

IFTE 2017
III International Forum on Teacher Education

**INTERACTIVE TECHNOLOGIES OF TRAINING MIGRANT
CHILDREN IN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE LESSONS**

L.A. Kamalova (a)*, V.G. Zakirova (b), E. G. Sabirova (c)
*Corresponding author

- (a) Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Kremlyovskaya str., 18, 420008, Kazan, Russia, leraax57@mail.ru, 89061120794
(b) Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Kremlyovskaya str., 18, 420008, Kazan, Russia, zakirovav-2011@mail.ru, 89274009090
(c) Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Kremlyovskaya Str., 18, 420008, Kazan Russia, sabirovaelli@mail.ru, 89274037731

Abstract

The relevance of this study is due to migrant children entering Russian schools. School practice shows that teaching the Russian language to migrant children has its own specifics related to the problems of bilingualism and speaking three languages. Psychologists and educators believe that the more the analyzers are included into the work, the more effective the assimilation of the studied material for younger students- migrants. In order to teach the Russian language effectively to migrant children, it is necessary to use all channels of perception of verbal and audiovisual information, i.e. to use interactive learning technologies. The purpose of this article is to study and develop a science-based system of interactive teaching of the Russian language to migrant children of classes 1-4 which could contribute to formation and further development of adequate communication skills in Russian. The leading method of the study of this problem is pedagogical experiment (ascertaining, forming and control stages of experiment), and the method of expert estimations, statistical processing of quantitative results of the study. The developed methodical system on interactive teaching of Russian to migrant children of classes 1-4 contributes to the development of "sense of language", the formation of linguistic, speech and communicative competence, which contributes to the rapid socialization of foreign children in the foreign culture and the foreign environment.

© 2017 Published by Future Academy www.FutureAcademy.org.UK

Key words: Russian language, Migrant, Primary school, Interactive technologies, Lesson.



1. Introduction

Educational technologies are examined by Russian and foreign scientists. Works of our scientists Babanskiy, Bepalko, Kashlev, Kamalova, Klarina, Makushina, Likhachev, Pidkasistyj and Khaidarov, Selevko, Smirnov, Surkova, Khutorskoy are dedicated to educational technologies.

Babanskiy classified the methods of teaching in modern secondary school considering the problem of optimizing the learning process (Babanskiy, 2003). Polat, Bukharkina, Moiseyeva, Petrov (Polat & Bukharkina & Moiseyeva & Petrov, 2004) suggested the use of new pedagogical and information technologies in the education system. Sirotenko (2003) explored the methodological aspect of interactive teaching and learning technologies. Eroshenko (2007) developed the theory and methods of group learning activities of students. Khazigaleeva, Vasenkova wrote about the principles and techniques of interactive technologies of teaching Russian language in secondary school (Khazigaleeva & Vasenkova, 2005). Kashlev gave a description of modern technologies of the teaching process, determined the leading characteristics of the technology: the combination of any components; logic, sequence of components; methods, techniques, actions, operations (as components); guaranteed results (Kashlev, 2000). Kamalova studied the problem of formation of professional competences of students of universities on the basis of using interactive learning technologies in lessons of Russian language and literature (Kamalova, 2017). Klarin explored the interactive learning as a tool for the development of a new practice (Klarin, 2000).

Likhachev revealed the concept of technology, defining it as a body of knowledge about ways (a set of methods, operations, actions) of implementation of production processes which guarantee a certain result (Likhachev, 2001). Khutorskoy offered to use a student-centered teaching method in modern school, aimed at the development of mental and creative abilities of students, with use of various teaching technologies (Khutorskoy, 2005). Pidkasistyj, Khaidarov examined the current state of school education, proposing game technology as alternative method to traditional training in teaching and development (1996). Smirnov considered the goals, objectives, principles, methods and forms of communication and education in the systems of general and additional education. The scientist analyzed the content and effectiveness of the primary school of innovative teaching technologies (Pidkasistyj & Khaidarov, 2000). Selevko (1998) explored the theory and development of modern educational technologies. Schurkova represented the educational technology as a scientific discipline and as an essential element of pedagogical professionalism. The scientist described the ways of mastering pedagogical technology, offered the methodical material for independent work of future teachers on the formation of professional skills (Schurkova, 2002; Biktagirova, Valeeva, 2014). Foreign scientists Mead (2009), Abykanova et al. (2016); Nacher, Garcia-Sanjuan and Jaen (2016), Kwok et al., (2016), Kitchenham (2014), Gudmundsdóttir et al. (2014), Weia & Leeb (2015) studied the effectiveness of using different interactive technologies for learning and development of children of preschool and younger school age, students of pedagogical specialties. The American scientist Mead put forward the concept of interactionism, the area in modern social psychology and pedagogy, which became the basis for interactive learning technologies (Mead, 2009). Researchers Abykanova, Nugumanova, Yelezhanova, Kabytkhamit, Sabirova on the basis of experimental data came to the conclusion about the effectiveness of

interactive learning technologies in the College teaching and learning environment. The integration of interactive learning systems with traditional methods contributes to the quality of student learning (Abykanova et al., 2016).

Nacher, Garcia-San Juan., Jaen explored the use of interactive technologies in the kindergarten for children of preschool age. Game technologies are, according to the authors, the main driving force in the development of educational activities in early childhood (Nacher & Garcia-Sanjuan & Jaen, 2016), Kwok, Ghrear, Lee Haddock, Coleman and Birch examined the impact of modern interactive technologies for preschool children, 4 to 8 years old. The scientists compared the effects of traditional teaching methods and interactive technologies, and came to the conclusion that the effectiveness of the use of modern technologies depends on a number of conditions, among which there are the age of the children and the professionalism of the teacher (Kwok et al., 2016). Kitchenham examined the effect of interactive technologies on the productivity of professional activity of students, teachers from rural elementary schools in British Columbia and Canada. Studies have shown that the use of interactive whiteboard SMART Boards in mathematics lessons had a positive impact on the knowledge and skills of students (Kitchenham, 2014), Gudmundsdóttir, Dalaaker, Egeberg, Hatlevik, Nisse raise the issue of computer literacy of teachers. According to these scientists, the use of interactive whiteboards and tablets provides great opportunities for teachers to teach children, but on the other hand, teachers face difficulties that are associated with ongoing professional development and implementation of technologies in practice (Gudmundsdóttir et al., 2014). Weia, & Leeb (2015) have studied the effect of interactive technologies on the development of creative abilities of preschool children. The authors have developed nine sets of interactive devices using interactive desktop, Kinect, and iPad. Scientists came to the conclusion that the great success enjoyed by children from kindergartens in rural than urban boys have greater originality in creative problem solving than girls, and pupils of private kindergartens think more flexibly and laterally than children from the public children institutions (Weia, & Leeb, 2015).

2. Problem Statement

Interactive teaching means teaching based on an active interaction with the subject of training (leading teacher, trainer, and supervisor). Interactive teaching is training with well-organized feedback of subjects and objects of learning, with two-way exchange of information between them. Interactive training technologies are the organization of learning process based on the interaction of all participants of the educational process of learning. The goal of the interactive technologies is creating a comfortable learning environment in which all students interact with each other actively. Organization of interactive teaching involves modeling of situations, role-play, a common solution to issues on the basis of the analysis of the circumstances and situation. The structure of the interactive lesson structure differs from conventional lesson which requires professionalism and experience of the teacher. Interactive teaching of Russian language to migrant children solves many educational problems: a quick entry into the learning environment of the class, active

communicative interaction, effective language adaptation, mastery of Russian language (oral and written) on basic and advanced level.

3. Research Questions

In the modern school the concept of student-centered learning is implemented, whereby each student is an individual, the active actor in the educational environment with its own characteristics, values, attitude to the world, subjective experience. In the context of personality-oriented approach, each student is presented for a teacher as a unique phenomenon. The teacher helps each student to realize his potentials, achieve his academic goals and develop personal meanings of learning. The purpose of student-centered education is creation of conditions for the full development of the following functions of students as the ability of a person to choose; the ability to reflect and assess their lives, to find the meaning of life, creativity; formation of the "I" image; the liability (in accordance with the phrase "I am responsible for everything"); self-identity (as it is more exempt from other factors).

4. Purpose of the Study

The use of interactive learning technologies in teaching Russian language to children migrants is very important. The leading principles of the organization of the interactive process in school are the organization of mental activity; organization of meaningful work; freedom of choice; and the organization of reflection. Interactive activity in teaching Russian language involves the organization and development of dialog communication, which leads to understanding, cooperation, combined solution of tasks which are common, but very important for each child- migrant.

5. Research Methods

For the teaching of Russian language to children migrants in elementary school, we used the following educational technologies: the game-travel "To the Country of the Russian language", the technology of "finish the phrase", technology "Aquarium", "Microphone", "Brainstorm", "Electronic presentation", "Interactive whiteboard".

We used the game-travel "To the Country of the Russian language" technology on the lessons of Russian language and extracurricular activities. The game-travel technology is a technology of collective creative activity according to Ivanov. Game journey is an entertaining educational quiz tournament consisting of a number of stages (stations), where players travel in a certain sequence. At each stage (station) referee instructor offers players a range of issues, tasks, in accordance with the theme of the game and evaluates their performances.

"Finish the sentence". Participants are offered to complete a number of phrases related to the content, the atmosphere, organization of interaction for identifying the effectiveness of the lesson (extracurricular Affairs, seminar etc.), and the disclosure formation of a certain sense of what is involved. There can be such phrases as "Among the stages of the game- I especially liked..."; "During the game I learned..."; "the Game made me think about...". The technology is implemented as follows: the teacher says an incomplete sentence, and specifies the grantee to complete it. With

the same phrase, the teacher can refer to 2-3 participants. It is desirable each participant to complete at least one phrase.

"Aquarium". Students are split into groups of 5-6 people. One of the groups takes place in the center of the class, gets an assignment to read and discuss it. Other students do not interfere in the discussion, and listen carefully and take notes. After the public execution of the task the group members takes their places, and students discuss the debate, the arguments of the students.

"Microphone". Students are encouraged to express their point of view on the posed question or problem. The class takes an item, imitating a microphone. The pupil who takes the "microphone," should express his thoughts and draw a conclusion clearly and concisely.

"Brainstorming". Students are split into groups of 5 people. Independently distribute the roles: commander, secretary, speaker, and adviser. Students are encouraged to find as many ways, ideas, proposals as possible each of which is fixed on the board or on a sheet of paper for problem-solving question. After creating such a "Bank of ideas" they analyze and discuss.

"Electronic presentation". The technology of electronic presentation allows us to see and hear the new material in a vivid, concise and succinct format. Channels of visualization, hearing, speaking are involved, which are very important characteristics of learning new information by migrants.

"Interactive whiteboard". The Board implements one of the most important principles of the primary school- visibility. It is possible to place different amounts of diverse information (diagrams, tables, texts, pictures, animations, sound effects). The use of interactive whiteboard is an important visualization tool for migrant children: they can hear and see new words, and also understand how these words are pronounced and what they mean.

6. Findings

In modern science, there are several definitions of educational technology. According to Likhachev, educational technology is a set of psycho-pedagogical attitudes that defines a special set and layout of forms, methods, teaching techniques and educational means; it is the organizational-methodical toolkit of pedagogical process (Likhachev, 2001).

Bespalko believes that the pedagogical technology is a meaningful technique of implementation of the educational process (Bespalko, 1989).

Klarin defines technology as "the totality of the system and order of functioning of all personal, instrumental and methodological means used to achieve goals" (Klarin, 2000).

Russian and foreign scientists define interactive learning technologies as dialog learning, in which the interaction of all its participants. The word "interactive" is derived from the word "interact" (eng.), where "inter" - mutual, "act" - to act. "Interactivity" means the ability to interact or to be in the dialogue mode. According to the American scientist Mead, interactive learning promotes communication skills, ability to work in a group to make informed decisions, and the most important, develop "the self", ability to present themselves as objects of his own thought (Mead, 2009).

By interactive technology, we mean the system of methods of interaction organization of the teacher and students in the form of an interactive training, which guarantees pedagogically effective informative communication, which creates conditions for the experience of students in situations of success in educational activities, enrichment of their motivational, intellectual, emotional, and other spheres (Kamalova, 2017).

Development and introduction of an educational process monitoring system

Evaluation of the effectiveness of interactive learning of Russian language by migrant children at Russian lessons in elementary school was performed using the following criteria:

- the level of development of all kinds of speech activity of students (listening, speaking, reading, writing);
- the level of development of Russian oral and written speech of younger school students on a communicative basis;
 - enrichment of vocabulary and improvement of speech culture of students-migrants.
 - practical and creative activity of children-migrants in the Russian lessons.

3 levels of mastering of knowledge and forming of linguistic competence are developed: high – from 75 to 100%; medium – 50 to 75%; low – 25 to 50%.

Solution of the given task

The study was conducted on the basis of Grammar school "Gymnasium №5" with ethnic-cultural Tatar component of the Republic of Tatarstan. Fifty-two students -migrant of primary school were involved in the experiment.

Ascertaining phase of the experiment (September 2016) showed the following levels of students -migrants' knowledge in the Russian language:

The high level of Russian language proficiency: 47%

The average level of Russian language proficiency: 32%

The low level of Russian language proficiency: 21%

At the stage of the formative experiment (September 2016 – February 2017) we held Russian lessons using interactive learning technologies with foreign students of classes 1-4.

The results of experimental work in the control phase in the Russian language are following:

The high level of Russian language proficiency: 66% of students

The average level of Russian language proficiency: 21% of students

The low level of Russian language proficiency: 13% of students

Thus, in the experimental teaching of Russian language to migrant students with the use of interactive technologies, there were changes in the ratio of students to levels of proficiency in Russian.

The number of students, who speak Russian at a high level increased by 45%.

The number of students, who speak Russian at an average level decreased by 11%.

The number of students who speak Russian at a low level decreased by 34%.

Reserves and recommendations

At each Russian lesson, we used paired and group forms of work with the students- migrants. This differentiated work with children- migrants in pairs, in small creative groups helped to correct

speech errors of students by generating a dialogue on a given situation. The dialogue is built from simple sentences, often incomplete, supplemented by facial expressions, gestures, intonation; a major role is played by the situation of communication.

Implementation of effective educational technologies complex introduction

The joint activities of migrant students at Russian lessons by using interactive technologies create the conditions for successful learning, and effective communication. During the interactive lesson, each child migrant makes its particular individual contribution, sharing of knowledge, ideas, and ways of working. The lesson passes in an atmosphere of goodwill and mutual support. This allows students not only to acquire new knowledge, but also develops the cognitive activity itself, translates it into higher forms of cooperation and collaboration.

Solution of the given task

There were formed skills and abilities in such kinds of speech activities as speaking, listening, writing, reading by students-migrants of classes 1-4 in primary school which they can use in the most common standard situations of social, socio-cultural and educational spheres of communication. Students-migrants possess the required minimum of semantic-syntactic constructions of the Russian language, linguistic, speech and actually communicative material.

Reservations and recommendations

For teaching migrant students Russian language, it is necessary to use all channels of perception of verbal and audiovisual information, i.e. to use interactive learning technologies.

7. Conclusion

Primary school teacher, who works with children migrants, should familiarize students with all sides of Russian speech: the phonetic (sound); the lexical (dictionary); the grammar. Russian lessons with pupils of the migrant primary schools should undertake the following tasks: contribute to a more lasting and conscious understanding of the studied lesson material; to promote the language development of children; to develop skills of linguistic analysis; to raise the level of language development of students; to foster a culture of communication; to raise interest towards Russian language.

In the process of teaching the Russian language to migrant students of classes 1-4, we used such interactive technologies as game-journey "In the Country of the Russian language", "Finish the phrase", "Aquarium", "Microphone", "Brainstorm", "Electronic presentation", "Interactive whiteboard".

The developed methodical system of interactive Russian teaching to migrant children of classes 1-4 contributes to the development of "sense of the language", the formation of linguistic, speech and communicative competences, which contributes to the rapid socialization of foreign children in a foreign culture and a foreign environment.

Acknowledgments

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- Abykanova, B., Nugumanova, S., Yelezhanova, S., Kabylkhamit, Z., & Sabirova, Z. (2016). The Use of Interactive Learning Technology in Institutions of Higher Learning. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(18), 12528-12539.
- Babanskij, U. K. (2003). Methods of teaching in modern secondary school. Moscow: Education.
- Bespalko, V. P. (1989). Components of educational technology. Publishing House Pedagogika.
- Biktagirova, G., & Valeeva, R. (2014). Development of the teachers' pedagogical reflection. *Life Science Journal*, 11(9), 60-63.
- Guðmundsdóttir, G. B., Dalaaker, D., Egeberg, G., Hatlevik, O. E., & Tømte, K. H. (2014). Interactive Technology. Traditional Practice?. *Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy*, 9(01), 23-43.
- Kamalova, L. A. (2017). Interactive technologies in the training of future specialists of primary education in Kazan federal university. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 7(3), 531-537.
- Kashlev, S. S. (2000). Modern technologies of the teaching process: a Guide for teachers. Minsk University.
- Khazigaleeva, G. A. & Vasenkova, M. V. (2005). About principles and methods of interactive technologies of teaching Russian language in secondary school. Education.
- Khutorskoy, A.V.(2005). Methodology of student-centered learning. How to train all differently? Moscow, Publishing House "VLADOS-PRESS".
- Kitchenham, A. (2017). Indigenous Learning Preferences and Interactive Technologies. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 46(1), 71-79.
- Klarin, M. V. (2000). Interactive learning is a tool for the development of a new practice. *Pedagogika*, 7, 89-92.
- Kwok, K., Ghrear, S., Li, V., Haddock, T., Coleman, P., & Birch, S. A. (2016). Children can learn new facts equally well from interactive media versus face to face instruction. *Frontiers in psychology*, 7.
- Likhachev, B. T. (2001). Pedagogies: a Course of lectures. Textbook for students of pedagogical institutions. Moscow. Yurayt.
- Mead, J. G. (2009). Favorites. Moscow.
- Nacher, V., Garcia-Sanjuan, F., & Jaen, J. (2016). Interactive technologies for preschool game-based instruction: Experiences and future challenges. *Entertainment Computing*, 17, 19-29.
- Pidkasistyj, P.I., Khaidarov, J.S. (1996). Game technology in training and development. Moscow, Pedagogical University.
- Polat, E. S., Bukharkina, M. Y., Moiseeva, M. V., Petrov, A. E. (2004). New pedagogical and information technologies in the education system. Moscow. Academy.
- Schurkova, N. E. (2002). Pedagogical technology. Moscow. Pedagogical society of Russia.
- Selevko, G. K. (1998). Modern educational technologies. Moscow. Publishing House "People's education", 289.
- Smirnov, S. A. (2000). Pedagogy. Educational theory, technology systems. Moscow. Academy.
- Weia, W. J., & Leeb, L. C. (2015). Interactive technology for creativity in early childhood education. *Citeseer*, 75 (3), 121-126.