

The Participatory Approach and Student Active Learning in Language Teaching: Language Students as Journalists and Filmmakers

**SVETLANA SOKOLOVA, ANDREI ROGATCHEVSKI
KRISTIAN BJØRKLUND, DAVID HENRIK LAVÉN
HÅKON SVERDRUPSEN**

1. Introduction

This article contributes to two recent discussions in pedagogy and education, namely, the impact of the participatory approach (Jenkins et al., 2009; Yowell & Rhoten, 2009) on learning and the benefits of student active learning (Sokolova et al., in press; Spasova & Welsh, 2020). The participatory approach incorporates texts and tasks on the topics of interest that are relevant to students' daily lives and potential workplaces. Student active learning builds upon the idea that "L2 learners must engage in classroom activities that allow them to be active learners rather than passive listeners" (see Nettet et al., this volume). This idea is closely connected with the flipped-classroom approach (Abeysekera & Dawson, 2015; Strelan et al., 2020), in which traditional lecture content is moved out of the classroom, thereby freeing up valuable classroom time for student active learning tasks.

We show that the participatory approach and student active learning techniques dovetail to improve language learning. We summarize our experience with a new Russian course, *Media Language in Use*, introduced at UiT The Arctic University of Norway (UiT) in the Fall semester of 2020, and an educational film project, *Our Common Victory*, completed in the Spring semester of 2020 (see Bjørgve et al., 2020), which incorporated the active use of documentary filmmaking into learning Russian as a foreign language. In both cases, the student projects were multifaceted and included the following stages: (a) a brainstorming stage, (b) a preparatory stage with lectures on the selected topic given by specialists, (c) individual and group work to further develop the concept, (d) collection of relevant vocabulary and constructions, (e) a production stage (filming, interviewing, collecting data for the written genres), (f) and

a postproduction stage (editing the film, making subtitles, and writing an article, a review, or an op-ed and presenting it to a peer audience). We placed particular focus on interview techniques, which activate a range of practical language skills. While collaborating on the projects, language students became amateur journalists and filmmakers. The written genres they worked with reflect the types of texts that were most relevant for their potential future workplaces.

While the participatory approach ensures that the proposed topics are of interest to students, student active learning techniques provide a suitable environment for optimal interaction among class participants. With these projects, we moved away from the linear hierarchical communication of the typical teacher-student relationship and organized classes as joint workshops, in which all participants, including instructors, have shared responsibility. Providing meaningful tasks relevant for career development and creating a mutually supportive atmosphere in the classroom allowed students to master practical language skills above their proficiency level.

We present our argument through three case studies. First, we provide backstage insights into working with two text-oriented media genres as part of the language curriculum within the course *Media Language in Use*: book/film review (Sections 2.1 and 2.2) and interview (Sections 2.3 and 2.4). We then detail our experiences with the film-oriented project *Our Common Victory*, for which students made a documentary film (Section 3). Each section offers both the instructors' and the students' perspectives on the project, similar to Ryūnosuke Akutagawa's famous 1922 story "In a Grove" (Akutagawa, 1952) and its award-winning film adaptation (Kurosawa, 1950), which feature several different eyewitness versions of the same event. We first present the two perspectives independently to highlight the aspects that were most salient for the students. We then summarize the two perspectives in the conclusion (Section 4). Appendices 1–2 present the outcomes of the joint student and instructor work in the *Media Language in Use* course.

2. Text-oriented projects: "Media Language in Use"

The course *Media Language in Use* (Common European Framework of Reference [CEFR] level B1–B2) familiarizes students with four major media genres: news article, interview, book/film review, and op-ed.

Each genre is covered by a different instructor in six teaching hours, spanning three teaching weeks (with one two-hour class per week). Students are usually instructed in a mixture of Russian, English, and Norwegian, depending on their native language and relative fluency in these three languages. It should be noted that multilingual instruction is a common practice in Russian language classes at UiT (and possibly further afield) to accommodate Erasmus exchange students who may not know the host country's language and rely mostly on their English (rather than their less-advanced Russian) skills for communication and study purposes.

In the first segment of the class, students receive general information about the media genre and analyze a text sample provided in the course curriculum. In the second segment, the instructor and students collaborate on genre-specific projects (we provide selected examples in subsequent sections). In the last segment, students choose one genre for their course project and start working on their projects under individual supervision. At the end of the semester, students present the preliminary results of their projects to their peers and all course instructors at a mini-workshop. Before submitting the final course project, students have the opportunity to polish their Russian texts with the help of an assigned instructor and write a short project description (one to two pages) in their native language (usually Norwegian; occasionally, native speakers of Danish, Swedish, or Polish take the course, in which case English may become a lingua franca for both students and instructors). In their project descriptions, students explain why they chose a particular genre and outline the challenges they faced during the project, both related and unrelated to language.

In the following sections, we detail our experience with a collaborative effort between instructors and students, based on the two genres most popular among students: review and interview.

2.1. The review genre: The instructor's perspective

In the Media Language in Use course, instruction about the review genre is largely based on the instructor's (Rogatchevski's) considerable personal experience as a reviewer. In the past 35 years, Rogatchevski has published over 130 reviews of films, fiction, poetry, art exhibitions, theatrical performances, and academic monographs in venues that included, among

others, *Независимая газета* [*Independent Newspaper*] (Moscow), *Русская мысль* [*Russian Thought*] (Paris), *BBC Russian*, *Kinokultura* (Bristol), *The Times Literary Supplement* (London), and *The Los Angeles Review of Books*. The following descriptions, which encompass reviews' customary characteristic features, originate from the instructor's personal knowledge and not from a secondary literature source.

Based on the students' language proficiency and lack of prior professional experience, the Language Learning for Business and Professionals approach is not a suitable choice for this course segment. Rather, the instructor focuses on teaching students how to write a review using the fairly common structural, lexical, and syntactical conventions of the genre. The main language production output goal for this course segment is a concise review of a few hundred words that is linguistically and factually accurate. To ensure factual accuracy, the instructor must be acquainted with the books/films/shows that students choose to review as their last assignment of the course segment.

In class, students are first instructed about the dos and don'ts of review writing: (a) making sure they familiarize themselves with the material they are reviewing; (b) explaining why they liked or did not like the material using a couple of illustrations; and (c) avoiding the temptation to show off (i.e., prioritizing their own ego over the material under review). Furthermore, students are instructed that the review structure should consist of three principal parts: the introduction, the main section (*pro et contra*), and the conclusion.

As a rule, the introduction to the review covers the plot and conflict summary and the material's context, ideally in one or two paragraphs (the context may include the historical background, information about the author, awards and prizes, etc.). The main part of the review summarizes both the praiseworthy and questionable aspects of the material (the reviewer's attitude should be supported by representative examples). The conclusion of the review addresses the following questions: Is the material worth attending/reading/buying? What kind of audience does it suit? Finally, students are asked to give their review a catchy title (this should be the final task, completed after the review has been written).

Before the next class, students watch a (short) film in Russian, with subtitles in English or a Scandinavian language, chosen by the

instructor in advance (watching a film usually takes up much less self-study time than reading a book, hence the preference for films) and read and analyze a published review of the film. Students also watch another short film (a documentary or animation, also in Russian with subtitles, again chosen in advance by the instructor), and review it in about 300 words in Russian. The review drafts are co-edited with the instructor in class so that students, while actively participating in the editing process, can see how the language and content can be improved. The third and final assignment of the review course segment is to write in Russian a review of a film in any language (preferably Russian), chosen by the student independently of but in discussion with the instructor.

In the following section, we detail the experience of Lavén, a third-year BA student who reviewed the animation short *Шпионские страсти* [The Passions of Spies] (Gamburg, 1967) and co-edited his review in class with his instructor (see Appendix 1). The instructor's goal during the editing process was to interfere with the student's text as little as possible while helping the student make the text linguistically correct and meaningful. Lavén is a mature student with a diverse cultural experience. His ideas about the film were sufficiently profound and his Russian already quite advanced to merit only superficial involvement from the instructor.

During the editing process (carried out in a classroom with other students present and with Lavén's permission), Lavén was asked to identify the linguistic mistakes in his review. After such an identification, he was encouraged to suggest a correction. Lavén cooperated eagerly and helpfully. The instructor's input consisted only of providing the concluding sentence of the review (*Тема пародии остается актуальной и сегодня* [The topic of parody remains relevant today]) and the review title (drawing a parallel between the late 1960s when the animation was filmed and our time): instead of *Шпионские страсти* [The Passions of Spies], the instructor proposed *Шпиономания в зеркале сатиры: Тогда и сейчас* [Spy Mania in the Mirror of Satire: Then and Now]. Lavén kindly agreed to the suggestion. The resulting final edit has been added to the PowerPoint presentation of the review course segment for training purposes for other classmates and future students.

2.2. *The review genre: The student's perspective*

In this section, we provide Lavén's written experience of writing a film review. Lavén is a native speaker of Swedish and is also fully fluent in Norwegian and English. He chose to write his feedback in English:

The purpose of this assignment was to watch the Soviet animated film called *Шпионские страсти* [The Passions of Spies] and write a short review of it. I naturally started by watching and getting familiar with the film, which was easily accessible on YouTube. I also read a little about the film on Wikipedia to learn a little bit about the director, and maybe a little bit about the spirit in which it was conceived. The instructor also talked about the film and his personal relationship to it, growing up in the Soviet Union in the late 1960s, which I thought was very interesting. I personally liked the film, and thought it was very original and unique, which definitely inspired and helped me get started working on the review.

During the writing process, my main focus was not grammar and spelling. I tried to write a good review that would be properly structured and meet the criteria which we had talked about earlier in class. Also, my goal was to write an enjoyable review that would actually be fun and interesting to read. Having spent the last eighteen months learning Russian and Russian grammar without any previous knowledge of the language, constantly worrying about finding the correct grammatical forms, I found it very liberating to be able to write creatively, freely and personally. It gave me for the first time a real sensation that my Russian was "taking off," and it boosted my confidence. The pedagogical approach of discussing the students' work, correcting it, and reworking it slightly together in class was a new experience to me, but a very positive one. It was fun to discuss my own, and the other students', work together. I really appreciated the comments from the instructor and the other students in the group. During discussions I had the opportunity to identify my own mistakes, which was very helpful because it made me realize how difficult this is (your own work can make you blind after a while). It taught me how comments from teachers and peers can

definitely improve your work. However, this process was very time-consuming, and it would probably not be possible in a large group of students. There were only four of us, and we all know each other well, which enabled us to discuss each other's work in a very relaxed and comfortable environment.

2.3. The interview genre: The instructor's perspective

The interview segment of the Media Language in Use course builds on the instructor's (Sokolova's) experience with the interview-oriented film project *Our Common Victory* (2020), addressed in more detail in Section 3. While working earlier (in 2017-2018) on another interview-oriented film project *Homo ludens* (see Sokolova & Reisæter, 2017-2018), together with the internationally acknowledged team from the REC.A film studio,¹ the instructor helped develop the compendium *Documentary Film Basics* (Bokova et al., 2017), which contains a substantial section on interview techniques.

In the interview class, students learn about the main characteristics of interview as a genre, including finding a new angle of communication with a public person and providing unique information. Students also learn what to avoid when interviewing, including the following: (a) conducting a pseudo-interview, a format sometimes used by public-relations (PR) specialists in which frequent questions of the target audience are presented in the form of answers from the expert, e.g. with an intent to promote a specific brand; (b) making comments in which the interviewer's point of view outweighs the expert's answers; (c) flattering the interviewee, a technique often used by new interviewers who are eager to talk with a famous person; and (d) engaging in conflict, which most often occurs in biased political or business interviews to create negative PR.

We particularly emphasize the role of an interviewer and the types of questions interviewers should ask during an interview. During the first class in the interview segment, students analyze the types of questions presented in a published interview offered as part of the class curriculum.² We encourage students to begin an interview with more general questions about the interviewee to foster conversation. We

¹ See <https://www.rec-a.ru/about/>.

² We used an abridged and slightly simplified version of the interview given by the Belarusian film director Daria Zhuk to the *Village* journal (Sugak 2018). We wanted to select a text that would be both topical and suitable for CEFR level B2.

instruct students not to overuse closed questions that can be answered only with “yes” or “no” but mention that these questions can be handy to shift the topic or to give the interviewee some time to relax. We also instruct students that the core of the interview comprises specific questions (using the question words “when,” “where,” “why,” etc.) and alternative questions like “Do you plan to continue working in the USA, or would you prefer to return to Belarus?” The interviewer can also use clarifying questions when the interviewee’s answer is not complete or when something needs to be specified.

During the second class, the students interview a Russian speaking guest. In 2021, the guest was Igor Shaytanov, a member of the Tromsø International Film Festival (TIFF) team in charge of selecting Russian and Eastern European films for screening. Before the in-class interview, the students learned how to prepare for an interview. We provided links to news articles about Igor and his profile and asked students to prepare their own list of questions for the interview. During the first part of the class, before the interview began, students created a joint file with questions and analyzed the type and order of the questions, with special emphasis on the opening and wrapping-up questions. All the students contributed to this joint file, distributed the questions among themselves, and took turns asking the questions during the interview.

During the third class, students usually present an outline of their interview projects to the instructor and their peers, providing information about the interviewee and a list of questions. At the end of the class, the students informally present their outlines to an experienced journalist³ and receive instruction about challenging issues that might arise in the interviews. After finalizing their topics, the students conduct the interviews and start working on their respective texts under the instructor’s individual supervision (both during office hours and via email).

One student, Bjørklund, a third-year BA student, chose the interview as his final course project (his interview appears in Appendix 2). As it can be challenging for students to find a Russian native speaker to interview, students can conduct their interviews in any language, but the final project must be submitted in Russian. Students are also asked to provide a list of the project vocabulary that they found challenging.

³ In 2021, we invited Kirsten Elise Johannessen, a regular contributor to local newspapers such as *ITromsø* and *Nordlys*, as the external expert.

Typically, student interviews utilize rather informal speech, as the students mostly choose to interview their friends (e.g., international students). In Fall 2021, Bjørklund interviewed his mother, who is the head manager of their family farm. The interview, conducted in Norwegian and translated into Russian, addresses the challenges faced by present-day farmers in Norway, including the difficulties associated with combining regular office work with on-farm responsibilities. Discussing such a professional topic presented a challenge for Bjørklund, who has a CEFR level of B2, as a significant amount of industry-specific terminology was used. Bjørklund received some minor feedback from the instructor regarding Russian grammar⁴ but otherwise successfully tackled the professional vocabulary on his own.

One Norwegian term was particularly difficult for Bjørklund to translate, as the Norwegian realia had no matching phenomena in Russia: *avløserne* [temporary farm workers] vs. the Russian suggestion *временные наёмные сельскохозяйственные рабочие (сезонщики)*. In this case, Bjørklund and the instructor had to consult external specialists to find an appropriate Russian translation for the Norwegian term.

2.4. The interview genre: The student's perspective

In this section, Bjørklund shares his perspective of the interview project; he chose to summarize his reflections in English:

The new course “RUS-2022 Media Language in Use” gave us students an opportunity to learn about media genres and their uses, but also to make our own texts as an undergraduate project. For the interview genre, the courses’ lectures taught us especially about the purpose of interviews in Russian, what they consist of and how to use a suitable language, based on the target group and interview type.

To use what we had learned in practice, we got the great opportunity to prepare and conduct an interview with Igor Shaytanov, a producer at the Tromsø International Film Festival. During the preparation, we worked together to create an interview based on the courses’ lectures. This included coming up with

⁴ In general, the instructors try to retain as much of the students’ original text as possible, so some minor stylistic roughness may remain. In the process of correction, however, it is crucial that the students have the opportunity to correct the grammatical errors they recognize and, in other cases, can explain what has been corrected and why.

balanced questions, choosing the target group [and] the interview type, and finding out what we wanted to achieve by interviewing Igor. It turned out to be very beneficial and interesting, because we gained experience, in addition to learning more about him.

In the process of making our interview, we once again got to use what we had learned in practice. This bit consisted of three parts: the project description, the interview, and the glossary. The choice of topic was completely optional and flexible, which gave us an opportunity to decide what we ourselves wanted to find out more about. The interview itself could be conducted in any language, but the final project had to be written in Russian. Regardless of the languages used, such a process provides learning benefits in the sense that you either have to translate at a professional level to keep the interview as original as possible, or you get a training in listening and speaking. As a guideline for writing professionally, lectures included a list of common constructions and suitable expressions in Russian for interviews, and we could, at any point, ask the teacher for help. After handing in our written interviews, we received good feedback from both the teacher and other students, because we looked through each other's work in class.

Overall, the course "RUS-2022 Media Language in Use" is a very good addition to the bachelor's degree in Russian, because it focuses on the use of the language in practice. For students, this is both important and instructive, in terms of future work and professionalising the language skills.

3. The Film-oriented project: *Our Common Victory*

3.1. The instructor's perspective

The project *Our Common Victory* (Björgve et al. 2020) was planned in connection with the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II. The project combines three academic components—history, language, and film—and was primarily aimed at students within the Russian Studies program at UiT, which has a strong historical component. To discover what people know and remember about World War II 75 years after its end, a group of seven students from UiT traveled to Arkhangelsk and conducted interviews with eight representatives of different

generations (two in each age group): people who survived the war (age 80+), survivors' children (age 60+), survivors' grandchildren (age 40+), and survivors' great-grandchildren (age 20+).⁵

Through the lectures and seminars on World War II, as well as through personal communication with people who experienced the war, the students gained deeper insight into how the war affected Northern Norway and Russia. Throughout the project, the students had considerable exposure to both Russian and Norwegian: the interviews were conducted in Russian, and certain episodes were translated into Norwegian. The project resulted in a short documentary film called *Our Common Victory*,⁶ which the students were mainly responsible for producing. They were introduced to interviewing and filming techniques, selected relevant episodes, and wrote the Norwegian subtitles. The last component of the project was the social contact established across the border, fortified by joint academic and social gatherings, excursions, and the film's premiere, hosted at UiT and accompanied by a lively discussion.

The project involved 1) a preproduction stage that was meant to orient the participants in the details of World War II in Northern Norway and Northern Russia, 2) a production stage that included conducting and filming interviews, and 3) a postproduction stage, which involved analyzing and sorting the footage, as well as editing the film. At the preproduction stage, the student participants were offered introductory lectures about World War II: two lectures on the war in the North were held by Norwegian history professors at UiT (Kari Aga Myklebost and Marianne Neerland Soleim) before the students' trip to Russia; two additional lectures covering the same events with a special focus on the Arkhangelsk region were offered by Russian history professors (Andrej V. Repnevskij and Mikhail N. Suprun) at Northern (Arctic) Federal University (NArFU), Arkhangelsk, during the first days of the trip. The lectures in Arkhangelsk directly preceded the production stage that involved interviewing the informants. In addition to the history lectures, the preproduction stage included two seminars that covered methodological issues in connection with the interviews (e.g. how to conduct interviews

⁵ Eight students were supposed to participate (one interviewer per one interviewee), but one student could not come.

⁶ The film is available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qAdYm-JF_co&t=2740s.

with time witnesses from the war). The students were also encouraged to discuss and formulate questions for the film project *Our Common Victory*.⁷

The concept for the film was discussed by students at a brainstorming seminar that concluded the session of lectures by history professors at UiT. At this informal meeting with tea and snacks, the students and the instructors examined some of the following issues: what tasks each student was most interested in (e.g., formulating questions, interviewing, filming, editing, working with subtitles, etc.); what the students knew about World War II in the North, what this war meant to them, what they would like to learn about the war, and what kinds of questions they could ask the interviewees. The students drafted a plan that outlined preliminary working groups, provisional division of labor within the groups, and potential topics for the film. The topics, however, were further adjusted onsite, in Arkhangelsk, as it was hard to predict interview outcomes beforehand without much information available about the interviewees. The general questions that constituted the main concept for the film were as follows: What do the interviewees know about the war, and what do the war and Victory Day mean to them and their families?

The project was exceptionally multifaceted and engaged the students in various tasks. While some activities included familiar assignments, such as translating (the subtitles), other activities were quite new and thus more challenging for the students, e.g. coming up with the concept for the film, preparing questions for the interviews, and analyzing the recorded material.

One major challenge for students was choosing the interview questions and asking them at the interview. The students realized that it was necessary to collect information about the interviewees in order to come up with suitable and more personal questions. While in Arkhangelsk, the instructors provided the students with short biographies of each interviewee and helped them make a list of relevant questions.

Two student groups were formed consisting of three and four people, respectively. Each group was initially assigned to three interviewees. After the first interview, the group of four interviewers split in two and interviewed two more interviewees. Some students were

⁷ The list of activities offered at the preproduction stage is available at <https://site.uit.no/russianfilmclub/2020/01/30/our-common-victory-pre-production/>.

responsible for asking questions and keeping the conversation going, while others were in charge of the camera work. We typically used three recording devices: two for filming and one, a cell phone, to record the sound. In general, each interview lasted for about an hour. Interviews with older informants (age 80+) took a little longer and contained more digressions and reminiscences. As many interviews were highly emotional, this dynamic presented an additional challenge for the student interviewers.

The last major challenge was sorting through the recorded material and selecting relevant episodes for the film. Rather than utilizing a predesigned script as some professional documentaries do, we opted for free communication with the interviewees, following the pattern of the general questions.

The original plan was for Norwegian students to interview Russian respondents in Russia, and Russian students to interview Norwegian respondents in Norway. The goal for the language component of the project was thus to place the students in an environment where using a foreign language would be most natural. We managed to complete the Russian interviews before March 2020 but had to cancel the interviews scheduled in Norway because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Originally, one of the additional goals of the project was to provide students with opportunities to learn the technical skills of editing a film and working with subtitles. During the preproduction stage, the research technician at UiT MediaLab and film director Fredrik Mortensen presented a lecture to students on how to make a film from scratch. Mortensen was supposed to guide student volunteers through the process of editing at MediaLab when the footage was ready, but due to the outbreak of COVID-19 and a strict quarantine in Norway, we were unable to complete this step. The students selected the episodes for the film, while the editing was transferred to REC.A (Murmansk, Russia), our previous collaborative partner.⁸

Within the first three months of the nationwide quarantine, many students faced challenges staying motivated to work on the project. We kept in touch with students through email and online meetings via Teams or Zoom. Some students volunteered to proceed with the film editing and subtitles. Because the project received funding from the Norwegian

⁸ The film was edited using Adobe Premiere and Blackmagic DaVinci Resolve.

Barents Secretariat (BAR002-1045584, 265,000 NOK), we were able to pay small compensations to the student participants. The work on the subtitles (translating the Russian text into Norwegian) was divided among six student volunteers, who received approximately 800–1,500 Norwegian Krone for their work, depending on the length of the episode they translated.

3.2. The student's perspective

Sverdrupsen was a first year MA student at the time of the project's completion. He selected and transcribed episodes from the interviews that he had conducted, and prepared respective subtitles for the film. Following is his written perspective on the project, written in Norwegian and translated into English by Sokolova:

In the spring of 2020, I participated in the project *Our Common Victory* and traveled to Russia. I have always been interested in World War II, and especially the war on the Eastern Front. This is a part of history that is often overlooked when we talk about the war here in Norway. I appreciated the opportunity to learn more about the topic through new methods.

The most interesting thing was to get different perspectives on the war. Before the trip to Arkhangelsk, we had some lectures with Norwegian professors at UiT. Then we had lectures with Russian professors in Arkhangelsk. Even when the same events were described, different angles and views emerged. Given the current situation, it is interesting that the memory of the war is so different.

In the lectures and interviews, it was difficult to understand everything that was said. This is because some interviewees used difficult language and many technical terms, for example, military terminology. I learned a lot from this, especially in the work of editing the film. I helped to make the subtitles for the film.

One of the things I remember best from the interviews is our meeting with someone who survived the war as a child. His story of the post-war famine made a deep impression on me.

The highlight of the trip for me was the visit to Severodvinsk. I knew before that the city was a military one, and basically not open to foreigners. I was a little unsure of what I was going to

discover. However, the closed city turned out to be a completely normal Russian city.

4. Conclusion

In this article, we have presented advances in the use of the participatory approach to foreign language instruction through three case studies: two text-oriented genres as part of the language curriculum within the course *Media Language in Use* (review and interview) and the film-oriented project *Our Common Victory*. The participatory approach is meant to incorporate linguistic tasks into topics of interest that are relevant to students' daily lives. The written genres that students work with in the *Media Language in Use* course reflect the types of texts that are relevant for their potential careers as journalists, advisers, translators, or film festival organizers, as emphasized by the feedback presented by Lavén and Bjørklund. Sverdrupsen highlighted the benefits of learning relevant terminology through transcribing interviews and working with subtitles for a film. All three students appreciated tackling linguistic problems in practically oriented projects, supported by valuable feedback from both instructors and class peers.

While conducting and filming an interview could present technical challenges that may distract students from specific linguistic tasks, our experience with these projects indicates that such challenges can be resolved by providing thorough feedback at all levels of the process and by close interaction with and among the students.

The instructors place major focus on the methodological challenges of language instruction: students' difficulties with writing an advanced Russian text can be resolved through joint co-editing of student texts in class. The students emphasize additional challenges with terminology that inevitably appear in practically oriented texts. At the same time, the students appreciate the additional knowledge they gained by participating in such multifaceted projects – for instance, when visiting a closed Russian city or learning about different perspectives on the same historical phenomenon.

With these projects, we have created a natural environment for mastering the language at higher levels (CEFR B and C) and presented a case for the merits of the participatory approach that fosters student active learning.

Appendix 1. A Joint Student-Instructor Review Written During the Media Language in Use Course

Шпиономания в зеркале сатиры: Тогда и сейчас (рецензия Давида Лавена на «Шпионские страсти» Е. Гамбурга, написана для занятия 11 октября 2021, с поправками Андрея Рогачевского)

«Шпионские страсти» – советский чёрно-белый мультипликационный фильм, выпущенный в тысяча девятьсот шестьдесят седьмом году. Эта пародия режиссёра Ефима Абрамовича Гамбурга на шпионские фильмы стала очень популярной и считается культовым фильмом.

Сюжет такой. В Советском Союзе построили замечательное зубоврачебное кресло, которое лечит все стоматологические заболевания. У Директора иностранного разведывательного управления болит зуб. Поэтому он посылает шпиона в Советский Союз, чтобы украсть кресло из зубоврачебного техникума. План кражи – поставить бомбу, спрятанную в коробке конфет под креслом, и вывезти его через подземный ход. Проблема в том, что Советский Союз полон своих агентов, которые пробуют остановить работу иностранного шпиона и его помощников. Все шпионят за всеми, все вовлечены в систему доносов. Никому невозможно доверять. На экране развиваются невероятные приключения шпионов, агентов, лающих котов и говорящих младенцев, которые используют удивительную технологию.

В шестидесятые годы, когда шла холодная война, шпионские фильмы стали очень популярными. На западе, самый известный и любимый герой жанра – английский шпион Джеймс Бонд, объезжающий весь мир в процессе поразительных походов.

Мне кажется, что этот фильм – настоящая пародия, насмехающаяся над жанром шпионских фильмов, особенно в части употребления технологии и сцен действия, именно так, как в фильмах про Джеймса Бонда. Кроме того, в фильме присутствует элемент критики системы Советского Союза, среди прочего системы доносов. К примеру, даже младенцы могут позвонить в разведку. Такая политическая сатира придаёт фильму ещё один интересный элемент. В заключение о немаловажном: музыка к фильму прекрасна, она создает какую-то авантюрную атмосферу.

Я бы рекомендовал фильм людям, которые ценят оригинальное искусство кино. Тема пародии остается актуальной и сегодня.

Appendix 2. Student Interview Project from the Media Language in Use Course

«Заниматься сельским хозяйством – это образ жизни»

Интервью с фермером и медсестрой из Сёррейсы

Кристиан Бёрклунд - 3 декабря 2021



ОВЧАРНЯ: Зимой в овчарне полно животных. Красный свет хорош для сна овец. Фото: Кристиан Бёрклунд

Всё больше и больше фермеров закрывают свои фермы. Я поговорил с фермером Гри Бёрклунд, чтобы узнать её мысли об этой отрицательной тенденции. Мы также получим представление о жизни фермера.

– Вы давно занимаетесь сельским хозяйством?

– Мои родители начали заниматься сельским хозяйством, когда мне было семь лет. Поэтому в детстве я получила хороший опыт, помогая на ферме. С 1994 (тысяча девятьсот девяносто четвёртого года)⁹ по 2004 (две тысячи четвёртый год) мы с моим мужем там были временными наёмными сельскохозяйственными рабочими. В 2004 году (две тысячи четвёртом году) мы купили ферму и построили в 2016 году (две тысячи шестнадцатом году) новую современную овчарню. Сегодня у нас 220 (двести двадцать) овец.

⁹ In all practical Russian courses at UiT, students are asked to spell out numbers in writing.

– *Как выглядят Ваши рабочие дни?*

– Я думаю, что мои рабочие дни выглядят очень разнообразно, потому что у овцеводческой фермы много рабочих задач. Я также медсестра и работаю полный рабочий день в доме престарелых в Сёррейсе. Зимой овец содержат в овчарне и кормят трижды в день. Мой муж пенсионер, поэтому он работает полный рабочий день на ферме. Мы делим обязанности по кормлению, так что мне просто нужно ходить в овчарню раз в день. Весной, однако, в овчарне становится более беспокойно из-за окота. Таким образом, с начала мая до середины июня я беру отпуск с работы в доме престарелых. Тогда у нас есть план работы, потому что, помимо кормления овец, мы следим за окотом, который происходит круглосуточно.

– *Что представляет собой продукция овцеводства?*

– Продукцией овцеводства являются в основном мясо и шерсть, из которой делают пряжу. Овцы также важны для культурного ландшафта, поскольку они пасутся и предотвращают загустение леса. Сеннокос важен для кормления и сохранения земли под паром.

– *Давайте поговорим больше о Ваших рабочих задачах на ферме.*

– Да. Помимо практической части у меня есть административные задачи. Они состоят из учёта фермы, оплаты счетов, планирования работы, ответственности за сотрудников и контроля качества в сельском хозяйстве. В практической части я отвечаю за маркировку овец и ягнят, списки овец, стрижку и сортировку овечьей шерсти, а также за поиск овец осенью.

– *У Вас есть сельскохозяйственное образование?*

– У меня нет формального сельскохозяйственного образования, но у меня большой опыт работы. Я также прошла несколько курсов, среди прочего, курсы по благополучию животных, защите растений и первой помощи. Моя компетентность в качестве медсестры ценна при наблюдении за больными животными.

– *Выгодно ли заниматься сельским хозяйством?*

– Это экономично, но очень важно, чтобы у вас был контроль над инвестициями и организацией работы. Теперь на фермах должно быть

не менее ста овец. Из-за особого рабочего дня работу на ферме также можно совмещать с другой профессией. Это положительно скажется на экономике. В овцеводстве раз в год получают доход, когда осенью отправляют ягнят на убой. В феврале получают субсидию, которая рассчитывается исходя из количества овец на ферме.

– *Вы упомянули ранее об ответственности за сотрудников. Можете ли Вы рассказать нам немного о своих сотрудниках?*

– Да, у нас на ферме двое временных наёмных сельскохозяйственных рабочих, которые работают неполный рабочий день. У них много разных задач, таких как кормление, работа на тракторе и поиск овец осенью.

– *Сельское хозяйство кажется трудоёмким. Скажите, пожалуйста, это образ жизни?*

– Да, заниматься сельским хозяйством – это образ жизни. Это значит, что кормление и уход за животными важны каждый день, круглый год. Если вы собираетесь начать заниматься сельским хозяйством, то вам действительно нужно этого захотеть. Я также рекомендую другим фермерам время от времени делать перерывы в работе, чтобы заняться другими делами. Вот почему временные наёмные сельскохозяйственные рабочие очень важны: если вы делаете перерывы в работе, они могут работать вместо вас.

– *Как Вы думаете, почему фермеры перестают заниматься сельским хозяйством?*

– Мне кажется, что фермеры перестают заниматься сельским хозяйством, потому что они в этом не видят выгоды. Это трудоёмко и может быть затратно. В современном сельском хозяйстве много требований, которые создают трудности для многих. Очень важно, чтобы у вас был контроль над инвестициями, иначе у вас будет много долгов, которые приведут к снижению мотивации.

– *Что Вы рекомендуете людям, которые хотели бы начать заниматься сельским хозяйством?*

– Прежде всего важно следовать за своей мечтой. Я рекомендую поговорить с другими фермерами, чтобы получить хороший совет.

Вам легко может стать одиноко, будучи фермером, поэтому контакты очень важны.

– У Вас на ферме иногда бывают посетители?

– У нас есть предложение для людей с деменцией, которых мы приглашаем на ферму. Глядя на овец, мы дарим людям большую радость в повседневности. На этом я не зарабатываю деньги, но я рада, потому что могу использовать свой опыт медсестры в случаях деменции у пациентов. В нашем регионе такое предложение есть только у нас.

– Каким Вы видите будущее фермы?

– Я выросла со своей семьей. С раннего возраста у меня была цель – купить ферму. К счастью, мне это удалось. Я очень верю, что некоторые из моих детей купят эту ферму так же, как и я купила. Это очень успокаивающая мысль – знать, что ферма не опустеет.

– Хотите ли Вы сказать что-то в заключение?

– Несмотря на рост количества закрывающихся ферм, я надеюсь, что эта тенденция скоро изменится. К счастью, у нас скоро смена правительства.

Gloser [Vocabulary]

Временные наёмные сельскохозяйственные рабочие – avløserer (midlertidig ansatte gårdsarbeidere)

Овчарня – fjøs

Кормить/покормить – å fôre

Кормления – fôring

Круглосуточно – døgnet rundt

Пряжа – garn

Пастись – å beite

Предотвращать/предотвратить заустение леса – å forhindre fortykning av skog

Сохранение земли под паром – vern av brakkmark

Учёт фермы – gårdsregnskap

Контроль качества – kvalitetskontroll

Наблюдение – observasjon

Рассчитываться исходя из – å beregne ut fra

Уход за животными – dyrestell
 Пустеть/опустеть – å tømme, å bli tom
 Смена правительства – regjeringsskifte

References

- Abeyssekera, L., & Dawson, P. (2015). Motivation and cognitive load in the flipped classroom: Definition, rationale and a call for research. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 34(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2014.934336>
- Akutagawa, R. (1952) "In a Grove" [1922], in his *Rashomon and Other Stories*, transl. by Takashi Kojima (pp. 15-28), C.E. Tuttle and Co.
- Bokova, S., Gavel, V., & Znaskevich, A. (2017). *Основы работы над документальным фильмом* [Documentary Film Basics]. <https://site.uit.no/russianfilmclub/wp-content/uploads/sites/316/2017/10/Kompendium-HOMO-LUDENS.pdf>
- Gamburg, E. (1967). *Шпионские страсти* [The Passions of Spies], USSR, b/w, 20 min, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IVY25EMDoo0>
- Jenkins, H., Purushotma, R., Weigel, M., Clinton, K., & Robison, A. J. (2009). *Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century* (The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Reports on Digital Media and Learning). MIT Press.
- Kurosawa, A. (1950). *Rashōmon*, Japan, b/w, 88 min. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kvUolkugNv4>
- Nesset, T., Bjørklund, K., & Hov Jacobsen, P. (this volume). Flipping the classroom? From text to video in teaching Russian grammar.
- Björgve, E., Sokolova, S., & Reisæter, G. (2020). *Our Common Victory* [Norwegian: Vår felles seier]. Educational film project supervised by E. Björgve, S. Sokolova, and G. Reisæter at UiT The Arctic University of Norway, funded by The Norwegian Barents Secretariat (i.e. <https://barents.no/en>)
- Sokolova, S., Björgve, E., Janda, L. A., Kosheleva, D., Nesset, T., & Zhamaletdinova, E. (in press). My Russian Journey: Rethinking teaching Russian to beginners. In S. Nuss & C. Martin (Eds.), *Student-centred approaches to Russian language learning: Insights, strategies, and adaptations* (Russian language pedagogy and research). Routledge.

- Sokolova, S., & Reisæter, G. (2017-2018). Interview-oriented film project *Homo ludens* supervised by S. Sokolova and G. Reisæter at UiT The Arctic University of Norway, funded by The Norwegian Barents Secretariat (172525) and available at <https://site.uit.no/clear/2019/11/11/homo-ludens/>.
- Spasova, S., & Welsh, K. (2020). Mixing it up with blended learning. In E. Dengub, I. Dubinina, & J. Merrill (Eds.), *The art of teaching Russian* (pp. 405–430). Georgetown University Press.
- Strelan, P., Osborn, A., & Palmer, E. (2020). The flipped classroom: A meta-analysis of effects on student performance across disciplines and education levels. *Educational Research Review* 30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100314>
- Sugak, E. (2018). “Американские мужчины мне нравятся больше”: Дарья Жук о грин-карте и домогательствах продюсера [“I like American men more”: Daria Zhuk about the green card and the producer’s harassment]. *The Village Belarus*. <https://www.the-village.me/village/culture/int/271869-zhuk>
- Yowell, C., & Rhoten, D. (2009). Digital media and learning. *Forum for the Future of Higher Education*, 13–16. John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. <http://forum.mit.edu/articles/digital-media-and-learning/>