

Awareness in acquisitive understanding of second language oral aspect: intercultural, socio-cultural and cross-cultural reflections

Aida R. Nurutdinova – Elena V. Dmitrieva – Zuhra R. Zakieva – Adelina E. Astafeva – Elvira I. Galiullina

DOI: 10.18355/XL.2017.10.04.07

Abstract

This article is focused on the sociocultural and intercultural factors which may benefit or complicate the second language acquisition process in general, and primarily communicative skills. The study is about to explain the conditions of Teaching English as second language in Kazan (Russia) and focused on the area of the sociocultural and intercultural factors, which might contribute to the learning English proficiency. The leading methods are the observations, conversations, and pedagogical experiment, allowing to check the proposed structural competence and pedagogical conditions concerning Teaching English as a second language in the system of higher education. The study involves the interviews with English Language Teachers (non-native speakers) and Assistant English Language Teachers (native speakers), and as well as students' assessments. The paper submission is of the definite value for the process of second language acquisition in the system of higher education.

Key words: high education, proficiency, second language acquisition, (oral) verbal collaboration, linguistics, methodology, restructuring English education, sociocultural and intercultural, retraining system

1. Introduction

Although universities have developed since the 1980 - 90s witnessed a new wave of interest to the issues of the English language in higher education (Masalimova, Shaidullina, Usak, 2016; Golubkova, Masalimova, Birova, 2017; Kazakov, Zakirova, Birova, 2017; Li, Pyrkova, Ryabova, 2017; Nurutdinova, 2012; Nurutdinova, Dmitrieva, 2013). Though changes have been happening in the last ten years, there are clearly weaknesses in language education in the way of improving the communicative abilities in Kazan (Russia), which are not being mainly addressed. There seems to be the difference between Russian students and overseas students in their comfortableness and effortlessness in communicating English as a second language; students can read and write well, nevertheless they still struggle to interconnect directly. Particularly this awkwardness can be recognized to linguistic alterations, but there are also seems to be prominent or important intercultural, sociocultural and cross-cultural aspects that may trigger this metamorphoses. In this study, we challenge to find the solution how Russian educational environments and methodologies to teaching English might be perfected in providing the more successful outcome in the way of communicative English.

This research paper additionally pinpoints how comprehension and consciousness of intercultural, sociocultural and cross-cultural aspects may increase the understanding of how to more efficiently teach the communicative aspect of English as second language learners.

Growing interest towards the English education can be explained by different reasons. Firstly, the economy and labour markets pushed demand in competent workers with knowing of foreign languages, social and intercultural skills. As world economies become increasingly inter-connected, multilingualism and intercultural skills have

grown in importance on a global scale.

Secondly, an export of educational services has become one of the sources of revenue for higher education institutions (HEIs) and national economies. Currently, with increasing internal and external pressures Russian universities are expected to develop strategies in all areas, including the competitiveness appealing to both domestic and global markets (Knight, 2004; Nurutdinova, 2016; Nurutdinova, Dmitrieva, Gazizulina, Tarasova, Galiullina, 2016c; Shaidullina, Nurutdinova, 2016a).

Russia's education has traditionally been seen as a crucial resource for the country's progress. Since the Soviet era, Russia has boasted a wealth of experience in attracting foreign students (Nurutdinova, Dmitrieva, 2016a, Nurutdinova & Dmitrieva, 2016b). It should be noted that the Soviet Union used higher education mainly as a geopolitical tool and as an "ideological weapon" especially during the Cold War. With 126,500 foreign students enrolled in 1990, Russia was ranked among the first 10 countries in the world providing academic services for foreign students. However, after the break-up of the Soviet Union, Russia's share of the world's educational services market has been on a steady decline.

The higher education has become a pressing issue over the past years and the Russian government has paid attention and made a lot of efforts (Kraysman, Valeeva, 2014). Recent initiatives of the government in the area of higher education include innovative educational projects, development and support for national research universities and most recently, the international competitiveness program (Concept of Modernization, 2002; Concept of the Foreign Policy, 2013; Decree of the President № 599, 2012; The Russian Federation Government Resolution № 219, 2010; The Russian Federation Government Resolution № 218, 2010; The Russian Federation Government Resolution № 220, 2010; The Russian Federation National Security Strategy until 2020 № 537, 2009; National doctrine for education of the Russian Federation, 2000; Federal strategic program for the development of education for the period of 2006–2010, 2005). Why are the government and HEIs interested in international activities?

A clear understanding of rationales or motives is significant because, they dictate the kind of benefits or expected outcomes one would expect from efforts... rationales are reflected in the policies and programs that are developed and eventually implemented.

Over the past ten years, Russian Ministry of Education and Science has modified the teaching curriculum in order to establish students' individuality, creativity and newness. English education has also advanced as a way of growing individual living standard in the international society. The great goal of English language education is to deepen the understanding of language and culture, to raise the positive attitude towards communication (Shaidullina, Nurutdinova, 2016b).

English is a common language throughout the world: business and political meetings are carried out in English, because of the lack of self-assurance of communicating in English, Russian people are sometimes not capable to express their opinions appropriately when they go to another country or when they communicate with non-nationals. To identify Russia as the internationalized country, it is important for each individual explicit clearly his own ideas and culture to people in other countries.

2. Theoretical research base: condition of problem's study

The comprehensive nature of this trend is in need for deeper scientific understanding of the essence of intercultural, sociocultural and cross-cultural aspects and its role in the development of nature, man, and society (Brown, 2001; Edge, 1996; Hadley, 2000; Ganyaupfu, 2013).

We can see the traditional, homogeneous, and group oriented features in the teaching methods and university backgrounds in Russia. Professors put value on the

sameness of individual students and use traditional teaching techniques such as memorization, repetitions, drills; they focus more on reading and translating, rather than on speaking and listening; this approach “damages” English. In order to “create” Russian students who can express their opinions and introduce Russian culture to the international community, English education has to be changed from the traditional approach that accentuates rote memorization to the communication-based approach (Nurutdinova, Perchatkina, Zinatullina, Zubkova, Galeeva, 2016d).

In this analysis, we look at Russian approaches for teaching English to second language learners and analyse the challenges for English language education in Kazan (Russia). Throughout this analysis, we challenge to discourse some of the educational and cultural anxieties that may restrain the learning process of communicative English in Kazan (Russia).

The purpose of this research is to examine what kind of sociocultural, intercultural and cross-cultural factors contribute and impede in acquiring communication proficiencies (listening and speaking) in English. The study was undertaken to explain the history of the Russian approach to teaching English and will emphasis on the area of sociocultural, intercultural and cross-cultural factors that contribute to the English language proficiency.

Compared to the past years, the approach of English education since then has been more focused on communication. Most universities now have access to Assistant Language Teachers (native speakers of English) and such valuable tools as language laboratories, Internet, multimedia, and ICT. Nevertheless, there are several complications that may impede Russian students in acquiring English communicative skills.

Quantity. In Russia, most of the groups are made up of 40 students and all students are given the same directives by a single professor. It is difficult for the professor to pay individual attention to students and give opportunity for them to interact with each other; hence the students become unenthusiastic to communicate in English in such a large sized classroom, in addition to that, the methodology of grammar-based instructions didn't allow students to have a chance to communicate in English. Even when the students are given chances to pair up, to do sketches and demonstrations, they would become tired of struggling to speak in English and start conversing in Russian throughout the interaction.

Methodology. The other factor that seemed to influence English language learning was that students are forced to memorize correct grammatical structure, words, word-combinations, and set phrases due to which there is no flexibility of teaching. Professors use customary translation techniques and students become eager to memorize English sentence structure, words, and phrases as much as possible in order to pass the examination. Since the examination at present is the evaluation of memorization, for several years English education is emphasized by reading and translation abilities but not so much on communication aptitudes. Consequently, students learn English as knowledge based but not as the instrument for communication.

Sociocultural, cross-cultural and intercultural aspects. Regarding the teamwork teaching with Assistant Language Teachers (native speakers of English) in-group, many students couldn't speak English with the Assistant Language Teachers (native speakers of English) since they were nervous and afraid of making mistakes. Furthermore, when Russian students come to the USA and study English in ESL courses, they hesitate to ask questions or give their opinions and struggle with the diverse instructional styles. However, if students are always cold and hesitate to speak up, their speaking aptitude cannot be improved without practice. Though, being proud of Russia's long history and unique tradition and recognize the importance of keeping

and spreading many of our cultural and exceptional customs, however, culture and tradition which values on the “sameness of individual” rather than individual differences tend to exclude foreigners from Russian society and dissuade students to communicate with foreigners.

Professors’ education/trainings. Teaching credentials can be earned by taking the required courses, so even professors who teach communication English sometimes have the lack of training in communicating English. Most English professors major in English literature or Education, additionally, the period of practical training for college students less than three months, which is not enough to develop teaching skills. After becoming licensed professors, they not only become hectic with teaching English, but also become involved in supervision or club activities. Many Russian professors of English Language, specifically the older generations, are worthy at teaching grammar, but not communication since they were not trained in verbal/auditory proficiencies and don’t know how to teach communication in English. Those teachers tend to trust Assistant Language Teachers (native speakers of English) for the lesson planning and are not able to communicate with Assistant Language Teachers (native speakers of English) and use them successfully in lectures.

3. Methodological bases and research methods

Methodological basis of our work is the system approach including system and complex, systemic-structural and systemic-functional approaches. The purpose and problems of the research have defined the choice of methods of the analysis. In work such research procedures as hypothetical-deductive method, inductive method, descriptive and comparative method, definition analysis, elements of cognitive interpretation (including frame approach to the analysis of the political metaphor, technique of cognitive scenarios and neurolinguistics, cognitive mapping, analysis of cognitive complexity of texts) are used. Besides, in our research content analysis methods were applied to identification of the substantial party of texts of mass media. The discourse analysis, studying structure and units of a discourse, basic of which is the speech act, and the integrated approach to the analysis of mass media texts consisting in studying of their semantics, pragmatics, syntactic with use of the component, contextual and stylistic analysis were realized.

The study used a qualitative research method of inquiry, including review of literature and interviews. The survey was conducted with students to ascertain their insight of learning English language in Russia. In addition to the students’ survey, several Assistant Language Teachers (native speakers of English) and several teachers of English (non-native speakers) were interviewed. The research article examines students’ perceptions towards verbal communication, and non-native speakers of English (Russian instructors of English) and native speakers of English (Assistant Language Teachers) perception toward English instruction.

The analysis has been limited with respect to the individual personalities of the respondents. Since data was gathered within the relatively short period of time, we tried to measure how these descriptions may have recently changed or might be expected to have changed in the near future (prognostic approach).

In brief, the descriptions might be trustworthy in the future retesting period. The interview was done face to face, and was recorded; therefore, we were able to ask follow up questions for explanation (interpretation), so we might as well depend on the respondents’ explanations.

Another limitation is that the control specialty for the research article was selected from the students in technological universities; these students may represent a select of non-linguistics education (non-linguistics universities). For the consultation, several professors whose academic levels might vary were selected; as it is necessary to consider

the theoretical differences by academic level.

4. The Experimental base of the study

The data was gathered through interviews with several non-native speakers of English (Russian instructors of English) and native speakers of English (Assistant Language Teachers), and a survey of two groups of students (Bachelors and Master degree students) in technical Universities.

Experimental work was carried out on the basis of University educational district in Kazan, the Republic of Tatarstan, Russia, including Kazan National Research Technological University, Kazan State Power Engineering University, state and private universities of Kazan.

5. Literature Review

We review and analyse the additional literature having to do with sociocultural, cross-cultural and intercultural aspects on second language learning. There has been the meaningful volume of research done on second language instructions (techniques, approaches) in Russia, discussing the mentioned aspects, which may imitate or impede Russian learners to acquire communicative English including internalization, culture, teachers' training limitations, traditional instructions and students' perception toward English instructions. Several researchers (Kraysman, 2016; Shageeva, 2013) emphasize Russian's internalization in their articles.

These reviews literature produced on the policy issues of higher education on the whole and particularly in Russia. Literature review includes different kind of sources as official statistics, reports, scholarly journals, reviewed articles, reference books, research institutions reports on higher education integration, national and international universities libraries, computerized databases, the WWW. Material was identified mainly by reference searching and electronic literature searching using as search terms higher education, rationales for higher education integration, etc.

Accumulation and generalization of the experience of integration in higher education had always been distinguished by a high scientific and fundamental, active participation in international processes, including the field of scientific comparative studies.

6. Results and discussion

Russia is in the process of internalization within the foreign language improvement; Russian Ministry of Education and Science states that it is absolutely critical to encourage uniqueness in order to contribute to the awaiting international society in the moral educational policies. Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL) is considered to be the fundamental element for internalization; so the anxiety in communication, such as listening and speaking in specific is a thoughtful delinquent. Kraysman et al (2014) states that foreign language education has been focused on "importing" and students try to apprehend other nations in the world throughout English curriculum. Conversely, for Russia's internalization in the progress, and Russian people have to not only discover about other countries, but also transfer Russian way of thinking and Russian culture to the rest of the world by using the "device" named foreign languages. Shlenov (2009) discusses Russia's internalization by means of English education overall; English education has become an important concept in the process of re-establishing the education system in total and providing the identity view and the rest of the world.

As it was stated before, there are several sociocultural and intercultural that impede Russian learners to ascertain communicative English skills. According to Nurutdinova (2012), Russian sociocultural and intercultural aspects are characterised as

repressive, traditional and group oriented, which is intensely authoritarian. However, the author discusses all these issues regarding to educational system, which is responsible to form students' awareness. Though Russian education in general has more weight on originality, assertiveness, independence and critical thinking. During the education process, professors are the authority and students are taught to follow the structured instructions, more than that the instructions are manipulated by the semester examinations; so the examination is the memorization appraisal of words and phrases. Nonetheless, we consider that memorization-oriented approach depreciates creativeness and expressiveness.

Considering the sociocultural and cross-cultural disparities, Russian students struggle when they communicate with the overseas students, they as well face troubles when they continue the postgraduate studies. In most Russian universities, the team/group culture (behaviour) is more significant than the individual. Mostly, Russian students are well thought out to be not good at expressiveness and ask "acceptable" questions, as well as they put no values on personal interpretation.

In the Scholastic chronicle of the XXI century the principal outline is the originality advancement with the stress on "independence" yet we observe the "Paranoia-English", which may block students from stimulating their self-expressive proficiencies and their communicative talents. Mokhnachev and Negrebetskaya states that sociocultural style in student audiences value unresponsiveness in discussions where students listen and learn but don't speak (Scholefield, 1997).

Let's consider the knowledge organization as the intercultural aspect; knowledge belongs primarily to the enterprises: it is formed, organized and used principally within the corporations and former students communicate with each other in an agreeable balance; and they come to the conclusion through the process of mutual understanding. Most people consider about what others think before speaking and try keeping balance in the debates, whereas Russian people speak while thinking. Debates are usually noisy since they think and speak at the same time; they come to the conclusion through debating. This may also block Russian people to participate in conversation; as far as the way of communication, experimental research shows that less messages are transmitted verbally, and more are non-verbally, so-called "seeing" is the very strong in communication. We may consider that this "seeing" instead of "talking" might be the blocking aspect as well (Allwright, 1984).

According to the survey we gave to adult learners of English language, most answered that they had fear of uncertainty, lack of self-assurance in language learning class. Most feel comfortable following the instructions, teamwork (group work) and value balance, so that adult learners feel extra confident working in pairs or in groups. Accordingly, we suggest that it is important for professors to be sympathetic towards students' feelings and to build classroom atmosphere that adult learners feel relaxing to speak up. According to Richards & Rodgers (2014), when religion is applied to language learning, students are reluctant to express themselves loudly or fear of uncertainty, because in religious culture, compromise among people is the key so the students incline to be unenthusiastic to speak out and become quite in class.

Teachers' shortage of preparation is considered to subsidise the complications students have in the acquisition of communicative English. Regarding the conducted survey most professors major in literature in university, however the percentage of the professors who majored in linguistics (philology) is only 15% and the percentage of TESL/TEFL major is only 10%. Is it reported that those who majored in TESL/TEFL (Teaching English as Second Language/Teaching English as Foreign Language) at the undergraduate level felt more prepared for the many challenges since those who majored in literature were nor required to take additional courses in second language acquisition theory, ESL methodology, and techniques, testing (Block, 1994).

Scholefield (1997) criticizes the system of obtaining teachers' licence and the system of designations. TEFL training for professors is limited to the undergraduate

degree and teaching practice; besides taking some requirement classes in college, students are required only three – four weeks teaching practice. In teaching practice, professors are trained to follow the supervisors who usually practice traditional techniques (Scholefield, 1997). Correspondingly, the designations are based on examination results, which consist of written tests of education subjects, professional and teaching subjects, and interviews so that professor's communication skills are not really evaluated in the examination (Scholefield, 1997).

In the early years, many Russian professors of English found it hard to communicate with a foreigner. It has been over ten years since FULLBRIGHT program was established, but there is still a great deal of debate if the program has improved the quality of verbal (oral) language teaching in Russia, it had an impact on English ability and their confidence of working with native speakers of ALTs (Browne, 1998). Scholefield (1997) criticised "Handbook for Team Teaching" since it doesn't form systematic teacher education.

Besides this program, Russian Ministry of Education and Science started a three-months program for professors to study overseas; as the opportunities for study overseas have been increasing. Yet, the program pays less attention to educational research of schooling and instructions (Scholefield, 1997). Also there are several organizations among English teachers, for example the National Associate of English Teachers in Russia, in order to make visible changes in English education in Russia. However, less than half of the membership or contributors of those organizations pay less attention to the methodology and new techniques in teaching.

Viewing the traditional teaching methodologies (techniques, methods), we observe that students aren't proficient in communicative skills in English, tend to lack critical thinking and problem solving. The goal of studying English is to pass the semester examinations, so English training has traditionally emphasised methodology and resources; and teaching methods (like memorization, multiple answer tests, repetition, grammar approach, and drills) accentuate traditional techniques rather than creativeness and improvement. Because of the large number of students in one group, majority of them accustomed to the routine learning style, which focuses on memorization, test taking and preoccupying them with reading and translating (Hadley, 2000).

Scholefield (1997) explained the history of the teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) towards verbal methodology which stressed two zones of English education, teacher-training education and the production of teaching for the verbal approach. Conversely, many teachers found it hard to acknowledge verbal approach since they were not used to it and it was problematic to comprehend how this methodology would assist students towards to exams. In the mid 1960s, audio-lingual movement began, which moves away from grammar-translation technique and allow students obtain the capability to produce entirely of the sound system with basic grammar within an inadequate lexicon. Though, most language tutors (teachers, professors) used mixture of grammar-translation and some oral instructions; reasons for the reluctance of transition among language tutors were oral practice was limited to "imitate reading" of textbook and universities were not appropriate to the audio-lingual methodology since teaching hours are short and groups are overcrowded. Scholefield (1997) blames language tutors who were low in English proficiency, unenthusiastic to act as role models for students and choose traditional methodology because they are adapted to it.

There are several university professors who discuss the objectives for language tutors' inclination to traditional teaching methodology. On behalf of continuing to use grammar-translation involve the instructors with low proficiency in English and their justification that "it is handy to conduct lectures in Russian" and that students are still

vulnerable to face-to-face communication. The rest feel incapable to adjust these factors and endure to work within a system they may find theoretically indefensible but which they assume “will linger for the time being”.

It is significant to identify what kind of instructions students select and how they want to study English. While discussing the Russian students’ needed style of learning and preferred teaching methods, traditional methods, natural approach, TPR (Total Physical Response), neurolinguistics method, error correction. The outcome exposed that more Russian students selected new methods, however, to some extent, students wanted traditional methods because of their educational background. As far as the error correction is concerned, most students believe error correction as the constructive method to advance their language skills and they did not feel reluctant, therefore the language instructors need to take into consideration the techniques for error correction in order not to make students fear (Harlow, 1991).

We can consider some suggestions for the group instructions:

Group techniques should use Natural Approach which has stress on listening and speaking, with regard to error correction and rote memorization, traditional methodology should be used.

The use of TPR should be useful as well, but the language instructors need to admit sufficient time in order to lesser worry level and help to create the group atmosphere in which students feel relaxed about speaking up.

Students expect from the roles of the non-native speakers of English and native speakers of English: students perceive from Russian teachers of English as reading/writing; helping with grammar and guide how to study English; students perceive from Assistant Language Teachers as listening/speaking oriented; helping with pronunciation; as useful in the group and find team teaching more fascinating.

We consider that two-way communication among the three parties (students, non-native speakers of English (Russian professors of English) and native speakers of English (Assistant Language Teachers) are essential to advance the speaking as well as other communicative proficiencies. It is mentioned that team teaching should move towards the practice of team-learning, in which the three parties have chances to interchange ideas and express a sense of their individual intercultural standards. It is said that the high percentage of students want to be able to listen and understand everyday English, and agree with the idea that skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing are of equal importance; being able to read in English on not enough and focusing on reading only is not the correct way of English education. Regarding the fear of learning English, most students agree that studying English in schools caused panic and horrible feelings. In order to classify these factors in recent university settings, this research was conducted (James, VanPatten, 2016).

7. The results of the experiment: teachers’ attitude and insights

As it was mentioned before, this research studied students’ insights toward Verbal communication, and Russian Teachers of English language and Native Speakers (Assistant Teachers) insights toward English commands. The data was collected through the interview with teachers and survey with students regarding the effectiveness of verbal communication techniques as taught in Russia. The research took place in several universities specialized in technical and technological sciences.

Subject 1. Teachers’ perceptions towards Verbal Collaboration Lectures. Native teachers of English and Russian teachers of English both like instruction Verbal Collaboration in comparing with the general English lecture – it is more artistic, resourceful and interactive. In general English lecture, most Russian professors use only manuals and tend to make students translate the manuals, and do grammar drills. Conversely, Verbal Collaboration lecture is the only class where team-teaching is likely to happen, in addition to that there are more probabilities for instant collaboration

between teachers and students as students have the only chance to communicate with the native speakers, and professors like to see students' impatience, enthusiasm and willingness in learning the language from native speakers. It should be noted that for Russian Professors teaching English, Verbal Collaboration Lectures are always thought-provoking, in most cases they are not trained well in communication skills, so it is hard for them to conduct only in English and it takes much more time for planning. Moreover, the students speak English only in the class, so it tends to be duplication of certain phrases or imitation of the manual and lack variability. Some Russian professors (especially the older generation) are narrow-minded and prejudiced, and they prefer to use traditional methods, and hesitate to bring on innovative concepts, so it is problematic for Native Speakers and for Non-native to exchange and cooperate with each other.

For Native Speakers of English teaching Verbal Collaboration, the group extent is too enormous paralleled to another language education in their own countries, so it is hard for them to conduct so many students at the same time. Most of them mentioned that the manuals are too tedious, dull and monotonous: several topics are mentioned (like shopping, travelling, dinning out, talking on the phone) but the students tend to memorize the partial phrases for certain situations. More than that those teachers make supplements to the lecture by their own, but other teachers (non-native teachers of English) tend to rely on their preparation, so it is the double work for the teachers.

Subject 2. Planning, organization and techniques used by both teachers. As it was stated before, just some standard topics were presented in manuals; so in most cases teachers use their own ideas, mainly by introducing their own cultures, customs, and traditions. The best option so far, it to plan and organize the additional materials for lectures together; and possibly they should depend on each other to take the lead, however they do and must cooperate with each other.

Subject 3. The mode of conducting Verbal Collaboration lectures. It should be noted that most Native Speakers of English (French) who teach in Russian Universities are not able to speak Russian, so they do conduct their Lectures in their native language, offering no interpretations. Usually, it is the Non-Native speakers (Russian Professors) who sometimes help students with interpretations, so they use both Russian and English in their class. In that particular case, students will depend on the interpretations. Some students want to interpret each sentences, nevertheless, the connotation of Verbal Collaboration is not interpreted but communication in English without thinking in Russian, so teachers usually offer interpretations as little as possible.

Subject 4. The proficiencies which teachers accentuate during the Verbal Collaboration Lectures: encouragement for learners to express themselves. It is particularly significant to assess students' English skills and their inspiration or involvement towards Verbal Collaboration Lectures. The objective of Verbal Collaboration is to empower learners to develop communicative proficiencies in second language (English), so teachers have to present an environment that students feel relaxed speaking up during the Lectures. For example, certainly don't make students feel bad when they make grammatical or lexical mistakes, let them reconsider the situation, they have to get accustomed that mistakes are done in process of studying and that it is normal. Native Speakers of English stated that it is vital to make students feel worthy, using those encouragements as "good", "well-done" or "brilliant". In the Verbal Collaboration Lectures students do not generally take notes, so reading and writing skills are not really matters; the central is – the listening and speaking skills and the focus is on communication proficiencies, as well as the fluency and confidence in communication – as the skill.

Subject 5. The objectives you plan to achieve through learning English. The

only lecture is the Verbal Collaboration that can allow students to engage themselves in an English speaking environment by interrelating with Native Speakers; it is important for students to enjoy themselves when they learn something new; but as we can observe most Russian students are regularly anxious of making inaccuracies and don't have self-assurance for talking, particularly, they are so much worried about syntactic, structural and grammatical mistakes. Therefore, our first task is to encourage students to have self-confidence on speaking English; students can absorb extra about the world and advance the awareness behind the language by teaching not only the language itself but also cultures, stereotypes where English is spoken. As it was mentioned before, it is very important for students to have self-confidence, and that attitudes are as well important for language learning since they affect leaning a lot. So the first step is to teach students to be open-minded; Russian teachers use structured instructions according to the guideline (standard) and Native Speakers are also trained to follow those guidelines in pre-training period, even though they accustomed to their original way of instructions in their countries.

Subject 6. The credible techniques which can perfect communication skills?

Regarding these questions, both teachers (Native speakers and Non-native speakers teaching English) mentioned lack of opportunities to speak English, since Verbal Collaboration Lecture – is the only class form where English is used as the means of communication. Outside the classroom, they have no chance to speak English. Apart from that both teachers highlighted is the students' attitude towards language learning, such as being nervous, lack of assurance, and laziness (it was seen that some students slept in class, due to tiredness from extra studying and various club activities which cannot allow them fully concentrate on the class). Mainly Native Speakers (Assistant Teachers) complained about the syllabus that emphasizes too much on grammar, no proper manuals (textbooks), no appropriate audio-lingual facilities.

Since Verbal Collaboration Lecture is included into syllabus most Russian teachers of English are not certain how they can teach and find out good ways of teaching now, though they suggest that the way of assessment, might be helpful in some way. As for Native Speakers (Assistant Teachers) each of them revealed the diverse positions: they pointed the elimination of grammar teaching because students are so much worry about minor grammatical mistakes and it takes time to start the communication.

Subject 7. The studying features have you noticed so far. Both Teachers mentioned that students are reluctant about taking part in the dialogue and hesitate to express themselves and tend to be silent. Though overall, they work hard and are good at cooperating with each other.

8. The results of the experiment: students' attitude and insights

Subject 1. Instructional and studying inclinations. Partly the students agree to work in small groups, though we did not suppose that there are still some students who prefer full class instructions. Most students prefer small group work. It was as well shocking to know that most students think memorization words, phrases and grammatical structures help them to learn to speak English, nevertheless, in order to communicate, we need to acquire more practical skills that can apply for any conversation. So, in some aspect it is true, if they memorize many words, they can utilize those words in any conversation and make it useful for them. As far as the abilities they want to obtain, almost everyone say that they want to acquire communication skills.

Subject 2. Linguistic and syntactic mistakes. As it was expected, many students are scared of making grammatical or lexical mistakes because in other English classes, instructions are focused on grammar or structure; consequently, they are embarrassed when teacher corrects students in front of the class and that's why they hesitate to speak up in front of everyone.

Subject 3. Pressure for examinations. Regarding the pressure for examinations, most students have a pressure of memorization for term tests: students are usually tested on memorization of words, phrases and structure. Other students say that they study English just because they need to pass the examination session which means they do not want to learn it, it is just out of obligation.

Subject 4. Personality and attitude. Students are confident about expressing themselves; they are becoming more expressive and open about their ideas. If their motivations are high and they have positive attitude about language learning, they do not hesitate to communicate with Native Speakers (assistant teachers). If students don't have pressure on tests, they will have more time for enjoying learning language and be willing to communicate with Native Speakers (assistant teacher). And if students learn not only language but also culture they will acquire unbiased view toward different kind of people.

Subject 5. Listening. The bewildering result was that most students want their teachers to speak only in English, they do understand that it is vital to immerse students into English speaking atmosphere as much as possible, but they do depend on Russian teachers' interpretation. Most students know that reading and writing are for tests and passing examinations, however, listening and speaking are for communication; so they consider listening is important in order to improve their communication skills.

9. Conclusions

In this aspect we will consider the findings in this research to the original research questions discussed before. We will also compare the findings with the previous research questions and then we will list and study the implications for further actions.

The methodology and settings of learning English as a second language.

Both Native Speakers (Assistant Teachers) and Russian teachers of English enjoy conducting Verbal Collaboration Lectures since students get excited compared to general English class. However, there are some confusion between teachers concerning their team teaching: equally they want to lead, but they don't work well together yet due to several reasons like Russian teachers of English are not comfortable to work with native speakers and incline to use old-style techniques, and are close-minded. The ideal way of team teaching is co-operating among three parties: (1) when Assistant teacher is co-operating with students, Russian teachers of English provide students with interpretation; (2) when Russian teachers of English is co-operating with students, assistant teacher is usually listening (seems to be far from the perfect model).

The class size for Verbal Collaboration varies depending on the course; usually the class size is bigger as the curriculum is focused on general English in order to prepare for the semester sessions, consequently, students don't have much time for improving communicative skills. Claire (1999) criticised the class size while stating that the class is overcrowded with many students and students are comfortable to a role education style, which emphasizes on memorization and test taking. There is still argument going on concerning whether the renovating English curriculum has improved the quality of communicative language teaching in Russia; however, it is unquestionably had improved English speaking ability of Russian teachers of English and their confidence in working with native speakers for the preparations and instructions.

Intercultural, sociocultural and cross-cultural concerns which can block the communicative English acquiring. Without a doubt that most students have pressure of memorization for term test or winter/summer sessions, it happened due to the current curriculum which focuses on general English rather than Verbal Collaboration. Currently, most universities assess students' reading and writing abilities, but there is no part which assess students' communicative skills. Consequently, students tend to study

English just for the examination by using their familiar way, rote-memorization. They don't really enjoy learning language though they want to improve their Verbal Collaboration abilities.

Another factor – is the nervousness of making mistakes, which might block them from improving their communicative abilities. They got “humiliated” when teacher corrects the mistakes in front of the class, and they finally hesitate or the worst case scenario, they refuse to speak up in the class; subsequently, they try to seek “the right” answers for the teachers. We can observe that students more secure working in pair and in groups as they have no self-confidence in class.

Students' outlook toward Assistant teachers (native speakers) also vary on their characters and their inclinations regarding Verbal Collaboration: if their enthusiasm is high and they have confident outlook about language learning, they do not hesitate to interconnect with Assistant teachers. We do understand that students' outlook toward Verbal Collaboration Lecture is very important; consequently, students need to be assessed not only for the language skills but also for their attitudes to the process of language learning. Though, we can't blame only students, Russian teachers of English also need to train their communication skills: the system of obtaining teachers' education, the system of appointments, absence of proper training of Verbal communication skills add to the complications students have in the language learning.

The potential ways to advance the communication skills: educational settings and methodologies of teaching English. English education so far has been only focused on “introducing” other cultures and students try to comprehend cultures and customs of other countries through English syllabus. The students would learn not only about the countries, but they would acquire the way of thinking as well – accordingly we must produce students who are able to express their opinion in English as well. Providing more opportunities for students to speak English in real life, outside the Verbal Collaboration Lectures is important. The teachers must make the class interesting, and the ideal way is minimum 10 students in a class. The way of assessing might block students' acquisition of communicative English: if students are nervous, they can't progress in their abilities. It is of great important to be confident, open-minded and fearless of making mistakes. It might take time to overcome this manner.

Analysing the English education in Russia we can see that it is changing from traditional towards communicative to contribute alongside the practice of internalization. However, there are still many intercultural, sociocultural and cross-cultural factors that might block this transition in Russian university settings. English education is the crucial for Russia's internalization and integrational processes, so we need to encourage each individual student who can contribute to future international and academic society.

Bibliographic references

ALLWRIGHT, R. L. 1984. The Importance of Interaction in Classroom Language Learning. In: Applied Linguist, vol. 5, n. 2, pp. 156-171.

BLOCK, D. 1994. A day in the life of a class: Teacher/learner perceptions of task purpose in conflict. In: System, n. 22, pp. 473-486. ISBN: 0346-251X(94)00034-4.

BROWN, H. D. 2001. Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd edition). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Addison Wesley Longman. ISBN: 0133282201.

Concept of Modernization of Russian Higher Education by 2010 (2002). Available online: http://www.edu.ru/db/mo/Data/d_02/393.html.

Concept of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation Approved by President of the Russian Federation V. Putin on 12 February 2013. Available online:

[http://www.mid.ru/bdomp/ns-](http://www.mid.ru/bdomp/ns-osndoc.nsf/e2f289bea62097f9c325787a0034c255/c32577ca0017434944257b160051bf7f!OpenDocument)

osndoc.nsf/e2f289bea62097f9c325787a0034c255/c32577ca0017434944257b160051bf7f!OpenDocument.

Decree of the President of the Russian Federation dated May 7, 2012, № 599 “On Measures to Implement Government Policies in Education and Science”.

EDGE, J. 1996. Cross-Cultural Paradoxes in a Profession of Values. *TESOL Quarterly*, n.30. ISBN 1545-7249.

GANYAUPFU, E.M. 2013. Teaching Methods and Students' Academic Performance. In: *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, vol. 2, n. 9, pp. 29-33. ISSN (Online): 2319 – 7722, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 7714.

GOLUBKOVA O.N. – MASALIMOVA A.R. – BIROVA J. 2017. The Development of Sociocultural Competence in Future Translators Via the Methodology of Culture-Oriented Interpretation of English Language Fictional Texts. In: *Man In India*, vol. 97, n. 14, pp. 73-83. ISSN: 00251569.

Government of the Russian Federation. 2000. National doctrine for education of the Russian Federation.

Government of the Russian Federation. 2005. Federal strategic program for the development of education for the period of 2006–2010.

HADLEY, ALICE OMAGGIO. 2000. *Teaching language in context*. Illinois: Heinle & Heinle. ISBN-13: 978-0838417058. ISBN-10: 0838417051.

HARLOW, BRUNT MILL. 1991. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Essex, England: Longman. ISBN: 32808287.

JAMES, L. – VANPATTEN B. 2016. *Making communicative language teaching happen*. 2nd Edition. ISBN-13: 978-0073655178. ISBN-10: 0073655171.

KAZAKOV, A.V. – ZAKIROVA, V.G. – BIROVA, J. 2017. Modeling the Process of Forming Social and Cultural Competence among Students of Linguistics Faculty. In: *Man In India*, vol. 97, n. 14, pp. 291-305. ISSN: 00251569.

KNIGHT, J. 2004. Internationalization Remodelled: Definitions, Approaches, and Rationales. In: *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol. 8 n. 1, pp. 5-31. ISSN: 1028-3153.

KRAYSMAN, N.V. – VALEEVA, E.E. 2014. Integration of KNTRU into the world community as an example of cooperation with France. *Proceedings of 2014, International Conference on Interactive Collaborative Learning, ICL 2014, 43 IGIP International Conference 2014*. ISBN: 2194-5357.

LI, N. – PYRKOVA, K.V. – RYABOVA, T.V. 2017. Teaching Communication Skills and Decision-Making to University Students. In: *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, vol. 13, n. 8, pp. 4715-4723. . ISSN: 13058215, 13058223.

MASALIMOVA, A.R. – SHAIDULLINA, A.R. – USAK, M. 2016. Advantages and disadvantages of national and international corporate training techniques in adult education. In: *Current Science (India)*, vol. 111, n 9, pp. 1480-1485. ISSN: 0011-3891. eISSN: 0011-3891.

NURUTDINOVA, A.R. 2012. The new development in the foreign language training (FLT) system for young learners in the Russian educational system (retrospective analyses). In: *International Scientific and Research Journal*, vol. 7-2, n. 7, pp. 25-27. ISSN: 2303-9868. eISSN: 2227-6017.

NURUTDINOVA, A.R. 2016. The influence of ideological policy on methodical culture of teaching foreign language (case study: Cuba, India, Russia, China and Japan). *Foreign languages in the modern world. Materials IX International Scientific and Practical Conference*, 321-330. ISBN: 978-5-00019-712-7.

NURUTDINOVA, A.R. – DMITRIEVA, E.V. 2013. Structure and model of professional-oriented approach in teaching (case study: Non-language faculties).

XLinguae, Volume 10, Issue 4, October 2017, ISSN 1337-8384, eISSN 2453-711X

Applied and Fundamental Studies. Proceedings of the 3rd International Academic Conference. Publishing House Science and Innovation Centre, Ltd., pp. 369-372. ISBN: 978-0-615-67115-4.

NURUTDINOVA, A.R. – DMITRIEVA, E.V. 2016a. A Cross-cultural communication in a foreign language teaching in higher education: culturological component. Foreign languages in the modern world. Materials IX International Scientific and Practical Conference, pp. 28-33. ISBN: 978-5-00019-712-7.

NURUTDINOVA, A.R. – DMITRIEVA, E.V. 2016b. Innovative ICT-based foreign language learning: evaluation techniques, assisted learning and foreign language teaching. In: The Bulletin of South Ural State University, Series «Linguistics», vol. 13, n. 3, pp. 47-51. ISSN: 1991-9751. Online ISSN: 2413-0532.

NURUTDINOVA, A.R. – DMITRIEVA, E.V. – GAZIZULINA, L.R. – TARASOVA, N.M. – GALIULLINA, E.I. 2016c. Nature and principles of the phenomenon of higher education integration: mechanisms of implementation, pros and cons, the effectiveness and the management. In: IEJME-Mathematics Education, vol. 11, n. 6, pp. 1697-1712. ISSN: 2468-4945.

NURUTDINOVA, A.R. – PERCHATKINA, V.G. – ZINNATULLINA, L.M. – ZUBKOVA, G.I. – GALEEVA, F.T. 2016d. Innovation teaching practice: traditional and alternative methods (challenges and implications). In: International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, vol. 11, n. 10, pp. 3807-3819. Online ISSN: 1306-3065.

RICHARDS, J. C. – RODGERS, Th. S. 2014. Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (Cambridge Language Teaching Library). 3rd Edition. ISBN-13: 978-1107675964. ISBN-10: 1107675960.

The Russian Federation Government Resolution dated April 9, 2010, № 219 “On state support of innovation infrastructure in the federal institutions of higher education”.

The Russian Federation Government Resolution dated April 9, 2010, № 218 “On measures of state support of development of cooperation of Russian higher education institutions and organizations implementing integrated projects for high-tech industries”.

The Russian Federation Government Resolution dated 9 April 2010, № 220 “On measures to attract leading scientists at Russian institutions of higher education”.

The Russian Federation National Security Strategy until 2020, approved by Presidential Decree of 12 May 2009, № 537

SHAGEEVA, F.T. – KRAYSMAN, N.V. – GORODETSKAYA, I.M. – IVANOV, V.G. 2013. Socio-psychological competence of future engineers. In: ASEE International Forum, Atlanta, Georgia. Available online: <https://peer.asee.org/17265>

SHAIULLINA, A.R. – NURUTDINOVA, A.R. 2016a. The interference phenomenon in trilingual perception: Tatar, Russian and English/German Languages (Case Study: The Republic of Tatarstan). In: Social science, n. 5, pp. 177-182. ISSN: 2079-5505.

SHAIULLINA, A.R. – NURUTDINOVA, A.R. 2016b. Foreign language system for international communication: analysis of trends in teaching methodological speech activity: non-linguistic universities. In: Social science, vol. 6, n. 1, pp. 6-12. ISSN: 2079-5505.

SCHOLEFIELD, Wendy. 1997. An overview of the teaching and learning of English in UCLA/URL. In: Babel, vol. 32, n. 1, pp. 16-38. ISSN: 0044-3328.

Words: 7917

Characters: 55 368 (30,8 standard pages)

Associate Professor Aida Rustamovna Nurutdinova, PhD.

Associate Professor Zuhra Ravilevna Zakieva, PhD.

Associate Professor Adelina Erikovna Astafeva, PhD.
Senior Lecturer Elvira Ildusovna Galiullina
Faculty of Social and Technical Systems,
Department of foreign languages for professional communication,
Kazan National Research Technological University
Karl Marks, 68
420015 Kazan,
Russia
nurutdinova@my.com
zakievazuhra@mail.ru
universitymed@rambler.ru
vira80@mail.ru

Associate Professor Elena Viktorovna Dmitrieva, PhD.
Faculty of economics and information technology,
Department of foreign languages,
Kazan State Power Engineering University
Krasnoselskaja, 51,
420066, Kazan,
Russia
elenadmitrieva75@yandex.ru