Russian Language Studies
Русистика
ISSN 2618-8163 (Print); ISSN 2618-8171 (Online)
2024 Vol. 22 No. 4 681–697
http://journals.rudn.ru/russian-language-studies

DOI: 10.22363/2618-8163-2024-22-4-681-697
EDN: EUETJG

Research article

Pedagogical technology in the methodology of teaching Russian as a foreign language: transformation of the concept and author's classification

Irina A. Leshutina[1] ✉, **Maria A. Davydova**[2], **Elena N. Strelchuk**[3]

[1]The Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, *Moscow, Russian Federation*
[2]Lomonosov Moscow State University, *Moscow, Russian Federation*
[3]RUDN University, *Moscow, Russian Federation*
✉ leshirish@mail.ru

Abstract. "Pedagogical technology" is one of the actively used concepts of scientific and pedagogical discourse with dozen definitions and interpretations. The aim of the study is to consider pedagogical technologies in terms of their use in Russian as a foreign language classes and to propose the author's classification on the basis of a unified communicatively significant principle, taking into account the various approaches to their interpretation and systematization in methodological science. The research materials included more than 40 definitions of the phenomenon of "pedagogical technology" and about 10 classifications of those technologies. Methods of analysis, synthesis, generalization, and comparison were used. As a result, the approaches to pedagogical technologies in domestic and foreign methodological science are systematized; the author's classification of pedagogical technologies from the position of the communicative principle is proposed. The classification is based on such concepts as speech act/speech action, speech event, and speech genre. Examples of specific pedagogical technologies are given and divided into three groups according to students' communicative efforts; and the possibilities of combining various technologies and their synergy in the process of teaching Russian as a foreign language are shown. The prospects for the research are to create a textbook containing the theoretical foundations for pedagogical technologies integration into the educational process in accordance with foreign speakers' level of language proficiency and their professional orientation.

Keywords: didactic task, classification of pedagogical technologies, gamification, communicative competence, speech genre

Contribution: *Leshutina I.A.* — research concept, scientific consulting, general concept of the article, processing of research results, writing and editing the article; *Davydova M.A.* — literature analysis, selection of primary material, summarizing the experience of researchers, data collection, analysis of data and results obtained, processing of the material, writing the article; *Strelchuk E.N.* — formulation of conclusions, conducting a literature review on the topic, formatting the list of references, scientific editing.

Conflict of interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

Article history: received 11.04.2024; accepted 28.07.2024.

For citation: Leshutina, I.A., Davydova, M.A., & Strelchuk, E.N. (2024). Pedagogical technology in the methodology of teaching Russian as a foreign language: transformation of the concept and author's classification. *Russian Language Studies*, *22*(4), 681–697. http://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2024-22-4-681-697

Introduction

Teaching foreign languages, including teaching Russian as a foreign language, is at a new stage of its development: mixed forms of teaching are now in demand, creativity and multimodality are popular, information resources are used as the main and auxiliary means of teaching.

In our opinion, it is urgent to reconsider the attitude to pedagogical technologies as a significant element of the educational process. The technologies can not only diversify classroom and extracurricular work, but also solve the following problems: to intensify the learning process, to combine different forms of learning, to motivate students to work independently, to develop related competencies and soft skills (critical thinking, teamwork, processing large amounts of information and its structuring). Being a complex multi-component system conceptualizing the goals and objectives of learning and combining a variety of forms, means, methods, techniques of learning, pedagogical technology can be used as a basis for learning process organization and formation of competencies, skills and abilities.

Modern foreign language teaching methodology operates with a lot of pedagogical technologies: according to the most modest calculations there are more than 500 of them (this is how many technologies G.K. Selevko cites in his work "Encyclopaedia of Educational Technologies" and gives their classification) (Selevko, 2005b). However, we believe that many technologies can be combined because they are variations or modernisations of each other in the aspect of information space possibilities. Most Russian researchers (S.Y. Batyshev, E.V. Vishnichkina, L.A. Zubkova, I.B. Kotova, A.A. Mitskevich, T.S. Nazarova, I.A. Petrenko, etc.) appeal to the very extensive and detailed classification of G.K. Selevko, explaining or slightly modifying it. G.K. Selevko's approach deeply elaborates all kinds of details when describing pedagogical technologies and criteria for their classification. The scientist distinguishes technologies according to human-personal orientation of the pedagogical process, activation and intensification of students' activity, didactic improvement of the material by the teacher, efficiency of management and organization of the educational process, etc. (Selevko, 2005b). However, this classification seems to be very difficult to organize in the classroom. Moreover, not all the technologies are suitable for Russian as a foreign language classes.

The aim of this study is to examine pedagogical technologies in terms of their use in Russian as a foreign language classes and to propose the author's classification on the basis of a unified communicatively significant principle, considering various approaches to their interpretation and systematization in methodological science.

Methods and materials

More than 40 domestic and foreign definitions of the phenomenon “pedagogical technology” and about 10 classifications were used as the research material. The methods of analysis, synthesis, generalization, comparison, and contrast allowed authors to propose a classification of pedagogical technologies developed on the basis of the actual communicative principle in the context of teaching Russian as a foreign language. The author's classification is based on the theory of speech genres by M.M. Bakhtin (Bakhtin, 1986; 1996) and his followers — linguists, methodologists, who at different times were engaged in the issues of communicative interaction and its effectiveness. The research has diachronic and synchronic aspects, characterizes the level, personality-oriented, value-cognitive and other known approaches to teaching. It is based on personal experience of teaching Russian to foreigners.

Results

The authors prove that the term “pedagogical technology” is one of the actively used concepts with its various interpretations in scientific and methodological discourse both in Russian and foreign studies. The pragmatic nature of pedagogical technologies aimed at intensifying the educational process with its systematicity and efficiency, as well as stage-by-stage design based on the communicative approach is noted. The article determines students’ special role in pedagogical technologies implementation: they act both as subjects and objects of learning.

An updated classification of pedagogical technologies from the position of the communicative principle is proposed, since the formation of students' communicative competence, its development and improvement are among the priority tasks in the practice of teaching Russian as a foreign language. As a classification basis for the new typology, we used such concepts as speech act/speech action, speech event, and speech genre. Examples of specific pedagogical technologies, categorized into three groups depending on students’ communicative effort are given, the possibilities of combining different technologies and their synergy in the process of teaching Russian as a foreign language are shown.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in the generalization of classical and modern studies on the topic and an attempt to combine pedagogical theory with the communicative approach in teaching Russian as a foreign language.

Discussion

"Pedagogical technology" in domestic pedagogical science

In Russian pedagogical science, the concepts of "pedagogical technology" (PT), "technologization of educational process", "educational technology" are used as synonyms, close in meaning, but the first one is the most frequent. The term was introduced into scientific discourse in the late 1970s – early 1980s and received many definitions. At the same time, according to V.I. Bogolyubov, the term was not recognized until 1971 (Bogolyubov, 1996: 19). The term 'PT' originates from "Fordism", the teachers' movement of the early XX century "For the scientific organization of the pedagogical process", and also the audiovisual approach and programmed learning (Bogolyubov, 1999). I.A. Petrenko believes that the historical roots of the ideas of learning technologization can be found in I.G. Pestalozzi and J.A. Comenius (Petrenko, 2007: 223), although these medieval scientists-pedagogues did not use the very concept of "PT". For example, I.G. Pestalozzi believed that, relying on his "mechanism of education", any teacher could achieve the goals of education (Pestalozzi, 2021: 176). J.A. Comenius insisted on mastering a special "pedagogical toolkit" based on "skilful distribution of time, subjects and method" (Pedagogical Technologies, 2006: 9).

Russian and foreign methodologists (V.P. Bespalko, E. Bisterski, G.A. Kitaygorodskaya, M.V. Klarin, N.F. Talyzina, J. Zeller, etc.) reflected on the place of pedagogical technology in pedagogical theory, but the peak of interest in the problem falls on the second half of the 80s–90s of the XX century (Bespal'ko, 1989; Bisterski, Zeller, 1977; Kitaigorodskaya, 1986; Klarin, 1989; Talyzina, 1977). In 1986, UNESCO gave an official definition of the phenomenon, "considering learning technology as a systematic method of consciousness, application and definition of the whole process of teaching and knowledge learning, taking into account creative and personal resources and their interaction, aiming to optimize education" (Glossary..., 1986: 5). At the same time, the official definition noted the necessity of three stages of the whole learning process: devising — applying — assessing.

Initially, there was a tendency generalize the concept of PT. V.V. Davydov, according to G.K. Selevko, allegorically called this period "content generalization" (Selevko, 2005a). V.P. Bespal'ko wrote that learning technologies are set by the pedagogical system, its leading principles, and approaches, embodied in the work of the teacher and students in the learning process: "Pedagogical technology is a project of a certain pedagogical system, realized in practice" (Bespal'ko, 1989: 6). The scientist defined technology as a procedural part of the whole didactic system realization. G.K. Selevko saw this feature of PT and in his fundamental work, as a result he described three aspects of PT: scientific (description of the goals of a particular technology, its content and teaching methods), procedural-descriptive (development of an algorithm of the whole process in order

to achieve learning outcomes / planning), procedural-action (realization of the process by applying a set of pedagogical means) (Selevko, 2005a: 16).

A practice-oriented definition of PT was given by the methodologist B.T. Likhachev: "Pedagogical technology is a set of psychological and pedagogical attitudes that determine a special set and arrangement of forms, methods, ways, techniques of teaching, educational means: it is an organizational and methodological toolkit of the pedagogical process" (Likhachev, 1999: 147). In his turn, V.I. Bogolyubov described the evolution of the concept of "technology" in the educational system: at first, these were information, innovative technologies, but then pedagogical technologies became closer to modern understanding of the term (Bogolyubov, 1991: 123–128). In his dissertation research, the scientist described the strategy and methodological basis for the design and implementation of PT, and came to the conclusion that the ultimate goal of this process should always be to improve the efficiency of the education system; PTs themselves are modelled at the intersection of didactics, teaching methods, scientific organization of teacher's work and practical psychology (Bogolyubov, 1999).

Methodological researchers G.V. Lavrent'ev and N.B. Lavrent'eva also emphasized the generalizing nature of PT and described it as "a global, providing a general theoretical model for educational process restructuring, for creating specific managed learning systems, optimal for achieving the planned results strategic scheme" (Lavrent'ev, Lavrent'eva, 2002: 103). Intensification of learning, its technologization, or electronization, purposeful management and efficiency began to prevail among the principles of PT construction (Lavrent'ev, Lavrent'eva, 2002: 93–96). In the same period, a tendency towards pragmatization of PT and modernization of educational methods also emerged.

E.G. Azimov, A.N. Shchukin in the "Modern Dictionary of Methodological Terms and Concepts" use the variant "educational technologies", and add the concept of learning goal to the established definition, noting that "technologies contain not just a set of methods of interaction between teacher and student, but such a set, which ensures the realization of language teaching goals — mastering language as a form of human communication" (Azimov, Shchukin, 2018: 195). A similar interpretation is given by I.P. Podlasyi, who argues that all the things mentioned above are "between the goal and the result", i.e. teaching methods and techniques, forms and means, technical capabilities and other resources (Podlasyi, 2009: 344). The works by A.M. Kushnir note the importance of creating technologies considering specific conditions and tasks of teaching (Kushnir, 1996).

It should be recognized, however, that the pragmatic nature of PT was emphasized by scientists earlier, although it was not mentioned systematically. For example, N.V. Talyzina noted that the essence of learning technologization is reduced to the selection of the most rational ways to achieve a set of learning objectives (Talyzina, 1977: 91–96). M.V. Klarin drew attention precisely to the systemic set of a variety of means used to achieve pedagogical goals, which focuses on

the personal characteristics of learners, as well as didactic tools and technologies (Klarin, 1989).

Many researchers of the turn of the century emphasize that the concept of PT is not identical to the concept of "teaching methodology"; it is much more extensive than it. Thus, G.K. Selevko gave the following comment: "In technology, target, procedural, quantitative and calculative components are most represented, and in methodology, semantic, qualitative and variant sides are represented" (Selevko, 2005a: 9). E.V. Vishnichkina in her dissertation notes the teachers' positive attitude to PT; at the same time, she emphasizes the insufficient formation of technical skills in the educational process, so the attention is focused on the qualitative aspect of the methodological process (Vishnichkina, 2000).

It is important that students play a significant role in technological theory: they act both as subjects and objects of learning. Some authors even sought to fix this feature in the definition of PT. Thus, V.M. Monakhov and his scientific school described this phenomenon as a "model of joint pedagogical activity" of the teacher and students aimed at designing, organizing and consistent comfortable implementation of the learning process (Monakhov et al., 2007). The above definition emphasizes the stage of PT implementation in practice: this semantic emphasis appeared not only in recent works, but also mentioned in UNESCO statements.

T.S. Nazarova and her coauhors suggest differentiating PT and teaching methods: PT is mainly focused on standardization of learning content, greater coherence, and consistency of the learning process, and — as a result — more predictable achievement of didactic goals (Nazarova et al., 2012; Technologies of Successful Learning, 2022). Learning effectiveness becomes a guaranteed result not only due to the *teacher's skill*, although it is very important as well, but also due to the primarily thought-out *activity of students*, focused on obtaining knowledge, skills and abilities in the process of consistent implementation of a certain algorithm of learning actions (what later became known as the *technologization* of the learning process). L.V. Zagrekova, when describing PT, draws attention to the importance of high-quality intersubjective interaction between the participants of the educational process. The author suggests proceeding from the principle of unity of the teacher and students' activities and motivation of each party in terms of achieving the didactic goal (Zagrekova, 2012). A.A. Mitskevich emphasizes the importance of special competitive knowledge and skills of teachers, as the success of learning directly depends on them (Mitskevich, 2008: 90).

Modern authors point out the importance of certain aspects of already existing PT. Thus, T.S. Grishina, N.Y. Zykova, etc. propose to consider them in an interdisciplinary aspect and primarily in relation to distance learning: within the framework of communication theory, cognitive psychology, didactics, social philosophy, behaviourism, semiotics, etc. (Pedagogical Technologies, 2019: 14). N.E. Shchurkova proposed to consider PT as an independent academic discipline and an essential element of pedagogical professionalism (Shchurkova, 2002).

A.A. Mitskevich notes the importance of PT selection and its role in the success of teaching (Mitskevich, 2008). A.N. Shchukin, L.V. Moskovkin described in detail and systematized the technologies most suitable for effective foreign language teaching (Moskovkin, Shamonina, 2017; Shchukin, 2017).

"Pedagogical technology" in foreign pedagogy

The discussion about the essence of PT, concepts of their modeling, connotations and perspective application took place not only in Russia, but abroad (in the USA and Europe), starting from the time of the technological revolution in education — 1930s. Famous scientists and methodologists-practitioners participated in the discussion (L. Anderson, E. Bisterski, J. Block, B. Bloom, D. Bruner, S. Wedemeyer, G. Geis, T. Gilbert, N. Gronlund, M. Clark, J. Carroll, V. Coscarelli, P.D. Mitchell, F. Percival, A. Romiszowski, J. Zeller, etc.) (See Pedagogical Technologies, 2019).

P.D. Mitchell was one of the first to present a clear definition of pedagogical technology in the London Encyclopaedia of Pedagogical Media, Communications and Technology in 1978: "Pedagogical technology is an area of research and practice (within the educational system) that has links (relationships) with all aspects of pedagogical system organization and the procedure for allocating resources to achieve specific and potentially reproducible results" (Pedagogy..., 2007: 293). The scientist saw the difference between PT and learning tools in the interdisciplinarity of the first concept and its close connection with all aspects of education.

A year later, in 1979, the following definition of PT was officially adopted by the Association for Pedagogical Communications and Technology in the USA: PT is "a complex, integrative process involving people, ideas, means and ways of organizing activities to analyze problems and manage their solutions, covering all aspects of knowledge acquisition" (Cit. ex: Bukharova, 2017).

Some European scientists (B. Bloom, D. Bruner, G. Geis, V. Coscarelli, etc.) (Encyclopedia..., 1999) saw the peculiarity of learning process technologization in its orientation towards scientific design and algorithmization of all pedagogical actions.

The introduction of information technologies into the sphere of education and science in the 1990s gave additional connotations to the concept of PT. For example, A. Lumsdaine associated PT with machine learning, which was to be built on the data of behavioural theory and cognitive learning theory (Cit. ex: Mitskevich, 2008: 89). G. Ellington and F. Percival associated the term "technology in education" primarily with the use of audiovisual learning tools (Ibid.).

Many ideas of foreign researchers echoed the conclusions of Russian scientists. For example, German psychologist and educator C. Wedemeyer described the essence of PT through its supra-contextual nature, as an interdisciplinary resource area of didactic knowledge and as a "system of systems", "capable of ac-

commodating the achievements of teaching, general theoretical teaching methodology, cybernetics, heuristics, communicative theory, behavioural psychology, social philosophy, etc." (Encyclopedia…, 1999).

In the 1970s, the Hungarian methodologist L. Szalai noted that technology focuses the means and resources of learning on achieving didactic goals and the overall increase of learning effectiveness (Petrenko, 2007: 226).

His colleagues E. Bisterski and J. Zeller saw a special role of the new technological system in the development of subjective effectiveness of the learning process, influencing pedagogical, psychological, personal, and cognitive thinking of both teachers and students (Bisterski, Zeller, 1977).

A group of researchers from the University of Taiwan interviewed secondary school teachers about various innovative PTs. They proceeded from the theory of planned behaviour. It was found that 85% of teachers perceived PTs as useful tools for classroom work, and about 40% of respondents indicated that there were some difficulties in using them that negatively affected the process (Chien et al., 2014: 198).

English articles on this topic show that PT is still understood as the effective use, evaluation, and adjustment of a set of opportunities, resources, and means of learning in the learning process aimed at achieving the predicted results. At the same time, the use of various technical capabilities is often considered as one of the essential aspects of learning technologization, and the teacher becomes a manager and moderator of the learning process (Izzatullaeva, Narzieva, 2021). At the same time, the compatibility of scientific and practical pedagogy with modern technologies is undoubtful (Isahonova, 2021: 550). Technologization is recognized as the optimal way of organizing educational activities (Umarova et al., 2021: 11819).

X. Perraton, F. Saba, D. Keegan are interested in the theory of distance learning and PT application. The researchers argue that it is necessary to artificially create points of contact between the teacher and the learner since independent study of the topic always follows its learning with a teacher (Pedagogical Technologies, 2019: 29–36).

There are many definitions and interpretations of the concept of PT. However, we cannot identify different fundamental approaches and classify the available theories. Generally, deductively oriented aspiration of the essence of PT as a part of the pedagogical system has shifted to the study of individual technological components, their "upgrading" resources increasing the PT potential.

Pedagogical technologies classifications

There is some ambiguity with available classifications of PT. At a conservative estimate, there are more than 50 of them, and most are based on multiple bases. This is due to the specifics of the phenomenon of PT itself; the concept is

multidimensional and generative, so modern researchers make up massive classifications. Thus, Azimov & Shchukin (2018) subdivide technologies into game, computer, training technologies, those creating a speech environment, and those forming strategies for language learning and mastering.

Bespal'ko (1989) relies on the so-called control factors and distinguishes automated and manual, cyclic and open, scattered and directed, group and individual PTs.

G.K. Selevko's encyclopaedic two-volume book describes about 500 PTs. The author proceeds from the ideas of the traditional classroom-lesson teaching system modernization, although he does not find a single basis for describing PTs. As a result, G.K. Selevko (2005b: 54–60) bases his classification on 15 parameters, for example theoretical and philosophical basis of technology, the factor of student's personal development, basic methodological approach, mechanism of knowledge and skills transfer, leading activity, teaching aids, the learning process management.

Russian scientists (Zhurakovskaya, Simakova, Rykov, 2020) base their classification of PTs on the degree of their novelty and distinguish modernized, combinatorial, and progressive technologies.

Zubkova (2017: 75–76) identifies personally oriented and subject-oriented PTs; informational, interactive learning technologies, and technologies for assessing students' achievements.

Kazakova (Technologies of Successful Learning, 2022) singles out technologies developing critical thinking and skills in working with sources of information; collective, game-based PTs, group problem discussions, and case-study technologies.

Thus, the presented classifications are diverse and most often do not seek to cover and systematize all available learning technologies. We do not aim to create another classification of teaching technologies, for it is unlikely to simplify the teacher's task and influence the effectiveness of the educational system as a whole. Our task is rather to classify the most demanded technologies for teaching a foreign language, and Russian as a foreign language as well, to use the basis for systematization conditioned by the specificity of work with language material.

Author's classification of pedagogical technologies

From our point of view, PTs in Russian language classes should be focused, firstly, on the maximum development of foreign speakers' communicative competence (communicative aspect); secondly, it should prepare them for effective professional activities in Russian (professional aspect); finally, it should expand their knowledge of Russian culture, traditions, customs, and etiquette (linguistic-country studies aspect). In addition, when selecting PTs, we considered interactivity resource and learning intensification, as well as simplicity for any teacher of Russian as a foreign language in average environmental conditions (i.e., we did

not count on specialized equipment or serious changes in the teaching mode in accordance with the curriculum for students of a particular specialization). Interactivity is understood here after the famous foreign language teacher, scientist, methodologist R. Mil'rud as purposeful coordination of efforts of subjects and objects of learning, mutually reinforcing interaction to achieve the communicative goal through pedagogically verified speech means (Mil'rud, 1991: 19). The pedagogical process intensity is described by G.A. Kitaigorodskaya as a temporal limitation of the didactic task solution with a high concentration of incidental linguistic and communicative tasks performed by students within group forms of work (Kitaigorodskaya, 1986: 103).

Thus, our classification of PTs is based on the different share of learners' communicative participation and includes three main groups of PTs; it is made up in the line with the pragmatic theory of communication, which distinguishes: a) speech action or speech act, b) speech event, c) speech genres. The traditional understanding of these notions goes back to M.M. Bakhtin's theory (Bakhtin, 1986; 1996). Following M.M. Bakhtin, *a speech action* or deed is understood as any speech act directed at the addressee with a certain purpose. *A speech event* assumes durability, space and time limitation, integrity, and social meaningfulness; in this case, the interaction of communicators has a certain form (Matveeva, 2003: 286). A speech genre is understood as a whole, complete speech work that incorporates not only linguistic features, but also extra-linguistic reality, or verbal design of a typical situation of social interaction between people (Sedov, 2007: 10).

The first group of PTs based on a simple speech action (speech act) of a learner or a set of actions / acts includes the following PTs:

– "snowball",
– PRES-formula,
– "brainstorming",
– linguistic briefing,
– quests and web quests,
– "6 thinking hats" (E. de Bono),
– mind maps.

At the same time, PTs of this group imply from the point of view of communicative participation a sequence of independent speech actions which are not stretched in time, rather "isolated", monologically oriented, requiring personal speech concentration. At this level, individual components of linguistic and communicative competence are developed.

The second group of PTs includes technologies based on a more conscious and prolonged communicative participation of several subjects of learning in speech production, speech event:

– theatre technology,
– problem-based learning technology,
– critical thinking development,
– case technology,

– quiz-technology,
– "role-playing game",
– dramatization and imitation technology,
– emotive technology.

Most of the above-mentioned PTs are based on dialogue / polylogue as a leading communicative strategy and game / game modeling / gamification as a form of implementation. These technologies require great speech efforts and emotional and cognitive costs because students take part in interpersonal interactions. However, at this level, not only various aspects of communicative competence are perfectly developed, but also professionally significant skills: team building and teamwork, the ability to build interaction with participants of the educational process, adequate understanding of tasks and their fulfilment, role switching, etc., as well as mastering some culturally significant meanings (speech etiquette, etc.).

In this group of PTs, the dialogue strategy directly correlates with game modelling; most of the PTs assume pair and/or group format and learning process interactivity. Thus, the game format provides increased motivation, concentration on tasks, and learners' involvement thanks to stimulating components, novelty, and collaboration as factors of successful achievement of the learning goal (Pidkasisti, Khaidarov, 996; Ermolaeva, 2005; Rodina, 2012). In addition to communicative and professional skills, game develops emotional intelligence and skills of building social ties, helps learners to explore different aspects of their personality, understand its resource sides and self-identification. Didactic games are most often cognitive and serve as a means of acquiring knowledge, but they also help to practice skills.

The third group includes PTs which are the most extensive in terms of conditions, time, and communicative resources; they are aimed at creating a text of a certain speech genre according to the task. This requires participants to follow certain verbal and non-verbal rules, among them the team-building ability, learning in cooperation, the ability to think critically and adequately assess the situation, the ability to creatively solve the learning tasks in accordance with the linguistic-cultural specifics of communication. This group comprises the following PTs:

– "language portfolio",
– "project technology",
– group discussion in its variants (e.g. "Aquarium"),
– rhetorization technology,
– debates,
– research technology,
– technology of excursion teaching,
– pedagogical workshop technology,
– training technologies.

The third group of technologies is the most multifunctional and has a complex integrative character for it synthesizes and combines technologies from the first and second groups, bringing them to a more complex level, enriching them

with new techniques and directions of communicative development. At the same time, the third group of technologies preserve their algorithm of realization and are applied in a different, more functional pedagogical environment. For example, the technology "Discussion" includes PTs from the first and second groups, "brainstorming", PRES-formula, "6 thinking hats"; at the same time, the technologies of problem-based learning and critical thinking development form the basis of the technology "Discussion". Consequently, smaller technologies can form a stage of the discussion, prepare for it or, on the contrary, summarize it.

The "Debate" technology can also include brainstorming, mind maps, PRES-formula, rhetorization technology, role play, critical thinking technology, etc. It is important that technologies from the first and second group have been practiced earlier, so their inclusion in the third group does not make them heavier, but, on the contrary, facilitates their implementation in the learning process and seems didactically justified.

Finally, *the pedagogical workshop technology* can be combined with mind maps, case analysis, role play and other technologies. In this case, it is important for the teacher to use the PT in the classroom according to the principles of didactic expediency and rationality, following the algorithms of technology implementation, considering the educational and communicative objectives, and developing students' motivation and intensification of learning.

Integrative PT of the third group can be implemented not only for developing students' "communicative and professional skills", but also for forming foreign-language personality, students' life position, developing their emotional intelligence and "creative potential", socialization skills, critical thinking, and teamwork skills (Strelchuk, Ilikhamu, 2022: 525).

Conclusion

Having summarized the approaches to the classification of pedagogical technologies in methodological science, we conclude that it is necessary to present and justify a new classification of teaching technologies for Russian as a foreign language classes. This classification is based on a unified principle valid for methodology and the pragmatic theory of communication. This implies an increasing complexity of communicative efforts for the didactic tasks in terms of volume, topics, structure, genre, lexical-grammatical design of a speech utterance, etc.

The developed classification is designed to connect the pedagogical technologization of the educational process with the communicative tasks that are in demand in modern linguodidactics; it asserts the innovative direction of the methodology of teaching Russian as a foreign language — increasing the efficiency of language learning and communication in a foreign language.

The prospects of the work are seen in the creation of a textbook containing the theoretical basis for pedagogical technologies integration in the educational

process in accordance with the level of foreign speakers' language proficiency and the professional orientation of educational programs.

References

Azimov, E.G., & Shchukin, A.N. (2018). *Contemporary dictionary of methodological terms and concepts (theory and practice of language teaching*). Moscow: Russkii yazyk Publ. (In Russ.).

Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Literary and critical articles*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura Publ. (In Russ.).

Bakhtin, M.M. (1996). The problem of speech genres. In M.M. Bakhtin *Collected works*. In 5 vol. Vol. 5 (pp. 159–207). Moscow: Russian Dictionaries Publ. (In Russ.).

Batyshev, S.Y. (Ed.). (1999). Pedagogical technologies. In *Encyclopedia of professional education*. In 3 vol. Vol. 3. Moscow: Nauka Publ. (In Russ.).

Bespal'ko, V.P. (1989). *Constituents of pedagogical technology*. Moscow: Pedagogika Publ. (In Russ.).

Bisterski, E., & Zeller, J. (1977). Teaching technology. In *International seminar on teaching technology*: Final document (pp. 215–223). Budapest. (In Russ.).

Bogolyubov, V.I. (1996). *Introduction to pedagogical technology*. Pyatigorsk: PGLU Publ. (In Russ.).

Bogolyubov, V.I. (1991). Pedagogical technology: evolution of the concept. *Sovetskaya pedagogika*, (9), 123–128. (In Russ.).

Bogolyubov, V.I. (1999). *Theoretical bases of construction of modern pedagogical technologies: on the material of English-speaking sources*. (Doctoral dissertation, Pyatigorsk). (In Russ.).

Bukharova, G.D. (2017). On the essence of the concepts of "Technology" and "Pedagogical technology". *Mastery online*, (1). (In Russ.). http://ripo.unibel.by/index.php?id=2721

Chien, S.P., Wu, H.K., & Hsu, Y.S. (2014). An investigation of teachers' beliefs and their use of technology-based assessments. *Computers in Human Behavior*, (31), 198–210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.10.037

Encyclopedia of professional education. In 3 vol. Vol. 3. Moscow: Nauka Publ. (In Russ.).

Ermolaeva, M.G. (2005). *Game in the educational process: methodical manual*. St. Petersburg: SPb APPO Publ. (In Russ.).

Glossary of terms in educational technology. (1986). Paris: UNESCO. (In Russ.).

Grishina, T. S., & Zykova, N. Y. (2019). Pedagogical technologies. Voronezh: FGBOU VO "VGIFK" Publ. (In Russ.).

Isahonova, Z. (2021). Pedagogical technologies and pedagogical skills. *ORIENSS*, (5), 550–557.

Izzatullaeva, M.Sh., & Narzieva, M.S. (2021). The usage of pedagogical technologies in teaching. *Proceeding of international conference on research innovation in multidisciplinary sciences* (pp. 161–164). New York.

Kazakova, E.I. (Ed.). (2022). *Technologies of successful learning: educational-methodical manual*. St. Petersburg: SPBU Publ. (In Russ.).

Kitaigorodskaya, G.A. (1986). Methodology of intensive teaching of foreign languages. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola Publ. (In Russ.).

Klarin, M.V. (1989). *Pedagogical technology in the educational process. Analysis of foreign experience*. Moscow: Znanie Publ. (In Russ.).

Kukushin, V.S. (Ed.). (2006). *Pedagogical technologies*. Moscow; Rostov-on-Don: Mart Publ. (In Russ.).

Kushnir, A.M. (1996). Pedagogy of literacy. *Shkol'nye tekhnologii*, (4-5), 98–102. (In Russ.).

Lavrent'ev, G.V., & Lavrent'eva, N.B. (2002). *Innovative teaching technologies in professional training of specialists*. Barnaul: ASU Publ. (In Russ.).

Likhachev, B.T. (1999). *Pedagogy. Course of lectures: textbook for students of pedagogical educational institutions and students of IFE and FFE*. Moscow: Yurait Publ. (In Russ.).

Matveeva, T.V. (2003). *Training dictionary: Russian language, speech culture, stylistics, rhetoric.* Moscow: Flinta: Nauka Publ. (In Russ.).

Mil'rud, R.P. (1991). Cooperation at the lesson of a foreign language. *Foreign languages at school*, (6), 18–26. (In Russ.).

Mitskevich, A.A. (2008). Pedagogical technologies and their influence on the success of schoolchildren training. *Man and Education*, (4), 89–93. (In Russ.).

Monakhov, V.M., Bakhusova, E.V., & Oleinikova, I.A. (2007). *Pedagogical technology of V.M. Monakhov from A to Z: Self-teacher of designing the educational process*. Lipetsk: Lipetsk Institute of Education Development Publ. (In Russ.).

Moskovkin, L.V., & Shamonina, G.N. (2017). *Productive innovative technologies in teaching Russian as a foreign languag*e. Moscow: Russkii yazyk Publ. (In Russ.).

Nazarova, T.S., Tikhomirova, K.M., & Kudina, I.Yu. (2012). *Instrumental didactics: promising means, environments and technologies of teaching*. Moscow: St. Petersburg: Nestor-istoriya Publ. (In Russ.).

Pestalozzi, I.G. (2001). *Harmonious human development. Traditions of European education*. In M.V. Klarina (Ed.). Moscow: Amrita Publ. (In Russ.).

Petrenko, I.A. (2007). Retrospective analysis of the concept of "Pedagogical technology" in Russian and foreign pedagogy XX – early XXI centuries. *Siberian pedagogical journal*, (11), 221–232. (In Russ.).

Pidkasisti, P.I., & Khaidarov, J.S. (1996). *Game technology in teaching and development*. Moscow: MPU; Rospedagenstvo Publ. (In Russ.).

Podlasyi, I.P. (2009). *Pedagogy*. Moscow: Yurait Publ. (In Russ.).

Rodina, N.E. (2012). Business game as a technology of formation of social competencies of students. In *Materials of VI scientific and practical conference "Pedagogical achievements of the teachers-winners of the NSPO – the potential of the new school of the Moscow region* (pp. 164–166). Moscow: SEI Pedagogicheskaya akademiya Publ. (In Russ.).

Sedov, K.S. (2007). Man in the genre space of everyday communication. In *Anthology of speech genres: everyday communication* (pp. 7–38). Moscow: Labirint Publ. (In Russ.).

Selevko, G.K. (2005a). *Alternative pedagogical technologies*. Moscow: Narodnoe Obrazovanie; RI ST Publ. (In Russ.).

Selevko, G.K. (2005b). *Encyclopedia of educational technologies*. In 2 vol. Vol. 1. Moscow: Narodnoe Obrazovanie Publ. (In Russ.).

Shchukin, A.N. (2017). *Methods and technologies of teaching foreign languages*. In S.V. Fomina (Ed.). Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Ikar Publ. (In Russ.)

Shchurkova, N.E. (2002). *Pedagogical technology*. Moscow: Pedagogical Society of Russia Publ. (In Russ.).

Smirnova, S.A. (Ed.). (2007). *Pedagogy: theories, systems, technologies: a textbook for higher and secondary educational institutions*. 7th ed. Moscow: Academia Publ. (In Russ.).

Strelchuk, E.N., & Ilikhamu, S. (2022). Teaching Russian to Uyghurs in PRC universities: pedagogical toolkit of nationally oriented methods. *Russian Language Studies, 20*(4), 515–530. https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2022-20-4-515-530

Talyzina, N.F. (1977). Teaching technology and its place in pedagogical theory. *Sovremennaya vysshaya shkola*, (1), 91–96. (In Russ.).

Umarova, N.Z., Abdushukurova, Z.Z., & Tsagaraeva, O.B. (2021). Use of Innovative Pedagogical Technologies in Education. *Nat. Volatiles & Essent. Oils, 8*(5), 11814–11819.

Vishnichkina, E.V. (2000). *Attitude of teachers to modern pedagogical technologies*. (Candidate dissertation, Kaliningrad). (In Russ.).

Zagrekova, L.V. (2012). Pedagogical technology: theoretical and methodological aspect. *Nauka i shkola*, (4). (In Russ.).

Zhurakovskaya, V., Sichinava, A., Simakova, T., Olicheva, O., Rykov, S., & others. (2020). Innovations in Education – The Development of a New Pedagogical Technology of a Combinational Type, Focused on the Development of Personality of Students. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 6*(4). https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc6040123

Zubkova, L.A. (2017). Pedagogical technologies in modern education. *Vestnik Donetskogo pedagogicheskogo instituta*, (2), 73–81. (In Russ.).

Bio notes:

Irina A. Leshutina, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Professor at the Department of Teaching Russian as a Foreign Language, Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, 6 Akademika Volgina St., Moscow, 117485, Russian Federation. *Research interests*: methods of teaching Russian as a foreign language, pedagogical / game technologies in teaching foreign languages, professionally oriented teaching Russian as a foreign language, pedagogical rhetoric and psychology. ORCID: 0000-0002-3432-2994. SPIN-code: 1071-3241. E-mail: leshirish@mail.ru

Maria A. Davydova, Lecturer at the Department of Comparative Analysis of Languages, Lomonosov Moscow State University, 1 Leninskie gory, bldg. 13, Moscow, 11999, Russian Federation. *Research interests:* teaching Russian as a foreign language, lexicology, lexical semantics, media linguistic, comparative studies in the field of lexis and phraseology. ORCID: 0000-0001-6906-5732. SPIN-code: 6839-2667. E-mail: mdav95@mail.ru

Elena N. Strelchuk, Doctor of Pedagogy, Associate Professor at the Department of Russian Language and Methods of Teaching, Philological Faculty, RUDN University, 10 Miklukho-Maklaya St., bldg. 2, Moscow, 117198, Russian Federation. *Research interests:* methods of teaching Russian as a foreign language, native and non-native language, applied cultural linguistics, speech culture. ORCID: 0000-0003-2161-3722. SPIN-code: 3397-3210. E-mail: strelchukl@mail.ru

DOI: 10.22363/2618-8163-2024-22-4-681-697
EDN: EUETJG

Научная статья

Педагогическая технология в методике преподавания русского языка как иностранного: трансформация понятия и авторская классификация

И.А. Лешутина[1], М.А. Давыдова[2], Е.Н. Стрельчук[3]

[1]Государственный институт русского языка им. А.С. Пушкина, *Москва, Российская Федерация*
[2]Московский государственный университет им. М.В. Ломоносова, *Москва, Российская Федерация*
[3]Российский университет дружбы народов, *Москва, Российская Федерация*
✉ leshirish@mail.ru

Аннотация. Педагогическая технология — одно из активно употребляемых понятий научно-педагогического дискурса, получившее несколько десятков определений, трактовок и интерпретаций. Цель исследования — оценить валидность использования педагогических технологий на занятиях по русскому языку как иностранному (РКИ) и предложить авторскую классификацию на основе унифицированного коммуникативно значимого принципа с учетом уже известных в методической науке разнообразных подходов к их трактовке и систематизации. Материалами исследования стали более 40 определений феномена «педагогическая технология» и около 10 их классификаций. Использованы методы анализа, синтеза, обобщения, сопоставления, сравнения. В результате предложена систематизация имеющихся в российской и зарубежной методической науке подходов к трактовке педагогических технологий, а также авторская классификация педагогических технологий с позиции коммуникативного принципа. В основе классификации лежат понятия: речевой поступок / речевое действие, речевое событие и речевой жанр. Приведены примеры конкретных педагогических технологий, распределенных на три группы в зависимости от затраченных учащимися коммуникативных усилий, показаны возможности сочетания различных технологий и их синергия в процессе обучения РКИ. Перспективы исследования заключаются в создании учебного пособия, содержащего теоретические основы интеграции педагогических технологий в учебный процесс в соответствии с уровнем языковой подготовки инофонов и профессиональной направленностью.

Ключевые слова: дидактическая задача, классификация педагогических технологий, геймификация, коммуникативная компетенция, речевой жанр

Вклад авторов: *Лешутина И.А.* — концепция исследования, научное консультирование, общая концепция статьи, обработка результатов исследования, написание и редактирование статьи; *Давыдова М.А.* — анализ литературы, подбор первичного материала, обобщение опыта исследователей, сбор данных, анализ данных и полученных результатов, обработка материала, написание статьи; *Стрельчук Е.Н.* — формирование выводов, проведение анализа научной литературы по теме, оформление списка использованных источников, научное редактирование.

Конфликт интересов: Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

История статьи: поступила в редакцию 11.04.2024; принята к печати 28.07.2024.

Для цитирования: *Лешутина И.А., Давыдова М.А., Стрельчук Е.Н.* Педагогическая технология в методике преподавания русского языка как иностранного: трансформация понятия и авторская классификация // Русистика. 2024. Т. 22. № 4. С. 681–697. http://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2024-22-4-681-697