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Abstract

This is a study of teachers’ responses to the push towards greater technology use in a Russian Higher Education context viewed through the Russian notion of perezhivanie and, taken more broadly, of why and how the teachers make decisions and act the way they do. Unlike earlier work in the teacher development field, where predominantly cognition served thinking and decision making processes, here the focus is on a unity of emotion, cognition, and context in the notion of perezhivanie. I define perezhivanie as a given psychological phenomenon of ‘cognitive and emotional reciprocal processing of previous and new experience’ (Golombek & Doran, 2014:104). Perezhivanie is close to reflection, but more related to the teacher’s feelings, and this study is motivated by the possible developmental potential of perezhivanie.

Using audio data from two in-depth qualitative interviews with each of ten university language teachers about their experience with technology, I first explored contextual complexities the participants identified, and then the participants’ perezhivanie related to these complexities. I analysed the data, using techniques of thematic textual analysis and structural analysis of the narrative parts of the participants’ accounts.

The findings show that the teachers responded to complexities of technology integration in various ways. A broad pattern emerged, however, when teachers were prevented from fulfilling their motives, due to the complexities that appeared. The teachers initially experienced frustration, denial, and various other emotions. After that, they passed through a stage of acceptance, and started to engage with the problem more cognitively, and this induced sense-making and, therefore, moving forward. My second finding has brought to the surface that perezhivanie, following Vasilyuk (1991), exists in three forms, which are perezhivanie-experiencing, perezhivanie-apprehension, and perezhivanie-reflection, and I discuss how these forms of perezhivanie work across the above described periods of difficulty. Finally, the thesis discusses how perezhivanie is complex and has a multileveled structure, but with clear potential for understanding teacher development.
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Chapter 1: Introducing key concepts

In this introductory chapter I provide an orientation to my study. In section 1.1, I report how my interest in perezhivanie developed. I explain why I have chosen to explore perezhivanie rather than any other concepts in the teacher development field, and why I thought it is necessary to do the research I have done. In section 1.2, I contextualise the study in a Russian higher education setting, and then, in the subsequent sections 1.3 and 1.4, I introduce the key terms of the study, which are complexities and perezhivanie. In section 1.5, I present what this study attempts to explore by outlining the aims and research questions, which shaped my research approach, and give a brief outline of analytical frameworks that I draw on. I conclude this chapter by giving a general structure of the thesis.

1.1 Introduction to the thesis

I remember a thick book on the ‘Mathematical fundamentals of the theory of complex systems’, which started with the words ‘As is generally known, …’. Since that first degree in computer programming, the statement has challenged my mind several times when it came to theories or value propositions. One of them was that teacher cognition is pivotal to understanding how teachers teach, learn and develop, and it is teacher cognition that shapes teachers’ activity (e.g. in Borg, 2003, 2015; Richards, 2010). If something is true, check out its opposite and see what that can do for you, as John F. Fanselow wrote in his famous ‘Try the opposite’ book.

I did not even have to check or try the ‘opposite’ to what the teacher cognition literature said. Life sometime offers us opportunities as gifts, which we have not expected. What we need is to be open and ready to accept them. On graduating from the University of Manchester with the MA dissertation ‘Using Action Research to explore Web 2.0 possibilities with Russian teachers of English’ (Smirnova, 2012), I was invited to run an in-service teacher training project to help the Russian Presidential Academy of National
Economy and Public Administration teachers integrate technology in their language classrooms in Moscow. The teachers were expected to conduct a small-scale action research project (Burns, 2010:36) to improve their teaching. I introduced some technologies for them, which the teachers could use in the VLE Moodle. My objective as a trainer was to enable the teachers to go on with action research and integrating technology, when I would withdraw my support in six months.

During this project I encountered a puzzle, which boosted my interest. I noticed that not many teachers were eager to look critically at what was going on in their classrooms. After a lesson the teachers were supposed to reflect on it, but they tended to say they had not had any issues in the lesson to think of, as they are highly educated and experienced. One teacher explained this reluctance by assuring me that any post-lesson evaluation was always a waste of time for her, as she had already reflected on everything in her mind, and did not see a point to do it again, even more so in public. Such teachers’ feedback was not unusual. In the capacity of teacher trainer, I had encountered a similar attitude before. However, the teachers’ reluctance to reflect gradually turned into a puzzle, which made me really curious. From time to time the teachers stayed behind after my tutoring sessions, and we had an informal chat sitting next to each other, often in front of the computer, because the trainees often asked me about something related to the recent sessions.

To my surprise, discussing various things in this informal setting, they eagerly shared with me lots of issues about teaching, which they had not managed to reflect on when asked during the sessions. On sharing, they were always emotionally involved, and as a trainer on the project I was perplexed by how to respond to it. I immediately tried to raise their awareness of the issue in question, and help them make a sense of it until their attention and focus moved on to other things. This sense-making was amazing, it was an interplay of their emotions and cognition, but it did not feel like any traditional reflective practice at all.
I started with this piece of my biography not to share an experience that has just flooded out of my memory, but because it explains how this study was conceived. The above described project drove my interest in the inconsistency between teachers’ apparent resistance to cognitively reflect on any issues ‘on request’, and a desire to share their feelings and emotions when they wished to. After the project I became more attentive to teachers’ reflections, and, much to my amusement, started noticing teachers’ emotional reflections very often. I witnessed several times how eagerly the teachers shared their problems if the impetus to remember the issues was driven by their own sense of necessity. It made me think that choosing where and how to share issues related to their teaching was a part of their global thinking process about a problematic situation, in an attempt to gain a new understanding, which potentially could lead to a more meaningful practice.

I believe in growth, no matter whether it is about our professional or personal skills. This is why I love being a trainer for teachers. Helping others to become a better version of themselves is a lot of fun, and it sometimes allows me to pass on to my trainees those values that I value most highly. The puzzle, however, triggered not only my empirical curiosity, but also an academic one. As I mentioned above, the teachers’ stories tended to be very emotional. Looking for a notion, which could comprise both cognitive and emotional factors, I realised that to date a considerable amount of literature has focused much more on the former, and traditionally has given emotions a somewhat subordinate or a peripheral role in human consciousness. This is probably due to the lack of agreement among scholars on the importance of emotional factors overall, and in the teacher education field in particular, and this has inevitably influenced the practice of teacher training.

Meanwhile, the empirically witnessed phenomenon, which turned into the puzzle I described above, became a kind of a ‘rock painting’ (Lévi-Strauss, 1955) for me, metaphorically speaking. The French anthropologist and ethnologist, Claude Lévi-Strauss, explored ancient myths and legends, and suggested turning upside down the traditional
researcher move, from setting a question to finding answers to it. He proposed that a ‘rock painting’ might be the answer to a question, which we do not know yet, but as soon as we find the question, we understand the answer. Accordingly, the phenomenon I observed, and described here above, was a sort of an answer, for which I had to find the question.

As a result of my engagement with the relevant literature, I found the notion of perezhivanie in Vygotsky’s (1933 - 1934) lectures on the sociocultural theory of mind, and in this I thought I found the question. The question to the phenomenon observed could be ‘Is it perezhivanie, that is not appealed to in formal reflection, but called for when teachers voluntary narrate the stories of their choice?’. Getting excited by this question, I started working on the PhD proposal with perezhivanie as its focus. I was thrilled to launch a study to understand how perezhivanie works ‘for’ or ‘against’ the teacher on various occasions. However, I immediately noticed that there was so little research done on the notion, either by Vygotsky or by his followers, that I got an ‘impostor syndrome’. If nobody had researched perezhivanie before, was there something wrong with me?

To make matters worse, very soon after starting the PhD I faced another struggle. This new struggle was about the clarity of my explanation of perezhivanie; so not so much emotional this time, but very cognitive. I was eager to do fieldwork to consolidate the nature of perezhivanie with data, but people around me could not understand what my research topic was. As any other psychological phenomenon, perezhivanie cannot be visually observed, and I came to realise that I was not able to clearly define perezhivanie, even in plain terms. Being a Russian speaker, I use the notion as an everyday ordinary concept, like ‘love’, ‘happiness’, etc. We use these words, but can we explain their meaning in a short phrase to somebody who does not have them in their schema? Perezhivanie is highly polysemeic, and its folk-psychological definition (our feelings and reactions to everyday life) differs from its sociocultural definition (a unity of cognition and emotion). What is more, perezhivanie is normally accessible in retrospective reflections. We tend to realise what our perezhivanie
was only when it is over, and when we can cognitively reflect on it. Thus, without empirical
data, which could support my definition of perezhivanie, the epistemological and
definitional challenge seemed very hard, and I gave it up for the time being.

Meanwhile, the same but slightly changed Lévi-Strauss question haunted me. ‘Is it
perezhivanie, that is neither addressed nor used in formal reflection, but present when
teachers voluntary narrate the stories of their choice?’ My passion helped me crystallise the
focus in a second attempt to write a proposal, where I did not name the phenomenon
directly. I introduced perezhivanie in conventional terms, accepted by the Western
audience. Extensive reading helped me find two concepts, which I then used to outline the
study without mentioning the phenomenon as perezhivanie. They were ‘complexities’ and
‘unrealised motives’. The thesis may, therefore, be read not only as a study of the
phenomenon of perezhivanie, but also as the process of becoming able to articulate
perezhivanie for a Western academic audience, who do not have the notion in their schema.

The struggle with articulating perezhivanie, which I described above, gradually converted
into the second challenge, this time with the data. It was by no means a lack of data as I had
plenty of it. However, the deeper I got into the analysis, the less obvious for me was the
strategy for how to reveal the developmental potential of perezhivanie, which I had noticed
empirically and described above. Initially, I had planned to explore perezhivanie following
Vygotsky’s suggestion, i.e. as a unit of analysis of teachers’ consciousness in the sense that a
teacher is a product of their perezhivanie. I was going to analyse the teachers’ development
through their teaching activity as reflected in their perezhivanie, and vice versa, rather than
assuming that development occurs naturally when teachers become more experienced.

I read the transcripts, listened to the interview recordings, again and again, with a feeling
that I already knew them by heart. However, the more data I got, the less I understood ‘how
perezhivanie works’. The data contained a wealth of teachers’ perezhivanie, beliefs, feelings, emotions and attitudes, but revealed in so many cases, so many various events, that I struggled to find a common ‘developmental’ trend. Extensive interactive reading, but now with the data at the back of my mind, initiated that knowledge generation process, which happened to be quite insightful. Once encountering the Kübler-Ross’s (2009) change curve, I got a feeling that I finally found the trend. When I joined together my conceptual framework and the change curve, it was like a ‘bang’. After that, in each and every perezhivanie I saw that framework and that developmental potential, captured by the change curve. It got so apparent, and it worked so well, that I even was surprised why I could not have come up with such an idea before. The thesis may, therefore, be read as a methodological discovery of an epistemology for understanding perezhivanie for development. It was a real pleasure to solve a puzzle I had been approaching for a long time. Finally, the study was conceived, and I started writing it up, and present it here.

1.2 Context

The notion of perezhivanie appears to be particularly relevant for investigating the challenges of teachers using technology in the Russian higher education context. This is for a number of reasons. First, integrating technology changes any contextual settings dramatically (Palloff, & Pratt, 2001), because it requires teachers to diagnose and solve issues, demonstrate skilful application of new tools, and transfer their professional expertise to a new technologically enhanced setting. This is challenging for teachers (Ball, 2012), and, therefore, might trigger teachers’ perezhivanie. Second, a Russian sociocultural setting is pertinent to explore perezhivanie because the notion is used there as a folk-psychological concept to convey meanings and communicate events, including professional life. Finally, the university classroom seems the most conducive to this exploration, as technology has a bigger impact on the Russian tertiary level than on other levels such as primary and secondary education. This is because the attempts to adjust the Russian Higher Education sector in response to the Bologna Process (Motova & Pykkö, 2012), and internationalisation of Russian Higher Education (Frumina & West, 2012).
This is my rationale behind the choice of the setting for my exploration of perezhivanie, and in this section I provide a description of the institutional context where the study was conducted. I have to admit that there has not been much relevant research done in Russia (Rasskazova, et al., 2017), mostly due to the fact that the Russian educational system remains rather closed (Morgan & Kliucharev, 2012:3) to international research. The studies done to date tend to look into overall tendencies and trends (e.g. West & Frumina, 2012; Frumina & West, 2012), rather than inductively explore and explain classrooms situations, where the Russian teachers’ voices are heard. This being the case, this study draws somewhat on the literature from academic contexts outside of Russia. However, I also draw on my own experience, and I adopt an insider’s perspective as a teacher trainer, and a teacher in various settings in Russia. This researcher perspective allows me to communicate socially constructed meanings through the lens of my own practice. Hereafter I use ‘teachers’ to mean language teachers integrating technology at the university level.

The higher education system in Russia has been extensively reformed since the collapse of the Soviet Union. There are some factors that have contributed to the improvement of Russia’s capacity to deliver high quality, internationally recognised education. A first factor is that in 2000 - 2012, when oil prices increased every year, the government progressively invested into the tertiary education sector. The generous investment allowed Russian universities to buy online courseware packages, such as Touchstone (Cambridge) in MISIS, renovate their computer systems with modern hardware and software, and equip classrooms with IWBs or audio and video players. Some universities, including HSE and MISIS where I did research, provide their teachers with a secure space on the institute-operated server to design their courses there, and some IT support. However, there are still issues with assistance in their classrooms. For instance, there is no a lab specialist or classroom technologist available, who could help teachers resolve hardware and software issues, and the teachers normally have to solve the problems themselves.
A second factor is that the new Federal Law on Education, passed in 1992, launched a range of reforms to internationalise the system of higher education in Russia (Morgan & Kliucharev, 2012). In 2003, Russia signed The Bologna Agreement (Telegina & Schwengel, 2012), and English language competences became an essential prerequisite to study in programmes of joint diplomas and international educational modules (West & Frumina, 2012; Rasskazova, et al., 2017). These new requirements have influenced change in language learning methodology, towards more need-based approaches and skill-based language learning, which teachers have to adopt.

The current trend towards internationalisation does not mean teachers have to fit into western-designed moulds. Rather, as providers of the aforementioned reforms, the teachers often perceive implementing technology as an opportunity to improve design of their courses in their teaching context. Being highly experienced, they are keen to explore and adapt new technologies, because they have a number of professional needs that are not met in a traditional classroom. The impetus for innovation is likely to encourage them to search for more contemporary techniques, and develop context-sensitive approaches and methodologies, appropriate for them and their students. They understand that there is a gap between the present they teach in, and the future the students will have to work in. This is an exciting takeaway I got from my experience as a teacher trainer, and it signalled to me that such teachers are often intrinsically rather than extrinsically motivated to achieve broad change.

However, there are many fundamental challenges that are still restraining technology integration in higher education in Russia. It is my conviction that this broad-based change towards technology use is possible only if the teachers change. One of the major challenges seems to be, therefore, a methodological shift. Blended and online design presumes more learner centred teaching with a greater degree of learner autonomy, which is a real challenge even for experienced Russian teachers. To adapt their activity to the new
requirements, they need lots of additional time, which they normally do not have. Being overloaded, many of the teachers still use notorious Russian ‘metodichka’ [in-house teaching materials] (West & Frumina, 2012:20). Mostly based on the grammar translation methodology or audiolingualism, these in-house materials have grown in popularity since 2007, when, due to the political reasons, British Council libraries with materials and resources from international publishers were closed across Russia.

The second challenge relates to the teaching job itself, which the American cartoonist Donald J. Quinn aptly described as follows:

If a doctor, lawyer, or dentist had 40 people in his office at one time, all of whom had different needs, and some of whom didn’t want to be there and were causing trouble, and the doctor, lawyer, or dentist, without assistance, had to treat them all with professional excellence for nine months, then he might have some conception of the classroom teacher’s job.

As committed professionals, teachers try and accommodate the differences the students have in order to facilitate their progress in learning, and this can be enormously hard at times. In this complex setting, teachers have to act and balance a number of dichotomies (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Dimensions of methodology (adapted from Rogers, 2003:44ff.)](image)

These include acquisition vs. learning, procedural knowledge vs. declarative knowledge, experiential competences vs. analytic competences, skills vs. systems. The dichotomies also include input vs. output, learning vs. use, individual vs. social, explicit vs. implicit knowledge, teaching vs. assessment, teacher-centred vs. learner-centred pedagogy. Lantolf (in Verity,
2007) refers to this balancing of dichotomies as an ongoing task that teachers have to deal with. Experienced teachers often rely on their familiar repertoires, which are grounded in their knowledge, skills, methods and strategies. However, on designing their lessons and programmes teachers have to consider not only the above dichotomies, but also, among other, school conventions, rules and programme requirements, their own cognitive and metacognitive strategies, the teaching methodology, and equipment available. Moreover, the number of considerations increases when teachers start implementing technology (Washburn, 2009; Brown, 2012; Conole & Dyke, 2004:116-120; Bower & Sturman, 2015). There is, for example, the availability of the Internet in the classroom and in the students’ homes, IT support, and teachers’ and students’ e-literacy.

All the above listed considerations suggest that experienced teachers, while integrating technology, are not always able to rely on their ‘ordinary practical knowledge’ (Schön, 1983:54) and familiar repertoires. Committing to innovation and change, which may be unpredictable and uncertain, teachers are likely to draw on their beliefs about what is right and what is not right in their job to envision a learning process and its outcomes. However, more often than not, the lessons do not go the way the teacher expected, and this might form a contextual complexity (for this teacher), which is the subject of the next section.

1.3 Complexities

Having outlined the context of the study, in this section I clarify exactly what is meant by complexities in my research. I am using the term ‘complexity’ rather than ‘conflict’ because the latter implies an interaction of two or more conflicting sides or ideas, rather than teachers’ internalisation and working out a contextual feature. For the same reason, I do not use a more conventional term in Activity Theory (see section 1.5.1 for more detail) - ‘contradiction’. While ‘conflicts’ and ‘contradictions’ might comprise something contextual and personal, as in ‘I feel conflicted’, their implied meaning of two opposing sides or ideas is narrower than complexities, and hence does not work for my study.
Something contextual becomes a complexity for teachers if they are not able to reach a planned activity outcome when following a familiar procedure, or their established teaching repertoire. A complexity, therefore, can be defined as a contextual feature that gets in the way of reaching learning outcomes that the teacher has in mind. Complexities, while not referred to as such, are discussed in the literature as an inevitable part of a new and dynamically evolving classroom (Russell & Schneiderheinze, 2005; Russo & Benson, 2005).

An example of a complexity might be the following. A teacher designs a quiz in hopes of assessing the students fairly, but a student, being much more advanced in technology than their teacher, creates an HTML code with the answers for this quiz, and sends it out to the rest of the group in advance of the test. Now, all the students, by launching the small programme with the HTML code, are able to get the quiz done well. Teachers’ response to the fact that the students are able to generate a code and cheat can be different. For some of them it is a complexity, because they cannot reach a planned test outcome and assess the students fairly and equally anymore, as they are not aware who has cheated and who has not. For others, cheating students may be an expected part of their working context, and they may ignore the cheating, assess all the students with good marks, and immediately forget about the case.

Another example of a complexity is the following. A teacher prepares in advance some video input for a vocabulary lesson. One of her motives may be to run a successful vocabulary lessons, and another one can be to use a particular video, which effectively exposes the students to target vocabulary. However, due to a connectivity issue, the video cannot be run and both motives cannot be realised. Thus, the connectivity issue becomes a complexity for the teacher. The teacher may then get into a state of cognitive disequilibrium (Graesser & D’Mello, 2011:12) or even a dissonance, due to the mismatch between the teacher’s beliefs about language learning (e.g. that the new vocabulary must be presented effectively so that it is memorable for the students), and contingencies preventing such learning (no chance to
play the video). Facing such a complexity, the teacher might feel frustrated because the unrealised motives potentially create a sense of instability. To dampen the disequilibrium, and then restore an equilibrium, we have the natural psychological tool called perezhivanie, which I introduce in the section that follows.

1.4 Perezhivanie

Having explained what I call complexities in my study, I will now move on to define perezhivanie, as both units are tightly related. For this introductory chapter of the thesis, the best explanation is that perezhivanie is analogous to reflection, but more related to the teachers’ feelings, more emotional, spontaneous and intuitive than what reflection is (based on how reflection is positioned in the literature). Later, I will refine and develop perezhivanie in more detail. Perezhivanie is a manifestation of teachers’ interaction with their context of some kind, and it is a ‘cognitive and emotional reciprocal processing of previous and new experience’ (Golombek & Doran, 2014:104).

Perezhivanie, therefore, is a reflection of the complexity, but never accessible directly, whereas complexities are potentially observable. In this respect, surfacing complexities enables me to get access to the teachers’ trajectories to overcome these complexities. In the study, I was interested in how teachers make sense of their experience and resolve the issues in these complexities, which potentially might lead to a new, informed teaching practice. The process of overcoming issues is traditionally addressed in the literature via reflective practice (Burns, 2010), where teachers are advised to carry out small-scale classroom action research focusing on the issue in question. Reflection is a well-established practice leading to teacher development, and it may be that perezhivanie also has the potential to be used in this way. I was interested to know how perezhivanie possibly differs from reflection in terms of sense-making, reasoning, and problem solving, or coheres in some way. In the next section I present the focus of my study in more detail.
1.5 Thesis focus
So far, I have explained the reasons why I launched this study, how my interest in perezhivanie developed, described the institutional context, and introduced two main pillars of the study: complexities and perezhivanie. In the following section, I will outline my research aims and objectives, and present my research questions.

1.5.1 Research aims and objectives
As was discussed in the two previous sections, a teacher committed to innovation might encounter challenges, which have to be resolved. From the theoretical perspective of Activity Theory, the challenges might cause various contradictions in the activity system (e.g. in Kaptelinin & Nardi, 2006; Sannino, 2008; Engeström, et al. 2002). The contradictions need to be revealed in order for them to be resolved (ibid, and also in Engeström & Sannino, 2011; Engeström, 2001). Nevertheless, it is not clear how emotional factors work alongside cognitive engagement to reveal, and then resolve, the contradictions. As Schutz and Pekrun (2007:3) argue, ‘in spite of the emotional nature of classrooms, inquiry on emotions in educational contexts, outside of a few notable exceptions ... has been slow to emerge’. Over the last decade, however, sociocultural researchers have become increasingly interested in the role of emotions when exploring activity (Roth & Lee, 2007), development (Holodynski, 2013), as well as assigning meaning (van Huizen et al., 2005). It is now generally recognized that ‘thinking, knowing, representing knowledge, attending, processing information, reasoning, problem-solving and decision-making’ cannot be attributed solely to cognitive processing (Swain, 2013:196). The reason why cognition alone cannot serve these processes is that cognition tends to be a conscious process, and, as such, it does not describe sub-conscious aspects of motives (see discussion in chapter 2), which also contribute to the processes listed above.

The role of emotions in the processes of consciousness and activity is a considerably under-researched area to date, not only in relation to the teacher education and development
(Johnson & Golombek, 2016), but also much broader in teaching and human development (Smagorinsky, 2011). One of the most promising ways to overcome the dualism of emotion and cognition is to find a unit which captures the relationship between them, and which then can be used to explore them together (Golombek & Doran, 2014). It is my contention that perezhivanie, being a triunity of emotion, cognition, and context, can be this unit.

The focus on perezhivanie is congruent with the apparent shift, from more object-oriented to more subject-oriented studies of activity within the sociocultural paradigm. The recent interest in the phenomenon of perezhivanie is increasing (Ferholt, 2009; Gonzalez-Rey, 2002; Jaques, et al., 2003; Mahn & John-Steiner, 2002; Moran & John-Steiner, 2003; Robbins, 2004; Sannino, 2008; Smagorinsky & Daigle, 2012; Johnson & Golombek, 2016). Smagorinsky (2011:339), for instance, calls perezhivanie a ‘tantalizing notion’. In 2016, Mike Cole’s special issue of ‘Mind, Culture, and Activity’ was devoted to perezhivanie, and a year later, in 2017, an edited book was devoted entirely to perezhivanie (Fleer et al., 2017).

Although there have been a number of publications listed above that involve perezhivanie, there is little agreement among scholars what perezhivanie actually means, and, as Cole and Gajdamschko (2016:271) point out, ‘every use of the term perezhivanie is an invitation to theoretical misunderstanding’. Perezhivanie is often taken as either emotion or reflection (e.g. by Adams & March, 2015), and there is very little in the literature on the ‘anatomy’ of perezhivanie, or its potential for promoting development. The primary aim of this study, therefore, is to shine new light on perezhivanie. Another aim is to make perezhivanie a more accessible practical psychological tool for a Western audience. These aims guided me in formulating two research questions, which I present in the next section.

1.5.2 Research questions

In this section I outline the research questions that my study was designed to answer. In order to achieve the different perspective on how teachers experience and deal with
challenges, I first needed to be aware of what aspects of the teachers’ technologically enhanced contexts cause problems for them. As responsible professionals in the novel situation of integrating technology, they might question the consequences of their actions for the students or, more globally, their affective senses of self-worth and professional expertise. There might be plenty of issues, therefore, which can get in the way of effective teaching (see two examples in section 1.3). I intended to explore them, and see how they affected the teachers, and my first research question, therefore, was as follows:

RQ1: What complexities do teachers identify when trying to integrate technology in an institution of tertiary education in Russia?

RQ1 is descriptive, because incidents, where complexities emerge, are observable. Being an insider, I was well placed to identify complexities in the participants’ stories. Reflecting on their experience, my participants shared how they made decisions and resolved issues while integrating technology. To do so, they had to redesign their activity, and I was curious to explore how they had done it and why, and what helped them in this endeavour. This exploration went beyond RQ1, and I, therefore, needed another research question to explore the entire process, from getting aware of the complexity and making new meaning, to creating a new learning design. I assumed that perezhivanie played a role in this process, and my RQ2, therefore, was as follows:

RQ2: What is the teachers’ perezhivanie about complexities?

Exploring perezhivanie is the major part of my research strategy, and both research questions act as a means to accomplish my aims, outlined in the above section. A move from RQ1 to RQ2 is logical, because knowing what the complexities are (RQ1) is a step towards discovering the teachers’ perezhivanie (RQ2). When addressing RQ1, I work out the observable elements of contextual complexities. This is the groundwork needed to access
the totality of experience of a teacher, which I view in the study through the lens of their perezhivanie, which is not directly accessible (RQ2).

Returning briefly to the sociocultural perspective, which is the broader theoretical contextualisation of my study, it is important to note that this research was mostly concerned with the teacher. This is distinct from some other work in sociocultural studies. Sociocultural studies often focus on established units of analysis, such as ‘word meaning’ in Vygotsky’s work, or ‘activity’ in Cultural Historical Activity Theory (Engeström, 2001; Engeström, et al. 2002; Sannino, 2008; Engeström & Sannino, 2011). Word meanings and activity are located ‘between people’, whereas the centre of gravity of perezhivanie is shifted slightly more to the individual - the teacher. However, I do not see any potential danger of arriving in a no man’s land, i.e. end up taking an individualistic perspective. While my starting point is the individual rather than the social, teachers’ perezhivanie emerges in teaching, which is social activity. Before proceeding to the literature review chapters, in the next section, I explain how my thesis is organised.

**1.6 Thesis organisation**

In this chapter I have:

- outlined the development of my interest in the role of emotions in teachers’ thinking processes, and introduced the notion of perezhivanie, where emotional and cognitive factors are intertwined;
- provided background information about technology integration in the Russian higher education context;
- given a brief outline of the analytical frameworks which I draw on;
- indicated what I set out to achieve in this study, and how.

The remaining eight themed chapters are organised as follows. Although I do not have a chapter entitled theoretical framework, the next three chapters have a clear theoretical
orientation. I discuss relevant bodies of literature, which have underpinned my study, and from which I develop my conceptual framework. In Chapter 2, I introduce how I understand the key concepts of the study: critical incidents, needs and motives, and conscious and subconscious processes. Chapter 2 also discusses emotions as an essential factor in any activity, and relates emotions and cognition with complexities and perezhivanie. The focus is always on the unity of emotions and cognition, rather than on what particular emotions the participants experience dealing with technology, or what cognitive processes support teachers’ decision making. Then, in Chapter 3 I review the relevant literature on perezhivanie, and in Chapter 4 I discuss teacher development, drawing parallels and distinctions between perezhivanie and reflection. At the end of Chapter 4, I present my conceptual framework. The literature review, therefore, takes up three chapters.

Next, in Chapter 5 I lay out the methodological dimensions of the research. Since my research questions lend themselves to qualitative inquiry, in this chapter I consider the qualitative data collection design, describe the fieldwork I undertook, examine issues pertaining to data management, such as recording and transcription, and address the multilingual aspect of my work. After that, in Chapter 6, I describe the analysis of the data, including content and narrative structural analyses, which were designed to uncover complexities in the teachers’ technology integration, and their parallel perezhivanie when encountering complexities. In Chapter 7 I address RQ1, and in Chapter 8 I answer RQ2. In the remaining Chapter 9, I discuss my findings, consider the implications of perezhivanie for teacher training, discuss other contributions of the study, and identify possible areas for further research on perezhivanie.
Chapter 2: Understanding motives and emotions in this study

This chapter develops the conceptual cornerstones of the thesis. In a first section, I define technology integration as a teaching ‘activity’, and then introduce critical incidents as problematic situations, which cannot be resolved by any existing teaching activity due to complexities encountered. In the next section, I address the relationship between elements of activity, such as needs and motives, and link them to complexities. The third section looks at the literature on consciousness and the subconscious relevant to the study. The third section also adds emotions to the discussion of elements of activity, how emotions link to cognition, and finally I bring together these various concepts into an overall framework for studying perezhivanie, which will be the focus of chapter 3.

2.1 Critical incidents in teaching activity

To discuss and analyse teaching experience, I first need to define what is meant by ‘teachers’ activity’ in the study. Activity is a key idea and a unit of analysis of human experience in Cultural-Historical Activity Theory, as exemplified by the work of Engeström and Sannino among many others, and yet it is a concept difficult to define precisely. Differences in opinions still exist, but there appears to be some agreement that an activity is not solely a response to a stimulus, as ‘behaviour’ is in the Pavlovian or Bekhterevian sense. Activity is based on human needs, motives and emotions (Рубинштейн [Rubinstein], 2002; Давыдов [Davydov], 1997). In some languages, e.g. in Russian and German, ‘activity’ is referred to by two words with overlapping meaning. In Russian, they are ‘activnost’ and ‘deyatelnost’. Some authors (e.g. Bakhurst, 2009) take the former as being the closest to the word ‘activity’. However, it is the latter that implies transformation, and is likely to be triggered by human needs and motives. For the purpose of this study, ‘activity’ will be used in the sense of ‘deyatelnost’, which brings a slight nuance to the English word ‘activity’. Activity, then, refers to ‘a purposeful [intentional] interaction of the subject [teacher in my case] with the world’ (K aptelinin & Nardi, 2006:31). Here and hereafter in the thesis my comments are indicated by square brackets. In this definition, the key word is ‘purposeful’,
because it captures motives and a volitional aspect in goal-directed actions, and in which a transformation of motives implies a potentially developmental process.

Teachers get involved in various incidents in the classroom. An incident becomes a ‘critical incident’ for a teacher, if an issue that emerges in the lesson cannot be resolved by the teacher’s existing teaching repertoire, due to complexities identified. Sannino (2010:840) refers to a critical incident as a ‘critical conflict’, as ‘situations in which individuals face inner doubts that paralyze them in front of contradictory motives unsolvable by the subject [the teacher] alone’, and Engeström and Sannino (2011) call them ‘double binds’ or ‘dilemmas’. Critical incidents, therefore, represent a situation where teachers are not able to realise their motive in a teaching activity, therefore representing a tension between them and what happens in the situation. The tension in turn might challenge teachers’ attitudes to what they are doing, or even change their beliefs, and this potentially is a subject of the work of teachers’ perezhivanie. The resulting perezhivanie is an indicator, therefore, of the significance of the incident.

To illustrate this, I use the Vasilyuk’s (1984/1991) example of a walking activity. On stumbling, when a human occasionally falls down, they cannot go on performing the same walking activity. Therefore, their needs and motives fail to get satisfied, and this critical incident might cause a cognitive and emotional dissonance. To restore the equilibrium, the human has to stand on their feet first. This is a job that perezhivanie might do, as Vasilyuk (Василюк, 1984:25) suggests. The restoration neither enables a human to walk nor shows where to go, though. Regarding teaching, perezhivanie might encourage a state of mind that may help to revise and restructure the teacher’s motives. With new and restructured motives, the teacher might be able to perform a new activity, and hence find a solution to the issue. I was curious to explore, in the data, how teachers resolve issues that arise in critical incidents, and how perezhivanie might assist them, or not. In the section that follows I discuss the notions of needs and motives in more detail.
2.2 Understanding motives in this study

This section follows on from the previous one, where I mentioned the concepts of needs and motives as triggers for teaching activity. Before defining ‘motives’, one of the main concepts of my study, I situate ‘needs’ using two theories. The notion of ‘personal theory’ (Ayres, 2017) represents teachers’ beliefs of how they think everything should be in the supposedly safe and nurturing classroom environment. Teachers’ needs to create such an environment evolve from their ‘personal theory’. Second, in self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000), human needs might broadly fall into three categories, which can be applied to teachers as follows:

- **Autonomy**: this is teachers’ need to have freedom to construct their learning environment according to their ‘personal theory’;
- **Competence**: this is teachers’ need to feel effective in daily challenges and opportunities of teaching;
- **Relatedness**: this is teachers’ need to care about and be cared for by others.

For instance, if a teacher has got a feeling that the tasks, which she designs with technology, help her establish better rapport with the net-savvy students, her need for relatedness might get fulfilled. The teachers’ need for competence might be satisfied when she, while implementing the new technology, helps the students achieve better learning outcomes. Different needs can be intertwined. For example, if the teacher chose the technology that boosted learning herself, then her need for autonomy may be satisfied as well. Finally, needs are subjective, every teacher is likely to perceive them differently, and on some occasions a teacher has to prioritise one need over the other one. For example, a teacher may sacrifice the need for autonomy in technology choice, and get on with it, if her need for competence is endangered. This may happen when the teacher experiments with a new unpredictable technology, and is afraid to appear unprofessional in front of the students. As
a result, the teacher might stick to traditional teaching without technology, so to play safe and not to damage her need for competence. However, some time after, the teacher may get bored with the routine of her job and get back to technology. If this is successful, this may bring more autonomy and satisfy this other need, as well as the need for competence, and overall, then, it may bring the teacher a feeling of self-determined professional expertise.

Based on the above, the assumptions upon which my thinking is based are that a need can potentially become an internal force for teachers to change something in their practice. When a need is objectified in a particular material entity in the world, as an ‘object’ of further activity (Kaptelinin, 2005), it becomes a motive, which, according to Leontiev (Леонтьев, 1971), prompts people to perform an activity. That is, when a teacher finds an object for activity, their need becomes their motive. The motive might induce the teacher to revise some learning design by integrating technology.

For example, a Legal English teacher has a need for competence because he finds the coursebook practice insufficient to provide the students with sufficient vocabulary practice to internalise the Legal English jargon (see Figure 2 below). Coming across the Web 2.0 tool called Quizlet (https://quizlet.com), he decides to use it with his students to fulfil his need. In this respect, a better learning design might become an ‘object’ of his new activity, and his motive might be ‘to improve the learning outcomes by using Quizlet’. Figure 2 illustrates my understanding of the causal relationship between teachers’ needs and motives with Quizlet case as an example.
Leontiev (Леонтьев, 1971, 1975) understands a motive as belonging to the whole activity, whereas some other scholars (Рубинштейн [Rubinstein], 2002) see a motive as being related to actions rather than the entire activity. Throughout this study I do not differentiate between these two views, and use a motive in relation to either an entire activity or any action within it.

When teachers perceive a classroom situation as a critical incident (see section 2.1), they face obstacles that do not allow them to provide instruction according to their ‘personal theory’, and their motives do not get achieved as the teachers cannot do what they have planned. This situation goes beyond what Activity Theory (Леонтьев [Leontiev], 1971) considers, because a critical incident cannot be resolved by a set of actions, which are a part of the teachers’ repertoire. My hypothesis is that such unrealised motives disappear into the subconscious part of the mind and form ‘blocks’ there (Freud, 2005; Vygotsky, 1987b).
In the next section, I address some theories of consciousness, which assist me in relating motives with perezhivanie.

2.3 Consciousness and the subconscious

Before proceeding to provide an overview of the literature on consciousness, it is necessary to point out that the discussion in this section is purely theoretical. That is, we cannot trace any subconscious processes until they become conscious. However, the subconscious is a part of my understanding of teachers’ motives because, being partially subconscious, motives might be represented in consciousness as emotions (Леонтьев, [Leontiev], 1971, 1975:74; Рубинштейн [Rubinstein], 2002). Leontiev (1978:120) explains this relationship as follows:

> Emotions have the function of inner signals ... The special feature of emotions is that they reflect relationships between motives (needs) and success, or the possibility of success, of realizing the action of the subject that responds to these motives. Here we are speaking not about the reflection of those relationships but about a direct sensory reflection of them, about experiencing. Thus they appear as a result of actualization of a motive.

From this quote, I understand that emotions-signals might engender teachers’ motives to perform an activity, and in that respect emotions relate the subconscious, mental processes and activity (Рубинштейн [Rubinstein], 2002). I might, therefore, get a sense of teachers’ motives by understanding their emotional responses to complexities, because their partially subconscious unrealised motives are likely to get reflected in these emotional responses. This way, I can potentially capture and analyse teachers’ perezhivanie as well, because an emotional response is an inevitable part of teachers’ perezhivanie. This conceptualisation has affordances for understanding perezhivanie. Since emotional factors are likely to come from the subconscious, the presence of teachers’ emotional dissonance in critical incidents (see section 2.1) might explain why perezhivanie, comprising these emotions, tends to be always on.
It is worth pointing out that there are different ways to understand consciousness and the subconscious, and their dependence on one another. For example, using the metaphor of an iceberg, Freud (2005) suggested that the influence of the sub-merged part of the mind — the sub-conscious — could be understood by observing the non-submerged, or visible, part of the mind — the conscious. Consistent with this conceptualisation, several authors have suggested that consciousness is ‘the publicity organ of the brain’ (Ellis & Larsen-Freeman, 2006:571). Some authors suggest that both the subconscious and the consciousness have a semantic structure, and are responsive to words and signs (Vygotsky, 1987b; also in Lacan, 1998; Zinchenko, 2009:51). It is important to state here though, that neither unpacking the role of consciousness and the subconscious, nor essentialising them, are within the scope of the study. Rather, the above-cited metaphorical meanings contribute to how I understand perezhivanie, and assist me in building my conceptual framework.

I now continue with the example I used in section 2.2 (see Figure 2) to extend my conceptual framework further. As introduced in section 2.2, a teacher, motivated by his need to provide his students with more substantial vocabulary practice, designed a series of activities with Quizlet to use in a next lesson. However, imagine that a poor Internet connection does not allow the students to get access to the task, and the teacher’s motive (see section 2.2) gets unrealised. This, then, becomes a critical incident, or complexity, for the teacher (see Figure 3). He prepared and tested everything in advance, but the lack of a stable connection might then cause frustration, and hence perezhivanie.
I suggested earlier that unrealised motives may disappear into the subconscious (Freud, 2005; Vygotsky, 1987). Returning briefly to the idea that the subconscious is responsive to communication, due to its possible semantic structure mentioned above, I now suggest that unresolved motives and related emotions about past experiences have the potential to reach consciousness in the process of meaning making. This process might be similar to Vygotsky’s ‘stages in speech – stages in abstraction – stages in consciousness’ (unpublished record ‘My remarks’, cited in Zavershneva, 2014:82). In fact, both Freud (2005) and Lacan (1998, lecture 11, cited in Zavershneva, 2016b:19) included raising awareness of a patient’s unrealised motives as a last stage of psychotherapeutic sessions. This was to enable a patient to make sense of a past experience they had just shared with the psychotherapist. While this technique seems a bit outdated nowadays, in the light of new psychotherapeutic trends (Gelso, 2011), it supports the suggestion that a relationship between unrealised motives and the subconscious exists.
It is though that in order to become conscious, an unrealised motive or any other subconscious process should ‘win a competition’ against other subconscious processes, due to the restricted processing capacity of the conscious mind (e.g. James, 1890; Выготский [Vygotsky], 1982). Signs, words and images might serve as a ‘torch’ for the mind to choose a subconscious process and focus on it, which is similar to how in learning signs, words and images may prompt the retrieval of other words or phrases stored in long-term memory. Signs, words and images are also utilised in various psychotherapeutic practices (e.g. in Freud, 2005; Lacan, 1998) in order to raise a patient’s awareness of unrealised motives. Both scholars argued that a transition from the subconscious to consciousness could take place when preconscious images met with a word, e.g. their verbal form of the past experience (Lacan, 1998), or an image, or some other stimuli. The power of subconscious processes has also been discussed, in recent neuroscience work, in relation to the notion of emotional intelligence. Neale, et al. (2011) state that the:

‘emotional brain is much more active than our logical, thinking brain. Estimates show that up to 6 billion nerve cells are firing in any one second in our emotional brain, compared to somewhere around the surprisingly small figure of 100 neuronal stimulations in our logical brain’ (Neale, et al., 2011:10).

Applying these insights into the conscious and subconscious to my study, I was curious to find in the data how my participants made their decisions about redesigning activities when they faced critical incidents, or complexities, and to what extent their emotions and perezhivanie assisted them. I analysed teachers’ perezhivanie focusing on teachers’ emotions, and complexities that triggered them, and which could be observable. Moreover, I draw on Vygotsky’s osoznanie, as a special form of consciousness, which I equate with sense-making. Since distinguishing between conscious and subconscious processes was not a part of my data collection and analysis, I analyse perezhivanie with reference to complexities, emotions and sense-making. In the next section, I move away from discussing theories that explain human mind, to introducing emotions. However, I appeal to the explanatory power of the theories and ideas for understanding the human mind at the end
of the thesis, where I suggest ideas for further research on how perezhivanie can be used as a developmental tool.

2.4 Emotions

The purpose of this final part of the chapter is to review the literature on the role of emotions in teaching, which is contested in the field. As was pointed out in the previous section, emotions often represent a current state of a need, and, to that end, our motives in consciousness, discussed earlier. I start this section describing how I understand emotions in this study (section 2.4.1). After that, I look at how emotions are reported in teaching (section 2.4.2), and then, I relate emotions to the other key notions of this chapter. Finally, I review the literature, which addresses emotions and cognition together, so to connect them in the notion of perezhivanie at the end of the chapter.

2.4.1 Understanding emotions in my study

Emotions are inextricably linked to people’s lives, and yet it is a phenomenon difficult to define precisely (Zelenski & Larsen, 2000; Schutz & DeCuir, 2002). Whilst some agreement exists that to describe emotions is a much more complex and difficult task than to describe cognition (Janack, 2000; Zembylas, 2002), to date the role of emotions in human consciousness has been the subject of intense debate. A majority of scholars, as Nussbaum (2001) argues, have tended to assume that the emotional sphere of human life is peripheral to consciousness, and this seems to be the case also in teaching and learning. So, Nias (1996:293) points out that ‘by implication and omission teachers’ emotions are not a topic deemed worthy of serious academic or professional consideration’. According to Hartman and Sternberg (1993), emotions are a part of intellectual performance, but their role in human consciousness is claimed to be peripheral. Vygotsky, however, suggests that emotions do not reside in the ‘organs of the periphery’, but comprise an inevitable part of consciousness (1987:332). He criticises Freud’s ‘state within a state’ view on emotions, and points out that emotions ‘cannot be understood outside the dynamic of human life. It is
within this context that the emotional processes acquire their meaning and sense’ (Vygotsky, 1987:333). As mentioned earlier, I understand emotions as internal signals of motives in consciousness and, therefore, of fundamental importance and an inextricable part of teaching.

Debate also continues about whether emotions contribute to activity or impede it. Some past studies (Claparède, 1928; Pieron, 1928) emphasised the counterproductive role of emotions in activity. So, Claparède (1928) held the view that an emotion distracts from the main activity, and encourages concentration on what caused that emotion. At the same time, he stipulated that there is no a direct causality here, and a distraction from the main activity is a by-product of activity rather than its aim (similar to how a parade might stop the traffic, but it is not its aim).

It is almost certain that Claparède tends to equal emotion with affect. What distinguishes affects from emotions is that affects are intrapsychic events, or ‘the private, inner reactions of an individual’ (Swain, 2013:196), whereas emotions are social. While the basis of emotions is biological, they are revealed and interpreted in a social and cultural setting, i.e. from our interactions with others (Vygotsky, 1987, 1999). Mediated by cultural tools emotions are:

transformed by thought and word, they are liberated from their natural substrate (Vygotsky, 1987), and, as a result, the ‘higher emotions’ are flexible and finely differentiated. The dynamics of specifically human emotions are no longer determined by a bodily state, ‘from below’, but by meanings, ‘from above’ (Zavershneva, 2016a:131)

In his ‘Lectures on psychology’, Vygotsky further develops his argument that emotions come from ‘the top’ through cultural objects through the process of internalization (Vygotsky, 1987b:166) and attributes emotions, unlike affects, to higher mental functions. This view of emotions aligns Vygotsky with Humanistic Psychology.
Finally, it is important to distinguish emotions from feelings in this thesis. Activity theory assumes that emotions are situational (Рубинштейн [Rubinstein], 2002), and often related to critical incidents. By contrast, feelings are more independent from context and more related to the objects of activity. To that end, feelings are more prominent, stable and long-term than emotions are. In light of these starting points, I discuss emotions in teaching in the next section.

2.4.2 Emotions in teaching

I now return briefly to the view, which I addressed in the previous section, that emotions are peripheral in research on cognition and consciousness, as well as teaching and teacher development. Several researchers point out that over the last century studies have tended to ignore the affective domain (e.g. Johnson & Worden, 2014:126). Accordingly, emotions were mostly viewed as a distractor or an obstacle for professional growth. The majority of studies have used information-processing models of cognitive systems, and appealed solely to teachers’ logical thinking and action (Zembylas, 2005:466). Thus, teachers were advised to utilise purely cognitive problem solving strategies, which had reflection at their core, without acknowledging an emotional component in them, with some exceptions, though (see chapter 4 for more detail). To add, teacher trainers were generally advised to suppress trainee’s emotions to ‘protect’ against teachers’ complaints about various classroom issues, which would almost certainly be emotional, and could turn it into a ‘moaning-shop’ (Oliphant, 2011:79). Another example is when trainers were recommended to use any means to dampen trainee’s negative feelings, e.g. anxiety (Richards & Farrell, 2005:73), rather than to acknowledge, accept and use them in the teachers’ problem solving and decision-making.

However, the growing dissatisfaction with the current educational models, coupled with an increasing interest in emotions, as expressed by several authors (DiPardo & Potter, 2003; Golombek & Doran, 2014; Gabryš-Barker & Galajda, 2016), has encouraged ‘an affective
turn’ in teacher education and development (Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2014; Uitto, et al., 2015:124-125). To date, several attempts have been made to reveal emotional processes when teachers face challenges in their job (Hargreaves, 2000, 2001; Day & Leitch, 2001; Sutton & Wheatley, 2003; van Veen & Lasky, 2005; Uitto, et al., 2015), and with technology in particular (Ball, 2012). There are at least three reasons why English language teaching can be a highly emotionally charging job, and I summarise them below.

The first reason is that fostering empathy with students from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds requires a deep emotional undertaking. It includes ethnocultural empathy, or ‘an ability to see the world from a perspective of someone from another culture’ (Gkonou & Mercer, 2017:8), as well as active listening, which Kumaravadivelu (2012: 67) takes as ‘to listen attentively to others without prejudice’. The second reason is that a post-method pedagogy of ELT (Kumaravadivelu, 2001) is highly social and interpersonal in nature, and requires authentic classroom interactions with students, and this is as unpredictable as any human communication. To create positive group dynamics, language teachers need to invest emotionally to maintain rapport and show empathy and caring for others (Spencer-Otey & Franklin, 2009). Third, teaching is highly charged with emotions, because teachers’ motives are not only directed towards their students but also aroused by their own beliefs and attitudes. If their motives get realised in a successful lesson, the teachers may feel exhilarated. For example, when their unmotivated students get inspired by a speaking task and enthusiastically work on their speaking skills. At the same time, teachers may feel stressed from being overloaded with marking student work, sorrowed about cheating students, or frustrated by the lack of administrative support where they expected the contrary.

Finally, the level of teachers’ emotional engagement intensifies when they must transform their practice (Scott & Sutton, 2009:152; Zembylas, 2005:468). When it comes to technology choice, a search for the ‘right’ solution becomes enormously difficult. The number of
options is endless, and this uncertainty potentially creates cognitive disequilibrium, and a sense of instability, which is ‘ubiquitous in complex learning’ (Graesser, & D’Mello, 2011:12), since the teacher can never know for certain how one or another option might work for them and their students.

The above reasons explain why emotions are an inevitable part of teaching, but what is not yet clear is the exact role of emotions in teaching. With some exceptions (Zembylas, 2005; Scott, & Sutton, 2009), there is a general lack of research into emotions in teaching. My framework suggests that when teachers cannot do what they wanted or planned, they may realise a mismatch between their ‘personal theory’ of language learning (see section 2.2) and actions required to facilitate such learning in their particular context. To resolve this mismatch can be a cognitively demanding task, and, I suggest, emotions and cognition act here as ‘an inseparable whole’. In the next section I discuss this interrelation between emotions and cognition in detail.

2.4.3 Emotions and cognition

Borg (2003) provides a comprehensive review of language teacher cognition research, and he only refers to a single study that addresses emotions (Golombek, 1998). While emotions have been considered alongside cognition since the 1970s, in most published studies in the cognitive research community, emotions have been treated separately from cognition until relatively recently, as noted by several scholars (Shelley et al., 2013; Burns at al., 2015). With some exceptions (Wyatt et al., 1993; Graesser & D’Mello, 2011), much of the available literature on cognition has tended to neglect their dialectical intertwining, claiming cognition as the sole instrument for knowing and learning. For instance, Mandler in his seminal book ‘Mind and Emotion’ (1976; cited in Graesser & D’Mello, 2011:11), equated cognition with ‘perception, attention, memory, judgment, decision making, problem solving, [and] language’, and did not leave a room for emotions. Such a privileging of cognition is a
possible explanation for why research on emotions in teaching has remained an unexplored territory until recently, as was discussed in the previous section.

The dichotomy of emotions and cognition has had an impact not only on research on teaching, but also on teacher training programme design. Trainees have been advised about how to suppress one’s emotions and, separately, how to develop a knowledge base and pedagogical expertise in order to be ‘professional’ (Johnson & Worden, 2014:126). For example, King (2016) studied how language teachers in Japan manage and suppress their genuine emotions to look professional. Hiding emotions is recognised as an appropriate behaviour in Japanese educational culture, which prescribes not to reveal private selves ‘in order to achieve educational goals and to conform to their institution’s socially-derived tacit rules concerning “appropriate” emotions during classroom encounters’ (King, 2016:110). In this fashion, emotions tend to be treated as a distraction in teacher training and development programmes, rather than acknowledged and utilised as a resource.

Returning briefly to the earlier review of psychological theories, it is worth noting that Vygotsky (1986:10) called a separation of emotions from cognition ‘a major weakness of traditional psychology’. His own view, to unite cognition and emotion, was a result of a gradual development. During his ‘instrumental period’, between 1927 and 1931 (Zavershneva, 2016b), Vygotsky viewed the cognitive and emotional dimensions as a dichotomy. During this time, he was engaged in elaborating a theory of consciousness (e.g. in Выготский, 1999) to understand subconscious processes, and looked into the role of speech and word meaning in the genesis of consciousness as a unified whole. His move back from this cognitive psychology to a more holistic view may have been his reaction to the limitations he had run into in his analysis of thinking, as he admitted that in the dichotomy of cognition and emotions ‘the unity of consciousness as such disappears’ (Vygotsky, 1997:294). He explained that it ‘makes the thought process appear as an autonomous flow of ‘thoughts thinking themselves’, segregated from the fullness of life, from the personal needs and interests, the inclinations and impulses, of the thinker’ (Vygotsky, 1986:10). In
the same vein, Bruner, being a socio-constructivist, criticised ‘heavy conceptual boundaries between thought, action, and emotion’ (Bruner, 1986:106), and warned against the separation of the cognitive and emotional, stating that ‘to isolate each is like studying the planes of a crystal separately, losing sight of the crystal that gives them being’ (ibid:118). Bruner also suggested constructing ‘conceptual bridges’ between emotion and cognition.

One of examples of a conceptual bridge is the notion of ‘emotional intelligence’, which is an ability to notice emotions, to cope with the situation where they emerged, and to use the emotions as ‘signals’ to make right decisions. For example, Swain’s (2013) research into the language classroom manifests emotional and cognitive inseparability in language learning. She states that ‘as teachers we need to reflect on what is mediating our own emotional responses to students, and what is mediating students’ responses to us, and to the activities we give them’ (ibid:204). As an outcome of her study, Swain (ibid) states that ‘thinking, knowing, representing knowledge, attending, processing information, reasoning, problem-solving and decision-making’ (ibid:196) cannot be attributed to solely cognitive processing anymore, and suggests five practical ideas for how to use emotions in language teaching. Another unity of emotional and cognitive processing is perezhivanie, which the subject of my study.

The more recent trend, then in teacher education and development is that there is a dialectical relationship between emotions and cognition (Ratner, 2000; Nussbaum, 2001; Schutz & DeCuir, 2002; Vadeboncoeur & Collie 2013; Burns at al., 2015). Nias (1996:294) points out that ‘one cannot separate feeling from perception, affectivity from judgement’. To date, several attempts have been made to trace the interconnection of emotion and cognition for teacher development theoretically (Savina, 2000; Gregoire, 2003; Golombek & Johnson, 2004; Kubanyiova, 2012; Vadeboncoeur & Collie, 2013; Clara, 2015; Davis, 2015), and practically (Ferholt, 2009; Quiñones & Fleer, 2011; Dang, 2013; Golombek & Doran, 2014; Adams & March, 2015). My study contributes to these attempts by suggesting that
emotions originate in the subconscious. Traditional cognitive perspectives focus on conscious processes, and, as such, do not capture partially subconscious motives, which may trigger activity, such as teaching practices in my case. Thus, there is a niche for studies on the role of emotional positive valence in human consciousness, and seeing emotions as integral to motives. I illustrate this theoretical conception by two examples, introduced in section 1.3, and developed below.

The first example is: getting inspired by an exciting video I have just watched, and I might decide to design an activity based on it, even if I am not fully aware of my motives. It is likely that I become more aware of them when I face an obstacle while teaching with this resource. For example, the obstacle might be that a video player, installed in a university computer connected to the projector, cannot play my video. This critical incident might make me revise my motives, and I would have to decide whether it is important to play this video in order to gain the lesson’s objectives, or whether I can get by without it. Responding to such a critical incident may be rather frustrating, and emotions are likely to play a significant role in the process of prompting cognition to think about and find a right solution. The solution might be to install another video player, or to find and use another computer, or to run a lesson without this video at all. When searching for the most effective solution, I am likely to question my motives and probably restructure them to achieve the lesson’s objectives.

Sometimes we, as teachers, resign ourselves to the contextual complexities; we concede and get on with things. In Figure 4 below, I illustrate this with a second example, used in sections 2.2 and 2.3. It presents a casual process of dealing with the complexity of a poor Internet connection, which did not enable the students to do the tasks designed with Quizlet.
As was hypothesised in section 2.3, teachers’ unrealised motives might go to the subconscious. Then, over time, emotions related to these unrealised motives could help the unrealised motives to reach consciousness, as shown in Figure 4. For example, having experienced frustration with a video recorder, as in the above-discussed first example, in the future I may always prepare an extra device with a video player. My past emotions about things going wrong – the complexity – would certainly work as a heuristic tool to help me not to forget to check that extra device. In the second example with Quizlet, I might decide to carry a device with a mobile Internet hotspot as a plan B.

![Figure 4. Emotions prompt unrealised motives to bubble up to consciousness](image)

Both examples above illustrate my argument that emotions could be central in responding to a critical incident, and to deal with what appears to be a complexity in teaching practice. However, we cannot manage emotions, as they are believed to be partially subconscious. We can notice an emotion, when we experience it, and if we manage to get detached from this emotional state, such as e.g. frustration, this could work as a catalyst for getting aware of our not yet conscious motives related to this frustration. This sense-making is likely to be guided by a cognitive factor, which might work as an extra tool to help pull out from the subconscious something we have not realised yet.
Summary

The discussion in this chapter has been purely theoretical. Teachers make sense of teaching in various ways. This chapter discussed an emerging conceptual framework, which I used to explore the data in this study. I developed the framework, drawing on concepts from Activity Theory as well as various other literature. The conceptual framework appears useful to me because it has explanatory power. First, I introduced ‘motive’, which I use as a mediator of the principal dialectics between complexities and perezhivanie, and then explained how each next element in the framework is likely to ‘work’ in critical incidents, i.e. in those situations, which cannot be resolved by habitual teaching activity, however perfect a teacher’s awareness of this situation would be. After that, I discussed emotional and cognitive factors, and how Vygotsky finally arrived at the phenomenon of perezhivanie, in the move from dichotomy to interdependence and further integration of cognition and emotions. The next chapter, focusing on perezhivanie, builds on my emerging conceptual framework.
Chapter 3: Perezhivanie

As discussed above, an interaction between teachers and technologically enhanced learning environments might trigger teachers’ perezhivanie, which then in turn can transform that initial interaction. I argue that complexities and perezhivanie are intertwined, and where a contextual feature can be identified as a complexity for a teacher, it almost always has related perezhivanie, because her or his motives do not get realised. In the previous chapter, I developed an emerging constellation of concepts necessary to communicate complexities and perezhivanie in the thesis. First, I appealed to the literature on Activity Theory, which, while not being used in data collection and analysis, has an explanatory power through such concepts as ‘critical incidents’, motives and needs. A probable explanation of emergence of perezhivanie is that unrealised motives might go down to the subconscious, and then bubble up from there as emotions. The discussion allowed me to bring the notions together into a coherent framework, and present perezhivanie as a unity of cognitive, emotional and contextual factors at the end of the previous chapter. The purpose of this next chapter is to focus solely on perezhivanie, and review the relevant literature, which is extensive, yet not exhaustive.

I organise this chapter chronologically, in two parts, so to discuss how the understanding of perezhivanie has evolved in the literature over time. This order reveals the progression of thinking around human development over time as well. I start from Vygotsky’s work, and in the first part I contemplate the history of perezhivanie, and speculate how Vygotsky, replicating Piaget’s experiment on egocentric speech, occasionally noticed how children’s perezhivanie worked in a critical incident. In the second part of the chapter, I continue with how perezhivanie was developed, or actually, remained underdeveloped after Vygotsky’s premature death. Then, I suggest my own analytical trichotomy of perezhivanie, referring to the work of Fedor Vasiluyk (1991). These three suggested forms of perezhivanie echo Vygotsky’s proposal that perezhivanie is a foundation in the cultural-historical approach to development. By making this parallel, I link this chapter with the following one, devoted to
reflection and teacher development. Finally, in this chapter I discuss possible translations of perezhivanie.

Before proceeding to review Vygotsky’s work, it will be necessary to mention criticisms of English translations of Vygotsky’s texts (e.g. in van der Veer & Yasnitsky, 2011). In this chapter I cite Vygotsky’s works in English depending on the quality of the available translation. I do so in one of three ways: a) by quoting the English translation text as it is, b) by correcting the quote from an English publication, or c) by providing my own translation from the original text in Russian.

3.1. Vygotsky’s stance on perezhivanie

As was mentioned in the introduction, this section adds a historical dimension to the discussion of perezhivanie. The first mention of perezhivanie dates back to Vygotsky’s work (1971) ‘Psychology of Art’, originally published in 1916 and 1925. As a theatre critic himself (see e.g. van der Veer, 2015), he positioned perezhivanie in cultural studies, and suggested that for people, deeply engaged with a piece of art, and who have related perezhivanie, it might be profoundly transformative. The piece of art, therefore, might act as an environmental tool.

An engaging movie or a play can be an illustration here. It might be a deeply emotional event that grabs and shakes the audience. This experiencing does not seem to fit into the categories of either emotion or cognition, but instead represents a unity ‘in the aesthetic experience of catharsis’ (Vygotsky, 1971:250). Vygotsky explains that in order to become developmental, perezhivanie must be ‘recalled’ and ‘worked over’ in catharsis, which is related to what Mike Cole (XMCA listserv communication, 2015) later referred as ‘prolepsis’.
It is worth noting here that the beginning of the last century signified a transition from the dominant Sigmund Freud's structural model of the psyche as a tripartite of the 'id', 'ego', and 'superego', which was focused on traces and isolated psychological functions, to process oriented psychological units. It was almost certainly at that time that Vygotsky was a proponent of cognitive psychology, and focused primarily on cognitive representation of higher psychological functions (see section 2.4.3 for more detail), trying to find a unit of analysis of consciousness within this field (e.g. Выготский, 1999). That ‘instrumental’ period (see section 2.4.3), Vygotsky promoted sense of the word as such a unit, where ‘thought and speech unite into verbal thought’ (Vygotsky, 1986:6). Attracted by social determinism, he viewed in the ‘sense of the word’ a unity of the social and personal.

However, despite this revolutionary move, Vygotsky was criticised for intellectualism by viewing consciousness ‘from the standpoint of verbal thinking’ (Zavershneva, 2014:78). It may be that Vygotsky himself noticed the limitations of viewing the ‘sense of the word’ as a unit of analysis of consciousness, and for at least two reasons. First, ‘sense of the word’ was too socially determined, because there was a necessity to articulate it in his experiments. Second, ‘sense of the word’ did not reflect subjective factors in full. It neither represented all aspects of consciousness nor disclosed the subconscious processes, which I addressed in Chapter 2, such as motives with their affective-volitional power. To that end, Vygotsky tried to overcome the immediate social determinism in, e.g. Leontiev’s work (1978), and went on to search for a unit that represented a unity of all the subjective factors in child development.

A probable explanation of why Vygotsky, now as a psychologist, turned to perezhivanie was that he noticed the generative character of children’s imagination, creativity and fantasy, where emotions played an essential part (Moran & John-Steiner, 2003). It is possible that Vygotsky happened upon the phenomenon of perezhivanie in his generic methodology experiments (e.g. in Vygotsky, 1999:43,44). He had an interest in human development
throughout all his life, and once aimed at reconstructing Piaget’s experiments on ‘egocentric’ speech (Piaget’s term), in order to show how such inner speech works for development. Vygotsky (ibid), and later Kohlberg et al. (1968), concluded that egocentric speech has a role in cognitive self-guidance. In an experiment a child was placed in a deliberately challenging situation - a sort of a double bind. Asked to draw a picture with a sky, the child was not given a blue pencil, and, on noticing the absence, responded with the following (my comments are provided in the square brackets):

where is the blue pencil? where is the blue pencil? [Irritation - emotion] I need a blue one [cognitive reflection]. All right, I’ll draw it by a red one, then pour some water on it and it’ll get darker and be like blue [solution] (Vygotsky, 1999:44).

This child’s ‘egocentric’ speech could be a manifestation of the child’s perezhivanie: ‘where is the blue pencil? where is the blue pencil? ... I need a blue one ... all right’. This speech could help him find a solution; that is to take a pen of red colour, and then cover the paint with some water to ‘be like blue’.

As his thinking developed rapidly, Vygotsky in his ‘Лекции по педагогии’ (Выготский, 2001) diverges from the well developed and researched area of ‘word and meaning’ to the unity of emotional and intellectual sides of human being (Yasnitsky & Van der Veer, 2015:128). Addressing the dynamic nature of the environment, Vygotsky (Выготский, 2001:81) might have thought that ‘perezhivanie’ could subsume the sense of a word, because it merges the environmental impact, i.e. society as communication on one side, and the individual’s thought processes, which he earlier considered in the sense of a word. For Vygotsky, perezhivanie now captured tensions between two essential sides in a dialectical process of change (Zavershneva & Van Der Veer, 2017); i.e. the tensions between the context as a social, and individual thought processes. He united them in perezhivanie as an ‘indivisible unity of personal characteristics and situational characteristics’ (Vygotsky, 1994:342). To recap, Vygotsky, finally moved from the earlier focus on instrumentalism, and then, social determinism, developed perezhivanie as a psychological conception as an
alternative to direct causality of the environment. Thus, the environment is one factor in the dialectic of human development.

Before moving to the epistemology of perezhivanie in Vygotsky’s terms, it is necessary to mention that when he crafted the notion he was influenced by the ‘perezhivanie method’ of the stage director and theoretician Konstantin Stanislavski. Stanislavski’s dramatic system, or stage theory (e.g. in Stanislavski, 1949, 2013) required actors to denote or reproduce the internal psychological side of acting, by drawing on their own life experiences, so to allow the spectators to get engaged with perezhivanie of the actors, rather than simply watch and listen. Stanislavski ‘searched for the sense of words in order to identify the characters’ motives behind them; he was thus able to help his actors express these motives through gesture, intonation, vocal range, and emotional tone’ (Mahn & John-Steiner, 2002:n.p.). In other words, the system required actors to:

live through the role by utilising their autobiographical emotional memory. In order to naturally portray the character, the actor is required to think of a moment in her own life when she felt a particular emotion and then relive the emotion while in character. Lived-through experience can be enhanced by multiple sensory and kinaesthetic experiences. Therefore, acting or pretending (rather than just watching and listening) can yield possibilities for intense lived-through experiences (Cole, XMCA listserv communication, 2015).

The use of perezhivanie in Stanislavski’s method of acting can be contrasted to another method referred to as ‘predstavlenie’, or performance (Pitches, 2005). Using the ‘predstavlenie’ method, actors create an externally focused onstage image by utilising clichés to convey emotions, or physically imitating them, whereas with the ‘perezhivanie’ method actors live through the character’s experience.

The epistemology of perezhivanie is presented in one of his last work (Vygotsky, 1994), where he illustrates perezhivanie by a tragic account of an alcoholic single mother who sometimes beats her three children. Each of them has a different reaction to their drunk
mother’s cruel behaviour, because they experience perezhivanie in a different way. The difference leads to different diagnosis and prognosis of the children, because they are in different stages of development. The youngest son gets terrified when it happens, and loses his voice at times. The middle son gets deeply traumatised, and thinks of escaping from home. As for the oldest son, his mother’s cruelty became really transformative. He takes responsibility for everybody and everything in the house, including his ill mother, the younger brothers and for the house overall. Using this example, Vygotsky points out the dialectic relation between the social environment and a human, showing that a particular contextual feature triggers human development, but also how the significance of the feature will depend on the emotional experience of the human:

the essential factors which explain the influence of environment on the psychological development of children are made up of their emotional experiences. The emotional experience arising from any situation or from any aspect of his environment, determines what kind of influence. Therefore, it is not any of the factors in themselves (if taken without reference to the child) which determines how they will influence the future course of his development, but the same factors refracted through the prism of the child’s emotional experience (1994:339 ff.).

Here Vygotsky equates ‘emotional experience’ with perezhivanie (1994:341), and understands social environment as relative depending on its significance of the development of the child’s psychological resources. In Vygotsky’s above example, the eldest of the three boys does not overtly relate to his mother’s cruelty through emotions, but gets aware of the event in the context of their life, and this awareness makes his perezhivanie different from those of his younger brothers.

From the eldest brother’s experience, Vygotsky conceptualises perezhivanie as a unity of the emotional and the intellectual in a particular context. This unity should not be interpreted as something subjective plus the particular environment. Rather, it is a specific correlation between them. Vygotsky states that this relationship can have different
implications because, as said above, each of three siblings responded to the alcoholic mother’s cruelty differently.

In Figure 5, below, I develop my conceptual framework by adding the notion of perezhivanie to it. I use the same critical incident (see Figures 2-4 in Chapter 2), and draw on Vygotsky’s latest works, where he refers to consciousness as a means of active relationship with environment: ‘Meanings are not psychische Gestalten, but sozio-Gestalten: consciousness is a relation, [i.e.] my relation to my environment’ (Vygotsky’s archive, unpublished record, ‘The role of semantic field’, 1933, cited in Zavershneva, 2014:82).
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Figure 5. The unity of the cognitive and emotional in perezhivanie

I assume that perezhivanie is likely to comprise partially subconscious emotional factors as well as more conscious factors that involve cognitive awareness (see Figure 5). The teacher has perezhivanie (due to the poor Internet connection his Quizlet activity does not work, see section 2.2 for more detail) and, as a result, he cannot reach the lesson aims and objectives. This perezhivanie is likely to act as a ‘provider’ to raise teachers’ awareness about his unrealised motive to improve the teaching of Legal English vocabulary using Quizlet. Restructuring the motive becomes a cognitive activity, which in turn might bring the associated emotions and the unrealised motive to the conscious level, allowing it to be
considered, and potentially find a solution. The solution might be to give the students Quizlet tasks as a part of their homework.

Vygotsky points out that restructuring of motives can ‘show empirically the origin of the freedom of human volition’ [my translation of ‘эмпирически показать происхождение свободы человеческой воли’ in ‘Воспитание высших форм поведения’ (Выготский, 1985:291)]. He relates emotions and agency, calls it the ‘affective-volitional tendency’, and explains that ‘[behind] every thought there is an affective-volitional tendency which holds the answer to the last “why”’ (Vygotsky, 1986:252). This way he positions the restructuring of motives as the roots of human free will, or volition.

Concurrently, he criticises reliance solely on the affective-volitional power to overcome obstacles of the context (in his critique of Levin’s school, e.g. on the results of experiments on ‘mental satiation’ of Karsten (1976)). It is worth mentioning here, again, that Vygotsky first noted ‘the influence of thought on affect and volition’ (1986:10) in his ‘instrumental’ period, where he stated their mutual influence and transformation in the notion of sense (see above, and in section 2.4.3 for more detail about this period of his work). Then, when his thinking developed (as I described above), he suggested perezhivanie, as a unity of emotional, cognitive and contextual factors.

Vygotsky, in his unpublished diaries (Zavershneva, 2010; Zavershneva & Van Der Veer, 2017), endorses his earlier hypothesis of perezhivanie as a unit of analysis of consciousness. Given his interest in creating a theory of consciousness throughout all his life, he managed to foreground perezhivanie much more than any theoretical construction of a new psychological process. Vygotsky pointed out perezhivanie’s dynamic, transforming and transformative nature (Varshava & Выготский [Varsha & Vygotsky], 1931). His stance on perezhivanie was a radical move towards a more ecological, mutualist type of thinking around human beings in their environments, which now comprises the basic ecological principle in psychology, where ‘the individual and the environment form an inseparable
dialectical unity that cannot be understood if the unity is broken’ (Poehner & Lantolf, 2005:239).

However, because it was developed in the latest period of his life, the notion of perezhivanie was not developed fully theoretically (Valsiner & Van der Veer, 2000:382) or practically. What is more, by using perezhivanie as a central notion Vygotsky addressed a mostly Russian audience; i.e. those who have the notion of perezhivanie in their schemata, use it daily, and for whom his suggestion of perezhivanie was absolutely comprehensive and exhaustive. For a Western audience, those who do not understand the ordinary meaning of perezhivanie, the suggestion is more challenging. Vygotsky did not make explicit how perezhivanie comprises historical, social, and cultural factors, which all influence the human experience. His exposition of perezhivanie was not conducive for people outside Russia to understand the relationship between emotions and cognition. Long after Vygotsky’s premature death, perezhivanie remained mostly unexplored outside Russia, or the Soviet Union. In the next section, I discuss how the notion was developed, or actually stayed underdeveloped, and remained outside the current trends in psychology after Vygotsky.

3.2 Developing the notion of ‘Perezhivanie’ after Vygotsky

In the last two years of his life, in 1933-34 Vygotsky ran a series of ‘closed seminars’, where he presented to his associates the idea of perezhivanie as a new unit of consciousness (Zavershneva & Van Der Veer, 2017). Nevertheless, few his followers developed the notion further. One exception was Bozhovich (e.g. in 2009), who studied the affective sphere of human beings. Focusing on the motivational sphere of consciousness, she tried to relate perezhivanie to Vygotsky’s notion of higher mental functions. Later, Bassin (Бассин, 1973) positioned perezhivanie as a concept of CHAT, uniting its apprehension and activity forms, and introduced the concept of ‘meaningful experiences’ (Бассин, 1972), a unity of the notion of ‘sense’ [smysl] and perezhivanie. However, none of Vygotsky’s followers managed to unite different forms of perezhivanie, even theoretically (Vasilyuk, 1991).
Vygotsky’s associate Leontiev (Леонтьев, 1998) viewed perezhivanie as an interaction between the environment and an individual. Leontiev saw the individual as a personality, and believed that over time the environment formed a particular personality, who then would interact with the environment in its current state. Thus, the more a human got aware of the environment, the more impact it had on his/her personality. While there are some analogies between Leontiev’s social deterministic view of the environment, and Vygotsky’s ‘social situation of development’, the individual’s awareness of the environment, almost always cognitive, does not play such a crucial part in the late Vygotsky’s work (see sections 2.4.3 and 3.1).

As discussed in section 3.1, Vygotsky (1994) analyses three brothers’ different perezhivanie, and their perezhivanie is singularly formed by their awareness of their drunk mother’s cruel behaviour. In fact, they are all three aware of what is going on; i.e. they are all three aware of the environment. By contrast, Leontiev (Леонтьев, 1998) separated the environment from individuals acting in it, claimed that the environment formed the child’s perezhivanie, and that perezhivanie was primarily intellectual. From Leontiev’s perspective, perezhivanie was a kind of reflection of human comprehension of what was going on around them. Leontiev, therefore, seemed to leave the dialectical stance behind, to a more dualistic approach of environment vs. individual. To mitigate against this separation, Leontiev advocated object-oriented practical activity, mostly collective, as a unit of consciousness. This is contrasted with Vygotsky’s stance on the perezhivanie of the individual, and its roots in the motivational sphere of the individual. Keeping in mind the political climate of the Soviet era in which Leontiev worked, for his professional and personal safely he may have had to consider the constraints of being the Head of the Faculty of Psychology of Moscow State University. While the discussion of these circumstances is beyond the scope of my work, I think it is worth mentioning them here as one on the reasons why perezhivanie, which takes people to a psychology of the individual rather than the collective, was not much developed by Vygotsky’s associates.
Leontiev and Engeström (e.g. in Engeström, 2001:136) position activity as the unit of analysis of consciousness. Activity theory in its current state mostly ‘focuses in analyses on activities without taking into account the individual involved in the activity at the same time’ (Toomela, 2000:298), tends to overlook the fact that an individual is a part of social phenomena, and positions an individual as something that is the opposite of social. Not surprisingly, such dualism in sociocultural theory has received considerable critical attention (Dafermos, 2015; Mermen & Mironenko, 2015; Veresov, 2016). Vasilyuk (1991:16) explains it as follows:

the reason why activity theory has so far touched only in passing on this area of mental reality is to be found in the fact that this school of thought has paid most attention to the study of object-oriented practical activity and mental reflection, while the need for experiencing arises in precisely those situations which cannot be resolved by practical activity, however perfect their mental reflection.

A major criticism of activity theory seems to be that taking out lived experience, and dividing up subjects, objects, tools and environment even for analytical purposes, might break their dialectical unity. Teachers are individuals that have developed from their own professional background and personality, but at the same time they interact within a particular context, which inevitably influences them. The teachers’ learning environment changes as a result of both psychological effort and activity, in their original, rather than synthetic, unity.

In recent years, some sociocultural researchers emphasise that perezhivanie does not combine two abstractions - cognition and emotion - but rather that it names the already existing unity, from which those very abstractions have been made (e.g. in Blunden, 2014). Similarly, Ferholt and Nilsson (2016:298) highlight that perezhivanie ‘is not a combination of emotion and cognition, but a unity before such distinctions are made, a unity that includes will; grapples with a problem; is both subjective and objective; and, again, includes not just “an experience,” but also the working over of this experience, which takes place over time.
in stages in which people are active participants'. This view on perezhivanie echoes Dewey’s (1934) notion of ‘an experience’ as well, and I discuss this in more detail in section 3.4.

There are two different methodological approaches to account for perezhivanie empirically. One of them is to create a setting, which may trigger teachers’ perezhivanie, and another one is to use a narrative type interview, where the researcher works out what the interviewee’s perezhivanie is from their narratives. Ferholt (2009:164) pursues the first approach, and proposes synthetic-analytic methods of representation, which ‘themselves evoke and manifest perezhivanie’, and make ‘perezhivanie an empirically researchable phenomenon’. She borrowed this idea from Stanislavsky’s (1949, 2013) stage theory, which I addressed in section 3.1.

Golombek (2015:481), following the second approach, embraces the epistemology of narrative knowing put forward by Polkinghorne (1988). To study psychological processes that accompany novice language teacher practice, Golombek (2015:472ff, see also in Golombek & Doran, 2014; Johnson & Golombek, 2016:48ff) employed content and discourse analysis of teachers’ journals to ‘spot’ their perezhivanie, which she defines as:

a cognitive and emotional reciprocal processing of previous and new experience. How a person perceives a previous experience influences how s/he perceives an in-progress experience, and this perception subsequently influences how s/he perceives, or reinterprets, that previous experience’ (Golombek and Doran, 2014:104).

A year later, Golombek called perezhivanie ‘reciprocal processing of old and new perceptions’ (2015:473). She analysed the journal writing experience of one teacher, Rose, and tried to understand her motivation in teaching, as well as what triggered her own annoyance at Rose’s writing. Golombek proposes that ‘by reading and interacting with the ideas expressed in a student’s reflection journals, teachers can develop understanding of a student’s perezhivanie and how it influences her/his development’ (Golombek, 2015:473). She explains the narrative mode as an externalisation (Johnson & Golombek, 2011; Johnson
& Golombek, 2016:23), where the journals play a mediational role, and help the intern teachers articulate ‘their tacit thoughts, beliefs, emotions, knowledge, and interpretations’ (Golombek, 2015: 471). She uses their perezhivanie as a means of communicating with the teachers’ perceptions, in order to understand how they are engaged in teaching (Golombek & Doran, 2014:104).

Relating perezhivanie and teacher development, Johnson and Worden (2014:129) suggest McNeill’s (e.g. in McNeill & Duncan, 1998) concept of the growth point. McNeill proposes the growth point as a minimal unit of ‘an imagery-language dialectic’, revealed through gesture and speech, in the process of constructing meaning or a particular mechanism for a thought to come into being (McNeill, 2008:104). Johnson sees a dialectical linking of cognition and emotion in the context of novice teachers learning, and McNeill’s gesture and speech unity, as similar in terms of their meaning making process (Johnson & Worden, 2014). Further, Johnson and Golombek (2016:39ff) explain McNeill’s growth point notion with two Russian notions, obuchenie and perezhivanie, exemplifying how they create the potential for the development of novice teachers.

In 2016, a special issue of the journal ‘Mind Culture and Activity’ was devoted to perezhivanie, where the use of the term was problematised by several western authors. Ferholt and Nilsson (2016:301) list a number of components and characteristics of perezhivanie. Clarà (2015, 2016a, 2016b), drawing on Vasilyuk’s (1984) work, equates perezhivanie with ‘struggle’ and ‘contemplation’, and links them to the well-developed psychological traditions of using coping strategies to overcome difficulties. While Clarà’s suggestions, as well as experiencing-as contemplation and m-perezhivanie (meaning-perezhivanie) (Clarà, 2016a:339) might be useful in clinical psychotherapy, their relevance for teachers’ work is unclear. Kozulin (2016:1) finds the idea of perezhivanie as a holistic unity very attractive because it corresponds to our intuitive understanding of consciousness as comprising subjective (my experience, my feelings, my understanding) and objective
environment) factors, and supports his observations of what happens in drug-taking experiences (Kozulin, 2016:2).

To recap, a theoretically grounded use of perezhivanie as a scientific notion is far from consolidated, and there is a need for more empirical work in the study of perezhivanie. Having said that, I think that Vasilyuk (1991) moved the research on perezhivanie forward in a significant way, both theoretically and practically, and in the next section I address his work on perezhivanie.

3.3 Three forms of perezhivanie

Having discussed how the notion of perezhivanie has developed, and, in fact, hardly (if ever) developed into the area of practical educational psychology until recently, in this section I address the work of one scholar, a Russian psychotherapist Fedour Vasilyuk, because his ideas influenced me greatly in my analysis of perezhivanie in this study. His prominent book on perezhivanie (Василюк, 1984 in Russian, 1991 in English) is written as a dialogue with activity theorists, whose ideas I discussed in sections 3.1 and 3.2. Unlike the majority of the activity theorists, Vasilyuk (Василюк, 1984:60 ff.) positions perezhivanie as a specific form of activity rather than a higher mental function. With reference to Leontiev (Леонтьев, 1971:26), Vasilyuk hypothesises that perezhivanie emerges when an individual has an inner conflict of motives, which he calls a ‘struggle between heterogeneous principles’ (1991:181). Vasilyuk, therefore, states that perezhivanie is an active internal process. It emerges when the individual cannot resolve an issue in activity in the present state of the activity system, and this emergence of perezhivanie psychologically might improve the situation:

These conflicts are often resolved only inadequately and one-sidedly. Although temporary, partial restoration of harmony to consciousness and personality may be achieved; overall the solution of such conflict may have negative results as destructive to the personality as the actual events being experienced. Thus experiencing can often be a prolonged, chain-reaction type of process, at each successive stage of which one has to deal not only, or not so much, with the original critical circumstances as with the unfortunate consequences of foregoing attempts to cope with those circumstances. Vasilyuk (ibid:171)
This improvement is not merely a cognitive and emotional living through experience to ‘overcome a crisis’, as Vasilyuk puts it, it also might have a formative effect on the person. According to Vasilyuk (ibid:31), perezhivanie is a particular type of work ‘directed towards the establishment of correlation between consciousness and existence in terms of meaning, the overall aim of the world of experiencing being to give greater meaningfulness to life’. Perezhivanie, therefore, almost certainly accompanies the active work that teachers conduct in critical incidents, to find solutions (see chapter 2), and to regain their ‘mental equilibrium’ (ibid:15).

Here, I cannot see a contradiction between Vasilyuk’s and Vygotsky’s understanding of perezhivanie, because they both spot perezhivanie within activity, and then point out activity within perezhivanie. Unlike Vygotsky, however, Vasilyuk objects to taking perezhivanie as a mixture of emotion and cognition. Rather, Vasilyuk defines perezhivanie as,

> a special inner activity or inner work by means of which an individual succeeds in withstanding various (usually painful) events and situations in life, succeeds in regaining the mental equilibrium which has been temporarily lost — succeeds, in short, in coping with a crisis (Vasilyuk, 1991:15).

With the idea of perezhivanie as inner work, Vasilyuk enriches Vygotsky’s notion of perezhivanie by specifying two core meanings; one of them is perezhivanie-activity, as discussed above, and another one is perezhivanie-pain. The latter is probably close to experiencing pain in a tragic event, such as the death of dear people. Vasilyuk suggests that pain accompanies perezhivanie, and their intertwining is likely not to allow people easily to forget what has happened, because the pain sticks the tragic event in memory. By being there all the time, the perezhivanie-pain urges people to re-live past painful events over and over again, until they realise the pain has gone.
While perezhivanie-pain as ‘contemplation’ (Vasilyuk, 1991:23ff.) has a side focus in my study, it is worth mentioning such tragic perezhivanie here, because it seems paramount for understanding the nature of perezhivanie. There is no contradiction between the two core meanings of perezhivanie, as perezhivanie-pain can be a part of perezhivanie-activity (ibid:204). Going through a crisis, and overcoming a complexity, can be a step forward for a teacher in their professional life, and it can open new opportunities.

Approaching perezhivanie epistemologically, Vasilyuk (ibid) suggests that it is likely to be an immediate, internal, and subjective phenomenon. It might be immediate in a sense that it is not something I have read in a book or something that somebody told me. I believe it is as it is, as it is me, who has experienced it. This immediacy brings trustworthiness and validity into the notion. Moreover, perezhivanie is internal and subjective in the sense that it relates to the work of emotions, feelings and cognition, and everyone experiences perezhivanie differently. Perezhivanie tends to be irreducible to a person because it is spontaneous, rather than made by a forceful act. For example, I cannot assign my trainee teachers a task to do perezhivanie, or, alternatively, tell them: ‘rather than being excited by your ideas, now I am going to get frustrated by them’.

One more feature of perezhivanie, which Vasilyuk brings to the surface (ibid), is that it has a multi-level structure. Drawing a parallel with N.A. Bernstein’s theory of the multi-levelness of movement, Vasilyuk describes the phenomenon as follows:

In each particular instance of the experiencing activity, the levels of consciousness detailed above come together for its realisation into a functional unity unique to each instance, in which any one level may assume the leading role... In the passage quoted earlier from Bunin’s “Life of Arseniev” the experiencing activity was mainly on the unconscious level (“the secret work of the soul”), with some active participation by the level of direct experiencing* (the hero feels “the desire which spontaneously arises in his soul for some change in life, for freedom from something, and a sense of wanting to set off for somewhere”). When all the “somes”, “somethings”, and “somewheres” start to acquire definition and present themselves clearly in consciousness, that indicates that the level of apprehension is taking a hand in the work. And if it is taken further, the subject asks himself,
“Why this desire in particular? ”, “Why do I need freedom?” etc., so the work of experiencing has moved to the level of reflection (Vasilyuk, 1991:204).

In this quote, Vasilyuk suggests that subconscious and conscious processes combine in unique ways in every activity, in which one of them may dominate. Building on this, he presents a typology of four ‘functional regimes of consciousness’ (ibid:22). These regimes can be interpreted as forms of perezhivanie, which I discuss next.

I employed Vasilyuk’s idea that perezhivanie exists in various forms, but in my study I understand the forms differently from Vasilyuk’s ‘regimes of consciousness’. Also, I did not consider Vasilyuk’s fourth form of perezhivanie (ibid), purely a subconscious process, because it does not seem to be congruent with teaching activity, which always involves cognitive processing. The other three forms I understand as follows. One form of perezhivanie is about the general state of things, and teachers are not central in it. They are likely to notice what the general state of things is, but they cannot do very much to change it. I call this form ‘perezhivanie-apprehension’. The second form of perezhivanie in my taxonomy, ‘perezhivanie-experience’, is very close to teachers’ own unique experience. That is, what happens to themselves and in themselves, and this form is possibly quite emotional. It frequently can be about something that happened in the teachers’ past practice, or something happening now, i.e. ongoing. In the third form, the teachers’ consciousness is likely not only monitoring what is going on, but also reflecting on what is happening (analogously to Schön’s (1983; 1992) reflecting-in-action and reflecting-in-practice - see section 4.2), and I call this form ‘perezhivanie-reflection’. An additional distinction between practical and critical reflection-in-action, given by Anderson (2019:2), is a potentially more complete description of Schön’s reflecting-in-action, and therefore also what various perezhivanie-reflection might be. Both reflecting-in-action and perzhivanie-reflection are related to things we are able to do something about, and which we can cognitively, consciously, logically, or through some other productive way of thinking, consider and
change. Overall, then, these three forms of perezhivanie comprise my analytical framework, and from this trichotomy I analyse teachers’ perezhivanie in Chapter 8.

3.4 My definition of perezhivanie and the problem of its translation

Before proceeding to examine perezhivanie, in the next chapter, in relation to teacher development, it will be necessary to define perezhivanie and address the issue of its translating into English. I define perezhivanie as an emotionally powerful experience of an event, with (potentially) developmental consequences.

Addressing challenges of Russian-English translation in general, Josheph Brodsky once noted that,

> translation from Russian into English is one of the most horrendous mind benders. There aren’t all that many minds equal to this. Even a good, talented, brilliant poet who intuitively understands the task is incapable of restoring a Russian poem in English. The English language simply doesn’t have those moves (Volkov, 2002:86).

As was mentioned in the introduction, perezhivanie has been somewhat obfuscated by misinterpretation, and was called ‘an elusive phenomenon’ (Ferholt, 2009:224) for this reason. Several authors have found its translation problematic (e.g. Clarà, 2016a, b; Blunden, 2016). Ferholt (2009:34), referring Dorothy Robbins, hypothesises that perezhivanie ‘is difficult to understand for us outside of Russian [language], because it really captures the “Russian soul” in so many ways’. I think that to translate perezhivanie well is hard mainly due to its polysemic ambiguity. Being Russian myself, I do not wish to make an exhaustive list of meanings of perezhivanie here, nor do I dare say that such a list, even being provided, can vanquish possible misinterpretations. Nevertheless, I believe that an overt discussion of the translation challenge, in this section, may support the reader with a broader understanding of perezhivanie, which they then can use to dispel any misunderstandings. I will try to convey, in this section, how access to the meaning of
perezhivanie by translation is impossible. I agree with Blunden (2016), that perezhivanie should be translated in every instance, not only linguistically but also culturally.

Interestingly, while perezhivanie has multiple and varied meanings, in German the notion can be translated into the single word ‘erlebnis’ (Zavershneva, 2014:78). That is, the semantic fields of perezhivanie and erlebnis almost certainly overlap. In English there is no a single word for perezhivanie, although attempts to find such one were undertaken several times. The most common translation of perezhivanie in the literature to date is experience, with its derivatives ‘lived experience’ or ‘emotional experience’ (Blunden, 2016). In Vasilyuk’s (1991) book, which I referred in the previous section, perezhivanie is translated as experiencing (see also Ferholt 2009:34). I find either ‘experience’, or its derivatives, confusing interpretations of perezhivanie, rather than clarifying, for a number of reasons. First, ‘experience’ is polysemic itself. Second, in Russian there is a translation of the word experience. It is opit, which is a combination of knowledge and skills, as in ‘working experience’, and its meaning does not overlap with perezhivanie. Third, perezhivanie is much broader than experience, as it includes working over a complexity, and could be compared to sublation in Hegelian terms (Palm, 2009; Williams & Ryan, 2014). In his article, devoted to translation of perezhivanie, Blunden (2016) insists that Dewey’s (1934) term ‘an experience’ is the closest to perezhivanie, if we want to translate it in a single word. This seems questionable because Dewey’s ‘an experience’ covers much broader territory by its meaning than perezhivanie does. In section 4.2, I discuss Dewey’s ‘an experience’ in more detail, by contrasting as well as drawing parallels between this and perezhivanie.

The etymology of the prefix ‘pere’ is no less complicated than the translation of the whole word, as it is also highly polysemic and has 14 different meanings. In its broadest sense, it can be translated as a transition to a new better future space by making effort and overcoming difficulties getting in the way. For example, perecrichat means ‘out voicing somebody’. In much narrower sense, ‘pere’ can be translated as ‘done again’, as in the
prefix ‘re’ in English. The second part of the word, ‘zhivaniye’ is a noun, formed from the verb ‘zhit’, meaning ‘to live’.

Finally, in terms of grammatically correct use, I find Blunden’s (2016:2) suggestion plausible. He points out similarities between the use of perezhivanie and activity in the literature. While being singular nouns, they are both frequently used as mass noun.
Chapter 4: Perezhivanie and Reflection

I presented perezhivanie in the introductory chapter as a notion which is close to reflection, then, in Chapter 2, I specified it as comprising a triunity of cognitive, emotional, and contextual factors and then, in Chapter 3, I developed it, following Vasilyuk, as related to the work of consciousness, and outlined three possible forms of perezhivanie: Perezhivanie-Apprehension, Perezhivanie-Experiencing, and Perezhivanie-Reflection. Throughout the previous chapters, I nurtured the idea of a developmental power for perezhivanie, and in this chapter I discuss directly in comparison with reflection, because most of teacher development programmes and courses have reflective practice at their core (Wallace, 1991; Farrell, 2007; Mann & Walsh, 2013). However, the question of what happens in the mind of teachers, when they reflect, has not been properly addressed in the literature. It is not quite known how teachers get the competence of a reflective practitioner and how they develop by using reflection. It is also not quite known what the interaction between their context and their mind is. Therefore, there are lots of unanswered questions to me concerning how reflective practice works.

In this chapter, I explain how I understand similarities and differences between perezhivanie and reflection. It allows me to present the key concepts of cognition, emotion and perezhivanie in a more nuanced way, which in turn enables me to finalise, at the end of the chapter, the conceptual framework I use throughout the thesis. I organise this chapter as follows. I first define teacher development, because it is often taken as self-explanatory in the literature. Then, I address similarities and differences between perezhivanie and reflection from the perspective of development. After that, I discuss the role of emotions in reflection as contrasted with their role in perezhivanie, and finally outline my conceptual framework.
4.1 Understanding teacher development in my study

I understand teacher development as ‘a strategy of influence and indirect intervention that works on complex, integrated aspects of teaching; these aspects are idiosyncratic and individual’ (Freeman, 1989:40). The apparent simplicity of this definition masks a number of assumptions. For example, the phrase ‘a strategy of influence and indirect intervention’ clearly suggests a social impact, whereas I would agree with Edge (1988) that ‘develop’ in this context acts as an intransitive verb, and thus development implies teacher self-development rather than a teacher working with their ‘developers’ collaboratively. Anyway, I use this definition here in its broadest sense, viewing development of teachers as a series of transformations, from one stage to another, where the teachers enhance and shift their awareness of teacher practice to become a more logical and rational system, which can be described as a ‘developed whole’ (Cole & D’Andrade, 1982:20), and where the teachers get ‘more empowering teacher identities’ (Johnson & Golombek, 2016:13).

It is almost certain that teacher development is an inevitable part of professional well-being, as evidenced by a substantial body of research. To maintain themselves in the complex settings of technologically enhanced language classrooms, keep on being professionals as the university teachers they are, they are compelled to change through the working-out of complexities that emerge, in critical incidents and more generally (see section 2.1). A probable explanation of why many complexities cannot be resolved by existing teaching activity (see two examples in section 1.3), is that critical incidents might require the teacher to revise their needs, motives, beliefs and attitudes. This revision and further transformation is likely to enable the teacher to restructure their activity, and so resolve the incident. Traditionally, such revision is dealt with via reflective practice, which often becomes an inevitable part of teachers’ practice. As Tripp, among many other advocates, teachers should make ‘value judgements’ (Tripp, 1993: 24-5) rendering the incident in question through analysis. Tripp (ibid) suggests that reflecting has two stages: the ‘what’, that is what has happened, and the ‘why’, that is why it has happened.
Although Tripp’s idea to focus on the ‘what’ and the ‘why’ seems plausible, there seems to be an inconsistency here. Reflection on the ‘what’ and the ‘why’ is a cognitive practice, but our needs, motives, beliefs and attitudes are likely to often belong to the subconscious sphere. It means that we cannot always cognitively and consciously get access to them. This may prevent teachers to make sense of a complexity, to resolve a critical incident, or to regain their emotional and cognitive equilibrium. To address this inconsistency, I approach critical incidents differently, in this study, than Tripp did, as outlined in my research focus (see section 1.5). I first describe the critical incident and identify complexities, and this is linked to Tripp’s stage of ‘what has happened’. However, I turn to the teachers’ motives to reveal complexities, and this way I address my RQ1. The second of Tripp’s stages is ‘why it has happened’. It is aimed at teacher meaning making, which might be experienced as teacher’ perezhivanie, and this relates to my RQ2. In the next section I develop my ideas, comparing reflection with perezhivanie, and also address differences between them in more detail.

### 4.2 Perezhivanie and Reflection

Having defined teacher development in my study, I will start this section by defining reflection, and then move on to compare it with perezhivanie. While there is no broad consensus in the literature about this nebulous term, reflection is generally understood to mean an intentional act of mind; conscious, forceful, intellectual and affective activity (Boud et al., 1985b:33). Cruickshank and Applegate (1981:153) define reflective practice as thinking over ‘what happened, why it happened, and what else they could have done to reach their goals’, which echoes Tripp’s definition (see section 4.1).

Perezhivanie and reflection might look quite similar in empirical data, and where perezhivanie is accompanied by reflection in particular, because the differences between them are subtle, but they exist. One of them is a difference in the discourse pattern. Most types of reflection have a pragmatic focus. For instance, motivated by Schön (1983),
reflection is a discourse of transition from a problem to a solution. Reflection is triggered by an issue or a case, incident, etc., and inevitably finishes when the issue is resolved. By contrast, perezhivanie is more of an ongoing experience for teachers. Transition, while resembling a reflective process, certainly occurs, but it depends on what form perezhivanie takes at any point in time (see section 3.3), and the process can be quite unpredictable in terms of its discourse pattern. Thus, in contrast to reflection (see above), perezhivanie is not a forceful intellectual activity aimed at solving a problem.

Another clear difference between reflection and perezhivanie is the nature of both processes. Reflection deals with complexities by noticing them, understanding them, thinking about how to overcome them, and then to act. These are all mostly conscious actions. Perezhivanie, however, is different. Perezhivanie is something we cannot control, as we are sometimes not even fully aware of the complexities that have triggered our perezhivanie. A possible explanation of why my trainees relied on their perezhivanie, rather than on reflection (see introduction to the thesis), is that nature of perezhivanie was less planned, and partially subconscious, and this helped them deal with issues much better than reflection could do.

Having said that, I argue that at least two prominent scholars, researching reflection, Dewey and Schön, were very close to arriving at perezhivanie, from different perspectives. Dewey (1933, 1938) highlighted reflection as a higher mental function, just as Vygotsky, but attributed it to a special form of thinking that was influenced by the symbolic interactionism position of American pragmatism. He suggested looking attentively at situations when teachers were perplexed, because this involved unrealised motives rooted in the teachers’ beliefs. In these situations, which I call critical incidents, and in which a teacher has perezhivanie, Dewey suggested that cognitive reflective practice would take place. He defined reflecting as ‘active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in light of the grounds that support it and the further consequences to
which it leads’ (Dewey, 1933:9, cited in Farrell, 2007:9). As I understand it, Dewey saw reflection as a meaning making process in an emotionally charged situation. For instance, when an individual has emotions such as surprise, frustration, uncertainty, etc. Dewey (1938:42) called them the ‘internal conditions’ of ‘an experience’. Moreover, I understand Dewey as suggesting that that even if we do not fully understand our motives, and probably do not fully understand our goals as well, our emotions act as signals to engage in a deliberate, forceful cognitive ‘consideration’ of the situation where the emotions emerged. An emotionally coloured incident, noticed and reflected upon, enables the individual understand more deeply their various experiences and the relationships between them.

Dewey’s theoretical assertion, to use emotions as signals for reflection, seems plausible. However, as I pointed out in the introduction to the thesis, there are contexts where reflective practice has not been successfully used yet. My experience of working in a teacher training capacity (see the introduction to the thesis and above in this section) confirms the observation that a number of Teacher Development projects run in Russia, which had reflection at their core, were not as successful as they could have been (West & Frumina, 2012:21; Scholey, n.d.). Similar observations were made in Kazakhstan (a post-Soviet country), as part of a project run by the University of Cambridge (Bridges, 2014). Poor use of reflective practice is probably deeply rooted in the Russian educational culture. It might be a consequence of the one-size-fits-all methodology of Soviet times, and the influence of teachers’ ‘apprenticeship of observation’ (Lortie, 1975) from their school days. While this is beyond the scope in this study, in the future I might wish to investigate why reflective practice still cannot gain popularity in Russia.

Another of Dewey’s ideas, which can be taken as a rough approximation of perezhivanie, was that reflection allowed to teachers to re-establish their emotional equilibrium (Dewey, 2004, cited in Tripp, 1993). As every experienced teacher knows, to establish one’s emotional stability in the classroom is very important in order to deal with the challenges of
teaching and learning. The same is true for their students. Emotional stability is a prerequisite for learners to construct new schema (Piaget, 1967). However, in a transition from old to new experiences, people experience various intellectual and emotional disequilibrums. To re-establish an emotional equilibrium, Dewey suggested reflective practice as a cognitive means to process emotions, i.e. to do ‘emotional labour’ towards stability. He proposed a set of reflective procedures, which, unfortunately, he did not specify in much detail. However, Mezirow (1981, 1995) and Boud et al. (1985b) have developed Dewey’s approach and enriched it with a practical framework (see section 4.3). Unlike Vygotsky, however, these scholars see emotions as obstacles for development, which, as such, should be suppressed.

In a sense, Schön (1983; 1992) got the closest to the notion of perezhivanie with his reflective practice. Inspired by Dewey’s ideas, he introduced reflective framings as a basis of ‘professional artistry’. Schön designed methods to generate pragmatic professional knowledge in an attempt to add more credibility to the ‘soft’ professions of doctor, teacher, and architect. These professions did not have much credibility in the modernist society of the 60 and 70s in the USA. In the early chapters of his prominent book ‘The Reflective Practitioner’, Schön (1992:125) suggests that reflecting-in-action is ‘an ephemeral episode of inquiry that arises momentarily in the midst of a flow of action and then disappears, giving way to some new event, leaving in its wake, perhaps, a more stable view of the situation’. However, Schön also allows for less spontaneous and more critical, but still cognitive, reflecting-in-action (Anderson, 2019). Just as Dewey, Schön’s (1983:68) positions emotions as markers of uncertainty:

The practitioner allows himself to experience surprise, puzzlement, or confusion in a situation, which he finds uncertain or unique. He reflects on the phenomenon before him, and on the prior understandings, which have been implicit in his behaviour. He carries out an experiment, which serves to generate both a new understanding of the phenomenon and a change in the situation.
Here, I understand Schön’s (1983) ‘experiment’ as a new practice, which requires special settings and frames, such as e.g. a set of questions. Another parallel between reflective practice and perezhivanie is the multilevel nature of both. Specifically, Schön’s ‘reflecting-in-practice’ suggests longer lasting timeframes where reflection can make a difference to action (1983: 59ff). Moreover, Schön’s ‘reflective conversation with the situation’ (Schön, 1992: 123) is much broader than his reflecting-in-action, which is in response to ‘aha’ moments. The former considers not only situational problems, but encompasses a much wider, a transactional perspective, as Schön (1992:125) calls it, referring to Dewey.

Having said that, I need to emphasise a possible difference between reflection in Schön’s work and perezhivanie. From his perspective, reflecting appears to be a cognitive, rational process. Although Schön talks about an emotional sphere, e.g. in ‘experience of surprise’ (Schön, 1992:126), he mostly says that we are able to reflect on something if it becomes conscious. In ‘The Reflective Practitioner’ (1983), Schön refers to this ‘something conscious’ as an ‘aha’ moment. However, the teacher’s motives might not be fully sensed if they belong to the subconscious sphere (see sections 2.2 and 2.3), and, therefore, reflection does not reach them, whereas perezhivanie may do. This may be the biggest contribution perezhivanie may make in relation to teacher development, as compared to reflection, because sustainable change in thought and action, which development implies, tends to be accompanied by a process of revising and restructuring of motives, partially subconscious. Thus, perezhivanie is likely to assist the teacher to reach this profound internal change, to overcome dissonance and perform a new activity differently, and perhaps more successfully than reflection might do, for the reasons I pointed out above.

Meanwhile, a number of scholars have found that uncertainties, dissatisfactions, and discrepancies do play an important role in reflection. Atkins and Murphy (1993) call a reflective stance as ‘an awareness of uncomfortable feelings and thoughts’ (1993:1189), Boud and Fales (1983:106) define these emotions as ‘a sense of inner discomfort’, and
Mezirow (1981:7) views them as ‘disorienting dilemmas’. These other scholars raise questions about a role of emotions in reflective practice, and in the next section I discuss this in more detail.

4.3 Dealing with emotions in reflective practice

As was mentioned in the previous section, some parts of the literature on reflection pays attention to emotions. In this section, I discuss why these studies, while addressing emotions, treat them differently, and, therefore, might fall short of providing solutions in critical incidents. Then, I make a comparison with perezhivanie, so to show the role of emotions there, and this way bring more detail to the key concepts used by my study, before I unite them in the final conceptual framework in the next section.

While a considerable amount of literature has argued for a dominant role of cognition in reflective practice (see section 2.4.3), emotions have been neither completely ignored nor viewed as fully separate from the conscious processes. Magda Arnold (1960), researching how people respond to a stressful situation, positions their evaluation of the situation as an emotional and mostly intuitive reaction, and distinguishes it from thinking and reflection. While calling it ‘cognitive evaluation’, she almost certainly demonstrates a special case of perezhivanie, similar to how I positioned it in the discussion of how teachers react to critical incidents (sections 2.1).

Then, Lazarus (1984:25), drawing on Arnold’s (1960) ideas, suggests a coping strategy, which he calls ‘3-step Cognitive Appraisal’ (1984:31). His 3-step strategy (primary, secondary, re-appraisal) might be viewed as facets of perezhivanie in Vasilyuk’s (1991) terms. In a sense, Lazarus’s strategy can be compared to the process of restructuring teachers’ motives in a critical incident. However, Lazarus’s (1984) Cognitive Appraisal and Arnold’s (1960) cognitive evaluation are somewhat different from perezhivanie. Lazarus’s and Arnold’s concepts imply that cognitive factors precede emotional reactions, then determine and regulate the
emergence and appearance of emotions. In contrast to this view on reflection, in perezhivanie emotional, cognitive, and contextual factors are intertwined dialectically (see Chapter 3).

Another strand of studies on reflection that take into account emotional factors is represented by the work of Mezirow (1981, 1995) and Boud et al. (1985a, 1985b). As Dewey's followers, they added emotions to reflection, but in a different way than Lazarus and Arnold did. Mezirow (1995) and Boud (1985b) prompted people to surface emotions through their stories; e.g. by talking about their past. These researchers tried to identify emotional blocks so that the person could bracket them; i.e. to block emerging emotions by a number of coping strategies. Their framework of reflective practice was to focus on an emotion, and then to put it to one side, believing that the emotion may obstruct reflection.

More specifically, Boud et al. (1985b) suggested a three-stage model with the intermediate stage aiming at ‘discharging’ negative emotions. The third stage in Boud’s et al. (ibid) model consisted of four sub-stages, which were purely cognitive. Mezirow used the term ‘blockage’ to recognise the emotional. Once it was recognised that the blockage was there, the person should reflect on the emotion that had created the block. For this process Mezirow (1995) constructed a framework, which comprised ten stages of transformative learning. The framework considers the emotional dimensions to what is happening in each stage, but with a particular focus on emotions in stages two through four:

1. A disorienting dilemma;
2. Self-examination with feelings of guilt or shame;
3. A critical assessment of assumptions;
4. Recognition that one’s discontent and process of transformation are shared, and that others have negotiated a similar change;
5. Exploration of options for new roles, relationships, and actions;
6. Planning of a course of action;
7. Acquisition of knowledge and skills for implementing one’s plans;
8. Provisionally trying out new roles;
9. Building of competence and self-confidence in new roles and relationships;
10. A reintegration into one’s life on the basis of conditions dictated by one’s new perspective. (Mezirow, 1995:50)

Somewhat similar to Mezirow’s and Boud’s suggestions, in perezhivanie emotions work along with cognition. However, Mezirow and Boud et al. seem to appeal mostly to the conscious level. Even if teachers are able to reflect on a complexity, they are not always aware of their motives, which cannot be realised due to the complexity. If teachers do not understand their motives, they are not able to restructure them in a critical incident. With technology integration, they do not always have past experience they can rely on, and there may be not familiar repertoire for them to resolve the issues that have emerged in the incident. Even when being motivated to improve the situation, a teacher cannot consciously access subconscious processes.

Emotions are likely to be partially subconscious (see Chapter 2), and in his notebooks (Zavershneva & Van Der, 2017) Vygotsky suggested that perezhivanie acts as a ‘bridge’ between consciousness and the subconscious, so to establish emotional equilibrium. Instead, I would offer a more dynamic metaphor, which develops Vygotsky’s suggestion. A more dynamic metaphor may be ‘crossing the bridge’, because perezhivanie is a process, a dynamic and dialectical process of working out emotions that have emerged and tackling a complexity. Prompted by perezhivanie, irreducible by its nature (see Chapter 3), a teacher might think over an issue, and come to terms with emotions caused by a critical incident. Influenced by their perezhivanie, the teacher may understand better the causes of the incident, such as complexities, motives and other relevant factors in the ‘small culture’ (Holliday, 1999) of their work. As a probable result, their frustration, anger, fear, guilt, embarrassment etc., may then disappear during this sense-making process.

To recap, as compared to reflection, emotions play a different role in perezhivanie. This difference may be evident, also, in the difference between propositional and narrative thinking, which I address in Chapter 5. Reflection appears to rely on propositional thinking
as a forceful act, whereas perezhivanie may be linked to more of a narrative way of thinking. Before proceeding to discuss these two modes of thought, and their role in my thesis, in the final section of this chapter I present my conceptual framework.

4.4 Summary of the conceptual framework

As was stated earlier, one objective of this thesis is to help people who are not from the Russian context to understand the notion of perezhivanie, so that they can work with it in the teacher development field. I demonstrate in the thesis how perezhivanie can be identified, and then analysed it in its various forms. To reach this objective, in Chapters 1 and 2 I conceptualised the notions of complexities, critical incidents and motives so to define perezhivanie through them. In this section, I finalise and outline my conceptual framework, which was developed gradually, starting from section 2.2, see Figure 2.

Figure 6 summarises the four previous figures, graphically representing a dynamic process of teachers’ sense-making while they go through the crisis of a critical incident. It is worth noting here that all the stages displayed in Figure 6 are not externally related in a cause-and-effect form. I understand them as intertwined in an inner dialectical relationship, and use this linear framework for analytical purposes only. I assume that a teachers’ response to complexities may be less linear and more iterative, diffracted, and multi-dimensional; I use this 2-dimensional linear diagram for clarity. Perezhivanie is marked in grey in the figure, and comprises the four intermediate blocks.

![Figure 6. My conceptual framework, where perezhivanie is marked in grey](image-url)
When, working in the technologically enhanced context, a teacher faces a contextual complexity, her motives are likely not to get realised because of some obstacles in the context. There is a strong possibility that this situation will evoke a spontaneous emotional burst and then, if the teacher starts thinking about it, perezhivanie. Perezhivanie has two immanent components: its form, and its content. Its form can be revealed in the teachers’ uncontrolled emotional reaction. However, if the teacher manages to suppress it quickly, the form of perezhivanie can be revealed by its cognitive component as well, e.g. when the teachers reflect on a complexity that has emerged. Such a reflection might provide the content of perezhivanie.

A probable explanation of why perezhivanie is almost certainly on, or present, in a critical incident is that the unrealised motive, as any motives according to Leontiev (Леонтьев, 1971), are present in consciousness as emotions, which are a part of the perezhivanie. It seems possible that due to this presence perezhivanie might have a generic power for teachers to solve problems. With reference to section 2.3, consciousness has a restricted capacity (James, 1913), and as such, it is able to attend to only those tasks that are ‘active’. Perezhivanie, therefore, is likely to keep an issue a teacher has faced in some type of ‘active’ state. An ‘active’ state of an unrealised motive probably makes the teacher’s mind work on how to resolve the complexity, which triggered the crisis. Thinking it over, the teacher might make new sense from the situation, which in turn may assist the teacher to revise and restructure their motives, and to realise them in a new activity that follows.

Without doubt, some motives may not be realised, and may get hidden from observation in the subconscious and form ‘blocks’ there, as Freud (2005) suggests. As a result, teachers are sometimes not fully aware of their motives, and are not able to restructure them. There is a chance that perezhivanie might be central for these ‘hidden’ motives, to bring them back to teachers’ mind for consideration and restructuring, and, as I suggested above, it could give new meaning to teachers’ practice.
Summary

This section finishes the literature review of the thesis, which main aim was to develop my conceptual framework. It is built from a whole range of blocks (see Figure 6), which I introduced gradually in the three chapters of the literature review. I first presented critical incidents, motives, emotions, and perezhivanie as the key concepts of my study. Alongside my development of how I see perezhivanie in the study, I discussed its similarities with reflective practice as well as how perezhivanie differs from reflection. Following this, I finally demonstrated and explained the conceptual framework.

While this upfront conceptualisation may leave the impression that this is what I look for in the data, it is in fact a very broad and open conceptualisation. The reader may view the conceptual framework is a broad perspective with which I am going to approach the data. The conceptualisation enables me to demonstrate how perezhivanie could be identified, and then used as a developmental tool, which I do in Chapters 8 and 9 respectively. The conceptual framework assists me to reveal some nuances of perezhivanie in the teachers’ stories, and in Chapters 8 and 9 I arrive very close to what perezhivanie means, because the teachers’ accounts of their engagement with technology were, in fact, stories of their perezhivanie. Before demonstrating my data analysis and interpretation, however, it is necessary to describe my methodological tools in the next chapter, as well as the broader methodological considerations of the study.
Chapter 5: Methodology

In this chapter I provide an overview and rational for my research methodology, including specific research tools. The research methodology was designed to respond to the following two research questions.

RQ1: What complexities do teachers identify when trying to integrate technology in an institution of tertiary education in Russia?
RQ2: What is the teachers’ perezhivanie about complexities?

As I pointed out earlier, to reveal perezhivanie is an epistemological challenge, and this is reflected in the literature (Vasilyuk, 1991:77). Contrasting perezhivanie with another unity, the notion of sense (see it also in Chapters 2 and 3), I can clearly see that there are challenges with perezhivanie in terms of its analysis and classification. In case of analysing sense, we have an objective element, the sign or the word, whereas in case of perezhivanie we do not have access to any objective form(s). It means that the totality of teaching experience is not directly accessible to me. What is more, my access to perezhivanie is restricted to only that perezhivanie which appears in teachers’ consciousness during our dialogues. This restriction might cause problems, because I may lose some perezhivanie that does not appear in the teachers’ consciousness, and hence is inaccessible through my dialogues with the teachers. In addition, I can get a distorted view of the participants’ perezhivanie because it is twice a subject of rationalisation; first by the teachers’ account shared with me, and second by my interpretation.

This chapter deals with these challenges by taking into account various factors, which include my role of as a researcher, the participants in the study, the context, where the research was conducted, and research design considerations. This chapter is divided into seven sections and organised as follows. It begins with my methodological orientation in section one, and in section two I explain how I understand narrative in my study. Then, I go
on to explain my research design in section three, situate the study in relation to time and place, and provide a rationale behind my choice of two interviews with each participant as my data generation tool. In section four, I explain criteria and procedures adopted for the participant recruitment, provide detailed information on my ethical considerations, and give a brief account on the initial contact with the participants, introducing the fieldwork this way. After that, I describe the fieldwork and supplement the section by accounts of the actual meetings with the participants, at a sufficient level of detail for the reader to get sense of how the data generation was conducted. In two final sections I explain how I managed the data, and how my stance as a researcher encouraged me to work multilingually across Russian, transliterated Russian, and English translation, and provide an explicit display of multilingual research practice.

5.1 Methodological orientation
This section presents my methodological orientation to address my research questions. Since perezhivanie is subjective, complexities are subjective as well, as part of the unity of perezhivanie. They both are realities of teachers’ activity, and to study them I needed a dialectical approach. To approach a teacher’s experience holistically within the qualitative domain, I looked for a person-centred methodology, where the teachers’ voice, describing various teaching realities, would be heard (Greene, 1991), and I present my thinking about such an approach in this section.

The context of the technologically enhanced university language classroom seems conducive to get access to teachers’ perezhivanie. This context is changing and challenging for teachers, because not many of them have used technology for teaching before and, therefore, experience lots of critical incidents (see section 2.1). Critical incidents, as stated in the literature, ‘can reveal some of the underlying principles, beliefs, and assumptions that shape classroom practices’ (Tripp, 1993:266 cited in Richards & Farrell, 2005:118). However, an observation of classroom incidents would be insufficient for the purpose of my research,
as it would not make teachers’ implicit belief systems explicit and would struggle to uncover specific emotions (however well-established the classroom observation methodology would be). Swain, for instance, makes a list of possible emotions teachers might experience in the classroom, including ‘enjoyment, relief, happiness, excitement, envy, admiration, hope, surprise, pride, gratitude, jealousy, love, hate, guilt, disgust, shame and boredom’ (Swain, 2013:203). I needed a methodology that represented this domain because by getting access to the teachers’ emotions, and analysing them in relation to teachers’ attitudes and beliefs, I would be able to understand teachers’ perezhivanie and complexities (see my conceptual framework in section 4.5).

After extensive reading on approaches, I turned to narrative research (Johnson & Golombek, 2002) as appropriate for my study. There are several advantages of this type of research, which helped me fulfil the aim of the study, and I address them in detail in section 5.2. The crucial one was that narrative can provide a coherent form of data (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000:32). In relation to my study, by narrating, in order to put their messages across, the participants had to organise various ideas into a coherent story. By doing so they potentially could make sense of the critical incident they narrated. This sense-making might encourage the participants to generate rich data on complexities and perezhivanie.

Having decided on a narrative orientation, I then faced a dilemma of whether to use a ‘formative interventions’ method (Engeström et al., 2014), or, alternatively, to conduct open ended interviews with teachers using technology in their practice without any interventions. The first option implied running a short term in-service training course on technology integration, and interviewing the teachers so engaged, which would allow me to observe the teachers implementing the technology introduced. The teachers would have to make changes in their practice, and potentially could experience perezhivanie about various complexities involved. I could surface their perezhivanie during our interviews about their newly obtained experience. Using the second option I would get data on much broader
teaching experiences than the first one, but there was a possibility that by asking the teachers about integrating technology in general, it would be harder to understand what constitutes their teaching realities, perezhivanie and related complexities.

Neither of the two options guaranteed that I would get sufficient data on perezhivanie. Perezhivanie is not automatically triggered if people are asked to talk about their experience and issues they face. Both options have been previously used to account for teachers’ experience, and there is some research done in this area. The ‘formative interventions’ method is supposed to be based on the expansive learning cycle (Engeström et al., 1996:4). If I used this method, I would interview the participants before the interventions about their experience with technology, then intervene with a short-term in-service teacher training course on integrating technology, which supposedly should trigger their perezhivanie. After the course, I would interview the same teachers again, and ‘measure’ the differences in their experience, so to estimate the impact of the intervention. The problematic aspect of this method is that it requires teachers’ willingness not only to participate in at least two interviews, but also to invest time into the training. If they cannot find extra time in their busy lives for either of these two engagements, this becomes an insurmountable barrier to recruit participants for my research. In addition, the training could work as a restriction to extensive data collection, because the teachers would likely be more focused on the issues that emerged in the training, rather than on their wider experience (see section 5.5.1 for more discussion).

I, therefore, chose the second option and enquired into teachers’ experience by talking to them about their professional ups and downs when integrating technology in their actual practice. However, as I mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, this meant that my access to teachers’ experience was restricted to what appeared in their consciousness post factum in our dialogues after this experience. This might miss some aspects of complexities and perezhivanie, because they did not appear in their consciousness at the time of their
choosing of what to share, and, as a result, in the data. Their experience might also be subject to rationalisation by themselves, and then again by me as a researcher of this experience. For the teacher, a part of this rationalisation would take place in the dialogue with me, and thus would also be subject to the distortions of co-creation. To that end, it could give a distorted view on the teachers’ experience. The issue of distortions is, perhaps, inevitable in any successful operationalisation of perezhivanie, and I do not consider it as a limitation of my study, but have to take into account this restriction.

To partially compensate for this, I rely on the nature of narrative research, ‘which allows for or encourages the projection of human attitudes [teachers in my case] upon this material’ (Scholes, 1980:210). The generative nature of narrative to link everything in the story into a coherent whole assisted me to find relationships between ‘forgotten’ aspects of teachers’ perezhivanie and their emotions, motives, attitudes, beliefs, and activity shared with me. Thus, I tried to reconstruct some missing parts of the teachers’ perezhivanie. This is also the reason why I call this stage of research data ‘generation’ rather than data ‘collection’. In the section that follows, I position my narrative orientation in more detail, and discuss how it helped me respond to my RQs.

5.2 Understanding narrative in my study

Before proceeding to explain my research design, in this section I define narrative in my study, and discuss how narrative helps me answer my research questions. People lead ‘storied lives’ (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990: 2), and their narratives ‘constitute the psychological and cultural reality in which the participants in history actually live’ (Bruner, 1986:43). Teachers’ narratives, therefore, were a source for me to get a sense of complexities of their job and related perezhivanie. In the following paragraphs, I address four features of narrative methodology, highlighted in Johnson and Golombek (2002), which are important for my study. These features are that narrative has a chronological structure, it is meaningful, it is socially mediated, and it captures emotions.
First, narrative is chronological in the sense that it is ‘a movement from a start point to an end point, with digressions, which involves the showing or the telling of story events. Narrative is a representation of events and, chiefly, re-presents space and time’ (Cobley, 2001:236-37). The chronological feature of narrative is important for my research because it enables me to reveal the possibly dynamic nature of complexities and perezhivanie. Mishler, however, warns that not every temporally ordered account is a narrative. For instance manuals, while being sequential, do not convey 'a relation ... beyond temporal order: for example such as causality, implicativeness, or thematic coherence’ (Mishler, 1995:91). In the interviews I, therefore, tried to guide our discussions to more narrative accounts, rather than trying to elicit details, when the teachers told me how to use this or that technology, of showed how the particular technology might work.

Second, narrative is a way of imposing meanings on experience. I think of narrative as a process of sense-making of past experiences (Wells, 2011), and as ‘the primary form by which human experience is made meaningful ... it organises human experiences into temporally meaningful episodes’ (Polkinghorne, 1988:1). Echoing Polkinghorne, Feldman et al. (2004:148) suggest that ‘narratives are useful data because individuals often make sense of the world and their place in it through narrative form. Through telling their stories, people distil and reflect a particular understanding of social and political relations’. My research is interested in these relations, between teachers’ motives, perezhivanie, and complexities as reflected in my conceptual framework (see Figure 6). The telling of stories ‘can enable teachers to gain increasing control over their thinking, feelings, and actions’ (Johnson & Golombek, 2016:14). Teachers compose a narrative, using a number of cognitive actions (Bruner, 1991; Holstein & Gubrim, 2000; Elliott, 2005; Hollway & Jefferson, 2000; Riessman, 2008). For example, Hollway and Jefferson (2000:33) suggest that ‘thinking, perception, imagination and moral decision-making are based on narrative structure’. There is a possibility that while narrating, teachers might choose various accounts of practice, available in their memory, and craft them together into a meaningful sequence of events by
reflection, selection, organisation, rationalisation, exaggeration, and interpretation. This is a probable explanation of how researchers can understand the way a teacher makes sense of their world, i.e. through the narratives available to them.

Third, with regard to narrative as socially mediated experience, ‘narratives are a natural part of teachers’ talk’ (Cortazzi, 1991:9), which is always social. A considerable amount of literature views narrative as a socially mediated experience (Polkinghorne, 1988:1; Lieblich et al., 1998:8; Hollway & Jefferson, 2000:31-32; Holstein & Gubrium, 2000:104; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000:21; Johnson & Golombek, 2002:5; Bruner, 2004:14). Constructing a story, teachers employ a number of socio-historical and socio-cultural aspects (Gee, 1985), rather than simply reflect a pre-existing reality. These aspects might include participants’ past and recent experience, classroom setting where the meetings took place, and the interviewer as a listener. These aspects influence the flow of the dialogue, as well as the narrator in terms of how to present and what to include in the narration (Cortazzi, 1991:13). Bruner emphasises that narrators are guided by ‘culturally shaped cognitive and linguistic processes’ (2004:694). In my research, in order to be understood, my participants shaped their stories according to particular cultural conventions, and I could understand these conventions because the participants and I are immersed in the same large culture – the Russian higher education context – and often also the same workplace ‘small cultures’ (Holliday, 1999). We share similar working experiences, and I genuinely cared about the complexities they had to deal with, because I could envision them in my own practice as well. I was emotionally invested and empathised with the participants during our meetings, and this mutual understanding and my active listening helped create a narrative impetus for the participants to share their experience with me as a colleague.

Finally, through the act of storytelling teachers get the necessary space to express their emotions (Nelson, 2011). Nelson (2011:472) states that in telling stories and ‘reflecting on the moments of emotional dissonance, teachers are often better able to identify moments
of cognitive dissonance and, as a result, to consider how their emotions, beliefs and teaching practices are likely to affect their students’ learning’. Here Nelson links emotional and cognitive engagement, and I understand it as perezhivanie. Johnson and Golombek (2002:5) add that ‘teachers’ narratives embody emotions such as frustration, fear, anger, and joy, and they center on the caring emotions and actions of trust, dialogue, feelings’. By conducting a narrative study, therefore, a researcher is able to surface emotions in teachers’ accounts (Verity, 2000; Johnson & Golombek, 2002:110; Mann & Walsh, 2013:304 ff.; Golombek & Doran, 2014; Farr & Riordan, 2015). ‘It is in narratives – anecdotes and stories of learners’ experiences – that the centrality of emotion and its connections to cognition becomes evident’ (Swain, 2013:196), and I understand this connection of cognitive and emotional factors as perezhivanie.

Before proceeding to describe my data generation tool in the next section, a note on terminology. Some narrative researchers, e.g. Riessman (2008), distinguishes ‘story’ from the other types of narratives, emphasising that the plots of stories always contain disturbance and unexpectedness which inevitably results in certain actions that are not evident in other types of narratives. However, I do not focus on the ‘tragicality’ of the events narrated. In fact, I use the terms storytelling, stories, and storytellers interchangeably and synonymously with narration, narratives, and narrators respectively. I assume that both narration and storytelling are driven by a ‘narrative necessity’ (Bruner, 1991:9). It is important to note, here, that what I call narrative sometimes took the form of a reflective account in the data, rather than a coherent story. In section 6.1.1 I explain the nature of my data in detail.

5.3 Designing my data generation tool

Turning now to the rationale for my choice of an interview design, it is worth noting that the piloting, conducted with my friend, a very experienced teacher of English, eliminated the concerns I reviewed in section 5.1, regarding an open ended interview as a means to reveal
complexities and perezhivanie. Driven by a ‘narrative necessity’ (Bruner, 1991:9), my pilot participant told me several stories about implementing technology, and in doing so she constantly made sense of her past and present experience, as well as interpreting and reinterpreting these experiences. The piloting gave me an opportunity to explore this teacher’s thinking and responses to specific social, cultural and historical circumstances of integrating technology. I also observed how narrative worked as a means of teacher development for her, which is an idea that is also supported by the literature (e.g. in Lyons & LaBoskey, 2002; Johnson & Golombek, 2002). The piloting experience was the first time I did this type of interview, but it boosted my confidence. I realised that narrative interviews can potentially produce data that would enable me to address my RQs. In this section, I explain how, informed by my piloting experience, I designed my data generation tool and why I did the fieldwork in two universities.

5.3.1 Interview design: duration, procedure
I was considering a number of encounters with each participant, and this shaped how I got to grips with the literature on the interview procedures. Seidman (2006:16) recommends conducting a series of three interviews, with different focus each time. His argument is to devote the first meeting to the life history (ibid:17), the second one to the details of the experience (ibid:18), and the third meeting to reflection and meaning-making, where ‘we focus on that question in the context of the two previous interviews’ (ibid:19). In line with Seidman, Clandinin & Huber (2010:12) suggests that

the dialogue with participants around interim research texts can lead the inquirer back for more intensive work with the participant if further field texts are needed in order to compose a more complex account of the participants’ experiences.

It was almost certain that a single interview with each participant was not enough, because people do not tend to talk about their emotions, beliefs and attitudes to a stranger. A likely explanation for why my piloting was successful was that I was, and am, good friends with my pilot interviewee. Therefore, I needed to establish a good rapport and trust with my
participants first (see section 5.4.4 on how I did this), and I decided to include a second set of meetings, so that there would be an opportunity to establish good rapport across the meetings. What is more, the awareness of the participants’ experience, gained from the first meeting, allowed me to design much more detailed prompts for the second meeting than for the first one (see section 5.5), and they brought more nuances of the participants’ inner life to the surface.

Conducting more than two interviews seemed too much. I did not expect the participants to speak for 90 minutes, as Seidman (2006) advises, on their history of engagement with technology, since technology integration was a relatively new experience for them. I, therefore, altered Seidman’s structure and combined aims and agendas of the first and second encounters in Seidman’s interpretation into one; i.e. the first meeting. Teachers’ responses to their initial stories, narrated with some ‘new language’, served the purpose of the second meeting in Seidman’s (ibid) three-interview series.

These two interviews with each participant achieved different aims and objectives. Our first meeting was aimed at establishing a good rapport and the foundation for our dialogues around topics chosen by the teachers. Then, I decided to send the participants a prompt for the second meeting two days prior to it. The prompt contained my interpretation of their perezhivanie, shared in the first meeting, and I asked the participants to respond, in the second meeting, whether I had got their perezhivanie right. The second meeting, therefore, enabled them to reflect on my interpretation, and potentially enrich the data with more detail. This way I brought meanings to the follow-up meeting (Given, 2008:77), and provided space for the participants to remember and reconstruct some ‘subconscious’ parts of perezhivanie and emotions (see Chapter 2 for the theoretical consideration of this idea).

Regarding the delay between meetings, Seidman (2006) advises it to be from three days to a week. He warns that the participant might lose a connection with the preceding interview if
the time slot between the interviews increases. In my research, this meant that I had to do both interviews, with ten participants, in two weeks. This short time period did not seem feasible, because I needed time to listen and analyse the first meetings (see section 6.2 how I did this), and design prompts based on this analysis. I decided to postpone the second meetings, and to minimise the ‘connection lost’ effect (ibid) by sending the transcript of the previous interview to the participants prior to the second meeting. This delay had some benefits though. As teachers’ utterances are never really finished (Bakhtin, 1981:7), I anticipated more teachers’ sense-making, and, therefore, richer data in the subsequent meeting. That is, the extended period between meetings allowed time for their ‘transformative’ thinking. I held the first set of interviews in late December 2016 and January 2017, and the second set of interviews were conducted in May 2017 and June 2017. The distribution in time over the course of approximately five months allowed me to communicate with my participants informally from time to time, to establish a good rapport, and hence to engage as deeply with the teachers as possible within a study of this size and scope.

My other alterations to Seidman’s structure concerned the duration of each interview. As pointed out above, Seidman (2006) suggests 90 minutes for each meeting, but I decided to add flexibility, so not to overload the teachers with our emotional talks. I scheduled two 60-minute interviews with each participant, but allowed more time if necessary.

As for the types of prompts, I found Seidman’s (ibid:85) two basic ideas for creating open-ended questions a good match with the principles of my study. The first one is to ask a participant to ‘reconstruct ... [part] of an experience’, which is narrative in nature, and the second one is to ask the participant to ‘focus more on the subjective experience’ (ibid:85). Following Seidman (ibid), I started with general prompts (see section 5.5.1), and then asked some follow-up questions. To recap, two close, detailed, and tailored interviews with each
participant enabled me to produce very sensitive data (see section 6.1.1). The interview procedures are outlined in Appendices 3 and 5, respectively.

5.3.2 Interview design: place

With regard to location, all of the interviews were held at the participants’ respective universities, because this was the most convenient location for them. Both the National University of Science and Technology (MISIS hereafter) and the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE hereafter) are located in the centre of Moscow.

The two universities were chosen on the basis of their technology provision, LMS configuration and institutional culture. I also took into account the effectiveness of the initial communication; that is, how promptly the management of the university responded to my enquiries and offers. MISIS and HSE have leading positions in integrating technology for language teaching in Russia. HSE introduced their institutional VLE in 2010, but teachers decide for themselves whether to use it or not. Whereas in MISIS it was obligatory for all the teachers to create a blended learning environment. MISIS adopted the TouchStone CUP platform for language learning in 2011.

Initially, due to the time constrains, I had planned to collect the data in one university only - HSE - which I had chosen using the above criteria. Before that, I had contacted five leading Moscow universities where I have professional as well as personal ties, to identify possible research venues. This included MISIS, the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (RANEPA), Moscow State University of Printing Arts (MGUP), National Research Nuclear University (MEPhI) and HSE. As an outcome of our initial communication, the HSE Director of Online Studies provided me with a confirmation letter (see Appendix 10), and e-mails of 41 potential participants for my study, who I was going to contact once ethical approval had been obtained from the University of Manchester.
My ethical approval application form for the University of Manchester Research Ethics Committee (UREC) was submitted three days after the formal progress meeting, called the Annual Review, with my Independent Reviewer. He gave me the ‘green light’ to start the fieldwork. This happened in the middle of September, 2016, but I only got the Ethical Approval a week before Christmas, when my prospective participants, state university teachers, were busy finishing the term and were going on winter holidays, which traditionally last in Russia until the middle of January. Teachers normally do not go to the university until the new term starts in February. Early February, as the beginning of any term, is usually a hectic time in universities, when teachers are normally very busy with their new schedules, new courses, and new groups. Due to this reason, I was very worried that I would not get responses to the invitational e-mail at all, and, therefore, would not be able to generate the best data possible. I decided to play it safe, and recommence the contact with another university, MISIS, which was on my initial list of potential universities. To my pleasure, the head of the MISIS ELT department was very supportive and helped me pass though the bureaucratic procedures, needed to contact MISIS teachers, very fast.

As a result, I started data collection in late December 2016 with 47 potential participants from two universities, and looked forward to meeting them. I was excited to explore two different contexts where teachers are actively engaged with technology. The following section addresses participant recruitment, and in section 5.5 I describe in detail how my fieldwork went.

5.4 The Participants and Ethics

In this section, I first describe how I recruited teachers for my study, then I briefly provide participant profiles. After that I discuss possible ethical issues, relating to both data generation and analysis. Finally, I explain how I tried to create a good rapport and develop trust with my participants.
5.4.1 Participant recruitment and sample size

On having obtained the ethical approval from the University of Manchester Research Ethics Committee (UREC), I sent a recruitment advertisement to 47 teachers overall. Prior knowledge of the context as an insider helped me design the invitation e-mail as personal and welcoming as possible (see Appendix 1). As a result, I got 14 initial responses; five from MISIS and nine from HSE teachers. To form my participant pool I used Wells’ (2011:19) criteria-based sampling strategy. My criteria were that the teachers should have used technology on the regular basis for at least three years, and have more than five years of teaching experience overall. I chose 10 teachers, because two others were novice teachers with less than three years of teaching experience, and one was not available in January. Finally, these 10 teachers signed the Consent Form and Participant Information Sheet (see Appendix 2), which was a part of the recruitment process (see section 5.4.3 for more on the ethical procedures).

Having a relatively small sample size for a narrative study is supported by the literature (Goodson & Sikes, 2001:22; Wells, 2011:20). Challenges to estimate adequate sample size (Blaikie, 2000) are related to a number of factors, such as time and resources available, and intensity of analysis. It was a question of manageability as well, as I needed to transcribe the interviews entirely, and to keep as much of the richness of the narrations in the transcriptions, which were done in the restricted period between the interviews.

I decided to start with 10 participants, because there was a possibility that people could withdraw for some reason. For example, it could happen due to the time constrains. My research was not naturalistic, because I took the teachers out of their normal university classroom teaching, and participating in the study was an additional task to their normal life, and the teachers had to allocate separate time for it. Another reason for participant withdrawal could be a nature of my prompts. They encouraged the teachers to share their troubles, which could be associated with less than positive feelings, or, at least, were almost
always emotional. It could be that some teachers, for example more introvert individuals, would be reluctant to reveal this ‘emotional’ part of their professional life. I discuss this in more detail in the discussion of ethics in section 5.4.3.

5.4.2 Participants’ profile

This section briefly presents the participants’ profiles, background information on the participants, and a brief description of their working history. More detailed profiles of three teachers Anna, Nuala, and Eva, selected for the final analysis (see the process of selection in section 7.4), are provided in Chapter 8.

Table 1: Background Information on the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, Uni</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Experience using technology for TEFL</th>
<th>Work history</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna, MISIS</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>for 5 years as a student; for 7 years as a teacher</td>
<td>First worked as a private language teacher and started using technology there, has the CELTA, and was doing the DELTA (both are Cambridge certificates).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuala, MISIS</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>for 10 years in the department</td>
<td>first worked as a teacher of Russian as a foreign language, now works as coordinator in the ELT program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olesia, MISIS</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>for 10 years in the department</td>
<td>her first university degree was an engineer, than she worked as a researcher of the Academy of Science, has lots of hobbies apart from teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmy, MISIS</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>for 5 years, uses social media a lot</td>
<td>a former system administrator, has the CELTA, uses social media for teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odina, MISIS</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>for 9 years in the department</td>
<td>has the CELTA, created lots of activities with technologies, uses social media for teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva, HSE</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>for 7 years in the department</td>
<td>got a university grant on using technology for ELT, tried to organise a technology training in her university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane, HSE</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>for 5 years in the department</td>
<td>volunteered at creating her own Academic Writing course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasha, HSE</td>
<td>30th</td>
<td>for 6 years in the department</td>
<td>has published a book on giving presentations, made a number of multimedia for the book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasha, HSE</td>
<td>late</td>
<td>for 6 years in the department</td>
<td>is writing about technology to complete a ‘candidat’ academic degree in Russia, creates her own online courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that my participants’ teaching experience, and experience with technology, varies dramatically. This varied representation might be a possible explanation of their perceptions and different responses to technology integration, which I explore in Chapters 7 and 8.

5.4.3 Ethical considerations

The aim of my study, introduced in section 1.5, is to understand how my participants deal with the complexities of their teaching job. As was pointed out in Chapter 1, technology integration is indeed a beneficial focus to get such an understanding empirically, because it allows for an exploration of the challenges that may emerge, and where instances of teachers’ perezhivanie are likely. Two interviews with each of the teachers (see 5.3.1) enabled me to generate data on such challenges. Communicating possible cognitive dissonances (see Chapter 2), the participants inevitably stepped into an emotional sphere of their professional life, and it could be perceived as potentially ethically problematic. My ethical procedures sought the teachers’ voluntary participation in the study. To be respectful of those who decided to contribute to my research, I identified possible ethical issues, which could emerge. I needed to minimize them (Zeni, 2001), and this section is devoted to how I did it.

There were both potential challenges and potential strengths in terms of ethics in the study. Choosing narrative and open-ended interview methods, I allowed the participants to speak holistically about their experience. To prepare the teachers for an interview, I carefully informed them beforehand, because they may have expected more of a structured style interview, or a questionnaire. Narrative and open-ended interviews were potentially more ethical than traditional structured interviews, because I did not push the participants to speak on a particular topic, which could turn out to be rather sensitive for the teacher. On
the contrary, in my study it was them who decided whether to touch on any subjective things or not, and it was an opportunity for me as a researcher to explore their choices.

I did not intend for my participants to produce intense emotional engagement when I planned the interviews. However, when they addressed things that were sensitive for them, it triggered various emotions. This is an inevitable part of narrative methodology (Johnson and Golombek, 2002), as discussed it in section 5.2. I thought that not all of them would be happy afterwards. Following the Social Research Association (http://the-sra.org.uk/) codes of practice for research ethics, I included the right to withdraw at any time in the Participant Information Sheet (see Appendix 2). To emphasise this right, I told the participants in advance, i.e. prior to turning on the tape recorder, that if, at any point, they felt that they did not want to share something, or would like to stop, then they could do it immediately without giving any reason. The teachers did become emotional at some points, but did not want to stop the interview. It could be that their emotions helped them articulate the meaning they wanted to convey.

At the second meeting, I asked the participants whether they did not mind if I had used the data in full, or had any comments and objections. All the teachers confirmed that I could use the data from the first interview in the thesis. Regarding the second meeting, we agreed that they would contact me in case they thought they should not have said something they did. Nobody contacted me afterwards with any issues in regards to the second meeting. We have been in touch since then, and met personally on several occasions in conferences.

The conversation often went on after I stopped recording it. The teachers, perhaps driven by ‘narrative necessity’ (Bruner, 1991:9), usually wanted to tell me something important afterwards as well. I appreciated that they did take time to tell their stories, and I could not stop the meeting when I had turned the recording off. I tried to take the time and continued to get engaged with teachers’ stories as an active listener, i.e. in the part, which was not
recorded. I allocated special time for this in the interview agenda (see Appendices 3 and 5) for this wrap up stage.

I guaranteed my participants’ privacy and encouraged them to select a pseudonym in order to maintain their anonymity. Seven teachers agreed on a pseudonym, two said they did not care, and one of the teachers wished to be called by her maiden name. The teachers talked about their experience with the same VLE, and, therefore, the chances for them of being identified are very small. Nevertheless, I assured the participants on several occasions that information disclosed during the interviews would remain confidential. I pointed it out in the Consent Form (see Appendix 2), and confirmed during the meetings that no identifying information would be included in the chunks of data that would be present here in the thesis, and that it would be moderated against any professional repercussions. Thus, I obscured the details in the participants’ narratives that might lead to the identification of the teachers, such as student group numbers and the names of the faculties they worked with. Finally, I kept the recordings of their interviews on my password-protected computer, and do not provide the recordings, assuming that their voice can be recognised, here in the thesis.

Since my participants took time out of their work, we carefully chose a time and place that was convenient to them. As a result, I met with the participants somewhere between their teaching practice and life, in the comfortable ‘thinking’ space of their staffroom or their classroom, where they felt more relaxed to talk about their experience.

I deliberately choose to speak to my participants in Russian. Although they are English teachers, and are able to speak English fluently, from my teacher training experience I know that Russian teachers of English language tend to be very concerned with their own English. Being recorded, they would inevitably have felt embarrassed, and be in fear of ‘losing face’, if they had made any language mistakes speaking English. I did not want them to be limited
by their language resources and feel they lacked the language skills. To that end, I did not want them to struggle to sound correct in English. Instead, I made an effort to relax them and to minimise any possible obstacles, so that they would feel free to share with me the particular experiences that they wanted to share.

The consent form (see Appendix 2) states that their participation is completely voluntary and that they can withdraw anytime without giving a reason if they decide so. I wrote about audio recording my participants in the information sheet and the consent form. The consent form assures them that their data are protected under the UK Data Protection Act 1998 and the University of Manchester Data Protection Policy (2013), and that the data collection and data analysis materials are stored in password protected files in my personal computer.

Looking at my ethical responsibility as a researcher who generates new knowledge, I am convinced that exploring perezhivanie has human, moral and social value. I am passionate about this study, but I do not have blind passion. I would not have conceived of this research just because of my curiosity. I explored perezhivanie with the aim to bring about teacher development, and this is a path that follows Kubanyiova (2008:510) ‘macroethical principle of beneficence’:

> Educational research whose purpose is to promote change in teachers with the aim to improve the conditions for student learning seems to satisfy the fundamental macroethical principle of beneficence.

As explained in the introduction to the study, I noticed the possible power of perezhivanie in the capacity of a teacher trainer, and my enthusiasm to explore its power further was driven by Dadds’ (2004:5) suggestion that:

> We need both head and heart in passionate research and they must be in dialogue with each other: heart helps us to know what matters; head helps us to see, think and feel our way carefully and thoughtfully towards more enlightened action.
Finally, I try to be as transparent and reflexive as possible in how my own existing insider knowledge affected the research, and how the research affected my newly obtained research knowledge. In section 5.7, I address my multilingual stance, and address the importance of reflexivity in multilingual research, highlighted in the literature (e.g. in Temple & Edwards, 2002). Having said that, I take perezhivanie for given and recognise it in the data as a phenomenon. For a Western audience, perezhivanie is not obviously ‘more enlightened action’, because they do not have this phenomenon in their schemata, and readers may therefore have to trust my interpretations and me. Being aware of this, and feeling responsible for this, I did not ask the participants any leading questions, but instead simply offered a space for their stories, and then stepped back. This space allowed for critical incidents to emerge in their narrations, with complexities of integrating technology and related perezhivanie. I got plenty of perezhivanie in the data, and this was telling by itself in terms of the ubiquitous nature of the phenomenon. In addition, I have chosen a deductive approach, so to gain a deeper understanding of it, to enhance the quality of the research, and to strengthen its validity.

5.4.4 Building rapport and developing trust
Before proceeding to describe my fieldwork, I need to address my personal relationship with the participants. In planning any of the encounters, I always tried to build our mutual rapport, because we looked at a complicated area of human feelings, which was impossible without empathy and understanding.

I first met with each participant in late December 2016 or the middle of January 2017. During this ‘Christmas’ time of the year, presents are perceived as quite natural, and I wanted to please the teachers with a box of chocolate, which name tellingly reflected my gratitude to them, ‘Merci’. Presenting the chocolate, I told them how I appreciated the time they devoted to me, and for the interviews. Surprisingly, some of the participants had listened to my talk on technology integration in a conference a month prior to the first
interview, and, on meeting, asked me thoughtful questions about that talk. I tried to answer some of the questions on the spot, and promised to think over and send the sources mentioned in my presentation. In the presentation I had demonstrated the ‘adaptive’ design of my courses in Moodle platform, and happily shared it with the participants interested in it. This informal participation was a part of my rapport-building effort.

Another part of building rapport with the participants was that I started the first meeting with each of the teachers by telling them about my professional life, and the reasons why I decided to undertake this study. I believed that disclosing aspects of my background and experience might strengthen our relationship. While I did not consider offering my narrative as a way to position myself within the data, I think it was a way to view our relationship as multi-directional rather than one-way, where I asked the teachers and they answered my questions.

A more multidirectional relationship was important because the research implied some authoritative, and therefore dominant, position for me as a researcher. Being aware of this, I tried to lessen any signs of inequality. For instance, I deliberately sat at the student’s place in the classroom where the interview took place, and welcomed the participant to sit at their habitual teaching chair. I always told the teachers that I am a colleague, an insider to some degree, rather than an outsider, and by no means an evaluator of their work. I tried to demonstrate my genuine interest in their experience, and several times throughout our meetings attempted to communicate this enthusiasm to them. The narrative format assisted me to maintain a dialogue, where the participant took control of the flow of the meeting, which encouraged a greater equality in the interaction. It allowed the teachers to feel free to follow their own agenda, and simultaneously gave me an opportunity to build on their responses, for example, by asking for clarification (see more of how I did this in section 5.5).
I maintained four principles for building rapport and developing trust with my participants, and the first letters of each principle taken together form Russian word ‘ЧУДО’, and this word might be translated into English as ‘miracle’. The principles are as follows:

Ч - честность, honesty, meaning that any information from my part is true;
У - уважение, respect, meaning that I respect your values and your time;
Д - доверие, trust, meaning that I trust you as a professional and rely on your teaching expertise;
О - открытость, sincerity, meaning that I tell you about my research, and answer all your questions and respond to all your concerns.

In the next section, I describe how I applied these principles with my participants during the fieldwork.

5.5 The fieldwork
Having discussed how I constructed my methodological tool, in this section I provide an account of my meetings with the participants. I describe my fieldwork chronologically, in two sections. Section 5.5.1 addresses the first set of meetings, and in section 5.5.2 I explain how the second set of meetings went. It is worth noting two important points. First, I refer to our interviews as ‘data generation’, rather than data collection, because the interviews involved creating data rather than observing the teachers. Baker (1997:139) suggests that interviews can be ‘developing’, which ‘serves to add to and elaborate on the categories and activities proposed in the initial description’. Thus, the interviews were interactional events, and jointly constructed. It means that my own insider knowledge, as well as the awareness of the cultural context, and the prompts, and the questions I designed became a part of the data. I now describe how the data generation went.
5.5.1 First interviews: Eliciting stories about complexities

In the first meeting, I informed each participant at the beginning that the focus of the research was on her experience of what it felt like to integrate technology, and explained the format of the first interview. I deliberately did not mention that the study was on perezhivanie as a phenomenon, as my main objective was to elicit how each participant was engaged with technology in as many detail as possible. I wanted to explore how the teachers would talk about this experience, and to discover the place of perezhivanie within these accounts.

After the participant had signed the consent form, I sought her permission for audio recording the interview, and on obtaining it, I turned on two independent audio recording devices. This included my mobile and a dictaphone. I did this for safety reasons; they had malfunctioned on several earlier occasions. Next, I briefly told the participant about myself and answered her questions. After this warming-up stage, including small talk and initial exchange, I moved on to a narrative interview by giving the participant some of the following very simple prompts (approximately):

Could you tell me the story of your existing practice of integrating technology, please?
How did you come to be the kind of teacher that you think you are now?
What were the best times and the worst times that you had experienced?

Using these prompts, I tried to get the teacher into a ‘narrative flow’, and to offer a space for her to talk about some ‘hot’ issues (Bauer, 1996:11) of her teaching with technology. It should be emphasised here that positive experience of using technology was deemed just as important as problematic experience. If I needed to prompt the narrative some more, I helped the teacher to bring back the most vivid events, available in her memory, by asking (approximately):

Can you tell me a story of a memorable teaching experience you have had with engagement with one or some of these web tools, please?
Or by giving the teacher a bit more specific prompt:

Please, tell me a story of one interesting thing that happened to you with integrating technology as you have experienced it in your teaching from the beginning.

The prompts often evoked emotionally coloured stories, and the teachers got fully engaged with the storytelling. My previous teacher training experience enabled me to be confident in running such a narrative session, and to deal with possible contingencies. For example, I tried to adjust the prompts according to the themes that emerged in the dialogue. I listened what the participant said, or implied, or did not say, and tried to relate this to the potential complexities in the critical incident that the teacher narrated. I did this in my mind, and, as a result, the teacher got a prompt such as: ‘How did that happen? ... How did you feel? ... Why? ... And then ...?’ (Snell, 1992:13). I also tried to capture as much context as possible for each critical incident that emerged in the narrative, using prompts such as (approximately):

What was the context?  
How did that come about?  
Who was involved?  
What were they doing?  
What were you doing that made it a memorable experience?  
What do you feel you now?  
Do you feel differently as a result of this memorable experience?

Although Bauer (1996:11) mentions that there is no such a thing as ‘an ideal’ narrative interview procedure, I almost always managed to get participants smoothly into a ‘narrative flow’, where they became fully engaged with the storytelling. Once in a narrative flow, they seemed to stop monitoring what they were saying, or to worry about whether or not it was what I wanted to hear them say. This was a magic turn, after which I learnt a lot about how the teachers constructed their understandings of the context, and made meaning of their experiences. Thus, once ‘narrative flow’ occurred, and the participant started using ‘spontaneous language’ (Bauer, 1996:3), I stepped back and went for low researcher mediation: back channelling, nodding and asking the storyteller ‘What happened next?’, if
anything at all. At the end of the interview, in the last five or ten minutes, when the teacher finished their 'take' on the story, I moved to a more researcher-mediated dialogue, and asked follow-up probing questions, such as (approximately):

- What specifically do you value now about this event?
- What did you feel about it?
- What was it about the context that caused the tensions?
- What was it about the context that helped/did not help you to excel?
- How would you do it differently next time?

One of the last questions was a ‘deep story question’ (Given, 2008:22) about the future, and how the participants would design ‘the best learning space’. The idea to use such a prompt was based on Evald Ilyenkov’s (e.g. in 2008) notion of ‘ideal’. He states that in creating an image of how things should be ideally, people get aware and make meaning of the route to this ideal image, and address obstacles which get in the way for them to reach this image. On reflection, this prompt worked well, and the participants shared various issues that might be impeding them to get to that ideal image.

By and large, there were several enlightening moments in the sessions. The most striking one was that my data collection tool appeared exactly what I needed to fulfil the aim of my research. The teachers narrated their perezhivanie in the critical incidents and beyond them at ease and very openly, and I managed to elicit data from which I was further able to identify complexities and perezhivanie. Initially, at different stages of the project design, I had considered interventions, structured interviews, and lesson observations (see Chapter 1 and section 5.1). The narrative methodological tool proved the most effective of all the options I had considered. A complicated tool, such as interventions, would have taken much more time, and the result in terms of data could have been worse. The stories that I did generate surfaced so many issues which I could not have anticipated before, let alone pack into ‘interview questions’, if I had opted for structured interviews in my research design. Regarding lesson observations, if I had done them, the teachers would have been focused
mostly on the issues that emerged in the lessons observed, rather than on their teaching more broadly, and this would not have brought to the surface so many contextual factors and the teachers’ attitudes to them.

Another striking moment was that the teachers narrated their perezhivanie with ease and very openly. While a focus on perezhivanie was not my main aim in the first meeting, and I did not ask the teachers about their perezhivanie directly, it was almost always present in their narratives. It seemed like the issues the participants communicated prompted their perezhivanie, and their perezhivanie, in turn, allowed them to see more, and to get more aware of the contextual features. This dialectical relationship, between the contextual features and perezhivanie, is a likely explanation for why perezhivanie emerged in the first set of sessions. During the narrative interviews, I may have relied on this dialectic, and probably intuitively focused on moments of possible teachers’ perezhivanie, and as a result, this strategy generated rich data.

It is important to acknowledge again, that nearly everything the teachers said was relevant to my research focus. The richness and fullness of the data made me hesitate, because I did not know where to start the analysis with so many possibilities and potential paths available to me. I realised that I was able to partially respond not only to RQ1, but also to RQ2 with this data. However, the first set of interviews did not enable me to fully analyses the teachers’ perezhivanie. Although every account contained from two to four instances of perezhivanie, and most of them were quite revealing in terms of the mechanics of perezhivanie, the vast majority were lacking in details and, therefore, insufficient for the purposes of detailed analysis. It was the first step, and it allowed me to go more deeply into perezhivanie during the second encounter with the teachers. Thus, I looked forward to seeing them again. I also felt that we had established a good rapport, not only professionally but also personally. This may have been due to my intrinsic interest in their practice with
technologies and sympathy for their perezhivanie. In the section that follows, I address our second meeting.

5.5.2 Second interviews: aims and design

The first set of the interviews enabled me to identify the complexities the teachers faced, and generally understand their related perezhivanie. With the data collected, I was able to answer RQ1 in full. However, the data collected in the first set of meetings was insufficient to answer RQ2 in full, and make a selection for a presentation of the data in the thesis. The literature suggests that follow-up interviews can add depth of meaning (Given, 2008:77), and in the second meetings I intended to zoom in on perezhivanie and its mechanism in detail. In this section, I present the purposes of the second interview with each participant, its design, and an account of how it was conducted.

The second set of interviews had three purposes. The first purpose was to explore possible different forms of participants’ perezhivanie, which originally emerged in the first interviews. The second purpose was to explore the heuristic nature of perezhivanie. That is, how perezhivanie helped teachers make decisions and solve problems. The second purpose was to trace the relationship between perezhivanie and teacher action, and how this contributed to restoring the teachers’ emotional and cognitive equilibrium (see sections 1.3, 2.1, 2.4.2, 3.3). The third purpose was the follow-up selection of three participants and their stories, which would lead to an analytical step, and then to a representative step, where I demonstrate and discuss various forms of perezhivanie of these three participants.

Regarding the number of participants for the second meeting, I had to collect enough data to reveal the nuances of perezhivanie, and to enable the later presentation of perezhivanie in the thesis. However, given the depth and richness of narrative data, the following analysis would be time-consuming. I could not analyse in detail a huge number of stories, because I would not have done justice to what the teachers were saying if I had too many stories.
Thus, I needed to find the right balance between quantity and quality. In the end, nine teachers kindly agreed to participate in the second meeting, i.e. in the full data generation. The tenth teacher, who participated in the first interview as well, told me that she was very busy at work in May and June 2017, but would be available for the second interview in late June, but I did not hear from her again. Therefore, I conducted the second set of interviews with nine out of ten participants.

I intended to create conditions and offer space for the participants to talk about their perezhivanie first in relation to particular critical incidents, and then, in more general terms. For this reason, I designed the second interview as a combination of two parts. In the first part, I aimed at enriching the data collected in the first meeting. In the second part, I aimed at revealing the heuristic nature of perezhivanie. In two subsequent sections (5.5.2.1 and 5.5.2.2), I provide an account of these two parts of the second meeting, including their focus and procedures.

5.5.2.1 Enriching previously collected data

As discussed in section 5.3.1, I sent the participants the transcripts of the first interview two days prior to the second meeting and asked them (as a ‘member-check’) to read it through, and tell me in the meeting what they wanted to change in it. In the meeting, I first explained the format of the interview and the structure of the questions, and then initiated a discussion around the transcript sent to them just before. All the participants stated that they had enjoyed reading the transcript, and during the meeting we frequently returned to the information that the transcript contained. The participants often made meaningful comments on this transcript, and this enriched the data.

When I sent the transcript of the first interview, ahead of the second interview, I included my interpretation of their perezhivanie, and how this perezhivanie seemed to relate to the complexities they talked about. I wrote that I had analysed the data and, for example, my
understanding of their perezhivanie about the complexity of interacting with the IT service was such and such. I also included prompts that we could use in the second interview. There were from three to five prompts for each participant (see Appendix 6). I tried and used the participant’s language in the prompts, and they normally started with wording such as:

I have an impression that ...
From the story that you told me last time I get a sense that (e.g. interacting with the IT service) causes your perezhivanie. Is that the case?

These prompts brought out salient themes from the previous narrative interview, and the presentation of my understanding of their experience, and perezhivanie was a kind of check. The teachers mostly approved of my interpretation of their perezhivanie, and nothing was discarded or objected to. This part of the meeting gave the participant space to engage with my interpretation dialogically as well. Thus, I essentially invited the teacher to talk about my interpretation, and, therefore, to enrich the themes I was beginning to develop with more detail. In addition, due to the temporal nature of narratives, I sometimes elicited what seemed like a new story of the same event. The participant often commented on the prompt with ‘new language’, which emerged in this second meeting. I would argue that the process of thinking and communicating events a second time is developmental, because any retelling of a story is a further co-construction of understanding.

When I felt that our dialogue was ‘drying up’, I prompted the participant with a ‘deep story question’ (Given, 2008:22), which created further ‘narrative necessity’:

Now you have told a story which to me is quite simple, my understanding is that you major perezhivanie is ...

Unlike the first series of prompts (see above), which focused more on the contextual complexities that triggered perezhivanie, the deep story question encouraged the participants to talk about their beliefs, attitudes and values related to this perezhivanie.
Through the deep story question, I elicited the reasons why my participant had this perezhivanie, and this way addressed that invisible, partially subconscious, part of perezhivanie. The deep story question acted as a bridge between two parts in the meeting, and allowed me to move the interview forward to the second part, which I present in the next section.

5.5.2.2 Co-theorising perezhivanie

In the second part of the second interview, I asked the participants about the role of perezhivanie in their teaching practice, using a bank of ten questions prepared in advance, about the phenomenon of perezhivanie (see Appendix 5 step 3). My main concern, when doing this ‘semi-structured’ part of the interviews, was to avoid a heavily interrogative style, where my participants could not take responsibility for the flow and relevance of the telling (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000:32). Such an interrogative question and answer style session, where, unlike storytelling, participants are expected to tell something that the researcher further theorises, contradicted my research intentions. Instead, I needed what Burgess (1984:102) calls 'conversations with a purpose'. To achieve this, I asked questions that flowed from the conversation itself. That is, I segued into and out of the questions so that each next question organically and situationally emerged from what we had discussed before. As a result, the second part was a kind of co-theorising of perezhivanie, which was grounded in the complexities discussed before.

On several occasions, I had to make a special effort to move the discussion along, so that the previously agreed timetable could be followed. Even so, because the participants were eager to talk about their perezhivanie, some of the interviews lasted much longer than the planned one hour.

On reflection, I found the data generation fascinating, as I learned so much from the teachers. There were cases where I was absolutely astonished because, for example, I could have not imagined that students are able to write HTML code to crack an online test, or that
they could participate in online classroom activities from a distance even when being expected to be present in the lesson on campus. In the next section, I explain how I processed the data that I generated with the teachers.

5.6 Data Management

The duration of the each interview ranged between 47 minutes and 2 hours, with an overall total of about 28 hours (of which 26 hours of interview time was audio recorded). To ensure that the data was stored properly, organised systematically, and to guarantee easy retrieval, I followed a number of steps. In this section I explain how I did this.

The audio-recorded interviews were downloaded onto my personal computer and saved in folders named after the participant initials, and then changed to their pseudonyms. As we used Russian in the meetings, the participants’ native language, I first transcribed verbatim in Russian, in order not to lose the particularities of the Russian language in the further analysis. For transcription, I used a free tool called ExpressScribe. It allowed me to synchronise the speed of an audio recording with the speed of my typing. The synchronisation made this time consuming process more manageable. While transcription is a, in part, a mechanical process, Green at al. (1997:173) emphasise that ‘a transcript is an analytic tool constructed for a particular purpose embedded in a program of research’. My purpose was to capture not only what was said in the interviews, but also why it was said and, therefore, a verbatim transcription (rather than summarising) was necessary to enable to later narrative analysis, where everything matters. In Appendix 7, I provide a sample transcript of Nuala’s data in Russian.

Since I was going to listen to the audio recordings, along with reading the transcripts, prosodic features were not attended to during the transcription process. What is more, the thematic analysis (see Chapter 6), which I started after the second set of meetings, was more concerned with what was said rather than the way it was said. All the transcriptions in
Russian were saved in .docx format, and then I exported the file in .txt format to upload the transcriptions to the qualitative data analysis software Nvivo for backup, and further coding and analysis purposes, this time in English. It is important to note here that all the translations of the interviews from participants’ Russian into English are mine. They may not read fluently in English, because they are originally written as said in Russian. That is, rather than aiming for fluent English, the main concern was to preserve the original meaning of the participants. The next section describes how I dealt with the data in Nvivo.

5.6.1 Nvivo

As I mentioned before, I had such rich accounts of data (in terms of contextual features and the teachers’ various perezhivanie) that I felt I could not analyse it all using ordinary tables in Microsoft Word. I came to see that I would not be able to cope with so many interesting and varied themes if used e.g. three-column tables with ‘data, translation, and code’. Given the huge corpus of data generated, I searched for a tool that would help me manage the information collected. This was my major ‘perezhivanie’ at that stage, and it pushed me to search for an optimal solution. After some research into the dedicated software packages for manipulating data, I decided to use Nvivo (QRS International, 2007). While this decision required me to invest considerable time into learning how to use this qualitative data management tool, it freed me from a frustrating and dispiriting experience of using bulky tables in Word.

I found a number of benefits and affordances when using Nvivo. First, Nvivo is systematic and facilitates the storage of various pieces of data in one place. It has a ‘Find’ function, and I could immediately access a required place in the data by using it. Second, Nvivo facilitates rearranging, linking, and categorising data. It allowed me to rearrange codes and group them together if necessary, and therefore, it was a helpful thinking tool for deeper interpretations and insights. Third, Nvivo supports the Russian language. Fourth, by using the ‘memo’ function in Nvivo, I could attach reflective notes to bits of data, or codes, which I
struggled to fully comprehend on my first pass of coding. Later, I used these memos to aid the merging and rearranging of codes (see section 6.3). Memos also helped me relate the data from separate meetings with one teacher. I would look at a memo with my notes from the first meeting, and a particular place in the transcript of the second meeting on the screen, and sometimes this helped me find coincidences and similarities that I could use to join the data of the separate meetings together. Fifth, Nvivo uses a text editor in codes, transcripts, and comments, and I could export the text extracts, or copy and paste them into any other application.

Sixth, and crucially, it made my data analysis much easier because of the visualisation of the codes, which Nvivo offers. This allowed me to generate mind-maps and other graphical images. For example, the Nvivo feature to depict the codes as coloured vertical strips gave me an opportunity to locate the codes in the transcript simply by clicking on the stripe. Also, displaying codes in a hierarchy within Nvivo, assisted me in analysing relationships and in drawing associations between various codes and categories of complexities and perezhivanie, which I demonstrate in Chapter 6. To recap, Nvivo helped me to organise the data in a structured way, and it helped to structure my thinking dramatically. In the next section I explain how I marked phonological aspects in the data.

5.6.2 Marking phonological aspects

Turning now to the process of marking specific characteristics of the teachers’ speech in the transcripts, it is worth noting that initially I transcribed all the data verbatim as a plain text for the purpose of thematic analysis (see section 6.3). For my argument here in the thesis, however, I needed to make visible emotionally charged teachers’ utterances as well. In this section, I explain how I marked phonological aspects in those data extracts, which I present in the thesis in Chapters 6, 7, and 8.
The emotional subtext of utterances is a type of information that is available in linguistic and paralinguistic speech signals (Rost, 2011:34). To indicate emotions in the extracts I first included oral speech features such as false starts, repetitions, break-offs, redundancy, and overlapping speech in the initial verbatim transcription. Then, I edited selected extracts only, linguistically and paralinguistically, by drawing on the transcription systems of Du Bois et al. (1993).

I followed Swann’s (1994:39) advice that ‘it is probably best at least initially to use as little conventional punctuation as possible’. However, for the selected extracts I used Du Bois et al.’s (1993:61) indication for pauses ‘…’. I marked in capital letters when the speaker strongly emphasised something, and I used bold font when the emphasis was heard but was not as strong. I underlined negatively charged lexis, such as anxious, frustrated, nervous, really uncomfortable, as well as phrases such as ‘I felt shaky about this activity’, ‘I felt excited/overwhelmed’, ‘I really wish I had …’. For my comments about paralinguistic speech signals I used square parentheses, i.e. the same symbols as I used for any of my comments in the thesis placed in direct speech of others. In addition, I used:

- Du Bois et al.’s (1993:67) indication for laughter – the @ symbol.
- carriage return (Du Bois et al.’s, 1993:46ff.) to mark intonation units
- double slashes (//) to indicate boundaries between units, which sometimes included pauses between bursts of speech.

In Appendix 8, I provide an example of how I marked prosodic features in the same sample of Nuala’s data as was used in Appendix 7.
5.7 Working and Researching Multilingually

Having discussed how I coped with the wealth of data, how I dealt with emotional aspects in this data, and before proceeding to discuss the actual data analysis, it is necessary to discuss the multilingual aspects of my research. The multilingual aspects of my research included:

- engagement with the literature (in Russian);
- collecting and then transcribing data (in Russian);
- coding the Russian transcripts with codes, categories and themes (in English, see the following discussion for why and how I did this);
- writing up (in English);
- presenting and dissemination for the research (in both languages).

I have explained my decisions about whether to use English or Russian, in each of the above-indicated parts of the study, in other parts of this chapter. For instance, the decision to conduct the interviews in Russian was informed by ethical considerations (see section 5.4.3), and my conviction that emotional experiences can be much richer expressed in a native language. What is more, Russian is famous for ‘the tremendous stress on emotions and on their free expression, the high emotional temperature of Russian discourse, the wealth of linguistic devices for signalling emotions and shades of emotions’ (Wierzbicka, 1992:395). Moreover, my participants and I are Russian speakers, and speaking our first language helped me to create a setting of mutual understanding and trust (see section 5.4.4 for more detail), which I believe is an important element of studying perezhivanie.

I prepared the transcripts for coding in Russian because translating them entirely into English was not only very time consuming, but also ineffective. I noticed a considerable loss of meaning due to highly idiomatic emotional language the participants used. As a result, I decided to code the Russian transcripts, and then translate into English only those extracts, which I needed to re-present in the data chapters of the thesis.
As for the names of the codes, I used English for this. It saved me time, and using English was consistent with the use of English language literature, having English language research questions, and the subsequent presentation of my data analysis, here in the thesis, in English. Not surprisingly, finding names for the codes was much easier in English than in Russian for me, because most of my professional communication over the last few years, and use of ELT jargon, has been in English.

When presenting the data in Chapters 7 and 8, I tried to be as reflexive and transparent as possible about cross-language interpretations I made. When a phrase contained an idiom, or had a metaphorical meaning, I provided the original Russian data, and always its translation in English. While this process was more time consuming than the one in a monolingual study, it assured that the minimum of meaning was lost in translation. Another benefit was that Russian texts brought me confidence that I relied on real data with their original meaning, and helped fine-tune English translation where necessary. In the final version of my thesis, I removed some of the more bulky original Russian excerpts, because I finally found that my English versions very close to the original.

The purpose of this chapter was to provide details of the data generation part of my research. I presented my methodological orientation, design of my data generation tool, and explained how I recruited the participants and dealt with possible ethical issues. I also argued that developing trust and mutual rapport was paramount for my study, and described how I maintained the relationship with my participants. I went on to provide an account of two meetings with each participant, and further explained how I managed the data. I finished the chapter outlining the multilingual aspects of my work. In the next chapter, I present my data analysis thinking and procedures.
Chapter 6: Data Analysis

This chapter elucidates empirically the theoretical claims about the role of motives in critical incidents, complexities, and perezhivanie addressed in Chapters 2, 3, and 4, as well as methodological claims as to how to approach complexities and perezhivanie epistemologically proposed in Chapter 5. It draws on this elucidation in elaborating the data analysis strategy used to address the research questions.

As was said earlier, to recognise and describe the phenomenon of perezhivanie was an epistemological puzzle for me. This was a challenge, but also an opportunity to contribute to an ongoing conversation around perezhivanie, where perezhivanie is often confused with other overlapping phenomena, e.g. reflection or emotions. After considering several options, I designed four analytical instruments to analyse the data. They combine the following approaches. I used thematic analysis to capture complexities, then content analysis to identify different forms of perezhivanie, and then narrative analysis to reveal its dynamic nature. Hence, I explored the data several times in different ways. These three approaches intertwined and I distinguish them in this thesis, for analytical purposes only, by splitting them into four instruments.

This chapter presents my emerging approach to data analysis, and details its rationale and procedures. It is divided into six sections. Section 6.1 starts with documenting the ways my thinking about the analytical instruments developed alongside my engagement with the literature, and finishes by outlining my four instruments, which I call ‘passes’ with the data. Then, in subsequent sections 6.2 - 6.5, I lay out the practical dimensions of each pass by describing its step-by-step procedures.

6.1 Data analysis thinking

As was noted in the previous chapter, the data were rich in instances of perezhivanie in the technologically enhanced classroom. Despite their richness in the data, teachers’
perezhivanie is not always accessed directly, because it is a part of a teachers’ inner world. I, therefore, had to design a ‘lantern’ (Stewart, 2011), which would enlighten for me this hidden phenomenon in its variety. This section presents how my ‘lantern’ to explore perezhivanie was designed, but before doing so, I will describe the nature of my data.

6.1.1 Nature of my data
With reference to Chapter 5, I collected my data in two in-depth qualitative interviews with each of the ten university language teachers about their experience with technology. I collected more than two hours of audio data from each participant, which were then transcribed, and both, audio recordings and transcriptions, were uploaded to Nvivo (see section 5.6) for analysis.

Regarding the nature of my data, some parts were more narrative, some were more expository, and in some parts the narrative nature was intertwined with less narrative and more reflective parts. When my participants were talking to me in the interviews, I felt at times that they were in the ‘action-present’ of their practice, and for that reason the data represents what Schön calls ‘reflection-in-action’, or rather ‘reflecting-in-practice’ because this is Schön’s (1983) term for reflecting in the longer lasting action present of practice. Thus, I sometimes felt that the action was still present for the teacher, and the critical incident in question was still ‘live’ for them. At the same time, the interviews were initiated by myself and, thus, my participants may at times not have been in the action present and reflected in the way Schön emphasises. Rather, the data may also represent what is commonly referred to as ‘reflection-on-action’ in the teacher education and development literature, or what Schön refers to as reflection on reflecting-in-action (see also Anderson, 2019:6).

According to Bruner (1985, 1991:5), narrative and analytical modes complement each other, and ‘efforts to reduce one mode to the other or to ignore one at the expense of another
inevitably fail to capture the rich diversity of thought’ (Bruner, 1986:11). As was mentioned in the previous chapter, the teachers talked about their job with passion, and it felt, at times, like they were still experiencing what they talked about. However, for the most part they reflected on their perezhivanie retrospectively, rather than seeming to experience perezhivanie during the meetings. My keen sense was that the teachers used both modes for understanding reality and self-construction. In my analytical instruments I integrated methods, which helped me get access to both modes of thought as Bruner advises.

Apart from being expository and narrative and mixes of both, my data are mixed in two other ways as well. First, the discourse in the data was varied. Sharing their experience with technology, the teachers sometimes told their stories in a linear way, and sometimes did not, as in the case of Anna’s story (see section 6.5.3). Second, even if the teachers were focusing on similar critical incidents, their stories were not alike. Sometimes, a teacher, in the midst of her story started reflecting on something seemingly irrelevant to it, and this reflection significantly changed the direction of the story, often, in the process, revealing her beliefs and attitudes. To capture those teachers’ motives, beliefs, and attitudes for the purposes of the analysis the teachers’ perezhivanie, I needed various methods to analyse my mixed data. In the next two sections I present how I constructed my analytical instruments.

6.1.2 ‘Narrative truth’ in my study
This study looks into how critical incidents and complexities trigger teachers’ perezhivanie, and how their perezhivanie then transforms what the teachers think of and do in their classrooms. I understand perezhivanie as a triunity of cognitive, emotional, and contextual factors, i.e. a unity in a sense that these factors are united in teachers’ perezhivanie, and cannot be separated. However, I need to operationalise and abstract them for the purpose of analysis and demonstration of perezhivanie here in the thesis. I sometimes address
contextual factors, cognitive and emotional engagement separately, but they are always united in perezhivanie.

The problem of any hermeneutic approach is the transparency and quality of relationship between ‘word’ and ‘world’, or ‘the relation of a story to the events to which it refers’ (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000:34). While ‘story-telling stays closer to actual life-events than methods that elicit explanations’ (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000:32), one can argue that what the participants decided to share with me may depart from an objective reality, and, therefore, be ‘untruthful’. Nevertheless, the criteria of validity and reliability in studies of human experience, teaching in my case, need to be different from a science of objective reality (Bauer, 1996). Complexities the teachers experience as well as perezhivanie they have, reveal their subjective understandings or ‘narrative truth’ (Bruner, 1991:17), which is ‘not as a record of what happened (which is in any case a non-existent record), but rather as a continuing interpretation and reinterpretation of our experience’ (Bruner, 2004:691 ff.).

The criteria of validity and reliability, therefore, are mostly addressed through my own reflexivity i.e. through my own intellectual journey, via which I try and make sense of the teachers’ ‘narrative truth’. This hermeneutic positioning seems to underpin any narrative research, which ’does not strive to produce any conclusions of certainty, but aims for its findings to be ‘well-grounded’ and ‘supportable’ (Webster & Mertova, 2007:4), and my reflexivity enables me to make transparent the ‘narrative truth’ of my participants.

**6.1.3 How my analytical instruments were conceived**

The obvious heterogeneity of the data (see section 6.1.1) made me think of multiple ways of analysing them. Turning now to the actual design of my instruments, it is important to remind my readers of the research questions, which guided me in this discussion:
RQ1: What complexities do teachers identify when trying to integrate technology in an institution of tertiary education in Russia?

RQ2: What is the teachers’ perezhivanie about complexities?

The study employs two analytical processes to address the RQs. More specifically, I adopted a data-driven analysis, which involved open and axial coding to demonstrate the emergence of various themes of contextual features. I approached the data by reading, listening and making sense of teachers’ stories. An interpretation of what is ‘told’ is referred in the literature as thematic analysis (Riessmann, 2008:53). I describe the procedure of my data-driven thematic analysis in section 6.3.

The second process I used was deductive analysis. Applying my conceptual framework (see section 4.4), I identified complexities and perezhivanie by deductive content analysis. I define deductive content analysis as a procedure that ‘set out to test whether data are consistent with prior assumptions, theories, or hypotheses identified or constructed by an investigator’ (Thomas, 2006: 238). Through a logically derived process, I interpreted particular instances of data to understand complexities and perezhivanie. I looked into what the participants had said, how they said it, and why these particular stories and incidents emerged in their minds at the time of speaking. These what, how, and why helped me, using evidence in the data, to outline three forms of perezhivanie. The procedures of deductive analysis are demonstrated in sections 6.4 and 6.5.

As pointed out at the beginning of this chapter, perezhivanie is hidden from direct observation, unlike complexities. To address RQ2 I used narrative analysis, because it is ‘one of the clearest channels for learning about the inner world’ (Lieblich et al., 1998:7). I need to specify here what I mean by narrative analysis, because, as Wells (2011:8) points out, ‘how narrative is analysed is intertwined with how it is defined’. Definitions of narrative vary, and
I use the ‘sequential’ one, where narratives is taken as a means to ‘organise a sequence of events into a whole so that the significance of each event can be understood through its relation to that whole. In this way narrative conveys the meaning of events’ (Elliott, 2005:3). This ‘sequential’ perspective helped me trace how teachers’ perezhivanie, as well as activity, change over time, and to study their relationship. As the data on perezhivanie were spread through the whole of the interviews, this perspective enabled me to perform two important actions for the analysis. First, I extrapolated a participant’s perezhivanie from small stories, where it emerged, to the whole of her teaching experience, as shared with me. Second, I related a teacher’s perezhivanie to complexities, as well as to her motives, attitudes and beliefs. Discerning these relationships enabled me to construct a picture of a psychological part of the teaching activity viewed through the lens of a participant's perezhivanie, and how they are intertwined.

Although narratives communicate relations that convey the meaning of things, I came to see that it was not enough to use narrative analysis solely, to address RQ2. As it is clear from the previous paragraph, the ‘sequential’ perspective could be effective to reveal the ‘inner’ world of the teacher; there was a small chance that narrative analysis would help me identify contextual features related to perezhivanie, as teachers’ perezhivanie is always context-related. However, there were so many instances of complexities and those instances were so disconnected and varied that I could not elucidate them all. I needed an analytical approach, which could capture the ‘outer’ world of the teacher. This was a key point of my thinking, and I decided to combine thematic and narrative analysis in my analytical instruments, where ‘themes are concepts indicated by the data’ (Merriam, 1998:179).

Wells (2011:44) distinguishes content analysis from narrative analysis, and states that the former ‘provides a way in which investigators may conceptualise all of the independent themes that are present in the narrative’, whereas the latter enables a researcher ‘to link
those things in the relation to an evolving plot’. I discovered such independent themes of contextual complexities, which in turn provided a source for my further understanding of a participant's unrealised motives, and in this way enriched my understanding of her perezhivanie. In the next section I present how my data were analysed and mapped on to the research questions by outlining the details of my four analytical instruments.

6.1.4 Data analysis outline
This section can be read as an introduction to my data analysis presented in the rest of this chapter. It is worth noting at the beginning that any data analysis is iterative by its nature, and generally not linear and systematic (Patton, 2002). For clearness of description I divided my analysis into four ‘passes’ with the data, see Figure 7. The first one was taken after the first set of meetings, and all the rest were done after the second round of meetings, when I analysed the totality of the data.
Figure 7. My data analysis pathway

My first ‘pass’ with the data was a holistic listening of an audio recording of the first interview with each participant to gain understanding of the teachers’ various perezhivanie, so that to back it to the participant at the beginning of the second interview to generate richer and deeper data on the same events. While listening I created proto-codes as well, and used them later, in the next ‘pass’ of thematic coding. In section 6.2 I explain this primary engagement with the audio data in more detail.
In the second ‘pass’ with the data I did the groundwork to answer my RQs. My analytical instrument in this ‘pass’ consisted of three steps. I analysed thematically various contextual factors within each data set, using a procedure of open coding. After that, I grouped the codes that had emerged into categories. Then I used axial coding to revise the categories across the data sets. Section 6.3 describes this data-driven ‘pass’ in detail.

The third ‘pass’ aimed at distinguishing the contextual features from the subjective complexities to address RQ1. I used textual analyses in this analytical instrument as well. By revealing contextual features of teaching with technology during the previous ‘pass’, I made sense of potential complexities by deductive approach. In this ‘pass’ I got an insight into real complexities by analysing the unrealised teachers’ motives in the critical incidents (see section 6.4 for more detail). This analysis was almost dialogic in my own mind. It enabled me to come close to seeing into teachers’ perezhivanie, because as said earlier, perezhivanie and complexities are tightly related. However, this thematic analytical instrument did not allow me to reveal the dynamic nature of perezhivanie. To overcome this, I moved from the paradigmatic-type to narrative-type of analysis in Polkinghorne’s (1988) terms in the forth ‘pass’.

This final ‘pass’ with the data was the narrative textual analysis of perezhivanie to address RQ2. Drawing on Mishler’s (1986) and Labov and Waletzky’s (1967) frames, I developed an instrument, which incorporated elements of both structures, and included complexities and perezhivanie. I present this analysis in section 6.5. Interestingly, the ways the teachers responded to complexities, revealed not only their perezhivanie, but also their potential trajectories of improving their teaching, and, therefore, development. As was pointed out in the previous chapter, I had to make a selection because the number of instances of perezhivanie in the data of ten participants was enormous. I address the selection process in section 7. 4. On a final note and as indicated elsewhere, in reality, all the ‘passes’ with the data were intertwined, and I distinguish them here for analytical purpose only.
6.2 Holistic content analysis to capture perezhivanie

Although it did not address the research questions directly, this first ‘pass’ with the data pursued two aims. I prepared the ground for answering both of the RQs by generating proto-codes, gaining initial, surface understandings of the teachers’ various perezhivanie. I used these understandings to design prompts, which delved deeper into perezhivanie, for the second meeting with each participant.

To fulfil the aforementioned aims I had to work out how to make initial sense of teachers’ perezhivanie. I considered whether I needed to transcribe the interviews, and then work out teachers’ perezhivanie from the text, or to get the best sense of perezhivanie from listening. While contextual and cognitive factors, comprising perezhivanie, were accessible in the text to some extent, the teachers rarely referred to their emotions explicitly. I, therefore, could not really understand their emotional engagement by reading the transcript. As noted by Sullivan (2012:64), emotions are not given away by the content of the text ‘waiting to be uncovered’. However, I could get access to them by means of listening to the audio-recordings of the interviews. They contained acoustic non-verbal information revealing the teachers’ emotions.

Another point in favour of prior listening was that I first needed to make sense of the whole of the teacher’s perezhivanie. It almost always permeated the whole of the data, was often not explicitly expressed, and was usually not bounded by a single critical incident. By engaging with particularities of each critical incident before obtaining the whole understanding, I, therefore, could lose a sense of teachers’ perezhivanie. Obtaining a ‘bird’s-eye view’ of the participants’ engagement with technology was, therefore, very important.

The third reason for prior listening was implicit in the very nature of a spoken language and its ‘least effort’ principle (Zipf, 1949). To maximise communication we tend to minimise
articulatory effort and hence encourage brevity to provide maximum information with minimal language, e.g. we use ellipsis, and omissions. Unlike in writing, in spoken language we compensate for possible gaps in meaning through non-verbal language. By listening I could pick up these signs (Rost, 2011:34), and, therefore, make much better sense of that the teachers said, than by reading reduced elliptical utterances in the transcript.

Taking these three reasons into account I decided to start my data analysis by listening. I did it very shortly after the interviews, a day after at the latest, while the interview was still fresh in my mind, and I still could remember the key points of it. Drawing on the understanding (Wierzbicka, 1992:395; Yanushevskaya, et al., 2008) that emotional factors often speak louder than words, I made the maximum use of the teachers’ bursts of speech, emotional tones, intonation, and vocal range. I paid attention to any paralinguistic speech signals, for example, noticed where the speakers emphasised something, laughed, and made pauses. I used all the aforementioned non-verbal information to indicate the places in the data, where perezhivanie could be revealed because every perezhivanie contains emotions, overtly or not, and created possible approximate proto-codes.

To recognise perezhivanie in the data I used Lieblich’s et al. (1998) method of holistic content analysis, and combined two strategies. First, I asked myself: ‘what is the core teacher’s perezhivanie here?’ Second, I tried to be emic and relied on my own emotional engagement with in an incident narrated. Johnson and Golombek (2016) state that this identity fusion plays a crucial part in interpreting events. Similarly, Helin (2013:224) referring to Bakhtin, views this identity fusion as a mediation, which ‘can offer a feeling for that which we bodily “know” but do yet not understand cognitively’. Both strategies, a cognitive one of a holistic analysis, and an emotional one of more intuitive perception, enabled me to create prompts for the second meeting.
With regard to the procedure, I listened to the entire recording of each participant once, and created proto-codes of possible themes of perezhivanie. I took notes of the timespan, where I could identify something related to perezhivanie, and often wrote down an exact phrase from the recording. This helped me create a protocode, and a rough analytical idea about teachers’ attitudes, beliefs, motives, and anything else, related to perezhivanie. For example, Nuala repeatedly pointed out that ‘everything that goes on in the class is of the teacher’s responsibility. They do not have the right to make a mistake’. I first wrote this exact phrase next to the time span, so as to locate it easier in the transcribed recording later. Then, I took notes of the time of any instances echoing somehow Nuala’s stance, in order to retrieve them via the timespan later. I normally listened to a particular place with the traces of perezhivanie several times, and often improved my notes. This multiple listening took me from three to five hours for each recording hour.

As regards the multilingual aspect (see section 5.7 for more detail) of this work, I did everything in Russian, because the prompts I needed to design for the second interview were in Russian (see them in Appendix 6, translated). Then, I quoted Russian interviews, took all the notes and created proto-codes in Russian (see an example of my notes taken from listening Eva’s data in Appendix 9). The proto-codes equipped me with rough ideas of possible codes, which were finally translated into English during the textual thematic analysis, and I present this part of my data analysis in the next section.

6.3 Thematic analysis to derive codes that surface Russian context

My second ‘pass’ with the interview data was thematic coding and indexing. It offers a ‘deliberate and rigorous way’ of approaching data, being flexible at the same time (Braun & Clarke, 2006:77). I used it in the form of analytical induction, where ‘findings emerge out of the data, through the analyst’s interactions with the data’ (Patton, 2002:453). I understand, therefore, data-driven analysis as ‘a process of coding the data without trying to fit it into a
pre-existing coding frame, or the researcher’s analytic preconceptions’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006:83).

This ‘pass’ enabled me to get a more detailed picture of the context the participants work in than the one I got during the preliminary listening (see section 6.2). This way the second ‘pass’ provided the groundwork for addressing my RQs. While I had started to identify complexities straight after the first ‘pass’, for the purpose of clarity I call ‘a formal coding’ this ‘pass’, i.e. my engagement with the whole of the data corpus gathered from both meetings.

For coding I used two techniques, which in grounded theory are referred to as open coding and axial coding. In this section I present my formal coding procedure, which was split in to three stages (see Figure 7 in section 6.1.4 for my data analysis pathway to understand the place of these stages in the whole data analysis process). Stage one dealt with open coding within each data set (section 6.3.1), stage two dealt with creating and comparing categories within each data set (section 6.3.2), in stage three I merged categories and created common themes related to potential complexities across the data sets (section 6.3.3).

6.3.1 Stage one - open coding

Prior listening, addressed in detail in section 6.2, enabled me to generate a list of ‘proto-codes’ on the context. I used them to establish a set of workable codes, from which I further could generate a dataset on potential complexities to address RQ1. Mapping the contextual features was also important for the discussion on perezhivanie, which is contextually dependant, to address RQ2.

As previously stated, I approached the data without imposing any pre-arranged themes informed by e.g. my own experience, any theory, previous research, etc., and made sense of what emerged. Then, I explored the data in an organic way, i.e. without any pre-determined
procedures, and only being curious what was there in the data. More specifically, what I did at this stage of the grounded theory (Walker & Myrick, 2006:552; Corbin & Strauss, 2008:2) can be referred to as open coding. Informed by this literature, I understand open coding as ‘the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing data’ (Corbin & Strauss, 2008:61).

My open coding became bi-directional from the start. Equipped with my notes and proto-codes (see 6.2), I kept them next to the transcript, uploaded to Nvivo (see 5.6 for more detail), and constantly compared and revised my initial proto-codes with emerging ideas of my engagement with the transcript in Nvivo. The coding enabled me to refine my initial notes, meanwhile the notes themselves informed the coding. My existing insider knowledge played a relevant part in viewing code from various standpoints, and helped me search for and find alternative versions for the codes. I gave a name to the meanings not only of what the teachers did, i.e. to their actions and activities, but also to what they thought. I coded their opinions, beliefs, attitudes, and relationships, to preserve detail that might otherwise be missed. I coded substantially where the story itself contained emotional features, and features which suggested that there was something important to code. As to relevance, I mapped utterances that related to reoccurring topics, or because they surprised me, or reminded me of other data I read about in the academic research, for example, in Johnson and Golombek’s (2002:110) data, or because for some other reason I found it relevant to the teaching context. At times the codes overlapped in the text, because any discourse is almost always multifunctional (Brown & Yule, 1983: 71), and in this case I used multiple codes for the same utterance.

With regard to the procedure, I conducted open coding by simultaneously reading the transcript and listening to the corresponding audio-recording. Similarly to the ‘first’ pass, listening made my engagement with the data more sensitive, and enabled me to notice where the teachers were engaged emotionally in what they were saying, which, along with
the corresponding text in the transcript, helped me make senses of the words, e.g. capture an issue the teacher identified. It always enabled me to identify and highlight a code in Nvivo. After highlighting I would give the code an appropriate name that would sufficiently capture its meaning. Table 2 below presents the process of moving from the data to codes, using the data of two meetings with Eva, where Eva 1 corresponds to the first meeting, and Eva 2 to the second one. These data were later joined in one category ‘Students’ approaches to Learning’.

Table 2: Open coding example using Eva’s data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eva 1</td>
<td>There is at least one student – a distractor in each group, who is always speaking Russian, commenting on [everything] or something else</td>
<td>Student as a distractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva 1</td>
<td>Not all 100% of the groups are homogeneous in terms of English skills. There is always a student, who is weaker, as well as one who misses lessons.</td>
<td>Mixed abilities students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva 1</td>
<td>Third year and first year student – they are different people... they know the Russian legal system by the third year ... so we treat them differently, there are different kinds of tasks [in legal English] for them</td>
<td>Student development from 1st to 3rd year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva 2</td>
<td>They are open to everything</td>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva 2</td>
<td>Students of the 4th year cannot do a presentation or study by heart a text in English. Oh they say ‘I’m scared to talk in public’.</td>
<td>Poor memory and presenting skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva 2</td>
<td>They simply cannot work. New generation cannot work. Their thinking operates as follows: when they are asked a question, they just go and google it. That’s all.</td>
<td>Google instead of thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva 2</td>
<td>They do not read much.</td>
<td>Poor extensive reading skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More specifically, I looked at my data as related to Ryan and Bernard’s (2003:87) questions: ‘What experience is the participant trying to describe?’, or ‘What is her belief, attitude or perezhivanie here?’ or ‘What is this expression an example of?’. It was a challenging and time-consuming task. I recursively read and listened to the chunk asking these questions. I went through the highlighted extract and the proto-code and notes, examining each phrase and establishing a limited range of short, meaningful versions of names to choose from. I tried to come up with a different name every time until the most salient one emerged. While my proto-codes were in Russian, from this stage on I created English names for all the codes, as it was more convenient for me, not least in terms of further elucidating the analysis.
At the end of the coding, I used an Nvivo feature and created a visual of all the codes of each participant. Figure 8 above demonstrates the mindmap, created using Nuala’s data. The mindmaps enabled me to look at the teachers’ accounts from a ‘bird’s eyes view’, and to see the most salient topics so as to reconstruct the ‘whole’ of an interview, building on my previous holistic approach towards the initial listening, but now in greater depth and detail.
As a result of the initial coding, I got 428 coding references in total (see Appendix 11). To consolidate overlapping codes and shrink their number to a manageable and workable set, I revised the existing codes, and tried to find possible overlaps in meaning between them. For this purpose, I conducted intra-informant comparisons of primarily descriptive codes within each data set.

In these multiple further waves of coding, I examined two or more of the most relevant, and close in meaning codes. I looked at the participant’s mindmap as in Figure 8 (above), taken from the initial coding, and the Nvivo nodes, and checked similarities and differences by asking myself a question: ‘Is the teacher talking on the same topic here?’ On having found similarities in the content I joined them, and then decided which name of the merged codes was the most significant. I disregarded some names, moving back and forth in the content, the mindmap and strips with codes on the right, and continually fine-tuned the merged code and its name.

For instance, in Nuala’s data (see Figure 8) I merged the ‘benefits of technology’, ‘teaching with and without technology’, and ‘TS benefits’ codes together under the name of the latter ‘benefits of Touch Stone platform’, because Nuala talked about technology, referencing VLE Touch Stone in all three cases. I sometimes assembled several codes with similar content and created a new name for them, which captured and reflected these codes. For example, I created a new code ‘assessment issues’, joining ‘pointing-rating system’, ‘deadline’, ‘auto-grading’, ‘benefits of deadline planning’, and ‘peer-assessment’ together.

Using the mindmap (see Figure 8 above), I visually divided all the codes from each data set into two groups. The first group was the codes related to contextual features (see group 1 in Figure 8), and the second group was related to the teacher’s subjective factors, such as her beliefs, attitudes, and perezhivanie (see group 2 in Figure 8). Such a division was useful for
further macro-coding analysis, because at that stage (see section 6.3.3) I did the analysis across the data sets, and needed the codes from group 1 of each participant only. Whereas group 2 codes were used at later ‘passes’, i.e. for understanding teachers’ perezhivanie (see section 6.5).

To recap, stage one in this second ‘pass’ worked as an audit trail of the totality of my data. I initially coded it, and then through linking and sorting codes I played with ideas that came from getting to know the data. As an outcome of this low level coding I generated 187 codes, which was approximately 16 - 30 working codes for each participant. The next stage was to group them into workable manageable sets of codes, or categories, which I describe in the next section.

6.3.2 Stage two - categorising codes or an intra-informant comparisons

My goal at this intermediate stage was to do the groundwork for answering RQ1. I aimed at preparing sets of working codes to reveal those contextual features, which potentially could be complexities for the teachers. The difference with the previous stage was that at this stage I found much deeper connections than in the previous one, and, to that end, was able to see overarching topics within each data set.

What I did at this stage of the grounded theory is what Walker & Myrick, (2006:552) and Corbin & Strauss, (2008:2) refer to as axial coding. I conducted axial coding as follows: ‘[codes are] compared, and then placed in a category. Similar data [i.e. codes] are placed in similar categories, and different data [i.e. codes] create new categories’ (Walker & Myrick, 2006:549). I took categories as ‘concepts indicated by the data’ (Merriam, 1998:179), which ‘are identified within the explicit or surface meanings of the data’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006:83. One axis presented one category.
More specifically, I looked for relationships between coded segments, and synthesised them into developed categories. I compared and contrasted various codes, thinking about how their content fit together, giving a recognisable basis for a category. If it did, then I created a category for these codes. After that, I focused on those codes, which had not fit into any category in the first iteration. I tested them out thoroughly, looking for any patterns that could potentially fit together, and got some broad categories this way. As well as with open coding, I employed my ‘insider’ awareness of the broader socio-cultural and academic context the teachers work in. My knowledge inevitably influenced this process.

To develop categories and revealed the overall trends I also used the mindmap feature of Nvivo, (see Figure 8 as an example). This visualisation tool assisted me in discerning relationships between codes, and in dragging and dropping codes in order to group them in categories, constantly comparing their content with the existing code(s) in that category. Table 3 presents an example of the analytical procedure of moving from codes to categories, using the same Nuala’s data set, displayed in Figure 8, but now in its improved version after merging codes (see the end of section 6.3.1).
Table 3: An example of developing categories from codes in Nuala’s data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Touch Stone</td>
<td>Description of online environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of deadline planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto-grading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-assessment design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring description</td>
<td>Description of working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors create tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How machine learning replaces teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic students</td>
<td>Description of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning deadlines</td>
<td>Nuala’s activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring – why LMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors design forums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decent salary</td>
<td>Nuala’s beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular is not always effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing students’ autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-student relationship matters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power of self-assessment and reflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a humanistic system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should stop babysitting students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should have opportunities to try new things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While some codes in the table have names, which might sound similar at first glance, their content signifies that they belong to different categories. Take, for example, two codes on Nuala’s mentoring role in MISIS, which I describe in detail in section 8.2.1. They are ‘mentors create tasks’ and ‘mentors design forums’. A category ‘mentors create tasks’ belongs to the ‘working conditions’ category, because to create tasks is one of the mentors’ responsibilities, whereas ‘mentors design forums’ was Nuala’s initiative, and it was beyond her responsibility as a mentor. Nuala decided to do Forums for her teachers because they often had to substitute their colleagues, and such Forums, where Nuala meticulously explained the tasks for the students, could help the substituting teachers to get involved in teaching of a new group dramatically.
From some names of my codes it might be not sometimes clear why they belong to a particular category. For instance, I put ‘decent salary’ to ‘Nuala’s beliefs’ category rather than to ‘working conditions’. Nuala mentioned the salary matter, when she stated that online teachers’ work is very time consuming, and these teachers should have a ‘decent salary’ in order to be able to invest time to the course design and its development. This was less a statement about actual working conditions than one of belief about how to help teachers in their teaching roles.

As an outcome of this stage I developed not only categories but also two broad themes within each data set. The first theme was ‘Perezhivanie’, which I kept intact for the fourth ‘pass’ with the data (see section 6.5) because this theme was unique for each teacher. The second theme was ‘Context’, and it contained categories related to the context and complexities. These formed the basis for the axial coding stage across the data sets, and I present this stage in the next section.

6.3.3 Stage three - creating connections by inter-informant comparisons

The final stage of the second ‘pass’ with the data was to prioritise the categories and conceptualise the data in order to gain an overall understanding of the teachers’ context. It was as a step towards identifying contextual complexities in the context in order to address RQ1. For this procedure I used axial coding too (see section 6.3.2 for more detail), but this time it was used across the data sets. Since similar categories often emerged in different datasets, I looked across them and surfaced similar categories, joining them in to one. As suggested by grounded theory (Braun & Clarke, 2006) this procedure of axial coding dealt with discovering key analytic categories, and forming common themes from them, themes I refer to as a higher-level category. I present one of the themes in Figure 9 below.
To link together two categories from different data sets with similar names was not problematic at this stage. For example, the problems with a particular LMS I initially had grouped under a category named after this LMS, e.g. ‘Efroom - viewing the grades’ or ‘Touchstone - not flexible’. After repeatedly revising the alternatives, I assembled them in one broader category of ‘VLE - issues’, because this name covered the aforementioned categories. Then, comparing ‘VLE - issues’ with ‘Coursebook - issues’, I decided to group these categories together as the problems the teachers addressed there were very similar.

Finally, out of these I generated the category ‘LMS, [Online] CourseBook’ (see it in a screenshot of one of the themes ‘Online environment’ in Figure 9).

This stage of axial coding enriched my understanding of potential complexities. As a result, I generated an overall picture of five potential complexities, see Figure 10. This became my framework to address RQ1. In the next section I present my third ‘pass’ with the data, where I critically analysed these five groups, and finally established three themes to address RQ1.
6.4 Analysing Complexities

The previous, second ‘pass’ with the data, presented in section 6.3, surfaced plenty of themes of contextual features. It provided a source for my conceptualising of potential complexities, which I present in this section to address RQ1:

What complexities do teachers identify trying to integrate technology in an institution of tertiary education in Russia?

In reality I started an inquiry into possible complexities straight from stage two (see section 6.3.2), when I joined the isolated codes into categories, and was able to make sense of a complexity by analysing codes in each category in each data set, and came up with a patchwork of various category combinations in each of ten teaching accounts. Then, in the third stage of the second pass I joined similar categories across the data sets, which allowed me to build five themes of potential complexities (see Figure 10), which provided a source for my final outlining of complexities in this section.

It is important to note here that teachers’ accounts of incidents occurring in their classroom differ. For some of them a contextual feature could potentially become a complexity, whereas for the other teachers it is simply a feature of their working context because teachers’ motives vary, and the teachers work out their attitude and relation to the context
in their own subjective way. When a participant was talking about their context, she was stating that ‘something is the case’ with no emotional investment. For example, Anna said: ‘We have been working with the software Touchstone for five years’. Whereas in case of a complexity, the teachers overlay the context with their own thoughts and discussion of experiences. For instance, Odina said that ‘I could not imagine how I could work without Touchstone online, and thought to quit the job [in case the software would not have been bought by the university in the following year]’. In instances such as this the teachers signalled their subjective experience. On noticing them, I approached the data with a more specific question about teacher’s motives, and whether they were realised or not. Another example of where a contextual feature for some teachers became a complexity for others, related to the category of ‘Learner autonomy’. A majority of teachers talked about using peer-assessment as one of the practical ways to foster autonomy. Some participants viewed peer-assessment as a contextual feature, whereas others identified it as a complexity, for example Anna:

It [peer-assessment] is AMAZING. But ... let’s be fair ... It seems that in the study with the diploma as a outcome ... this is not a good idea for all the assignments ... If a student understands that their grade depends on the grading of a particular mate ... there is always a possibility that they’ll give each other the highest grades ... but ... where the task is just do and get feedback - why not, from the other point of view.

In this excerpt Anna appreciated peer assessment as a valuable activity to reduce her own workload saying that with properly run peer assessment ‘my [her] teaching load would be reduced several times’. She felt confident about setting it up, because she had experienced how it worked doing some Coursera courses as a student. However, she identified running ‘peer assessment’ in her teaching course as a complexity, because it appeared ineffective. Anna complained that even when students were provided with rubrics, they did not assess peers’ work fairly, and tended to put the highest possible grade if the grade had been set up to influence the overall peer’s grade. Therefore, a contextual feature of ‘peer assessment’
was a complexity for Anna, because one of her basic attitudes is to assess the students fairly, which ‘peer assessment’ did not allow.

Surprisingly enough, I found that complexities, while experienced differently, were often similar in the totality of my data. For instance, almost all the participants encountered the complexity of student cheating. In these instances the teachers’ motives to assess the students fairly were not realised, because some students copied the other’s work. The teachers narrated this complexity differently, and shared with me different critical incidents in which their students used various means for cheating. To sum, the complexity was the same across the data sets, but appeared variously in different sets.

Procedurally, I looked at each of the five themes of contextual features (see Figure 10), and analysed categories under each theme one-by-one. To remind the reader, these categories were obtained during the macro-level coding across the data sets in the last stage in the second ‘pass’ (see 6.3.3). I looked at the codes within each category, asking (approximately) ‘whether it is a description of contextual features or a case of teacher’s subjective engagement with them?’, or ‘if it is a subjective experience, is there any teacher’s perezhivanie involved?’ (Given, 2008:114). These questions helped me contrast and distinguish a contextual feature from a subjective complexity, and reveal its properties in the data of different participants.

In establishing an understanding of what potential complexities are I used my conceptual framework (see section 4.5). As defined in section 1.3, I understand a complexity as a particular contextual feature, or a case, or an event of teaching where the participants often faced double binds of some kind, i.e. when they could not do what they had planned. In order to recognise a complexity in a participant’s account, I first needed to see what participants had said about a particular contextual factor, which acted for them as an obstacle and caused issues. I presume that the teachers talked emotionally about the issue,
not only because of the ‘high emotional temperature of Russian discourse’ (Wierzbicka, 1992:395), but also and primarily in attempts to achieve an equilibrium after the cognitive and emotional dissonance of their unrealised motives (see Chapter 2 for more detail). However, it is thought that emotions are not easy to capture and measure (Lieblich et al., 1998; Imai, 2010), because ‘teachers rarely announce their emotional experiences directly. Instead, their expressions of emotion tend to be much more covert, infusing their talk and actions in incredibly subtle ways’ (Johnson & Worden, 2014:145). Lieblich et al. (1998:9) highlight that affective characteristics are hard to detect at first glance, and they require studying the data meticulously. In section 6.2 I described in detail how listening to the recorded interviews increased my sensitivity in recognising emotions, and helped to construct a model of the speaker’s reactions, attitudes and intentions.

Another difficulty in capturing an emotional reaction to a complexity is that complexities are ultimately temporal, and related to a subjective experience in a particular action. To address this difficulty and capture the temporal feature of complexities, I use the concept of ‘motive’, introduced in section 2.2. Teachers’ motives to perform a particular activity are almost certain triggered by their beliefs about teaching, their attitude to students and to what I refer to here as a ‘teaching need’. As it was pointed out in section 2.2, when a need meets an object, which helps the teacher satisfy this need, it becomes a motive, and the motive triggers actions and activities.

Returning briefly to the relationship between motives and emotions, I refer the reader to Chapter 2 again, where I addressed it in more detail. Emotions have been found to represent motives in consciousness (Леонтьев [Leontiev], 1971; 1975:74). Unrealised motives, therefore, are likely to cause an overt emotional reaction (Рубинштейн [Rubinstein], 2002). Teachers do not always make it public, but it is always there, as with any partially subconscious process. To sum up what I have reminded the reader of in this theoretical detour, an analysis of teachers’ unrealised motives assisted me in distinguishing
complexities from merely contextual features. I used teachers’ emotional engagement as a signal of a possible complexity.

Turning now to the emotions of my participants, as I mentioned above, they often described their initial emotional reaction to an issue, and said that they were frustrated, enraged etc. For instance, ‘I got disappointed’ (Anna), ‘this was very stressful and surely, frustrating’ (Glasha), ‘I encountered such terrible things ... it’s awful!’ (Emmy). It correlates with the literature, where an initial reaction to a critical incident is presented as ‘unacknowledged feelings of hurt, guilt, resentment, fear, injustice, and shame’ (Day & Leitch, 2001:403). Golombek (2015:471) calls this ‘emotional dissonance’ and defines it as follows:

> a disharmony between the emotions expressed (annoyance and fear) and my expected, normative emotion as a professional (controlled compassion).

While sometimes they did not reflect their emotional state explicitly, their intonation, tone and the other prosodic features assisted me in discerning their emotional state. Sometimes the participants used words such as issue, problem, and obstacle to signal that they could not do what they planned. The teachers often addressed a complexity directly, using terms, in Russian, that are synonymous with 'issues' 'double binds' or 'critical incidents'. Sometimes, however, I could not find the linguistic or non-linguistic clues to the teachers’ emotions in the data. Analysing teachers’ beliefs in relation to the event in question, often enabled me to speculate about the teacher’s unrealised motives, and get access to possible complexities this way.

To recap, by appealing to teachers’ motives, I gained a sense of various complexities as discussed by different participants. The logical progression from potential complexities to actual ones assisted me in understanding which complexities are more common, which are less, and which are unique for each of my participants. I grouped and finalised complexities into the three most salient over-arching themes (see Figure 11 below).
Figure 11. Final themes of Complexities

Figure 11 demonstrates themes, categories, and codes, and their relationship and hierarchies. As in Figure 11, the complexities themes are related to:

- Russian students’ approaches to learning;
- Online environments;
- Working conditions.
To summarise sections 6.3 and 6.4, I did textual data analysis, and broke the data into bits to produce taxonomies and themes. Although this analysis allowed me to get access to the participants’ experience with technology, and enabled me to map complexities and perezhivanie in the data, its power to fully unpack the complex phenomena of perezhivanie was restricted. It did not allow me to reveal the dialectical relationships between the emotional, cognitive and contextual factors in perezhivanie.

What is more, thematic analysis assumes the teachers’ ‘uncomplicated subjectivity’ (Parker, 1994:243), as if the teachers simply represented their thinking rather than continuing to develop their thinking. Whereas when narrating, my participants were making new meanings, getting new ways of expressing things, and gaining insights into their practice. A likely reason why they had chosen the particular incidents to share with me, was that they were still trying to understand something in these incidents for themselves. New understanding lies at the core of any narrative, but once again, the textual analysis did not allow me to reveal it, as my data were segmented after coding. In the next section I present my final, forth ‘pass’ with the data using a narrative instrument.

6.5 Narrative Thematic Analysis

So far I have described the task of listening of audio data in search of the teachers’ perezhivanie, and how I deconstructed stories into codes through textual analysis to reveal contextual features and finally identify complexities. I have noted that although I assembled the ‘broken’ data into a coherent whole at the end, the lengthy data transcripts did not allow me either to reveal the relationship between emotions, cognition, and teachers’ context, or the dynamic nature of perezhivanie. I, therefore, needed an analytical instrument that could help me divide these long texts into small stories in which the aforementioned relationship and the nature of perezhivanie could be revealed.
I found the structural approach, i.e. moved from the paradigmatic-type to narrative-type of inquiry in Polkinghorne’s (1995) terms. The move enabled me to create a narrative of the entire teachers’ perezhivanie, and address RQ2:

RQ2: What is the teachers’ perezhivanie about complexities?

In the three subsequent sections I present my fourth, final ‘pass’ with the data: the analytical instrument, the coding procedure, and an example of the data analysis using this instrument.

6.5.1 Developing my instrument
As explained in the introduction, to put the data of each participant together after coding in one account, I looked for a framework, which enabled me to divide it into meaningful stories so that through them I would be able to trace the dynamic and possibly developmental nature of perezhivanie. I considered two frames, Mishler’s (1986:92) ‘Setting, Problem, Plan of action and Outcome’, and ‘Abstract, Orientation, Complicating Events, Evaluation, Result/Resolution and Coda’ suggested by Labov and Waletzky’s (1967, L&W hereafter). According to L&W’s structural approach to story analysis, a well-formed narrative contains these six elements (ibid), which are attributed to a specific succession of clauses in a story. To design my analytical instrument, I borrowed Mishler’s (1986) and L&W’s analytical perspective on how various story elements can provide meaning. In Table 4 below I compare these two frameworks with my own (see Figure 6 in section 4.5).
Table 4: Comparative table of three frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My framework</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L&amp;W</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>When? Who? Where? What? i.e. information about the setting (e.g. people involved, time, place)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Complicating Events</td>
<td>The problem occurred (M), Then what happened? What happened next? (L&amp;W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Response</td>
<td>Plan of action</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Reflection how to overcome it (M) So what? What do the events mean to the narrator? (L&amp;W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Response that comprises Perezhivanie</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Result/Resolution</td>
<td>Evaluation of the plan (M), What finally happened? How did it end? (L&amp;W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>Return the perspective to the present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While both aforementioned structures matched perfectly with my conceptual framework, I could not apply them blindly. Mishler’s frame seemed too broad to capture teachers’ perezhivanie in their narrative, and, therefore, required much more nuanced labelling. For this reason I used his frame initially only to consider other possible frames, and do not refer to it further. In the rest of the section I discuss perezhivanie through the elements and functions of the L&W’s structure. I adapted it because my data varied in terms of a
succession of the story elements. The teachers did not narrate in the linear way, as L&W’s structure prescribes, and the succession of elements in teachers’ stories was almost always different. To add, L&W’s structural analytical approach was focused on a clause-centred presentation of the data, which was restricting for me to some extent, even in their more elaborated semantic structural pivot, presented later, in Labov (1997). In following paragraphs I explain how I apply the L&W’s frame to my analysis of each teacher’s account. For the purpose of clarity I use capital letters for the elements of L&W’s structure.

L&W suggest that their first element ABSTRACT and their last element CODA are not often present in the stories. This was the case in my data, because the participants rarely started with a summary, only if they were prompted by my question or comment. Similarly, the teachers did not summarise at the end what they had just said, with a moral or conclusion of some kind. L&W’s ORIENTATION element, on the other hand, was always in the teachers’ stories. In L&W’s frame it is considered to map out ‘contextual features’ (e.g. the name of the course, students’ profile, group dynamics, time of the term, technology used, etc.), and the main role of ORIENTATION is to situate an event in a specific time and place for the benefits of the intended audience, i.e. me in this case.

L&W’s COMPLICATING EVENTS refers to contextual information, which maps out a complexity a teacher faces. That is, this element indicates the main problems or issues that the teacher encountered. It could be a particular lesson stage, or a lesson preparation, or a slightly broader situation than one lesson. Identifying a complexity here, as well as relating it to the previous section, enabled me to explore why it was a problem through the lens of the teacher’s unrealised motives and perezhivanie. It is important to note here that teachers might have various motives because as active subjects they form various relationships (to the students, the program, the colleagues). For clarity of analysis here, I focus on one, a particular pivotal motive, which could trigger an activity, but which was not realised.
EVALUATION, according to L&W is considered an element that maps out participants’ emotional and cognitive response, that is to say, as related to my focus, perezhivanie. EVALUATION can occur in various parts of the story, and even ‘overlap with other structures’ (Cortazzi, 1991:17). In section 6.5.3, where I exemplify this structural narrative analysis with Anna’s story, this jumbling of EVALUATION element becomes apparent.

RESULT/RESOLUTION in L&W’s terms is an element that refers to a restructuring activity. I understand it as related to my study that the teachers became able to design a set of new actions as a result of their cognitive and emotional engagement with the critical incident, and the transformation was reflected in RESULT/RESOLUTION. Teachers’ new actions often yielded some kind of positive changes and, as a result, their perezhivanie almost always disappeared because an issue, which had triggered the incident, was resolved.

To sum up, identifying these story elements enabled me to locate critical incidents within the whole narratives, zoom in on them, and then analyse teachers’ perezhivanie there. It proved useful because I was able to make sense of the teacher’s particular perezhivanie as a response to the complexities, identified earlier. Having outlined my analytical instrument in this section I will now move on to demonstrate the coding process in the next section, and will present how the elements of the story, introduced above were mapped into my data.

6.5.2 Coding procedure

This section addresses structural and thematic narrative analysis I carried out to address RQ2 about teachers’ perezhivanie. The process of analysis took place in two steps. First, I mapped the small story in the whole narrative and copied it into the Word (.docx) table for coding. Second, I mapped its different elements to visualise them by different colours and underlining for coloured and black and white copies of the data analysis (see table 5).
Table 5: List of colours matching different story elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Elements (L&amp;W frame)</th>
<th>Story Elements (my instrument)</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Underlining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicating Events</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Emotional Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Cognitive Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result/Resolution</td>
<td>Restructuring Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 below demonstrates Nuala’s data coded according to the colouring of different elements of the story provided in Table 5 above. The colours reveal a transition from Context to Complexities, which empirically contributes to the conceptual framework, developed in section 6.5.1 (see Table 4).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. That happened ...
I had to substituted another teacher. // |
| 2. at the middle of the term ...
at the middle of the term (repeats). |
| 3. I was registered in our Canvas ...
and there ...
all people were BUSY at the middle of the term ...
with the conference preparation that time ...
and I was registered not as a teacher but // |
| 4. as an ORDINARY STUDENT ... |
| 5. just simply neglected ...
@ simply I had access// |
| 6. I WAS STRUGGLING with the tasks design ...
that is// |
| 7. I am able to view everything but cannot add anything ...
as an ASSIGNMENT SECTION ...
I've tried everything// |
| 8. logged in ...
AS A DIGITALLY NATIVE GROWN WITH TECHNOLOGIES// |
| 9. tried each and every button to click ...
((gesture of clicking is heard))// |
| 10. then found I could do something through the area of discussions ...
that is I can upload some discussions ...
and all the tasks uploaded ...
reported [the problem] to each and every department. While there was a conference NOBODY PAID ATTENTION ...
that happened ...
they said yes yes I'll have a look ...
so uploaded something through the area of discussions... something through the area of discussions // |
| 11. while the uncertain period of changing a teacher ...
for the substitution ...
some students got relaxed and started working a bit later ...
//when they understand that I won't give them pass ...
if they DO NOT DO ONLINE WORK ...
but the deadlines for the tasks were programmed in advance ... |
| 12. So the students tried to 'BREAK THROUGH' THE DEADLINES ...
but could not ...
So the problem was we faced deadline ...
the task has shut ...
the same was me ...
I was registered as a student ...
and did not have // |
| 13. the rights //to change them// So, what I felt? the deadlines started shutting up the tasks for me as well as ...
the platform offered to do the task ...
warning as late submission ...
I cannot see what my students have done. COMPLETELY. This is the ADVANCED [level] group ...
one boy has guessed to do it via messaging ... |
| 14. SO he sends me a message and attaches all his tasks(.) (laughing) and found how to solve the issue, i.e. they uploaded the assignments via messaging, with their comments and so on |
6.5.3 The change curve

The structural analysis using L&W’s frame, as discussed in the previous section, helped me reveal perezhivanie in the data, as indicated in the combination of orange and yellow colours in Table 6. However, as I said in the introduction to the thesis, the instances of perezhivanie were so various in the data that I needed a pattern, much more precise than my conceptual framework (see section 4.5) and L&W’s frame. This unanticipated observation encouraged me to consult the literature on people going through change, and I found a model that seemed to resonate with my focus.

The model was originally developed in the 1960s by the Swiss psychiatrist Kübler-Ross (2009). She studied psychological challenges people go through when their loved ones become terminally ill. Feeling grief is not simply an affective state for Kübler-Ross, it is inner work to make new meaning of the life project, now with the changing role of the loved one (not) in it.

I found similarities between the Kübler-Ross model and Vasilyuk’s notion of perezhivanie-pain (see section 3.3). What is more, Kübler-Ross identifies grieving as a job, done in particular stages and reflecting people’s general reactions, when they cope with the undeniable change in their life due to the loss of beloved ones. Her positioning of perezhivanie as a job echoes with perezhivanie-activity, in Vasilyuk’s terms, i.e. the focus of my study. While perezhivanie in teaching is not as dramatic as the life-changing traumas that Kübler-Ross (2009) researched, the stages can be applied to teaching experience in the changing and unpredictable context of technology integration. Analysing the data, I noticed similarities between the pattern of teachers’ responses to complexity and the response patterns that Kübler-Ross researched. On discovering this, I adapted Kübler-Ross’s Change Curve, informed by my data, and demonstrate the resulting pattern in Figure 12.
In the section that follows I use the data of one participant, Anna, and discuss her perezhivanie as related to some critical incidents Anna shared with me, analysed using the change curve, presented in Figure 12, as well as L&W’s frame, introduced in section 6.5.2.

**6.5.4 Anna’s data example of narrative analysis**

Anna’s story naturally emerged in the flow of our dialogue, as a logical progression of her thinking around the complexity of student cheating (see more about this complexity in section 7.1). Remembering various incidents of student dishonesty, Anna first shared with me several cases where students cheated. The following critical incident, probably, mulled over in her mind, popped up when she intended to help me understand her Peregzhivanie about student cheating. At some point in our dialogue we both acknowledged an affordance of Quiz, an activity in the VLE Canvas to randomly mix questions, so that students would not be able to copy each other’s answers. In response to my prompt ‘is it [this feature of quizzes] important?’ Anna emphasised: ‘it IS important’, and it felt like my prompt gave
Anna a narrative impetus to share one more case, now with her perezhivanie about student cheating being clearly articulated.

Referring to section 6.5.1, I analyse this part of Anna’s data using L&W structural approach. To remind the reader, a story, according to the authors, contains the following elements: ABSTRACT, ORIENTATION, COMPLICATING EVENTS, EVALUATION, RESULT/RESOLUTION and CODA, which are attributed to specific clauses in a narrative. The following discussion of Anna’s data is structured by these elements, and I use capital letters for the elements of L&W’s structure as I used them in section 6.5.1. I add the corresponding timestamps from the Nvivo transcript to each extract as well, to show the chronology of the account presented.

Anna began with the summary or the main point, addressing the complexity of student cheating, i.e. with an ABSTRACT, according to the L&W’s framework. The students’ willingness to get a grade by any means rather than knowledge and skills triggered Anna’s perezhivanie about student cheating, and this is how Anna abstracted it:

[00:10:20] Yes, it IS important … it’s important because the students … I’m sorry [to say] (giggle) … often tend not to gain new knowledge (giggle) … but get a grade or a ‘tick’ [in the assessment list] … It happens that they simply … they all are now in social media … and ask somebody more advanced to do the test on behalf of them … SIMULTANEOUSLY … at least … just to record an iPhone video what they are [doing], that is which ‘ticks’ they are putting where … Then there is Team Viewer … to look at the other student’s screen. Just simple as that … commonplace … So, yes, it IS important.

Anna described the complexity very emotionally, by giggling and emphasising some words, such as ‘SIMULTANEOUSLY’ and ‘IS’, which I present in capital letters for more visuality. Then, Anna’s story surprisingly deviated from L&W’s sequence, subverting it. Instead of ORIENTATION, which is the second element in the framework, Anna communicated how she
normally deals with this complexity, expressing her teaching need. This indicated a turn to EVALUATION element:

[00:10:58] I need them to have different successions of the task questions ... I mean that the answers of one student were not [in the same succession] ... the same as the answers of the other one.

To add, it signalled that Anna’s related perezhivanie and meaning making process were still ‘on’ and, by diverging from the story, Anna articulated her attitude to cheating this way.

Straight after that, Anna returned back to the story, and in L&W it was RESOLUTION:

[00:11:20] for example, this year I gave my students as a test 15! (exclamation) different tasks for writing.

Here Anna’s voice went up when she said ‘15’ and was emotionally coloured, which signifies to me as a listener, that Anna tried to communicate unusual and important details at the same time. To ‘unpack’ this emotional reaction, I prompted her with the question:

[00:11:15] Lada: According to the number of students?

Anna: Yes, they wrote online and I needed ... them not to copy from each other ... [I] did not think long ... just gave them all different [writing] tasks. I told them I did not care which essay topic to read on, essay is an essay even in Africa! I will read what YOU will write.

The sequence of EVALUATION ‘I needed ... them not to copy from each other’, followed by ORIENTATION ‘they wrote online’, challenges the traditional L&W’s sequence again. It seems that the reason, why the succession of elements got more jumbled, was not only Anna’s ongoing sense-making, but also Anna’s intention not to overload me with the story details, that could make me feel sorry for her. Anna seemed to be concerned about my possible negative feelings as the story was very emotional. Since, in fact, it was a success story at the end of the day, Anna intuitively relocated the elements, and reported the positive outcome of the critical incident much earlier than the end of her story. There was
also a possibility that her visceral intention was likely to turn her perezhivanie ‘off’. In this way the problem is solved; there no perezhivanie anymore, and she could then cognitively reflect at the end of the story without intrusion of her emotions and perezhivanie.

The three following elements made the story clear for me. First, it was COMPLICATING ACTION ‘[I] did not think long’, second EVALUATION ‘I told them I did not care which essay topic to read on, essay is an essay even in Africa! I will read what YOU will write’, and third, Anna’s emotional CODA ‘an essay is an essay even in Africa’. The fact that this CODA was emotional is evident in Anna’s lexical semantics as she uses the Russian proverb ‘even in Africa’, since using proverbs and idioms signifies an emotional engagement (Wierzbicka, 1999:218). In this context the proverb means that whatever essay the student writes, it has a learning impact.

What Anna did not say, but it may be inferred, is that marking and giving feedback on fifteen different tasks is much more demanding and time consuming work than marking a similar task for all the students. This is an important note in order to understand her motives, and to me it signifies that Anna’s belief in fair assessment motivates her to sacrifice her personal free time in order to achieve the aim, as she said, ‘not give them an opportunity to cheat’:

00:11:45 Lada: Is it a problem?

Anna: Yes, the problem ... the problem is when you communicate in distance [with students] ... not entirely distant you have to rely on the student’s diligence, that they come to get knowledge ... Unfortunately not a 100% graduate students have THIS desire. To make matters worse ... it happens sometimes ... at the end of the term they get so overloaded ... such huge load ... that they are eager to get by as soon as possible ... and they [cheat] ... on me ... I do understand it ... and try and create a space so that not give them an opportunity to cheat.

Here Anna appeared to be engaging with the CODA in L&W terms. She concluded similarly as she did several times before, communicating again her statements of intent to ‘try and
create a space so that not give them an opportunity to cheat’, and her story naturally emerged from this conclusion. I analyse the story using Kübler-Ross’s (2009) change curve, presented in Figure 12, as well as L&W’s frame.

To outline the story, Anna occasionally noticed that the number of submitted assignments were higher than the number of students in the room. Her students, ‘wise guys’ as she calls them, had quickly realised that in order to submit an assignment they did not need to go to the university since the assignments were submitted online. While Anna provided a unique group link, available during the class time only, somehow the absent students got this link as well. Knowing the link, some students sent the assignment from home synchronously with the others mates who were in the class that time. They completed activities and assignments from home, which did not guarantee that they had done everything themselves. Anna had perezhivanie about the student dishonesty, and finally found a solution, which prevented her students from cheating. She used ‘Google preferences’, and granted all the students a ‘Reader’ role in Googleclass. It meant that everyone could read the assignment task, but could not submit their work via the platform, with a ‘Reader’ role. During the test Anna manually changed the students’ roles from ‘Reader’ to ‘Editor’, but did it only for those students, who raised a hand when were ready with their assignments. Therefore, those, who had decided to stay at home and, potentially cheat, were not able to submit the assignment, because, being absent, they could not ‘raise their hands’. Below is a synopsis of the story as related to Anna’s narration. Anna started with ORIENTATION, which was the following:

[00:12:51.9] For instance, last spring I ran a course ‘information technology’ ... and once a week they had two lessons of practice ... so ... two lessons of practice ... and they do it just very easy ... They come to the computer cluster, which MISIS provides ... they log in from their Google account ... I give the a link to the assignment tasks AT THE BEGINNING of the lesson ... that is, they have an access to the tasks ONLY there. This assignment can be accessed ONLY THERE ... and the tasks are visible by this group of students.
Lada: So, closed for anybody else.

Anna: Everything is hidden and the others, trying to enter from this link get a message: ‘you do not have access to this space’. Even the students from the same course ... There were four groups there and so there were a lot of students on this course ... So ... each group had their own space in the site ... Yes, the tests were the same sometimes, but to get to them [from the outside] was hard. So ... provide them with the link.

Anna: Super will be later! They could read the task but could not get engaged with the assignment until they raised the hand and told me that they were ready.

There was a sense of Anna being delighted and excited when she exclaimed: ‘Super will be later!’, because she was going to tell me about her solution, above described. The solution was a RESULT in L&W’s terms: ‘They could read the assignment task, but could not get engaged with it until they raised their hand, and told me that they were ready’.

Interestingly, the RESULT was followed by the ORIENTATION, and this revealed a potentially reconstructing role of perezhivanie in her narrative. As Anna was still thinking over and working out or evaluating the new assignment design, she presented COMPLICATING EVENT immediately after RESULT, starting with ‘because’, which she said quite emotionally:

[00:15:25.9] They could read the task but could not get engaged with the task until they raised the hand and told me that they were ready ... BECAUSE I noticed it very soon that the number of the works submitted and the number of the students DID NOT MATCH. These ‘clever’ guys ... What did they do? They stayed at home during my class, opened my link - they could do it [as the students on the same group and those who are in the class can immediately send the link to those who are at home] ... and uploaded them [into the site] as they had access to do it. It’s a Google site for goodness sake.

Anna expressed surprise, describing the complexity of student cheating: ‘what did they do?’, and her voice often went up. She humorously called the cheating students ‘these clever guys’, meaning that they guessed she would not have managed to spot their absence in the classroom, as the attendance of students was not regular. Some students tended to come
late, and others left the class earlier. Due to the online mode of the assignment, she never knew who had done the tasks themselves in the class, and who had done them at home, presumably using help of others people or resources.

It is almost certain that this critical incident reveals a complexity for her, as she could not realise her motive to grade student work fairly because she could not spot which students were being dishonest. Anna’s *Perezhivanie about student cheating* appeared to push her to look for a solution. Speaking about the case was very emotional, and this signifies to me that Anna’s perezhivanie was still ‘on’:

> [00:16:16.5] I am not able to finetune the link during the class - it is time consuming ... I have to choose 25 ticks from the list. It is not challenging at all, but requires some concentration ... I do not want to do it at the beginning of the class ... It takes time ... This is their learning time after all ... So ... And it is impossible to know in advance who would come and who would not ... I would have to constantly distract [from the lesson] to fine-tune the access control in case somebody is late ... no, it is not  [a solution] This is foolish.

In this extract Anna identifies the issues in her initial means of addressing the complexity and shows her frustration at not being able to address it. This indicates to me that she was preparing to restructure her motives, and run the assignment differently. These ideas are, therefore, different versions of RESOLUTION. For example, one of her ideas was to generate a link for each present student during the lesson. However, as Anna mentioned, this would take up much of the lesson time, which if ineffective, as she said: ‘this is their learning time after all’. Anna rejected this idea, because otherwise, the students would wait until she prepared unique assignment links for each student, and wasted time waiting.

Returning once more to the way she structured this story, I understand it as Anna starting with ORIENTATION, then providing a RESULT, then a COMPLICATING EVENT. Those options, which would not work for her as a solution, could be attributed to EVALUATION, and now,
by saying ‘No’, and meaning that these solutions did not seem to be effective, she got straight to the complexity, which she started narrating as COMPLICATING EVENT:

[00:17:36.6] What did they do? They stayed at home during my class, opened my link because they could do it [as the students on the same group and those who are in the class can immediately send the link to those who are at home] ... and uploaded them [into the site] as they had access to do it. It’s a Google site for goodness sake.

This humorous and emotional ‘for goodness sake’ signifies to me that Anna saw a dodge students’ temptation to cheat, and she understood that they could easily do it by using ‘Google site’, i.e. by working online. The whole quote also implies a sense of agency over the situation, because Anna’s reflection of the students’ cheating means that she had been already fully aware of what was going on. Her Perezhivanie about student cheating seemed to push her find an effective solution, and resolve the issue. As I said in the story outline above, the new solution was to use the ‘Google preferences’ feature, and change the student’s rights from ‘reading’ to ‘editing’ manually during the test, when the student in the class raised a hand, and this was a RESOLUTION:

[00:18:56.7] Google site has preferences … for instance he [the student] can ‘read only’ … when they finished, they said: ‘I have finished’, I asked his name and [the number of] the group, because they sometimes studied together [some groups], I went to their line and changes access - from ‘read only’ to ‘read and edit’. And only then they could upload something … After completing the task I again change their status: from ‘read and edit’ to ‘read only’. I sometimes remove the link so that they could not come again and copy the screen to the group … So … Agreeably … Thereafter … Until I have marked the work the link to the student’s assignment does not work: ‘you have done, submitted, you then leave’.

L&W’s analytical framework allowed me not only to reveal an interesting feature of storytelling, but also to explore the transformative power of perezhivanie. As demonstrated in the discussion above, Anna moved faster to the end of the story, where her perezhivanie was more cognitive. Two probable explanations why Anna subverted L&W’s structure were that she tried to understand something for herself in this past event, and realized that her
story did have a successful outcome. We, as human beings, want to point that out earlier if there is a positive outcome, and this jumbling of elements can be quite natural. It enables us to create a safe space to tell the story in a more pleasant way for the listener.

Using the change curve (Kübler-Ross, 2009) I got a more nuanced understanding of the teachers’ perezhivanie and its developmental potential. Below I demonstrate it with the same story from Anna analysed above, but now with the change curve (see Figure 12). Anna experienced a complexity of student cheating, and got frustrated as she could not find an immediate solution: ‘I am not able to finetune the link during the class’. Following her initial frustration, Anna first tried and diverged from what had happened: ‘it is time consuming ... I have to choose 25 ticks from the list. It is not challenging at all, but requires some concentration ... I do not want to do it at the beginning of the class ... It takes time ... This is their learning time after all’. At some point Anna started to think of possible solutions, and it was the beginning of the acceptance stage, according to Kübler-Ross’s change curve. Anna experimented with different assessment procedures, such as giving the students the link manually, setting up the assignment just before the class, etc. Then she experienced ‘aha’ moments, i.e. something that brought her satisfaction: ‘after completing the task I again change their status: from ‘read and edit’ to ‘read only’. Anna attached a lot of emotional meaning to her sense-making process, which in the data above was indexed by adjectives, metaphors, and idiomatic expressions she used.

It is important to note here that the teachers were telling the stories when the critical incidents were over. Not surprisingly, telling them post-factum, the teachers tended to make a story more cognitive, and in this way they were able to reflect on their emotions experienced during the incident. I assume if they had still been in the incident and experiencing perezhivanie, they would not have been able to reflect on their emotional state that much. On the other hand, something was still going on in the meetings because
they were still engaged emotionally. It could be because of the developmental power of perezhivanie, and the developmental mode the teachers sought.

The Fourth ‘pass’ with the data revealed how the participants spoke in the interview. In my further analysis in Chapters 7 and 8 I suggests why they were talking this way by identifying complexities and analysing teachers’ perezhivanie.

In this chapter I drew upon the entire thesis, tying up theoretical strands of the literature review and empirical strands of the methodology, and presented my data analysis strategy to address the research questions. First, I described the mixed nature of my data and my thinking of how to approach them. Then, I demonstrated my four step analytical instrument, which comprised textual and then narrative analysis of the data. After that, I continued to provide a detailed account of how I analysed the data in several passes. Two following chapters of the thesis are concerned with addressing my RQ1 and RQ2 correspondently.
Chapter 7: Answering RQ1

As pointed out earlier, the participants’ stories provide rich accounts of the complex work of educational practice with technology. In the previous chapter, I described how I used procedures of thematic analysis and systematised the data, and obtained a rich nuanced picture of context and potential complexities. More specifically, I carried out a number of progressive steps, utilising an open and axial coding procedure from grounded theory, and broke the data into bits in order to produce categories and taxonomies of contextual features, and to map various themes of potential complexities. Finally I analysed across all the interviews to establish an understanding of what the complexities might be, in order to gain a sense of them as discussed by different participants. As an outcome of this final stage, which was a deductive analysis, I created a general system of three over-arching themes, which are potential complexities related to Students’ Approaches to Learning, Online Environment and Working Conditions. This enabled me to address RQ1 in this chapter:

RQ1: What complexities do teachers face trying to integrate technology in an institution of tertiary education in Russia?

There are several points important to note here. While RQ1 is more descriptive than interpretive by nature, it is fundamental to how I interpret the complexities the participants shared with me, because it is me who decides to what extent the teacher experiences a contextual feature as a complexity. This is therefore an analytical discussion, which attributes to teachers’ motives and perezhivanie, rather than merely a description of how various contextual features hinder the participants in their efforts to do what they have planned (see section 6.4 for a more detailed explanation of how I recognised complexities). Finally, the analysis, presented in this chapter, does the groundwork for accessing the totality of experience of a teacher, viewed through the lens of their perezhivanie. This is then taken up in Chapter 8.
The main part of this chapter is divided into three sections, according to the themes. Within each theme, I first establish what the contextual features are, and then explore how they are complexities, as viewed by the teachers. For the remainder of the chapter I explain how, informed by this analysis, I selected three out of ten participants to present their data to address RQ2 in Chapter 8. I had to make this selection because the number of instances of perezhivanie in the data of ten participants was enormous. I address the selection process in section 7.4.

7.1 Complexity 1: Students’ approaches to learning

Turning to what the participants said regarding how their students go about learning, and what complexities the students’ attitudes to learning might cause, I can reveal three major trends, which I discuss below. In section 7.1.1, I address complexities related to a particular student factor. The next section is devoted to the complexity of academic dishonesty, which I identified in almost all the teachers’ accounts. In section 7.1.3, I discuss student complaints that the teachers found unfair, and which caused their perezhivanie. I view these three trends of complexities as consequences of the overarching complexity of student approaches to learning.

7.1.1 Student factors

The majority of the participants mentioned that learning English is not the students’ priority in the university, which Jane claimed to be one of the drawbacks of a non-linguistic university. She said, ‘we, linguists, are not in the first place for them [the students]’. This means that their students tend not to make an effort to improve their language skills; as Eva said, ‘their English is as it was at school [level B1-B2 according to Common Europe Framework for References]’. This intermediate plateau of students’ General English became a complexity for Eva to design effective Legal English classes, aimed at the development of
her students’ language proficiency, but her students mostly learned their own presentations by heart, rather than practising using specific English terms:

Perezhivanie is still there ... A student does a presentation excellently ... but ... when they are asked a question - it is like a completely different student speaks ... it reveals that they do not have a good command of juridical terminology... simply learn their presentations by heart [cannot say a word themselves in the professional jargon ... I tell them wherever you come for the job interview they will ask you to translate. It is important for the lawyer ... as for you grammar tests I have the smallest perezhivanie ... but Legal rendering ... this is the most challenging ... it IS required in the job interviews! I ask my last students ... even the weakest thank me afterwards.

Tonia remembered that once she asked them about their priorities in English, trying to make her lessons less teacher-centred. However, her students immediately responded that English is not their priority at all.

The second complexity was related to the students’ IT skills. The teachers of both universities acknowledged their students’ high e-literacy skills: some of them are able to improve the HTML codes of the online tasks, or remove bugs they have found in the open code. Anna’s students, for example, often share with her their investigations of web pages she uses with them for online work; for example, they always tell her which page has a beautiful HTML code, or which page has an ugly code. Surprisingly, while high e-literacy skills seem to be more of an advantage than a problem in learning, the participants communicated it as a complexity on several occasions. As exemplified in section 1.3, where I introduced complexities, Anna’s and Emmy’s students sometimes ‘hack the tasks’, i.e. they create an HTML code which generates keys for quizzes designed by their teachers.

Since this technical knowledge is often beyond the expertise of ordinary language teachers, they cannot compete with their technologically-advanced students in programming skills, nor spot the cheaters. Their motive to provide a fair grading, therefore, is not always
fulfilled in the face of this contextual complexity, as they never know whether their students have done the tasks themselves or have launched a tool with the HTML code which contains the keys. To prevent this cheating, my participants appealed to the students’ sense of responsibility. Jane, for instance, tried to boost students’ motivation by allocating a whole induction month of the unit to discuss the goals and objectives of the study, and students’ agency. She explained that it helped her to create a common sense of purpose for learning and to avoid cheating, claiming ‘It’s necessary to mobilise [podsobrat] them’. Both senses, of purpose and responsibility, would not allow them to cheat in any way, she believed. In the next section, I discuss more widely how my participants perceive student dishonesty, and provide their responses to the complexity of student cheating in more detail.

Another complexity is that students’ motivation to learn, if they have any, seems to be extrinsic. As a result, the students are very oriented towards high grades, rather than towards learning as a process. To put it in Anna’s words, her students have a single-minded aim ‘to get a higher mark or a tick’. Dasha confessed that ‘to get a [decent] grade is the best [student] motivation’. Olesia, the most experienced teacher of all the participants, complained that her students are ‘obsessed with grades’, rather than with opportunity to learn. However, Nuala, contemplating this obsession from various aspects, found it a fairly natural feature of immature students. The following excerpt from Nuala’s thinking provides evidence of how focusing on grades was not a complexity for her, as she took students’ primary focus on grades as a natural part of their maturing:

they [students] cannot evaluate themselves, they do not understand what they really ‘cost’… for many - this Point-Rating-System (PRS hereafter) is a ‘pass’ of some kind: ‘I have already passed it’… they cannot evaluate themselves and accept what the others give them … they are not mature yet - morally not ready to evaluate themselves … it happens many have so negative self-feeling … Some say ‘you have underestimated me!’, some have very high self-appreciation, but others say ‘You have overestimated me … I’m nothing … my parents always tell me off: ‘you’re not a human!’”… we teach them, we give them some framework they have never had … they had no idea what self-assessment is, they have never assessed themselves because they never did anything [meaning - learned passively, by transmitted
learning] ... and then PRS something ... which is transparent for everybody. I think that to go through all these stages ... this evaluation ... it is very important for a student ... so ... they can blame us in everything: that we do not let a personality to develop ... but I think that before showing where to grow to it is necessary to show what evaluation systems exist ... so that the student would be able to orient in them and then go ‘out of the box’.

In contrast, as I pointed out above, for the other teachers grade-oriented students were a complexity because they tended to get the highest grade by any means, even by cheating. In the next section I address the complexity of academic dishonesty, as it cuts across the majority of the participants’ accounts.

7.1.2 Academic dishonesty

As pointed out in the previous section, the complexity of academic dishonesty mostly stems from students focusing solely and ultimately on grades. For example, the teachers complained that the students often put enormous effort into gaining unearned academic credits, e.g. by asking others to do their assignments. Anna felt frustrated talking about this complexity (see the extract below), as indexed by her repetition of ‘it’s important’ [to fight with student cheating] and her use of examples of how the students cheat, which she appeared to be repeating for herself so that she understood it:

Yes, it’s important ... because the students ... I’m sorry [to say] ...often tend not to gain new knowledge ... but get a grade or a ‘tick’ [in the assessment list] ... It happens that they simply ... I understand them ... they all are now in social media... and ask somebody more advanced to do the test on behalf of them ... at least to record a video what they are [doing], which ‘ticks’ where should be are put. Then there is Team Viewer ... to look at the other student’s screen. Just simple as that ... commonplace ... So, yes, it IS important.

Tonia found that students are accustomed to falsifying their performance: ‘It’s natural, cheating is in their blood’; Emmy referred to cheating as ‘an old school habit’. Odina remembered a story of her relative, describing him as ‘a sensible adult’, motivated to learn English for his job. However, facing challenges, he ended up encouraging his child, a more
advanced English speaker, to complete the tests on his behalf of him, because they contributed towards academic credit. Odina concluded that ‘if there is a chance to cheat [in learning], even sensible people cheat a lot’, meaning that people tend not to feel guilty for breaking true authorship. Nuala shared a case to show that the students are aware of the problem themselves, but cannot resist the temptation to cheat:

They are not bad people, no. I have a special box in the room where they put their mobiles before the test. When we got familiar to each other … I told them that they could leave their gadgets with them, but they still put the mobiles in the box saying: ‘no, it’s a temptation, I cannot resist it, I can do a task or two … but later I will habitually turn it on … but do not want to compromise myself’.

Interestingly enough, no one blamed technology for offering extra opportunities for cheating. As Odina pointed out, ‘technology is just a means of learning. If you consciously choose to cheat, you’ll cheat anyway’. Meanwhile, my participants addressed student dishonesty very emotionally in the technology-enhanced classroom. I identify this as a complexity because the teachers could not realise their motives.

One of their motives is to assess the students equally, and not to advantage students unfairly. Teachers are not able to realise this motive if they know that some students have not completed the assignments themselves, but they do not know who cheated. Dasha explained it thus: ‘Some students have 95 out of 100 points for their online work, but being in the classroom they cannot do more than 6-7% [on similar tasks]’. It clearly signified for her that the student had cheated doing the homework online. Similarly, Anna’s motive to assess the students fairly remains unrealised in running peer-assessment tasks. Anna said that this assignment type appeared extremely ineffective in terms of equal grading: ‘let’s be fair … If a student understands that their grade depends on the grading of a particular mate … there is always a possibility that they’ll give each other the highest grades’. While peer-assessment is highly recognised and frequently used internationally, and might lead to greater learner autonomy, a possible explanation for why it does not work in contexts such as Russia is the high tolerance for cheating.
Another motive related to teachers’ well-being is to feel professional and experienced, which stems from a similar need (see section 2.2). It is unrealised if students cheat, and if the teacher feels, in Glasha’s words, that the students ‘make a fool’ of her. She feels that she is treated by her students as a bad teacher for not being able to catch them cheating:

Even making bad jokes in the classroom never causes that negative reaction from my part [as cheating] ... This is what I’ll never forget unfortunately ... I can forgive the student if they cannot do the tasks well, do not do their homework, or miss the classes ... But when they ‘make a fool of me’... it surely irritates ... because it is a fraud in a very low level.

The participants consider plagiarism, defined as students’ intentional or unintentional use of someone else’s work, as the biggest complexity. As they are not provided with anti-plagiarism software, which can detect cases of cheating, the teachers easily get frustrated when they are almost certain that a student has plagiarised but they are unable to catch it. It is obvious that when they face these most serious cases of academic dishonesty, their motive to assess the students equally cannot be realised. This is how Glasha explains it:

I will always look and think whether the student [previously] caught on plagiarism, did it [the following work] himself or not. My opinion about the student changes dramatically ... I cannot say that it does not offend me...it does not leave me indifferent ... I get furious ... absolutely ... Because a person cheats ON YOU, pretending that it is their work but it is not. This is cheating and this definitely causes temper/irritation and negative perception of the student ... Even if we have an argument about the high grades it does not cause any negative reaction from me ... but cheating.

Plagiarism is advanced in the literature not only as a feature of Russian academic culture but also as an important international concern (Ashworth, et al., 1997; Pecorari, 2003). Glasha takes the consequences of plagiarism very seriously for the student, who compromises their own level of individual effort. In her words, ‘the student stops developing and starts degrading’, because ‘WE [her emphasis] do not get a result ... I am focused on the student’s
result, rather than an ability to download something from the Internet ... let it be a humble or poor result, which will improve in the future, but it will be your own, rather than stolen from somebody else’.

The participants see the complexity of academic dishonesty as a challenge. To deal with it the participants have to make complicated decisions in terms of task design and procedures, in order to prevent plagiarism in the future. Dasha, for instance, asks ‘testing’ questions in the lesson to see who did their homework on their own, and who did not:

I can ask a question on new vocabulary and if he ‘nichts verstehe’[German, which means don’t understand], but got 10 points online at home ... how can he say it ‘differently’ if he does not know the meaning? ... ‘Darling, who did it?’ [for you at home] I say ... Who lives in student halls ... they do all the individual homework together and this is the problem ... If they were from different towns and did not know each other – it [their assessment] would be more fair.

Tonia and Anna try and provide creative tasks for assessments, such as unique writing tasks where each student gets a different task and therefore has no chance of copying a mate’s work. See sections 8.1 and 8.2, where I render Anna’s experience in detail.

However, the participants’ solutions were not always effective, because this bunch of issues related to student cheating seems hard to resolve. As an example of how challenging it might be, Glasha shared a case of running a Writing test. She had taken all the necessary preparations against cheating: the students signed a form, and left their bags, mobiles and tablets in a specially allocated place at the window. In spite of the preparations, one student managed to copy an assignment from the Internet, which Glasha easily recognised by using Google. Glasha admitted that she felt ‘fooled again’, and that detected cheating was a warning for her that the other students’ cheating remained undetected, which made her feel very bad. Similarly, Tonia’s higher-stakes test in Reading revealed cheating. During the
test she was looking at the weakest student, but he managed to copy correct answers from somewhere, as she says:

They get the keys from the Internet very fast ... You cannot imagine ... [I] am looking at him, know that he’s very weak ... he looks at me all the time, I tell him: ‘Why are you always looking at me – it’s a reading test, you have to look at your text’. So, we looked at each other during the entire lesson long, and I didn’t notice when and how he copied the answers.

This is a complexity for Tonia. She planned to get fair results on her student performance in Reading, as a part of their final exam, but owing to the student cheating she was unable to do so. Therefore, Tonia’s motive to assess the students fairly was not realised. Tonia reacted emotionally: ‘I am shocked. They manage [to share the keys] in spite of the fact that I give each group a new version of the test’. Another time Tonia spotted a plagiarising student, and again reacted very emotionally:

There are some students ... Do everything they can [to cheat] ... One copied the entire work from the Internet ... probably thought I’m such an old hat that cannot use the Internet. I say: ‘Why did you do that? For whom? For me? For you? For whom?’ He did get ashamed and apologised.

This excerpt reveals Tonia’s deep emotional engagement, which she reflects. It signifies her strong perezhivanie about students’ performance and learning related to the complexity of academic dishonesty. The participants who addressed the complexity are caring professionals, and think of the moral and ethical implications of the various critical incidents with which they become involved. The fact that constant cheating inevitably leads to student limitations in knowledge and skills deeply disappoints them. Another disappointing facet of the job was when their students reacted aggressively to the grades at which the teachers assessed them. In the next section I address some complexities, which I identified in relation to student complaints.
7.1.3 Student complaints about teachers' professionalism

Student dissatisfaction with teaching was surprising, because my participants are highly experienced, enthusiastic teachers with a strong commitment to change and grow. They seemed not to have such issues. In one example, a student got a lower grade than expected, and complained to the management team. Some participants treated such complaints as disrespectful and a challenge to her expertise and professionalism. After some consideration, however, it became clear that the complexities I discuss below have very little to do with teachers and teaching, and much more with student misunderstanding of their role in learning.

Interestingly, several participants noted that the students often ‘tested’ their expertise, asking for translation of a word or a phrase, rather than using the much quicker approach of asking Google or an online dictionary. I interpret this as occurring because the inquiry into word meaning was not paramount in this case; rather, the student wanted to confirm that their teacher was an expert in English, that they were ‘the font of all knowledge’.

Although Jane shared a ‘testing’ incident with laughter, her body language conveyed a different story, communicating her negative emotions. She seemed to feel embarrassed while explaining that she never pretends to know everything, and does not bother when the students tell her that the previous teacher translated a particular word or a phrase differently. As embarrassment has a strong association with being emotionally attuned to how one looks to others, it may be that Jane perceived that she would have been viewed by the students as unqualified for not knowing the translation asked. I recognise this as a complexity, though not stated overtly: it related to the teacher’s motive to maintain her esteem in the student group, which was not realised here, and, instead, she was considering how to ‘save face’ in front of the students.
Tonia narrated a similar case, she once provided a wrong answer on a student’s question regarding whether ‘forecast’ or ‘forecasted’ is correct. The students spotted her, and then she immediately admitted it, adding that ‘teachers are humans and do not have to know everything’. Having said that, she seemed to be annoyed with herself rather than being totally frustrated by this student test, as she narrated it. For other participants, however, such ‘testing’ could cause a fear of ‘losing face’, and be frustrating. It is almost certain that they take it as a complexity. In order to avoid it, they have to spend time translating any possible vocabulary as part of their lesson preparation. This can be time-consuming, as no one knows exactly which vocabulary might arise in the lesson.

This ‘saving face’ complexity, although ubiquitous, was not a serious reason for teachers’ perezhivanie. However, another complexity, related to challenging teacher’s expertise and professionalism, inevitably triggered much stronger teachers’ perezhivanie. This was a shower of students’ complaints at the very moment when a student got a lower grade than expected. Olesia, for example, once had a student complain that she had been 40 minutes late for a lesson at the beginning of the term. However, the complaint was made at the end of the term, after she had graded the student’s work. Dasha got a complaint from a student that ‘the assignment task was not clear’, and Eva remembered a student complaining that her grading system was not clear, but in neither case had any student asked for clarification during the term, and the complaints appeared only after the marking.

The majority of the teachers referred to these complaints as disturbing incidents, which almost always took up a great part of their very busy lives during exam time. The teachers had to respond urgently, and consequently had much less time for their everyday teaching activities. The participants explained that they are normally overburdened with the final lesson preparations, assignment marking, giving written feedback and other everyday tasks, and often do not have sufficient time to respond to preposterous complaints, sometimes constructed and articulated so that the teachers might feel guilt, fear, shame and related
negative emotions. Although they may be interpreted in different ways, the point is that such complaints signify a situation detrimental to teacher well-being, and they cannot see a way forward. Teachers’ motives to look professional in assessing the students are challenged as they have to invest sufficient time in building a contra-argument. In this excerpt, Eva acknowledges particularly difficult student groups to work with in this respect:

“teaching lawyers [student lawyers] makes me concentrate immediately … I cannot relax as with philologists and politologists … The latter … everything is alright [for them] … goes fine … they do not care … With lawyers [students, lawyers-to-be] I have to … something … because they can complain [everything]. The procedure [of the test] is broken, anything else … everything … These [student complains] are made immediately … straight from the first term … and it is awful.

In this excerpt, I see Eva’s frustration in her assertions that this occurs ’straight from the first term’ and that ‘it is awful’. These phrases exude her perplexity, along with ‘I cannot relax’, which signify for me an ongoing complexity for her and her perezhivanie.

Nuala narrated a critical incident in which a student approached her with real disrespect:

“There was a case when I gave a student a ‘fair’ grade and he then came to me with a bitter complaint … really furious and resentful: ‘Why?’ I said: ‘Let’s open your blogs, let’s see’. He had been expected to use particular structures and target vocabulary from the unit we studied but he had not. What is more, the level of the blog was much higher than his and it was usual ‘Copy & Paste’ rather than his own writing. I tell him: let’s reflect how writing this blog helped you consolidate the unit you have just studied: where you used the Grammar and Vocabulary from the unit. He politely apologised and we did not have any conflict there, he said ‘Yes, I see’. I opened the blogs of the other students, saying: ‘There is some difference between this and yours’.

There was certainly a complexity for Nuala here, as she had to waste time and repeat explanation of the course requirements for this student, and again outline the grading process.
It is also interesting to note here that not all the participants perceive student complaints about teachers’ professionalism as a complexity. Glasha, for example, found student complaints about teachers’ professionalism as ‘ordinary working moments’, contrasting student complaints with cheating (discussed in the previous section) and emphasising that student cheating caused much more of her perezhivanie. She reported her interactions with students as follows: ‘If we have an argument about low grades I put them … it does not cause any negative reaction from me, it is an ordinary working moment and I understand it, but cheating …’. She could see a clear way forward from students ‘testing’ her; see, for instance, the incidents I discussed above, in which Glasha usually invited the students to discover word translation together. The complexity of student complaints was therefore a clear example of a contextual feature, which became a complexity for some but not all of the teachers.

In section 1.2, I introduced the context of my study, reinforcing the idea of reciprocal relations between teachers and the environment in which they work. Students are an inevitable part of the environment. For example, listening tasks made with ESLvideo (www.eslvideo.com), or reading tasks made with Newsela (https://newsela.com), afford extensive receptive skills practice if teachers are e-literate enough to make the tasks. Yet, however ideal the activity is, if their students cheat, for example by copying others’ answers, it will almost certainly become a complexity for the teacher because any learning will be minimal. In the next section I discuss contextual features of the technologically enhanced classroom, and two groups of them that I indicated as complexities for my participants.

7.2 Complexity 2: related to the factors in the online environment

As mentioned above, interaction between teachers and technologically-enhanced learning environments might trigger teachers’ perezhivanie, which may then in turn transform that initial interaction. Apart from the clear benefits of an ‘anywhere–anytime’ online learning environment and its capacity for interactive learning, indicated by all the participants, I
identified some complexities in their accounts. I broadly divided these complexities into two groups, related to VLE restrictions and technical issues. While these complexities are highly subjective and dependent on the teacher’s capacities and capabilities, it is almost certain that attending to these complexities has a direct impact on problem solving, and in the sections that follow I present my data from this perspective.

7.2.1 Complexities related to restrictions of online environment

For my participants technology is likely to be a historically bounded motivational factor, because it requires adopting a more learner-centred approach (Edwards & Usher, 2000; Littlejohn & Pedler, 2007), which they appeared to do eagerly. Odina mentioned that she uses a blended design for her courses in Canvas as an opportunity for more learner-centred learning. Emmy admitted that her students would get apathetic if she asked them to ‘read aloud’ from the coursebooks, or if she gave them lengthy lectures about English grammar rules. She seemed not only to avoid a methodological failure here but also to choose proper means with which learning should be organised. For example, her students became much more readily engaged with English grammar rules if these were exposed to them in context, such as through a short video. When Emmy did not have sufficient time to look for a proper video she prepared animated .pptx slides, and turned grammar presentation into a game. Then, in the practice stage of the rule, Emmy often used a tool which converted students’ phrases with the target grammar structure into writing. Afterwards, she could discuss students’ mistakes on the screen with the group.

This apparent consistency in how the teachers tried to meet these students’ needs in active, technologically-enhanced learning, was aptly summarised by Tonia: ‘They are digital natives, we are not able to make them buy [paper] books and learn from them ... they bring their own computers to the classes ... and even our paper handouts look ridiculous’. Similarly, Jane expressed students’ attitude to old means as follows:
even if you’re a teacher with very clear handwriting writes on the board ... and does a [power point] presentation ... this is much more visual ... the students have changed ... and do not want to get engaged with this [board writing] ... they get it better when the picture of another visual ... The students say: ‘Thank you Jane, only you give us LMS, other groups do not have it ... you understand how we ‘digest’ information.

From this excerpt it is clear that Jane’s students appreciate the LMS platform. However, as with any other means of users’ input, teachers’ rights to use LMS are often restricted by IT services. As a result the teachers were not able to design their courses the way they planned, and this caused a complexity. Dasha complained that ‘we have to work with ... our IT department [according to their rules and regulations]’. This means that the teachers were not given administrative rights and they had to negotiate several actions with their IT departments, like adding a new plugin such as social media within the LMS. This was a complexity for an experienced teacher, who wants and knows how to gain a particular goal, but cannot do it because the IT department does not approve of their use of some services available on the Internet but not installed in the university LMS. The teachers were therefore restricted in their choice of activities for learning, which they could otherwise design using these plugins. As Dasha said:

I sometimes want to design a ‘matching’ task for them rather than multiple-choice questions. It exists in eFront [LMS] ... but EDuX [another LMS] does not have it. But eFront has some features that EDuX does not. It’s like in Gogol a nose from one and the lips from another one ... [N Gogol ‘Marriage’: ‘if lips of Nikanor Ivanovich join with nose from Ivan Kuzmich, then I would get married immediately’] ... something working everywhere.

It was a complexity for Dasha when she discovered that a matching task which she had designed in one LMS could not be used in another. ‘No joy, only problems’ [одни проблемы, а не радости] was her comment, because this type of task was not supported there and she did not have permission to install the necessary plugin.
The messaging system in eFront could be identified as another complexity for Dasha. Teachers usually send out messages and announcements for students to read and respond to, but students can easily miss these because the messages are not visible in the dashboard due to its specific design and ‘pull-technology’. Similarly, if a student sends a message, it is not ‘pushed’ to their teacher’s mailbox. Dasha reported that she had to open a particular page to check them:

In eFront to understand who sent me a message I have to click an icon and then I will see whether there are messages or not ... the students don’t pay attention [to the icon] if they have deadline in particular ... they rush to the assignments ... and this is minus ... this is minus ... And I have perezhivanie ... because I want the students read my messages in time, my guidance and comments I give them.

With student numbers approaching 100 or more it is nearly impossible to go and check all their pages manually, and this might prove to be a real communication break in the course. When Dasha showed me this feature in January 2017 she discovered a message from a student dated October 2016, commenting ‘look ... it does not make sense to respond now, the student has forgotten what he asked me about ... If only I could install a social media plugin here’.

A complexity of restricted rights in LMS is linked to a complexity related to the lack of IT support, which I discuss in section 7.3.2. Before discussing the latter among the complexities of teachers’ working conditions, I address the most obvious complexity related to technology use in the next section - a complexity caused by various technical issues.

7.2.2 Complexities related to technical issues
Most of the teachers perceived technical issues as an inevitable part of technology integration. The apparent consistency in how the teachers experience this unpredictability is evidenced by Glasha’s words: ‘technical issues inevitably emerge ... when the projector does not turn on, or when the computer absolutely unpredictably turns off. These problems exist
and have always been’. While her reference to ‘unpredictability’ was replete with expressions of emotion, being experienced in facing technical issues, my participants almost always prepared a plan B. As Eva confirmed, ‘having known our hardware, I do not have perezhivanie because always have ‘a plan B’’. Eva said that she got used to facing breaks due to the technical issues, and usually thought about how to restructure her lessons during the breaks: ‘When I’m going down the hall to the IT room to change a broken projector, I am thinking how to optimise the time left in order to gain the lesson objectives’.

Having said that, I have identified a number of complexities related to technical issues in almost all teaching accounts. Emmy highlighted the occasionally slow Internet in the classes as a serious problem because they have already got used to the broadband, but for some reason, the connection was sometimes unstable:

> Not every institution can afford new technologies for many reasons. Many even do not have the Internet. I mean, that broadband [that Emmy usually has], which would allow to get access to the platform.

Once she wanted to run a lesson where she needed to use the university’s LMS, but the software did not allow her to do so. Access to the LMS became a complexity for her as sometimes neither she nor her students could log in owing to the system slowing down at the number of simultaneous logins:

> Lada: What other contextual factors might cause double binds for you?

> Emmy: Regarding the technical aspect I get frustrated when the LMS gets ‘frozen’ and rebooting does not help ...

I get worried about increasing the site and server load ... how they carry it ... Any technology project requires an excellent hosting. We do not have them in Russia. There are some reliable ones, but they are so pricey ... as a researcher I cannot afford it to create such a base [with videos and other ‘heavy’ tools] ...

I am concerned about the students, when there are more than 700 people do the same test and the system slows down - it is so pity for me as a creator of the test as I
understand why it happens ... but the students when face it ... can be easily demotivated ... They get used to the social media where there are rare technical crashes ... And in a local project as our LMS it immediately gets striking.

Emmy always aimed to motivate the students, and for this reason she invested considerable time in learning to use new tools. However, she felt that the slow Internet demotivated her students, because they could not get used to such a poor Internet connection.

A probable explanation for why connectivity, taken more broadly, is one of the biggest complexities for teachers, might be its unpredictability. It is not a technical bug, nor something that should be mended, and then disappears. It is almost always an issue that inevitably accompanies technology use. This is why it ‘creates a push on teachers’, as Anna said, sharing a related critical incident:

I planned to run this video on Monday but we ran out of time ... enjoyed a discussion ... and I decided to do a video on Wednesday ... it was right to do it ... then ... On Wednesday I come just before the lesson and see that we have two notebooks and no right cable to connect them to the projector ... On Monday it was but the lesson went differently ... I get disappointed.

The excerpt above provides evidence that this critical incident was emotionally demanding for Anna: ‘I get disappointed’. A contextual feature of running a video lesson had become a complexity for her when she realised that there was no cable to run a video even though all had been prepared and tested in advance. In section 8.1.2 I address this critical incident in more detail when I discuss Anna’s perezhivanie. Glasha also recounted a critical incident very similar to Anna’s:

Plan B should be always yes ... they are technologies ... they can be tricky ... and one moment let you down. They [the students] understand it, when the cable does not fit ... they understand ... we use the tools they eagerly help ... that is ... they understand I have neither a field engineer nor an assistant, who would do it instead of me. The teachers normally connect everything themselves ... there is a projector on the ceiling everywhere ... but anyway ... to connect it all ... the teachers connect
everything themselves. So, every time the technology does not work there should be plan B because this is very stressful and surely, frustrating.

… It happens ... Just recently I was running a very successful lesson before a stage with a Power Point presentation to watch the video [vocabulary input session] and do the following activities ... I realise there is a simply blue screen, the projector does not work ... I tell the students: ‘Dear students it’s so stuffy in the room, let’s air it ... those 5 minutes of wild rushing and horror as a result [of inability to solve the problem]. It’s clear that when these technical issues emerge, this is a very stressful situation, because I have to [run an effective lesson] I always try and have paper copies, which can use.

Eva remembered a similar case when her aim to conduct a strict exam procedure was not realised owing to a connectivity issue:

... Or ... it happened in the exam. Connected the loudspeakers ... they did not work [in listening], it was terrible ... I took a computer and said: ‘First listening play I stay at this corner of the room ... for the second listening I go to the opposite side’ ... it was a 100 student capacity room ... so ... [there were] 50 or 80 people there.

This complexity is related to the other one, which is caused by the ‘old’ soft and hardware.

Some participants noted that the issues with connectivity very often emerged when they tried to connect their modern computers to the old hardware. Once Eva wanted to run a lesson in which her students were expected to present their coursework, but the hardware did not allow them to do so:

The students have prepared presentations ... the projector does not ‘see’ the computer ... I get used to facing it [the issue] ... It is usually enough to restart the computer ... and it does ... push the buttons, and it ‘sees’ .... This [projector] does not want to ‘see’ the computer ... had to go and change it ... we have old hardware.

Echoing Eva, Emmy added that the old soft and hardware was not only a complexity for her, to fulfil her teaching motives, but also a demotivating factor for her students:

I hear from colleagues from the other institutions that they use cassettes [for listening]. I do not mind, but now everything is online and technologies develop ...
The institutions [in Russia] have such ‘technology’, that they need more and more innovations. They should not be any ingenious nanotechnologies global ... no ... just simple ... For using technology it is vital to have modern hardware and necessary software. If we use Excel, then it is necessary to have a full Microsoft Office pack, with Power Point to do presentations ... the teacher would like to design an attractive presentation ... rather than ... roughly speaking ... in a slow computer where each slide downloads slowly ‘crawls out’. I encountered such terrible things as a freelancer [in other institutions] - it’s awful! It immediately demotivates me as a teacher, a student as a participant of the process ... I mean if it is a technology, it should work [be reliable] ... I believe.

About eFront, Dasha said: ‘In 2014, when we had the [technology] teacher training, they bought an old version’. As a result, by the time the system was fully installed, some tools had stopped working with this version.

I now turn to the final group of complexities I identified in the teachers’ accounts. It is worth noting that this division into three groups is somewhat artificial, because in reality the complexities discussed above are intertwined with those I am going to address in the next section regarding my participants’ working conditions.

7.3 Complexity 3: related to the working conditions

Whereas the two previous groups of complexities were common for any higher education institution to a greater or lesser extent, this group is specific to the institution the teachers work in. It has been reported that more than 90% of Russian university teachers are not satisfied with their working conditions (Фролов [Frolov], 2015). One might wonder why, if the teachers face serious issues which obstruct their teaching, they do not change their place of work? To quit their job seems an obvious solution. However, Russian teachers rarely make this effort (Абанкина и др. [Abankina et al.], 2014), which I interpret as a sign of the comparatively stable position of the teacher in the university they work in. At the same time, ‘the importance of working conditions in contributing to teachers’ feelings of psychological exhaustion and discouragement’ (DiPardo & Potter, 2003:324) cannot be
underestimated, and in this section I address some of the complexities linked to my participants’ working conditions.

7.3.1 Time investment with technology is not taken adequately

The first complexity in this group was related to the overall social perception of technologically-enhanced teaching. This complexity was surprising because it contradicts the phenomenon of ‘digital nativeness’. That is, a considerable number of people perceive technology as a natural part of their life, and therefore should take to the use of technology quite adequately. However, Anna expressed the issue quite openly:

... Back to teaching - I GET DISAPPOINTED that the students stop seeing my job of marking 16 assignments of each student as hard work, which takes time and writing even one line of feedback takes time as well.

It’s one case when I run a course of IT with two assignments ... but even there ... when I give them a simple open close test I have to think of four possible options how they can write the word ‘algorithm’: with or without a capital letter, as this is the last word in the sentence they can add a full stop as one more sign ...

That is, when you mark a pile of papers and return it back to students, they understand what you [as a teacher] did. When they pushed ‘submit’ and then they got ‘feedback’ there, they do not see those 20 hours of work ... Please, listen and understand me right: I’m not afraid of work - I’m afraid that the hard work will disappear in the easiness of its performance ... The result looks so easy come that it’s hard to realise how much work underpins it.

When I started editing audio and video files for the students ... I once brought this job in the class and we tried all together cut and glue for one hour and a half and they realised ... it’s not like ‘sit and push two buttons’ [means - very easy]...And then if I could not prepare that ‘cut’ audio file for them later - I could easily say: ‘Sorry guys, we will be listening 40 sec of irrelevant material because yesterday I did not manage to cut & glue it well’... and they will understand...will understand ... Will understand ... but how will look at the eyes of the group who haven’t tried it and do not know how hard it is? ... that is I will look aa an under-qualified unprofessional [teacher] ... They are different things.
Anna explained that her students did not perceive technology as hard work because they did not equate feedback given on paper with feedback given electronically:

you mark a pile of papers and return it back to students, they understand what you [as a teacher] did. When they pushed ‘submit’ and then they got ‘feedback’ there, they do not see those 20 hours of work.

Anna’s desire to look professional in the students’ eyes could not often be realised, because the students underestimated the time invested in giving feedback and therefore under-appreciated her effort. This is why it seems to be a complexity for Anna.

Echoing Anna, Odina adds that the online work is underestimated not only by the students but also by the employer:

dthis is ridiculous ... it is of no use to come and show ... I have to demonstrate Canvas only ... if I write them in Vkontakte [Russian version of Facebook] ... I have to post in Canvas only ... because they assess us formally, they control us anyway ... how we work ... in the LMS or in Canvas ... nobody cares if I discuss a mindmap with the students at 3am ... nobody will take it as a proof.

Odina is saying here that any online work done outside LMS, such as communication with students on social media, is not considered ‘work’ at all. Jane also reported the lack of appreciation of online work as a complexity:

It is so pity ... I’ve done a lot in the LMS, designed lots of things ... unfortunately the university does not value it ... What is a problem? ... When a teacher works online these hours do not count as work ... They think we just uploaded there our material and it works itself ... the students read it and we just control ... I think this is that very main reason why very few people use the LMS ... They see that it’s optional and not paid ... we told you last time [with Tonia] in detail how it started and how we were pushed to use LMS and really realised all its benefits finally ... created and it did work ... But some colleagues did not ... this is a pragmatic thing ... we all are overloaded ... that’s clear ... a teacher understands that her resources [time, effort, money] are restricted ... then fear... fear of technology ... when there is not enough support ... this is also very important at the beginning ... if there is no such support - it’s very hard to start integrating technology being alone.
The last Jane’s words relate to another complexity which the majority of participants identify - the lack of IT support, which I address in the next section.

7.3.2 Lack of IT support

Lack of IT support was mentioned by most of the teachers. Glasha reported that they ‘get used to working without IT support and do everything themselves’. Echoing her, Dasha mentioned that ‘there is no IT support’. It was certainly a complexity: ‘I am worried … you know … that is that the university has gradually been abandoning the development of the EduX [LMS they work in]’. In other words, Dasha’s university stopped supporting EduX, and they had to do all the administrative work for themselves if wanted to use EduX in teaching.

For Nuala, more specific IT service negligence emerged as a complexity of running a course as a substitute teacher. This is how she described this critical incident:

[58:23] That happened … I had to substituted another teacher at the middle of the term … at the middle of the term (repeats) … I was registered in our Canvas … and I was registered not as a teacher but … as an ORDINARY STUDENT … just simply neglected.

The except above reveals that, contrary to Nuala’s expectations as a substitute teacher, she was mistakenly registered on the platform as a student and consequently did not have the level of administrative rights to set up and deal with the students’ work. The complexity related to this critical incident relates to issues with the restricted rights in Canvas (see section 7.2.1 for more detail about this complexity). Nuala further explained:

[59:02] I WAS STRUGGLING with the tasks design … that is I am able to view everything but cannot add anything as an ASSIGNMENT SECTION … I’ve tried everything … logged in … AS A DIGITALLY NATIVE//GROWN WITH TECHNOLOGIES … tried each and every button to click … (gesture of clicking is heard).

Being ‘a digital native grown with technologies’ herself, Nuala tried various features of the platform with no success. As well as the inability to design tasks, she could neither set up an
assignment nor monitor students’ submissions, because she did not have access to the student submission space organised by the teacher for whom she was substituting. This IT bug therefore became a complexity for Nuala, as she could not do what she planned or needed: ‘I was struggling with making tasks ... I could not upload anything in ‘Assignment’ area’.

Nuala could not realise her aim to assess the students fairly and equally in the module as she had no idea who submitted the final assignment, and who did not. This complexity triggered her *Perezhivanie about fair grading* (see section 8.2.2 for more detail), because she could not distinguish good students from those who did not bother to submit their work on time. Her perezhivanie prompted her to act, and she developed some options for dealing with this situation.

First, having become frustrated by this case, she could reconsider her role as a substitute teacher, report that she was not able to work in such circumstances and quit the job. However, she did not even allow herself to think this way owing to her belief in teachers’ crucial role in effective learning (see section 8.2.1 for more detail). This IT mistake became apparent in the middle of the term at a very hectic time when everyone was very busy, and to quit the job would mean to leave the students without a teacher. Nuala was fully aware of the consequences of this step, and prompted by her more overarching *Perezhivanie about her mission* (see section 8.2.2 for more detail), she sought other ways to overcome this crisis.

The second option was to wait until some ‘external force’ changed the situation. This is actually what she expected initially when she reported the problem:

[59:25] [I] reported [the problem] to each and every department. While there was a conference NOBODY PAID ATTENTION ... that happened ... they said yes yes I’ll have a look.
The third way was to deny that anything troublesome had happened. She could reconsider the issue as ‘ordinary’, try not to notice complexities, and go on working guided by established rules, procedures and regulations. She initially considered this way possible as well, by trying different options in the platform:

That is … I have access to the group, I can see everything … I tried everything, I entered, clicked EACH and EVERY button.

Focusing on the emotional dimension (Nuala repeated the word ‘everything’, and emphasised ‘EACH and EVERY’ [button]) helped me to understand how she finally accepted this critical incident as something she had to resolve herself. At this stage, however, she probably felt guilty. The previous teacher had set up assignments in Canvas in advance, and that teacher’s name was written there. Owing to the change of teacher the students did not bother about these assignments and took them as irrelevant. Since Nuala did not have access to the teaching area, she could change neither the teacher’s name not the assignments in Canvas. It was almost certain that along with feeling guilty, she became frustrated as a responsible professional. Nuala seemed unable to see a way forward at that stage:

that happened that the students themselves … because of the teacher change … got lazy … and got involved into the online work later … but the deadlines for the tasks were programmed in advance …

So the problem was we faced deadline … the task has shut … the same was me … I was registered as a student … and did not have … the rights … to change anything.

The extract above demonstrates that this turned out to be a complexity not only for her, but also for her students. The initial IT mistake with her registration in Canvas as a student had not been the students' fault, but they could seriously suffer from it in consequence. There was a risk that they could lose the credits and even fail the whole course. The time flew, and there was not much time left until the deadlines. Nuala felt more and more resentment and
guilt, due to her belief about the teacher’s responsibility for everything in the classroom (see section 8.2.2). The students finally became aware of the situation and became anxious about their grades: in Nuala’s words, ‘the students tried to break through the shutting tasks’. Nuala felt absolutely helpless:

So, what I felt? the deadlines started shutting up the tasks for me as well as ... the platform offered to do the task ... warning as late submission ... I cannot see what my students have done. COMPLETELY. so they surely were worried that I won’t be able to see their work.

In this chunk, Nuala seemed to accept the critical incident, because she could see the situation from different perspectives (her own, her students’, the IT department’s), and was then able to make sense of what was going on. Nuala had to act somehow, and, according to Rubinstein (Рубинштейн, 2002:471), every intention for action is followed by consideration or reconsideration of motives and aims. The aim, in fact, finally became Nuala’s new and absolutely conscious motive, and the motive was to run the fair assessment in a new activity:

so, for goodness sake ... this case ... then [I] found I could do something through the area of forums ... that is I can upload some ‘discussions’ [assignment tasks] ... In fact, I looked it from my position [with ‘student’ rights] ... what I can do urgently and what facilities are available and ... realised occasionally that even students can make tasks ... It has turned out as a main problem ... I made a task, an assignment and hit ‘submit’ ... Then I came there the next day to check what my students had written ... Surprisingly the computer offered me to write the tasks myself so that to be able to read the students’ ones. You cannot believe, but I had to write an ESSAY so that to read the others’.

When she re-evaluated the importance of a valid assessment, her motives certainly became restructured, and she got the new motive-aim ‘to run a fair assignment’. It is my contention that Nuala’s Perezhivanie about fair grading (see section 8.2.2 for more detail) played a crucial part in restructuring her motives, and it is her perezhivanie that enabled her to keep a ‘fair assignment’ motive in her mind all the time. This new motive was likely to prompt her
to test Canvas more thoroughly than she had done initially. Nuala finally discovered two options, which could work for her. The first was to use the ‘Forum’ area, and the second was to use the ‘Messing’ service. She discovered that students could get access to each other’s attachments to messages, so she could too. However, it was only a half-successful solution, because the issues with the tasks assigned in advance by the previous teacher could not be resolved in this way:

so, for goodness sake ... [I] found I could ... download messages ... One [student] sends me a message and attaches all his tasks ... (laughing)

Thereafter he tells the group about it ... and when the IT pays attention to me and endorses me as a Teacher in the system finally ... we have some questions with grading ... because informally they submitted them [the assignments] ...

But I was so PLEASED that they were anxious and wanted to get that grade ... we found how to solve the issue, i.e. they uploaded the assignments via messaging, with their comments and so on.

It is almost certain that Nuala’s Perezhivanie about her mission (see section 8.2.2 for more detail) assisted her in finally resolving this critical incident. From my own teacher training experience, I sense that the majority of teachers would not allow submission through the messaging system. Nuala’s solution did break the whole system of rules and regulations about submitting and assessing student work, and not every teacher would be able to put their reputation at risk. However, for Nuala, it was much more important to assess her students fairly and with accountability, because the incident was not her their fault.

Grounded in her attitude to the students as equals, and urged by her perezhivanie, Nuala, in cooperation with the students, solved the issue with assignments.

To conclude, Nuala found two solutions: first, to design the students’ course assignment designed via forums; and second, to get all the other course assignments designed by the previous teacher via messaging until the complexity with the IT issue was resolved. By using a combination of two solutions, Nuala was able to distinguish those students who really
worked and those who did not: ‘we have some questions with grading ... because informally they submitted them’, and so her aim for a fair assessment was accomplished.

The lack of IT support can result in a critical incident like Nuala’s. It is almost certain that in integrating technology, teachers need more guidance, structures, support, and possibly new regulation, to assist them in coping with various technological demands. However, sometimes these new regulations became new complexities for my participants, and I address these in the next section.

7.3.3 Rules and regulations

As regards the sociocultural context in which my participants are immersed, they experience rapid and constant changes of rules and regulations due to the Bologna process (see section 1.2). As a result, they feel insecure, which can be taken as a complexity in itself. Tania pointed out that ‘when we come to work on 1st of September we are always surprised by new rules ... and you understand that you can never relax and simply work’. Eva, echoing Tania, complained that she ‘never knows which rules we have to follow this time’. Eva added that it felt that they were not one team, i.e. a community of managers, teachers, and students, but rather that everyone had their own tasks, often contradictory to the other stakeholders.

One of the new rules introduced several years ago was a contract system in which all the university employees sign a one-year contract which is renewed on a competitive basis. This made Jane feel ‘nervous ... you always worry – you will get it [the job] or not ...’. I identify this as a complexity for Jane because she admitted that:

    during this competition period I could not sleep and got stress all the time ... assuming that the university would not prolong my contract ... all my materials and courses simply would get lost in this LMS ... got fired as nobody would need them ... and I would not be able to take them with me.
An obligation to publish at least one article a year has also become a new contract rule, introduced at the beginning of a new academic year when all the teachers were busy with teaching. This pressure for publication seemed to make Eva depressed. The fact that she had been expected to finish the article in the spring, in order to have it published in time for the new job competition, made her resist the contract rule:

> Why I work so much ... I get a small salary ... instead of writing [an article] I have to get more job to earn more ... cannot break the cycle.

From this excerpt, I can see how an apparent opportunity to increase her publication record could be a complexity for Eva. She certainly had a number of contradictory motives, which could not be realised all together or at once. She wanted to teach professionally and effectively, she wanted to earn more, and to spread her word by publishing her ideas. Her solution to somehow lessening her perezhivanie seemed to be to resist the idea of publishing:

> Not all the teachers can do academic research ... Those articles they [the management - LS] require ... we are practitioners ... I would like to share my experience with a practitioner ... I am not very interested in reading something from a young girl, say of 30 years old, they write just for the sake of being published anywhere ... I am not interested ... She does not have teaching experience ...

> ... Those who write up their research ... they need to present ... ok ... but they do not give anything to me ... They advance their research ... but ... all our research unfortunately is so far away from our practice ... and I’ve read lots of theories ... I am purely a practitioner, I need practical things.

This section concludes my data analysis addressing RQ1. It is important to again note here that the complexities are illustrative in the sense that I was able to distil them across the totality of the data. For instance, I discussed the complexity of student cheating addressing the teachers’ motive of fair grading, which could not be realised because their students tended to copy others’ work (see sections 6.5.4 and 7.1.2 for more detail). The complexity emerged in different critical incidents, but was the same for different teachers. In contrast
to complexities, perezhivanie is always unique, and different for different teachers, whether or not the content is similar. Before proceeding to demonstrate it in the next chapter and addressing RQ2, in the next section I present my selection of three participants for analysis of their perezhivanie in Chapter 8.

7.4 Data Selection
As mentioned in Chapter 5, I generated a large corpus of data from the first set of interviews. While it was surprising to some extent, it was congruent with the literature, where narrative researchers are advised to share only a small portion of the totality of field texts due to their enormous quantity (Clandinin & Huber, 2010). I used all the data collected for preliminary analysis of perezhivanie (see section 6.2) in order to prepare the prompts for the second meetings, and of complexities (see section 6.4) to address RQ1. As I became more deeply immersed in this process, though, I came to see that the stories are so plentiful that it would be impossible to cover all the stories of teachers’ perezhivanie in full detail in this work.

Therefore, one the purposes of the second round of interviews, was to select a small number of stories for my presentation of various forms of teachers’ perezhivanie to address RQ2. I made a selection of three teachers out of ten, on the basis of their interviews being the most illustrative in the study. I looked for the presence of most of the themes of complexities in their accounts and mechanisms of perezhivanie, and selected three teachers. While perezhivanie was ubiquitous in all teachers’ accounts, I chose three participants whose perezhivanie was clearly expressed and did not require my imagination to make it apparent. The number does not matter particularly here because this is an exploratory study, and an important criterion for me was to uncover various complexities, reveal different forms of perezhivanie, and show how they are intertwined.
This analytical step of choosing only three teachers was, I believe, both an appropriate and viable decision. The stories chosen are in some way representative of the complexities and perezhivanie of the larger group of ten participants. Therefore, on the basis of what I have learnt from them during four ‘passes’ of analysis (see chapter 6), I address RQ2 in the next chapter.
Chapter 8: Answering RQ2

Chapter 6 addressed the procedures I used to undertake data-driven thematic analysis of the participants’ transcribed speech, where I broke up the data to produce categories, taxonomies, and themes. This enabled me to outline the potential complexities. Then, in Chapter 7, equipped with a definition of complexities as real obstacles for the participants in doing what they wanted and planned, I identified and provided three groups of complexities. This deductive approach allowed me not only to answer RQ1, but also to do the groundwork to address RQ2, which I address in this section:

RQ2: What is the teachers’ perezhivanie about complexities?

This chapter operationalises teachers’ perezhivanie in integrating technology, where they have critical incidents involving complexities, which lead to emotions and thoughts united in teachers’ perezhivanie. The complexities represent tensions between the teachers’ motives for the activity and their actual experience. However, it is no longer an emotional engagement with things that go wrong, as was my focus while discussing complexities in the previous chapter. Since perezhivanie comprises not only emotions but also thoughts associated with this experience, in this chapter it becomes an intellectual analysis, which engages different forms of perezhivanie in the move from complexities to perezhivanie.

In addition, operationalising teachers’ perezhivanie, I discuss its ‘developmental’ role, because teachers’ perezhivanie helps me explore the interaction between the teachers and their context, and how this changes over time. According to Vygotsky, it is the interaction between their context and, in my case, the teacher, that determines the impact on the teachers and therefore their development. The quality of this interaction is highly subjective because it depends on teachers’ commitment to potential complexities, as the discussion in the previous chapter demonstrated. I would suggest that the quality of this interaction depends on the level of teachers’ awareness of the dynamics of their technologically-
enhanced classroom. The more teachers become aware of these, whether with the help of their perezhivanie or not, the better their interaction and potential development. This idea echoes Vygotsky’s view, where he positions perezhivanie as a key for understanding ‘how environment influences development’ (Выготский, 2001:9). While ‘developmental’ path is beyond the scope of my study, in this chapter I discuss how the teachers work out their attitude to what happens in their classrooms, and how they change the dynamics, and how the dynamics change the teachers themselves. In Chapter 9 I return to the developmental role of perezhivanie by summarising how three different forms of perezhivanie contribute to teacher development.

With respect to these forms of perezhivanie, introduced in section 3.3, one is about a general state of things, and teachers are not central in it. In this form of perezhivanie a teacher notices what actually happens, but cannot do very much to change things. I call this form ‘perezhivanie-apprehension’. The second form of perezhivanie in my taxonomy, ‘perezhivanie-experience’, is very close to teachers’ own unique experience, to what happens to themselves and in themselves, It may be quite emotional, relating to something that happened in teachers’ past practice, or something that is happening now. In the third form, teachers’ consciousness seems to act quite differently. A teacher is likely not only to monitor what is going on, but also to reflect on what is going on. This process is analogous to Schön’s ‘reflecting-in-action’, including perhaps also ‘reflection on reflection-in-action’ (cited in Anderson 2019:3, with reference to Schön, 1995) in the cases where the teachers were not in the action-present of their practice. This third form, then, is related to things we are able to do something about, and which we can cognitively, consciously, and logically think and do something about in a productive way. Perezhivanie-experience is likely to precede perezhivanie-reflection in most cases. It can become the latter if it becomes conscious, i.e. more analysed. Perezhivanie-reflection enables teachers to move between subjective emotional and more detached analytical conceptual work, and this movement is crucial. Through the intellectual analysis, teachers are likely to become more aware of what
their unrealised motives are, and this awareness leads to future restructuring of their motivational sphere, new actions and potentially new practice.

I analyse the movement here, and have organised this chapter as follows. The beginning of each section is devoted to the introduction of one teacher, Anna, or Nuala, or Eva. I also provide there an overall sense of the structure of the entire session with that teacher. Then, using narrative textual analysis in the Labovian sense, which I described in detail in section 6.5, I explore how the teachers responded to complexities, gained new understandings, and restructured their motives according to these new understandings, and how their perezhivanie was integral to this process. This chapter can be read, therefore, as a twice-told narrative, since I present not only the teachers’ perspectives on shared complexities and critical incidents, but also my own interpretations of all of these. However, the teachers’ perceptions and voice are visible in the data included in this chapter. I reproduce my translations of the excerpts alongside my own interpretations.

8.1 Anna
This section consists of two parts. In section 8.1.1 I introduce Anna, and in section 8.1.2 I present Anna’s perezhivanie. I invite the reader to engage with Anna’s voice and my interpretations in order to gain understanding of different forms of Anna’s perezhivanie.

8.1.1 Introducing Anna
Anna was the first teacher in my first set of interviews. We met in the staffroom in MISIS, and then she invited me to the classroom where she usually teaches. She noticed that I was focused on following the agenda, which I printed out for myself and looked at from time to time, and cheerfully took the lead after my introduction. She tried to convey the most important events of her professional life. For example, when I mentioned in my self-introduction that I had done a Diploma in English Language Teaching to Adults (DELTA), she shared her own DELTA experience with me. Unlike me, Anna did her DELTA online, and I
encouraged her to tell me more about this online mode from her perspective as an online trainee. Anna described the design of her distance DELTA course in Moodle, pointing out that it was very convenient to access it from any place with an Internet connection, which is one of the biggest benefits of technology for her. This short account ultimately became a bridge in our dialogue, from our introduction to Anna’s story of her experience of teaching with technology.

Anna graduated from the university twelve years ago and had already gained an initial understanding of implementing technology in the language classroom from her university days, an experience she is very grateful for. As she says:

Since then [graduation from university] I understood that technology is not always a rocket science, it is simply when you make a crossword in Word and you’re there … this is already a technology, which you’re using. If you manage to send out this crossword via e-mail … it’s wonderful.

Using technology helped Anna to start her career in teaching English, when she was a student herself. While she admits that ‘it is hard to find a group to teach when you’re a 3rd year student yourself’, using Quizzes and Hot Potatoes enabled her to create engaging tasks; her first students appreciated it, and promoted her as a private language teacher. Similarly, it boosted her confidence as she gained understanding that technology is engaging, motivating, and helps her to be responsive. As she says: ‘I came to see that it’s interesting, fast-moving, doable and flexible’.

On graduation from the university, she started working for MISIS. Initially Anna designed a Google site as a virtual learning environment (VLE hereafter) for her students. To me, a former programmer, the ability to design a VLE is a sign of a highly e-literate teacher, as I know that it requires a lot of special knowledge and expertise. At the time of the interview Anna had a plan to develop a Canvas-based VLE course:
This term I have realised that the course has got a well-designed structure by the end of the term … Yes, sure, this is work … this is good work … Now, in January I need to transfer my course on ‘Technology in linguistics’ to Canvas (smiling) ...

She seems to view this transformation not as an extra load, but as an opportunity to design something new. She enthusiastically anticipated the dynamics of her future course and looked forward to interacting with the students in Canvas:

I have been designing how to push the students (laughing) … read before the lecture … after the lecture … ask to reflect [on what they have read] … Limit the time … not to limit the time … some individual internal tasks … How to design it in terms of methodology.

Her willingness to invest her time in such creative, but immensely time-consuming work, indicates to me Anna’s overarching aim ‘to provide effective language instruction’. She compared Canvas with the previously-used Googlesite, and explained how she was going to discern new opportunities in Canvas and how it would allow her to do her job more effectively:

Canvas has much more facilities compared to the Googlesite. It has more flexible instruments … I want to use them … because if Canvas can check the test instead of me - let it check … if it can mingle the questions as well as the options [in each multiple choice question], it is already wonderful.

The overall meeting time with Anna was more than three hours and it was hard to choose critical incidents to exemplify Anna’s various perezhivanie. The stories I have chosen and present in the next section are unique in the sense that they show how a teacher can deal with a very complex case, where a number of complexities exist for Anna, and at the same time, how perezhivanie enables her to overcome the complexity and realise her motive. Regarding complexities, Anna made sense of them in different ways. Anna’s explanations of why and how she felt in a particular incident evoked different sorts of articulation and mental processing, and some were more narrative than the others. This combination of
genres in Anna’s data assisted me in creating a picture of Anna’s perezhivanie, which I now present.

8.1.2 Anna’s perezhivanie

‘Without perezhivanie it is hard to find a motivation to improve.’ Once articulated, this thought of Anna’s was regularly apparent in what she was saying. Another thread, which ran through both of our dialogues, was that Anna views professional growth as a prerequisite to providing effective teaching. While Anna probably assumes a common-sense view of the term perezhivanie from culture, which is broader than my use of the term in the study, it aptly summarises what perezhivanie means for her as a psychological tool.

Her overarching perezhivanie is grounded in her belief in a teacher as a high-quality learning provider, and her attitude to teaching is grounded in seeking opportunities to improve it. I call this main perezhivanie her *Perezhivanie about the quality of learning*, and she communicates it thus:

> I always think about how to provide sufficient support for learner independence but it is mostly related ... I would like ... I think ... I have a personal responsibility for the quality of the graduates. I often tell my colleagues that I would not give a diploma to this student. Because I do not think we all have managed to help him become a specialist ... because without self-study ... like ... do you remember the proverb ‘to lead a horse to water’? ... but you cannot make it drink ... it decides whether to drink or not itself ... [we should provide an instruction of such quality] ... so that they could ‘drink’ themselves ... To grant a horse a token if you made it drink sounds strange ... to me ... metaphorically speaking.

I attribute her *Perezhivanie about the quality of learning* to perezhivanie-reflection as Anna explicitly communicates complexities related to this perezhivanie, e.g. connectivity and technical issues (section 7.2), insufficient IT support (section 7.3.2). She can reflect on these and does much to address the problems. One telling example of how this perezhivanie enabled her to find a solution is as follows. Having mentioned complexity of connectivity as one of the biggest emerging issues which ‘creates a push on teachers’, Anna remembered a
critical incident related to the complexity:

I planned to run this video on Monday but we ran out of time ... enjoyed a discussion ... and I decided to do a video on Wednesday as it was right to the theme.

A contextual feature of video presentation of target vocabulary became a complexity for her when Anna had not found the right cable to connect the computer with the projector. Anna had prepared a video for a vocabulary lesson, prompted by her motive to present the vocabulary with the video. She had tested the hardware and the video a day before the lesson. However, when she realised that there was ‘no right cable to connect’ and she could not play the planned video, her motive, mentioned above, could not be fulfilled, and it triggered an emotional reaction:

On Wednesday I come just before the lesson and see that we have two notebooks and no right cable to connect them to the projector ... On Monday it was ... but the lesson went differently ... I got disappointed ... I look at my group, they have come in spite of the hectic time at the university ... they are choosing what to attend ... [and they have chosen me, but I cannot manage technology and fail to provide a successful lesson].

More broadly, this critical incident is a good example of how different forms of perezhivanie easily transform one into another. Having initially been perezhivanie-reflection, her

Perezhivanie about the quality of learning transformed into perezhivanie-experiencing once this critical incident occurred. Anna’s emotional engagement with it was indexed by her switch from the past tense to the ‘historic present’: ‘On Monday it was ... but the lesson went differently ... I got disappointed ... I look ... they have come ... ’. This storytelling device made the story sound ‘live’ and Anna was totally intertwined with what she narrated at that moment. She remembered that she had checked everything far in advance to make sure it would work fine. She explained that it was neither her own nor the students’ fault that they could not access the video. When it happened she became frustrated and then, gradually, her perezhivanie-experiencing became more cognitive because Anna started to think over the solutions available.
Listing the solutions (e.g. to read the video extract aloud, or completely redesign the lesson in order to play the video next time, or not to do any input at all), her perezhivanie-experiencing was likely to become transformed into perezhivanie-reflection. Anna could possibly weigh up possible solutions in terms of effectiveness and quality of vocabulary training, which was the focus of the lesson. Looking for another computer that could be connected to the projector with the available cable seemed the most effective solution. Anna did not choose this initially, calling such a chance ‘a miracle’. Her explanation was that her students rarely carried a computer with them because they usually used the well-equipped computer cluster at the university. What is more, it was unlikely that even if anybody had a computer, it would have the right socket.

However, the miracle did happen, because one student suddenly remembered he could get one:

    and I said SOOOOO ... and then the student brought the laptop ... We connect it to the screen ... hopefully it is NOT super new and can be connected to our [old] projector ... I pull out my USB-flash ... and ... the miracle HAS HAPPENED.

To recap, Anna’s initial perezhivanie-reflection transformed into perezhivanie-experiencing once the critical incident occurred, and then, when Anna considered the possible ways to solve the issue, to perezhivanie-reflection again.

This sort of data, such as in the excerpt above, might distinguish perezhivanie from reflection. The probable explanation, that in the story it was Anna’s Perezhivanie about the quality of learning, rather than reflecting-in-action (e.g. in Grushka et al., 2005), is that the phrase ‘the miracle HAS HAPPENED’ was very emotional. It revealed Anna’s relief, or happiness, or enjoyment, or excitement, or a combination of these, rather than a cognitively-forced reflection (see section 9.3, where I compare reflection with perezhivanie). It was unlikely that Anna disengaged her emotions in this situation and then reflected in the
moment. The emotional meaning Anna attached to this story therefore became a natural part of her perezhivanie that the students would not get sufficient target vocabulary input otherwise. Teachers rarely ask their students to find a computer with a particular socket for a single activity in one lesson. Anna called the decision to ask the students her ‘creativity’, and I would interpret it as a process of restructuring her motives. Anna pointed out that she prioritises the quality of learning, and her perezhivanie about this could prevail over any other ideas and thoughts, and probably guided her to resolve the issue. It is hard to guess how the alternative, ‘reflective’ scenario would have worked in this critical incident, but it may be that it would have been completely different from what happened.

To look at Anna’s overarching Perezhivanie about the quality of learning beyond any particular critical incidents, it is almost certain that it urged Anna to think over and work out how to help the students become independently-thinking and -working professionals, or, as she put it, how she ‘leads a horse to water’. However, her students were not always motivated to ‘drink that water’, i.e. to gain new knowledge and skills, and were not always diligent and honest, as Anna admits:

they are motivated to get a point or a tick solely ... so they’re eager to cheat, to copy from each other, look at the each other’s screens or use Team Viewer and other means ... Just simple as that [meaning that students do not take cheating as an illegal action] ... commonplace.

This extract illustrates the complexity of student cheating, which I discussed in detail in section 7.1.2. Anna probably knows that she will never ultimately win this battle, and it will continue to be a complexity:

Once a colleague told me if you want to be 100% sure that the students does not cheat ... do not teach them with technology at all ... just as simple as that ... even if you manage get their fingerprint on ‘shift’ [button] ... ok, and the system reports that there is a half a meter between the keyboard and the monitor ... Ok, he will put his finger ... but somebody standing behind him will do the assignment.
Having said this, Anna goes on to reflect on this problem because she is so emotionally disturbed and her conception of ‘honesty’ and fairness, and her understanding of her role, do not let her give in: ‘So, yes, it IS important [to try to resolve it] ... at least partially’. She does not believe that the students can stop cheating themselves, even if cheating can be easily caught. They choose to cheat deliberately, and hope that they will not be found out:

Stop cheating themselves? ... No ... even being aware that it is ... er ... very quickly ‘slapped one's hand’ [Russian idiom, meaning that it is easily spot] ... say ... you have twenty writings on hand and to open two and compare ... it is not that hard.

Her second perezhivanie, therefore, is subordinate to the first one, and I call it *Perezhivanie about student cheating*. This perezhivanie is related to her deep-rooted belief that teachers share responsibility for learning with their students. This perezhivanie is relatively common among the participants, and is triggered by the complexity of student cheating (see section 7.1.2). Although participants try to use various strategies to prevent plagiarism, these strategies may not be as effective as would be desirable, which is why, in spite of all their effort, it is an ongoing complexity which most of the teachers identified.

Induced by this perezhivanie, Anna invested considerable time in thinking over and developing effective preventive measures against student cheating. For instance, she designed fifteen unique essay tasks for different students, according to their number, so that they could not copy each other’s work. To prevent cheating, Anna created other new tasks for the students who had missed the test for a valid reason, e.g. had been ill on the day of the test. This took up much of Anna’s personal free time, but she sacrificed this so that the missing students could not ‘go to the page where there were already 18 answers shown’. This is how she explains it:

Even if a student brings an [official] ‘notice’, why they missed the class, I create another link ... a separate space for him so that he could not ‘go to the page where there are already 18 answers shown.
I attribute her continuous *Perezhivanie about student cheating* to perezhivanie-reflection. It seems to enable Anna to take effective preventive measures, so that the students had to work hard and could not get by with minimal effort in assignments on several occasions she shared with me. This perezhivanie-reflection has become her perezhivanie-experiencing in critical incidents related to student cheating. One such incident was discussed in detail in section 6.4.2, and another was even more revealing in terms of the transition from perezhivanie-reflection to perezhivanie-experiencing. I discuss this below.

The cheating happened in the Public Speaking module. Anna had designed a final assignment in which the students were expected to perform one famous public speech of their choice rehearsed during the module. As she was teaching the module for the first time, she had invested considerable time in designing a tutorial for the assignment, and in the assignment itself. Anna anticipated that the students would appreciate all her effort, and that their presentations would become a good starting point for boosting their presentation skills. Surprisingly for Anna, one-third of the students turned out to be cheating. They presented the famous Martin Luther King speech, which they had previously learnt by heart for the Intercultural Communication Unit in the previous term, and which meant that they had simply repeated the same task. As a result, Anna became frustrated because formally the students did present, and completed the task. This critical incident moved her reflective *Perezhivanie about student cheating* towards more emotional instant perezhivanie-experiencing. Anna asked the students:

‘Girls, how come that you all have chosen the similar speech to rehearse?’ … and they, knowing that they would not be punished in any way … why do we take another one if we already studied by heart this one?

Some other teacher, for example, who does not bother about student cheating and quality of learning, and believes that it is entirely students’ responsibility, would not do anything in this situation. Anna, however, prompted by her *Perezhivanie about student cheating* along
with her more overarching *Perezhivanie about the quality of learning*, viewed the case as her negligence because it was she who allowed such cheating:

It has really bothered me ... They are cunning ... but ... it’s ok ... once I got cheated ... lesson learned ... next term I will change it ... HA!

Her ‘lesson learned’ signals for me that Anna’s perezhivanie-experiencing transformed into perezhivanie-reflection, and impelled her to improve the final assignment design, so as not to make this mistake again in the next iteration of the course. The new assignment design decision helped re-establish her emotional equilibrium as well: ‘HA!’ Prior to the next term she also talked to the Intercultural Communication Unit tutor to find out which extract was to be rehearsed in this unit, and told the students not to take this particular extract for their presentations. Once again, if Anna had not had such perezhivanie she would not have made any adjustments, as formally students attended, seemed to work, and did their presentations as an outcome of the unit.

On a more general note, it is interesting to see in the data how perezhivanie-experiencing, perezhivanie-apprehension and perezhivanie-reflection, i.e. all three different forms of Anna’s *Perezhivanie about student cheating*, overlap and even dialectically intertwine in the following short chunk:

Yes, I cannot entirely control them ... whether they open the answers of those who completed the work earlier ... don’t look at who and what answered [before] ... But ... I don’t see a problem here ... I want them to do the work ... if they have cheated somewhere a little ... I cannot monitor 25 screens at the same time ... they’ll inevitably sit the exam and will do nothing [if always cheated during the term] ... there is such a moment ... I MUST THINK A LOT ABOUT IT.

First the excerpt reveals that Anna delegates some responsibility for learning to students, as ‘they’ll inevitably sit the exam’, not she. This signifies to me that her *Perezhivanie about student cheating* is more like perezhivanie-apprehension - everything goes as it goes, and is
the way it is. However, in her very emotional utterance ‘I MUST THINK A LOT ABOUT IT’, she perhaps moved away from perezhivanie-apprehension towards perezhivanie-reflection. Anna recognised that she has not resolved the problem, and must reflect further. The contradiction between 'I don’t see a problem here' and ‘I MUST THINK A LOT ABOUT IT’ indicates her ongoing sense-making process, prompted by her Perezhivanie about student cheating.

Anna’s third perezhivanie I call Perezhivanie about misunderstanding technology, and I attribute this to perezhivanie-apprehension. As we collectively become used to the ease of social media, people may come to think that everything done with technology is not a hard piece of work. This is how Anna addressed the trend:

Because those pictures you watch [in Instagram] … they make you … this … this … they make you feel depressed very much … they create that very feeling of an ideal life … with a permanent smile … posh food … and that your life is a constant ongoing party… BUT … you observe just moments of a daily life … artificial posed moments of life … (long pause) … just recently watched one … and in the comments below found: ‘it’s easy for you because you’re a beauty’ … you’re mad … you do not realise how much work needs to be done before such showing up … to look as a beauty … it’s hours if not days … in a search of the best shot, in search of the best perspective … then light, where you look smart, where you do not have bruises under your eyes … There are endless searches with the stylist … this is hard work … and the fact that the society does not realise it as hard work … it’s scaring a bit.

This excerpt highlights a number of complexities, as discussed in Chapter 7. These are related to technical issues (section 7.2.2), and reduced hours, when the management mistakenly takes for granted that technology can teach the students instead of the teacher, and consequently reduces the contact hours between the teacher and the students in order to cut costs. One of the complexities, time investment in online task design, is not sufficiently appreciated. Anna commented:
‘that is ... if to go back to teaching ... I AM REALLY WORRIED that the students stop coming to realise that marking 16 assignments of each student is a hard job which takes time, and writing even one line of feedback takes time as well’.

Another complexity linked to time investment, now related to her students, Anna expressed thus:

That is, when you mark a pile of papers and return it back to students, they visually understand what you [as a teacher] did. When they push ‘submit’ and then get ‘feedback’ there, they do not see those 20 hours of work in between [submission and feedback].

Anna’s overarching Perezhivanie about the quality of learning motivated her to create engaging tasks and courses. However, neither the students nor management seemed to appreciate it, believing that technology does a great deal of teaching work and that a teacher ‘sits and pushes two buttons [it means - very easily], thus not seeing ‘those 20 hours of work in between [submission and feedback]’. This attitude almost certainly caused Anna’s Perezhivanie about misunderstanding of technology, because people might oversee the hard work behind implementing technology. This is related not only to marking assignments but also to other aspects of teaching, such as making tasks:

It’s one case when I run a course of IT with two assignments ... but even there ... when I give them a simple open close test I have to think of four possible options how they can write the word ‘algorithm’: with or without a capital letter, as this is the last word in the sentence they can add a full stop as one more sign ... Please, listen and understand me right: I’m not afraid of work - I’m afraid that the hard work will disappear in the easiness of its performance ... The result looks so easy come that it’s hard to realise how much work underpins it.

It is important to note here that I first understood Anna’s Perezhivanie about misunderstanding of technology as a clear example of perezhivanie-apprehension. Anna could not realise her motive to be ‘a superwoman’ in the students’ eyes, as they were not able to see the pile of work behind her teaching. Anna communicated her perezhivanie about this misunderstanding as this is the way things are. However, the more Anna talked
about this, the more I became aware of the transformation from perezhivanie-apprehension to perezhivanie-reflection, because not only could she reflect on it, she also could, and did, do something about it:

I am ready to explain a logic of my actions to them ... I am ready to explain to them what happens ... I can always tell them ‘sorry, I do not have handouts today as I got to bed at 4 am, marking your assignments and did not show up 5 min earlier before the lesson as printed out the feedback for you’ ... Yes, they take it al as a bit strange for the first time ... but then they see ... that yes, ok, [the teacher] can be a human.

The extract above indicates to me that Anna tried to convince the students of her professionalism, which is likely to have been provoked by her perezhivanie. She told them how time-consuming using technology for teaching is. Another example of Anna’s transition of her initial perezhivanie-apprehension to perezhivanie-reflection was that not only did she talk to the students, but she also redesigned her classroom practice so that the students could ‘be in her shoes’:

When I started editing audio and video files for the students ... I once brought this job in the class and we tried all together cut and glue for one hour and a half and they realised ... it’s not like ‘sit and push two buttons’ [means - very easy] ... And then if I could not prepare that ‘cut’ audio’ file for them later - I could easily say: ‘Sorry guys, we will be listening 40 sec of irrelevant material because yesterday I did not manage to cut & glue it well’ ... and they will understand ... will understand ... Will understand ... but how will look in the eyes of the group who haven’t tried it and do not know how hard it is? ... that is I will look as an under-qualified unprofessional [teacher] ... They are different things ... That is ... it’s necessary to understand what you do with whom.

The excerpt above revealed to me one of the seemingly crucial reasons for Anna’s _Perezhivanie about misunderstanding of technology_. It revealed her much broader _Perezhivanie about appearing professional_, which drove Anna not only to talk to the students about her time investment in technology, as discussed above, but also to convey an idea that every ‘teacher-superman’ is also a ‘human’. Below Anna insisted on her rights to make mistakes and have weaknesses:
That is ... [I value more] human qualities ... [I am] much more flexible...awareness that everything might happen [during the lesson] ... allows to survive in all of this [when her professionalism is under threat due to mistaking her teaching load] ... and look creatively at the potential problems ... That is, I do not have fears about it ... I mean ... I do not want to create an image of an ideal teacher, who is excellent in everything every time ... It’s not me ... It’s so far from me ... I’m not afraid to admit that I haven’t managed to do something ... That is ... I want to keep that human image and want them to see that we are also humans ... we are not ideal and we also need to be approached with the awareness that we have our weaknesses.

In this excerpt, I see how her Perezhivanie about appearing professional might enable Anna to sustain a good rapport with her students, who, in my own experience, usually react to such conversations positively.

Anna’s reflection on the issue of feeling and looking under-professional made me very curious. On the one hand, this perezhivanie was so apparent across all the teachers’ accounts, that I wondered whether a concern about looking under-professional in teaching is a specifically Russian cultural feature. This difficult and sensitive issue may have its root in Soviet times, when teaching was treated as a life mission, and the teacher, as a provider of existing knowledge, was associated with this knowledge. In order to be trusted, therefore, teachers were not allowed to make mistakes at all. On the other hand, Anna did not name this perezhivanie as such. What is more, she overtly claimed that she was not concerned about how she looked in the eyes of her students. Anna emphasised that to be like an impeccable ‘superwoman’ in teaching is not her aim, and that she wants to be treated like a human. However, this Perezhivanie about appearing professional led her to highly professional teaching with creativity, enthusiasm, intolerance for cheating, and very deep reflexive thinking about learning and her role in it.

This contradiction is a clear signal to me that her Perezhivanie about appearing professional had not become fully conscious yet as any perezhivanie-experiencing, and as such it pushed Anna to take necessary steps while possibly not being fully aware of her motives. In the next
chapter I account for more differences in perezhivanie between those that become perceived and reflected upon, and those that do not. I summarise Anna’s and other participants’ data there, but here I hypothesise that Anna’s perezhivanie-experiencing is related to the existing, while yet not fully conscious, system of motives. In contrast, in her perezhivanie-reflection her motives were revised and then restructured in a new activity, meaning that Anna became fully aware of them.

Another of Anna’s perezhivanie overlapped with students’ global misunderstanding of the role of technology in language learning. I call this Anna’s *Perezhivanie about the relationship with students*, and it is related to Anna’s *Perezhivanie about misunderstanding of technology*, discussed above. Anna was afraid to lose the relationship because they understand technology differently. This somehow influenced her relationship with the students, because she tried to be on the same page as them. To have all their software updated is a natural part of the students’ engagement with technology, but it sometimes resulted in an argument with Anna, as the students could not understand why Anna resisted doing updates at times. Anna talked about the collision as follows:

This is hard ... this is very hard because the students have much higher expectations and demands [than before] ... they are get used to high technology ... I explain [the problem] to them: this is not comfortable, it’s hard to do for me, I want and will try to avoid it ... they can understand it only at the human skills, that is ... they do not understand HOW hard it is for me ... that is, to explain them why it is not comfortable to update a new Word ... just one version [works] ... ok a kid of strange old hat ... this is the only [explanation].

The students wanted to use the latest versions, e.g. of Microsoft Word, but Anna had become used to working with one particular version. Since the Word updates do not match dramatically, she insisted on her rights to go with this version. As a busy teacher, overloaded with her various duties, she did not see any point investing her time in learning new features in the updates. It did not make sense for her, because she did not need them. This being the case, it was a source of resistance and *Perezhivanie about the relationship with*
students, which is clearly her perezhivanie-experiencing to me and was very emotional at times:

Ok, let’s call me an old hat, which cannot get it. I’ll bear with it, if you call me a bit strange than I’ll start explaining why I do not feel comfortable [e.g. with a new version of Word]. Take it as a fact that we are different … we are different. Yes, we’re different and this is inconvenient for me … if you do not want to use old resources because you know new - ok … I take it easy … If I ask you to do a presentation in .pptx and you bring it done in Prezi … ok … I never tell you [the students] to do something in an old format if you know something more advanced … The only thing I’ll ask you is to make sure that my system works with your new tools.

Her Perezhivanie about the relationship with students encouraged her to make sense of it, but she did not seem quite sure how to come to a balanced decision to in order to establish a good rapport and avoid collisions in the future. This example of Anna’s perezhivanie reveals the generic nature of perezhivanie, which was likely to push her towards making sense of the situation. I suggest that her emotional perezhivanie-experiencing later transformed into perezhivanie-reflection, and, as a result, led to a new understanding of, and improvement in, her relationship with the students.

Looking at her perezhivanie as a phenomenon, Anna stated that she usually talked over her perezhivanie with some colleagues, and one friend, very often on the way home. This might mean that by sharing her perezhivanie she made sense of her experience, and probably gained new insights. She said that although her job is emotionally very charged, she would not agree to have a job without perezhivanie, even if it was feasible:

Yeah … perezhivanie is ‘spices’… because it encourages … sometimes it disappoints though … [I’m sometimes] thinking … oh no … why … then think from the other side … I’ll be stronger and will be aware that this can go wrong.

Overall, Anna’s data signify that her sense-making is a cognitive process only in part, because it was hard to recognise at times whether it was emotional or cognitive factors which played a leading role in her perezhivanie. Anna’s various perezhivanie and related
complexities are represented in Figure 13.
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Figure 13. Anna’s perezhivanie and related complexities

Her overarching *Perezhivanie about the quality of learning*, which I mainly attribute to perezhivanie-reflection, influenced her *Perezhivanie about student cheating*. The latter tended to be more perezhivanie-experiencing because Anna remembered critical incidents where it had emerged very emotionally, even post-factum. *Perezhivanie about the quality of learning* related to Anna’s identity in some way, whereas her other overarching *Perezhivanie about appearing professional* was a more instrumental one. The latter pushed Anna to take immediate practical steps in critical incidents and beyond. While she did not state it explicitly as for her other perezhivanie, *Perezhivanie about appearing professional* seemed to permeate all her practice and influence most of her decisions. It was very emotional at times, and I attribute this perezhivanie mainly to perezhivanie-experiencing. The reason why Anna did not reveal *Perezhivanie about appearing professional* explicitly might be that it had not become fully conscious yet, but as perezhivanie it appeared in the data, as discussed above. For example, Anna said more about her *Perezhivanie about misunderstanding of
technology, whereas I understand it as part of her *Perezhivanie about appearing professional*, and attribute the latter more to perezhivanie-apprehension. Another subordinate perezhivanie under the umbrella of *Perezhivanie about appearing professional* was *Perezhivanie about the relationship with students*, which I attribute to perezhivanie-reflection. It urged Anna to reflect on, and take measures to prevent or clear up, possible misunderstanding with the students regarding software updates, because Anna felt she would lose her good relationship with the students (see discussion above).

8.2 Nuala

This section consists of two parts. In section 8.2.1, I introduce Nuala, and in section 8.2.2, I present Nuala’s perezhivanie. As with Anna, I invite the reader to engage with Nuala’s voice and with my own interpretations in order to gain understanding of different forms of Nuala’s perezhivanie.

8.2.1 Introducing Nuala

I met Nuala in January 2017. She was not in my initial list of participants granted to me by the EFL department of MISIS, probably owing to her higher position of teaching tutor as well as language teacher. However, when we occasionally met in the staffroom and one of the potential participants introduced me, Nuala quickly and cheerfully agreed to take part in my research, and to start that very day. I outlined my research and its aims, Nuala signed the consent form (see Appendix 7), and then invited me to her regular classroom, where the interview would take place.

Nuala started her narrative by recounting the biographical facts of her life. She had been teaching for 16 years, seven years at MISIS. Interestingly, she first appeared in MISIS occasionally as a substitute teacher on a Russian as a Foreign Language course she used to teach. Nuala holds several ‘specialist’ degrees, which are traditional Russian higher education diplomas: one in Engineering, and the others in Linguistics. Nuala is currently
undertaking her PhD in philosophy with MPGY, one of the leading Russian universities specialising in Pedagogy.

After a short biography, Nuala shared with me her pride to be a part of the vibrant ELT team in MISIS because they use technology at a much more sophisticated level, compared to other universities in Moscow and across Russia. In addition to language teaching, Nuala works as a teaching tutor, or coordinator, as they call this position in MISIS. Nuala sees this position as an opportunity to make a difference in the context where she works. One of the coordinator’s responsibilities in this tutoring capacity is to design new online activities, such as forum discussions. This way Nuala helps the teachers she mentors or ‘coordinates’ to create effective blended learning spaces, because Nuala believes that if teaching is effective the students are actively involved in learning.

What struck me very much from the beginning was how confidently, deeply and inclusively Nuala talked about herself and two of her jobs, mentioned above, and about being an educator in a very broad sense of the word. It was perhaps her desire to have an impact beyond the classroom and spread the word beyond her teaching that motivated her to participate in this study.

Nuala’s vision of how teaching should be performed in the ‘ideal’ system (according to her beliefs about effective educational systems) was apparent in her narrative, as ‘narratives ground their [teachers’] beliefs and attitudes within the context of classroom events’ (Golombek, 1998:448). It was not merely a cognitive evaluation of experiences; rather, there were a lot of indications in the data of what she holds and thinks valuable and important for her. It was a rich account, which reflected her inner world of her wishes, needs, motives, attitudes and beliefs, inevitably emotional, but generally expressed in a flat, non-emotional tone. ‘Emotions are not allowed on the Academic English course’, as Nuala repeatedly warned the students. It is almost certain that she applied the rule to herself,
seeming to suppress her own feelings and emotions in our dialogues. In spite of looking calm, rational and reasonable, Nuala shared with me her various perezhivanie, which I discuss in the next section.

8.2.2 Nuala’s perezhivanie

As mentioned in the previous section, Nuala has a very high level of aspiration in her job. Her major perezhivanie is related to her agency and commitment to change, and I call this *Perezhivanie about her mission* as a language teacher and a teachers’ tutor. While it may sound somewhat abstract and obscure initially, it will become apparent later in this section because this perezhivanie permeates Nuala’s other perezhivanie, and is highly reflective. To understand her perezhivanie, it is necessary first to see how Nuala philosophically outlines her relationship with the world:

> We all begin with this. We want to be ideal in the eyes of the others. That is, at least to be like an ideal ... that is ... from the history ... people first were focused on the external and only then... we get interested in more serious things ... turning into the inside ... in teaching this is the same ... this is ... it was very interesting to notice it ... for myself ... then it seems when an individual studies themselves inside ... that is ... if your first perezhivanie is directed ... it is like a sliding sight through the world ['скользящий взгляд по миру' - a very metaphorical expression, my note] ... we do not understand it first [the world], then we look inside, study ourselves ... and after that we start seeing ourselves not as individuals, but rather as a part of a community ...‘me - family’... ‘me - professional community’... that is this is a group with shared interests ... then we stop seeing ourselves as an individual ... at all [and start identifying ourselves as a part of the community].

In this extract Nuala explained how important it is for her to feel and be a valuable part of a community of EFL teachers and students in MISIS. As a part of the community, Nuala shares responsibility for learning with her students:

> Everything that happens in the classroom ... nobody will ever convince me in the opposite ... I do not believe in ‘unteachable’ students. Any mistake and failure is a failure of the teacher in the first place.
In this excerpt, I see Nuala’s belief that the teacher is responsible for the outcome of learning, and this responsibility is likely to be a teacher’s mission. This helps me to understand Nuala’s *Perezhivanie about her mission* as her perezhivanie-apprehension, according to Vasilyuk’s (1991) taxonomy (see section 3.3). This perezhivanie spreads beyond any critical incidents and influences Nuala’s second *Perezhivanie about fair grading*, which is related to the complexity of student cheating (see section 7.1.2).

This perezhivanie of Nuala’s is a clear example of how one complexity might have triggered different perezhivanie in different participants. Unlike Anna, for whom this complexity created her *Perezhivanie about student cheating* (see Section 8.1.2), Nuala did not have such a perezhivanie: ‘I do not have perezhivanie about the students at all … it is their agency to learn or not’. Her espoused attitudes are autonomy and democracy in professional as well as social life, which she comprehends as ‘the dialogue of equals’. She therefore viewed her mission differently from Anna, expressing her student-teacher relationship as ‘I try not to baby-sit the students’. Nuala encouraged her trainee teachers to follow her in this, and to grant their students more autonomy. However, as she admitted, it is hard to resist guarding her students from possible troubles and challenges at times, not least because ‘baby-sitting’ students is rooted deep in Russian culture. Nuala said that she understands teachers’ *Perezhivanie about student cheating*, even though she does not share it.

Following her attitude to teaching as a ‘dialogue of equals’, Nuala conveys the principles of a humanistic holistic approach to language learning: ‘we have humanistic system and do not push our students’. Her *Perezhivanie about her mission* as well as the beliefs, addressed above, influenced her second perezhivanie related to conducting assessments: ‘My biggest perezhivanie is how fair I am [in assessing the students] … The most difficult thing for me is to convey some objectivity’. This *Perezhivanie about fair grading* encouraged Nuala to act.

As a caring professional, she discussed grading with the students:
I discuss their progress with the students. We have a point-rating system, which comprises many different things [ways of assessment]. I tell them: ‘If you want to get a pass grade, there are some tasks which you have to do. If you haven’t done them, even if you’re very smart … but this is a unit … they develop your skills … doing them means you at least set to do them … we discuss it at the beginning of the term and if you haven’t done the tasks, we cannot give you pass even if your English is perfect.

Nuala pointed out that one of the most difficult issues for her was to be objective in assessments, and in the ‘weak’ groups in particular:

This is one of the most difficult moments. In the ‘weak’ groups there is always an issue of fair grading … as there are always two or three strong students who can do everything at once. In the ‘strong’ groups there are no such a problem … [if somebody] hasn’t passed so … hasn’t passed … there are re-sits for this … in the weak groups this is a real issue. Two-three people passed and all the rest will still learn until they are there … everything goes so hard … I try to be fair as much as possible … Those two-three, who do it on time, get extra tasks … usually games, intrinsically motivating something … whereas the weak students try to catch up with the assignments … And the strongest are always under impression that they do more.

This Perezhivanie about fair grading induced Nuala to differentiate the tasks for mixed-ability language classes, so that the majority of students in the ‘weak’ groups would be able to catch up. However, when it came to assessing the students’ work, it happened that the strong students had done more. Nuala’s Perezhivanie about fair grading urged her to find a balanced solution for grading the students fairly in this situation. As a result, Nuala came up with the idea of encouraging low-level students by giving them three attempts for the final test, instead of one as traditionally given to all the students. If a weak student had failed the first attempt, they would have to decide for themselves whether to study more or try to do the test immediately again, but with a high possibility of failure.

Her Perezhivanie about fair grading urged Nuala to include a task about ‘student reflection on their personal growth [личностный рост]’ as a criterion for assessment. Grounded in the belief that everybody can develop, particularly from the ‘inside’, Nuala initiated discussions
with the students on their personal growth:

Personal growth … we all discuss it: ‘Guys, have you noticed that Peter’s command of English has grown? … or ask … who do you think improved their English this term? in the majority of groups I manage to create that ‘atmosphere’ … the dialogue of equals … and they say … ‘you know, we think it is necessary to endorse Masha, because she’s made a breakthrough, but Sasha - as he came with a good level … he’s just served time.

In addition, Nuala assigned the students a ‘self-assessment’ task as part of their overall assignment with the groups of intermediate level and above. Her Perezhivanie about fair grading urged her to look for and find such non-traditional assessment forms in order to encourage ‘weaker’ students to learn and develop from their own mistakes:

In my groups I practised self-assessment … they wrote on the paper … feedback on their own activity the whole term … I tried and included it in our planner … that is … take a test … then write a feedback on this test … quiz - the feedback on the quiz … Then take a blank paper and write … I deserve this mark for this term because I’ve done this and that, learned this, this and this.

Using this line of reasoning, Nuala seemed to be ‘talking’ with her own perezhivanie, which helped her find the balance in assessing mixed-level groups. Reflecting on her Perezhivanie about fair grading, Nuala rationalised:

What is fair grading? There is no such a thing [in assessing language] in principle. It is very subjective. We set frames … we negotiate with the students [the system of assessment] … This is usual, the point is that we make an agreement to assess or be assessed according to particular criteria/rubrics. We also use all the other types of assessment the students get used to.

Nuala’s third perezhivanie related to her colleagues. It is worth noting here that one of the most notable features of higher education in Russia is that the system changes so rapidly that it can be hard to find a stable programme to follow (see section 1.2, where I introduced a university system transformation in Russia). As a result of this transformative move, rules and regulations have changed very fast (see section 7.3.3).
With respect to teachers, this means that they have to construct their programmes drawing solely on their own expertise and experience. As a consequence, and as Nuala articulated, ‘we [language teachers] form the demands for language education’. It is a tremendous responsibility, as well as freedom, for the teachers:

The teaching impact has become much wider and much bigger. I mean, apart from regular teaching … we do not have a state programme [in higher education] in Russia … to tell the truth … [meaning the teachers do all the design] … We contacted companies, the other institutions, talked to teachers, programme directors and made a list of approximate needs … so to call … of our students … alumnus … This is very important … that is why this is an extra load … we are forming the demand to a greater or lesser extent … We estimate a situation and … drawing on it we build our programmes.

However, Nuala’s perezhivanie was that the teachers tended not to use this freedom to improve their teaching. Instead, armed with this flexibility, they did not do their job properly, and provided low-quality teaching. I call this Nuala’s Perekhivanie about irresponsible colleagues, following her own blunt statement: ‘I have perezhivanie that they do not want to teach well’. As a coordinator, Nuala admitted that she could not monitor all their teaching in full: ‘It is very hard to control them … I reckon it is impossible’. When complaints were received from the students, Nuala, in the capacity of programme coordinator, undertook observations, where the teacher usually performed well and showed professionalism:

I am not worried that they cannot [teach well]. They can … When you say: ‘I’ll come to observe your lesson’ … the teacher will prepare a 100% … will demonstrate everything [I want to see from her], because before that I send a list of skills I want to observe - teaching some skills, vocabulary, grammar … It is clear when they prepare they can perform well … they are experienced and highly qualified...The problem is when you leave the classroom, all the rest lessons become something different … that is … they do not always prepare responsibly … not every teachers prepares lessons every day [with the agency].
As Nuala explained, it was normally reported by the students that the teachers tended not to prepare lessons at all, and, instead, would ‘discover the coursebook with the students, crawling from one page to another’, or become ‘a talking Teacher Book with the keys’, as students humorously complained. Nuala is concerned about this situation:

> The overall situation, how to motivate the teacher ... how to sustain this dynamic ... self-actualisation as a teacher ... it’s hard because people get tired ... it’s intensive [ELT course] ... challenging programme ... and if a teacher does the same from year to year, they start preparing less ... allow herself to get lazy ... it’s hard.

I attribute Nuala’s *Perezhivanie about irresponsible colleagues* to perezhivanie-experiencing according to Vasilyuk’s (1991) taxonomy (see section 3.3), because, while not expressed overtly, this perezhivanie was quite emotional. Nuala used idioms, repeated phrases several times, and made pauses every time her emotions overtook her: for example, Nuala repeatedly stated that ‘any mistake and failure is first of all a failure of the teacher’, and that ‘nobody will convince me [Nuala] of the opposite’. Once, after noting this, she immediately remembered a critical incident related to her agency and responsibility, which I provided in detail in section 7.3.2. This all signifies for me that her perezhivanie was still ‘on’, and was likely to be the narrative impetus for Nuala to share her story with me.

*Perezhivanie about irresponsible colleagues* was related to Nuala’s aforementioned broad *Perezhivanie about her mission*. As a tutor and coordinator on the programme, she had no idea what could be done in this situation, and this caused her frustration. On the one hand the teachers demonstrated decent-quality teaching in the observed lessons; on the other hand, the students constantly moaned and grumbled that the rest, i.e. the unobserved language lessons, are a waste of time for them because they do not need a teacher to process the coursebook, and Nuala feels resentment and anger at the teachers for that. Grounded in Nuala’s belief that all development comes from ‘inside’ rather than ‘outside’ people, she constantly questions her mentoring role and her impact on the teachers, and perhaps feels guilty if something goes wrong.
I also interpret Nuala’s *Perezhivanie about irresponsible colleagues* as well grounded in her belief that a teacher should be a real-world example for the students. As Nuala stated:

Anyway, what does the teaching job start with? ... with very simple things ... if you cannot come to the classroom 15 min earlier as your students come ... Come in time ... You’re in front of them ... if you come 9.15 [15min later than the lesson starts], they do then absolutely the same.

I call Nuala’s fourth perezhivanie similarly to one of Anna’s, *Perezhivanie about misunderstanding technology* (see section 8.2.2). However, Nuala’s has different content and takes another form. I attribute Nuala’s *Perezhivanie about misunderstanding technology* to perezhivanie-reflection. In the capacity of coordinator, Nuala observed how technology was implemented in other institutions. She witnessed technology often being used for its own sake, without a clear rationale for why it was necessary, or how to use it effectively. For example, her observation revealed that many teachers use the IWB as an ordinary blackboard. At the same time, this perezhivanie seems much broader:

I am concerned about human factor ... that is I understand how technologies develop, how they get adapted to learning ... but I think the teacher gets tired from all of this ... and then ... [after all this investment of human resources] it is stated that we do not need teachers anymore ... what we need now is just a tutor, who helps the others to learn ... I’m thinking more and more about education in the future.

This *Perezhivanie about misunderstanding technology* relates to Nuala’s first *Perezhivanie about her mission*. Looking for ideas for improving the state of the art, she told me about her dream of taking part in a project:

I’d be pleased to participate in the [online learning project] where the teacher is absent at all. There have been some [projects], already. I tried to know about them ... how is it going? I’d create a community and monitor ... just some tutorials without ... people [teachers]. What would be the process like? What could people [students] learn? what would be the results? ... It would be a great social project ... Social in the first place as I am interested in the humanitarian component.
Reflecting on her *Perezhivanie about misunderstanding technology*, Nuala noted that she always thought about how machine learning could do part of everyday teaching duties more effectively, and where teachers’ effort was necessary.

Nuala’s overarching *Perezhivanie about her mission* contains three other perezhivanie:

- *Perezhivanie about irresponsible colleagues*
- *Perezhivanie about fair grading*
- *Perezhivanie about misunderstanding technology*

Figure 14 shows a hierarchy of Nuala’s four perezhivanie and related complexities.

![Figure 14. Nuala’s perezhivanie and related complexities](image)

Speaking more broadly about her perezhivanie, Nuala did not believe that teachers were able to turn their perezhivanie ‘off’:
If somebody claims they leave their perezhivanie at work and go home without it ... they are cunning ... This is a level of immersion [into the job] ... I observed those people...how they spend their day ... they say: ‘I leave my perezhivanie at work’ ... But what they actually do? They are they are usually more fussy ... and seem overloaded ... I always do something ... no matter whether it is related to the job or other interests ... that is, the tasks I have to do ... But I always think - whether I’ve made a right choice ... because to a greater or less extent all my interests fall into my job...it can’t be like ‘now I think about this, now I leave this, and think over a different [thing].

Nuala’s perezhivanie have transformed over time and now they are helping her to find effective solutions - in both language teaching and teacher tutoring. Now it is mostly a cognitive process, and as I pointed out at the beginning, while she experienced emotions she tried to suppress them in our dialogues.

8.3 Eva

This section consists of two parts. In section 8.2.1 I introduce Eva, and in section 8.2.2 I present Eva’s perezhivanie. I invite the reader to engage with Eva’s voice, and my interpretations of her accounts, in order to gain understanding of the different forms of Eva’s perezhivanie.

8.3.1 Introducing Eva

Eva works in a different institution from the two previous teachers, HSE. This university offers much broader specialisation compared to MISIS, and has the position and reputation of the most progressive university in terms of the democratisation of higher education in Russia. It therefore attracts the brightest and most ambitious students, whose average grade in the Russian State Exam after school graduation fluctuates around 90% each year.

Eva had been teaching for 27 years by the time of the interview, and she had worked in HSE for 22 years as an ESP teacher. Her area of expertise is Legal English, and as Eva emphasised, this area of teaching needs a particular focus on Legal English Vocabulary. Interviewing Eva, I
was curious to know why and how she came to the decision to voluntarily invest enormous time in learning a new technological tool for extensive vocabulary practice. This is Eva’s narration of how her innovative teaching started:

I was one of the first ... who ... in 2010 or 12 year ... don’t know ... had an interest ... it got apparent that ... first was the intramural [HSE] conference ... and then it got apparent that lots of people think of technology ... we did presentations ... so creative people ... have an aspiration ... to try new, engage students ... I got so much from all of that [conference] ... Then I applied for a grant and got the grant.

We met at the recreation area as it was hectic time at the university and all the rooms were busy. We sat side-by-side, which allowed us to share my iPad screen with Quizlet when Eva was talking about this technology. Although the use of technology in HSE is not obligatory, as is the case with MISIS, I was flummoxed by the discrepancies in how enthusiastically Eva spoke about technology and her experiments with it, to which she devoted nearly all of her free time. I interpret her major impetus for participating in my research and giving me interviews as the desire to share her experience of incorporating technology into her practice, because her colleagues tended to respond reluctantly to any of her initiatives.

As with the other nine participants, I deliberately did not tell her about the topic and gave her prompts only when the recording was on. I decided to offer her a smorgasbord, i.e. a set of three simple questions in order to start with what she found most comfortable: ‘Tell me how you decided to use technology, how you understood it that it was the right time to start, and how you started’. I relied on her ability, as an experienced teacher, to cover things logically and thoroughly. I anticipated that she would try and address all three prompts, and I was interested in which order and how she would construct her story. Stories are never told; they are always in progress. When we finished, Eva stayed silent for some minutes, and then, suddenly, she continued addressing issues from the interview, wanting to go deeper and more holistically into the things she had addressed during the meeting. I asked her if I
could record it, and she gave a ‘philosophical’ reflection on her perezhivanie as a phenomenon, with which I start the next section.

8.3.2 Eva’s perezhivanie

It may be that in situations of change, the more experienced teachers become, the more effective working solutions to various issues they can find, and their emotions become more positive. Their perezhivanie becomes more independent from particular critical incidents, and permeates the teaching as a whole. This - Eva’s reflection shared with me when the interview was over - will probably explain why it was hard to separate critical incidents in her data, because they felt like one story of Eva’s perezhivanie.

Her major perezhivanie was similar to Anna’s Perezhivanie about quality of learning. However, the content of Eva’s perezhivanie was completely different, and had different contextual factors related to Eva’s ESP teaching of Legal English: ‘We graduate specialists in Law, who do not speak English’. After studying Legal English for four years, which is compulsory for all the students in her department, they did not make any considerable progress:

we have the 4th year students, who cannot do a presentation in English ... or cannot remember the text. Or, for example they say: ‘I’m afraid of any public speaking’ … I tell them: ‘guys, you’re lawyers ... it’ a rare thing that you’ll deal with paper only ... we’ll need to negotiate things anyway’.

There were a number of complexities linked to Eva’s Perezhivanie about quality of learning. One of them was related to her students’ dishonesty (section 7.1.2). Once a student of her Legal English course submitted an assignment, ‘Literature review on crime’, professionally written by the agency he had paid. It was a real literature review, but on works of fiction, including Dostoevsky and other famous Russians writers. A professional translator, employed for this job, probably misinterpreted the word ‘literature’. The student, however, did not even bother to look at the paid review, and submitted it as it was, to Eva’s surprise
and amazement.

Another complexity is related to the subject of Eva’s teaching - ESP. Owing to some specifics of Legal English, which is full of specialist terms, its vocabulary cannot be replaced by everyday words: for example, ‘cost and expenses’ is a particular term which should be learned by heart as a concept, and there is no way to use any other words instead, e.g. ‘price’, or ‘payment’. However, there was a shortfall of practice of specific legal English vocabulary in ‘English for Lawyers’ course books, and her Advanced-level students often tried to get by with general English:

This is a huge challenge in learning that particular ESP vocabulary. When I start I show them ... this is ... that is ... straight in columns ... this is Informal ... this is Academic ... this is Legal ... General ... every time ask them to paraphrase [according to the register] ... use at least what we’ve already chosen ... It does not work [to the students, they say]: ‘but I’ve managed to say it and they have understood ... if to translate it means the same’... I tell them ‘the same but not the same’... it is nonsense from the [professional] legal English perception ... the lawyers don’t say so ... I’m ... apart from teaching from [an ESP] book ... I read a lot, read in English, in Russian ... so that to be able to explain ‘Cost and Expenses’ ... they cannot be explained in plain terms, they need ... [special jargon].

To overcome this complexity, Eva designed an activity for student presentations, aimed at developing ESP student accuracy and learning special vocabulary terms. However, the students tended to learn their presentation speech ‘by heart’. It therefore had only a minimal effect on learning, because when the students were asked questions ‘they became different people, and could not say a word’. Her Perezhivanie about quality of learning encouraged her to look for, and finally find, a solution to overcome the complexities I addressed above. Using Quizlet (https://quizlet.com), Eva managed to provide her students with sufficient vocabulary practice in Legal English (see Chapters 2, 3 and 4, where I introduced my conceptual framework through Eva’s critical incident with Quizlet).

I call Eva’s second perezhivanie Perezhivanie about indifferent colleagues. Nuala’s similar
perezhivanie was related to her job as a teacher trainer (see section 8.2.2), whereas Eva’s perezhivanie was about her colleagues. This perezhivanie related to some complexities of working conditions (see section 7.3.1). Eva was open to sharing and presenting her work in her language department in the hope of creating a community of enthusiastic professionals, but there was little interest. This was a complexity for Eva, and caused her perezhivanie. Her motive for colleagues to share and learn from each other’s experience with technology could not be realised there. What is more, she could do nothing about it, because she did her best to engage her colleagues:

At first I tried ... with so called ‘kindness of the soul’ I shared what I did. Then I came to see this as waste of time. I share ... just in hope somebody will share theirs...if not resources, probably some methodology ... ideas ... anyway ... and ... got in response: ‘If you’re that bored’ or ‘you’ve got too much time on your hands’ ... the end...

Lada: Why are you so worried about the other teachers’ indifference to technology?

Eva: Because we live in the 21st century ... and because we graduate specialists, who do not speak English ... they [the teachers] don’t raise the alarm ... do not try anything ... [They say] What sense does it make? ... for everything I do ... I spent lots of my free time ... people think that it does not need to invest so much of themselves for such a [small] salary ...

I simply measure it differently ... if I work I work 100%. Otherwise they need to give it up and search for another job ... When I invest so much ... I will get anything back ... ok ... not a 100% I invested ... but any result ... It happens the students come and it’s so hard for them and they get ready to give up ... I tell them ... just come for some time ... Even if you increase your ESP vocabulary by 10%, it will be a victory.

Eva’s third perezhivanie is Perezhivanie about her mission. This perezhivanie was initiated by the complexities of one-year contracts, and pressure of publication (see 7.3.3): ‘with these contracts on a competition basis ... all those theories ...’. Eva holds a firm belief that practice matters much more than any theoretical knowledge, at least for experienced teachers.

Eva, however, sees the complexity more globally, such as misunderstanding of the teaching role at the institutional level. This is a complexity that more than half of the teachers told
me about. The misunderstanding appears at different levels and I address it in detail in section 7.3. The following response synthesises many prevailing views of teachers, and reveals Eva’s *Perezhivanie about her mission*:

The biggest and main problem of our education is ... different aims ... Aims of the head of the university administration ... different aims of the department ... [different] in our school of languages ... and [different aims] of each particular teacher in a particular classroom ... I need to engage the students, develop their skills, improve something but the university administration needs absolutely different things ... formal attitude ... formal rules and regulation... lack of interest to the genuine needs of students ... and more global understanding that education consists of single units - teachers [meaning the university authorities do not cater to the teacher needs].

Not all the teachers can do academic research ... Those articles they require ... There are practitioners ... I would like to share my experience with a practitioner ... I am not very interested in listening to a young girl, say of 30 years old, writing for the sake of being published anywhere ... I am not interested ... She does not have teaching experience.

... Those who write up their research ... they need to present ... but the do not give anything to me ... They advance their research ... but ... all our research unfortunately is so far away from our practice.

... and I’ve read lots of theories ... I am purely a practitioner, I need practical things ... This impossibility to share or to know about the others’ experience, no matter Russian, or foreign.

The last words echo Eva’s *Perezhivanie about indifferent colleagues*. Eva repeatedly said that a synonym for perezhivanie for her is a concern and sensibility, which indifferent colleagues rarely have:

Perezhivanie is a sensibility, a desire to give the student something useful ... to get a result of your effort ... I cannot just come, run a lesson, then go. I need to get a result ... and getting the result is related to the engagement of my soul [dusha], envisioning in an individual approach ... That is why each my course in every group is taught differently...we get a common result but the routes to it are always different.
Eva also contrasted perezhivanie with discomfort: ‘Perezhivanie is not an escape from discomfort ... not at all’. On the contrary, she described her perezhivanie as an engine, [двигатель прогресса] in Russian, which pushed her ahead and helped her improve her teaching. For her, perezhivanie is a common word, a ‘guidance where to move’. In Figure 15 I summarise all Eva’s perezhivanie, as I outlined above, and related complexities.

Figure 15. Eva’s perezhivanie and related complexities

Eva’s perezhivanie changed over time. At first, she was more concerned with herself as a teacher, and whether or not she ‘matched’ the teaching job. Now she is concerned with the quality of learning for her students:

In the beginning my perezhivanie were about me, what a teacher I am, whether I know everything [or not], whether I make mistakes [or not] ... it was closer to a fear ... internal feat - to what extent you match [the students’ expectations] ... fear of unpredictability...

Now I don’t have that fear of unpredictability ... I can admit that I cannot do something right now ... or it sometimes happen the students ask about Legal practice
... I tell them ‘it’s not my area ... you need a professional in Law, I can help you as a linguist only ... Now, even if I make mistakes ... I admit it: ‘yes, I’ve made a mistake, forgot or something else ... With experience ... Yes, Before you write a [lesson] plan and get afraid not to complete it. Now it’s more general, say an aim for 2-3 lessons ... And objectives to attain ... Because with one group you’ll gain it in 2-3 lessons, with another for 1,5, but you will add something because we need to complete one programme.

Conclusion
In this chapter, I have discussed three participants’ various perezhivanie, looked at how it permeated their practice, and summarised all the forms of their individual perezhivanie with a visual at the end of each section. I aimed to demonstrate that the interaction between teachers and technologically-enhanced learning environments could reveal complexities, which then might trigger teachers’ perezhivanie. Their perezhivanie, in turn, helped them retain important events in their memory and create effective solutions. To that end, teachers’ perezhivanie could transform that initial interaction. The next, final chapter of the thesis presents discussion of my findings and suggestions for further research.
Chapter 9: Results and Discussion

This study set out with the aim to explore how teachers respond to integrating technology into their language classroom in the Russian higher education context. It sought to understand teachers’ responses to those challenges in the form of perezhivanie, and how perezhivanie can serve as a prompt for development. My understanding of perezhivanie rests on the assumption that when teachers get exposed to complexities, experienced as obstacles, they get motives to look for new solutions (Sannino, 2010), and perezhivanie emerges as a cognitive and emotional response to this situation.

In order to generate meaningful data and capture perezhivanie in them I initiated two open-ended interviews with each participant. My epistemology is grounded on the premise that teachers engage their emotions and cognition when they make meaning of their practice. Teachers introspectively interpret current events through the lens of their teaching and learning experience. This epistemology is compatible with narrative research. It is within the narrative flow of the teachers’ stories that I could get a manifestation of emotional reactions on the obstacles, because within the narratives the teachers’ challenges of using technology got authentic and started surfacing.

The aforementioned meaning making was almost certainly a developmental process. While I did not seek to understand teacher development per se, I assumed that teachers may have started seeing an obstacle through the lens of their perezhivanie, and could become more conscious of their motives. This awareness could be an ecologically valid way for the teachers to understand the situational dynamics around them, find a solution, and grow.

Returning briefly to my deductive analysis, I operationalised perezhivanie by discussing critical incidents in teaching. Understanding them enabled me to see how an interaction between teachers and the technologically enhanced learning context triggered teachers’ perezhivanie, and then how emergent perezhivanie transformed that initial interaction. As a
result of the analysis, I revealed three forms of perezhivanie: perezhivanie-experiencing, perezhivanie-apprehension, and perezhivanie-reflection.

It is important to note here that the data analysis in the two previous chapters highlighted the intertwining and interweaving interdependence of instances of perezhivanie, and their multilevel nature. A possible explanation of how teachers could become more conscious of their motives is that though having recursive and recurrent perezhivanie, teachers are likely to go through some key phases, where they get more aware of the dynamics in their classrooms. The awareness helped them to resolve issues by a restructuring of their activity, e.g. see Anna’s critical incident in section 6.5.4.

The purpose of this chapter is to revisit and to consolidate what I have learned about perezhivanie, synthesise the findings, and present the main conclusions. The first section is devoted to the discussion of how teachers go through stages of change, and I understand perezhivanie as a foundation of these stages. In the second section, I discuss the three forms, mentioned above, in which perezhivanie exists. Then, I address the multilevel nature of perezhivanie, and conclude the thesis by suggesting ideas for further research.

9.1 Perezhivanie and the change curve
In section 6.5.3 I introduced and then exemplified how I used the change curve with Anne’s data in section 6.5.4. Summarising my findings from all the data, I can explain teachers’ perezhivanie, using the change curve (see Figure 12), as follows. Interacting with their context, a teacher may experience something as a complexity, and, as a result, undergo an intense emotional experience. Although it was hard sometimes to differentiate nuances of participants’ emotions, they seemed to always feel pressure in their activity in a critical incident. Even if they had expected a particular complexity, their first reaction was almost always frustration. They could not always determine if the complexity was positive or negative. They felt that something had just happened, because they could not do what they
had planned, and, therefore, got frustrated. Some teachers described their emotions overtly (e.g. Anna - see section 8.2.2), and some did not (e.g. Nuala - see section 8.1.2), but their frustration was apparent in what and how they spoke about the incident. The power of the first frustration was sometimes linked to the extent of predictability of the complexity. For example, when Eva contemplated technical issues (see section 7.2.2), she called them ‘ordinary’, whereas for another teacher a technical issue could be a disaster.

Following the initial frustration, the teachers started to deny and diverge from what had happened, and this was indexed by the data. Nuala, for instance, initially could not see a way forward, and did not do anything to change the situation (see section 7.3.2). She waited for the IT department to notice that they mistakenly had assigned her as a student in the university site, and for them to assign her as a teacher. Denial is known in psychology as a defensive behaviour. People try to escape from reality, so teachers in my case could ignore an ongoing critical incident. Therefore, the situation becomes ‘better’ in their mind than it in reality is. For example, in the pilot project that I mentioned in the introduction, my trainees often said: ‘we are professionals, and we do not have any issues’. Another example is when Emmy remembered her colleague, who did not pay attention to her cheating students.

The denial stage might last for a long time, but often a time of changing emotions comes then. Teachers might experience either despair, or panic, or fear, or depression, or gilt or a combination of these, as is shown in Figure 12 as a downward spiral of emotions. Teachers may feel disturbed, this is extremely uncomfortable, and this is a period of high vulnerability. In the data this was indexed by teachers’ complaints, or by their concerns that they could get penalised. For example, my participants talked about the pressure of publication (see section 7.3.3), and their despair in reaction to their students’ complaints (see section 7.1.3).

At some point the cognition element came back in, and the participants usually either
resigned to the situation, left it alone, or passively accepted it. Kübler-Ross positioned this moments as the beginning of the acceptance stage. Sometimes, however, my participants went for it, began to embrace the change, and started to experiment with teaching. It was hard to anticipate all possible ways the changes could be undertaken, and my participants did it differently. For example, Anna experimented with designing a new assessment procedure, and Nuala tried various ways to set up an assignment. It was a more cognitive sense-making stage, and less an emotional experiencing, and they tried to make use of this recovery process, imaginatively, or with some kind of intervention, to push the boundaries of their practice.

Then, a sense of helplessness gradually played out, and the participants often experienced ‘aha’ moments, i.e. something that brought them pleasure and satisfaction. It meant that, while being forced to accept a complexity through the circumstances of a critical incident, they finally adapted their use of some new technology. I argue that this stage almost certainly leads to a transformation, and that it affected their well-being. It was interesting how differently my participants experienced these ‘aha’ moments. For Nuala, for example, it was a very cognitive process of getting new insight. Whereas Anna attached more emotional meaning to her sense-making process, which in the data was indexed by adjectives, metaphors, and idiomatic expressions she used. This finding echoes Kübler-Ross’s note, in the preface to ‘On Death and Dying’, that the stages might differ slightly according to the people’s individual experience.

To recap, I have described my participants’ experience of going through change into units of their perezhivanie. Exploring various transformations of their activity and perezhivanie, I could understand how they achieved what they did, and how they developed. The teachers often admitted that their perezhivanie changed over time, and their changing perezhivanie was, to me, a story of their development. Analysing and interpreting their experience enabled me to notice three forms of perezhivanie, which I present in the next section.
9.2 Three forms of perezhivanie

I reported in section 3.3 that perezhivanie might take several forms. One possible reason could be a various degrees of awareness and agency in each form, as Vasilyuk (1991) suggests. In Chapter 8, I demonstrated that even when dealing with similar complexities, the teachers had different perezhivanie. This provided an analytical affordance for me to distinguish between forms of perezhivanie slightly beyond Vasilyuk’s taxonomy, as I introduced it in Chapter 3. I suggest the following forms: perezhivanie-experiencing, perezhivanie-apprehension, and perezhivanie-reflection. In Figure 16, below, I show them graphically on the same change curve as in Figure 12 in Chapter 6.

![Figure 16. Three forms of perezhivanie](image-url)
Taking as an example Anna’s *Perezhivanie about looking under-professional* (see section 8.1.2 for more detail), it is possible to hypothesise that forms of perezhivanie differ in whether they are perceived and reflected upon, or have not been yet. In section 8.1.2, I suggested that her perezhivanie-experiencing was related to her existing system of motives, whereas her perezhivanie-reflection emerged when her motives got restructured. This might be a distinguishing feature between the forms. Below, I discuss all three one by one.

Returning briefly to the start of the Change Curve (see Figure 12), when the teachers encountered a complexity, which they were sometimes not fully aware of, they could experience frustration, anger, fear, guilt, embarrassment and so on. Being perplexed, they were not able to disentangle from it. I call this phenomenon perezhivanie-experiencing. It is always emotional, while not always overtly emotional. It is a kind of psychological ‘work out’, which may enable teachers to come back to an emotional stability. Perezhivanie-experiencing, in my data, appears to be always related to a particular incident, which is not always the case with the two other forms of perezhivanie.

By way of illustration, I refer to Nuala’s story, discussed in section 8.2.2. When Nuala could not set up an assignment, she was very unsettled emotionally. In fact, she was frustrated, as she did not know how to act in order to resolve the issue. Her *Perezhivanie about fair grading* was a clear example of perezhivanie-experiencing. She first had no idea what to undertake in this critical incident, and randomly tried different options: ‘I’ve tried everything ... tried each and every button to click ... (gesture of clicking is heard)’. Nuala’s perezhivanie-experiencing was very cognitive at times, though, and it was often hard to recognise whether an emotional or a cognitive factor played a leading role in her perezhivanie-experiencing.

Perezhivanie-apprehension is a bit different. This form of perezhivanie is mostly related to
teachers’ values, beliefs, and attitudes, and is likely to be always ‘on’. It is a teachers’ ongoing workout routine, and comparing it to perezhivanie-experiencing the difference, in my data, was that perezhivanie-apprehension was not always related to a critical incident. Teachers seemed to have grasped the common problem, but not yet come to their own solution. My research suggests that the reflection in perezhivanie-apprehension only ends when the developmental work has been done, and the emotional experience is close to being dissipated.

Perezhivanie-apprehension is demonstrated by Eva’s data. Her *Perezhivanie about quality of learning* (see section 8.3.2) was not triggered by a particular critical incident. Anna described her perezhivanie-apprehension as ‘everything goes as it goes, and is the way it is’ (see section 8.1.2). When the participants told me that their perezhivanie transformed, as they got more experienced, they nearly always meant perezhivanie-apprehension. A likely explanation of this transformation is that in different stages of their career, continuing teachers have different needs, or a ‘hierarchy of needs’ (Freeman, 1982:27).

As is suggested by Freeman's hierarchy, novice teachers are mostly concerned with *What do I teach?*, and their needs include training to clarify the content they teach. When certain basic techniques and skills have been mastered, teachers are likely to be concerned with the question *How do I teach what I teach?*, according to the hierarchy (Freeman, ibid:27), and this triggers their perezhivanie about this ‘how’. Further along the road of their professional development, as Freeman (ibid) suggests, teachers get concerned with *Why do I teach what I teach?* and *Why do I teach the way I do?*. As a result, at this point in their career, teachers almost certainly have an absolutely different kind of perezhivanie. For instance, Nuala surprisingly reacted to the word ‘perezhivanie’ at the beginning of our second meeting, when we started discussing my interpretation of her data. She explained that she did not have perezhivanie now as much as she did before, i.e. at the beginning of her career. What she experienced at the beginning of her career she called ‘bespokoistvo’, which
English translation is close to a combination of ‘worry-anxiety-care’. That ‘care’ part in Nuala’s ‘bespokoistvo’ coincides with the common belief that the more experienced we, as teachers, become, the more reflective our teaching gets, and, therefore, our initial perezhivanie-apprehension is likely to get transformed into perezhivanie-reflection.

Perezhivanie-reflection is the closest to Schön’s ‘reflecting-in-action’ (Schön, 1983; 1992), something that is evident from its name. Perezhivanie-reflection, unlike the other two forms of perezhivanie, is mostly a conscious action. As was demonstrated in Chapter 8, when having this form of perezhivanie, the participants dealt with complexities by noticing them, and getting aware of them. Perezhivanie-reflection involved the teachers in thinking about how to overcome the issues in the complexities they experienced. In Schön’s terms, it meant that the teacher was in a ‘conversation with the situation’. The word ‘conversation’ Schön (1992:125) comprehends metaphorically, and it is reasonable to assume that in this conversation teachers’ perezhivanie assists them in their thinking. For instance, such ‘conversation’ enabled Eva, whose over-arching perezhivanie was *Perezhivanie about quality of learning* (see section 8.3.2), to find a solution to use Quizlet for her course of ESP Legal English.

The difference between perezhivanie-reflection and reflective practice is that the former is not reducible to the person, whereas the latter must be forced cognitively, e.g. by prompts or questions, and needs deliberate forceful cognitive ‘consideration’ in Dewey’s terms (see section 4.2 where I discussed various reflective practice frameworks in detail). In the following section I exemplify it with Anna’s data how reflective practice can be stopped at any time, whereas perezhivanie is only truly ‘over’ when the teacher is able to re-count the whole thing.

Not surprisingly, the participants admitted that they ‘bring their perezhivanie home’, meaning that they were not able to ‘turn off’ their perezhivanie, and did not want to,
because perezhivanie assisted them in cognitively complex tasks, and stimulated envisioning new solutions. This generative function of perezhivanie is consistent with the literature on ‘inclusive’ professional presence (e.g. in Ekebergh, 2007), related to the nursing field. My participants admitted that when having perezhivanie, they thought about the issues, and this enabled them to come to terms with emotions as well. They came to understand better the triggers of the critical incident in question, such as complexities, unrealised motives, and other relevant factors. As a result, perezhivanie-reflection helped their frustration, anger, fear, guilt, and embarrassment, and so on to disappear.

It was sometimes hard to distinguish teachers’ perezhivanie-reflection from perezhivanie-experiencing, because these seemed to overlap at the stage of thinking and looking for new solutions. This was evident in the case of Nuala’s perezhivanie-experiencing related to the case of substitute teaching, where she was first registered as a student in the platform (see 8.2.2 for more detail). This perezhivanie-experiencing later got transformed into perezhivanie-reflection, and assisted her in restructuring her motives, and to set up an assignment activity. Her new motives, related to a new object, which was to use the ‘Forum’ area in the LMS, enabled her to finally run the assignment successfully. What I noticed about the interrelation of these two forms of perezhivanie was that when the participants came back with new solutions, and managed to resolve the issues that had emerged in the critical incident in question, perezhivanie-experiencing always ebbed out, probably because the teacher’s motives get restructured. A further example of the overlap between different forms of perezhivanie, this time involving all three forms, is Anna’s story about the complexity of connectivity (see section 7.2.2).

To recap, my findings do not contradict Vasilyuk’s taxonomy, but add an important dimension of time. I do not understand the forms of perezhivanie as Vasilyuk’s ‘regimes of consciousness’, or consider the forms as simply different. Instead, there is a potentially interesting interaction between my three forms of perezhivanie. Perezhivanie-experience is
likely to be happening at an earlier stage than perezhivanie-reflection, but perezhivanie-experience can transform into perezhivanie-reflection if it becomes conscious, i.e. gets more analysed.

I believe there are several benefits in pointing out the possible sequence of the three forms of perezhivanie. At the same time, as seen in Figure 16, the three forms of perezhivanie may partially overlap. The movements and dynamics between perezhivanie-experiencing, perezhivanie-apprehension and perezhivanie-reflection are intriguing and seem to have a potential for further research. Before proceeding to discussing ideas for further research on perezhivanie, I address differences that I see between perezhivanie and reflective practice.

9.3 Perezhivanie compared to reflective practice

The findings of the current study, reported in the previous section, resonate not only with those of Kübler-Ross (2009) studies, but also confirm the association between perezhivanie and reflection. As was pointed out in section 4.3, reflection has a multileveled structure, reported in the work of Schön (1992:123ff.). Schön tries to identify cognitive forms of processing across action and practice. My research and focus on perezhivanie, in addition, looks at emotional processes. Perezhivanie in its three forms, discussed in the section above, offers new dimensions to understand reflection in professional development that is slightly different from what Schön suggests.

It is my contention that perezhivanie-reflection rather than reflection-for-action (e.g. in Grushka, et al., 2005) assisted the participants in resolving the critical incidents discussed in Chapter 8. An example of this is Anna’s data, analysed in section 8.1.2. Anna could not disengage her emotions during her reflections focus by the critical incidents, but even so seemed to be processing the complexities. Reflection-for-action would involve an emotional distance between the incident and the reflection. By contrast, perezhivanie involves a dialectical processing of emotions and cognition. Reflection-for-action involves cognitively engaging with observed events; perezhivanie is generated by lived experience that includes
Another difference I addressed in the previous section, where I compared perezhivanie-reflection and reflective practice. Unlike reflection, which can be stopped at any time, perezhivanie is only truly ‘over’ when the teacher is able to re-count the entire incident. It is ‘on’ until such a moment, when the emotional experience has not done its work, so to speak. In section 9.1, I addressed this in detail by describing a change curve the teachers are likely to go through. Thus, perezhivanie reflects the full engagement with a critical incident over time, or as one teacher said: ‘it was a shock, but I got through it, and am now a different, maybe better, person’.

Finally, returning to Figures 13, 14, and 15, as well as the descriptions of a possible hierarchical structure of perezhivanie at the end of sections 8.1.2, 8.2.2, and 8.3.2. My study has suggested that perezhivanie may be a multi-level phenomenon. Thus, it may be that some instances of perezhivanie are subordinate to other ones, and some instances of perezhivanie are overarching ones. For example, I suggested that Anna’s *Perezhivanie about appearing professional* was superordinate, and that her *Perezhivanie about student cheating* was subordinate. I suspect that different perezhivanie may be ordered in different ways, by different researchers. However, I have suggested the possibly useful principle that more global perezhivanie is that which reaches beyond any single critical incident. I suspect that a similar analysis might be possible for reflecting-in-action, as exemplified by Schön’s distinctions between knowing-in-action, reflecting-in-action and reflecting-in-practice (Schön, 1992:124ff.). Knowing-in-action is more unconscious and in-the-moment, reflecting-in-action are in response to Schön’s ‘aha’ moments, and reflecting-in-practice is across an ‘action-present’ which can extend across days, weeks or months. Recently, Anderson (2019) has suggested a further development of Schön’s reflective practice, including a typology of teacher interactive thought and taxonomy of interactive reflection. It would be interesting to compare Andreson’s new typology with the different forms of perezhivanie, and their
‘multilevellness’, in further studies.

To recap, while several studies have explored perezhivanie to date, there is little research done on perezhivanie either as a theoretical or practical tool. My research has served to move the notion of perezhivanie forward in both areas. In the next section, I conclude with what I have learnt in this study, about the teachers from the perspective of perezhivanie, and make suggestions for further research.

9.4 Concluding remarks
This section deals with the originality of my work. It brings together my literature-based understanding and my data-based understanding, and presents what I have discovered about the notion of perezhivanie. The section consists of two subsections, including one section that presents the contributions of my study, and another that makes suggestions for further research.

To recap, my belief that perezhivanie is an invaluable psychological tool for teachers’ growth is established on three conceptual pillars. They are addressed in the thesis as follows: the philosophical rationale containing cultural-historical and socio-cultural ‘bricks’ (Chapters 2, 3, and 4), the research evidence (Chapters 6, 7, and 8), and my assumptions of the strength of perezhivanie (Chapter 9). The findings and contributions discussed above in this chapter provide some directions for future research as well, which I discuss in sub-section 9.4.2.

9.4.1 Contributions of the research
While integrating technology into their university language classroom in Russia was the context of my study, its findings might be potentially useful much wider in different levels of education across the world, and extended beyond teaching as well.

I believe my research has both theoretical and practical contributions. The main theoretical contribution is the understanding of perezhivanie that the thesis has provided. I have shown
how, when faced with obstacles, the teachers went through a change process, which involved initial frustration, then denial and various emotions, and after that, in the stage of acceptance, more cognitive engagement with the problem, and finally a sense of moving forward, making progress and finding solutions (see section 9.1 for more detail). This is how I describe the work of perezhivanie, which is the foundation of these stages.

Another theoretical contribution is my identification of three forms of perezhivanie, which are perezhivanie-experiencing, perezhivanie-apprehension, and perezhivanie-reflection. This contribution is related to the more general contribution, reviewed in the previous paragraph, because the three forms of perezhivanie seem to appear in sequence, but with overlaps (see Figure 16 in section 9.1), as the teachers move through the change process. Another related theoretical finding is that perezhivanie is a multi-level experience for the teachers. The teachers in my research had to deal with multiple issues at the same time in the dynamic process of their teaching. Among these multiple issues, there may be more global forms of perezhivanie, and within the global form there may be more short-term forms of perezhivanie. The shorter forms of perezhivanie are linked to critical incidents, and more global perezhivanie may not be linked to incidents in this way. However, this latter finding could be the subject of further research (see section 9.4.2).

Finally, my research has contributed more nuanced theoretical detail about what perezhivanie is, and therefore moving beyond what was apparent from the theoretical conceptualisation in Chapters 2, 3, and 4. As regards to sociocultural theory, the combination of findings provides support for the conceptual premise of perezhivanie as ‘crossing the bridge between the subconscious and the conscious’. To that end, perezhivanie is likely to work for teachers as a heuristic tool that may help to guide their problem solving strategies and beyond, and thereby maximise their sense of accomplishment and success.
There are also practical contributions. An understanding of teachers’ perezhivanie may be useful for teacher development activity. By revealing teachers’ perezhivanie, we can get access to teachers’ motives, which shape the practices that teachers engage in. The literature suggests that motives get more salient in breakdown moments, i.e. when things go wrong. Perezhivanie exploits this in a useful way. By way of illustration, if a teacher gets surprised by the apparent irrationality of his or her own anger, as a response to a critical incident, they can reflect on the reasons for this ‘anger’, and the reflection can become a telling moment to the teacher about unrealised motives. Motives are not fully conscious, though, as discussed in Chapter 2 and, therefore, are sometimes not readily available to conscious reflection. However, perezhivanie is more easily communicated, and, being reflected upon, potentially assists people in sense-making and finding new solutions.

Thus, perezhivanie can be used as an analytical tool by teacher educators. For instance, when a teacher trainer notices a trainee’s unexpected emotional reaction, it can give the trainer information about teacher’s perezhivanie. Using this information, the trainer might work out a more nuanced understanding of the trainee’s motives and needs. Blunden suggests that a dialogue around teachers’ perezhivanie may have this kind of potential for teacher development:

> the aid of another person who is capable of objectifying and reflecting back the feelings of the person going through a perezhivanie, guiding them and making use of the resources of the culture to assist them in finding an accommodation with their new situation is normally needed (2016:4).

The teacher trainer, then, may invest time to become attuned to complexities and critical incidents in the teacher’s environment, and may scaffold a trainee to notice, for instance, the emotional dissonance expressed in the trainee’s frustration. If trainers recognise teachers’ perezhivanie, and frame it as growth points for the trainees, it may prove to be a powerful step in creating teachers’ experiences that support and sustain productive teacher development in teacher education and development programs.
At the same time, I argue that transformative processes, including the experiences of integrating technology, does not always need an active intervention by trainers into experienced teachers’ thinking and activity. It is my contention that an awareness of perezhivanie can equip practitioners themselves with a heuristic tool, to sustainably assist them in sense making, problem solving, and decision making without, or with a minimal help, from the outside. Sustainability is an important part of teacher development, because as Allwright (1997:369) points out ‘without sustainability nothing of value is going to be happening in the long term’.

Finally, when experiencing perezhivanie, teachers may experience a sense of ‘narrative necessity’ (Bruner, 1991:9), and therefore feel a need to share this e.g. with a colleague. This may be exploited to encourage collaborative teacher development activity. Exploring and revealing other people’s motives, and their associated perezhivanie, can be a resource when teachers collaborate on problems. Sharing perezhivanie, perhaps through narratives, could contribute to the relational agency, defined at Edwards (2005:169), of everyone engaged and could develop common motives and knowledge of what matters for everyone involved. This may lead to much more productive team work, where issues important to groups of teachers are addressed.

9.4.2 Suggestions for further work

I see my study as an initial investigation of perezhivanie as a psychological tool in teacher development, and one challenge that I have faced is the conceptualisation of perezhivanie. One limitation of my conceptualisation is that I relied on critical incidents to prompt the teachers’ perezhivanie. The reason why I restricted the study to explore perezhivanie through critical incidents is because such incidents can trigger stronger emotions than more ordinary events, and are more likely to be recognised in consciousness by the teachers. Critical incidents, therefore, were easier for the participants to discuss thereby, and gave
me, as a researcher, access to the teachers thinking, emotions, and perezhivanie. However, I assume that development also occurs outside of critical incidents, or at least in those times in between such events, where complexities emerge in more general ways, and perezhivanie may play a role in relation to them. Further research on perezhivanie could, then take into account these ‘outside of critical incidents’ times, so to understand the role of perezhivanie in the bigger picture of teachers’ lives.

Secondly, understanding perezhivanie from Vygotsky’s perspective, I addressed the subconscious in the theoretical part of my study (Chapters 2, 3 and 4). The role of the unconscious has an explanatory power in my study. I have suggested that perezhivanie builds metaphorical bridges from the subconscious to the conscious. However, I was not able to recognise and illustrate this part of the theory with concrete data or analysis. This is because subconscious processes are difficult to access. Although it is possible to hypothesise that emotions are partially subconscious, and some levels of perezhivanie are more conscious than other ones, this study, given the methodology it used, has been unable to demonstrate exactly how the subconscious plays out in perezhivanie.

Having said that, I designed the second set of meetings so that at the end of the meeting we together tried to rationalise their perezhivanie in conversation, and this peripherally addressed this subconscious. For example, Nuala admitted that she does not believe that teachers are able to turn their perezhivanie ‘off’, stating that ‘if somebody claims they leave their perezhivanie at work and go home without it … they are cunning’. Moreover, Eva expressed that perezhivanie was ubiquitous and always a ‘guidance where to move’, and Anna told me that she usually talks over her perezhivanie with colleagues and a close friend, very often on the way home. Thus, perezhivanie seems to have an ‘always on’ quality, and this suggests that it may be present also in the subconscious at all times.
While my methodological tool assisted me to partially fill in the missing, ‘subconscious’ part of perezhivanie, I inevitably lost some aspects of perezhivanie, because we cannot trace any subconscious processes until they becomes conscious. As I said in Chapter 4, my research has been unable to find the unconscious forms of perezhivanie that Vasilyuk (1991) suggested existed, because this form does not appear in consciousness. In further investigations it might be possible to contribute to this part of theory.

Finally, future research could look at how historical, social and cultural factors, which influence perezhivanie. Specifically, it would be interesting to learn whether perezhivanie is something only Russian teachers experience, or if it is a more universal phenomenon. I suspect that it is more universal, but the challenge of recognising perezhivanie in other contexts may be a linguistic one. There has to be a terminology, or language, to talk about perezhivanie. My study has taken a step towards creating such language to talk about perezhivanie in other contexts.
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Appendix 1: The introductory e-mail (in Russian)

Здравствуйте, (name of the teacher)!

Меня зовут Лада Смирнова и Вас очень рекомендовала (name of the person), советник ректора НИУ ВШЭ/МИСИС.

В недавнем прошлом мы с Вами были коллегами: в 2012 году я запустила проект в РАНХиГС по применению технологий для обучения иностранным языкам. Теперь в моей жизни новый этап – я делаю PhD в университете г. Манчестер. Целью моего исследования является повышение качества образования и улучшение условий работы преподавателей, использующих технологии. Я изучаю условия, в которых работают преподаватели. Одна из моих задач - сделать форму смешанного обучения более комфортной и эффективной, например с точки зрения временных затрат преподавателя.

Поэтому я пишу к Вам с просьбой поделиться со мной своим опытом, профессиональным и человеческим. Меня интересует любой он, связанный с особенностями нашей работы. И в этом Ваше дружеское участие не забудется!

В свою очередь, я готова поделиться с Вами результатами исследования, дизайном своих онлайн курсов и рассказать, как я использую технологии в этом семестре, чтобы не только получать радость от своей помощи, но и ощущать, благодаря Вам, наполненность жизни. Я уверена что вместе мы сможем создать такую информационную среду, которая поможет нам расти профессионально, загораясь от идей друг друга.

Ваших ответов никогда не будет мало и я буду рада получить от Вас любой ответ, в знак продолжения наших отношений – деловых и человеческих.

Спасибо!

С пожеланиями наилучшего,

Лада Смирнова
Appendix 2: Consent form and Participant Information Sheet

Integrating technology into the university language classroom: a study of complexities and perezhivanie in teachers’ experience

Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a study as part of my PhD. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the study is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Do take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.

Who will conduct the research?
Lada Smirnova
Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) School of Environment, Education and Development | Ellen Wilkinson Building Oxford Road | The University of Manchester | Manchester M13 9PL

Title of the Study
Integrating technology into the university language classroom: a study of complexities and perezhivanie in teachers’ experience

What is the aim of the study?
My aim is to generate a process of language teacher development when engaging with technology
Why have I been chosen?
I wish to conduct the research with experienced teachers of English, who are currently working for National Research University Higher School of Economics. Once you have read through this information sheet and decide that you do not want to take part or do not have enough time please tell me, I will understand.

What would I be asked to do if I took part?
You will be asked to take part in up to 2 interviews, over the course of three months. All interviews can be arranged at a time and place convenient for you. Each interview can last for up to one hour, though they may not take this long.

In the first interview I will ask you some questions about your experience of using technology for language teaching and about problems you encounter there. In the following interview I may ask you to talk in more depth about particular experience you mentioned, and to talk about your future plans and ideas how to integrate technology.

The interview will be conducted in Russian. Afterwards, I will translate Russian utterances into English then transcribe it all, and if you so wish, you will have the chance to read the transcript to check that you agree with what was said. Kindly express this explicitly. Again, with your permission, I will record and transcribe the interviews, and ask you to check the transcription.

You will not be asked to discuss any topic or answer any question you do not want to. You can withhold your response to any questions that you do not want to answer. You may also stop the interview at any time, without giving a reason.

What happens to the data collected?
I will upload the data to my personal password protected computer, to which no one else has access. A transcript will be printed out and used for analysis, which will be carried out my home. When I am not working on the data, all documents related to this study will be stored in a locked cabinet.

How is confidentiality maintained?
No one will have access to the data except for myself and my supervisors, and you if you request it. Where data is directly quoted in the text, names will be changed.
What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?
It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep and asked to sign it. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

What is the duration of the study?
Your part in it would be up to five individual interviews with me, lasting no longer than one hour each, over a period of five months. Five interviews is the maximum number, so it may be fewer; one hour is also a maximum length of time, and the interviews may be shorter than this. The maximum amount of interview time would be five hours over five months. I would like the first interview to take place in September, and the following interviews at times convenient to you over the five months.

Where will the study be conducted?
Interviews can take place at a location of your choice.

Will the outcomes of the research be published?
No, the study will not be published. It will, however, be publicly available in the University of Manchester library.

Contact for further information
If you would like to discuss the project further or ask any questions, please email me at ladasmir@gmail.com

What if something goes wrong?
Please contact my supervisor Susan Brown at the Manchester Institute of Education (MIE) School of Environment, Education and Development at the above address, or on Susan.A.Brown@manchester.ac.uk.
If you want to make a formal complaint about the conduct of the study please contact the Head of the Research Office, Christie Building, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL. E-mail: Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk
Telephone: 0161 275 7583 or 275 8093
If you are happy to participate please read the consent form and initial it:

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above project and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without detriment to any treatment/service.

3. I understand that the interviews will be audio/video-recorded.

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes.

I agree to take part in the above project

Name of participant __________________________ Date __________ Signature ________________

Name of person taking consent __________________________ Date __________ Signature ________________
Appendix 3: 1st Interview agenda

1. Have a small talk to break the ice and establish good rapport with a cup of tea or coffee.
2. Ask for the permission to record the session.
3. Start recording.
4. Introduce the interview (why we are here, what is an overall aim of the research, but do not tell the purpose of this session at this stage).
5. If the participant has the laptop, I will ask them to turn it on and listen what they say about their computer.
6. If the participant does not have a laptop, I will turn on mine.
7. Open the institutional LMS e Front.
8. Give the participant an opening prompt: Tell me about your experience with e Front.
9. Provide the first prompt: Tell me you story of your experience with technology.
10. Provide the follow up prompts.
11. Follow-up dialogue.
12. Stop recording.
13. Thank the participant and have a small talk.
Appendix 4: 2nd Interview preparation

1. I send the entire transcript to all 10 participants, thanking them for the first meeting. As I build in my second set of interviews on what I did in the previous meeting, I ask the participants to read it and also give them the prompt, which will allow them to continue engaging with the same narrative:

   Would you like to change or add anything?

and ask about the dates when they are available.

2. Two or three days prior to the meeting I send the participants my interpretation of their story in the form of the several prompts (see Appendix 6), and invite the participant to discuss them in our meeting.
Appendix 5: Second Interview agenda

I used three strategies in the second set:
1. As much as possible try and relate the story told in the first interview with the current teaching experience. I invited teachers by the prompts so that we could get a more advanced narrative on the same case.

2. The teachers’ perezhivanie informed me and signalled the cases: that is something, which could be taken as the new meaning and then could lead to resolving the issues. By focusing on the complexities in the prompts I tried to bring them up to the conscious cognitive level of the teacher’s thinking process, and give the participants space to react on them. I want to capture that process of raising awareness of complexities to the conscious level. So, the second strategy is, in fact, my small intervention to the teachers’ thinking.

3. Closer to the end of the interview, I got teachers to talk about perezhivanie and the role of perezhivanie in the teaching practice. This will help me understand and fine-tune my definition of perezhivanie. I have the follow-up questions on hand (approximately):

   • What is the role of perezhivanie in your teaching practice?
   • What else are you perezhivaete the most?
   • Does it give you the info where to move?
   • How have your perezhivanies changes throughout the times? Did you have a different perezhivanie about this before?
   • How do you cope with your perezhivanie?
   • When do your perezhivanies get smoother? After what?
   • Do you bring your perezhivanie home, sleep with them or leave them at the university?
   • Do you share your perezhivanie with your colleagues?
Appendix 6: Prompts with perezhivanie for 2nd meeting

Teacher 1. Anna
There were four examples of this in your first narrating and I kindly ask you to tell me whether I got you right, please:

1. Your first story was related to the online assessment done with Googledocs (context). Occasionally you noticed that not all students come to the class to get the test, some get the unique link and try and complete the test from home, which does not guarantee that they do it themselves (complexities). Your perezhivanie helped you find a solution: switch the roles in the Googledoc from ‘reading’ to ‘reading & editing’ during the test when they are ready and raise their hand.

2. Your second story does with writing (context) and plagiarizing (complexities). You have decided to design different unique essay tasks for different students – 15, as the number of the students (actions).

3. Your third story related to the Public Speaking module (context), where 5 out of 15 students (one third) took the similar and previously done extract as a presentation of their public speaking. They did not rehearse an extract of their choice as had been assigned, but took the famous M L King’s speech they previously learnt by heart in the Intercultural Communication Unit (complexities). Your perezhivanie enabled you to change the task design in the next version of the unit and warn from doing it. You also decided to talk to the teacher prior to the next term so that to exclude the extracts rehearsed in other modules (actions/solutions).

4. To add, from you story I have understood that multiple versions of Word cause serious tensions in your work. You cannot obviously avoid using Word but sometimes have up to 8 different versions of Word in one room, which are not compatible. How do you cope with the situation? Does your perezhivanie help you to resolve it?

Teacher 2. Jane
1. You’ve mentioned that ‘Connectivity’ this is also one of your major perezhivanies. How do you experience it? Does your perezhivanie help you to resolve them?

2. Jane, in your story you mentioned that you constantly experience a tension between your desire to run a well-developed effective lesson and the technical problems of connection of different devices, which sometimes ruin your great lesson plans. Could you tell me more, please? How do you experience it?
Appendix 7: Nuala’s data, transcribed verbatim

My translation:
That happened...I had to substituted another teacher at the middle of the term... at the middle of the term (repeats)... I was registered in our Canvas... and I was registered not as a teacher but... as an ORDINARY STUDENT... just simply neglected...

I WAS STRUGGLING with the tasks design...that is I am able to view everything but cannot add anything ...
I’ve tried everything...logged in...AS A DIGITALLY NATIVE//GROWN WITH TECHNOLOGIES ...tried each and every button to click... (gesture of clicking is heard)...reported [the problem] to each and every department. While there was a conference NOBODY PAID ATTENTION... that happened... they said yes yes I’ll have a look...

but the deadlines for the tasks were programmed in advance ...
So the problem was we faced deadline ...the task has shut...the same was me... I was registered as a student ...and did not have //
the rights...to change anything

I WAS STRUGGLING with the tasks design...So, what I felt? the deadlines started shutting up the tasks for me as well as ...the platform offered to do the task ....warning as late submission ... I cannot see what my students have done. COMPLETELY. so they surely very perezhivali that I won’t be able to see their work... so, for goodness sake..this case...

then found I could do something through the area of forums... that is I can upload some discussions ... and download messages... One sends me a message and attaches all his tasks... (laughing)

thereafter he tells the group about it... and when the IT pays attention to me and endorses me as a Teacher in the system finally ...we have some questions with grading ...because informally they submitted them [the assignments]...

but I was so PLEASED that they perezhivali and wanted to get that grade...we found how to solve the issue, i.e. they uploaded the assignments via messaging, with their comments and so on..
Appendix 8: Nuala’s data with prosodic features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>That happened ... I had to substituted another teacher //</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at the middle of the term ... at the middle of the term (repeats).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was registered in our Canvas ... and there ... all people were BUSY at the middle of the term ...with the conference preparation that time ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and I was registered not as a teacher but //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as an ORDINARY STUDENT ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just simply neglected(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ simply I had access//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I WAS STRUGGLING with the tasks design (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to view everything but cannot add anything as an ASSIGNMENT SECTION (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve tried everything//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logged in (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS A DIGITALLY NATIVE//</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROWN WITH TECHNOLOGIES (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tried each and every button to click ... ((gesture of clicking is heard))///</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then found I could do something through the area of discussions ... that is I can upload some discussions ... and all the tasks uploaded ... reported [the problem] to each and every department. While there was a conference NOBODY PAID ATTENTION ... that happened ... they said yes yes I’ll have a look ... so uploaded something through the area of discussions... something through the area of discussions //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while the uncertain period of changing a teacher ... for the substitution ... some students got relaxed and started working a bit later ... //when they understand that I won’t give them pass ... if they DO NOT DO ONLINE WORK ... but the deadlines for the tasks were programmed in advance ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so the students tried to ‘BREAK THROUGH’ THE DEADLINES ... but could not ... So the problem was we faced deadline ... the task has shut ... the same was me ... I was registered as a student ... and did not have //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the rights //to change them// So, what I felt? the deadlines started shutting up the tasks for me as well as ... the platform offered to do the task ... warning as late submission ... I cannot see what my students have done. COMPLETELY. This is the ITASY group [meaning that it’s a strong group] ... one boy has guessed//</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: My notes taken from listening Eva’s data
Appendix 10: A Confirmation Letter from HSE

This is to certify that we will be happy to assist Ms Lada Smirnova in her research leading to her PhD. Pursuits allowing her to use our university’s premises as well as our consent to contact our staff who have given their consent to participation as she might see suitable with the understanding that her findings will remain strictly anonymous and will be used only for the purpose of her research.

Sergey Roshchin  
Vice Rector  
sroshchin@hse.ru  
Room 303; 20 Myasnitskaya Ulitsa  
Moscow 101000 Russia
Appendix 11: Coding references after initial open coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created On</th>
<th>Created By</th>
<th>Modified On</th>
<th>Modi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complexity 1 Student S...</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22 Oct 2017 16:22</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>29 Dec 2017 20:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 00:54</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017 21:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS Nuala’s belief</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 Apr 2017 00:11</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 22:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS oriented</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 16:04</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017 21:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS e-literacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 Oct 2017 16:46</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017 21:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Cheating</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 16:30</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 15:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity 2 Online envi...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26 Feb 2017 15:19</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017 21:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS does not meet T’...</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 23:28</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>25 Nov 2017 22:02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Voicerecording</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 May 2017 18:53</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 20:56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow or no internet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21 May 2017 16:54</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 23:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Hardware does n...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25 Nov 2017 23:00</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>25 Nov 2017 23:06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T overwork</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 23:03</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 15:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical bugs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 00:43</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 22:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Player</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 00:47</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 00:47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popup windows Br...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 00:47</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 14:57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word updates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Apr 2017 22:22</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 14:51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity 3 Working c...</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26 Feb 2017 17:09</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017 21:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 23:26</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 23:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT bugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22 Jan 2017 23:13</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 22:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 23:49</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 23:58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time consuming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 13:06</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 14:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpayment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 13:11</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 02:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student profile</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 12:53</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 15:49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Description</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 17:21</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Today, 02:19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of technology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 Apr 2017 00:39</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017 21:09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 Apr 2017 00:43</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017 21:09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 01:25</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 01:26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing online</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 May 2017 17:09</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 23:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22 Jan 2017 23:08</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017 21:09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating video</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 May 2017 16:27</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 23:43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 03:02</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 03:02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task design</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 14:43</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1 Dec 2017 17:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicing a video</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 12:38</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 13:41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 01:00</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017 21:09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Initial Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>MS Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive - T’s work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26 Feb 2017 13:42</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017</td>
<td>21:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boosting learner au…</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 01:01</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017</td>
<td>14:35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-correction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 16:23</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017</td>
<td>16:33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom manage…</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21 May 2017 00:37</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017</td>
<td>21:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Progress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 16:17</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017</td>
<td>16:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS, CourseBooks, C…</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 Apr 2017 21:56</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017</td>
<td>21:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point-Rating-System</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 02:48</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017</td>
<td>15:44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T worries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 02:42</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017</td>
<td>21:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 19:19</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017</td>
<td>21:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva beliefs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17 Dec 2017 15:44</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017</td>
<td>21:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuala - major per</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 16:26</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017</td>
<td>16:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop babysitting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 16:06</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017</td>
<td>16:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T’s Stories</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26 Feb 2017 17:01</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Dec 2017</td>
<td>21:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Stories Per</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 21:47</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>30 Nov 2017</td>
<td>01:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Perezhivanie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26 Feb 2017 17:02</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>19 Nov 2017</td>
<td>00:31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna - Per Chea…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Apr 2017 20:02</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>19 Nov 2017</td>
<td>00:31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Per Conne…</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Apr 2017 22:01</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017</td>
<td>20:52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna per min S’s…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 15:26</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017</td>
<td>21:06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna per Word</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Apr 2017 22:24</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017</td>
<td>21:40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVlad per Vocab use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 May 2017 19:06</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>22 Dec 2017</td>
<td>16:35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials for pre…</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 May 2017 13:41</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>13 May 2017</td>
<td>13:49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 May 2017 13:32</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>13 May 2017</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Folder</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>By</td>
<td>New Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizlet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13 May 2017 01:48</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Nov 2017 00:28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 May 2017 17:57</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>13 May 2017 17:57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaby per work-life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 May 2017 01:08</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>23 Nov 2017 17:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 23:44</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 23:44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaby per chocolate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 Nov 2017 23:44</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>6 Nov 2017 00:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuala Per</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 21:43</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>17 Nov 2017 16:31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuala facilitating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 18:31</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 15:44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuala Per perfect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 13:07</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 14:35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuala per struct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 15:47</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 15:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuala’s agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 Nov 2017 12:29</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>8 Nov 2017 12:34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuala’s beliefs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 Nov 2017 15:02</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 21:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA per</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 21:44</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>30 Nov 2017 01:26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA per - liver burn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 Oct 2017 02:19</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>20 Oct 2017 02:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA per charity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19 Oct 2017 19:49</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 20:37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA perezh Gram</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 Oct 2017 02:11</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>20 Oct 2017 02:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1; Per - cases</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 02:50</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>17 Dec 2017 15:29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVKov - per S-T int</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21 May 2017 18:14</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 20:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaby - cheating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17 Oct 2017 20:35</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>6 Nov 2017 00:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA per - cheating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 Oct 2017 02:43</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>20 Oct 2017 02:44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per 1 assessing Ss</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 15:02</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 15:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per 2 Appearing un</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 16:48</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 20:28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per 3 preventing pl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24 Jan 2017 17:25</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 20:29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per 4 Getting S to</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24 Jan 2017 17:36</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 20:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per 6 SS success</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 Oct 2017 00:11</td>
<td>6 Nov 2017 01:58</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2; Per - role in teaching</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 02:20</td>
<td>6 Nov 2017 02:05</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3; Per - a signal for d...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 01:03</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 17:03</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4; Per changes over time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24 Jan 2017 01:02</td>
<td>6 Nov 2017 02:08</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5; Cope with per</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 02:25</td>
<td>6 Nov 2017 02:07</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7; Per - take home</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 01:11</td>
<td>6 Nov 2017 02:08</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8; Life without per</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 02:31</td>
<td>6 Nov 2017 00:38</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q_10; Per - spices or...</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 01:44</td>
<td>6 Nov 2017 02:10</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q_11; Per - Share per...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 Nov 2017 01:39</td>
<td>6 Nov 2017 02:12</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher beliefs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26 Feb 2017 15:17</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 02:33</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22 Jan 2017 23:52</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 15:11</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18 Oct 2017 03:04</td>
<td>24 Oct 2017 18:15</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 12:16</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 01:53</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuala - negative re...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 12:40</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 02:03</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuala - Russ Edu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 18:35</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 15:49</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 Oct 2017 01:15</td>
<td>24 Oct 2017 18:04</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection for TD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31 Mar 2017 22:53</td>
<td>6 Nov 2017 01:13</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Researcher; spelli...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 Oct 2017 18:31</td>
<td>17 Oct 2017 18:35</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher profile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 16:39</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 15:53</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher resistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017 13:01</td>
<td>24 Dec 2017 02:12</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's responsi...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 16:37</td>
<td>2 Apr 2017 16:38</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>