



EMOTIONAL SELF-REGULATION AND DIALOGIC INTERACTION IN DIGITAL RUSSIAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE INSTRUCTION IN MULTILINGUAL HIGHER EDUCATION

Alibekova Rano Khudayberdievna

Teacher of Russian Language and Literature,
Tashkent State Agrarian University, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article examines the psychological and didactic significance of emotional self-regulation and dialogic interaction in digital Russian language and literature instruction in multilingual higher education. The study proceeds from the view that Russian should not be taught merely as a system of grammatical norms, but as a complex communicative field in which textual interpretation, cultural memory, speech choice, interpersonal response, and professional self-expression are formed simultaneously. In digital learning environments, students often face unstable attention, fear of error, evaluative anxiety, increased cognitive load, reduced confidence in oral participation, and fragmented contact with literary meaning. These factors are especially visible in multilingual classrooms, where students move between languages, registers, cultural codes, and academic expectations. The article develops a conceptual instructional model that combines staged digital text work, emotionally safe dialogue, guided close reading, reflective writing, peer discussion, discourse-based tasks, and self-assessment criteria. The proposed approach treats literary text as a psychologically rich communicative situation rather than as a passive reading object. The results show that digital literary materials can strengthen students' speech initiative, interpretive autonomy, cultural sensitivity, self-regulatory habits, and professionally relevant discourse competence when they are supported by careful pedagogical mediation. The article has practical significance for curriculum design, classroom methodology, teacher training, and assessment in Russian language and literature courses taught in non-native and multilingual academic contexts.



Keywords: Emotional self-regulation, dialogic interaction, digital learning, Russian language, Russian literature, multilingual education, discourse competence, literary text, reflective writing, higher education.

Introduction

Annotatsiya:

Ushbu maqolada ko'p tilli oliy ta'lim muhitida rus tili va adabiyoti mashg'ulotlarini raqamli vositalar asosida tashkil etishda talabalar emotsional o'zini boshqarishi va dialogik o'zaro ta'sirining pedagogik-psixologik ahamiyati tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot rus tilini faqat grammatik normalar tizimi sifatida emas, balki matn, muloqot, madaniy xotira va shaxsiy refleksiya bilan bog'liq murakkab kommunikativ maydon sifatida tushunishga asoslanadi. Raqamli ta'lim sharoitida talabalar matnni o'qish, talqin qilish, munozara yuritish va yozma javob yaratish jarayonida diqqat tarqoqligi, nutqiy ishonchsizlik, baholanish xavotiri hamda kognitiv yuklama kabi psixologik omillar bilan to'qnashadi. Maqolada bunday omillarni kamaytirish uchun bosqichli raqamli matn bilan ishlash, emotsional xavfsiz dialog, izohli o'qish, reflektiv yozuv, juftlik va kichik guruh munozaralari, hamda o'z-o'zini baholash mezonlari asosida ishlash modeli taklif etiladi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, raqamli adabiy matnlar to'g'ri metodik boshqarilganda talabalar nutqiy faolligi, interpretativ mustaqilligi, madaniy sezgirligi va professional kommunikativ kompetensiyasi kuchayadi.

Аннотация:

В статье рассматривается психолого-дидактическое значение эмоциональной саморегуляции и диалогического взаимодействия студентов при цифровой организации занятий по русскому языку и литературе в условиях многоязычного высшего образования. Исследование исходит из понимания русского языка не только как системы грамматических норм, но и как сложного коммуникативного пространства, связанного с текстом, культурной памятью, речевым выбором и личностной рефлексией. В цифровой образовательной среде студенты сталкиваются с рассеиванием внимания, речевой неуверенностью, страхом оценки и повышенной когнитивной нагрузкой. Для преодоления этих факторов предлагается модель, включающая поэтапную работу с цифровым текстом,



эмоционально безопасный диалог, комментированное чтение, рефлексивное письмо, парные и групповые обсуждения, а также критерии самооценки. Показано, что методически организованный цифровой литературный текст способствует развитию речевой активности, интерпретативной самостоятельности, культурной чувствительности и профессиональной коммуникативной компетентности студентов.

The digital transformation of higher education has changed not only the technical conditions of teaching, but also the psychological structure of students' contact with language, text, teacher, and group discussion. In a traditional classroom, the literary text is usually encountered as a printed page, a teacher's commentary, and a collective act of oral interpretation. In a digital classroom, the same text appears inside another ecology: screens, hyperlinks, online dictionaries, electronic platforms, audio fragments, chat responses, presentation slides, and parallel streams of information. This ecology gives Russian language and literature instruction new resources, yet it also creates new psychological risks. Students may read more quickly but understand less deeply; they may produce more written messages but participate less confidently in live dialogue; they may have immediate access to commentary but lose the slow discipline of independent interpretation. These contradictions are particularly important in multilingual higher education, where Russian functions not only as a subject of study but also as a medium of academic communication, intercultural mediation, professional mobility, and contact with a large literary tradition.

The problem is not that digital tools are harmful in themselves. A tool is not a pedagogical method; a screen is not an enemy of thought, although it is sometimes a very persuasive accomplice of distraction. The real question is how digital environments reorganize the learner's attention, emotional state, speech confidence, interpretive behavior, and willingness to enter dialogue. Russian language and literature classes are a productive field for this question because they unite linguistic precision with cultural meaning, and because literary texts naturally activate emotional response, ethical judgment, memory, empathy, disagreement, and self-positioning. A student who reads a literary episode in Russian does not only decode vocabulary and grammar. The student also decides how to respond to a voice, how to evaluate an action, how to distinguish authorial position from narrator's perspective, how to formulate a judgment without



reducing the text to a slogan, and how to defend that judgment in a group where other interpretations may appear.

In multilingual groups, these processes are complicated by linguistic asymmetry. Some students may possess sufficient receptive vocabulary but lack oral confidence; others may understand the plot but miss stylistic nuance; still others may be able to translate words yet remain uncertain about cultural connotations. Digital platforms can either deepen these difficulties or soften them. They deepen them when the lesson becomes a mechanical sequence of files, tests, and copied answers. They soften them when the teacher uses digital text as a space for gradual orientation, emotional safety, collaborative interpretation, and reflective speech production. This study therefore focuses on two interrelated psychological-pedagogical categories: emotional self-regulation and dialogic interaction. Emotional self-regulation refers to the learner's ability to manage anxiety, hesitation, cognitive overload, frustration, and fear of error during reading and communication. Dialogic interaction refers to the ability to respond to another voice, formulate one's own position, listen to alternatives, and participate in meaning-making as a social process.

The relevance of the topic is determined by several circumstances. First, the digitalization of university education requires methods that protect depth of reading rather than merely increase the speed of information exchange. Second, multilingual students need not only grammatical explanations but also psychologically safe conditions for speech practice and interpretation. Third, Russian literature offers unusually rich material for developing empathy, perspective taking, argumentative speech, and value-oriented reflection. Fourth, professional competence in contemporary higher education increasingly depends on the ability to interpret complex texts, communicate responsibly, and regulate one's speech behavior in uncertain communicative situations. The aim of this article is to substantiate the psychological and didactic role of emotional self-regulation and dialogic interaction in digital Russian language and literature instruction and to develop a model for their systematic use in multilingual higher education. The research questions are as follows: what psychological difficulties appear when students work with Russian literary and academic texts in digital environments; how can dialogic tasks reduce speech anxiety and increase interpretive independence; what role does emotional self-regulation play in the development of discourse competence; and how can teachers design digital

activities that unite close reading, language practice, cultural reflection, and professional communication.

The scientific novelty of the article lies in its attempt to connect digital pedagogy, Russian philological education, multilingual learning, and educational psychology within one methodological framework. Instead of treating digitalization as a purely technical modernization, the article interprets it as a change in the psychological conditions of language and literature learning. Instead of treating emotional factors as secondary, the article considers them structurally significant for discourse development. And instead of viewing dialogue as a simple classroom technique, it presents dialogue as the central mechanism through which students transform reading into speech, perception into interpretation, and linguistic knowledge into communicative competence.

Materials and Methods

The study is based on a qualitative interdisciplinary design that combines principles of linguodidactics, educational psychology, literary hermeneutics, discourse analysis, and competence-based pedagogy. The material of the research includes typical digital tasks used in university Russian language and literature classes, fragments of literary and essayistic texts suitable for multilingual groups, student response formats such as online comments, short interpretive essays, oral micro-presentations, reflective diaries, and peer discussion notes, as well as theoretical works on dialogue, self-regulation, reading, cultural mediation, and academic communication. The analysis does not aim at narrow statistical measurement; its purpose is conceptual modeling and methodological justification. In this respect, the study follows the logic of pedagogical design research: it identifies a problem in teaching practice, interprets it through theoretical categories, constructs a model, and formulates transferable classroom procedures.

The first stage of the methodology consisted of theoretical synthesis. The concept of dialogue was interpreted through the tradition that understands speech as responsive, socially situated, and value-loaded rather than as a neutral transfer of information. Literary text was therefore examined as a field of voices in which students encounter narrator, character, authorial perspective, social language, irony, conflict, and implied reader. The concept of emotional self-regulation was considered through educational psychology as a learner's capacity to maintain



purposeful activity under conditions of uncertainty, linguistic difficulty, time pressure, and social evaluation. In the context of Russian language and literature instruction, this capacity becomes visible when a student continues to read despite lexical gaps, asks for clarification without shame, risks an interpretive hypothesis, revises a written answer, or listens to a different view without immediately withdrawing from discussion.

The second stage involved didactic analysis of digital learning situations. Several recurring classroom formats were considered: reading a literary text on a shared screen; annotating fragments in a digital document; writing comments in a learning platform; discussing characters or problems through online forums; preparing oral responses from digital notes; comparing original text with translation; and transforming literary material into professional genres such as analytical commentary, argumentative paragraph, interview question, or reflective report. Each format was examined in terms of its psychological demands. The analysis asked what the task requires from attention, memory, emotional control, linguistic choice, response time, and interaction with peers. This step was necessary because the same digital tool may have opposite pedagogical effects depending on how it is framed. A shared online document may produce mechanical copying, but it may also produce collective close reading; a chat may become noise, but it may also give hesitant students a first safe route into discussion.

The third stage was discourse-oriented task modeling. The study classified learning tasks according to the kind of speech behavior they develop: identifying textual evidence, formulating a hypothesis, expressing agreement or disagreement, asking an interpretive question, explaining a stylistic effect, connecting literary conflict with personal or professional experience, and transforming emotional response into reasoned argument. Special attention was paid to tasks that gradually move students from receptive activity to productive speech. This progression is important for multilingual learners, because immediate oral discussion of a difficult literary text may create anxiety and silence, while a staged sequence - private reading, lexical orientation, written note, pair exchange, group discussion, and final reflection - allows the student to regulate emotion and prepare speech more consciously.

The fourth stage was the construction of an instructional model. The model includes five interdependent components: psychological orientation, guided



digital reading, dialogic interpretation, reflective production, and transfer to academic or professional communication. Psychological orientation prepares students for the difficulty of the text and normalizes partial understanding. Guided digital reading focuses attention on selected lexical, syntactic, stylistic, and cultural signals. Dialogic interpretation organizes exchange of meanings through questions rather than ready-made explanations. Reflective production requires students to produce oral or written speech grounded in textual evidence. Transfer connects the literary-discursive activity with broader communication tasks such as presentation, academic argumentation, professional correspondence, or intercultural dialogue. The validity of the model is supported by triangulation: theoretical categories, classroom task logic, textual properties, and communicative outcomes are considered together.

The methodological position of this article can be summarized as follows: in multilingual higher education, a digital Russian language and literature lesson should not be reduced to electronic delivery of content. It should be designed as a psychologically mediated communicative situation. The teacher's role is not simply to upload texts or check answers, but to regulate the conditions under which students meet the text, each other, and their own speech limitations. This approach allows the study to move from a surface question - which digital tools should be used - to a more serious pedagogical question: what kind of learner, reader, speaker, and professional is formed through the digital organization of Russian philological education.

Results

The analysis made it possible to identify several results that characterize the relationship between emotional self-regulation, dialogic interaction, and digital Russian language and literature instruction. The first result concerns the psychology of attention. Digital text changes the rhythm of reading. It encourages movement between fragments, quick scanning, dictionary checking, search functions, and external commentary. These affordances are useful when they are subordinated to a clear reading purpose, but they weaken interpretation when the student treats the text as a set of isolated answers. In Russian literature classes, this problem is especially visible because meaning often depends on tone, rhythm, repeated motifs, syntax, narrative delay, and implicit evaluation. Therefore, guided digital reading must slow the learner down. Effective tasks include



marking repeated words, comparing two descriptions of the same character, identifying evaluative verbs, noticing changes in pronoun use, and explaining why a sentence is emotionally tense. Such tasks transform the screen from a corridor of distraction into a field of observation.

The second result concerns anxiety and speech inhibition. Multilingual students often avoid oral participation not because they have no thoughts, but because the public form of speech exposes grammatical uncertainty, pronunciation insecurity, and fear of incorrect interpretation. Digital tools can reduce this anxiety when they create intermediate forms of response. Before speaking aloud, students may write a one-sentence hypothesis in a shared document, choose a quotation that supports their view, record a short audio comment, or exchange notes with a partner. These forms do not replace live dialogue; they prepare it. The psychological effect is significant: the student enters discussion not from emptiness but with a small verbal anchor. In this way, emotional self-regulation becomes not a private moral effort but a didactically organized condition. The teacher designs steps that help the learner move from hesitation to participation.

The third result is connected with the educational function of dialogue. In many language lessons, dialogue is understood as question and answer. In an integrative Russian language and literature lesson, dialogue has a more complex function: it allows students to test interpretations, compare perspectives, and discover that meaning is produced through evidence and response. Digital platforms can support this process through threaded comments, collaborative annotation, online debate cards, and peer feedback forms. However, productive dialogue requires rules. Students need to distinguish a personal reaction from an argument, disagreement from dismissal, and quotation from proof. The most effective dialogic prompts are not those that ask, 'What is the main idea?' but those that ask, 'Which word changes your attitude toward the character?', 'What alternative interpretation is possible?', 'What is left unsaid in this dialogue?', or 'How would the meaning change if the narrator used another register?' Such questions activate linguistic observation and psychological involvement at the same time.

The fourth result concerns emotional vocabulary and ethical reflection. Russian literary texts give students access to complex emotional states: shame, pride, resentment, compassion, fear, alienation, moral hesitation, hope, and responsibility. In multilingual groups, this is not only a literary advantage but also a language-learning resource. Students often know basic emotional adjectives but

lack the lexical and syntactic means to express nuanced psychological evaluation. Working with digital text allows teachers to create emotional vocabulary maps, contrastive synonym clusters, character state timelines, and reflective prompts. For example, students may compare words such as тревога, страх, беспокойство, смущение, and неуверенность, then use them to explain a character's behavior and later to describe a communicative situation in academic life. This movement from literary psychology to personal and professional speech deepens vocabulary acquisition and makes language emotionally meaningful rather than mechanically memorized.

The fifth result is the strengthening of reflective writing. Digital environments often produce short and fragmented messages, but they can also support systematic reflection if the teacher establishes a clear genre. A reflective note after reading should not be a casual impression. It may include three elements: a textual observation, an emotional or ethical response, and a reasoned explanation. For instance, students may be asked to write: 'The phrase that changed my understanding of the character is...'; 'This detail creates tension because...'; 'My first reaction was..., but after discussion I understood that...'. Such writing develops self-regulation because students learn to observe the movement of their own understanding. They see that confusion is not failure, that interpretation may change, and that speech can become more precise through revision. For multilingual learners, this is particularly valuable because it reduces the psychological pressure to produce a perfect answer immediately.

The sixth result is the development of discourse competence. Emotional self-regulation and dialogic interaction are not separate from language competence; they are conditions for its real use. A student who cannot manage fear of error will avoid complex syntax. A student who cannot listen to an alternative view will produce monologic and rigid speech. A student who cannot tolerate ambiguity will reduce literary and academic texts to primitive formulas. Conversely, when students learn to regulate emotion and engage dialogically, their speech becomes more flexible. They begin to use hedging expressions, argument markers, contrastive structures, evaluative vocabulary, explanatory clauses, and evidence-based reasoning. These features are essential for academic communication and professional discourse. Russian language instruction therefore benefits when psychological and dialogic dimensions are treated as part of communicative competence rather than as external classroom atmosphere.



The seventh result concerns the role of the teacher as mediator. In a digital lesson, the teacher's authority is not diminished; it is transformed. The teacher must structure the learning environment more carefully because students can easily move away from the text, copy external interpretations, or hide behind technical participation. Effective mediation includes selecting manageable text fragments, preparing lexical support without oversimplifying the text, setting time for silent reading, requiring evidence for comments, distributing speaking roles, and providing feedback not only on correctness but also on interpretive courage and communicative appropriateness. The teacher also models self-regulation by showing how to approach difficulty: reread, mark, compare, ask, formulate, revise. This modeling is more effective than simply telling students to be active. The eighth result is assessment reform. Traditional assessment often counts grammatical errors or checks factual knowledge about the author and plot. These indicators are not useless, but they do not fully capture the competences formed in digital dialogic work. More adequate criteria include the ability to identify textual evidence, explain linguistic effect, formulate a defensible interpretation, respond to another student's idea, use appropriate register, revise a statement after feedback, and connect literary analysis with broader communicative situations. A rubric for such assessment may include four dimensions: textual accuracy, linguistic precision, dialogic responsiveness, and reflective self-regulation. This type of assessment makes visible the psychological and communicative progress that remains invisible in ordinary testing.

The ninth result is the formulation of a practical model for classroom use. The model begins with emotional orientation: the teacher explains the purpose of the task, predicts possible difficulty, and creates a low-risk first response. It continues with guided digital annotation: students mark linguistic and semantic signals in the text. The third stage is pair or small-group dialogue, where students compare observations and prepare one collective claim. The fourth stage is public discussion, where claims must be supported by quotation and linguistic explanation. The fifth stage is reflective writing, in which students describe how their interpretation changed and what language resources helped them express it. The sixth stage is transfer: students use the same discourse pattern in an academic or professional communicative task. For example, after interpreting a conflict in a literary dialogue, students may write a short professional email resolving a



misunderstanding, prepare a mini-presentation on communicative ethics, or analyze tone in an institutional text.

Taken together, these results show that digital Russian language and literature instruction becomes pedagogically effective only when digital form, psychological support, and dialogic method are integrated. The literary text should not be sacrificed to technology, and technology should not be rejected in the name of tradition. The more precise position is methodological: digital tools are valuable when they help students read more attentively, speak more responsibly, regulate emotional difficulty, and enter dialogue with textual and human voices.

Discussion

The findings invite reconsideration of several common assumptions about digital education. The first assumption is that digitalization automatically modernizes teaching. In reality, an electronic version of a weak task remains a weak task, only now it loads faster. A scanned text followed by reproductive questions does not create a new pedagogy. Modernization begins when the digital environment changes the quality of student activity: from passive reception to annotation, from isolated answer to dialogue, from fear of error to staged participation, from superficial opinion to evidence-based interpretation. For Russian language and literature instruction, this means that the teacher should not ask how to place the literary text on a platform, but how to organize a psychologically meaningful encounter with that text.

The second assumption is that emotional factors belong mainly to general psychology and are secondary for language methodology. The present analysis shows the opposite. In multilingual education, emotion directly affects language behavior. Anxiety narrows vocabulary, reduces syntactic complexity, blocks oral initiative, and pushes students toward memorized formulas. Confidence, by contrast, allows experimentation, questioning, and revision. The teacher cannot simply demand fluent speech from students who experience public speaking as a threat. Self-regulation must be built into the lesson through predictable stages, manageable tasks, supportive peer interaction, and assessment criteria that value progress and evidence rather than instant perfection. This is not softness; it is methodological realism.



The third assumption concerns literature. Some professional-oriented curricula treat literature as less practical than language skills. Such a view is too narrow. Literature is a demanding simulator of communicative life. It contains conflict, ambiguity, irony, hidden motivation, ethical choice, social roles, and competing voices. These are exactly the phenomena students meet in academic and professional communication, only often in less artistically visible forms. When students analyze a literary dialogue, they practice identifying intention, tone, implication, and response strategy. When they discuss a character's decision, they practice argumentation and value-based reasoning. When they compare narrative perspectives, they learn that every discourse positions the speaker. This is practical competence with cultural depth, not decoration.

The fourth assumption is that digital communication naturally promotes dialogue. In practice, digital communication often produces parallel monologues. Students post separate comments, repeat each other, or write minimal responses designed only to satisfy task requirements. Dialogic interaction requires structured dependence between responses. One student's statement must become material for another student's clarification, agreement, objection, or extension. This can be achieved through task formats such as 'respond to one interpretation with textual evidence,' 'ask one clarifying question,' 'find a linguistic signal that supports or weakens your partner's claim,' or 'revise your first answer after reading two peer comments.' These formats transform digital participation into actual intellectual exchange.

The fifth issue concerns multilingual identity. Students in non-native Russian-speaking contexts often experience Russian through several layers: school memory, family or regional exposure, academic necessity, media contact, and professional expectation. Their relation to the language may include respect, distance, insecurity, pragmatic motivation, or cultural curiosity. Digital literature classes can recognize this complexity by allowing comparison of languages and cultural codes without dissolving the specificity of Russian textual form. For example, students may compare how emotional restraint, politeness, irony, or conflict is expressed in Russian and in their native language. Such comparison strengthens metalinguistic awareness and reduces the deficit view of multilingualism. The student's first language becomes not an obstacle but a resource for understanding another linguistic worldview.



The sixth issue is teacher training. An instructor working in this model needs a combined professional profile. It is not enough to know grammar rules, literary history, or digital platforms separately. The teacher must be able to select psychologically manageable texts, explain language in context, formulate open interpretive questions, moderate disagreement, diagnose speech anxiety, design reflective tasks, and evaluate discourse behavior. This is a demanding profile, but it corresponds to the real complexity of contemporary higher education. Teacher development programs should therefore include modules on digital annotation, dialogic facilitation, multilingual classroom psychology, discourse assessment, and reflective writing in Russian language and literature courses.

The seventh issue is curriculum design. Courses should be organized not around a mechanical alternation of grammar topics and literary biographies, but around communicative problems and textual situations. A unit may focus on voice and perspective, conflict and argumentation, emotional evaluation, academic commentary, professional dialogue, or intercultural misunderstanding. Grammar, vocabulary, and literary analysis then appear as resources for solving a communicative and interpretive problem. This approach gives students a reason to learn linguistic forms because forms become necessary for expressing meaning. It also gives literature a clearer methodological function because literary material becomes a laboratory for discourse competence.

The broader implication is that digital Russian language and literature instruction can become a counterweight to fragmented attention if it is designed correctly. The digital world often trains students to skim, react, and move on. A well-organized philological lesson trains the opposite habits: to pause, reread, compare, listen, formulate, and revise. This is not an anti-digital position. It is a disciplined digital position. The task of the teacher is not to defend the old classroom against technology, but to defend serious reading and responsible speech inside the technological environment. In this respect, emotional self-regulation and dialogic interaction are not optional pedagogical ornaments. They are the psychological infrastructure of meaningful language and literature education.

Conclusion

The study confirms that emotional self-regulation and dialogic interaction are essential components of effective digital Russian language and literature



instruction in multilingual higher education. Digital learning environments create new opportunities for access, annotation, collaboration, and flexible response, but they also intensify problems of fragmented attention, speech anxiety, superficial reading, and mechanical reproduction of ready-made interpretations. These problems cannot be solved by technology alone. They require a psychologically informed and text-centered methodology in which students are gradually prepared to read, interpret, speak, listen, write, and revise.

The proposed instructional model demonstrates that literary text can function as a powerful resource for self-regulation and discourse development. Through guided digital reading, students learn to slow down attention and notice linguistic evidence. Through emotionally safe dialogue, they overcome fear of error and participate in collective interpretation. Through reflective writing, they observe the development of their own understanding and transform emotional response into reasoned speech. Through transfer tasks, they connect literary interpretation with academic and professional communication. Thus, Russian language and literature instruction becomes not a set of separate exercises, but an integrated process of forming a reader, speaker, interpreter, and future professional.

The practical significance of the article lies in its applicability to curriculum design, classroom methodology, teacher training, and assessment. Teachers can use the model to structure digital lessons, select tasks, support multilingual learners, and evaluate competences that ordinary tests often miss. The theoretical significance lies in the argument that emotional and dialogic dimensions should be understood as internal to communicative competence, not as external motivational conditions. A student who regulates anxiety, listens to another voice, supports interpretation with textual evidence, and revises speech after dialogue demonstrates a mature form of language competence. In the contemporary university, such competence is not secondary. It is one of the clearest indicators that digital education has served human development rather than merely accelerated information exchange.

References

1. Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
2. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.



3. Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). *On the Self-Regulation of Behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Gee, J. P. (2011). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York: Routledge.
5. Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
6. Iser, W. (1978). *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
7. Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and Culture in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Leontiev, A. A. (2003). *Foundations of Psycholinguistics*. Moscow: Smysl.
9. Lotman, Y. M. (1990). *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
10. Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and Minds: How We Use Language to Think Together*. London: Routledge.
11. Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies: Self-Regulation in Context*. New York: Routledge.
12. Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
13. Shcherba, L. V. (1974). *Language System and Speech Activity*. Leningrad: Nauka.
14. Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2011). *Cognitive Load Theory*. New York: Springer.
15. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
16. Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
17. Winne, P. H., & Hadwin, A. F. (1998). *Studying as Self-Regulated Learning*. In D. Hacker, J. Dunlosky, & A. Graesser (Eds.), *Metacognition in Educational Theory and Practice*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
18. Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). *Becoming a Self-Regulated Learner: An Overview*. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2), 64-70.
19. Vinogradov, V. V. (1980). *Selected Works: On the Language of Fiction*. Moscow: Nauka.
20. Verbitsky, A. A. (1991). *Active Learning in Higher Education: Contextual Approach*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.