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Abstract. The paper considers language identity of multilingual students in the situations of intercultural communication. The model of a language identity structure researched by the famous Russian linguist Yury N. Karaulov is a basis for the analysis of higher education students’ multilingual conscience. The subject of consideration is the readiness of the university students to participate in the intercultural communication activities, which is developed in the educational process. The paper aims at revealing the cognitive strategies used by multilingual students in the experimentally specified conditions of intercultural communication. The results of the psycholinguistic associative experiment show us that the multilingual students mostly use the different types of meta-cognitive and social affective strategies (paraphrasing, avoiding, explanatory strategies). The indicator of their multilingual identity is the intercultural competence of these students making the communicative outline of their speech both in their mother tongue (L1) and the foreign language they learn (L2).
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Introduction
The research deals with the multilingual identity of a student in the situations of intercultural communication, both educational and real, including the contemporary pandemic situations with distance learning technologies being used (see also: [Culperer, Kan, 2020]). The subject of the study is the readiness of higher education students to participate in these situations which is developed in the educational process.

The research aims at revealing the cognitive strategies used by multilingual students in the experimentally specified conditions of intercultural communication.

The acute material of the study is the data of a psycholinguistic experiment conducted among the students of philology and linguistics and the teachers of Altai State University. About 3,700 responses were given to the stimulus tokens offered to the participants of the experiment.

The theoretical basis of the research was the work of scientists in the field of educational linguistics [Murzin, Smetyuk, 1994; Galskova, Gez, 2009; Khaleeva, 1989; Trotzke, Kupisch, 1974] http://www.webology.org
The model of language identity developed in the works of Russian linguists

The model of language identity, which was firstly researched in the works of a Russian linguist Yury N. Karaulov, can be used as a model of a personal ability to communicate in several languages. In the educational process, this model is being developed while students are taking the modules included language and literature courses. It is worth noting that in the afterword to his monograph which described the concept of “language identity”, Yury N. Karaulov suggests that the question of a bilingual language identity was not deeply investigated in his work [Karaulov, 2010, p. 259]. Though, some problems associated with the reproduction of speech by a foreigner or the possibilities of embedding a foreign language system fragments into the multilingual consciousness of an individual were nevertheless discussed (see also: [Mateu, Sundara, 2022]).

Various aspects of language identity are researched on the basis of Yury N. Karaulov’s model, which is represented by the three main levels:

1) verbal-semantic (verbal-grammatical) level or vocabulary, to which Yury N. Karaulov refers the units traditionally used to describe the lexical and grammatical structure of the language (a word, a morpheme, a word form, a phrase, a sentence, etc.);

2) a cognitive linguistic level or thesaurus, the units of which are denotations, frames, phraseological units, metaphors, wordplay, etc. Accordingly, these units organize a static and relatively stable worldview;

3) motivational or pragmatic level, the unit of which are texts, argumentation methods, “scenarios”, etc. These units reflect the intentions, goals and active position of a native speaker.
The development of Karaulov’s concept of language identity in relation to situations of intercultural communication was carried out in the works in educational linguistics by Alexandra A. Zalevskaya, Irina I. Khaleeva, Natalya D. Galskova, Nadezhda I. Gez, etc. The three structural levels of language identity can be correlated in a certain way with the three levels of communicative competence identified by Natalya D. Galskova. The linguistic component of the communicative competence correlates with the “zero” level of language identity, which is represented in the lexicon of an individual; the pragmatic component of the communicative competence correlates with the first and second structural levels of language identity, which is represented in the so-called thesaurus and pragmaticon of the individual; the sociolinguistic component of the communicative competence correlates with the pragmaticon of the individual.

If we take into consideration a bilingual or a multilingual person, his/her language identity should not be appreciated as a secondary one like some of the researchers suggest [Khaleeva, 1989, p. 54; Galskova, Gez, 2009, p. 22]. It does not seem a proper term. As well as the translation text is not in the full sense a secondary text created without the use of the heuristic principles of the translator’s consciousness, so the linguistic consciousness, the linguistic worldview of a multilingual person are not secondary phenomena. The term used in this case by Yury N. Karaulov (a bilingual identity), or its modification used in the works of Boris M. Gasparov (multilingual consciousness, multilingual identity) seems to be more justified [Gasparov, 1996, pp. 112-113].

The ways of forming multilingual identity with a poly-linguistic consciousness, which are the subject of close interest of linguists, psycholinguists, and specialists in the field of pedagogical linguistics, can be studied quite fully and objectively only if the explanatory apparatus of linguistics is used in the educational linguistics sphere. Considering the main barriers in the field of intercultural communication, faced by a multilingual person, emerging in the process of learning L2, L3, etc., many researchers say that the main barrier and the cause of communication failures is not a psychological barrier, but a linguistic one. By defining the linguistic environment of the multilingual person, the operational units of his/her speech activity at different levels of interaction with native speakers, the strategies that this person uses in the situations of interlanguage and intercultural communication, researchers thereby define the process of a multilingual individual development as an active, creative, and cognitive process. As a result, an individual is formed who is able to realize his communicative competence in the environment of his/her L1 and L2, that is, an individual who is creative, free, and tolerant to other subjects of communication.

**Multilingual identity in the process of L2 acquisition**

Multilingual identity of higher education institution students is formed not only in their practical classes in L2, but also in lectures and practical classes on the theory and history of the language which they study, theory and practice of translation, in professionally oriented translation workshops, in the process of extracurricular (independent) work of a student with audio and video products in L2, reading scientific, journalistic, fiction in the original. However, in the process of forming a multilingual identity of a student, the motivational factor of learning L2 plays rather an important role.

Activating not only the thesaurus level of the student’s language identity structure, but also the motivational, pragmatic level of his identity is perhaps the most basic task of a teacher in classes of the L2 teaching in higher education. Learning L2 outside the country with its native speakers allows us to perceive a language only as a means of education, entering another culture,
a means of learning and communication in the educational situation (cf.: in a natural language environment, the language being learnt is perceived as a means of socialization and everyday communication) [Galskova, Gez, 2009, p. 50]. Accordingly, the purely pragmatic aspect of learning L2 prevails in the second case (see also: [Hubers, Trompenaars, Collin, et al., 2020]). In the situation of educational communication, the educational (or linguistic) rather than the pragmatic aspect of L2 learning often prevails.

Increasing the motivation of learning L2 (and hence the purposeful development of the second, motivational level of the student’s language identity) is possible only if the learning process: 1) is focused on the student’s personality, his/her real needs and motives, socio-cultural, individual development programs; 2) is focused not only on the logic and consistency of the subject of assimilation, but also on the logic of the student’s development, his/her creative and cognitive abilities in the field of language use; 3) stimulates students to show their own activity, to the joy and pleasure of communicating with each other; 4) forms in the student an understanding that to speak a language means to be able to use it as a means of social communication in real situations of intercultural communication and that mistakes made in this case are not an obstacle to communication [ibid., pp. 64-65].

The formation of abilities and readiness to speak out L2 is determined not so much by subjective and psychological factors as by social conditions and the corresponding roles of the individual. Bilinguals have a more developed willingness to borrow than monolinguals, and the set of readiness of a multilingual person differs from the set of readiness of a monolingual person.

From the point of view of Yury N. Karaulov, certain correlations can be seen between the communicative and activity needs and the three levels of the language identity structure. The first group of needs is responsible for establishing and developing contacts between people. This group of needs is satisfied at the verbal-semantic level and is realized in the everyday use of language. The second group of needs correlates with communication situations involving the exchange of information and the development of a unified strategy for interaction in joint activities. The thesaurus of personality meets these needs. The third group of needs correlates with communication situations in which a person is directed to the perception and understanding of his/her communication counterpart. This group of needs “serves” the second level of language identity structure, and the pragmaticon responds to it. In real communication, there is no such a clear subdivision in the language identity structure. Nevertheless, these needs function as the main units of the motivational level, and their linguistic correlates can serve, for example, the samples of the precedent texts.

Currently, a significant role is given to the communicative needs of the individual and, consequently, the emphasis in teaching is not on the language structure, but on the language use, that is, on its pragmatic component.

Irina B. Vorozhtsova suggests that if a language is studied as a system of signs, then the units of learning are sounds, graphemes, syllables, words, word-forming formants, word combinations, auxiliary words, rules for changing and forming higher-level units [Vorozhtsova, 2007]. How are these units stored in the memory of a speaker? How does he/she extract these units from there? These questions were answered by Russian psycholinguists and neurophysiologists who believed that these units are stored in memory not in full form, but in the form of a network of phonemes, morphemes, and lexemes [Zhinkin, 1958; Luria, 1998].
A more explanatory point of view on the functioning and storage of speech units in memory is the point of view of a Russian linguist and semiologist Boris M. Gasparov. He understands language not as a factory that produces and releases new products from standard semi-finished products, but as an intellectual habitat. At the same time, the appeal to the phenomenon of bilingualism allows us to introduce the concept of multilingual consciousness of the individual. Gasparov believes that “multilingual consciousness is a single conglomerate of linguistic memory, in which various particles of language matter belonging to different languages and fields of associative connections diverging from them freely “float”, entering into new juxtapositions with each other and forming new configurations” [Gasparov, 1996, p. 118].

The understanding of language matter as a fluid, continuous linguistic environment, constantly moving and changing, is, from our point of view, explanatory in cases of interlanguage communication, when the mechanical “switch” from L1 to L2, from the system of one culture to the system of another culture leads to the languages interference. Conversely, the recognition of language as a dynamic entity, represented in a multilingual consciousness, makes it possible to explain why the interference does not occur, and the communication processes are carried out quite effectively. The very concept of language identity, which receives a multilingual environment as a habitat, is more successfully included in the conceptual apparatus of pedagogical linguistics and intercultural communication. The idea of Yury N. Karaulov that the language identity structure, in fact, begins only at the first level of its organization, the thesaurus level, and not the lexicon, whose units of representation, unlike the units of representation of the thesaurus, are only words and stable, cliché units of language, is well-explained. If Karaulov writes, “Communication at the level of ‘how to get through’, ‘where did you get it’ and ‘does the mail work’... does not belong to the competence of language identity” [Karaulov, 2010, p. 36], then, using Gasparov’s terminology, we can explain why a multilingual identity begins only when the person applies the individual fragments of the language (semantic) landscape in the necessary conditions, that is, at the levels of thesaurus and pragmaticon.

There is one more point in Boris M. Gasparov’s theory that seems quite productive in educational linguistics. Unlike most linguists who study the essence of “language in use”, Gasparov tries to identify a unit that helps to operate with the entire mnemonic conglomerate of linguistic consciousness (including multilingual). Such an “operational unit” Gasparov defines as a “communicative fragment”. “Communicative fragments are speech segments of various length that are stored in the speaker’s memory as stationary particles of his/her language experience and which he/she uses when producing and interpreting utterances. A communicative fragment is an integral segment of speech that the speaker is able to reproduce directly as a complete whole in the course of his/her speech activity and which he/she directly recognizes as a whole in statements coming to him/her from the outside” [Gasparov, 1996, p. 118].

Expressions such as in a very good book, rendering a book, have read some books in the original, etc. can function as a communicative fragment. Gasparov rightly believes that a communicative fragment is a unit of speech activity, but it differs from the stable language units. “The presence of a large number of stable repetitive expressions in the language practice of speakers of any language is a well-known fact. Phenomena of this kind, defined as idioms, stable words combinations, speech formulas, clichés, find a certain place in any language description. ...The concept of a communicative fragment differs from the concept of an idiom or a stable expression both quantitatively and qualitatively. ...Stable words combinations, idioms, formulas,
clichés – the very nature of these terms indicates an understanding of them as a secondary and additional phenomenon, built on top of the structural mechanism of the language. ...In contrast, the communicative fragment should be recognized as the primary unit of linguistic activity defined directly in the linguistic consciousness of speakers” [Gasparov, 1996, p. 118].

**Intercultural competence as an indicator of multilingual identity development**

One of the main conditions for effective interlanguage and intercultural communication is the feeling formed in the learners (students) that they can freely, fearlessly use their speech experience, that is, to realize their communicative competence. Communicative competence is the ability of a person to understand and generate L2 utterances in a variety of socially determined situations, taking into account the linguistic and social rules that native speakers adhere to. Generally speaking, the communicative competence consists of:

1) knowledge of the L2 system and the skills formed on the basis of operating linguistic (lexico-grammatical and phonetic) means of communication, which is a linguistic component of communicative competence;

2) knowledge, skills and abilities that make it possible to understand and generate L2 utterances in a specific communication situation, according to a speech task and a communicative intention, which is a pragmatic component of communicative competence;

3) knowledge, skills and abilities that allow to carry out verbal and non-verbal communication with native speakers in accordance with the national and cultural contexts of speech in another society, which is a sociolinguistic component of communicative competence” [Galskova, Gez, 2009, p. 19].

A multilingual identity implies the formed ability to implement foreign lexical and grammatical constructions according with the communication standards of a different linguistic and ethnocultural community. This is an ability that allows students to work successfully within the framework of a dialogue of cultures, that is, in the situation of intercultural communication. This ability is defined as an intercultural competence of a person.

The acute material of our research is the results of a psycholinguistic associative experiment. 130 people took part in the experiment, 120 of them were the students in the fields of Philology and Linguistics of Altai State University, 10 were teachers of the Department of Linguistics, Translation, and Foreign Languages of Altai State University. The age of the participants in the experiment ranged in the following way: the students were of 16-25 years old; the teachers were of 25-54 years old. Of the 130 people who participated in the experiment, 19 were male, 121 were female. 2 people participated in the experiment had the specialized professional education diplomas, 118 people were in the process of getting higher education, 10 people had higher education diplomas (MD, PhD).

As a result of the experiment, about 3,700 associative responses were obtained (we suggested to get 3,900 responses, but for certain reasons, which we will consider in a more detailed analysis of the experiment results, the students preferred in some cases to limit themselves to the so-called “zero response” to a certain lexeme or a phrase). These associative responses were analyzed from the point of view of the possibilities of forming a multilingual students’ consciousness in the process of their learning the linguistic module courses at the university, as well as the possibility of their cognitive strategies usage in the problematic situations of intercultural communication set with the help of the experimental conditions.
During the experiment, the students of philology and linguistics of Altai State University and teachers of Altai State University were offered an associative experiment questionnaire. In the first block of tasks, there were given the lexemes representing concepts of the English language which correlate with the situational frame STUDYING. The students were asked to give the English-language lexemes-associations for the proposed lexemes or phrases. In the second block of tasks, there were given the lexemes representing concepts of the Russian language which correlate with the situational frame ОБУЧЕНИЕ and only partially correlate with the English-language lexemes mentioned above (one of the additional tasks of the experiment was to check the students’ responses to the “false equivalents”). In the third block of tasks, there were given the lexemes representing mostly specific concepts of the English-speaking culture which correlate with the situational frame STUDYING. Thus, the methodology of the associative experiment assumed obtaining the responses of Russian native speakers who have been studying English for several years to identify: 1) the students’ linguistic and intercultural competence in the situations of intercultural communication; 2) the students’ strategies in a problematic educational situation; 3) the ways to correct mistakes and errors made by students in the situations of intercultural communication.

Intercultural competence should be studied in connection with the development of the students’ personalities, their ability and willingness to participate in the dialogue of cultures based on the principles of cooperation, mutual respect, and tolerance.

Intercultural competence is understood as the ability of people of different sex and age to exist in the same society peacefully and without mutual discrimination; as an ability to exist in a different culture; as an identity, integrating knowledge and patterns of behavior, which are based on the principles of pluralistic thinking and the historicity of cultural processes.

A. Knapp-Potthoff considers three structural components of intercultural competence:
1) affective (based on empathy and tolerance);
2) cognitive (a synthesis of L1 and L2 cultures knowledge);
3) strategic (verbal, educational, and research strategies of the student) [Takahara, Knapp, Enningem, et al., 1989, p. 895].

Cognitive strategies used by the students in the situations of intercultural communication
Alexandra A. Zalevskaya believes that there is no single generally accepted concept of a strategy applied to the conditions of learning L2 [Zalevskaya, 2000, p. 321]. Academic authors focus on certain features of strategies, more or less fully describing their goals, opportunities, significance for the success of learning L2. Peter Skehan could agree with this point of view, because in his monograph, which deals with the cognitive aspect of studying L2, he does not distinguish, for example, the communicative and the strategic competences of L2 learner [Skehan, 2004, p. 20]. Skehan focuses on the strategic area of operating interlanguage knowledge, though he uses the terminology and basic concepts of communication theory. Generally speaking, a strategy is understood as an unconscious or conscious activity that trainees perform in order to learn L2 [Zalevskaya, 2000, p. 321].

In recent years, the researchers in the field of pedagogical linguistics choose the communication theory and cognitive linguistics as a basis for the development of practical methods of teaching L2. They assume the following: “1) learning is understood as an active and dynamic process during which the individuals use a variety of information and strategic ways of
processing it; 2) a speech is considered as a complex cognitive skill; 3) language learning appears to be a movement forward from preliminary understanding and active manipulation of information to full automation of language use” [Zalevskaya, 2000, p. 323].

Based on this, the following main types of learning L2 strategies can be described:
- meta-cognitive strategies, including thinking about the learning process, planning learning, monitoring the speech understanding or production, self-assessment of learning results;
- cognitive strategies that are directly related to the individual learning tasks and that involve direct manipulation of educational materials or their transformation;
- social affective strategies, which include, on the one hand, cooperation in learning (communication, interaction to achieve a common goal, asking questions for clarification), and on the other hand, “talking to yourself” (the revision of negative ideas about the inability to cope with the task; the formation of confidence in the fact that the performance of a task is quite possible for the learner, etc.) [ibid., p. 324].

The meta-cognitive strategies use is mostly a characteristic of a teacher of a linguistic module (see also: [Whong, Gil, Marsden, 2013]). The cognitive and social affective strategies used by students as the main types of learning L2 strategies in the course of performing tasks of the associative experiment can be illustrated with the following examples. Such a cognitive strategy as direct manipulation of educational materials was used by a first-year student of philology: the student applied a new lexical unit from the active vocabulary on the topic “Character” as an associate (to teach – quick-minded). An attempt to transform the educational material was made by another student of the same group: trying to describe an academic advisor as a very intelligent person, the student created an occasional lexical unit of English (unfortunately, according to the word-formation pattern that does not work with this lexeme): academic advisor – *very minding people (from the word mind). Such a grammatical error indicates some knowledge of English vocabulary (the lexical unit mind is known for a student) and unsystematic knowledge in the field of English word formation (with the existence of such derivatives as absent-minded, high-minded, pure-minded, a lexeme minding does not exist in English).

The social affective strategies use by students both in the experiment and in L2 learning process has always been welcomed by the author of the experiment (albeit within reasonable limits). Thinking aloud while completing an educational task, thinking about the task already completed provides quite interesting, ambiguous material for reconstructing operational strategies (most often situational) used in the process of solving a problem in the classroom. A similar method of “thinking aloud” (TAP, thinking aloud protocols) for revealing translation strategies in an educational problematic situation was analyzed in detail in one of the monographs by Hans P. Krings [Krings, 1986]. When analyzing experimental data, Krings speaks about the key concept of a “translation problem”. By identifying several types of translation problems, the researcher tries to identify translation strategies that determine the nature of the translator’s actions in a problematic situation.

During the associative experiment, the students used social affective strategies to achieve the following goals:

1) to explain the meaning of the lexeme, not quite successfully, from their point of view, chosen from the lexicon to denote the corresponding concept (University – big room (аудитория. – Russ. for ‘a class’));
2) to compensate for the missing token in their thesaurus, which occupies one of the slots of the situational frame STUDYING: Tutor – шапка квадратной формы у студентов при окончании университета в США. – Russ. for ‘a square-shaped cap for the students graduated from the university in the USA’;

3) to explain the choice of a language shift that does not correspond to the task of a particular block of the experiment (“Can the associations be written only in Russian / only in English? It’s the only way I can do it”);

4) to explain the choice of associated tokens (“Is it okay if I have some strange, non-standard associations?”);

5) to express emotions (often positive) about the work done and their attitude to the problems of higher education, in general (Higher education – Yeah!).

The strategies of learning L2 in the situations of intercultural communication are understood mainly as those strategies which are used when the communication barriers are overcome (cf. the constant use of the term ‘concerns’ in one of the sections of P. Skehan’s monograph entitled ‘Problems with communication strategies’ [Skehan, 2004, pp. 22-27]).

These are the cognitive strategies in the situations of solving communication problems [Zalevskaya, 2000, pp. 337-338]:

1) the strategies of paraphrasing:
   a) an approximation, that is, the use of a lexical unit or construction about which the speaker knows that it is incorrect, but which is semantically close to the lexical unit in need to satisfy him. For example, big room (аудитория – Russ. for ‘a class’): a student knows that the words combination conveys the meaning of the word inaccurately, and that is why she adds the Russian word;
   b) occasional creative word-making, that is, the “invention” of a new word to convey the concept in need: lection instead of a lecture;
   c) the substitution of a description when the speaker describes certain properties, signs, elements of an object or an action instead of using the right word or structure (треугольная шляпа с кисточкой; шляпа, шапка квадратной формы у студентов при окончании университета в США. – Russ. for ‘a triangular cap with a tassel; a cap, a square-shaped cap for the students graduated from the university in the USA’);

2) transfer strategies:
   a) a literal translation: a course work instead of a term paper (8 reactions);
   b) a code shift: a learner uses transliteration of L1 word, without even bothering to translate it into L2: decanat (instead of a dean’s office), pre pod (Russ. short for a university teacher), roman (instead of a novel);

3) the strategy of avoidance:
   a) avoidance of the topic: to a tutor token, which was not well-known for some respondents, the following responses were given: University student, class, to teach, to study, etc.;
   b) refusal to continue the phrase due to the lack of necessary means of expression (the second-year student did not perform the tasks of the third block of the associative experiment, and for the tasks of the first block she wrote: “The same, but in English”, being sure that the lists of stimulus words differed only in the language code).

Such a classification of mistakes and errors made by the students does not include all cases of unsuccessful attempts to solve intercultural communication problems. We have not considered
the errors of an interlanguage nature associated with the incorrect spelling of words in both English and Russian. Errors of an interlanguage nature associated with the application of the rules of Russian grammar to English words (in English, the words knowledge, speech belong to such a grammatical category of number as Singulaires Tantum, and the word mathematics is used in Pluralia Tantum, unlike the Russian language), we also did not consider in detail. However, even the examples of errors analyzed that were made when the students tried to solve some intercultural communication problems allow us to draw certain conclusions about the possible ways to correct or prevent these errors in educational situations.

In cases of using paraphrasing strategies, there is a positive moment which deals with using lexical units that have approximately the same meaning with the words in need, however, and a teacher should encourage a student to further independent work with reference literature to find the proper lexical unit. The students’ creative “word-forming” is sometimes a good psychological relaxation procedure in the problematic situations of intercultural communication. However, it is worth explaining pragmatic context when using language play games within certain situations of intercultural communication.

In cases where transfer strategies are used, it is necessary to take some exercises in class to recognize the so-called “false equivalents” and the situations in which these tokens should not be used.

Avoidance strategies are used by the students most often in cases when the students are not sure in their knowledge in the field in question. The constant, systematic expansion of students’ vocabulary in the field of various topics related to their future professional activities or everyday communication they probably go into in the L2 country allows most of them to feel sure in the good command in L2. However, it is worth doing some discursive practices in L2. The skills of professional interpretation of L2 texts of different genres and the production of oral and written texts in L2 will help to cope with the problems in the situations of intercultural communication.

Conclusions
The readiness of higher education students to participate in the situations of intercultural communication, which is understood as their intercultural competence, is formed in the process of learning a large number of subjects of the linguistic module at the university (this includes both classroom and extra-curricular teacher’s and students’ work).

As a result of our research, we analyzed the main principles and ideas of educational linguistics as an applied, practically-oriented discipline, which, together with the theory of intercultural communication, is the basis for the development of a new field of language teaching theory, communicative educational linguistics. This discipline helps to present the process of learning the university courses in the linguistic module (which includes disciplines related to the teaching of both L1 and L2) as a process of personally-oriented learning, as a result of students’ multilingual identity development.

The model of language identity, developed in the works by Yury N. Karaulov, is successfully used as a model construing the process of learning L2 subjects in the university linguistic module. In our opinion, joining together the ideas of language identity research, produced by Yury N. Karaulov, and the theoretical principles, defended by Boris M. Gasparov, helps us to create an effective conceptual base for the communicative educational linguistics. For example, such terms as a “communicative fragment”, “multilingual consciousness”, a
“communicative outline of an utterance”, a “presumption of textuality”, etc. match successfully with the concept of multilingual identity. They also allow us to explain different mechanisms of applying various communicative strategies in the situations of intercultural communication (including their educational version).

As a result of the experimental material analysis, the most effective cognitive strategies (mostly situational) used by the students in the intercultural communication were revealed. From our point of view, these strategies are mainly the strategies of text production (or generation of certain communicative fragments in L1 and L2), but not the text interpretation, since the principle of the associative experiment is to stimulate respondents to speech production. However, during the experiment, a large number of communicative fragments of L1 and L2 as the associative responses were analyzed. They reflected the speech experience of the students’ interpretive activity. The study of the precedent texts elements functioning in the multilingual students’ consciousness seems quite promising. It lets appreciate the formation of the students’ multilingual consciousness, and gives a chance to see which precedent texts are currently relevant for the multilingual Russian speakers aged 16-54. In the process of analyzing the data obtained as a result of the associative experiment, we found out that one of the most important tasks of a teacher in the situation of educational intercultural communication is the formation of the students’ adaptation abilities to solve the communication problems.

Using their linguistic and cultural competences in the problematic situations of intercultural communication, the students learning L2 show themselves as creative and active multilinguals. As a result of analyzing the data of the associative experiment, we found out that the students most often use the social affective strategies for L2 learning. A fairly good indicator of it is the use by the students (especially undergraduates) of meta-cognitive language learning strategies related both to the perception of ready-made clichés of L2 and to the speech production (a language play game as a sphere of speech activity works in this case as a way of implementing mnemonic resources of multilingual consciousness).

Since the main barrier in the intercultural communication is not a psychological barrier, but a linguistic one, it seems possible to use the so-called “operational” correction of errors resulting from the use of certain strategies by the students. These strategies aim at overcoming communicative problems in the process of intercultural communication. In cases where students use communicative strategies of paraphrasing, language transfer or avoidance, it is worth using the following strategies to correct the students’ speech activity: 1) explaining the meaning of unknown lexical units, embedding them into the frame structures of background information of L2; 2) giving necessary linguistic and cultural commentary. However, the most effective, from our point of view, is the joint classroom activity of the teacher and the students on the text interpretation and text production in L2 In this case, there is formed multilingual identity of the student, who will be able to realize his/her linguistic and cultural competences in the problematic situations of both educational and real intercultural communication.
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