

# The effect of explicit instruction on comprehension and production of discourse formulas

*Tatsiana Maiko*

University of Milan

ORCID: 0000-0002-1740-1615

DOI: 10.54103/milanoup.305.c737

## **ABSTRACT**

This study investigates the impact of explicit instruction on the comprehension and production of discourse formulas among L2 Russian learners. Discourse formulas, as fixed expressions with pragmatic functions, present challenges for learners due to their non-compositional meaning and language specificity. The study focuses on the effectiveness of an online course *Kak skazhetsya?*, which offers corpus-referred instructional materials designed to enhance learners' pragmatic competence.

The research involved 29 students divided into an experimental group, which completed the course, and a control group, which did not receive any explicit instruction. Participants were assessed through pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests that evaluated their recognition, comprehension, and production of discourse formulas. Results indicated a significant improvement in the experimental group's ability to recognize and comprehend the target formulas, with gains sustained over time. However, production proved to be more challenging, with only moderate progress observed. The study highlights the need for further research into enhancing productive competence in teaching discourse formulas.

**Keywords:** discourse formulas; corpus-referred instructional materials; pragmatic competence; L2 Russian.

## **1. Introduction**

Formulaic language has received considerable attention in language learning research in recent decades. While the research has focused mainly on the acquisition and use of idioms (De Knop and Mollica 2016; Eyckmans and Lindstromberg 2017), collocations (Granger and Bestgen 2014; González Fernández and Schmitt 2015; Gablasova, Brezina and McEnery 2017), and multiword expressions in general (Ådel and Erman 2012; Siyanova-Chanturia and Spina 2020), there are still relatively few studies investigating discourse, or

speech, formulas – a particular class of formulaic expressions used as verbalized reactions to another participant's utterance in a conversation:

(1) - *Davaj zavrta schodim v kino* 'Let's go to the movies tomorrow?.'

- *Ja zhal* 'I'm up for it!' / *Tol'ko ne eto* 'No way'.

These fixed utterances with non-compositional meaning and pragmatic functions can pose a challenge for second language learners, especially when exposure to the target language is limited. Discourse formulas are highly idiosyncratic and language-specific, and they are often overlooked in lexicography and language teaching.

This study examines the effectiveness of an online course (*Kak skazhes'*) that incorporates corpus-based instructional materials on discourse formulas, assessing its impact on the development of pragmatic competence among L2 Russian learners.

The article is structured as follows: Section 2 provides a brief overview of what is referred to as discourse formulas and their key characteristics. Section 3 presents the instructional materials on discourse formulas in Russian, along with the test developed to address the research questions. In Section 4, the study's results and limitations are discussed. Finally, conclusions are drawn.

## 2. Discourse formulas

Due to diachronic processes that can be referred to as pragmatization (Diewald 2011, Heine 2013), Russian multiword units like *eshe čego* (meaning 'not a chance'), *a kak že* (meaning 'you bet'), and *da ladno* (meaning 'seriously/ok') have lost the original meanings of their individual components and acquired a pragmatic function. These expressions have become fixed, independent utterances that lack free slots and do not allow for transformations<sup>1</sup>, such as element replacement (2)-(3), pluralization (4), introduction of new elements (5), modification (6), or rearrangement of elements (7):

(2) *Uch ty* (lit. 'wow you', meaning 'wow')

\**Uch my* (lit. 'wow we')

(3) *Počemu by i net* (lit. 'why and not', meaning 'why not')

\**Počemu by i da* (lit. 'why and yes')

1 In some cases, minor variations can occur, such as adding one or more particles (*gde tam* meaning 'far from it' – *da gde už tam* meaning 'far from it') or replacing an element with another (*da gde už tam* meaning 'far from it' – *da kuda už tam* meaning 'far from it').

- (4) *Ne to slovo* (lit. ‘not that word’, meaning ‘tell me about it!’)  
 \**Ne te slova* (lit. ‘not those words’)
- (5) *I ne govori* (lit. ‘and don’t say’, meaning ‘you can say that again’)  
 \**I ne govori eto* (lit. ‘and don’t say that’)
- (6) *Ne vopros* (lit. ‘not a question’, meaning ‘no problem’)  
 \**Ne važnyj vopros* (lit. ‘not an important question’)
- (7) *Von ono čto* (lit. ‘over there it what’, meaning ‘oh, that figures’)  
 \**Ono čto von* (lit. ‘it what over there’)

Discourse formulas can presumably be found in any language. They are used in response to a preceding utterance and serve to express various pragmatic meanings, such as surprise (*Nado žel* meaning ‘Wow!’, *Ne možet byt!* meaning ‘No way!’), indifference (*Mne to čto!* meaning ‘Who cares!’, *Kak znaeš* meaning ‘As you wish’), agreement or confirmation (*Vot imenno!* meaning ‘Exactly!’, *I ne govori!* meaning ‘You can say that again!’), disagreement or negation (*Ne skazal!* meaning ‘I wouldn’t say that’, *Ničego podobnogo!* meaning ‘Nothing of the kind!’), consent to a request or invitation (*Ja ne protiv!* meaning ‘I don’t mind!’, *Ja za!* meaning ‘I’m up for it!’), refusal or prohibition (*Ni za čto!* meaning ‘No way!’, *I reči byt ne možet!* meaning ‘Absolutely not!’), requests for clarification (*V smysle?* meaning ‘What do you mean?’, *Čego-čego?* meaning ‘Come again?’), and expressions of discontent or devaluation (*Tože mne!* meaning ‘Oh, please!’, *Kto by govoril!* meaning ‘Look who’s talking!’). They generally express either a negative reaction (disagreement, refusal, or discontent) or a positive reaction (agreement or consent).<sup>2</sup>

For the first time, attention to these formulaic expressions with a pragmatic function was brought by Charles Fillmore (1984), who referred to them as “speech formulas”. He noted that the preceding utterances made by another participant determine the choice of a specific formula. Rachilina *et al.* (2021) suggested that when describing discourse formulas, it is necessary to rely on the classification of speech acts (Searle 1976) and consider the correlation between the semantics of the stimulus speech act and the reaction formula:

[...] típy predšestvujuščich replik dialoga - t.e. vyskazyvanij, proiznosimych drugim učastnikom, - vypolnjajut dlja DF tu že rol’, čto pustye sloty/peremennye dlja konstrukcij: tak že, kak dlja konstrukcij, oni obespečivajut kogerentnost’ teksta, soedinjaja raznye ego fragmenty meždu soboj i, čto osobenno važno, opredeljadajut izbor toj ili inoj edinicy<sup>3</sup> (Rachilina *et al.* 2021, 15-16).

2 An exception is represented by formulas expressing a request to clarify the preceding utterance. Formulas of surprise and indifference can take on both negative and positive meanings depending on the context.

3 ‘[...] the types of preceding dialogue remarks – i.e., utterances spoken by another participant – perform the same role for DF as empty slots/ variables do for constructions: just as for

For instance, the formula for disagreement or negation, (*Nu*) *ne skaž(i)te!* (lit. ‘don’t say’, meaning ‘I wouldn’t say that’), is used exclusively in response to evaluative hypotheses, judgments, or opinions (8)–(9), but not to questions (10), proposals (10), or requests (11).

(8) *U nas budet men'se raboty, vot i vsë. – Ne skaži, – vozrazil Bočkin. – Sovsem ne men'se, a daže naoborot* ‘We’ll have less work, that’s all. – I wouldn’t say that, – Bočkin objected. – Not less at all, but quite the opposite.’ (Arkadij Macanov. *Master i podmaster’e*, 2016).<sup>4</sup>

(9) - *Ty ž u nas melanholik/pravil'no?* ‘You’re a melancholic/right?’

- *Nu ne skaži/ne skaži...* ‘Well, not exactly/not exactly...’ (Oral corpus of NKRJA).

(10) - *Ty byla v bufete?* ‘Did you go to the cafeteria?’

- *Net (\*ne skaži)/ya že nedavno tol'ko prišla.* ‘No (\*I wouldn’t say that)/I just got here.’

- *Da/ja zabyla. Možet, schodim?* ‘Oh, I forgot. Shall we go?’

- *Da nu/esiče ne chočetsja (\*ne skaži)* ‘Nah, I don’t feel like it yet (\*I wouldn’t say that)’ (Oral corpus of NKRJA).

(11) *Mudryj sverčok: Poslušaj/Buratino. Broš baloval'sja. Idi v školu.* ‘Wise Cricket: Listen, Buratino. Stop fooling around. Go to school.’

*Buratino: Eščë čego! (\*Ne skaži) Daj mne žiž' spokojno!* ‘Buratino: Not a chance! (\*I wouldn’t say that) Let me live in peace!’ (Leonid Nečaev, Inna Vetkina. *Priključenija Buratino*, 1975).

Discourse formulas need to be distinguished from other classes of pragmatic units. Unlike discourse markers (e.g., *bezuslovno* ‘certainly’, *na moj vzgljad* ‘in my opinion’, *na etom vsë* ‘that’s all’), which ensure the coherence of discourse (Baranov *et al.* 1993, 7) and are integrated into the syntactic structure of a sentence, discourse formulas (DF) function as autonomous utterances used as responses in dialogue. Another class of formulaic expressions is represented by routines (Bardovi-Harlig 2006); however, unlike DF, these expressions are bound to specific circumstances, such as greetings (*dobryj den'* ‘good afternoon’) or other expressions of courtesy and social exchange (*spasibo* ‘thank you’ or *pozdravljaju* ‘congratulations’). Additionally, similar but broader classes of units have been identified in Russian linguistic literature, which only partially overlap with the class of discourse formulas: *kommunikativny* (Šaronov 2012), *kommunikemy* (Melikjan 2021), and *pragmatemy* (Bogdanova-Beglarian 2014).<sup>5</sup>

---

constructions, they ensure the coherence of the text by connecting its different fragments and, most importantly, determine the choice of a particular unit’.

4 The examples (8)–(11) are extracted from the main and the oral subcorpora of the *Russian National Corpus* (*Nacionalnyj korpus russkogo jazyka* NKRJA), available at: <https://ruscorpora.ru/>

5 For a detailed review, see (Žukova 2021).

### 3. Russian discourse formulas in language learning

Mastering discourse formulas can be challenging for L2 Russian learners. Due to their non-compositional and opaque meaning, learners often attempt to translate these expressions literally, which can result in communicative misunderstandings. Moreover, the correct use of these formulas is closely tied to the nature of the preceding remark, making their acquisition particularly difficult.

Discourse formulas are underrepresented in dictionaries because they are multi-word units with specific usage contexts. Additionally, they are rarely included in textbooks for learners of Russian as a foreign language, where phraseological units in general tend to be overlooked.

#### 3.1 Description and instruction of DF in Russian

Recently, a systematic description of the inventory of DFs in Russian, based on data from spoken and multimedia corpora, has been carried out within the project *Pragmaticon*. The results of this project are integrated into the free online course *Kak skazhets'?*. This course, designed for B1+ level students, introduces some of the most common discourse formulas of spoken Russian, divided into eight pragmatic classes (seven formulas for each class), such as indifference, disagreement, refusal, request to clarify the preceding utterance, discontent, agreement, surprise, consent. Each module of the course focuses on a specific semantic class of discourse formulas and includes 3-4 exercises, featuring a variety of tasks such as short videos with follow-up completion tasks, drag-and-drop exercises, matching exercises, and multiple-choice questions where students must choose the correct meaning of a DF or select the appropriate DF for a given preceding turn. To the best of my knowledge, this is the only Russian language course that explicitly addresses discourse formulas.

#### 3.2 Case study: effectiveness of explicit instruction on discourse formulas

There is still little empirical research on the effects of instructional materials on the acquisition of pragmatic competence by learners of Russian. Some studies have focused on the acquisition of specific speech acts (Artoni *et al.* 2020 on requests and advice; Artoni and Rylova 2021 on requests), discourse markers (Benigni and Nuzzo 2018, Stoyanova 2020, Bernasconi and Giampietro 2022), and vague language (Maiko 2022, 2023). However, research specifically targeting the acquisition of discourse formulas is virtually nonexistent, with only one exception (Furniss 2016), which investigated routine formulas, including some discourse formulas. Studies have proposed various treatments for teaching elements with pragmatic functions in different languages, utilizing authentic language data or innovative techniques like input flood (Ferroni 2020, Hernández 2011). Explicit instruction that includes metapragmatic information has been shown to be the most effective approach in teaching pragmatics (Ishihara 2010, Jones and Carter 2014).

This study examines the effectiveness of the online course *Kak skažeš'* and addresses the following research questions:

1. Does the course, which incorporates explicit instruction on discourse formulas, help students improve their understanding and use of these units (compared to a group that does not receive explicit instruction on the topic)?
2. Does the intervention have a lasting impact on learners' awareness of the targeted units?

To address these research questions, pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests assessing comprehension and use of the discourse formulas were administered to both experimental and control groups, consisting of first-year Master's degree program students (B1→B2) at the University of Milan. The experimental group (n = 16) completed the course during the academic year, while the control group (n = 13) did not receive any explicit instruction on the topic. The pre-test was administered at the beginning of the academic year (October 2022), the post-test at the end of the second semester (April 2023), and the delayed post-test five weeks after completing the post-test.

### 3.2.1 Test's composition

The test consisted of four tasks: three assessed receptive skills, while one evaluated productive skills using a total of 24 targeted formulas introduced in the course. At the beginning of the test, students received a brief explanation of what discourse formulas are, along with some examples in their native language, Italian.

In the recognition task, students were asked to select the expressions they were familiar with. This task included 8 targeted formulas and 4 distractors. The distractors were modified versions of discourse formulas in which a lexical element was altered. For example, in the case of *počemu by i net* (lit. 'why and no', meaning 'why not') the final element *net* 'no' was replaced with its opposite, creating the nonce phrase *počemu by i da* (lit. 'why and yes'). Similarly, the discourse formula *kak znaeš'* (lit. 'as you know', meaning 'as you wish') was changed by replacing the adverb *kak* 'as' with *tak* 'so'.

The second task assessed comprehension. Students were presented with 8 mini-dialogues (one for each pragmatic class of discourse formulas) and asked to choose the option that best described what the speaker intended to express using a discourse formula (12):

(12) *Julja: Peredaš' Ole ètu knigu?* 'Will you pass this book to Olja?'

*Anton: Ne vopros!* 'No problem!'

A) *Anton ne soglašajtsja* 'Anton does not agree.'

B) *Anton nedovoljen tem, što govorit Julja.* 'Anton is unhappy with what Julja is saying.'

B) *Anton soglasen* 'Anton agrees.'

The third task, which tested both comprehension and use, was a multiple-choice gap-fill exercise. It included 8 mini-dialogues with a missing formula, followed by three options: one correct formula and two pragmatically inappropriate ones. Learners had to select the formula that fitted the context of the dialogue (13):

- (13) - *Možeš dat' mne svoj komp'juter?* 'Can you lend me your computer?'  
 - *Ne mogu, on mne samoj nužen!* 'I can't, I need it myself.'  
 - \_\_\_\_\_  
 A) *Nu i ladno* 'Oh well'.  
 B) *Vot imenno!* 'Exactly!'.  
 B) *Ne skaz'ž!* 'I wouldn't say that'.

In the production task, students were asked to write the missing formulas in 8 mini-dialogues (14). Since the targeted formulas appeared in the other tasks, this task was administered first to prevent students from being exposed to potential responses beforehand.

- (14) - *Nemedlenno poprosi proščenija u brata!* 'Immediately apologize to your brother!'  
 - \_\_\_\_\_ *On sam vinovat! Èto on pervyj menja udaril!* 'It's his own fault! He was the one who hit me first!'

### 3.2.2 Results

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations of the recognition task scores for the instructed and control groups. The maximum possible score was 12 points.

**Table 1:** Results of the recognition task

Group	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Delayed Post-Test	
	Mean	Population standard deviation	Mean	Population standard deviation	Mean	Population standard deviation
Instructed group	4,31	1,04	8,75	1,2	8,63	1,32
Control group	4,15	1,03	4,07	0,73	-	-

The pre-test results of the instructed and control groups are comparable, demonstrating a very limited knowledge of Russian discourse formulas. The post-test results indicate that the instructional intervention significantly enhanced the learners' awareness of the targeted formulas, whereas the control group showed no improvement from pre-test to post-test. Additionally, there

is no significant difference between the post-test and delayed post-test scores in the instructed group, suggesting that the improvement had a lasting effect.

Tables 2 and 3 present the results of the comprehension tasks, with a maximum possible score of 8 points.

**Table 2:** Results of the task on comprehension

Group	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Delayed Post-Test	
	Mean	Population standard deviation	Mean	Population standard deviation	Mean	Population standard deviation
Instructed group	2,38	1,05	6,13	1,05	6,19	0,81
Control group	2,54	1,08	2,69	0,94	-	-

**Table 3:** Results of the task on comprehension and use

Group	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Delayed Post-Test	
	Mean	Population standard deviation	Mean	Population standard deviation	Mean	Population standard deviation
Instructed group	2,5	1,32	3,8	0,65	4,23	
Control group	2,38	0,86	2,87	0,81	-	-

In terms of comprehension, the experimental group showed significant improvement in the task where the formulas were provided, and they had to indicate their meaning. However, improvement was only marginal in the task in which students were required to select pragmatically appropriate formulas.

As expected, the production task proved to be the most challenging for the students, as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4:** Results of the production task

Group	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Delayed Post-Test	
	Mean	Population standard deviation	Mean	Population standard deviation	Mean	Population standard deviation
Instructed group	0,13	0,34	2,88	1,17	2,5	0,87
Control group	0,06	0,24	0,38	0,63	-	-

During the pre-test, both groups struggled to produce any discourse formulas. In the post-test, some improvement was observed in the instructed group; however, given the maximum possible score of 8, this improvement was not substantial.

Regarding the qualitative analysis of the results, some trends emerged. First, based on the most frequent errors, it appears that the students tended to analyze discourse formulas as compositional units or relied on the literal translation of specific components. For example, in (15), the students chose the option *voť èto da* ‘oh wow’ instead of *a kakè že* ‘you bet’, likely due to the presence of *da* ‘yes’:

- (15) - *Ty pridèš? ko mne na den’ roždenija?* ‘Will you come to my birthday party?’  
 - \**Voť èto da!* ‘Oh wow!’ (lit. ‘this is yes’)

Another example of this strategy is illustrated in (16), where 70% of students in both groups selected the second option incorrectly in the pre-test. In the post-test, 31% of the instructed group and 69% of the control group made the same mistake, likely due to the literal translation of the formula *i ne govori* ‘and don’t say’.

- (16) *Nataša: Kakaja u tebjā chorošaja mama!* ‘What a great mom you have!’  
*Vika: I ne govori!* ‘You can say that again!’ (lit. ‘and don’t say’)  
 A) *Vika nedovol’na tem, èto govorit Nataša* ‘Vika is unhappy with what Nataša is saying’.  
 B) *Vika soglasna s tem, èto govorit Nataša* ‘Vika agrees with what Nataša is saying’.  
 B) *Vika ne soglasna s tem, èto govorit Nataša* ‘Vika disagrees with what Nataša is saying’.

The students demonstrated difficulty in distinguishing between units with similar forms but different meanings. For example, *nu i ladno* ‘so be it,’ which expresses indifference, and *nu ladno* ‘okay,’ which expresses agreement (17). The difference between these two units lies only in the conjunction *i* ‘and’:

- (17) - *Davaj zāvtra schodim v kino* ‘Let’s go to the cinema tomorrow’.  
 - [\**Nu i ladno* ‘So be it’.]  
 - *Chorošo, togda ja napišu tebe, gde i vo skol’ko vstretimsja* ‘Alright, then I’ll text you where and what time we’ll meet’.

Similarly, the formula *èch ty!* ‘oh, come on!’, which expresses disappointment or mild reproach, was mistakenly used in a context where a formula of surprise or amazement, such as *uch ty!* ‘wow!’, was required (18). These two formulas

differ in form only by the interjections *èch*, which expresses regret or reproach, and *uch*, which conveys a strong emotional reaction.

- (18) - *Ugadaj, kogo ja videla včera v našem supermarketu! Aktrisu iz seriala "Kuchnja"*  
 'Guess who I saw yesterday at our supermarket! The actress from the tv show "Kuchnja"!'
   
- *Ogo!* [\*Èch ty! 'Oh, come on!']

Another example of the difficulty learners faced in distinguishing between two formulas with similar forms involves two discourse formulas with synonymous verbs: the aforementioned *ne govori* and *ne skaži*. Although both can be literally translated as 'don't say', their meanings differ significantly. The first one, *ne govori*, expresses a confirmative meaning ('You can say that again'), while the second, *ne skaži*, conveys disagreement ('I wouldn't say that'). In example (19), the preceding utterance contains an evaluation, which allows for either formula as a reaction, depending on the speaker's perspective. However, in the test task, the speaker's reaction was clarified by the phrase *Ja čut' ne usnul* 'I almost fell asleep', making the use of *ne govori* incorrect in this context:

- (19) - *Ja očen' rada, što my schodili na ètot fil'm. Kakoj on klassnyj!* 'I'm so glad we went to see this movie! It's so great!'
   
- [*Ne skaži* 'I wouldn't say that' /\**Ne govori* 'You can say that again']. *Ja čut' ne usnul* 'I almost fell asleep'.

One of the biggest challenges for the students was distinguishing between groups of discourse formulas that have similar meanings but are used in response to different types of speech acts. In example (20), the students incorrectly used the formula *vot imenno* 'exactly', which expresses solidarity with the interlocutor and should be used in response to a statement containing an evaluation. Instead, they should have used a formula that indicates agreement to a suggestion or acceptance of an invitation, such as *počemu by i net?* 'why not?', *ja za* 'I'm in', or *ja ne protiv* 'I don't mind':

- (20) - *Davaj zavra schodim v kino* 'Let's go to the cinema tomorrow'.
   
- [*\*Vot imenno!* 'Exactly!']
   
- *Chorošo, togda ja napišu tebe* 'Alright, then I'll text you where and what time we'll meet'.

In a similar way, the students confused formulas of refusal and negation. In example (21), in response to a request some students chose formulas of negation (*ničego podobnogo* 'nothing of the sort', *vряд li* 'hardly'), which can only be used after a polar question, assumption, or opinion:

(21) - *Nemedlenno poprosi prošćenija u brata!* ‘Immediately apologize to your brother!’  
 - [*\*Ničego podobnogo* ‘Nothing of the sort’/*\*Vrjad li* ‘Hardly?'] *On sam vinova! Èto on pervyj menja udari!* ‘It’s his own fault! He was the one who hit me first!’

According to our data, the students rarely used the strategy of creating calques from their native language. This occurred only in a few instances in the control group, such as in example (22), where *ne govori mne èto* is a word-for-word calque of the Italian discourse formula of surprise *non me lo dire!*

(22) - *Ugadaj, kogo ja videla včera v našem supermarket!* *Aktrisu iz seriala “Kuchnja”!*  
 ‘Guess who I saw yesterday at our supermarket! The actress from the tv show “Kuchnja”!’  
 - *Ogol!* ‘Wow!’ [*\*Ne govori mne èto!* (lit. ‘don’t tell me this’)]

This may be due to the students’ perception of these formulas as idiosyncratic, which led them to avoid translating them directly from Italian.

## 4. Conclusions

The test results indicate that the instructional intervention increased students’ awareness of Russian discourse formulas, particularly in their ability to recognize and understand these expressions in context. However, this improvement did not translate into a significant enhancement of the students’ productive skills. The challenges observed in distinguishing between formulas with similar forms and meanings, and in producing contextually appropriate responses, suggest that a more nuanced approach is necessary for teaching these units effectively.

A more intensive intervention that combines increased oral input, opportunities for oral production, and structured cross-linguistic comparisons could potentially lead to greater progress in the acquisition of discourse formulas. Integrating more interactive and communicative tasks would allow students to practice these expressions in a variety of contexts, thereby deepening their understanding and use.

This study has some limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results. One major limitation is the small sample size, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, important variables such as the time each student dedicated to studying the materials and their overall exposure to Russian input, particularly in spoken form, were not systematically controlled. These factors could have influenced the outcomes of the intervention.

Conducting a delayed post-test at a later stage could help further evaluate the long-term retention of the targeted formulas, offering a more comprehensive

view of the intervention's effectiveness over time. Future studies could also include a larger and more diverse sample to validate the findings and explore the role of individual differences in the acquisition of discourse formulas.

## References

- Ädel, Annelie, and Britt Erman. 2012. "Recurrent Word Combinations in Academic Writing by Native and Nonnative Speakers of English: A Lexical Bundles Approach". *English for Specific Purposes* 31 (2): 81–92.
- Artoni, Daniele, Valentina Benigni, and Elena Nuzzo. 2020. "Pragmatic Instruction in L2 Russian: A Study on Requests and Advice". *Instructed Second Language Acquisition* 4 (1): 62–95.
- Artoni, Daniele, and Anna Rylova. 2021. "L1 Interference in Interlanguage Pragmatics: A Study on Requesting in Russian L2 and Italian L2". *Annali di Ca' Foscari. Serie occidentale* 55: 65–86.
- Astafyeva, Irina, Ekaterina Afanaseva, Polina Bychkova, Fanya Daniel, and Anna Levinzon. *Kak skazhets'*. Available at <https://vsrussian.com/courses/5c0d40d765a47aa367cbfb4c>.
- Baranov, Anatolij N., Vladimir A. Plungjan, and Ekaterina V. Rachilina. 1993. *Putevoditel' po diskursivnym slovam russkogo jazyka*. Moscow: Pomovskij i partnery.
- Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen. 2006. "On the Role of Formulas in the Acquisition of L2 Pragmatics". In *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, edited by Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig, César Félix-Brasdefer, and Alwiya S. Omar, vol. 11, 1–28. Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Mānoa.
- Benigni, Valentina, and Elena Nuzzo. 2018. "L'insegnamento dei segnali funzionali in russo come lingua seconda". In *Le lingue extraeuropee e l'italiano. Aspetti didattico-acquisizionali e sociolinguistici*, edited by Alberto Manco, 151–165. Rome: Società di Linguistica Italiana.
- Bernasconi, Beatrice, and Marina Giampietro. 2022. "Teaching Discourse Markers to Students with Students: The Case of Italian Learners of L2 Russian". *Russian Language Journal* 72 (1). <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/rlj/vol72/iss1/8>.
- Bogdanova-Beglarjan, Natal'ja V. 2014. "Pragmatemy v ustnoj povsednevnoj reči: opredelenie ponjatija i obščaja tipologija". *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Rossijskaja i žarubežnaja filologija* 3 (27): 7–20.
- De Knop, Sabine, and Fabio Mollica. 2016. "A Construction-Based Analysis of German Ditransitive Phraseologisms for Language Pedagogy". In *Applied Construction Grammar*, edited by Sabine De Knop and Gaëtanelle Gilquin, 53–88. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Diewald, Gabriele. 2011. "Pragmaticalization (Defined) as Grammaticalization of Discourse Functions". *Linguistics* 49 (2): 365–390.

- Eyckmans, June, and Seth Lindstromberg. 2017. "The Power of Sound in L2 Idiom Learning". *Language Teaching Research* 21 (3): 341–361.
- Ferroni, Roberta. 2020. "Insegnare i segnali discorsivi a studenti brasiliani d'ILS a partire da un corpus di dati empirici". In *La competenza discorsiva e interazionale*, edited by Roberta Ferroni and Monica Birello, 111–148. Rome: Aracne Editrice.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1984. "Remarks on Contrastive Pragmatics". In *Contrastive Linguistics: Prospects and Problems*, edited by Jacek Fisiak, 119–142. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Furniss, Edie A. 2016. "Teaching the Pragmatics of Russian Conversation Using a Corpus-Referred Website". *Language Learning & Technology* 20: 38–60.
- Gablasova, Dana, Vaclav Brezina, and Tony McEnery. 2017. "Collocations in Corpus-Based Language Learning Research: Identifying, Comparing, and Interpreting the Evidence". *Language Learning* 67: 155–179.
- González Fernández, Beatriz, and Norbert Schmitt. 2015. "How Much Collocation Knowledge Do L2 Learners Have?: The Effects of Frequency and Amount of Exposure". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 166: 94–126.
- Granger, Sylviane, and Yves Bestgen. 2014. "The Use of Collocations by Intermediate vs. Advanced Non-Native Writers: A Bigram-Based Study". *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 52: 229–252.
- Heine, Bernd. 2013. "On Discourse Markers: Grammaticalization, Pragmaticalization, or Something Else?" *Linguistics* 51 (6): 1205–1247.
- Hernández, Todd A. 2011. "Re-Examining the Role of Explicit Instruction and Input Flood on the Acquisition of Spanish Discourse Markers". *Language Teaching Research* 15 (2): 159–182.
- Ishihara, Noriko. 2010. "Instructional Pragmatics: Bridging Teaching, Research, and Teacher Education". *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4 (10): 938–953.
- Jones, Christian, and Ronald Carter. 2014. "Teaching Spoken Discourse Markers Explicitly: A Comparison of III and PPP". *International Journal of English Studies* 14 (1): 37–54.
- Maiko, Tatsiana. 2022. "Nečetskaja nominacija v učebnom korpusu ruskogo jazyka". *Studi Slavistici* 19 (2): 211–230.
- Maiko, Tatsiana. 2023. "Nečetskaja nominacija v pis'mennoj i ustnoj reči ital'janskich studentov, izučajuščich ruskij jazyk". In *Język rosyjski w badaniach europejskich. Konteksty językoznawcze i edukacyjne*, edited by Marzanna Karolczuk and Anna Petrikova, 155–180. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku.
- Melikjan, Vadim Ju. 2021. *Slovar' emocional'no-ekspressivnych oborotov živoj reči*. Moscow: Flinta.
- Rachilina, Ekaterina V., Polina A. Byčkova, and Svetlana Ju. Žukova. 2021. "Rečevye akty kak lingvističeskaja kategorija: diskursivnye formuly". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2: 7–27.

- Šaronov, Igor' A. 2012. "Kommunikativy v grammatike i v slovare". In *Russkij jazyk segodnja. X Šmelerskie čtenija*, 448–462. Moscow.
- Searle, John R. 1976. "A Classification of Illocutionary Acts". *Language in Society* 5: 1–23.
- Sijanová-Chanturia, Anna, and Stefania Spina. 2020. "Multi-Word Expressions in Second Language Writing: A Large-Scale Longitudinal Learner Corpus Study". *Language Learning* 70 (2): 420–463.
- Stoyanova, Nataliya. 2020. "Diskursivnye elementy v ruskoj reči ital'jancev: nekotorye zakonomernosti usvoenija". In *Systèmes linguistiques et textes en contraste. Études de linguistique slavo-romane*, edited by Olga Inkova, Małgorzata Nowakowska, and Sebastiano Scarpel, 357–374. Krakow.
- Yaskevich, Alyaxey, Polina Bychkova, Evgenia Koziuk, Ekaterina Rakhilina, Evgenia Slepak, Alevtina Utkina, Svetlana Zhukova, and Tatiana Zotova. *The Russian Pragmaticon. An electronic database of the Russian pragmatic constructions*. Available at <https://pragmaticon.ruscorpora.ru/>.
- Žukova, Svetlana Ju. 2021. "Diskursivnye formuly russkogo jazyka v diachroničeskom aspekte (na materiale XVIII–XXI vekov)". PhD diss., Moscow.