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1. Introduction

The spread of English in Russia is closely associated with the acknowledgement of English as a global lingua franca. Being the country “with a unique geopolitical role between West and East” (Ustinova, “Multiple Identities” 69), today’s Russia claims English as a medium of communication with the rest of the English-speaking world. The present survey gives insights into English-Russian relations from the period of the Cold War to the New Russia, and consequently tries to define the current status of Russia among other English-speaking countries, the understanding of which would be impossible without a retrospective account discussing how the English language has been developing historically in national contexts. It further attempts to reveal micro attitudes of the three generations of Russian speakers towards the use and presence of English.

Preceding the major survey, it must be noted additionally that the spread of English in Russia is similar to other post-communist countries. Nonetheless, unlike many countries of the former Soviet bloc, up to the present time Russia has still put up greater resistance towards the penetration and influence of English. The major reason why Russians are not that ready to implicitly welcome the spread of English in Russian society is that feeling themselves as a part of big cultural legacy they still strongly depend on cultural values, transmitted through and by means of the Russian language and literature (Ustinova, “Multiple Identities” 69).
2. English in Local Contexts: from the Cold War to the New Russia

The role the English language plays in Russia has changed substantially over the last 70 years. As it will be observed further, the spread of English has been largely influenced by changing historical contexts, the political strategy of the country, and the desire for commercial, cultural and technological contact. Thus, there can be distinguished three major stages of English-Russian relations which influenced the status of English, the domains of its use, and attitudes towards its dispersal in the national settings. These stages, to a greater extent, coincide with the significant periods of the contemporary Russian history:

II. Post-perestroika: 1992-1999
III. The New Russia: from 2000 onwards

The period of the Cold War which lasted through the most part of the second half of the last century experienced a remarkable setback in relations between the Soviet Union and English-speaking countries, giving way to hostile and negative attitudes on either side of the Iron Curtain. As it is noted, “the Iron Curtain had been working two way — not letting stuff and information in and not letting anyone out” (English Russia, n.pg.).

During the years spent behind the Iron Curtain the use of English in Russia was basically limited to educational domains, not coming outside the school or university classroom. “English teaching in the Soviet Union suffer[ed] from the same malaise as society in general — lack of contact with English-speaking countries” (Nash 12). The fact that “foreign language learning was entirely a homegrown affair: made in the USSR” (McCaughey 456) was primarily, if not exclusively, due to the political isolation of the country.

For decades English in the Soviet Union was taught as a dead language like Latin or Ancient Greek because “the world of its users did not exist [and] the goals and techniques of dead language studies were applied to living ones” (Ter-Minasova 447). As such, the traditional Soviet methodology of teaching English had very limited scope of objectives. It required competence mostly in terms of reading, writing, grammar, vocabulary, and translation skills, making the whole process of language acquisition generally uninspiring, overwhelmingly tedious and boring.
Besides, most of the learners had little motivation to go beyond grammar rules as they understood that outside classroom or university settings they might never come in contact with native English speakers.

The tension between the Soviet Union and the West was interrupted by a phase of temporary revival of Russian-English relations during the period of the “thaw” (1953-1964). Trying to overcome the isolation from the rest of the world, on May 27, 1961 the Council of Ministers of the USSR adopted the decree “On the Improvement of Teaching Foreign Languages”. The purpose was to create 700 specialized language schools and elaborate new teaching material. However, despite these intentions all English textbooks studied at school and university levels were published under careful control of the Ministry of Education and continued to persistently impose the doctrines of the Soviet ideology throughout the teaching process. They still sought to establish the correct perspective on the foreign way of life and protect the Soviet learner from the influence and temptations of consumer society.

Historically, however, the starting point for the enhancement of the English-Russian relations is considered the year 1985 — the time when the new glasnost and perestroika reforms, including political, social and economic restructuring, finally opened the Soviet Union to the rest of the world. In consequence of these reforms, the end of the 1980s was marked by the hectic influx of foreign words, ideas, and ways of life, penetrating all the domains of every-day life. The new words and concepts were to name realities which did not exist in the USSR.

Nonetheless, the period which followed the perestroika turned out to be a contradictory time for Russian history, marked by economic downturn, enormous political and social problems that affected Russia and the former republics of the USSR. The changes in Russian society had a dramatic impact on the educational system, at that time greatly suffering from the absence of control from the state and rapidly declining educational standards.

Within just a short period of time a growing perception that English proficiency would provide access to better job opportunities and contacts with English-speaking countries through information and technology sharing created a considerable market of English teaching, including teaching material, language courses, and private tutoring. The consequences
for English-language teaching were enormous, as the period of the Cold War during which the Soviet learners were confronted with limited teaching resources, was followed by the time when the increase of language materials coming from different parts of the English-speaking world was nothing but “frustrating” (McCaughey 457).

The post-perestroika period, however, was a considerable breakthrough in the Russian-English relations, mainly due to the growth of international contacts and opportunities for free travel. Strains to overcome the years of linguistic isolation caused what is defined as “an English language boom in Russia” (Proshina and Etkin 443). A great number of English words started to sporadically penetrate into the Russian language. The domains of the use of English rapidly expanded into media, advertising and professional spheres. English became to be seen not only as a tool of accessing any culture in the abstraction known as the “global village” (Modiano 28), but also as the way to manifest one’s own culture and identity through the language. In other words, “the English language serve[d] as a means for spreading Russian culture throughout the world” (Proshina and Etkin 443). Recognizing the advantages of speaking the English language, more students started to choose English as their first foreign language.

Since Russia has bounced back from the crisis following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the demand for English is still increasing and is not likely to subside. Being recognised as the major tool of international communication, in the second decade of the 21st century English is spoken virtually in every part of the first biggest country in the world, stretching over two continents and nine time zones. The use of English has expanded into a range of domains including media, educational, personal, and professional spheres. Nowadays, its proficiency is often a must in professional settings. In media, especially on TV, in music and advertising, English is a popular language, frequently mixing with Russian. The excessive influx of foreign words Russia faced in the 90’s has finally subsided and stabilised, being no longer seen as a threat to national identity.

Learning English in Russia is encouraged from the earliest possible age and is pursued at all academic levels, from kindergartens to universities. Although in theory it is possible for students not to include English at all in their school curriculum, in practice almost all choose English as their
first foreign language and in rare cases as a second foreign language. It is increasingly common for Russian schools to introduce English for pupils of seven or eight years old, starting from grade 2.\(^1\)

Despite the inroads the English language has made into Russian society, the State Statistics Service estimates that only 1% of Russian population are fluent English speakers (Eremeeva, n.pg.). To compare with, ‘38% of EU citizens state that they have sufficient skills in English to have a conversation’ (European Commission, n.pg.). Although there are still no real estimates as to the total number of English learners in Russia, their proportion must be considerably higher and is not going to decrease in foreseeable future.

### 3. The Place of Russia among English-Speaking Countries

As illustrated in the previous section, until just recently it has been hardly possible to identify the place of Russia among English-speaking countries. Prior to 1985, the use of English in the USSR had been primarily limited to educational domains. Thereafter, almost up to the beginning of the 21st century the search for identification was largely hindered by political, social and economic problems Russia had to face after the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

In contemporary research Russia is most frequently referred to the Expanding Circle (Grushko and Petrosyan, n.pg.; Lovtsevich 461; Proshina, “Intermediary Translation” 517; Rivlina 478, etc.),\(^2\) hence joining the most numerous group of countries where English is learnt as a foreign language (EFL), including Japan, Korea, Germany, Brazil, and the former USSR

---

\(^1\) Until recently a foreign language in Russian schools was introduced from grade 5 of the secondary school. Nowadays it is increasingly common for Russian schools to introduce English starting from grade 2. In schools where there are no necessary conditions English is offered in grade 5. In this case, pupils may be offered an extra hour of instruction to catch up with their peers.

\(^2\) In the model suggested by Kachru the spread of English is discussed in terms of “three concentric circles”, the Inner Circle, referred to ENL countries, the Outer Circle, including ESL communities, and the Expanding Circle of EFL countries (Kachru 356).
republics, among many others. These are countries where English is neither an official nor a working language of the state or the government. Its functional range is restricted to such contexts like business, education, and tourism.

English in Russia falls under the category of the Expanding Circle countries (Kachru, 1992), where English does not have official status, neither is it developed to the stage of an institutionalized variety, nor is it used as a means of communication internal to the community. English in Russia is learned as a foreign language, has restricted users, and is employed in international commerce, tourism, study abroad, and science. (Ustinova, “English in Russia” 239)

Being learnt as a foreign language, in educational domains the English language is still orientated towards British English (in the European part) and American English (primarily in the Asian part of Russia) varieties (Proshina, The ABC 115), recognised as the only legitimate and authentic “material” taken for granted by both teachers and learners. Therefore, today the main goal of ELT still remains closely tied up to the language codified in grammars, dictionaries and textbooks. Having a native-like command of English as the only desirable endpoint, it is primarily aimed at communication with native speakers, who, in their turn, are automatically regarded as the only possessors of knowledge about the language which is considered their own. The firm belief in native-speakers’ “ownership” still persists among the majority of English learners, teachers, educators, linguists and language professionals, as such, affecting methods of instruction, teaching strategies, models and practices implied for English teaching in Russia.

Recently, however, the awareness has been raised that “English’s greatest use is as a contact language” (Grushko and Petrosyan, n.pg.), and the fact that the achievement of native-like competence should not be set as the only desirable target as the majority of learners use English in communication with other non-native speakers. The estimates show that about 80 per cent of verbal exchanges worldwide in which English is used as a second or foreign language do not involve native speakers of English (Beneke in Seidlhofer, A Concept of International English 7), the evidence that invariably shifts the focus to the majority of English speakers who do
not speak English as their mother tongue and challenges the relevance of
native speakers’ norms and models.

The recent developments concerning the use of English by the
majority of English users are addressed to as *English as an International
language* (EIL) or its shorthand ‘International English’, and as *English as
a Lingua Franca* (ELF), both terms referred to “English as a means of
international communication across national and linguistic boundaries”
(Jenkins 160). Although, in its turn, EIL allows for different interpretations,
in narrower contexts the term is used interchangeably with *English as a
lingua franca* described as

an additionally acquired language system that serves as a
means of communication between speakers of different first
languages, or a language by means of which the members of
different speech communities can communicate with each
other but which is not the native language of either — a
language which has no native speakers. (Seidlhofer, “Closing
a Conceptual Gap” 146)

Indeed, being in its purest form a tool of communication for speakers for
none of whom English is the mother tongue, the concept of EFL still does
not exclude native speakers from participation in international exchange,
but rather emphasises the fact that native speakers have to follow the
agenda set by the majority of non-native users of English and not vice versa.

Thus, if regarded from ELF perspective, the range of domains of
English in Russia allows for a broader perception of the type of English
and its functions in Russian society. To start with, the distinction is first to
be made between the contexts, where “English functions both as a tool
that links speakers of various languages in different domains of use and as
a language of creativity and identity expression” (Erling 218). The domains
that involve English as a lingua franca in communication between speakers
who may or may not have English as an L1 include educational, personal,

---

3 The approximate number of EFL speakers may vary from 375m to as high as one
billion as opposed to 320-450m ENL speakers and 375-500m ESL speakers (Crystal
107; Graddol 10).
professional, and, to a smaller extent, bureaucratic domains.\(^4\) Intranationally, English is more widely used as a language of expression “increasingly accommodated to suit localized needs and to express involvement in the international community” (Erling 220), penetrating into media and entertainment, advertising, creative, and identity domains.

Since English performs multiple functions in modern Russian society, there exist different names for the kind of English used in national contexts that has been coined to denote different interferences of the Russian and English languages, either as a second or foreign language, — from more formal Russianized English or Russian English to such informal coinages as Rus\((s)\)lish and Ru\((n)\)glish. Although these names are frequently perceived as humorous and even dismissive, they, nonetheless, can be treated as virtually linguistic terms depending on the level of proficiency, social factors and settings.

When it comes to the discussion of local English varieties, there is still little if any awareness

that learners may be producing forms characteristics of their own variety of English, which reflect the sociolinguistic reality of their English use, whatever their circle of English, far better than either British or American norms are able to”. (Jenkins 168)

Thus, despite the considerable bulk of works concerned with individual varieties of English, many scholars would argue that Russian English can develop into a separate variety. The argument is first that English in Russia is not used for intraethnic communication and does not have a linguistic environment in which to develop as a new variety. Secondly, it derives its norms from British English and American English; hence, its most typical “deviations” are most frequently seen as errors and not as systematic features of a separate variety.

\(^4\) English in Russia is not an official language of governmental or administrative institutions. The only exception is the Republic of Sakha-Yakutia where English is declared to be a working language along with two national (Russian and Yakut) and five official (Even, Evenk, Yukaghir, Chukchi, and Dolgan) languages (Samsonov in Proshina 114-115).
Eventually, the recent developments in the ELF approach has been so far considered very cautiously and are more often referred to as interesting but controversial (Grushko & Petrosyan, n.pg.).

The term ELF of Russian culture … emphasizes the role of language as a tool for communication between both native and non-native speakers and among its non-native speakers. The main obstacle to effective communication in this sphere is ideology; the Soviet ideology has influenced human mentality very strongly and it is still revealed today. As practice shows, using English as regional variety (Russian English) has not made it completely “regional”. It does acquire some changes to serve better the demands of regional communication but these changes are revealed only within British or American culture. To be a true lingua franca Russian English should be a variety that reveals Russian culture by means of the English language, making the latter change but not necessarily lose completely its own “ethnic” background. (Yuzefovich 509)

Whether the ELF approach will finally gain its approval in Russia, it’s too early to say, but the fact that English is no more used in highly restricted national and international contexts should not be called into question. It is more and more frequently implied as a tool of intranational communication, expressing Russian cultural and national identity through and by means of the English language. At the same time, it should be emphasized that in Expanding Circle countries both terms English as a foreign language and English as a lingua franca do not exclude, but rather complement each other, “partly because many of those who start out thinking they are learning English as a foreign language end up using it as a lingua franca” (Grushko & Petrosyan, n.pg.).

4. Questionnaire

The further data represent some of the findings of the survey addressed to the three generations of Russian native-speakers, grouped according to their age in 2010. The survey is directed to reveal respondents’ motivation to learn English; self-identification with the variety of English used; opinions
about the model variety to be taught at school; and understanding of the notions of nativeness, standard and variation; as well as attitudes towards the presence of English in Russia.

Proceeding from the division by age groups, group I includes the youngest age group of subjects of 18 to 22 years old, group II — subjects of 23-30 years old, and group III — subjects over 31 years old (see table 1). The years these groups of respondents entered the secondary school and started learning English correspond to the beginning of each period referred to in this project: the Cold War – group I, the post-perestroika period – group II, and the New Russia – group III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>23-30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>≥31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Division by Age Groups.

The subjects of this survey are Russian residents coming from Moscow and the Moscow region. For this reason, the present research is not representative of the Russian population on the whole. Although the questionnaire was administered in a geographically restricted area, the data obtained fully satisfied the set variable and the main criterion applied to the participants of this study.

It is very important to note that the respondents represent different professions, including physicians, teachers, accountants, musicians, librarians and shop assistants, and only, to a small extent, language professionals and educators. For this reason, opinions expressed by the subjects are not biased by their professional interest in the sense of language study and research. That is why the questionnaire was adapted to the extent to be understood by a wider range of participants from each focus group. The biggest group consists of students (39.2%).

At the beginning of this study it was assumed that the group I subjects, being the youngest participants of this research, would demonstrate broader perceptions of English variation and the notions of nativeness and standard language, compared with the respondents of the two other focus
groups, whose learning background has been, to a greater extent, influenced by language policies adopted by the country at different stages of its development.

5. Questionnaire Findings: Analysis from a Micro Perspective

Following the findings of this survey, figure I illustrates the respondents’ motivation to know English. Be it an indicator of stability of modern Russia or for some other reason, the equally high percentage of each focus group needs to know English to travel or to communicate with people from other countries. Short after Russia opened its borders to its citizens and to the rest of the world, and the turbulent time after the post-perestroika period had been finally overcome, millions of Russians rushed in different directions to explore what had been under a ban just not long before. According to the Russia Federal Agency for Tourism (Russia Federal Agency for Tourism, n.pg.) more than 14.5 millions Russians went abroad as tourists in 2011. This is six times more than the number of foreign tourists (2.3 millions) who visited Russia during the same period.

For the youngest age group one of the strongest motivations to learn English is a chance to increase job opportunities and advance in their career. This option is chosen by 88% of respondents of group I. In Russia, it is not surprising anymore to find advertisements for jobs in which English proficiency is a requirement for a job applicant. Employees of big companies and joint ventures are expected to have a good command of English in order to use it at meetings, for translating business correspondence, in phone conversations, email and business letters with partners, clients and suppliers, and in other professional settings. In 80 out of 100 vacancies for a secretary or a personal assistant position English proficiency is a must (Poletaeva, n.pg.). Besides, knowledge of English may raise the salary of an employee by 20-30%.

Higher percentage of subjects of group I in comparison with the two other focus groups needs to know English to learn more about English/American culture — 54%, and read books in original — 76%. Almost equal percentage of subjects of group I (60%) and group II (62.5%) needs English to read books and understand English TV programs and films.
To elicit the variety of English the respondents identify themselves with, they were asked to name the type of English they speak (see figure 2). It is not surprising that the highest percentage of those who identify themselves with British English — 66%, is observed by group I, composed, for the most part, by students — recent school graduates. Although since their school days the learners of English become aware of other English varieties, with the emphasis on the varieties of the Inner Circle, British English remains so far the target variety in the school curriculum. Hence, British English is perceived as more correct and proper, even in comparison with the other standard variety American English which until recently has been regarded as less prestigious and even vulgar (Ustinova, “Multiple Identities” 73). Like this, irrespective of the real outcome produced in the process of communication, the belief that it is British English which is spoken because it is British English which is learnt and taught is not that easily shaken.

It is interesting that a considerable number of respondents (27.7%), prefer not to specify the type of English spoken opting for a seemingly neutral answer — English, that is most likely a mixture of English American features influenced by the Russian language. 12.3% of those who identify the type of English they speak with Russian English attribute to it pejorative meaning and do not gauge their language skills as very proficient. To specify,
none of group I opted for this answer. 11.5% of the total reply they speak International English. This answer is chosen by 8% of group I, 12.5% of group II, and 15% of group III. The respondents who opt for International English have greater experience in international communication, including travelling, the use of English at work and in daily activities. Only 6.2% of the total choose American English, and 0.8% or one respondent respectively Rungalish or Ruslish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Russian English</th>
<th>British English</th>
<th>American English</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Rungalish/Ruslish</th>
<th>International English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
<td>29.50%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.30%</td>
<td>41.50%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>27.70%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Self-Identification with the Type of English.

In line with previous findings, the subjects were further asked to name the model variety to be taught in school (see figure 3). It is not surprising that the majority of those who define British English as the model variety are the subjects of group I. Only 8% of this focus group say the model variety to be taught in school should be American English. The results obtained once again prove that the group I participants are still greatly influenced by traditional views imposed on them throughout their language instruction with the pedagogical focus largely on Standard British English norms in spelling, pronunciation, grammar, and lexis.

Although initially the results were supposed to be quite the opposite, the majority of respondents of group I and group II opt for International variety to be taught at school, revealing greater awareness of the fact that
interactions in English do not presuppose exclusively communication with native speakers.

Table 2 analyses subjects’ opinions about the notions of nativeness, standard, and English varieties. Thus, for the majority of respondents Standard English remains British English rather than American English. Thus, British English is defined as standard by higher percentage of group I — 78%. 52.5% of group III consider it is native speakers’ right to decide how English should be used compared with 34% of group I. The majority of subjects of each focus group agree that there are different kinds of English in the world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th>Group III</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American English</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British English</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An international variety</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52.50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Opinion about the Model Variety to Be Taught at School.

Table 2. Opinions about Standard English, Nativeness and English varieties.
The predominately positive attitudes towards the presence of English in Russian society are registered in table 3, where the respondents had to express their opinion about the presence of English in Russia. The findings show that the English language is not seen as a threat to the Russian language and culture. On the contrary, the majority of respondents find the presence of English in everyday life useful because it improves their language skills, and broadens cultural horizons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The presence of the English language is...</th>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th>Group III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a threat to my native language.</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a threat to my culture.</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful because it improves one’s English.</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful because it expands one’s cultural horizons.</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Attitudes towards the Presence of English.

The answers demonstrate that the youngest generation is more open to the influence of the English language. The overwhelming majority of group I believes that the presence of English in everyday life only helps to improve their language proficiency.

6. Conclusions

In the second decade of the 21st century English in Russia manifests itself in a range of domains, including the use of English as a lingua franca for communication between speakers of different L1 backgrounds, and as a means of expression of national and cultural identity. In personal and especially in professional domains English proficiency is believed to provide with better social and economic perspectives. Depending on the level of proficiency and the situation involved, the English language is associated with many Englishes, including standard varieties of English, British English and American English, local English varieties such as Russian
English, Runglish and/or Ruslish, and an International variety of English.

As it follows from the findings of this survey, the assumption set at the beginning of this study has not been proved to be correct. Surprisingly, broader perceptions in the sense of English varieties and the notions of nativeness and standard language were demonstrated not by the youngest participants, but by the subjects of the two other age groups. Having varied international background and greater experience in international communication, the respondents of group II and group III recognise the importance of using the English language in intercultural settings rather than being a bearer of a language that reflects one speaking community and culture. Even on the level of language instruction the subjects of these groups show their readiness to accept other teaching models besides British English.

From what has been surveyed, it is evident that language instruction has a significant effect on subjects’ attitudes and perceptions of the English language, its acquisition and teaching standards. Indeed, the results obtained are first of all accounted for the traditional practices still involved in language instruction at school. The impact of school education is especially observed by the youngest group of participants — recent school graduates, who still remain under influence of stereotypical perceptions. As it is noticed, the majority of subjects from group I still gauge their English proficiency by how close they are to the native speakers’ model which is usually British English, introduced as the only correct and proper variety of English all throughout formal education with emphasis on British English vocabulary, grammar, spelling, and style, etc. Hence, despite the growing awareness of the existence of multiple Engishes, the most prestigious variety in Russia remains British English — the target variety the majority of respondents strives to achieve and claims to speak irrespective of the real outcome, produced in the process of communication.

Regarding the analysis of attitudes on a micro-scale, the results make it clear that, for the most part, Russians positively embrace the presence of English irrespective of age groups they are referred to. The positive reactions are primarily associated with social advantages the use of English may eventually bring. The use of English is thus considered as offering an alternate way of expressing national identity and building links to international community. Moreover, English is contemplated more as a
source of enrichment, a temporary phenomenon and a modern trend, rather than a menace to the national language. A lot of people quite consciously use English in their speech to demonstrate their international background and acceptability.

In conclusion, the survey suggests the need for significant pedagogical readjustments in English teaching in Russia. It involves the study of English in various contexts and broader perceptions of the domains of English use, teaching awareness and acceptance of other but standard English varieties, the reappraisal of native vs. non-native dichotomy, the shift from the monolingual to the pluricentric approach to the language, and the emphasis on communicative abilities. It is also quite obvious that English instruction obtained on the level of school education should be given a special emphasis as it plays a crucial role in the formation of the solid basis of language understanding and proficiency.
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Abstract
In the second decade of the 21st century English in Russia manifests itself in a range of domains such as education, workplace, media, entertainment, advertising, creative and identity domains. Such unprecedented spread is more frequently attributed to the status ensured to the speakers of English in social, cultural, and economic spheres. Depending on the level of proficiency and the situation involved, the English language is associated with many Englishes, including such local varieties as Russian English, Runglish and/or Ruslish. Currently in use both as a foreign language and more widely as a lingua franca, English builds links to international community and serves as a language of expression of national and cultural identity.
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Résumé
Dans la deuxième décennie du 21ème siècle, la langue anglaise, en Russie, se manifeste dans toute une gamme de domaines. D'abord dans l'éducation, dans les lieux de travail, les médias, le divertissement, la publicité, ainsi que dans les domaines de la création et de l'identité. L'expansion sans précédent de l'anglais, est plus souvent attribuée au statu des interlocuteurs dans les sphères sociales, culturelles et économiques. Selon le niveau des compétences et la situation en cause, la langue anglaise est associée à de nombreuses variétés locales, comme l'anglais russe, Runglish et/ou Ruslish. Actuellement la langue anglaise est utilisée comme une première langue étrangère, elle se pratique plus largement comme une lingua franca puisqu'elle établit des liens avec la communauté internationale, elle sert aussi comme une langue d'expression d'identité culturelle et sociale.
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