



The Russian language and state language policy in the formation of modern Russian civilization

Nina S. Kotova¹, Sofya S. Dukyan², Grigory S. Kotov³, Natalia V. Zaytseva⁴

^{1, 2, 4}South-Russia Institute of Management – branch of Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

³Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

Corresponding author: Nina S. Kotova, kotova-ns@ranepa.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5715-3495>

Abstract. This article examines the meaning and role of the Russian people unity, the role of communication in society in the state language, which is the fundamental basis of the civil self-identity of Russians. The article also substantiates the role of Russian language policy in four aspects (educational, scientific, cultural and legal) in order to preserve language as the cultural heritage of the nation in the formation of Russian civilization. The article emphasizes that the ability of the language to preserve the history, culture, and identity of the people for a long time ensures and maintains the state of national security and its spiritual unity at a high level.

Keywords: language policy, communication, culture, self-identity, civilizational component, spiritual unity, literacy, the Russian language, multinational state

For citation: Kotova N. S., Dukyan S. S., Kotov G. S., Zaytseva N. V. The Russian language and state language policy in the formation of modern Russian civilization. *State and Municipal Management. Scholar Notes*. 2024;(3):165–171. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.22394/2079-1690-2024-1-3-165-171>. EDN LHAGFG

Политология и этнополитика

Научная статья

УДК 32

<https://doi.org/10.22394/2079-1690-2024-1-3-165-171>

EDN LHAGFG

Русский язык и государственная языковая политика в становлении современной российской цивилизации

Нина Сергеевна Котова¹, Софья Сергеевна Дукян²,
Григорий Сергеевич Котов³, Наталия Викторовна Зайцева⁴

^{1, 2, 4}Южно-Российский институт управления – филиал Российской академии народного хозяйства и государственной службы при Президенте РФ, Ростов-на-Дону, Россия

³Южный федеральный университет, Ростов-на-Дону, Россия

Автор, ответственный за переписку: Нина Сергеевна Котова, kotova-ns@ranepa.ru,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5715-3495>

Аннотация. В статье рассмотрены значение и роль единства русского народа, роли коммуникации в обществе на государственном языке, являющимся фундаментальной основой гражданской самоидентичности россиян, а также обосновывается роль российской языковой политики в четырех аспектах (образовательном, научном, культурном и правовом) в целях сохранения языка как культурного наследия нации в становлении российской цивилизации. Способность языка долгое время сохранять в себе историю, культуру, самобытность народа, обеспечивает и поддерживает на высоком уровне состояние национальной безопасности и ее духовное единство.

Ключевые слова: языковая политика, коммуникация, культура, самоидентичность, цивилизационная составляющая, духовное единство, грамотность, русский язык, многонациональное государство

Для цитирования: Котова Н. С., Дукян С. С., Котов Г. С., Зайцева Н. В. Русский язык и государственная языковая политика в становлении современной российской цивилизации // Государственное и муниципальное управление. Ученые записки. 2024. № 3. С. 165–171. <https://doi.org/10.22394/2079-1690-2024-1-3-165-171>. EDN LHAGFG

The relevance of the topic of this article is due to the fact that Russia is currently experiencing a period of revival of its civilizational components, in which language, spirituality and culture play a key role. The Russian language acts as the basis for the historical development of Russia, reflects its civilizational path and culture from its origins to the present day, paves the way to the future, that is, it is an integrative factor of all periods of Russian civilization.

The purpose of the article - is to analyze the role of state language policy in preserving the Russian language as a fundamental component of Russian civilization.

Objectives posed in the article:

- analyze the role of the state in preserving the Russian language as an integrating component of Russian civilization in the dichotomous typology of the development of civilizations;
- determine the role of language in the development of Russia, based on the civilizational concept of V. von Humboldt;
- determine the role of the Russian language and the communicative unity of the multinational Russian society within the framework of ensuring the civilizational integrity of the country.

Scientific novelty is determined by the formulated conclusions:

- the article shows that Russia is developing according to a civilizational approach, which is based on the originality of culture, values, language, spirituality;
- it has been proven that throughout the history of Russia, the language policy implemented in the country was formed within the framework of a single civilizational type, determined by the originality of the Russian language as the state language of a multinational country, capable of preserving the historical and cultural identity of Russia, integrating existing and new linguistic phenomena.

Problem definition. President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin wrote in one of his articles: "The Russian people are state-forming - by the fact of the existence of Russia. The great mission of the Russians is to unite and consolidate civilization. To consolidate into a type of state-civilization devoid of ethical bias towards national minorities, where common culture and common values define the 'friend or stranger' principle". The head of the state noted that "the informational, cultural, state unity of the country, the unity of the Russian people directly depends on the mastery of our young people, on the state and spread of the Russian language."

The role of the state in the preservation and development of language is relevant beyond time and era. The recent history of our country has become a striking example of this. Over the past 30 years, in Russia there have been changes in the norms of the Russian language, which at various stages were approved by orders of the Ministry of Education and Science, designated as priority tasks in the messages of the President, meetings of the Federation Council, etc. The basis for the official change in norms has always been the good idea not only to analyze and select for recommendation the existing dictionaries and reference books that reflect modern norms of the Russian language (having analyzed them for the content of inaccuracies and errors), but to present criteria and requirements for the content and quality of used and published grammars, dictionaries and reference books on the Russian language.

The current situation is not accidental. Over the first 20 years of the post-Soviet period, significant damage was caused to linguistic culture. The level of literacy of Russians catastrophically decreased, we faced unprecedented processes of simplification and shift of styles towards vernacular, colloquial styles, as well as the dominance of argot not only in everyday life, but also in business communications, television and other media. The philological community has been paying attention to the problem all these years, but there has been no satisfactory solution to the problem. After another 10 years, it turned out that along with the decline in speech culture and the lack of a competent language policy, problems appeared in various spheres of life in our society: Russia faced a non-trivial task - to answer the question "who are we and what should we become as a country-nation-civilization?" It is obvious that with the growing role of communication in society, a modern state is impossible without a single state language, which exists within the framework of legislation and language policy implemented in society. The primary task of the language policy for us now is to preserve the Russian language, as it reflects the history, culture, values of Russia, as well as its development and compliance with modern achievements of science and technology, its multinational character (for example, the historical assimilation of some lexical units of nationalities living on the territory of Russia,

in the corpus of words of the Russian language), which is aimed at strengthening the unified Russian state as a multinational country. Back in 2013, in his speech at the opening of the Russian Literary Assembly, V.V. Putin noted that "The Russian language has always played a uniting role for the multinational people of Russia and formed the general cultural and humanitarian context of the country". Thus, gradually since the 2000s we have seen a dynamic of attention and support for the Russian language from the state, in particular, within the framework of strategic national interests. The Russian language is declared to be the basis of Russian statehood. In this regard, in the field of education and culture it is necessary to strengthen the understanding of the consolidating role of language in society, its paramount importance in social, cultural, and professional identification. The ability of a language to preserve the history, culture, and identity of the people for a long time ensures and maintains the state of national security and its spiritual unity at a high level.

Methodological background. In the history of linguistics, such approach to the perception and understanding of language was developed in the "philosophy of language" by Wilhelm Humboldt, a famous philosopher, politician and diplomat. His attempts to construct a scientific theory of language, which was based on the comparative historical method, were consonant with the philosophy of Kant (for example, his comparison of language with the soul, and he connected the process of language development with the laws of the spirit). According to Humboldt, "language is a reflection of the spirit of the people," and "the activity of thinking and language represent [...] an indissoluble unity" [1]. National linguistics and the development of state language policy has been characterized by this approach for more than 100 years, and it was always taken into account that Humboldt understood language as "genetically predisposed to evolution," which contains everything necessary for the development of the language itself and the people speaking it. Humboldt emphasized that language reflects the worldview of a nation, in which all the spiritual qualities of the people are revealed.

Civilization concepts, which include the issue of language as a fundamental component, appeared at that historical moment when the aspect of sociocultural community was included in the outline of the concept of civilization. Following the ideas of I. G. Herder and W. von Humboldt, a cultural approach to the study of language in domestic and foreign science is developing among anthropologists and linguists [2-5]. During this period, a significant number of scientific works appeared, which emphasized the importance of spirituality as a fundamental factor in the existence of civilization [6-11].

Currently, science has developed two approaches to understanding the development of the world, social development, the role and place of political subjects in it: the universalist-evolutionist approach (within the framework of the ideas of globalism) and the civilizational approach, which centers on the historical condition of sociocultural uniqueness. The modern civilizational approach is described in the works of O. Spengler, L. Gumilyov, A. Toynbee, S. Hantingon, B. Erasov and other scientists, who include in the concept of "civilization" the uniqueness and specificity of its culture, structure, as well as the specificity of the cycles of its historical development. Uniqueness or originality is determined at each stage of development of a particular civilization, making it possible to highlight a stable or little-changing aspect. This will characterize the specific basis, the character of civilization. A focus on historical and cultural identity requires addressing the country's common language (the state language) as a resource (historical and cultural memory) and a tool (a mode of official and everyday communication). Thus, the state language acts, among other things, as a tool for identifying the people.

Discussion. In modern world philosophical-sociological and historical-political science literature, civilizations are usually called stable socio-cultural communities that are reproduced on the basis of a set of characteristic cultural-symbolic, material and spiritual values, language, religion, art, and traditions [12]. In reference to Russia, its construction as a state-civilization, A. Toynbee's statement is true: "... the majority of ethnic groups involved in a single cultural space, introduced to Russian culture, bonded by the language of interethnic communication – the Russian language, became participants in a single cultural process, creators of common values in a single geographical, political and spiritual space" [13].

Language and communicative unity ensure the civilizational integrity of the people (nationalities) and the country. Storing in the language corpus information about history, culture and identity, integrating centuries-old diversity at each level of the language; the possibility of transmitting this information to the next generation at the level of the entire civilizational space, covering all segments of the population and ensuring the social community of people, is the basis and primary factor of communication within the framework of the civilizational aspect. Language is one of the fundamental forms of existence. Consequently, respect for language as a representative of culture, the importance of preserving and developing language as the main element of the identity of a people should be guided by its civilizational essence. It seems possible

to ensure this through a correct state language policy, at the center of which is the idea of a common language, people (peoples inhabiting the country) and civilization, as well as a reflection in it of the history and culture of the past and modern life.

In Russia, the Russian language and proficiency in it, as well as a common culture, at the center of which is the common identity of a multinational country, indicate its civilizational character, which can be traced cyclically throughout all stages of its historical development. For example, in the Soviet era, the key period was 1930-1950: since 80 of the 127 "eastern" peoples of the USSR had their own written language, new alphabets and writing systems based on the Cyrillic alphabet were introduced for the peoples inhabiting Central Asia, Siberia, the Far East, the European North, Ural and Volga region. In 1945, V. Vinogradov's book "The Great Russian Language" was published, scientifically substantiating the concept of the Russian language for the nation, and the Russian language gradually became universal in communication, education and professional activities of a multinational country.

Since 2014, we have experienced regular adjustments to the language law, including amendments adopted on February 28, 2023 "On Amendments to the Federal Law "On the State Language of the Russian Federation""¹. The significance and role of changes and standards should not only be to emphasize the importance of this issue, to try to increase the literacy of our compatriots, but also to overcome the unfavorable state of the linguistic environment, the contamination of the language, to improve linguistic culture, and subsequently to overcome spiritual degradation of an individual and the entire people. All this has long been a cause of concern not only for linguists and scientists, but also for the country's leadership. The vector for defining Russia as a state-civilization does not mean a return to old/archaic norms, but competent, balanced development and use of the language, which will preserve its historical beauty, uniqueness and originality and at the same time reflect the modern development of the country in all spheres without compromising cultural and linguistic uniqueness.

Back in 2014, the Russian Language Council under the President of the Russian Federation was created in order to improve state policy in the field of development, protection and support of the Russian language. "For Russia, with its ethnic, cultural diversity and complex national-state structure, a balanced, effective language policy is one of the obvious priorities"². As part of the framework, legislation is being improved, the most important documents have been adopted aimed at developing the comprehensive use, dissemination and promotion of the Russian language as the fundamental basis of civil self-identity, cultural and educational unity of multinational Russia, its civilizational component.

Thus, simultaneously with the adoption of amendments to the law "On the State Language", aimed at ensuring that citizens, including civil servants and officials, comply with the norms of the Russian literary language in the public sphere. A special commission on the Russian language was created under the government, tasked with compiling a list of dictionaries and reference books that comply with the adopted law. However, the mechanisms for how control over official speech will be carried out is not an easy task, since it seems to be legal and normative, but not yet cultural. In fact, we are talking about compliance with the norms of the modern Russian language in the public field. The norms of the modern Russian literary language are codified language tools and rules for their use, that is, what is recorded in normative dictionaries, reference books and grammars. This implies compiling a list of such publications, united by the concept of a "single body" of grammars, dictionaries and reference books. The process of ongoing changes must be codified, normative, and return to the public attitude that a nation and people are, first of all, language and culture; it cannot be reduced only to publications and laws [14].

Compliance with the norms that laws, dictionaries and reference books are aimed at is the formal side of the issue, normative, legal, which is still far from going through the process of adoption and becoming entrenched in the mind of every Russian. It will take a lot of time until these norms come into widespread use in official, business communications, especially in the media, in government agencies, in the Duma, in the official speech of deputies and government officials, since their speech and texts are aimed at many people and depend on the ability to choose wisely the appropriate word and expression in a particular situation. Pushkin also said: "The point is not in rejecting any word, but in a sense of moderation and expediency when using it."

¹ Federal Law of February 28, 2023 No. 52-FZ "On Amendments to the Federal Law "On the State Language of the Russian Federation"" // <http://www.kremlin.ru/acts/bank/48976>; <http://publication.pravo.gov.ru/document/0001202404220037>

² Joint meeting of the Council for Inter-Ethnic Relations and the Council for the Russian Language. <http://www.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/copy/49491>

In this regard, the principle of reasonableness and understanding that language is a dynamic and living phenomenon, requiring a correct and reasonable attitude of society and each of its individuals to language, indicates that, simultaneously with the legal side of the issue, educational and a cultural strategy for reviving respect for the state language should be worked out and come to life. Also in this matter, it is important not to go into formalism and servility, which often happens in Russian history: the desire of some officials and executives to be the first or "original" with their own ideas proposed "in pursuance of an order," rushing to declare how and at what expense it is necessary to realize the revival in the public consciousness of the previous attitude towards the Russian language. However, love, respect, reverent attitude and care for the Russian language as uniting for centuries all people and numerous nations living on the territory of Russia, requires, first of all, the return of the authority of philologists, scientists and thinkers. In this sense, for example, in the spelling dictionary of the Institute of Russian Language named after V.V. Vinogradov RAS last year included 151 new words. The next update took place in September. Among the new words are, «*antivakser*», «*burgernaya*», «*valyutoobmen*», «*dopandemiinyi*», «*keis-interv'yu*», «*keis-menedzhment*», «*krossfit*», «*mediarech'*», «*mediafeik*», «*millenialy*», «*onlain-press-konferentsiya*», «*prokrastinatsiya*», «*telegram-kanal*», «*fan-zona*», «*shaurma*», «*shtrikhkodirovanie*» and others¹. It is known that among public figures there are enough opponents of such changes, and the history of Russia testifies that even Paul I, struggling with the consequences of the French Revolution, issued a law banning the words citizen, fatherland, revolution." But all these words were, are, and will be in the Russian language. It must be recognized that in world history, not a single language of the great nations avoided or feared foreign borrowings. The task of the state, scientists and philologists is to avoid the aggressiveness and concentration of such borrowings.

Let us note that we are now experiencing the development of Russia in the civilizational paradigm, which, according to V. I. Pantin, should be defined through the concept of "national-civilizational identity": "National-civilizational identity is understood as the identification or correlation of individuals with a certain national-civilizational community, i.e. such a community that simultaneously has the features of both a nation and a civilization, or is an intermediate formation between a nation and civilization." V.I. Pantin also points out that these processes are relevant and characteristic of China, India and Russia, since in them the national-civilizational identity includes not only specificity and originality (civilizational characteristics), but also the need to develop competitiveness, technological development, participation in global agenda ("increasing the characteristics of a nation") [15]. Consequently, modern Russia, according to the scientist, should develop as both a state-nation and a state-civilization, with the cultural aspect acting as a connecting link: a single Russian history, Russian as a state language and, due to the historical development of the country, acting as a language common communication for all citizens, nationalities and ethnic groups of multinational Russia – everything that contributes to the unity of Russia as a nation and civilization.

Conclusions. Today it is obvious that it is impossible to define Russia as a state-civilization within the framework of the Russian language solely by issuing orders and calls. It is necessary to recognize that language is a living social phenomenon and an independent organism, therefore it is possible to influence only its certain parties. And the state language policy should be aimed precisely at this, namely at the reasonable approval of literary norms of spelling and punctuation, defining the function of the state language in society; regulation of teaching the Russian language, cultivating the attitude in society to the Russian literary language as a model and cultural public oral and written speech, which will reduce and gradually eliminate popular slang in the public sphere (media, government institutions, etc.). This is the most important task of the state; it must be done in collaboration with leading philologists.

Therefore, we need a language policy aimed at the educational, scientific, cultural and legal aspects of preserving the language as the cultural heritage of the nation. N. Danilevsky noted that it is not so much geographical unity as cultural and linguistic unity that determine the thinking of a nation². In this sense, for Russia, Russian is not just a means of communication, it is its unique cultural, civilizational phenomenon, which makes it possible to unite and consolidate the numerous peoples inhabiting it, and also shapes their political and cultural self-awareness. And the point here is not the number of English and Internet inclusions

¹ Resource "ACADEMOS" // https://orfo.ruslang.ru/search/word?page=5&query=2022&title_check=1&text_check=2&yo=0

² Pokotylo M. V. Discussions about the functioning of the Russian language at the present stage (on the issue of reforming the modern Russian language). // <https://scipress.ru/philology/articles/diskussii-o-funktzionirovaniyu-russkogo-yazyka-na-sovremennom-etape-k-voprosu-o-reformirovaniyu-sovremenno-go-russkogo-yazyka.html>

in it, but how we treat our language as a truly native one, and how Russian people who speak Russian feel about themselves. The Russian language, in turn, throughout its history has been filled with borrowings from the peoples inhabiting it, thereby expanding Russian civilization to the point where it is comfortable for all peoples living on the territory of Russia. (For example, Turkisms existing in the Russian language Olzas Suleimenov).

Thus, the role of the Russian language in the formation and development of Russian civilization, its original culture and sovereignty is indisputable. As a state-forming language, the Russian language is consubstantial with the civilizational development of Russia: it originated with it, became a mirror of its history and modernity and guardian, and is a source of creative energy for the preservation and development of Russia itself.

References

1. Humboldt V. *Selected works on linguistics*. Moscow; 2000. 396 p. (In Russ.)
2. Sapir E. *Selected works on linguistics and cultural studies*. Moscow; 1993. 654 p. (In Russ.)
3. Whorf B. Relation of norms of behavior and thinking to language. *New in linguistics*. Moscow; 1960.
- Issue. 1. (In Russ.)
 4. Weisgerber L. *Native language and the formation of the spirit*. Moscow; 1993. 229 p. (In Russ.)
 5. Potebnya A. A. *Thought and language*. Moscow; 1999. (In Russ.)
 6. Erasov B. E. Introductory article. *Comparative study of civilizations. Reader*. Moscow; 1998. (In Russ.)
 7. Gadzhiev K. S. *Introduction to Geopolitics*. Moscow; 1998. (In Russ.)
 8. Naydysh V. M. The problem of civilization in the scientific thought of modern times. *Man*. 1998;(2):6-23. (In Russ.)
 9. Levyash I. Ya. Civilization and culture: logos, topos, chronos. *Human*. 1999;(5):43-55. (In Russ.)
 10. Grinin L. E. Formations and civilizations. *Philosophy and society*. 1998;(2). (In Russ.)
 11. Vasilenko I. A. Dialogue of cultures, dialogue of civilizations. *Vestnik RAS*. 1996;66(6). (In Russ.)
 12. *Modern political science: Methodology*. Rep. ed. O. V. Gaman-Golutvina, A. I. Nikitin. Moscow: Aspect Press Publishing House; 2019. 776 p. (In Russ.)
 13. Matyazh S.V. Theory of cultural genesis A.J. Toynbee: key ideas and conceptual context. *MNKO*. 2011;(6-1). Available from: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/teoriya-kulturogeneza-a-dzh-toynbiklyuchevye-idei-i-kontseptualnyy-kontekst> [Accessed 18 June 2024]. (In Russ.)
 14. Kiyanova O. N. Russian language as the state language of the Russian Federation in modern conditions. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 9. Philology*. 2016;(2). Available from: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/russkiy-yazyk-kak-gosudarstvennyy-yazyk-rossiyskoy-federatsii-v-sovremennyh-usloviyah> [Accessed 23 May 2024]. (In Russ.).
 15. Pantin V. I. National-civilizational identity: the specifics of Russia. *POLITEX*. 2011;(2). Available from: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/natsionalno-tsivilizatsionnaya-identichnost-spetsifika-rossii> [Accessed 18 June 2024]. (In Russ.).

Список источников

1. Гумбольдт В. Избранные труды по языкоznанию. М., 2000. 396 с.
2. Сепир Э. Избранные труды по языкоznанию и культурологии. М., 1993. 654 с.
3. Уорф Б. Отношение норм поведения и мышления к языку // Новое в лингвистике. М., 1960.
- Вып. 1.
 4. Вайсгербер Л. Родной язык и формирование духа. М., 1993. 229 с.
 5. Потебня А. А. Мысль и язык. М., 1999.
 6. Ерасов Б. Е. Вступительная статья // Сравнительное изучение цивилизаций. Хрестоматия. М., 1998.
 7. Гаджиев К. С. Введение в геополитику. М., 1998.
 8. Найдыш В. М. Проблема цивилизации в научной мысли Нового времени // Человек. 1998. № 2. С. 6-23.
9. Левяш И. Я. Цивилизация и культура: логос, топос, хронос. // Человек. 1999. № 5. С. 43-55.
10. Гринин Л. Е. Формации и цивилизации // Философия и общество. 1998. № 2.
11. Василенко И. А. Диалог культур, диалог цивилизаций // Вестн. РАН. 1996. Т. 66. № 6.

12. Современная политическая наука: Методология. Отв. ред. О. В. Гаман-Голутвина, А. И. Никишин. М.: Издательство «Аспект Пресс», 2019. 776 с.

13. Матяж С. В. Теория культурогенеза А. Дж. Тойнби: ключевые идеи и концептуальный контекст // МНКО. 2011. №6-1. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/teoriya-kulturogeneza-a-dzh-toynbi-klyuchevye-idei-i-kontseptualnyy-kontekst> (дата обращения: 18.06.2024).

14. Киянова О. Н. Русский язык как государственный язык Российской Федерации в современных условиях // Вестник Московского университета. Серия 9. Филология. 2016. №2. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/russkiy-yazyk-kak-gosudarstvennyy-yazyk-rossiyskoy-federatsii-v-sovremennyh-usloviyah> (дата обращения: 23.05.2024).

15. Пантин В. И. Национально-цивилизационная идентичность: специфика России // ПОЛИТЭКС. 2011. №2. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/natsionalno-tsivilizatsionnaya-identichnost-spetsifika-rossii> (дата обращения: 18.06.2024).

Информация об авторах

Н. С. Котова – доктор филологических наук, профессор, зав. кафедрой иностранных языков и речевых коммуникаций ЮРИУ РАНХиГС.

С. С. Дукян – кандидат философских наук, доцент кафедры философии и методологии науки ЮРИУ РАНХиГС.

Г. С. Котов – кандидат педагогических наук, ассистент кафедры начального образования Академии психологии и педагогики ЮФУ.

Н. В. Зайцева – кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры иностранных языков и речевых коммуникаций ЮРИУ РАНХиГС.

Information about authors

N. S. Kotova – Dr. Sci. (Philology), Professor, Head of the Department of Foreign Languages and Speech Communications, South Russian Institute of Management – branch of RANEPA.

S. S. Dukyan – Cand. Sci. (Philos.), Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy and Methodology of Science, South Russian Institute of Management – branch of RANEPA.

G. S. Kotov – Cand. Sci. (Pedagog.), Assistant at the Department of Primary Education of the Academy of Psychology and Pedagogy, Southern Federal University.

N. V. Zaytseva – Cand. Sci. (Philology), Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Speech Communications, South Russian Institute of Management – branch of RANEPA.

Вклад авторов: все авторы сделали эквивалентный вклад в подготовку публикации.

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Contribution of the authors: the authors contributed equally to this article. The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

Статья поступила в редакцию 05.08.2024; одобрена после рецензирования 02.09.2024; принятая к публикации 03.09.2024.

The article was submitted 05.08.2024; approved after reviewing 02.09.2024; accepted for publication 03.09.2024.