



Comparative Study of Hindi and Russian Languages: Linguistic, Cultural, and Pedagogical Insights

Upendra Kumar

Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi

Email: uksethi.jnu@gmail.com

Chamandeep Pallav

School of Foreign Languages, IGNOU, New Delhi

Email: pallavchamandeep@gmail.com

Jyoti Kiran

jyoti.kiran.anvi@gmail.com

Abstract: The paper presents a detailed comparative analysis of the Hindi and Russian languages, examining their linguistic patterns and structures, historical relationships, cultural ties, and pedagogical implications for language learning. Based heavily on the rich body of research conducted by Dr. Chandan Suman, the present study seeks to shed light on the similarities and differences among different linguistic fields, namely phonology, grammar (gender, case, number, tense), syntax, and numeral systems. In addition, it delves into the long-standing historical and cultural ties between Russia and India, as they tend to be mirrored in their linguistic environment. By synthesising these viewpoints, the paper is able to present an overall picture of the complex relationship between these two Indo-European languages and make suggestions for successful language education.

Keywords: Hindi Language, Russian Language, Comparative Linguistics, Indo-European Languages, Language Pedagogy

1. Introduction: Hindi and Russian, being members of different branches of the extensive Indo-European language family

(Indo-Aryan and East Slavic, respectively), share an impressive set of similarities and differences meriting a thorough comparative investigation. This research endeavours to systematically investigate these features based on previous work and above all, highlights the substantial contributions made by Dr. Chandan Suman. His vast work encompasses comparative linguistics, cultural similarities, and psychological aspects of language acquisition, and in doing so, offers a solid framework through which the subtleties of both these languages can be understood. The comparative method not only enhances our understanding of language but also sheds light on pedagogical implications for second language learning, particularly with the common heritage of the Indo-European phylum.

2. Linguistic Affinities and Divergences

The common ancestor between Hindi and Russian in the Indo-European family is a rich area for comparative linguistics. Both are usually traced back to Proto-Indo-European, and Sanskrit is a key intermediate for the Indo-Aryan branch.



2.1. Historical and Phonetic Connections with Sanskrit

The comparative linguistic similarity between Sanskrit and Russian forms a basis for comprehension of the similarities between Russian and Hindi. Both have a shared grammatical foundation, and they are close to each other in syntax, lexicon, and sentence patterns. Both Russian and Hindi, for example, like Sanskrit, have a strong predisposition to Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) word order, especially in colloquial or older usage, although Russian also uses SVO to emphasise the subject or in particular types of clauses. Phonological systems of both languages also exhibit striking similarities, especially in their consonantal richness and vowel contrasts (Suman, 2021a). This ancient linkage through Sanskrit offers a theoretical framework for comparative research.

2.2. Grammatical Features: Gender, Case, and Number

Grammatical structures of Hindi and Russian exhibit interesting parallels and differences, especially in their inflectional morphology.

2.2.1. Grammatical Gender

Both Russian and Hindi have grammatical gender systems, a feature inherited from Proto-Indo-European. Russian generally makes a difference of three genders: masculine, feminine, and neuter, applicable to nouns, adjectives, and pronouns, prescribing agreement rules. Hindi, on the other hand, makes a difference mainly between two genders: masculine and feminine. Comparative studies, like those on Russian and Arabic grammatical gender

(Suman & Shaban, 2023a) or Hindi and Russian (Suman & Suman, 2023b), highlight how nouns are classified differently in various languages and the concomitant difficulty this presents for learners. Awareness of these different gender assignment strategies is essential for correct understanding and production in both languages.

2.2.2. Grammatical Case Systems

Russian is famous for its complex system of six grammatical cases: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, and prepositional. Russian uses inflectional endings on nouns, adjectives, pronouns, and numerals to mark these cases, which demarcate the syntactic and semantic function of each within a sentence. Hindi lacks an overt case system in the same sense as Russian but employs postpositions to express grammatical relationships, which serve functionally a similar role to cases. For example, the Hindi postposition 'को' (ko) may work like the dative or accusative case depending on the situation. Dr. Suman's work on grammatical case systems is insightful, and it includes, among other things, comparisons between Russian and Sanskrit (Suman & Shaban, 2023b), and directly between Russian and Hindi (Suman & Kiran, 2023a). These works identify the structural and functional features of these case systems, which are important to learn.

2.2.3. Grammatical Number

Both Hindi and Russian mark the singular and plural forms for nouns, adjectives, and verbs for quantity. The rules of agreement and inflexion, however, may be different in specifics. For instance, Russian retains



traces of a dual number in certain older forms or constructions. Comparative studies of Russian and Sanskrit numeral systems (Suman, 2023b), Russian and Hindi (Suman & Kiran, 2023b), and even Russian and Arabic (Suman, 2023c) provide insights into how quantities in a language are conveyed and the morphological, syntactic, and semantic features that go with them. These differences are essential to produce correct and natural language.

2.3. Numeral Systems

Dr. Chandan Suman's work provides a meticulous comparative study of the Russian and Sanskrit numeral systems, which has a direct bearing on our knowledge of the Hindi numeral system because of its linguistic lineage. His investigations into cardinal and ordinal numerals demonstrate great similarities in their construction and use (Suman, 2019b; Suman, 2019c). Both of these languages use complicated inflectional systems of numbers for quantitative values, especially for larger numbers, and when numbers are qualifying nouns of various genders and cases, a feature common among many Indo-European languages. Such a similarity frequently comes as a hurdle for learning among non-native speakers.

2.4. Syntactical Structures and Tenses

Although the two languages are Indo-European, their syntactic structure shows commonalities as well as distinctive patterns. A comparative analysis of syntactical structure between Russian and Sanskrit (Suman, 2022a) forms the foundation for comprehending how these patterns are expressed and diverge,

extendable to Hindi. These analyses identify commonalities and distinctions in word order variability, verb conjugations, and agreement systems, all critical for attaining high-level language ability.

In addition, the translatability of tenses from Russian to English (Suman, 2016b) highlights greater issues in cross-linguistic semantic mapping. Although not comparing Russian and Hindi tenses directly, this research highlights the in-depth knowledge needed of both source and target languages' temporal systems in order to ensure precise translation, a principle that holds similarly for translating between Russian and Hindi.

2.5. Morphological Learning Aids: Mnemonics

The inflectional complexity of languages such as Russian will sometimes require powerful learning techniques. Research by Dr. Suman into mnemonics for Russian adjective endings (Suman, 2016a) provides insightful information about helps that can make memorising difficult inflectional patterns more manageable. These aids enable learners to comprehend and recall the complex patterns of Russian adjective endings, a task that learners of Hindi may also find difficult to achieve with its agreement rules, illustrating the applicability of such teaching devices.

2.6. Angika Linguistic Territory

Although centred mainly on Hindi and Russian, it is relevant to note the linguistic diversity of India that affects language perception and learning. Dr. Suman's studies on "Angika Territory: Unraveling Geographical Extent and Linguistic



Identity" (Suman, Kiran, & Kumar, 2023a) and "Script of Angika: A Historical Writing System" (Suman, Kiran, & Kumar, 2023b) bring forth the rich historical and linguistic background of other Indo-Aryan languages. Knowledge of such regional languages, their change over time (e.g., Angika's evolution from Anga Lipi to Kaithi and finally Devanagari), and how they correlate with dominant languages like Hindi, enriches the larger linguistic context and aids language policy and education within multilingual settings.

3. Cultural Affinity and Linguistic Reflection

Apart from grammatical and lexical affinity, there have been cultural affinities between Russia and India, which have shaped their languages over time. Long-standing historical contacts have created common cultural items, and these are commonly seen in linguistic borrowings and common ideas. A case in point is the Russian term for tea, "чай" (chai), which is a direct borrowing from a Chinese source that also was the origin of the Hindi term "चाय" (chai), expressing a common cultural item and linguistic route. Dr. Suman's study of the "Cultural affinity between Russia and India" (Suman, 2019a) highlights these profound historical ties that can contribute meaningfully to cross-cultural understanding and enhance motivation towards language learning by imparting a rich cultural context towards immersion. These interactions have certainly enriched both languages, adding to their growth and development.

4. Pedagogical Implications: Technology and Psychology

Knowledge of the linguistic features and cultural connections between Hindi and Russian has important pedagogical consequences for teaching and learning them. Contemporary language instruction makes greater use of technological advances and psychological understandings to maximise learning achievements.

4.1. Technological Advances in Language Pedagogy

Technological incorporation has transformed foreign language instruction and learning, providing adaptive tools that can prove very useful in handling complex languages such as Russian and Hindi.

4.1.1. Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Artificial Intelligence provides groundbreaking solutions for adaptive and personalized language learning. These are the provision of real-time translation and pronunciation, AI-based content personalisation, grammar guidance, and AI-governed language learning communities. AI chatbots are capable of mimicking everyday conversations, whereas virtual reality (VR) platforms driven by AI deliver immersive environments for practical language application. AI-based feedback systems process speech patterns, accent, intonation, and rhythm, providing accurate feedback for improvement in pronunciation and fluency (Suman & Suman, 2023a). The ability of AI to revolutionise Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) is an emerging and fast-expanding field of research (Chapelle, 2001; Syzdykova et al., 2023).

4.1.2. Multimedia Integration



Multimedia technologies immensely improve the efficiency of foreign language instruction through the provision of a rich and interactive learning experience. The strategic integration of videos, audio recordings, interactive games, and online resources improves student engagement and serves heterogeneous learning styles. Multimedia fosters a psychologically benign learning environment, surmounts learning obstacles, and promotes the acquisition of foreign language communicative ability (Suman, 2023a). CALL research attest that multimedia promotes overall language skills such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Felix, 2005; Mayer, 2001).

4.2. Psychological Models of Language Acquisition

Psychological aspects, specifically mindset and motivation, are instrumental in whether one is successful at learning a language. Much of this field of study has been addressed by Dr. Chandan Suman, who frequently works within existing theories in education psychology, which are applicable to the acquisition of Hindi and Russian.

4.2.1. Growth Mindset and Language Acquisition

The original theory of growth mindset, coined by Professor Carol S. Dweck (2006), suggests that people's perceptions of their intelligence and capacities deeply affect their response to challenges and learning. In the language learning context, students with a growth mindset welcome linguistic challenges, become resilient against mistakes, measure themselves in terms of incremental progress, and engage in an earnest desire to learn. This approach

promotes risk-taking, not by seeing errors as failures but by seeing them as vital opportunities for learning. Dr. Suman's work thoroughly investigates the way students with a growth mindset are inherently better at foreign language acquisition (Suman, 2023e) and highlights the need for promoting this growth attitude in classrooms (Suman, 2023i). His research also investigates revealing the language of growth mindset as a way to develop potential (Suman, 2018c).

4.2.2. Teacher and Student Interactions

Teachers' mindsets regarding their own pedagogic competence and their students' potential have a significant impact on the learning environment. A growth mindset among teachers creates a positive and encouraging classroom where students will be able to take linguistic risks and learn from mistakes. Evidence, such as that provided by Suman (2023d), suggests teachers' mindsets involved in teaching foreign languages can have a positive influence on students' performance via self-fulfilling prophecies and the establishment of a favorable learning environment (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968).

In addition, the nature of feedback and compliments provided by educators significantly influences a learner's attitude. Process praise, where feedback is accentuated on effort, strategy, and process, instead of pure inherent ability (person praise), instils a growth mindset with persistence and a willingness towards linguistic difficulties (Dweck, 2006; Suman, 2023f). This is consonant with research underscored by successful



feedback as a robust determinant of learning results (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

4.2.3. Motivation and Cognitive Load

Intrinsic motivation, the personal drive to perform tasks for their own sake, is a building block of lifelong learning. In language learning, it drives persistence, resilience, and greater involvement in the learning content. Autonomy, competence, and relatedness, as central elements of Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), are central predictors of intrinsic motivation. Although extrinsic rewards have the potential to provide immediate benefits, they have been known to sometimes detract from intrinsic motivation as seen in many educational psychology contexts and evidenced in Dr. Suman's research on the learning implications of intrinsic motivation and mindset (Suman, 2023g). This internal motivation, along with a growth mindset, is closely associated with enhanced academic performance, allowing students to transcend linguistic barriers and have a positive inclination towards their learning process (Suman, 2023h).

The interaction between cognitive load—the overall level of mental effort being utilised in the working memory—and mindset is also essential. Dr. Suman's work identifies how students' self-perceptions about their own capabilities can impact their ability to process and store new linguistic data (Suman, 2012a). Growth mindset can possibly counteract the adverse impacts of high levels of cognitive load through persistence, good problem-solving strategies, and a readiness to work with and

attempt demanding grammatical structures and new vocabulary.

4.2.4. Communication and Attitudes

Understanding self-image, inhibition, risk-taking, ego-permeability, and ambiguity is central to learning students' foreign language learning attitudes under the mindset model. Growth mindset induces learners to be willing to take risks in speaking, decreases inhibition, and facilitates receptiveness to the ambiguities that are inherent in language learning (Suman, 2012b). This openness is essential for successful verbal communication, where motivational meaning structure—purporting purpose, genuineness, emotional appeal, and audience engagement—is critical in motivating and leading learners to establish greater intimacy with the language (Suman, 2018a). Additionally, the particular "growth mindset language" employed by teachers in the classroom to encourage effort, praise progress, and view failure as an opportunity for learning is a crucial pedagogical practice consonant with constructivist teaching and learning strategies (Suman, 2018b; Vygotsky, 1978).

Lastly, Dr. Suman's contribution to "Eavesdroppers on Our Own Lives: How Implicit Learning Shapes Conscious Communication" (Suman, 2024) provides a novel insight into the cognitive processes beneath linguistic competence and communication and how most of our linguistic ability is developed through unconscious processes. This recognition supports the notion of not just explicit rule memorisation but also a holistic interaction between conscious and unconscious



processes, supporting an increase-focused, less restrained model of learning.

5. Conclusion

Comparative analysis of Hindi and Russian languages demonstrates a profound linguistic and cultural affinity based on their Indo-European origins. Parallels in their grammatical patterns, especially case systems, gender, number, and numeral formation, evince common evolutionary trajectories. The great cultural affinity between India and Russia further emphasizes an ancient bond expressed in their linguistic scenes.

Additionally, the incorporation of technological innovations such as AI and multimedia provides strong instruments for personalized, interactive, and efficient language learning, especially for challenging languages such as Russian and Hindi. Most importantly, the psychological paradigms of mindset and motivation, which have been studied extensively by Dr. Chandan Suman, enable learners and instructors alike to tackle the tasks of language learning with resilience, a receptive mind, and dedication to improvement. Through the blending of these various linguistic, cultural, technological, and psychological outlooks, Hindi and Russian—and, for that matter, any foreign language—may become an even more attainable, effective, and deeply enriching experience for everyone. Additional interdisciplinary investigation in these fields will continue to provide even more sophisticated understandings of the intricacies of human language and language acquisition.

References

1. Angika - Wikipedia. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Angika>
2. Anga Lipi - Wikipedia. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anga_Lipi
3. Aristotle. (1991). *On rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse* (G. A. Kennedy, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 350 BCE)
4. Atkinson, R. C. (1975). Mnemotechnics in second-language learning. *American Psychologist*, 30(8), 821–828.
5. Baker, M. (1992). *In light of theta: A study in English anaphora*. University of Chicago Press.
6. Chapelle, C. A. (2001). *Computer applications in second language acquisition: Foundations for research*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Comrie, B. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
8. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
9. Dehaene, S. (1997). *The number sense: How the mind creates*



- mathematics. Oxford University Press.
10. Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.
 11. Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
 12. Felix, U. (2005). *Analysing discourse on the world wide web*. Continuum.
 13. Grierson, G. A. (1903). *Linguistic survey of India, Vol. V, Part II: Indo-Aryan family, Eastern Group, Specimens of the Bihārī and Oriyā languages*. Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, India.
 14. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.
 15. Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford University Press.
 16. Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. Longman.
 17. MacIntyre, P. D. (1999). Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers. In P. J. D. MacIntyre (Ed.), *The modern language journal*, 83(2), 269-270.
 18. Mayer, R. E. (2001). *Multimedia learning*. Cambridge University Press.
 19. Montrul, S., Bhatia, A., & Bhatt, R. (2019). Case Marking in Hindi as the Weaker Language. *Frontiers in Psychology*.
 20. Neidle, C. (2012). *The Case System in Russian*. MIT Press.
 21. Rishi, W. R. (2014). *India & Russia: Linguistic & Cultural Affinity*. Hindu Press International.
 22. Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
 23. Simha, R. K. (2014). *Sanskrit and Russian: Ancient Kinship*. Russia Beyond.
 24. Suman, C. (2012a, March 14). *Cognitive Load and Mindset: A Comprehensive Analysis*. 2(1), 1–7. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374117431_Cognitive_Load_and_Mindset_A_Comprehensive_Analysis
 25. Suman, C. (2012b, March 14). *Attitudes of Mindset Towards Foreign Language Learning: Exploring Self-Image, Inhibition, Risk-taking, Ego-Permeability and Ambiguity*. 2(1), 8–14. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374117236_Attitudes_of_Mindset_Towards_Foreign_Language_Learning_Exploring_Self-Image_Inhibition_Risk-taking_Ego-Permeability_and_Ambiguity



26. Suman, C. (2016a, April 1). *MNEMONIC FOR ADJECTIVE ENDINGS IN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE*. 1(2), 48–53. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344295955_MNEMONIC_FOR_ADJECTIVE_ENDINGS_IN_RUSSIAN_LANGUAGE
27. Suman, C. (2016b, April 1). *Translatability of Tenses from Russian to English and vice versa*. 1(2), 54–60. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344295978_Translatability_of_Tenses_from_Russian_to_English_and_vice_versa
28. Suman, C. (2018a, April 30). *Structure of Motivational Meaning in Verbal Communication*. 3(1), 1–7. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380817539_Structure_of_Motivational_Meaning_in_Verbal_Communication
29. Suman, C. (2018b, March 31). *Growth Mindset Language in the Classroom*. 3(1), 8–14. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380817296_Growth_Mindset_Language_in_the_Classroom
30. Suman, C. (2018c, March 30). *Cultivating Potential: Unveiling the Language of Growth Mindset*. 3(1), 15–21. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379001105_Cultivating_Potential_Unveiling_the_Language_of_Growth_Mindset
31. Suman, C. (2019a, May 22). *Cultural affinity between Russia and India*. 4(2), 27–33. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374224097_Cultural_affinity_between_Russia_and_India
32. Suman, C. (2019b, May 22). *Comparative Analysis of Cardinal Numerals of Russian and Sanskrit Languages*. 4(2), 1–7. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374117522_Comparative_Analysis_of_Cardinal_Numerals_of_Russian_and_Sanskrit_Languages
33. Suman, C. (2019c, November 22). *Analysis of Ordinal Numerals of Russian and Sanskrit Languages: A Comparative Study*. 4(2), 8–14. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374117515_Analysis_of_Ordinal_Numerals_of_Russian_and_Sanskrit_Languages_A_Comparative_Study
34. Suman, C. (2021a, October 27). *Linguistic Affinity between Russian and Sanskrit Language*. 6(2), 52–58. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374199693_Linguistic_Affinity_between_Russian_and_Sanskrit_Language
35. Suman, C. (2022a, October 27). *A Comparative Study of Syntactical Structure of Russian and Sanskrit Languages*. 7(1), 1–7. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374199693_Linguistic_Affinity_between_Russian_and_Sanskrit_Language



- [cation/374201882_A_Comparative_Study_of_Syntactical_Structure_of_Russian_and_Sanskrit_Languages](#)
36. Suman, C. (2023a, August 15). *The Effective Integration of Multimedia in Foreign Language Teaching*. 8(3), 68–74. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374119410_The_Effective_Integration_of_Multimedia_in_Foreign_Language_Teaching
37. Suman, C. (2023b, July 10). *Comparative Analysis of The Grammatical Number System in Russian and Sanskrit*. 8(3), 110–116. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372570230_Comparative_analysis_of_Grammatical_Number_System_in_Russian_and_Sanskrit
38. Suman, C. (2023c, August 15). *A Cross-Linguistic Study of Grammatical Number of Russian and Arabic*. 8(3), 117–123. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374119006_A_Cross-Linguistic_study_of_Grammatical_Number_of_Russian_and_Arabic
39. Suman, C. (2023d, July 10). *Teachers' Mindset Engaged in Teaching Foreign Language*. 8(2), 26–32. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372570495_Teachers'_Mindset_Engaged_in_Teaching_Foreign_Language
40. Suman, C. (2023e, July 10). *Students with Growth Mindset are Good at Foreign Language Learning*. 8(2), 33–39. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372570396_Students_with_Growth_Mindset_are_Good_at_Foreign_Language_Learning
41. Suman, C. (2023f, July 10). *Implication of Feedback and Praise on Mindset*. 8(2), 40–46. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372570379_Implication_of_Feedback_and_Praise_on_Mindset
42. Suman, C. (2023g, July 10). *Implications of Intrinsic Motivation and Mindset on Learning*. 8(2), 47–53. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372568040_Implications_of_Intrinsic_Motivation_and_Mindset_on_Learning
43. Suman, C. (2023h, July 10). *Impact of Mindset on Academic Achievement: A Comprehensive Review*. 8(2), 54–60. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372567428_Impact_of_Mindset_on_Academic_Achievement_A_Comprehensive_Review
44. Suman, C. (2023i, July 10). *Cultivating a Growth-Oriented Mindset in Educational Settings*. 8(2), 61–67. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372566995_Cultivating_a_Growth-Oriented_Mindset_in_Educational_Settings



Oriented Mindset in Educational Settings

45. Suman, C. (2024, June 30). *Eavesdroppers on Our Own Lives: How Implicit Learning Shapes Conscious Communication*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/393647750_Eavesdroppers_on_Our_Own_Lives_How_Implicit_Learning_Shapes_Conscious_Communication
46. Suman, C., & Kiran, J. (2023a, August 15). *Grammatical Case Systems in Russian and Hindi Languages*. 8(3), 89–95. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374119550_Grammatical_Case_Systems_in_Russian_and_Hindi_Languages
47. Suman, C., & Kiran, J. (2023b, August 15). *Grammatical Number of Russian and Hindi*. 8(3), 103–109. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374119389_Grammatical_Number_of_Russian_and_Hindi
48. Suman, C., Kiran, J., & Kumar, S. (2023a, August 15). *Angika Territory: Unraveling Geographical Extent and Linguistic Identity*. 8(3), 44–52. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374119574_Angika_Territory_Unraveling_Geographical_Extent_and_Linguistic_Identity
49. Suman, C., Kiran, J., & Kumar, S. (2023b, August 15). *Script of Angika: A Historical Writing System*. 8(3), 53–59. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374119569_Script_of_Angika_A_Historical_Writing_System
50. Suman, C., & Shaban, Q. (2023a, August 15). *A Comparison of Grammatical Gender of Russian and Arabic*. 8(3), 75–81. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374119394_A_Comparison_of_Grammatical_Gender_of_Russian_and_Arabic
51. Suman, C., & Shaban, Q. (2023b, August 15). *A Study of the Grammatical Case System of Russian and Arabic*. 8(3), 82–88. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374119463_A_Study_of_the_Grammatical_Case_System_of_Russian_and_Arabic
52. Suman, C., & Suman, S. (2023a, August 15). *Using Artificial Intelligence for Foreign Language Learning*. 8(3), 60–67. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374119563_Using_Artificial_Intelligence_for_Foreign_Language_Learning
53. Suman, C., & Suman, S. (2023b, August 15). *Grammatical Gender of Hindi and Russian Languages*. 8(3), 96–102. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374119563_Using_Artificial_Intelligence_for_Foreign_Language_Learning



[cation/374119407_Grammatical_G
ender_of_Hindi_and_Russian_Lan
guages](#)

54. Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive Load Theory. *Educational Psychologist*, 23(3), 257–285.
55. Syzdykova, Z., Akhmetova, L., Bektembayeva, S., Balgabayeva, M., & Zhetpisbayeva, A. (2023). AI-based tools for enhancing foreign language learning: A literature review. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 19(2), 221-236.
56. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.