate Speaking-Speaking group provided a significantly higher number of correctly recalled propositions than the written mode of recall in the intermediate Writing-Speaking group, although both groups were provided with sufficient time for planning and monitoring their output in both recall modes. The responses to the pre-study questionnaire indicated that four out of eleven students working in the Writing-Speaking group had had a year break before taking their intermediate level classes due to the Covid-19 pandemic. In their responses, they indicated that they had decided to take a break from classes instead of taking classes online.
Since all four students recalled the smallest number of propositions, it is reasonable to assume that in their cases the written mode of recall could not compensate for their lack of practice, which led to the smaller number of recalled propositions.

Additionally, as the analysis among the three levels of proficiency indicated, the syntactic complexity and lexical diversity of the texts produced by the intermediate learners working in the Speaking-Speaking condition were significantly higher than the syntactic complexity and lexical diversity of the text produced by the beginner learners working in the same Speaking-Speaking condition. These results suggest that, likely due to a higher level of proficiency, intermediate learners have more opportunities to concentrate on improving the syntactic complexity of produced sentences than beginner speakers and use a wider vocabulary range in their responses.

Interestingly, unlike the Speaking-Speaking intermediate group, the intermediate group working in the Writing-Speaking condition did not demonstrate a significant difference in the increase of syntactic complexity and lexical diversity when compared to beginner learners working in the same condition. These results, again, can be explained by the lack of Russian knowledge of those students who had a year break before joining the intermediate level classes due to the COVID-19, thus reducing the overall intermediate scores.

Moreover, the syntactic complexity and lexical diversity of the text produced by both advanced groups was significantly higher than the complexity of the texts produced by the corresponding intermediate groups. These results confirm that the complexity and lexical diversity of produced output increase with each level of proficiency.

Finally, the post-test questionnaire indicated that the beginner and advanced learners working in both the Writing-Speaking and Speaking-Speaking conditions remembered new words they had guessed from context. The ability to remember separate words from the text after working in both writing and speaking indicates that, even though learners pay more attention to form during written output (Adams, 2006; García Mayo & Azkarai, 2016; Niu, 2009), both writing and speaking may provide enough opportunities to notice and incidentally acquire new vocabulary. Considering that the intermediate learners did not report unfamiliar words or grammar structures in the text but only refreshed
some words in their memory, it is only possible to assume that similar to beginner and advanced learners, intermediate learners could have enough opportunities to incidentally acquire new vocabulary from texts in both conditions.

10. Pedagogical implications
The results of the study demonstrate that although a spoken mode of recall provided all learners with sufficient opportunity to improve their lexical diversity and acquire new words from the text, only the students in the Writing-Speaking condition were able to notice their mistakes, modify them, and transfer this uptake in their speech production. These results have practical implications for L2 pedagogy. In order for learners to ‘notice the gap’ and transform their mistakes, in-class activities based on guided writing can be suggested. For example, text reconstruction activities, text mapping activities, dictation, and others. To elaborate, text reconstruction and text mapping activities can be done in pairs with ongoing feedback as a review session before an exam. Also, school boards can be used to complete these activities in pairs or groups. In this case, analysis of produced texts and mistakes can be done by the whole class. Additionally, text mapping activities can be used to introduce new grammatical concepts. The activities can be introduced as pair work, group work, or working with the whole class (see example, Sletova, 2021). Dictation, on the other hand, can be used for the whole class to allow students to work on their spelling through listening. In this activity, after the dictation stage students will need to read the original text trying to identify differences between the original text and their produced output.

This experiment can also lead to filling the gap in classroom research investigating how working with texts in writing can benefit spontaneous speech. Most importantly, further research is needed to confirm the effects of guided writing activities, and whether improved accuracy in carefully curated sequences of reading-writing-speaking can then lead to improvements in linguistic accuracy in spontaneous speech.

11. Limitations
This study investigated the possibility that L2 writing could scaffold L2 speaking grammatical accuracy in a text-reconstruction task. One of the biggest limitations of this study is the small number of the participants.
Another limitation is the absence of a proficiency placement test among the participants. It is possible that not everyone in the tested groups may have been at the actual expected proficiency level. Additionally, three different texts were used across levels, which may have negatively affected the conclusions made from research question number three. Furthermore, a future study is merited to examine whether improvement in grammatical accuracy of oral recall can lead to improvement in overall spontaneous speaking ability. Also, the analysis was conducted for only one input modality (reading) given that the sample size was too small to effectively measure both the reading and listening input modalities. Thus, the relationship between L2 speaking accuracy and L2 writing with the aural input (listening) also warrants investigation. Although the researcher tried to create an atmosphere as friendly as possible during the experiment, it is also possible that affective variables such as motivation, interest, anxiety, and fear of failure affected the results.

12. Future Research Directions
The results of this study provide several opportunities for future research. First, future studies can replicate this study with a bigger number of the participants. Second, testing participants’ proficiency level can be recommended in the future. Third, future studies can use one text adjusted for different levels of proficiency. Fourth, the number of participants in the present study was too small to test the effect of L2 writing on L2 speaking accuracy for the two input modalities (reading and listening). A study with a 2 x 2 group design (reading input x written output, reading input x spoken output, listening input x written output, listening input x spoken output) would build upon this one and offer further insights. Additionally, future research could examine whether lexical and grammatical structures that correctly appeared on the oral recall task would display the same level of accuracy in a task that involves spontaneous speech. In other words, does accuracy on an oral recall task transfer over to spontaneous speech? Also, the influence of L2 writing on L2 speaking accuracy for native speakers of languages other than English could be investigated. Finally, considering that our results demonstrated that practicing L2 writing helped learners improve their speaking accuracy, subsequent research in this area could likely provide new ideas for improving methods of L2 teaching in the field of ISLA.
13. Conclusion
The results of this study support the prediction that using writing activities in a communicative language classroom can help learners ‘notice the gap’, correct their mistakes, and transfer the uptake into their spoken recall improving their speaking accuracy for all levels of proficiency. Indeed, learners of all three levels of proficiency, i.e., beginners, intermediate, and advanced, improved their grammatical accuracy in the second oral mode of recall only when written recall preceded the oral text reconstruction. Thus, although a spoken mode of recall provided learners with enough opportunity to recognize and remember new words from the text, only working with the text in writing helps students to notice their grammatical mistakes and to not use them in subsequent spoken recall.

This study contributes to the field in two major ways. First, it adds to the understudied area of literature devoted to investigating how L2 guided writing activities can be used to improve the development of L2 speaking in a communicative language classroom. Notably, its research findings support the hypothesis that using L2 writing as a scaffold for L2 speaking accuracy can be beneficial for all levels of learners. Second, the study results have significant practical implications for L2 pedagogy. Demonstrating the benefits of supplemental activities that can improve learners’ speaking accuracy contributes directly to successful L2 learning. Text reconstruction activities, text mapping activities, dictation, and other supplemental activities can be employed to fill the gap in classroom research investigating how working with texts in writing in a communicative language classroom can benefit not only spoken recall, but also spontaneous speech. Specifically, a future study that investigates whether engaging in written recall tasks will lead to better accuracy in spontaneous speech is warranted.
Appendix A: Beginner, Intermediate, and Advanced Texts

Beginner Text
Note: Spaces have been removed from between lines.

Это Кирилл. Его жена - полицейский. Она много работает. Она часто работает ночью. Вечером она идёт на работу, а утром идёт домой спать. Днём она спит, вечером завтракает, ночью опять идёт на работу. Это не только трудная, но и очень опасная работа. Все хулиганы и бандиты знают его жену. Она очень хороший полицейский, поэтому они её не любят.

Кирилл адвокат. Он встаёт утром, завтракает, идёт на работу. Иногда он встречает на работе свою жену. Это бывает очень редко.

Конечно, все хулиганы и бандиты знают его. Он очень хороший адвокат, поэтому все хулиганы и бандиты его любят. Он хорошо их защищает, потому что это его работа. Но Кирилл их не любит, потому что они не любят его жену. А Кирилл её очень любит.

[This is Kirill. His wife is a policeman. She works a lot. She often works at night. She goes to work in the evening, and she goes home to sleep in the morning. She sleeps during the day, she has breakfast in the evening, she goes to work again at night. Her work is not only difficult, but also very dangerous. All hooligans and bandits know my wife. She is a very good policeman, so they don't like her.

Kirill is an advocate. He gets up in the morning, has breakfast, goes to work. Sometimes he meets his wife at work. This happens very rarely.

Of course, all the hooligans and bandits know him. He is a very good lawyer, so all hooligans and bandits love him. He defends them well because it is his job. But Kirill does not like them, because they do not like his wife. And Kirill loves her very much].

Number of words = 122; MLperT/AS = 6.78; T/√2W = 3.71.
[The Smirnov family had been living at the dacha for three weeks already. The weather was fine, there was almost no rain. Wife Lena and children went swimming and sunbathing every morning. Evenings were warm and quiet. Lena and her neighbors were drinking tea on the terrace, discussing the news and laughing. Sometimes they played volleyball. They were very happy at the dacha.

Husband Alexei worked for a well-known computer company. He had a lot of work, so he came to the dacha with a computer. Alexey got up late, drank tea alone, and sat down at the computer to work. Sometimes during the day Alexei watched TV. He especially liked sports programs and American films. After dinner, Alexei worked again, and then slept for a long time, like a happy man who had a vacation. All in all, he was also happy at the dacha.]
Advanced text
Note: Spaces have been removed from between lines.

В центре Москвы, недалеко от станции метро "Лубянка" стоит памятник: человек в старинной одежде держит в руке лист будущей книги. Это памятник Ивану Фёдорову. Его поставили в начале двадцатого века. Тридцать лет вся страна собирала деньги на него. Кто же такой Иван Фёдоров и почему ему поставили памятник в центре русской столицы?

В пятнадцатом веке в Европе напечатали первую книгу. Так началась новая эра. Однако в России ещё сто лет после этого не умели печатать книги. Их переписывали, и это был очень долгий процесс. Кроме того, книги были очень дорогие и в них было много ошибок. Только в шестнадцатом веке появилась первая печатная книга в России. Её напечата́л Ива́н Фёдоров на печатном станке, который он сделал сам.

[In the center of Moscow, not far from the Lubyanka metro station, there is a monument: a man in ancient clothes holds a sheet of a future book in his hand. This is a monument to Ivan Fedorov. It was placed at the beginning of the twentieth century. For thirty years, the whole country collected money for it. Who is Ivan Fedorov and why was his monument built in the center of the Russian capital?

In the fifteenth century, the first book was printed in Europe. It became the beginning of a new era. However, in Russia, they did not know how to print books for another hundred years. Books were rewritten, and it was a very long process. In addition, the books were very expensive, and they had many mistakes. Only in the sixteenth century, the first printed book appeared in Russia. It was printed by Ivan Fedorov on a printing press, which he made himself.]

Number of words = 118; MLperT/AS = 9.83; T/√2W = 6.99.
Appendix B: Questionnaires

1. Pre-Study Questionnaire
Note: Spaces have been removed from between questions.

Number (given by researcher): ________________________________
Date: ________________________________
1. What is your age? ________________________________
2. When did you begin studying Russian?
3. How many years have you been studying Russian? Have you been studying it continuously? Please mention any breaks in your study.
4. Have you studied abroad for Russian? For how long, in what program and in what city? How long ago was it?
5. What grades have you received in your Russian courses at OSU and elsewhere? Please list each course and the corresponding letter grade.
6. How much time, on average, do you devote to studying Russian every week?
7. What other foreign languages have you studied and for how long?
8. Do you have any other exposure to Russian on a regular basis? (i.e., family, friends, TV, etc.) If yes, please mention how often you interact with these people or things.
9. What aspects of Russian are the most difficult for you?
10. What strategies do you use to learn new vocabulary words?
11. Do you expect any benefits from knowing Russian for your future professional career?
12. Do you think your writing is better than your speaking in Russian or vice versa?

2. Post-Study Questionnaire
Note: Spaces have been removed from between questions.

Number (given by researcher): ________________________________
Date: ________________________________
1) Had you read this text before you participated in this study?
2) Did you pick-up any new words or grammar structures from the text?
3) Did the text include any unfamiliar words or grammar structures?
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Эвфемия как инструмент создания альтернативной реальности в российских пропагандистских медиа (на примере освещения войны России против Украины)

Ксения Туркова

1. Введение
В декабре 2020 года Экспертный совет независимого российского конкурса «Слово года» под председательством своего многолетнего куратора, философа и культуролога Михаила Эпштейна в очередной раз подвел языковые итоги года. Слова и выражения года эксперты выбирают в четырех номинациях: «Слово года», «Фраза года», «Антиязык» (язык пропаганды, лжи, агрессии, а также речевые штампы) и «Протологизм года». На четвертом месте в 2020 году в номинации «Антиязык» оказалась группа так называемых информационных эвфемизмов. Этот термин впервые упоминается именно в 2020 году в заключении Экспертного совета конкурса «Слово года»: именно тогда эксперты заметили всплеск частотности употребления таких слов, как хлопок (вместо взрыв), подтопление (вместо наводнение), финансовые трудности (вместо кризис) и так далее (30 декабря 2020) \(^1\).


---

\(^1\) [https://www.golosameriki.com/a/v-slovare-etogo-goda-mnogo-travmy/5718746.html](https://www.golosameriki.com/a/v-slovare-etogo-goda-mnogo-travmy/5718746.html)
Кремля — «русофобия». Это очень примитивная риторическая уловка» (16 марта 2023)².

В данной статье мы рассмотрим эвфемию как один из основных инструментов пропаганды и проанализируем:

— главные эвфемизмы, используемые после 24 февраля 2022 года российскими политиками и государственными медиа для создания альтернативной реальности;
— эвфемизмы, используемые гражданами, которые чувствуют необходимым высказаться о происходящем, но при этом стремятся себя обезопасить;

Прежде всего необходимо дать определение понятию эвфемизм и обозначить его основные признаки, чтобы, опираясь на них, выявить способы образования анализируемых нами эвфемизмов и определить их основные функции.

В современной лингвистике существует множество определений такого явления, как эвфемизм. Так, в Полном словаре лингвистических терминов Т.В.Матвеевой дается следующее определение: «Эвфемизм — нейтральное слово или выражение, которым заменяется другое — нетактичное, грубое, неприличное и потому с этических позиций неприемлемое» (Matveeva 2010, 537). Похожее определение дано и в Словаре лингвистических терминов под редакцией О.С. Ахмановой, где эвфемизм определяется как «перифраз, заключающийся в замене грубых, непристойных, а также неприятных выражений более вежливыми» (Akhmanova 1966, 513). В определении Д.Н.Шмелева в то же время содержится указание на то, что для использования эвфемизмов нужны определенные условия: эвфемизм он определяет как «слово или выражение, служащее в определенных условиях для замены таких обозначений, которые представляются говорящему нежелательными, не вполне вежливыми, слишком резкими» (Shmelev 1979). Российский лингвист Л.П. Крысин определяет эвфемизм шире — не только как способ замены неприличных и грубых слов; согласно его определению,
эвфемизм — это «способ перифразистического и смягчающего обозначения предмета» (Krysin 1994, 28-49). В российском языкоznании именно Л.П.Крысин представил наиболее подробную характеристику эвфемизмов как речевых приемов. Он также описал основные функции эвфемизмов в речи и обозначил темы и сферы эвфемизации. Как отмечает Л.П.Крысин, исследователи эвфемизмов должны «привлечь к анализу не только сами эвфемистические выражения, но и тот социально-культурный и языковой фон, на котором возникает нужда в эвфемизмах» (Krysin 1994, 28-49).


Как уже было сказано, существует огромное количество определений эвфемизмов; разнятся также и подходы к их изучению. Так, можно рассматривать эвфемизм как субститут, употребляемый вместо неудобного, неприличного или грубого слова. Однако можно смотреть на эвфемизмы и шире, учитывая их функциональный аспект — способность модифицировать значение исходного слова, скрывать нежелательную в тех или иных обстоятельствах истину, формировать нужное говорящему представление репонента о той или иной ситуации.

Итак, на основе приведенных определений можно выделить основные признаки эвфемизма:

— семантическая размытость, низкий уровень конкретности, который позволяет смягчать негативную оценку;
— создание положительной или нейтральной коннотации;
— сохранение формальной истиности высказывания, но при этом сокрытие (камуфлирование) определенных её аспектов;
Напоследний признак (сохранение истиности) обращает особое внимание исследовательницы политического дискурса Е.И. Шейгал. Она отмечает важную составляющую эвфемизма: он «высвечивает пути затемнения нежелательных смысловых составляющих, не выходя из референциальной сферы исходного значения» (Sheigal 2000, 440).

Иными словами, эвфемизм сохраняет исходное значение явления или события, однако «изымает» из него негативную составляющую. Яркий пример такого классического использования эвфемизмов можно встретить в рекламе, когда, например, стареющую (увядающую) называют «возрастной» или «зрелой». Цель таких эвфемистических замен очевидна: полстить покупателю, продемонстрировать уважение и так и побудить его совершить покупку. «Увядающая кожа — звучит мрачно-романтически, — отмечает лингвист И.Б. Левонтина. — А вот возрастная кожа — это уже почти формулировка задачи» (Levontina 2016, 400).

Едией классификации эвфемизмов ни в российском, ни в западном языкоznании нет. В целом, как отмечает Р. Холдер, автор популярного британского словаря эвфемизмов, отнесение того или иного слова или выражения к эвфемизму вообще весьма субъективно, и четких критериев эвфемии не существует (Holder 2008).

Тип информационный эвфемизм, который рассматривается в данной работе, можно считать новым — впервые он был упомянут в заключении Экспертного совета конкурса «Слово года», в то время как тип эвфемизм безопасности, который будет рассмотрен в дальнейшем, выделен автором данной статьи на основании собственного анализа медиатекстов. При этом важно отметить, что вторая группа, по сути, является следствием (порождением) первой: если бы российский президент не начал войну, а Государственная Дума в связи с этим не приняла бы новые репрессивные законы, необходимости в эвфемизмах безопасности не возникло бы. Именно поэтому целесообразно в первую очередь рассмотреть именно информационные эвфемизмы, их роль, способы образования и функции.

2. Информационные (пропагандистские) эвфемизмы
Авторы проекта реконструкции исторических событий «Минута в минуту» полагают, что одним из первых информационных эвфемизмов в постсоветской России стала формулировка «подлодка
легла на грунт» в отношении подводной лодки «Курск». Именно такое выражение использовала пресс-служба Военно-морского Флота России в своих официальных заявлениях. Журналисты, в свою очередь, цитировали чиновников: «По предварительным данным, на корабле произошли неполадки, в результате которых подводная лодка была вынуждена лечь на грунт в районе боевой подготовки Северного флота в акватории Баренцева моря» (14 сентября 2022). Последующее освещение трагедии «Курск» в российских медиа подтвердило, что использование такой формулировки было не случайным: власти пытались скрыть правду и о самой трагедии, и о спасательной операции.

Как уже было сказано выше, один из главных признаков эфемизма — сохранение формальной истиности высказывания. Однако особенность информационных эфемизмов, используемых в пропагандистских целях, заключается в том, что они как раз выходят из референциальной сферы исходного значения, что ведет к полному искажению смысла. Так, например, снос старых зданий в Москве, вызвавший возмущение многих жителей российской столицы, власти называли реновацией, хотя речь во многих случаях шла именно о сносе и замене старых зданий новыми.


---

Так, в публикации Стычишиной проанализированы слова с первой частью спец: спецакция, спецоперация (вместо военная), спецдакар (вместо нападение, атака), спецсредства (вместо химическое оружие, отправляющие вещества, применяемые в военных целях). Как известно, именно пропагандистское сочетание специальная военная операция стало главным, корневым эфемизмом войны России против Украины. В той же публикации отмечаются и другие типы эфемеристических замен: например, замена слова война на слова и словосочетания, имеющие яркие позитивные конnotationи: гуманитарная миссия, наведение конституционного порядка, восстановление действия конституции. Как известно, целями «специальной военной операции» были объявлены «денацификация и демилитаризация» и «освобождение» Украины. Само слово освобождение как пропагандистский перевертыш, синоним агрессии, в работе Стычишиной тоже упоминается. «Ликвидация» и «освобождение» звучат не так страшно, как «убийство» и «агрессия», — отмечает автор.

Важно также подчеркнуть, что Стычишина в своей работе анализирует исключительно западный (в частности, американский) политический дискурс и эфемизмы как способы сокрытия истины американскими политиками и военными, но при этом никак не затрагивает использование этих инструментов в российском дискурсе. В то же время автор как бы невольно предсказывает основу пропагандистского словаря именно российских властей образца 2022-2023 годов. Рассмотрим основные единицы этого словаря.

Специальная военная операция (СВО). Основной эфемизм военного дискурса в России. Именно это словосочетание прозвучало 23 февраля 2022 года из уст российского президента Владимира Путина: «Мною принято решение о начале специальной военной операции». Обращает на себя внимание использование пассивного залога: не «я принял решение», а «мною принято решение». Такой формулировкой Путин подчеркивает вынужденность этой меры и закладывает основу для одного из главных пропагандистских нарративов этой войны — нарратив о том, что Россия не нападала, а была вынуждена ответить на якобы готовившуюся агрессию: «Нам с вами просто не оставили ни одной другой возможности защитить Россию, наших людей, кроме той, которую мы вынуждены будем
использовать сегодня. Обстоятельства требуют от нас решительных и незамедлительных действий».

Наименование *специальная военная операция*, таким образом, стало единственной официально разрешенной номинацией происходящего, а слово *война* оказалось под запретом. Несмотря на то, что в словосочетании *специальная военная операция* есть слово *военная*, оно на самом деле не проясняет, а лишь затемняет и вуалирует истинное значение события. *Операция* указывает на решение некоторых задач, *специальная* — на особый характер этих задач, их чрезвычайную важность.

Американское радио NPR в подборке главных терминов войны России против Украины так описывает значение сочетания *специальная военная операция*: «Путинский термин для обозначения атаки его страны на Украину в лучшем случае является эвфемизмом, а в худшем — знаком пропасти между реальными событиями в Украине и тем нарративом, который «скрывают» россиянам. Пока весь мир наблюдает за трагедией и гуманитарным кризисом, Кремль настаивает на миротворческих усилиях в Украине» (21 марта 2022 года). Термин *специальная военная операция* также попал в американский онлайн-словарь сленга Urban dictionary⁴. В нем это словосочетание названо «честным эвфемизмом» для обозначения военной агрессии. Данный эвфемизм образован с помощью одного из самых распространенных способов эфемизации — перифраза (оборота речи, заменяющего прямое название объекта его описанием с указанием характерных признаков). Словосочетание *специальная военная операция* содержит указание на основные признаки слова-денотата *война*: прилагательное *военная* и существительное *операция*, которое часто используется для обозначения именно военных действий. В то же время можно сказать, что прием перифраза тут сочетается с другим приемом — использованием слов с достаточно общим смыслом (*операция*) для называния конкретных предметов и действий.

Еще один распространенный прием эфемизации (аббревиация) используется для образования другого эфемизма — СВО (*специальная военная операция*), который по мере развития
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событий использовался все активнее и в политическом дискурсе, и в прессе, и в бытовом, повседневном общении россиян. В данном случае сокращение СВО, на наш взгляд, является еще более действенным мелиоративом: оно не содержит в себе никаких намеков на военные действия, трагедию и масштаб события, а звучит просто как некий нейтральный термин, например ЕГЭ (единий государственный экзамен). Массовое использование такого сокращения притупляет ощущение происходящего.

Освобождение. Использование данного эвфемизма в российском пропагандистском дискурсе основано, даже не на изъятии сем с негативным значением, а на замене слова на противоположное по значению: освобождением называется захват, оккупация украинских территорий. Соответственно, российские военные называются освободителями. Примеры из российской прессы:

«Освобождение Мариуполя: как это было» (Вести.ру, 22 апреля 2022 года)5

«В освобожденный от националистов Мелитополь возвращают символы Великой Победы» (Первый канал, 2 мая 2022 года)6.

«Шойгу сообщил об освобождении ВС РФ семи населенных пунктов» («Известия», 7 февраля 2023 года)7.

В то же время стоит отметить, что в пропагандистском дискурсе это не просто эвфемизм, основанный на антонимической замене, а слово, которое выражает альтернативное представление о ситуации: исходная позиция этого заявления состоит в том, что это Украина якобы оккупирует территорию, а приори принадлежащие России. Смысловая подмена в этом случае была настолько очевидна, что это слово стало активно использоваться и в ироническом значении — как россиянами-противниками войны, так и украинцами.

«Пришли российские “освободители”! Александр показывает, что случилось с его квартирой в Херсоне после обстрела России»

5 https://www.vesti.ru/article/271011
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(«Настоящее время», 28 ноября 2022 года)⁸.

«Здесь был Бахмут. Потом пришли российские "освободители" из ЧВК «Вагнер» (https://www.ostro.org, 18 мая 2023 года)⁹.


Докторфилологических наук, профессор, член Национального союза писателей Украины Элеонора Соловей отмечает: эфемизм освобождение появился, когда речь шла о расширении территорий СССР после Второй мировой войны: «Освобождение, освободители — это эфемизм. Кульминацией завершения войны советские власти называли "освобождение" территорий, хотя на самом деле это было не так. Людей "освобождали" танками и ракетами»¹¹.

Таким образом, термин освобождение российские политики достали из старого, советского словаря эфемизмов. Основная цель его использования — убедить аудиторию в том, что Россия не ведет захватническую войну, а защищает себя и помогает людям, освобождая их от «преступной» власти.

Целая группа эфемизмов в то же время призвана не обозначить успех, а завуалировать явные неудачи российской армии. В этом списке — такие эфемизмы, как перегруппировка, блокирование, жест доброй воли, кардинальное сокращение наступления. Их общий денотат — вынужденное отступление. Все эти эфемистические замены построены на использовании окказиональных замен. Как указывает Д.Н. Шмелев, такие замены «не основаны на синонимичности соответствующих слоев, их назначение как раз в том, чтобы скрыть подлинную сущность обозначаемого» (Shmelev 1977, 335). —

Журналисты независимого издания «Проект» в июне 2022

⁸ https://www.currenttime.tv/a/32152567.html
¹⁰ https://www.golosameriki.com/a/6540935.html
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года составили «Толковый словарь»12 спикера Минобороны РФ Игоря Коншенкова. Авторы публикации отмечают, что формулой планированной перергруппировки войск Минобороны обозначает отступление, а глагол блокировать используется тогда, когда российская армия ведет бои на подступах к городу, но не может его захватить: «Чтобы война в Украине выглядела успешной и идеологически правильной в глазах российского телезрителя, Минобороны стало использовать огромное количество совершенно непонятных слов. 25 февраля Коншенков торжественно доложил: «Завершено блокирование города Чернигов». Фраза звучала как успех, но на самом деле означала, что бои в это время шли на подступах к городу, а сам он в итоге так и не был захвачен. Впрочем, слово «захват» Минобороны никогда не использует — вместо этого российская армия «берет под контроль» города и села Украины».

Глагол блокировать призван создать позитивное впечатление у аудитории о действиях российской армии: в значении слова блокировать содержится элемент контроля, это соответствует одному из основных нarrативов российской власти и государственных СМИ — всё под контролем. Таким образом, слово с позитивной (в данной ситуации) коннотацией скрывает истину: нахождение на подступах к тому или иному населенному пункту, но невозможность его захватить.

Жест доброй воли. Данную формулировку представители Минобороны России использовали для описания событий, связанных с отступлением российских военных от украинского острова Змейный (известного как место рождения главного военного мема: «Русский военный корабль, или на х.») Представитель Министерства обороны РФ заявил, что российский контингент покинул остров «в качестве шага доброй воли». Стратегически важный остров был захвачен россиянами в первый же день войны, однако с тех пор позиции российских военных регулярно подвергались украинским обстрелам. В результате остров пришлось оставить, однако российские военные чиновники подали это как добровольное решение, а не вынужденный шаг. Расхождение между реальностью и официальным заявлением было настолько очевидным, что выражение жест доброй воли очень быстро стало мемом.

https://www.proekt.media/research/ofitsialnaya-statistika-minoborony/
Его ироническое значение — провал, выдаваемый за успех.

«Итакони якобы смогут объяснить людям, почему закончили активные боевые действия в Украине. То есть им придется озвучить «жест доброй воли» под видом некоего катаклизма на территории РФ. Резников не исключает, что РФ может озвучить очередной «жест доброй воли» под предлогом техногенной катастрофы у себя в стране» («Интерфакс-Украина», 2023 год).

**Хлопок.** В основе данного информационного эвфемизма (денотат — взрыв) лежит мейозис — приём выразительности, основанный на намеренном преуменьшении интенсивности свойств предмета речи, действий, процессов. Эвфемизмы, образованные путем мейозиса (подтопление вместо наводнения, задымление вместо пожара, жесткая посадка вместо крушения) обычно используются в манипулятивных целях, поскольку содержат в своей основе слабо отрицательный денотат. Те, кто прибегает к использованию данных замен, стремятся создать у рецепента впечатление, что его не обманывают, ведь само явление названо, однако потенциальное воздействие на аудиторию при этом значительно смягчено.

Эвфемизм хлопок активно используется российскими чиновниками и медиа на протяжении последних нескольких лет, однако частотность его употребления значительно возросла на фоне российского вторжения в Украину. Эвфемизм хлопок (замена взрыву) появляется в российском информационном пространстве всякий раз, когда речь идет о чрезвычайном происшествии именно на территории России (падение или атака беспилотника, обстрел, взрыв). Таким образом, эвфемизм используется для того, чтобы успокоить население, скрыть от людей серьезность происходящего и представить событие как незначительное, поскольку взрыв, в отличие от хлопка, может вызывать панику и страх.

Психолог Марина Диленко отмечает: «Если мы используем нейтральное слово, мы будем вкладывать в него другой смысл. К примеру, когда слышим взрыв, нам страшно. Но если звучит слово хлопок, мы не имеем с ним стойкой эмоциональной ассоциации. Поэтому ответной реакции не будет или она будет не столь

13 [https://www.pravda.eom.ua/rus/news/2023/05/2/7400287/](https://www.pravda.eom.ua/rus/news/2023/05/2/7400287/)
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сильной. Если произошел хлопок, можно ничего не делать, потому что это не страшно» (20 июля 2022). Интересно при этом, что, как отмечает украинский специалист по манипулятивным практикам и медиаэксперт Оксана Мороз, когда речь идет о взрывах на территории фронта, подконтрольной Украине, проблемы в использовании слова взрыв нет.

Слово хлопок стало неотъемлемой частью речевого портрета губернатора граничащей с Украиной Белгородской области Вячеслава Гладкова, который даже получил прозвище губернатор Хлопков. В российских медиа можно найти многочисленные примеры употребления им именно слов хлопок/громкий звук по отношению к взрывам.

«Гладков заявил о серии хлопков над центром Белгорода и сообщил о трех пострадавших»15 (Газета.ру, 3 июля 2022 года).
«Оперштаб Белгородской области прокомментировал информацию о «хлопках»16 (ТАСС, 10 октября 2022 года).
«Губернатор объяснил громкие хлопки в Белгороде»17 (Лента.ру, 3 июля 2022 года).

Нептутаный сход боеприпаса. Эфемеризм, который использовали представители Миноброна для описания событий в Белгороде 20 апреля 2023 года. В результате падения авиационной бомбы прямо на улицу города образовалась воронка диаметром в двадцать метров, ударная волна отбросила автомобиль на крышу здания, а окрестные дома оказались повреждены; три человека обратились за медицинской помощью. Однако вместо того, чтобы признать, что военный самолет РФ Су-34 просто уронил авиабомбу на российский же город, чиновники придумали формулировку, вуалирующую суть события сложным, тяжеловымся и непонятным названием: нептутаный сход боеприпаса: «Двадцатого апреля 2023 года около 22.15 мск при выполнении полета самолета Су-34 Воздушно-космических сил над городом Белгород произошел нептутаный сход авиационного боеприпаса. В результате имеются повреждения жилых строений, жертв нет»18. Данный эфемеризм

15 https://www.gazeta.ru/army/news/2022/07/03/18053036.shtml
16 https://tass.ru/proisshestviya/16003213
17 https://lenta.ru/news/2022/07/03/gladkov/
18 https://ria.ru/20230420/belgorod-1866770271.html

166
интересен тем, что, на наш взгляд, основан на использовании сразу трех приёмов: мейозиса (интенсивность и серьезность события намеренно преуменьшена), ознакомительной замене (нештатный сход боеприпаса — новая в контексте событий формулировка военных чиновников) и искусственной книжности. Последний прием заключается в использовании книжной, официальной и терминологической лексикисвельюпридательчелокомысленный или наукообразный характер и затемнить суть дела, запутать реципиента. В данном случае представители Минобороны используют отглагольное существительное сход (использование отглагольных существительных — один из главных признаков официально-делового стиля), а также форму единственного числа от слова боеприпасы. Данное существительное, как правило, используется во множественном числе, а форма единственного числа встречается редко — в основном в терминологических сочетаниях и в научном стиле.

Частичная мобилизация. 21 сентября 2022 года в России была объявлена «частичная мобилизация». На деле же оказалось, что она была скорее полной, чем частичной: среди мобилизованных оказывались и многодетные отцы, и инвалиды, и другие категории граждан, которые не подлежат призыву на военную службу. Таким образом, стало очевидно, что власть использует очередной эфемизм, причем в данном случае не потребовалась даже замена слова — к исходной номинации просто добавили определение частичная, которое и выполнило функцию эфемизма. В данном случае, как и в случае с хлопком, эфемистическая замена базируется на приёме мейозиса, то есть на преуменьшении интенсивности и масштаба события. Не случайно появилось народное наименование — получая мобилизация, то есть мобилизация, правила которой непонятны, которая начинается исподволь и постепенно разрастается.

Передряга. Эфемизм, использованный российским министром иностранных дел Сергеем Лавровым для описания ситуации с бунтом/мятежом главы ЧВК «Вагнер» Евгением Пригожиным, который вступил в открытый конфликт с руководителями Минобороны, устроил мятеж и попол с танковой колонной на Москву, однако в последний момент развернулся обратно. После этого, как выяснили многие независимые
Эвфемия как инструмент создания альтернативной реальности
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журналисты, имя Пригожина оказалось фактически под запретом на российском государственном телевидении, а слово мятех, использовавшееся вначале, стало постепенно исчезать из словаря российских чиновников. Наконец, глава российского МИД заявил: «Действия предпринимателя Евгения Пригожина и ЧВК «Вагнер» трудно назвать громче, чем передрягой» (30 июня 2023)\(^1\). Выбор именно эвфемизма передряга тут представляется очень важным. Во-первых, он призывает значимость случившегося (передряга — это просто затруднительное положение), а во-вторых, лишил произошедшее событие субъективности: существенное передряга, в отличие от существенного мятех, не содержит указания на ответственных за события. Иными словами, передряга бессубъектна, безлична; в передряге виноватых нет — просто сложилась такая ситуация, но мы из нее выбрались, как бы говорит аудитории министр Лавров.

Данный эвфемизм, как и перечисленные выше, также основан на приёме мейозиса (преуменьшения).

3. Эвфемизмы безопасности
Вторая группа эвфемизмов военного времени представлена так называемыми эвфемизмами безопасности. Их главная прагматическая установка — помочь говорящему высказать свою позицию, но при этом избежать преследования, репрессий или просто неприятностей.

Один из главных эвфемизмов этой группы — существенное вобла, которое стало антивоенным символом и породило множество мемов. Автором этого эвфемизма стала девушка Алиса из Тюмени, которая написала на асфальте «Нет в***е!». Алису задержали, однако в суде она пояснила, что имела в виду не войну, а воблу, так как «испытывает неприязнь к данному виду рыб» (13 октября 2022 года)\(^2\). Сначала Алису отпустили, однако спустя несколько месяцев все-таки передумали и оштрафовали. За это время вобла успела превратиться в один из самых ярких примеров эзопова языка, а в социальных сетях наблюдается настоящий всплеск антивоенных высказываний, основанных на языковой игре. «Когда же уже кончится вся эта вобла!» — писали пользователи соцсетей. Появился

\(^1\) https://tass.ru/politika/18156873
\(^2\) https://www.sibreal.org/a/vobla-i-mir-rassmotrel-delo-o-nadpisi-net-v-e-32080826.html
также шуточный слоган «Хек вобле!» — эвфемизм, заменяющий слоган «Нет войне!».

В основе данного эвфемизма лежит прием замены близкозвучным или схожим по написанию словом; в данном случае речь идет о графической аллюзии. Именно эта аллюзия и используется для обыгрывания известных фраз, заголовков и цитат, содержащих денотат война, который легко заменяется на воблу.

Мужской глянцевый журнал «Максим» даже превратил воблу в развернутую метафору: опубликовал статью под названием «5 причин ненавидеть воблу» (15 октября 2022)21. В публикации перечислялись причины, по которым воблу можно считать вредной и даже опасной. В первом пункте сказано: «Вобла разрушает. Можно сломать хлипкий столик или табуретку, если с силой дубасить по ней сущеной воблой. Это свойство воблы подметили еще советские мультипликаторы в эпилоге «Ну, погоди!» про Волка и воблу». Перед нами — пример целого текста, построенного на игре слов и эвфемистических заменах. Хотя ни одно запретное, с точки зрения российского законодательства, слово в тексте не употребляется, абсолютно очевидно, что скрывается за воблой: что разрушает, ни перед чем не останавливается, ведет к кровопролитию, встает поперек горла и вызывает желание напиться до беспамятства.

По мнению социального антрополога Александры Архиповой, такие эвфемизмы, как вобла, выполняют в том числе и функцию ироничного дистанцирования: «Оно несет в себе желание показать сам факт владения эпоповым языком, доказать, что слово всё ещё свободно» (Архипова 2022).

Иногда в роли кода, за которым скрывается заменяемое понятие, могут выступать цифры. Цифровой заменитель слогана «Нет войне!» — это сочетание цифр 3 (нет) и 5 (войне) в разных комбинациях: 3+5, 35, 3 и 5. Эти цифры противники войны оставляют на асфальте или на стенах домов.

В целом же в публичной сфере перед противниками войны, которые остались в России, все это время стояла непростая задача: как называть происходящее, если не хочешь использовать пропагандистские формулировки и в то же время

21 https://www.maximonline.ru/longreads/5-prichin-nenavidet-voblu-id841987/
хочешь избежать ареста? Именно поэтому в бытовом общении стали часто использоватьсь дейтики — слова, выполняющие референциально-отсылачную функцию: вся эта ситуация, эти события и так далее.

Важно отметить, что данные эвфемизмы, основанные на дейтической функции слов, используются и самими представителями власти, которые в своих публичных выступлениях, вероятно, стараются избегать «опасных» формулировок. Так, журналисты Русской службы ВВС подметили, что на Петербургском экономическом форуме летом 2022 года российские чиновники ни разу не произнесли даже легальное слово спецоперация, не говоря уже о запрещенном существительном война. Вместо этого все они использовали такие формулировки, как эта ситуация, то, что происходит сейчас в мире, такие сложные этапы.

Также использовались существительные с общим смыслом, слова с размытой семантикой: беспрецедентная неопределенность, сложный этап, период экзистенциальных изменений. Данный прием Л.П. Крысин причисляет к одним из основных средств эвфемистической запищировки.

Стоит отметить при этом, что само российское руководство в какой-то момент стало открыто использовать слово война, не прибегая к эвфемизмам. В конце декабря 2022 Владимир Путин сказал: «Наша цель не раскручивать маховик военного конфликта, а наоборот — закончить эту войну. Мы к этому стремимся и будем стремиться». Однако война в данном высказывании — это не война России против Украины, а война России и всего Запада, именно поэтому необходимость в табуировании этого слова в таком контексте отпадает.

Релокация, релоканты. Лингвисты И.Б.ЛЕВОНТИНА и Е.Я.ШМЕЛЕВА отмечают, что до войны слово релокация употреблялось исключительно в бизнес-коммуникациях в значении «перемещение бизнеса в другое место внутри страны или за границу, перевод сотрудника на новое место жительства, связанный с деловыми целями компании» (Levontina, Shmeleva, 2023). Однако в 2022 году это слово стало широко употребительным и у него появилось

дополнительное значение — отъезд из страны из-за войны и мобилизации. Авторы статьи «Зээтики и нетвойняшки. Каким стал специальный военный русский язык» называют существительное релокація эвфемизмом, который используется для самоуспокоения: «В русском языке есть слово для вынужденного отъезда из страны по политическим или экономическим мотивам — эмиграция. Почему же используется другое слово? У слова эмиграция есть целый ряд коннотаций: эмиграция — это навсегда, из неё мало кто возвращается, эмиграция — это тяжелый опыт и так далее. А слово релокація пока еще не обросло коннотациями, можно надеяться на то, что ты сейчас временно уехал из России, а потом вернешься, и все будет по-прежнему».

Через месяц после начала войны, в марте 2022 года, петербургское издание «Бумага» опубликовало статью, которая так и называлась: «Мы не эмигранты, мы релоканты». Как живут россияне, уехавшие после 24 февраля»23. Директор петербургской рекламной компании Галина, которая переехала в Кыргызстан, в интервью журналистам подчеркивает, что уехавшие в другие страны после 24 февраля не называют себя эмигрантами. «Они приехали переждать и точно себя эмигрантами не считают. Скорее — релоканты».

Не случайно самый большой чат на эту тему в российском мессенджере Telegram называется «Гайд по релокаціи». Существительное релокація также имеет оттенок новизны, а значит, воспринимается теми, кто его употребляет, как более современное и привлекательное по сравнению с эмиграціей. В любом случае оно выполняет функцию эвфемизма: помогает скрасить ситуацию и не представлять себя жертвами.

Анализ обеих групп эвфемизмов (информационные/ пропагандистские эвфемизмы и эвфемизмы безопасности) позволяет нам сделать вывод о том, что власть и народ используют для создания эвфемистических замен разные инструменты. Эвфемизмы власти базируются на таких приемах, как мейзис, окказиональные замены и использование слов с более общим значением. Таким образом, в ход идут именно те приёмы, которые основаны на семантической

23 https://www.fontanka.ru/2022/03/17/70514732
размытости, искусственной книжности и нарочито неточной речи, то есть на том, что позволяет затемнить смысл происходящего и запутать реципиента. В свою очередь, эвфемизмы, которые использует общество, основаны на других приёмах: графических/фонетических аллюзиях, использовании иностранных слов и дейдического сочетаний. Данные приёмы объединяет одно: стремление, с одной стороны, затушевывать послание, а с другой — сделать его понятным для людей, придерживающихся схожих взглядов.

4. Заключение
Подводя итог, можно сказать, что эвфемия в условиях войны и репрессий внутри страны становится обозоодоострым инструментом и используется в соответствии с коммуникативными задачами говорящих: власть стремится показать, что все под контролем и ничего плохого не происходит, а обычные люди, которые не поддерживают действия властей и не верят пропаганде, вырабатывают свои языковые коды и слова, позволяющие им высказывать отношение к происходящему. При этом по мере того, как война продолжается, а репрессии в России усиливаются, эвфемия как инструмент претерпевает определенные изменения: в одних сферах она усиливается, а в других, напротив, перестает быть актуальной. Дальнейшие наблюдения за этими трансформациями важны не только для понимания изменений в языке, но и для понимания картины происходящего в целом.
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This volume consists of twelve chapters, three written by the editors setting an overview of “student-centered teaching” (two at the start of the volume and one at the end), with nine chapters in the middle, written by different authors. These nine center chapters share a basic structure: an opening statement of the problem they will look at, a Russian-language version of that overview, then several pages of theory/background on the specific topic being addressed, and then a discussion of the specific study/intervention conducted. Each chapter ends with both a conclusion and a “lessons learned” section. Each of the nine center chapters focus on different aspects of instruction, and they are often further enriched with appendices providing specific examples of the materials referenced in the chapter. These nine chapters will be particularly helpful to current and future teachers in providing guidance and examples for how to implement practices that can only loosely be called “student-centered.”

The first three of these nine chapters rely on survey data from Russian-language learners. Maslova explores how to increase beginning students’ self-regulation skills in relationship to micro-level Can-Do statements and strategy use. Lorenz surveys learners at the end of first-semester Russian about their attitudes toward grammar instruction, finding that his cohort of students preferred a deductive approach and mechanical exercises. Lorenz’s study, conducted at a single university, raises questions about how representative his sample is, especially in absence of demographic data about the students completing the survey. Replicating the study with a national survey would give the field a better sense of the range of learner attitudes toward inductive/deductive grammar approaches. Místecký and Místecká document attitudes to the Russian language in Czechia up to 2018, drawing on corpus and survey data for their findings. Theirs is the most methodologically rigorous of the three mixed-methods studies in this section of the volume.
Three chapters look at various aspects of classroom teaching and testing. Anderson describes a curriculum revision process that starts with setting course proficiency outcomes and leads to implementing a “flipped” classroom model for intermediate Russian. Baer and McIntyre explore task-based assessment and rubrics in the context of remote instruction; their examples of rubrics and integrated performance assessment will be particularly useful models for other teachers of Russian. A’Beckett explores the teaching of figurative language with late beginners on the basis of the nominal metaphor, illustrating her ideas with a comparison between Venice and the “Venice of the North.”

Three other chapters describe useful teaching/learning projects. Zheltoukhova focuses on preparing students for a short-term study abroad experience with online activities that highlight cultural differences, linguistic preparation in pragmatics, and an electronic exchange. While few of her students took advantage of this preparation because it was extracurricular, the chapter reminds teachers of the need to explicitly prepare students for study abroad in a multidimensional way. Khotimsky and Leontyeva offer a helpful, practical survey and evaluation of digital tools that teachers can use for student-centered classroom practice and projects. Sokolova and her multiple coauthors describe the process of creating an online textbook for learners of Russian as a foreign language in Norway. Their reflection and evaluation of development process may help others find the right platform and models for new open-access textbooks.

The best coedited volumes are ones where the whole is far more than the sum of the parts because all the chapters contribute to elucidating multiple dimensions of a well-conceived and clearly-defined central point. Despite the nine interesting contributions, this volume falls rather short of giving the field a clear picture of what making Russian language instruction “student centered” would look like. Part of the problem is that the term “student-centeredness” remains amorphous. In the second chapter Nuss gets close to defining it when she presents a contrastive list of the characteristics that distinguish instruction in teacher-centered vs. learner-centered environments. Yet she doesn’t go on to explain how to operationalize some or most of these characteristics in structuring a university-level Russian course in any detail. Her chapter ends with some small suggestions about offering alternative assignments, but it
would have been more helpful to see how the nine characteristics of the “student-centered” classroom are reflected in an actual course syllabus or other student-facing materials.

Despite this, the individual contributions do much to recommend the volume, especially to an international audience, since four chapters (Mistecký and Mistecká, A’Beckett, Sokolova, and Leontyeva) address Russian-language learning outside of the United States. The volume is also quite up to date, since most chapters explicitly address changes that the COVID pandemic has had on students and teaching practice.

William J. Comer
Portland State University


For decades, Martinsen fostered international dialogue on Dostoevsky’s Crime and Punishment, gathering interpretations from the most dedicated students and scholars. Her reader’s guide distills this criticism into a concise, accessible handbook, an authoritative scholarly guide in English. Martinsen’s guide is handy for syllabus writing and as a teaching supplement to cover the novel’s central themes and narrative techniques.

In Chapter 1, Martinsen contrasts Dostoevsky’s novel with the usual whodunnit, terming it a “whydunnit” as the murderer’s identity is known from the outset. She situates Raskolnikov’s motives within the context of Western materialist ideologies, comparing the influence of superficial ideologies on Russian society to the facades of St. Petersburg that mask the earth’s regenerative power. Martinsen aligns Dostoevsky with the pochvenichestvo movement that saw earth-rooted peasants as morally superior to the well-read intelligentsia.

Chapter 2 explores Dostoevsky’s third-person narrative shifts: at times, implicating the reader in Raskolnikov’s thoughts, and at others, providing a detached perspective. Martinsen orients readers within the narrator’s seemingly chaotic narrative, which often mimics Raskolnikov’s evaluative emotional process, thereby inducing Raskolnikov’s feverish psychological and philosophical momentum in the reader. For Martinsen, Dostoevsky destabilizes the guilt script (feeling bad about and making
These chapter summaries sample Martinsen’s meticulously prepared guide, which offers an entrée into Dostoevsky’s complex narrative, illuminating the novel’s most profound facets while facilitating the reader’s independent exploration. Martinsen posits Dostoevsky as a master at portraying the psyche’s nuances, moral extremes, and transformative potentials. This guide helps readers understand Dostoevsky’s novel as an exploration of shame, conscience, and morality under the sway of unconscionable and morally regenerative narratives.

Michael Ossorgin
Fordham University
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