18th PCSF 2018
Professional Culture of the Specialist of the Future

INTERACTIVE TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGE COMMUNICATION IN MULTI-LEVEL CLASSROOM IN NON-LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY

Natalia Komina (a), Anastasiya Tikhomirova (b), Andrey Bogatyrev (c)*, Olga Bogatyreva (d)
*Corresponding author

(a) Tver state university, Studencheskii per., 12, Tver, Russia, natkomina@yandex.ru
(b) Tver state university, Studencheskii per., 12, Tver, Russia, innova86@mail.ru
(c) Moscow Pedagogical State University, Pirogovskaua st., 1, Moscow, Russia, bogatyria1967@gmail.com
(d) Tver state university, Studencheskii per., 12, Tver, Russia, bogatyrevaolga4@gmail.com

Abstract

Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) in the context of educational opportunities for everyone faces a number of big challenges. In this connection the professional culture of English teacher in non-linguistic university demands appraisal from the perspective of modernity and efficacy of pedagogical approaches, solutions and methodological techniques as well as from the standpoint of educational outcomes in multi-level and extra-large academic groups. Sweeping changes in educational conditions and directives worldwide demand reassessment of attitudes, sets, skills, instructional tools and techniques of the teacher conceived as professional communicator. The communicative paradigm in education encourages elaborating special teaching technologies, designed for solving the task of training foreign language and intercultural communicative skills for professional and everyday communicative purposes. Interactive Teaching is a trendsetter in modern Second Language Acquisition practices. The article elicits vital challenges for modern university teacher; refines the concept of Interactive Teaching; specifies scaling approach to educational Interactivity in TEFL; describes Interactive Learning conditions for the multi-level students' classroom and teacher's methodological techniques; represents a case study of a pedagogical experiment; analyses the benefits and shortcomings of interactive educational process organization; elicits the benefits of multi-patterned interactive educational process organization for teachers, for students and for the learning outcomes.

Keywords: Interactive Approach to TEFL, Professional culture of non-linguistic university EFL teacher.

1. Introduction

Teaching Foreign Language communication and culture detached from everyday practice in target natural linguistic and cultural environment is a formidable task for pedagogy, modern innovative technology and applied linguistics. Nowadays teaching foreign languages is becoming more and more labour-consuming in overcrowded classroom of multilevel and multicultural students, gadget addictive students, students with special educational needs, true and *false beginners*, often having prejudiced predispositions and a lot of negative experience in learning languages. Such challenges affect impetuously the professional demands and influence the professional culture of modern English. They stipulate exploration, testing and evaluation of new approaches, sets, methods, teaching tools, skills and solutions for Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) at a non-linguistic university. Reassessment of Teacher's educational strategies, methods and teaching tools in the classroom is part of general rethinking the priority tasks, routes and trends of modern education.

1.1. Professional culture and the concept of Teacher are undergoing changes

The core role of the Teacher as the one who is directly responsible for educational outcomes of the learners remains the same, but the conceived image of Teacher undergoes re-interpretation in time lapse. Nowadays the teacher is often conceived as a manager and a dispatcher of knowledges and competences, an organizer of learners' educational activity, not just an excellent performer only. Within frame of Interactive Educational Approach, regarded as a trendsetter in modern educative practices, the teacher is no more a bank of knowledges, but rather an interlocutor and a partner in decoding 'hidden codes' of universe. This may be conceived a step forward, especially concerning pupils' team-building and networking skills. And it may be conceived a kind of long-awaited return to noble Ancient Greek Academia tradition of "*maieutike*", turning classroom routine into a sort of intellectual cafe. Now new knowledge is not just a substance served to each pupil's head as a sort of ready-made meal, but a discovery made by way of research, task-solving and negotiating for new meaningful experience.

Interactive Teaching is an attempt to project and construct the image of modern teacher, trying to answer the challenges of time. In a methodological sense it is a quest for better teaching techniques and learning outcomes (Hanghøj, Lieberoth, & Misfeldt, 2018; Karaaslan, Kilic, & Guven-Yalcin, 2018; Tikhomirova, Bogatyrev, & Bogatyreva, 2018). From a linguistic standpoint Interactive Teaching modern foreign languages is perceived as another attempt to construe "Language in Action". It corresponds to the renowned methodological triangle, used by Schmitt, giving definition to Applied Linguistics as using (a) knowledge about language, (b) know-how of language learning and (c) know-how of 'purposeful application of language tools in the real life (Schmitt, 2010, p. 1). The interconnection between three is so tight, that rethinking any facet is likely to lead to amendments in the conception of the other two. Therefore, the decomposition of priority of traditional linguistics model in educational context opens new opportunities for methodological research within field of TEFL for communication purposes.

2. Problem Statement

The most general and embracing problem of the research can be stated as the one of re-imaging the Teacher of English as professional communicator in modern educational environment. This problem can

be re-stated as issue of developing Innovative Teaching Skills as helpful resources of overcoming the challenges of profession. And the teacher of English these days faces numerous serious old and new challenges. There are various and deep social, methodological, psychological and economic roots of such a knot of educational issues as low output level of communicative competency and general low performance of EFL learners at non-linguistic departments, then lack of motivation for educational activity, especially acutely felt in a multi-level and overcrowded academic group of learners. Can innovative Interactive Teaching approach help the teacher in providing motivating and efficient tools for EFL communicative competence formation? The particular tasks of the present research are refining the notion of Interactive Teaching and assessing innovative educative potential of this approach under condition of extra-large multi-level EFL classroom in a non-linguistic university.

2.1. Key Aims and Objectives of the Study

The main task of the case study is to verify and assess the efficacy of Interactive Teaching approach to TEFL in a multi-level classroom. Solving the main task of the study demanded completing a number of particular tasks, such as (a) to refine the concept of Interactive Teaching; (b) to specify the scaling approach to educational Interactivity and Interactive Teaching and Learning of EFL; (c) to provide a brief description of Interactive Learning conditions for the extra-large multi-level students classroom; (d) to give a brief overview of special teaching techniques; (e) to carry out a pedagogical experiment of introducing Interactive Teaching approach in an overcrowded multi-level FL classroom; (f) to elicit and assess the benefits (as well as possible shortcomings) of multi-patterned interactive educational process organization for teachers, for students and for the learning outcomes.

3. Research Questions

3.1. What is Interactive Teaching and Learning?

The essence of interactive education is not just teaching in interaction, that takes place in educational communication in any case. Rather, it is learning by means of intensive meaningful interacting. Interactive Teaching is providing conditions for learners' self-efficacy in finding feedback and support by designing special strategies and techniques of learning, networking and negotiation. Interactive Teaching is using challenging tasks to stipulate the levels of learners' preparedness grow. Interactive Learning is a search for a new balance between past experience and the new challenging reality, based on finding and exchanging information, reflecting and detecting the clues. Interactive Learning implies discovering the hidden codes of universe based on communication, self-management, action, feedback, research, analysis, reflection and dialog. It is not like taking tips from the teacher. It is like discovering a sort of 'second sight', based on rethinking and re-modelling of educational task solution, implying changes of procedures and methods of information processing, data analysis and assessment, decision making. Generally speaking, Interactive Teaching is not designed to reproduce knowledges in students' mind, but rather to make learners generate new knowledges, skills and competences in communication, action, interaction, information exchange, discussion and reflection.

Not everything, that makes teaching interactive is digital (e.g. TPR). Not all 'going digital' in education is Interactive Education. One can watch educational video, but not follow the interactive regime

of education. So there is an issue of methodological support for interactive learning process. Teacher needs an '*interactive system in teaching*' to make things go the right way (Padilla Padilla 2018). Interactive Teaching is there, when there is a goal-seeking educational system of task-based learning interactions. Interactive Teaching brings students engagement, defending personal position in role play involvement, intensive exchange of information and values, rethinking dialectics of knowledge tools, reassessment of values and attitudes. Interactive Teaching is flexible and multimodal. It is conceived in contrast to the rigidity of the old school monologue, admitting of losing touch with modern learners.

3.2. Is Interactive Teaching scalable?

Interactivity is multi-faceted and multi-level. As Moore (1989, p. 1-7) justly points out, interactivity is to be measured in a number of aspects and relations. These literally include "learner-content interaction, learner-instructor interaction, and learner-learner interaction" (ibidem). As Dr Moore remarks, some teaching programs are "solely content-interactive", because those are designed for just one-way-communication. The second facet of educational interactivity is disclosed, when instructor cares for his students and "provides counsel, support, and encouragement" to each of them. The third facet comes on stage, when there is a group work, peer-group interaction and peer evaluation in educational activity. This scheme of planning interactive educative practices provides most significant implications for modern educator as organizer of educational activity.

Now if we look back at Schmitt's (2010, p. 1) definition of language and applied linguistics and pay attention to the nature of three key elements, such as language (A), then language in its purposeful use (C) and "how it is learned" (B), we'll see that interactivity is present in any of them 'in potentia' or 'in actu' due to indisputable supremacy of communicative function of human Language. There are asymmetric relations between two languages A1 and A2 (e.g. foreign and native). And there are asymmetric relations between two communicative cultures C1 and C2 (e.g. foreign and native). So, it is hard to comprehend Foreign Communicative Culture without interacting by its rules.

Mandrik (2013, p. 231) discerns four levels of interactivity: (1) so-called passive; (2) action-based: (3) activity based; (4) exploring. In this connection we can mark out *the fifth level of Interactive Teaching*, dedicated to eliciting personal predispositions, resources, experience and motivation of each learner in solving the educational task. It is a *dialog-based level* of interactivity, most needed in a multi-level and multi-cultural group of learners. The individual experience peculiarities are not always transparent. Therefore, the intrinsic triggers and blocks in educational task-solving activity are to be detected so that the strengths could be exploited with due efficacy and the weak points balanced by due support from the teacher and peers. The dialogical clue in exchange of interpretative approaches and presuppositions gives teacher more opportunities to provide flexible direction for the student's learning activity coordination and implementation of learner's own task completion strategies.

Distinguishing Interactivity Levels in TEFL can also be based on typology of communicative competence aspects and levels. Learning Foreign Language and Communicative Culture is a multi-step dialectical process. This trait was explicated in the four-step model of Foreign Language wording acquisition, achieved gradually by such stages as *semantization*, *validation*, *valorization*, *revalorization* (Tikhomirova et al. 2016). The first step is often associated with guessing a meaning or finding a match for a an expression in a dictionary. Validation is based on effective of use the word in speech context.

Valorization of FL words, phrases and utterances is based on learning and understanding the indirect meanings of expressions. Revalorization of expressive means of language occurs on the basis of strategic speech organization (Tikhomirova et al. 2016). These linguistic steps of Foreign Language Communicative Competence acquisition form the task-based hierarchy of interactive teaching in our case. The top EFL Interactive Teaching task in our case may be viewed as reaching by learners the level of revalorization of English teaching materials.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is essentially an "experience-based view of second language teaching" (Mart, 2018, p. 166). And this is particularly true about Interactive TEFL educational target, conceived as formation of second language linguistic personality as subject of communicative interaction. Scaling stages of language acquisition is a clue for the pedagogue to teach in a student-centred mode, to make student comfortable at the classes, provide due feedback (e.g. Goodwin, 2018, 92), set attainable goals for developing learner's second language personality, motivate and give perceived support for the learner to gain self-efficacy in study of language.

3.3. Is Interactive Learning scalable?

Interactive Learning is a multi-level and multi-faceted process. Let's take into account the three relationships in interactive educational process – (1) between a teacher and a student; (2) a relation of the student to success or failure, good marks and bonuses; (3) a relation of the student to new experience; (4) relation of the student to himself as a learner and the subject of educational experience. All these relationships imply assessment. And the last one reflects *integrative educational position* of the student.

Comprehension can be measured by way of leaner's assembling a model of what one has understood (Brudniy, 1975, p. 115). This thesis may prove useful in assessing student's level of involvement in interactive educational process. For example, one can do an interactive exercise and memorize the right solution of the task. One can also try to uncover the principle of the right solution and formulate a rule. But one can go further and try to find out why this exercise works and what exactly and how much in fact it explains. Even online Interactive modules can be copied by learners. Few students do that. Even less of the latter keep them as a part of personal portfolio. Few and far between try to modify them to make them more helpful for educational use. This also makes a scalable difference.

Now let us take another example. One of the most pleasurable moments in Interactive learning is remuneration of student's educational effort. And it is pleasant to be the first among fellow-students to complete the task. But does the process of learning stop at that point? Or are there any more exacting questions to ask? A *true interactive learner* applies meta-cognitive and meta-communicative reflection both to negative and positive experience of solving interactive tasks. And it is true because Interactive Teaching has a special educational target – to teach students not only critical, but also creative thinking.

3.4. Does Interactive Learning have any inherent shortcomings?

All complimentary remarks about interactive teaching solutions reflect the upside of it. But there is a downside of it though. Based on practical precedent as key source of new educational experience, Interactive Learning inherits the general shortcoming of inductive method of knowledge acquisition. It may be noticeable, when a powerful deductive scheme of knowledge system is required to get off the ground.

So Interactive Teaching should be well balanced with other approaches in educational practice. And the multi-levels should enjoy the opportunity of user friendly access to supportive materials.

4. Purpose of the Study

The particular purpose of the case study was to verify and evaluate the efficacy of Interactive Teaching approach to TEFL in a real life overcrowded multi-level classroom (of over twenty students) under condition of post-graduate education in a non-linguistic university. The optimistic hypothesis suggests that learning language and communication by interactive techniques leads to better personal knowledge of FL interaction, if the pre-planned learning achievements in interaction (I) are trained interactively in multi-patterned interactive modules; (II) the interactivity is used fully to the benefit of goal-centred task-based learning process; (III) a multitude of target language conversation episodes is role played, decomposed and re-interpreted by learners, uncovering the hidden rules and mechanisms of FL.

5. Research Methods

The Research was based on empirical investigation of educational outcomes of introducing the Interactive Teaching approach as based on a holistic goal-centred system of Teacher's sets, attitudes, teaching tools and techniques, aimed at teaching English communicative Interaction in conversational context. The assessment of learning outcomes in two compared groups of students was based on passing an interactive communicative quest, checking not only grammar and words, but first of all the strategic approach to pragmatic conversation building and appropriateness of English expressive means choice.

The theoretical objective of *the case study* was to evaluate efficacy of Interactive Teaching for the educational outcomes, concerned with forming EFL Communicative Competence under condition of extra-large multi-level group of postgraduate students in non-linguistic university. So the teaching endeavours were concerned with providing focus on preparedness for English communicative interaction in everyday conversation, based on the rules of English etiquette and English conversation grammar.

The main interactive accent in learning methodology was laid on *multi-patterned* investigation and interpretation of learning material and creative synthesis of English conversation whenever possible. The interactive educational exercises and games were based on assembling puzzles of English utterances and their meanings in conversation, eliciting the hidden rules of etiquette and conversation building, admitting competition between micro-groups of learners (Interacting in English, 2017). The key interactive teaching materials were sets of English phrases and utterances, presented in the form of discrete paper cards and interactive e-learning modules (exercises and tests) in Moodle and LearninApps formats.

5.1. The basic learning conditions

The pedagogical experiment was conducted in October 2017 with two groups of first year postgraduate students of Tver state university Pedagogical department (Russian Federation), studying the first module in Business English. It took four classroom lessons within a month time span. Learners passed the placement test first and then enjoyed the introductory module, aimed at mastering general English conversation skills, English conversation etiquette and necessary Classroom English phrases. So the phatic and conversational components of the English syllabus content are quite apparent. The experimental group had twenty four multi-level students (of age from 22 to 50), including four students with pre-intermediate

level of English (one of them a foreign student from Jordan), twelve false beginners and six true beginners in English. The control group had twelve multi-level students (three pre-intermediate pupils and nine false beginners), studying the same program with the same teacher.

The module syllabus included a report of the teacher on the current rules of politeness in common English mundane conversation, watching and commenting the video on the same topic, followed by reading and translating two English dialogs, as well as listening to the audio recordings of the English dialogs (with English scripts). The instructor tried hard in both groups to 'level the multi-levels' and to pay attention to each individual student. Both groups had the same syllabus and obligatory educational content. The difference was in application of Interactive Teaching style and introducing various 'extra' interactive trainings, games and exercises, briefly described in section 5.5. The home task for the experimental group also included extra digital training based on interactive modules (What British People Say vs What They Mean, 2018) and other reliable and authentic supportive materials (Thompson, 2018). In fact the students found more fruitful and exciting doing interactive modules is the classroom than doing it at home. This fact fully corresponds to the observations and reasoning of Turkish researchers (Karaaslan, Kilic, & Guven-Yalcin, 2018, p. 65-66). This is why extra bonuses were introduced to stipulate learners for performing at home extra interactive exercises and tests in Moodle.

5.2. The multi-pattern Interactive Teaching methodology and special levelling techniques

The Interactive Teaching approach was introduced with regard to providing some necessary basic conditions. First of all, multi-levels need to face the learning task that may level the differences of their learning background. Communicative studying English did not play a great part in learners' experience. So the choice of the subject of the first module ('Meeting People') paid well for that purpose. Secondly, the differences of learners' experience were used productively in the classroom. For example, the teacher used a chorus recitation of English dialogs (supplied in the course book), applying special distribution of English sentences between students with different levels of speaking English preparedness. The 'movers' had to do their best to sound distinctly English. And the beginners had to repeat and constantly expand step by step the range of English phrases they say. And of course, providing special conditions for Interactive Teaching presupposed establishing "friendly and mutually supportive relationship" (Eltanskaya, Popova, Linkova, Arzhanovskaya, & Kulichenko, 2017, p.100) between instructor and learners, as well as learners and learners, contributed to team spirit and involvement of all students.

The Interactive Teaching exploited all 5 key features of communicative task-based teaching, described earlier by Nunan (Nunan 1991, p.279), such as (1) interacting in target language, the authenticity of (2) teaching resources and (3) tasks, (4) developing 'learning to learn' techniques and (5) powerful accent on the positive role of learner's personal experience. The attainability of foreign language and culture real life context was provided in modelling English conversation (a) by authentic conversation samples and recitation, (b) by explication of politeness rules, (c) by exploiting a bank of useful English expressions and helpful information found in the dictionary, (d) by instructional design exercises (provided in the workbook and on interactive modules site), (e) by multi-focused semantic and pragmatic interpretation of case studies, and then (f) by communicative quests, based on standard communication scenarios and intrinsic rules and standards of English conversation grammar. Both the control and the experimental group practised application of (a-d) learning methods in the classroom. The (e-f) techniques were used widely only in

experimental group. The dominion of traditional English 'inexplicable' patterns and use of various delicate shades of meaning was part of the learners' interactive learning by doing and monitoring the success or failure results. The uncompromising interactive digital tools played the key role in providing *methodological authenticity* of learning materials and challenged various learning strategies of validation, valorisation and revalorization of acquired English conversation collocations. The multi-levels cooperated in *micro-groups* (of 3 to 6 learners) for brainstorming.

Interactive EFL Teaching is designed to "provide a full communication between the students and the formation of skills of solving communicative tasks" (Fahrutdinova, Yarmakeev, & Fakhrutdinov, 2014, p. 36). Classroom lessons in multi-level groups send additional challenge to Interactive Teaching. So, the pupils had to learn EFL in the context of target communicative culture by networking in a team of learners with significant knowledge and personal background divergence gaps.

The inter-learner interaction was based on peer consulting and peer evaluating. The elderly learners were true and false beginners in English, but they had a rich experience of interpersonal business communication (in native language) in real life. As a rule, they were organizers and moderators of brainstorming. They asked a lot of questions and consulted the teacher willingly. And they played well the roles of peer reviewers of communicative events. Teaching multilevel group of students faced the problem of involving all the students in educational communication. The more advanced students were ranked as experts and coaches of four teams of students. The true beginners enjoyed the priority of asking for help and answering teacher's questions. The false beginners were the next to answer teacher's questions. The pre-intermediates enjoyed higher authority. If some of them failed to give a good explanation of the English discourse phenomena the voice was passed to another team of students in the classroom. This way the teacher *delegated authority* to the students when possible. This granted not just more ample engagement of students in exchange of opinions, but also stipulating exchange of roles between students. It was absolutely necessary for solving such professional tasks, as to "make the student "visible" in the educational context", to model and tune the educational process as "focused on the achievement"; to insure contact and productive interaction regimes with participants of the educational process; to create or transform due educational environment. And these key tasks do comply fully with the current criteria of teacher's professional compliance (Khakimowa & Kaguy, 2018, p. 183).

The teacher asked a lot of provocative questions like 'Do you think it is right to say 'How are your family?' (Longman New Cutting Edge Intermediate); 'Is it not better to ask "How is your family?"' or 'What do you think is the difference between "Hello", "How are you?", "Hi" and "How do you do?"'; "What English signals (deictic linguistic markers) of interpersonal distance can you elicit in the dialog?"; '"Should you answer "Hello" or "Good bye", when you hear "Good day"?'. This 'maieutike' was supported with another one little interactive teaching technique. It was used, when students had to put all their various explanations on the blackboard (or whiteboard). So one of them could accept or argue, or even cross out the discredited explanation, but not wipe it out completely. This way the brainstorming procedures were fixed and (sometimes) the dialectics of the investigation was well traced and disclosed.

The key interactive technique was used by using English phrase cards as structural elements for dialog construction. The students had to assemble a set and sequence of cards to make a meaningful conversation, based on roles distribution between students and on English conversation etiquette rules. So,

students had to make notes not only concerning vocabulary meaning in the dictionary, but also try to detect '*pragmemes*' – the often hidden from outsider's perception indirect functional meanings of English words and phrases in conversational context. The search for truth stimulated more observation and reflection to samples of English everyday discourse (What British People Say vs What They Mean, 2018). Discussion and reflection made good companions for students' interactions.

The multilevel learners were given the same content, but with a slightly different span of learning mission and responsibility. The beginners were to master the material by doing, watching, listening, repeating, learning by heart, reproducing the patterns. The more advanced students were to assist the teacher in explaining the phenomena of English conversation. The 'movers' were allowed not to learn by heart any readymade dialogs, but to combine a new meaningful one, based on the given set of elements.

The beginners also benefited from using so called Interactive modules, deployed on the teacher's support page, based on LearningAps and Moodle facilities (Interacting in English, 2017). These digital interactive tools helped to fix student's actions and gains. These tools fit the definition of 'clever software' as providing 'Boolean feedback – correct/wrong interactivity' (Pim, 2013, p. 30). This was the case with translating, finding a missing link, putting the phrases in the right order and choosing the best saying appropriate to the pragmatic situation and context. The teacher used LearningApps.org tool to provide interactive digital support for activities previously performed by learners in the classroom. The individual results were also scrupulously checked in detail by using Moodle testing tools.

5.3. The control

The introductory module was completed with a revision lesson. The latter included (A) a rather traditional oral examination (reciting a dialogue and answering questions), (B) a written grammar test and (C) a short 10-12 minutes English interaction communicative quest (Tikhomirova et al., 2018). The holistic task of the quest was to reconstruct a dynamic multi-step conversation between three or more people. (And it proved easier for learners to do rationally, when based on experience of interpreting, classifying, re-interpreting, arranging and rearranging the multi-patterned clusters and sequences of English phrases and speech moves in different pragmatic situations and meaningful contexts.). The students had to make a meaningful choice of appropriate English sayings to unlock the next speech move, keep the conversation going and finally reach the end of conversation in case they make no gross error or three minor mistakes in any one episode out of nine in interactive online module (Shaking hands, 2017).

6. Findings

Both experimental and control groups of students had to pass the final test at the end of the module. Although the control group had some initial advantage (because there were fewer students and the same amount of time for class activities with the same teacher), the students, who were trained in a traditional style, showed not so competitive results in digital revision quest as their fellow-students from the experimental group. Here are the experimental group results. It took the leading micro-group (of six) 7.38 minutes to pass a nine communicative moves quest (Shaking hands, 2017) without making a mistake. There was some minor divergence between micro-groups of six students in revision communicative quest walk-through results (from 10% to 30% of extra time needed to be compared with the leading micro-group). The control group was also split into two micro-groups of six students to do the same task. It took one of the

contestant micro-group 23 minutes to solve the task completely (after they got a little tip from the teacher). It made more than 200% from average time used to walk through the quest in experimental group. The other micro-group made three errors and failed to further unlock the communicative quest despite the fact the students had very good results in recitation, dictation and grammar tasks. This fact may be interpreted as another evidence of moderate productivity of a passive learning method and higher productivity of learning based on interactive task-solving activities.

The experimental group students were taught English conversation grammar and etiquette for the sake of communicative interaction by role playing and interacting and by assessing, interpreting and reinterpreting their own English interaction and its linguistic and strategic resources. Here we cannot but agree with the statement of researchers Hanghøj, Lieberoth, & Misfeldt (2018, pp. 775, 780), who claim that the positive impact of role-playing game-based classrooms (which is also true about Interactive Learning in our case) "is not due to their fun element, but rather how they enable reframing of social participation", concerned creating new social spaces for students. To say nothing about the intercultural and inter-lingual reframing of Russian students in English conversation construction, the impact of the interactive classes was observed in reframing the into a team of explorers, role players, experts and social interaction designers. The results of the case study show clearly the advantages of interactive teaching Foreign Language and Communication over so called traditional one, associated with "one-way" teaching a host of silent listeners, prevailing passive forms of learning, and scarcity of student's initiative, variety and criticism.

The results of the study confirmed the hypothesis. The students of experimental group were more successful and efficient at doing a revision test because they had more motivating opportunities to spot more correlations, connections, interconnections and oppositions between various English spoken discourse elements. Interactive Teaching was not confined to repetition drilling exercise, but almost always involved a research activity, targeted at uncovering and interpreting the hidden rules of English Conversation Grammar. Almost everything the students did was subject to analysing, finding clues, assembling and reassembling the holistic model of English conversation. So, they could adopt a more thoughtful approach to the analysis and the choice of wording and phrases, trying to pick appropriate speech elements for solving the communicative task effectively.

7.   Conclusion

Introducing multifarious interactive learning games and activities into TEFL educational practice *provokes intensive multi-pattern revising* of target language resources and skills, stipulates meaningful choice of words, phrases and speech acts in culturally appropriate foreign language conversation. This intensive *valorisation*, based on Interactive Learning and multi-patterned exploration of language expressive means may serve a reliable key to success in solving real life communicative tasks.

Interactive Teaching implies stipulating fruitful strategic thinking and *collaboration* in the *multilevel group*. Interactive Learning involves not only action and response, trying, failing and trying again, but also team-building, networking, negotiating for meaning, research, collecting, exchanging and processing of information, critical thinking and passion. Interactive Learning helps the student to receive and accept new experience as personal and meaningful part of life and activity. The teacher benefits from Interactive

Teaching engagement and higher motivation in the classroom. The learning outcomes benefit from Interactive Teaching *integrity of personalized knowledge*. The students benefit from Interactive Teaching *applicable competences* for real life and *perceived self-efficacy* in the classroom.

In a somewhat oblique way the results of the experiment also suggest productive application of transmedia approach in interactive teaching applied linguistic task solving. This suggestion may need to be tested in a separate research. Another suggestion is that Interactive Teaching is productive if it is based on a resourceful learner's support and used in combination with instances of deductive explanation of language and communication phenomena. Therefore, Interactive Teaching approach in education also contributes to developing flexible and multimodal teaching skills of the educator.

References

Brudniy, A.A. (1975). Ponimanie kak filosofsko-psikhologicheskaya problema. [Understanding as a philosophical and psychological problem]. *Voprosy filosofii. [Issues of Philosophy] 10*, 109–117. [in Rus.].

Eltanskaya, E., Popova, O., Linkova, Y., Arzhanovskaya, A., & Kulichenko Y. (2017). Types of Interactive Methods in Teaching English to Students of Economics. In E.Yu. Malushko, N.L. Shamne, N.V. Martyushev (Eds.), *Advances in Social Science Education and Humanities Research 97*, (pp. 100-102). Volgograd: Atlantis Press Retrieved from: https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/cildiah-17/25886084

Fahrutdinova, R.A., Yarmakeev, I.E., & Fakhrutdinov, R.R. (2014). The Formation of Students' Foreign Language Communicative Competence during the Learning Process of the English Language through Interactive Learning Technologies *English Language Teaching, Vol. 7, No. 12*; 36-46. doi:10.5539/elt.v7n12p36. Retrieved from: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1075921.pdf

Goodwin, R. (2018). Language Proficiency and Students Behavior in the Classroom: A Comparative Study. *Modern journal of language teaching methods*, 8 (1), 91-103. Retrieved from: http://mjltm.org/article-1-74-en.pdf

Hanghøj, Th., Lieberoth, A., & Misfeldt, M. (2018). Can cooperative video games encourage social and motivational inclusion of at-risk students? *British journal of educational technology*, 49(4), 775-799. doi: 10.1111/bjet.12642 Retrieved from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/bjet.12642

Interacting in English (2017). *Interacting in English: support page*. Retrieved from: https://wansbaa.jimdo.com/hora-inglesa-interacting/

Karaaslan, H.; Kilic, N.; & Guven-Yalcin, G. (2018). Students' Reflections on Vocabulary Learning through Synchronous and Asynchronous Games and Activities *Turkish online journal of distance education*. *19* (3), 53-70. doi: 10.17718/tojde.444640 Retrieved from: http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/508164

Khakimowa, N.G., & Kaguy, N. V. (2018). System-Effective Model of a Modern Teacher Professional Competency Evaluation. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 8 (7), 180-185. doi:10.1111/bjet.12642 Retrieved from: http://mjltm.org/article-1-99-en.pdf

Mandrik, P.A. (2013). Tekhnologii interaktivnosti v uchebnom protsesse. In P.A. Mandrik, & V.V. Kazachenok (Eds.). *Interactivity technologies in teaching process* (pp. 228-232). Minsk: BSU.

Mart, C.T. (2018). Communicative Competence to Language Development. *International Journal of English Linguistics. Vol. 8, No. 2;* 163-167. Retrieved from: http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ijel/article/download/70958/39773 doi:10.5539/ijel.v8n2p163 / URL: http://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n2p163

Moore, M. G. (1989). Three types of interaction [Editorial]. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 3*(2), 1-7. doi:10.1080/08923648909526659

Nunan, D. (1991). "Communicative tasks and the language curriculum," *TESOL, Quarterly* 25(2), 279-295.

Padilla Padilla, N.; Cayambe, P., Angel, H.; Lara, O., & Lenin, I. (2018). Multimedia applied to English Language. Resources for teaching vocabulary in university level. *Dilemas contemporaneos-educacion politica y valores*, 5(3), 29.

Pim, C. (2013). Emerging technologies, emerging minds: digital innovations within the primary sector. In G. Motteram (Ed.), *Innovations in learning technologies for English language teaching (*pp. 15-42). London, UK: British Council

Schmitt, N. (2010). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* (2nd ed.). In N. Schmitt (Ed.). *Hodder Education, London, England* (pp. 342), ISBN: 978-0-340-98447-5, ISBN:0340764198 (ISBN13: 9780340764190).

Tikhomirova, A.V., Bogatyreva, O.P., Bogatyrev, A.A., & Zhuravleva, T.A. (2016). Key linguodidactic steps and stages of Fl wording acquisition. *Russian linguistic Bulletin*, 2 (6), 115-116. doi: 10.18454/RULB.6.16 Retrieved from: http://rulb.org/wp-content/uploads/wpem/pdf_compilations/2(6)/2(6).pdf#page=115; https://doaj.org/toc/2313-0288; https://doaj.org/toc/2411-2968

Tikhomirova, A.V., Bogatyrev, A.A., & Bogatyreva, O.P. (2018). Communicative Quest as an innovative EFL teaching technology. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 8 (6), 147-158. Retrieved from: http://mjltm.org/article-1-124-en.pdf

Shaking hands (2017). *Shaking hands [Interactive module].* Retrieved from: https://learningapps.org/display?v=pb9ih4suk18

Thompson, L. (Director/Producer). (2018). 541. *What British People Say vs What They Mean*. [Video file]. Retrieved from: https://teacherluke.co.uk/2018/07/31/541-what-british-people-say-vs-what-they-mean/

What British People Say vs What They Mean (2018). *What British People Say vs What They Mean [Interactive module]*. Retrieved from: https://learningapps.org/display?v=pyij4z3s518.